

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

San Diego, California
Thursday, April 30, 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 RANDY FISHER
4 Executive Director, Pacific States Marine
5 Fisheries Commission(PSMFC)

6 KEN FRANKE
President, Sportfishing Association of California

7 MICAH McCARTY
8 Executive Officer
Nisqually Tribal Council

9 MIKE OKONIEWSKI
10 Pacific Coast Seafood

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

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

15 PETER SHELLEY
Conservation Law Foundation

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

19 NOAA Fisheries Participants:

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

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

* * * * *

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
Offshore Aquaculture 6

DON KENT, Director, Hubbs-Sea World Research
Institute

Close Out: Review of Decision, Action Items,
Next Steps

KEITH RIZZARDI, Chair

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

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

2 (8:31 a.m.)

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you for being
4 here promptly. I know we've, in addition to
5 Micah, had a few members who had other business.

6 Ken Franke had to run, as well, but I
7 want to recognize Ken for organizing last night's
8 social event. It was good to see some folks from
9 the community, and looking forward to meeting more
10 of them on Friday, on our boat excursion, and
11 spending a little bit more social time with all of
12 you today.

13 MR. RHEAULT: Point of order, Mr.
14 Chairman -- if somebody failed to pay their bill
15 last night, talk to me after.

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Those things
17 happen when you're at a happy hour, I suppose, so
18 thank you for helping out, Bob, and we'll figure
19 out if we can fix that for you.

20 Any other outstanding issues like that
21 that I need to (inaudible)? Anybody else pick up
22 a bill?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 All right, somebody else go and quietly
2 settle up with Bob, and we'll figure it out.

3 But this morning, we've got with us Don
4 Kent -- is the President and CEO of Hubbs-Sea
5 World Research Institute. He is also a former
6 MAFAC Chair. So, he has been around, doing this
7 stuff for many years. Don has been a tremendous
8 resource for me in my effort to research
9 aquaculture. I'm grateful to him for sending me
10 all sorts of great PowerPoints and information.
11 And he is here to share his vast wealth of
12 knowledge to get us started this morning, and to
13 introduce us to the future of aquaculture.

14 Thanks, Don.

15 MR. KENT: (inaudible). Ladies and
16 gentlemen, I wasn't the Chair of MAFAC; I was a
17 member for six years, and it was a great
18 experience for me, having that long-term goal.

19 Anyway, what I want to talk about is
20 Rose Canyon Fisheries, which is an enterprise and
21 undertaking.

22 But I'd like to first -- got to turn on

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- that's right -- there we are -- a little
2 perspective. Now I'm a native San Diegan. I, you
3 know, lived out (inaudible) high school; drove
4 down to the big city here to go to movies and
5 things like that -- (inaudible) and things like
6 that.

7 Anyway -- and back when I was a kid,
8 Southern California/Long Beach/San Pedro/San Diego
9 were the tuna capital of the world. We had 40,000
10 seafood jobs. We had 16 canneries, and more
11 seafood being landed here than anywhere else in
12 the U.S. That's pretty much gone now. We have
13 about 500 seafood/tuna jobs for Bumblebee. The
14 corporate offices are still here in San Diego
15 (inaudible) in the Western Pacific.

16 In perspective, for commercial fishing
17 in California, this is the 2013 commercial catch
18 reported by county. And you'll see in the
19 northern end of the state, we have fairly good
20 volume; worth quite a bit. This is the Dungeness
21 crab fishery.

22 But down here in San Diego -- remember,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we used to be the tuna capital of the world --
2 we're down to about 1,000 metric tons a year --
3 worth about \$8 million. And we've seen a big
4 change in the economy of San Diego. The Navy's
5 always been the biggest contributor. Tourism --
6 it used to be fisheries number two, and then
7 tourism -- well, fisheries is way down.

8 Bioindustry, biocom industry is much bigger now
9 than anything that ever went on in fisheries.

10 But the point of this being that we have
11 a lot of infrastructure in San Diego. If you
12 walked down to the docks where you'll see artwork
13 now, and great restaurants, and everything, used
14 to be two or three tuna boats side-tied to one
15 another with the nets laid out on the dock. That
16 industry is gone now.

17 So, the infrastructure, in large part,
18 is gone, as well. We still have the capacity to
19 have a greater use of that infrastructure for the
20 seafood industry. And that's going to come from
21 primarily the development of aquaculture
22 (inaudible). Now this is the 1,000 metric tons

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 broken out by value. Over half of our value
2 coming into San Diego is lobsters, and that's
3 basically a single guy out on a skip, putting his
4 traps out, taking them back in the next day. And
5 a lot of that's even exported. The rest of it's a
6 mix of spot prawn, sea urchin roe -- very high-end
7 species. We actually have probably the highest
8 value per unit sold here of anywhere else in the
9 state, but we just don't have a large volume.

10 Now let's compare that to agriculture in
11 the State of California. We have a \$43-billion
12 agricultural economy, 400 different economies,
13 81,000 farms from the northern part of the state,
14 all the way down. But aquaculture is about -- the
15 \$12 billion that comes from livestock out of the
16 \$43 billion, only about \$54 million of that is
17 aquaculture. And, you know, we have one of the
18 longest coastlines in the U.S., and we have one of
19 the largest EEZs of any state in the union.

20 So, there's potential here, and there's
21 a mindset for agriculture being a part of our
22 economy. And when we think about aquaculture,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 it's simply another form of agriculture -- except
2 in this case, we'll be doing it out in open water.

3 So, along comes Rose Canyon Fisheries.
4 This is a project we've been preparing for for
5 several decades. And we recently, in partnership
6 with a group, Cuna del Mar -- it's an investment
7 group that is investing in aquaculture. They now
8 open the AquaPod company. They have the primary
9 ownership of the OceanSpar, the folks that made
10 the SeaStations. They took primary ownership of
11 Open Blue, which is a cobia farm off of Panama,
12 started by Brian O'Hanlon. And they have a
13 startup farm in La Paz that's working on
14 (inaudible). I think there's a very interesting
15 opportunity for MAFAC to consider -- that is, the
16 upcoming closure of the northern end of the Sea of
17 Cortez to protect the vaquita dolphin.

18 How are we going to displace the loss of
19 fishing jobs? Totoaba is a very popular species.
20 It, too, is endangered, and the primary reason
21 that the vaquita is going endangered is the
22 poaching of the totoaba for the Asian medicine

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible).

2 So, the culture of totoaba -- which is
3 something very similar to the white sea bass,
4 which we culture -- could help displace that loss
5 of economy, and, therefore, take pressure off of
6 fisheries, and hopefully help in the recovery of
7 the vaquita.

8 So, Rose Canyon Fisheries -- what we
9 intend to do is demonstrate the technologies that
10 are available now, and constantly work with
11 researchers and regulatory agencies to improve
12 that technology over the years -- will grow out to
13 a maximum of 5,000 metric tons per year of
14 production, and with an ex-vessel value of
15 somewhere between \$50 to \$80 million.

16 Now this is one farm, and 5,000 metric
17 tons is five times the production of what we're
18 getting in all of our captured fisheries in San
19 Diego. So, this would be a very large, immediate
20 increase to the value of the seafood industry in
21 San Diego. And, more importantly, it would
22 demonstrate the capacity that could be applied in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 other parts of the country, as well.

2 These are the species we're primarily
3 interested in working with. We can close the
4 culture loop on all of these. The yellowtail jack
5 or California yellowtail is very similar to the
6 jack (inaudible) yellowtail. It's suitable for
7 hamachi trade. All of the hamachi we eat in the
8 United States is farmed, but it's farmed in the
9 Western Pacific, primarily in Japan or in
10 Australia. Probably 90, 95 percent is farmed in
11 Japan.

12 So, what's great about this is, we're
13 the only part of the U.S. that has this species.
14 It's suitable for import that we're already
15 bringing in, and it doesn't compete with the wild
16 capture of the yellowtail, which isn't suitable
17 for hamachi.

18 So, what we'll be doing is creating new
19 seafood jobs in San Diego -- taking fishermen,
20 giving them a new paradigm for seafood production
21 that doesn't displace existing fisheries, but,
22 rather, displaces imports -- so thereby lowering

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the carbon footprint of the fish that's provided.

2 So, another species -- white sea bass is
3 one we've been working with for some time -- over
4 30 years now. It's a member of the croaker
5 family. It's similar to the totoaba in the Gulf
6 of Mexico; other members are red drum, spotted sea
7 trout, spotted (inaudible) fish on the East Coast
8 -- very popular species, but isn't legal until
9 it's about eight pounds -- about five years old.
10 And it's a very short fishery -- maybe six to
11 eight weeks long. And this could provide a
12 year-round supply of fish being grown to about a
13 kilo in size.

14 Striped bass is another species. This
15 is an introduced species to California back in the
16 1880s. It's very popular all over the country.
17 It's a designated recreational species in
18 California. It can only be sold if it's cultured,
19 but, unfortunately, there's a lot of concern about
20 this species because of potential (inaudible).

21 We have endangered strains of rainbow
22 trout that used to inhabit streams. The problem

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we have with rainbow trout or steelhead trout in
2 Southern California isn't the pervasion of other
3 species; it's the fact that we don't have water
4 flow back into our ocean anymore down our rivers.
5 But I think that's really a non-problem.

6 What we're going to be doing is putting
7 that on the back burner and focusing on the
8 yellowtail. But we like to include all these so
9 we can demonstrate to folks that there are
10 multiple species that are available to be cultured
11 if we spent the time developing the hatchery
12 infrastructure to supply them. And then all of
13 these would have substantial markets available to
14 them.

15 The site -- we're located down here, in
16 San Diego, and the site would be about four and a
17 half miles off the coast in federal waters. We
18 picked this site. We're interacting with
19 commercial and recreational fishermen, working
20 with the local NOAA Fisheries office, Southwest
21 Fisheries Science Center, to make sure we avoided
22 critical habitats. We're working with the Coast

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Guard and with the Navy to make sure we're not in
2 anybody's way.

3 These red lines represent -- if you were
4 (inaudible) over San Clemente Island, you'd be
5 north of our operation. Catalina sort of would be
6 far north of it. And the idea here is, what can
7 you do to minimize impacts on existing uses of the
8 ocean? And, of course, that leads into the whole
9 concept of marine spatial planning.

10 Permits that we're seeking -- we've
11 submitted applications to the Environmental
12 Protection Agency. And after six months of
13 deliberation back and forth between the Army Corps
14 for the Section X permit we need to get from them,
15 and from the EPA for the NPDS permit we need to
16 acquire. They finally decided that the EPA should
17 be the lead agency, but the EPA doesn't feel it
18 has the experience to undertake the NEPA
19 certification, the NEPA review.

20 So, NOAA's generously stepped up and
21 said, "Well, we'd be happy to be a collaborating
22 agency." And so now we're going to spend a couple

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of weeks or a couple of months chatting back and
2 forth about who's going to be responsible for
3 what, and getting that done.

4 The permits themselves are relatively
5 straightforward. An NPDS is -- this is the point
6 source discharge, this is what we're going to do,
7 here's the sampling protocol. If you violate
8 this, this, or this, you shut down. EPA knows how
9 to do that. The Army Corps of Engineers
10 (inaudible) engineering problem. You're going to
11 put something out in the ocean. What's it going
12 to be do? What's the drive coefficients? How
13 much anchorage (inaudible) configuration of
14 anchorage? What are your engineers telling us we
15 need to know?

16 The NEPA's where it really becomes
17 complicated, because there's environmental
18 concern, and NEPA requires the input from not only
19 all the agencies, but also the community at large
20 -- which is fine. We've been doing a lot of work
21 getting out there, informing people what we're
22 trying to do here.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 At the same time, it's a cumbersome
2 process. And if people don't really understand
3 how to undertake it, then it becomes a difficult
4 and lengthy process. But, thankfully, NOAA has a
5 lot of experience with NEPA, so we're feeling good
6 about that.

7 Additional permits -- U.S. Coast Guard
8 (inaudible) navigation. Now within the NOAA
9 consultation will be NOAA essential fish habitat,
10 endangered species, and mammal/wildlife
11 interaction. We'll talk a little bit about those
12 in a minute.

13 On the California level, we are seeking
14 a registration from the California Department of
15 Fish and Wildlife. Even though we're in federal
16 waters, and you can't permit the site itself, the
17 juvenile fish go back and forth. The product
18 comes back in. All of a sudden, there's 5,000
19 tons of small yellowtail on the dock. I think the
20 wards would like to know when that's going to
21 happen so they're not surprised.

22 And we are -- Pam could tell you better

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 than I could, but there are certain qualifications
2 as far moving fish, and certifying them being
3 healthy before you put them into the open ocean.

4 So, that would help us with that part of
5 it. And then the Coastal Commission -- we've
6 required from them a consistency review of the
7 Coastal Act.

8 So, San Diego's ideally suited for this.
9 We've got a mild Mediterranean climate, where our
10 coastline curves into Southern California
11 (inaudible) is shaded from large farm activity in
12 the Channel Islands, as well as the offshore
13 islands off sea (inaudible) protect us from very
14 large seas.

15 And it's interesting that we use the
16 analogy of the Mediterranean. This is a picture
17 of the Mediterranean Sea, and all these pushpins
18 represent locations where commercial cage farming
19 is undertaken. 250,000 metric tons a year of sea
20 bream and sea bass is grown in the Mediterranean
21 Sea. And we're starting to see it in our markets.
22 This (inaudible) here on the white is an import

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 from Greece that's in Whole Foods, a little bit
2 north of here, in La Jolla. I shot a picture of
3 that one day as I was walking around in the store.
4 And it's interesting. It's sustainably farmed in
5 Greece -- 7,000 miles away -- and it's \$12.99 a
6 pound.

7 Now why are we importing a one-pound,
8 one-and-a-half-pound fish from 7,000 miles away
9 when we can grow it ourselves four mach off to sea
10 -- and use the same environmentally sustainable
11 stand that seems to be suitable for Whole Foods
12 and the consumers that buy the product?

13 So, economic benefits: We're working on
14 this. We got some initial help from the NOAA
15 Fisheries Center, the Southwest Fisheries Science
16 Center -- their economists there. If you look at
17 the financials of the program, go about eight
18 years out, when we're in equilibrium, and we're
19 5,000 tons of production -- we could realize
20 anywhere from \$50 to \$80 million in gross sales,
21 with an economic overall benefit -- based on
22 wages, taxes, and everything else -- of about \$120

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 million a year.

2 Now this is based on a study done on
3 shellfish. So, this is being refined now by some
4 economists from the local economic development
5 corporation here in San Diego, in collaboration
6 with the Southwest folks.

7 So, addressing concerns -- this is
8 something, as environmentalists -- our research
9 organization is a problem-solving organization.
10 We're out there to find out how human populations
11 can work in the open ocean, can work along the
12 coastal zones, and not be an adverse impact on the
13 environment, not adversely impact the animals that
14 live there.

15 So, these are a wide range of
16 problems/suggested issues. I won't go through all
17 of them in detail, but it was interesting -- I
18 attended a workshop in Long Beach last week, and
19 I'll describe some of the results of what they
20 found there.

21 Not impacting other (inaudible) --
22 originally, we were going to put the farm here, in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 this purple square. And there's some habitat
2 there, on the outside edge of that, that was of
3 concern to the NOAA Fisheries Center. And there's
4 one commercial fisherman here in San Diego -- the
5 fishers for (inaudible) on hard-bottom substrate
6 (inaudible). So, at their request, we moved the
7 old project a little bit -- about a
8 mile-and-a-half south, southeast -- just a little
9 bit closer to shore, but same type of habitat
10 consideration; appropriate sandy bottom and the
11 right kind of current flow.

12 So, when we talk about these conflicts
13 between other uses and how do we develop a game
14 plan for the development of aquaculture, the phase
15 "marine spatial planning" comes up quite a bit.
16 So, this is already being worked on. The
17 California Sea Grant Program has funded the
18 University of California-Santa Barbara Bren School
19 to start looking at that. And we've been
20 interacting with them, telling them the criteria
21 -- you need to be deeper than 100 feet and
22 shallower than 300 feet. You need to avoid sewage

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 out poles. There's lots of things you need to
2 avoid. There's lots of things that you need to
3 look for.

4 And in doing that analysis, they've
5 identified over 500 square kilometers of area from
6 Santa Barbara to San Diego that would be suitable
7 for aquaculture development -- both shellfish and
8 finfish -- in Southern California.

9 Entanglements -- this is something that
10 our research organization has a lot of experience
11 with, and NOAA's folks have certainly the desire
12 to reduce bycatch. But one of the things to keep
13 in mind is, when we think about aquaculture as
14 fishing -- which is, you know, the determination
15 that's been made on several levels within the
16 federal agency -- fishing gear's designed to catch
17 and ensnare animals. Our gear is designed to keep
18 animals in or animals out. And it's quite a bit
19 different than the types of equipment that's
20 bothersome to these animals right now.

21 An example of this would be the farm
22 that exists within the Marine Whale Sanctuary in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the Hawaiian Islands. If you look at the big
2 island of Hawaii on the Kona Coast, this part of
3 the sanctuary there, this is the location of a
4 farm that's been there for well over a decade.
5 It's the former Kona Blue farm. It was started by
6 Neil Sims. And there's never been an entanglement
7 or a problem between whales in that locations and
8 the farm.

9 And the reason for that is that the
10 cages themselves are moored to the bottom with a
11 grid system that's comprised of very thick rope
12 that's tensioned by the current. We're not
13 talking about a 3/8-inch polypropylene that's
14 limply hanging there and attached to (inaudible)
15 on the bottom; if a whale swims by, it can catch
16 on the (inaudible) and get entangled. And the
17 cage material itself is made out of an extruded
18 plastic that's very strong, and where there's been
19 problems in the past with bull sharks biting
20 through mesh bags or mesh cages, this has been
21 tested and is demonstrated to keep the fish in and
22 the sharks and marine mammals out.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, what about environmental impacts
2 from effluent, from discharge -- too much feed
3 going into the water, or dissolved or sellable
4 salt?

5 So, (inaudible) again has funded a
6 program with these mixed principal
7 co-investigators -- the Department of Fish and
8 Wildlife, two gentlemen from the National Ocean
9 Service, Paul Olin from California Sea Grant
10 Program, Jerry Schubel from the Aquarium of the
11 Pacific to do educational outreach, Diane Windham
12 from NOAA Fisheries. She's our California
13 aquaculture coordinator -- and Dale Kiefer and
14 Jack Rensel are with Science Systems and
15 Applications. They're the modelers.

16 And so this is the presentation that
17 Jack did. I don't know how much experience you
18 guys have with listening to modelers. I won't go
19 into the excruciating detail about every little
20 parameter (inaudible) I'm going to show you some
21 pictures, okay?

22 So, basically, what you do here is, you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 take the physiology of the animal -- how fast does
2 it grow, how does it utilize the nutrients, what
3 are the discharges? We have a graduate student
4 that sat there and measured the settling rate
5 (inaudible). You know, I don't know if he ever
6 got that turned into a thesis or not, but these
7 are the types of input parameters that have to be
8 evaluated in order to make estimates.

9 Then you look at the characteristics of
10 the site in question. You look at the hydrography
11 of it, the depth, the water temperature, the flow.
12 You look at the metabolism of the bottom. You
13 look at the interaction between the aerobic and
14 the anaerobic players. You also look at what's
15 going on in the distribution of soluble ions --
16 nitrogen, phosphorous -- and you can also look at
17 the depletion of oxygen.

18 So, the system draws upon GIS databases.
19 This is the location of the farm; although we
20 don't have much interest in what the roads look
21 like in San Diego in this particular analysis, it
22 gives you an idea of the level of detail that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 would be available.

2 We then deploy our acoustic Doppler
3 current profiler, 300 feet of water at the site.
4 That sits there for five months, looking up
5 through the waterfall and giving the velocity of
6 the current and the direction of the current. And
7 then this is turned into a rosette. So,
8 (inaudible) that basically tells you, at different
9 depths, the direction and the intensity of the
10 current, okay? And then from that, that goes into
11 the modeling of the program. And it gives you
12 output like this.

13 The system will be two grids of 24 cages
14 each. I believe this is the oxygen -- that shows
15 the liner depletion of oxygen over time, and then
16 how that movement of that depletion of oxygen
17 occurs. And then what you see is, as that small
18 drop in oxygen simply (inaudible) recharges into
19 the water column.

20 This is an interesting one. One of the
21 concerns is with the bottom. It's really about
22 what happens on the bottom. When you hear about

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sand farming in Chile or the early problems with
2 sand farming in the Pacific Northwest, it was
3 because they put farms in protected areas without
4 much water movement. The tidal material or any
5 food that dropped to the bottom, it would shift
6 the metabolism at the bottom from aerobic to
7 anaerobic. There was indicators of -- you'd do
8 basically sulfite analyses, to see if you've
9 shifted, and the bottom is now producing sulfites.

10 So, what you want to do is avoid that,
11 and you do that by getting the right depth, and
12 the right current, and the right biomass being
13 developed. And this is what this basically is
14 predicting -- is that, at the cage site and around
15 it, they've caught 5,600 metric tons of standing
16 stock. What we'll see is an increase of about 0.2
17 percent from the background level of carbon on the
18 bottom. And that's really below the detectable
19 level. It's probably below the sampling
20 differential within samples.

21 And this is the type of information you
22 can put forward to the EPA and tell them, "Well,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 here's our plan for sampling" -- because one of
2 the things we want to do is validate this model.
3 We want to create this as a tool that can be used
4 for siting other farms, looking predictively at
5 what happens when multiple farms are in different
6 locations but in close proximity to one another.
7 What's the cumulative effects?

8 This is all based on decades of research
9 on salmon farms. They looked at cobia in warm
10 waters. They've looked at (inaudible) in Hawaii.
11 But this is going to be the first applicable in
12 water this deep, with the temperate water farm.
13 So, it'll be interesting to see how those output
14 variables, those predicted models work with these
15 species in this location, and then use that to
16 expand from there. That was the term that was
17 used -- tools for rules. Thank you.

18 So, what's going on here is that we're
19 starting to develop a suite of tools that can be
20 used by coastal regulators, federal agencies, to
21 take a look at what impacts there are for
22 aquaculture along the coastline, and how we can

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 either eliminate or at least mitigate those
2 impacts.

3 So, in 1980, the National Aquaculture
4 Act basically said it's the policy of the United
5 States that aquaculture is something we need to be
6 developing. And we need to encourage the
7 implementation of the technology and the
8 development of private commercial aquaculture
9 enterprises.

10 Now I had another slide that showed 50
11 different policies, and strategic plans, and
12 everything else that talked about the development
13 of aquaculture. But the reality is, when this was
14 written in the law, it cites that we're importing
15 50 percent of our seafood. We're now importing 91
16 percent of our seafood. It also said we're only
17 growing three percent of our food. Now we're
18 growing three and a half percent of our seafood.
19 We're not living up to what Congress told us we
20 ought to be doing, and it's time to move that
21 forward.

22 One of the things that was formed from

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that was the Interagency Working Group, which was
2 cochaired by the U.S. Department of Agriculture
3 and the U.S. Department of Commerce. Right now,
4 Gene Kim sits as Chair. Gene was the head of the
5 Sea Grant Program under OAR. He's now with the
6 Research Division of the Sea Grant Program, and
7 he's now with USDA.

8 Anyway, they established back in 2014
9 nine priorities for federal funding for advancing
10 aquaculture development -- improve nutrition,
11 novel feeds, create skilled workforce, the
12 socioeconomic and business research to advance
13 domestic -- employ genetics to increase
14 productivity and protect natural populations.

15 These are all great goals, and they all
16 make sense. But the only way we can really
17 advance them is within the context of existing
18 operations. There's no sense trying to come up
19 with all this if we're never going to use the
20 technology. And that's really what we're trying
21 to do now. At this moment in time, we have the
22 capacity to use existing technologies that are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 used around the world, use tools that have been
2 developed -- by NOAA, by Sea Grant, by
3 investigators around the country -- to evaluate
4 and improve upon those techniques to supply a
5 market we know already exists.

6 But the best way to realize this and
7 move this forward is to have actual farms that can
8 be worked on so we can identify what the novel
9 feeds ought to be. The feeds that need to be
10 developed are species-specific. And if what we
11 really want to do is create the lowest carbon
12 footprint supply of feed for a given species, then
13 we shouldn't be trying to import anchoveta from
14 Peru, send it to Canada to turn it into a fish
15 feed that we then bring down here.

16 We ought to be able to take fish
17 trimmings from local processors, grind that up,
18 mix it with soybean that we can get from Nebraska
19 -- now we have all the product, all the source
20 that goes into that feed coming from the U.S. And
21 then we turn that into a feed we take four miles
22 off sea, feed to a fish, bring that fish in, filet

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the fish; whatever's left over goes back into a
2 feed mill and turns into the next generation of
3 fish we're going to eat.

4 I just met with a researcher here in San
5 Diego two Fridays ago who has a process where they
6 take agricultural waste, put it in a fermenter,
7 create a high-grade protein and oil that can then
8 be turned around and used as a fish meal
9 replacement (inaudible). Imagine if we could take
10 that \$43-billion agricultural economy in
11 California, take all the waste that comes from
12 that -- the organic material, the leftover chicken
13 feathers -- turn that into a high-quality protein
14 that then could get turned into a valuable product
15 that then comes into our market.

16 All of a sudden, we've taken the
17 importation of all these ingredients, reduced that
18 down to near-nothing -- because now it's all being
19 produced locally -- and being turned into a
20 product that goes right back into our market --
21 thereby creating jobs for the entire supply
22 stream.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, the advantage of our program is, we
2 have no intention of putting 40 cages out there in
3 year one. We're going to start with four cages in
4 year one. We'll stock that. It takes two years
5 for the product to get to the right size. Four
6 cages in year one, four cages in year two -- we'll
7 have our first harvest of 1,000 tons in year
8 three, and then grow from there -- the idea of
9 this being that -- aim small, miss small.

10 We know that there's going to be
11 logistical issues. We know that there's going to
12 be expansion considerations. We have an untrained
13 workforce in here. We can't hire 70 guys tomorrow
14 that know how to work a fish cage. We can go hire
15 70 fishermen, and try to train them to do it, but
16 we need to work into this over time. And the best
17 way to do that is to start with a small group of
18 guys, and then grow from there -- and let the
19 older guys teach the younger guys how to
20 (inaudible) industry expanse.

21 The other advantages, of course, is that
22 as it grows, the regulatory agencies will get

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 realtime, hard, empirical data they can study --
2 is entanglement of protected animals a problem?
3 Well, it's better to understand that with four
4 cages before you go to 40 cages. What is the best
5 diet to use? We don't know what that is going to
6 be yet. How do we, stepwise, advance the
7 progression of the model that we're looking at to
8 reliably tell us what's going to happen on the
9 bottom, as well as in the waterfall? That's
10 better done in stepwise progression -- validating
11 the model as a farm expanse, rather than just
12 expecting it to work from day one.

13 These are the organizations that we're
14 already working with in advancing the research
15 that we do -- that supports this into the future.
16 We look at these folks as being partners with us
17 to help resolve problems that the farm will have
18 -- very interesting relationship here with the
19 Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund. World
20 Wildlife Fund spent four or five years developing
21 best-management practices for seriola and cobia
22 culture.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 We've reviewed that; found that they're
2 very workable practices. So, we've agreed with
3 them we will come in, and we'll be the U.S. test
4 case for those best- management practices.

5 Nature Conservancy would like to work
6 with us because they have influence in development
7 of fisheries- related programs in the Pacific.
8 They'd like to use what we're doing in Rose Canyon
9 Fisheries as a model to demonstrate sustainable
10 operations in other parts of the world. So, some
11 of the places we're buying our seafood from will
12 also use sustainable practices.

13 Genetics, nutrition, fish health -- big
14 components of what we need. Environmental effects
15 with NOAA, the Department of Fish and Wildlife
16 here in California -- and then the production --
17 these folks that have practical experience with
18 not only cage operations, but also with the
19 business aspects of running the farm.

20 So, what we're seeing is tools for rules
21 -- it's already being developed. This is a
22 summary of a report that was put out -- it's being

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 worked on by Ken Riley and James Morris from the
2 NOS Laboratory (inaudible) North Carolina. And
3 what they're looking at is tools that coastal
4 managers can use to evaluate proposals for
5 aquaculture development.

6 And, actually, when you look at marine
7 spatial planning and these other tools, you end up
8 with a capacity to predict what the industry could
9 look like. And I think that's a very valuable
10 tool.

11 So, giving a vision for what we'd like
12 aquaculture to be would be very valuable --
13 because then it helps establish the task by which
14 those strategic goals to research can be
15 undertaken -- so, a lot of things that they're
16 working on in their CAPES program -- coastal
17 aquaculture planning/environmental sustainability.

18 Anyway, the marine spatial
19 planning/environmental (inaudible) these gentlemen
20 are on the same group that's working with us on
21 the predictive model. So, that's rolled into
22 this. And then a data center -- they're creating

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 tools that managers can use to look at all kinds
2 of aspects to what would happen. So, this is a
3 resource that people will be able to tap into.
4 This'll be a website folks can go to.

5 And to give you an example of what this
6 might -- some of the tools that they have
7 available here -- looking at some of these
8 questions -- what are the environmental impacts?
9 What is the opportunity?

10 They're taking Rose Canyon Fisheries or
11 Rose Canyon Project as a test case. And so
12 they're working with us -- actually helping us
13 answer some of the questions the public has about
14 what this will look like; how it'll operate on the
15 frontend. And that's been a very powerful tool
16 for us -- because it's not us going and providing
17 the information; it's the National Ocean Service.
18 It's the Department of Fish and Wildlife. It's
19 the National Marine Fisheries Service that's doing
20 it.

21 But the idea here is, the economic
22 projections suggest that offshore aquaculture

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 could be a billion-dollar industry -- basically
2 four times larger than all the commercial catch
3 that comes in now. And this doesn't displace the
4 commercial catch. We're not growing squid. We're
5 not going to grow anchovies (inaudible). What
6 we're going to do is grow species that we can grow
7 here that aren't being grown right now, but then
8 we'll complement the existing seafood
9 infrastructure that we've already invested heavily
10 in.

11 So, AquaView is a really interesting
12 program that lets people take a look at what the
13 farm will look like. So, this is a picture of
14 Mission Bay, from right over the beach here. Our
15 institute's (inaudible) over here. So, if you
16 were to look at the farm location -- again, that
17 picture was taken from about here -- south. So,
18 here's the farm location.

19 And what they want to do was -- this is
20 what people have in their minds -- this is what
21 aquaculture's going to look like. When you look
22 at the pictures of what goes on in Japan and China

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- when you go down the coast of Baja, and are
2 driving on the coast highway and look in the
3 water, there's all these tuna cages. They don't
4 look like this, but the point is, that's what
5 people have in their minds -- my beautiful view
6 line's going to be taken up.

7 The reality is, if you study it -- and
8 what they (inaudible) went out on the Crystal Pier
9 in Pacific Beach, and took reference points -- the
10 heights of the piers, the heights of light poles
11 and that sort of thing -- they were then able to
12 put this into their model and come up with a
13 realistic simulation of what the farm would
14 actually look like.

15 And this is what people have in their
16 minds, but this is the reality. If you were on
17 the third floor of a building, potentially you
18 might see the top of the cages. The reality is,
19 if you're standing on the beach, that's what it
20 looks like. You don't see the farm. It's below
21 the curvature of the earth.

22 Now if view line's going to be the thing

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that keeps us from ever doing aquaculture, then
2 we're probably lost -- because people can get up
3 on the Empire State Building and see (inaudible).
4 And if that's the case, then we're never going to
5 find a place where we can do it. But the reality
6 is that we can use a very small amount of space,
7 and grow an awful lot of food, and have a huge
8 economic stimulus.

9 So, these are the kinds of tools for
10 rules that are being developed to provide tools
11 and services to help coastal planners develop
12 environmental models built upon existing natural
13 depths. It also tells us what we don't know.
14 What are the things we need to find out so we can
15 fill it in and be that much more accurate
16 (inaudible)?

17 What we need for our program is a better
18 understanding of balance. There's been so much
19 negative rhetoric about aquaculture -- just like
20 there has been about fishing. And what we need to
21 do is set the record straight on all that. We
22 need to bring the management agencies together.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 We can't deal with these guys as separate groups
2 handing off a series of permit materials from one
3 to the other. We need to have them sitting around
4 the table so the guy from the Army Corps of
5 Engineers understands that the NOAA marine mammal
6 guy knows what he's talking about, and he'll take
7 care of that -- so the EPA person knows that his
8 information will be incorporated into the
9 permitting process.

10 Educational outreach makes people
11 understand that there's a balance between the
12 concerns they may have and the benefits that could
13 be realized. And then (inaudible) authoritatively
14 reports the facts and not just a bunch of
15 rhetoric.

16 And we need people to appreciate that
17 farms will support existing, underutilized seafood
18 infrastructure. We have processing. We have
19 (inaudible). We have commercial bases, but the
20 boats are sitting there. They're not actively out
21 there, producing the fish. We have something like
22 600 commercial licenses here in San Diego, and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 only half of them are active. And most of those
2 are for lobster fishermen.

3 So, back in the (inaudible) calculation
4 -- we want to feed all of California the fish that
5 they would consume. So, I think it was the 2013
6 census -- let's say 39 million people in
7 California. Consumption of seafood, on average,
8 in the U.S. is 14.5 pounds. That's about a
9 quarter-million metric tons required, but that's
10 edible seafood -- figure 50 percent processing.
11 So, we need half a million metric tons.

12 If we were to use the technology we're
13 using -- that is, cages of 10 meters deep, with a
14 maximum harvest density of 20 kilograms per cubic
15 meters, a single cage -- 1.2 miles in diameter --
16 would feed all of California. And that's that
17 little dot right here. In the entire Southern
18 California, (inaudible) that's the amount of
19 actual culture area that's required.

20 There is a graphic I saw yesterday that
21 (inaudible) all the seafood that we needed in the
22 U.S. using these techniques, we would just need

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the area equivalent to the State of Vermont to do
2 it. There's a big question about how we get all
3 that water into Vermont -- get all the people out
4 and everything. They'll figure that out, I'm
5 sure.

6 Anyway, the idea here -- there's a
7 next-vessel value of six dollars per kilo. You've
8 got a \$3-billion industry. And we're just feeding
9 the people in California with this. But the point
10 is, that's not \$3 billion that's not going out of
11 the country; it's \$3 billion at stake here.

12 So, the economic benefit would be --
13 I'll multiply it by a factor of two -- and it
14 would create 21,000 seafood jobs.

15 So, we keep talking about the
16 sustainable fisheries, sustainable this,
17 sustainable that, and we don't spend much time
18 defining. And in my mind, we can't let the
19 sustainability (inaudible) to the fish that are
20 being harvested or -- I don't care if it's trees,
21 or fish, or any natural resource -- we need to do
22 it in a manner that doesn't just take care of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 immediate needs; it's not robbing from future
2 generations. And that's a combination of effects.
3 We can't just overharvest now so we can make a
4 buck now; we need to worry about the next 20
5 generations coming down.

6 So, we can't degrade the environment.
7 We can't dilute genetic resources. We can't
8 eliminate what we already have available to us.
9 We need to do what's technologically appropriate.
10 And one of the things that I find exciting about
11 what this will do is, if we have a viable
12 industry, we may get better technology. We may be
13 able to go further out to sea. Instead of being
14 300 feet is the maximum depth, we can come up with
15 warning systems that'll let us go 1,000 feet of
16 depth, and then really open up the amount of
17 (inaudible) that's available.

18 And it needs to be environmentally
19 viable at first -- and economically viable. If we
20 can't do it and the farm make a buck doing it,
21 then it's not going to last over the long term.
22 And it has to be socially acceptable.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 There was a report done in 2011 funded
2 by Conservation International and conducted by
3 World Fish Center in Malaysia, and the result of
4 the report was that if you look at all the forms
5 of animal protein production for human
6 consumption, aquaculture is by far the most
7 ecologically sound way to do it. And yesterday,
8 the folks at (inaudible) saw these diagrams.

9 If we wanted to feed all the people in
10 California the beef that they need to eat, it'd be
11 the equivalent of domestic water usage for 60
12 million people. In other words, just the
13 hamburgers we're eating in the State of California
14 is over twice the amount of water that we're
15 already using in the State of California.

16 So, these sorts of components all added
17 together come to the conclusion that, really, what
18 we want to do is be developing more aquaculture.
19 The seafood that we eat -- whether it's shellfish,
20 or algae, or finfish -- can all be produced in a
21 very sustainable manner if we utilize the world's
22 largest EEZ, which is what the U.S. has.

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 The alternative to this, of course, is,
2 we're importing 91 percent of our seafood. We can
3 import 95 percent. As we demand more and more,
4 somebody else will produce it.

5 The downside to that, of course, is, we
6 don't know how they're going to grow it. And,
7 also, we don't know if we'll be able to buy it,
8 because we might be outcompeted by growing markets
9 in other parts of the world. There is nothing
10 that I can grow in San Diego that can't be grown
11 in Baja, California and then simply brought into
12 our market.

13 In fact, we had a (inaudible) project to
14 compare two different kinds of cages. We couldn't
15 get the permits to do it in the U.S., so we went
16 to Mexico. We used striped bass in the cages. We
17 compared the two different kinds of cages. That
18 striped bass is now being sold in Santa Monica.

19 So, we developed the technology. We
20 developed the juvenile fish culture. We developed
21 the feeds. We developed the cage technology.
22 Then the whole thing's being picked up by Mexico,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and they're selling it back to us. That's a model
2 I wouldn't like to see continue. I have no
3 problem with Mexico developing an aquaculture
4 industry, but I see no reason why we can't expand
5 the use of our existing seafood infrastructure in
6 the U.S., and develop this industry so that our
7 fishermen have an alternative, a new paradigm for
8 raising the quality of life for them and their
9 families.

10 The advantage that Mexico has is, they
11 have a simplified permitting process. I can get a
12 permit to grow 10,000 tons in Mexico within six
13 months. I'm already a year into the program, and
14 I just got a decision on how to move forward on
15 NEPA. You start to talk to business investors,
16 and they're going, okay, as much as I don't like
17 the idea of importing more seafood to a person in
18 the business community, hey, I can spend my \$50
19 million in Mexico and start making money in two
20 years -- or there's what you're trying to do, Don,
21 which is maybe five, six years out.

22 So, this is the threat that we really

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 have. It's not that we'll take jobs away from
2 fishermen here in California; it's that we'll give
3 the jobs to fishermen in Mexico.

4 So, in summary, eventually producing
5 5,000 tons -- and, really, what we're looking for
6 is to pave the way for regulatory agencies to
7 build a comfort level for how we can develop a
8 sustainable industry for the nation that then
9 keeps the jobs and the revenues here.

10 And with that, I'd be happy to answer
11 your questions (inaudible) I don't know why. But
12 back in the '70s, he said, "We're going to learn
13 to farm the sea as we farm the land." Now
14 hopefully, we'll do it better than we farmed the
15 land. But his whole thing is, we've got to learn
16 to farm these animals instead of hunting them --
17 because that's what civilization's all about. I
18 don't necessarily agree with that, but he really
19 did see the idea that the ocean doesn't have all
20 the protein that we need in it. So, we've got to
21 come up with a different way to deal with that.

22 Thank you.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, Don.

2 Comments? Okay, Mike.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Don, our company does
4 -- Pacific Seafood does aquaculture, too, but
5 primarily shellfish. We have a steelhead farm in
6 Eastern Washington.

7 MR. KENT: And you guys are getting into
8 -- I thought you were getting into tilapia, as
9 well, in (inaudible) -- is that right, or --

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Not that I know of, but
11 it could be.

12 MR. KENT: Okay. Sorry.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: But frequently, I'm
14 left out of the aquaculture loop. But, you know,
15 one of our -- it didn't happen to us, but I talked
16 to (inaudible) grower at a fundraiser in
17 Washington State, and they told us how it took 18
18 years to get the permitting done for growing
19 oysters on their own property. Three sets of
20 hurdles, as I understand -- county, state, and fed
21 -- so they don't line up.

22 So, I think in (inaudible) fisheries, my

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 experience is, the toughest decisions are
2 allocation. And it seems like in aquaculture, the
3 toughest decisions are getting permitting -- could
4 be off; I don't know too much about it.

5 MR. KENT: No. And one of the
6 disadvantages that shellfish farmers have in
7 Washington State -- even though it's a really
8 well-established industry, and they want to expand
9 it -- the problem comes down to, you've got 40
10 different agencies -- because who's controlling
11 the use of that land isn't, you know, some
12 centralized large bureaucracy. It's broken up
13 into county, and city, and all these different
14 groups that you have to go to.

15 The advantage of being out in the EEZ
16 is, even though the process is maybe not
17 well-defined yet, we do understand the permits
18 that are required for somebody to get. We need a
19 discharge permit. We need a Section 10 permit.
20 We need the Coast Guard permit. And those are
21 relatively straightforward. And even though we
22 don't have a well-defined process for NEPA, we at

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 least know we need to do NEPA. One of the things
2 that came up yesterday was, you know, a guy from
3 the Army Corps said, "Well, you know, you went
4 four miles out because, you know, you wanted to
5 avoid, you know, how hard it would be to get
6 permits in California."

7 The reality is, we have a defined
8 process in California. It's established by SB201
9 10 years ago. And that called for the development
10 of a programmatic EIR, which is supposed to pave
11 the way for automatic CEQA. If you filled in all
12 the slots, you have CEQA taken care of -- which is
13 our California equivalent to NEPA.

14 But there's no regulatory framework, and
15 they've taken eight years to even, you know, try
16 to get to a point where they have a first draft of
17 the PER. So, it wasn't a matter of avoiding a
18 process that was defined by going out (inaudible)
19 it's really a matter of, if I were to try to
20 permit this in coastal waters, they'd tell me to
21 go away, because they don't have the regulatory
22 (inaudible) to back it up.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And, really, what we're hoping here for
2 is -- and I think there are real opportunities --
3 if this is an agency that advises the Department
4 -- the Secretary of Commerce and NOAA, the
5 argument I would make is that we need leadership
6 in this. When you go to the EPA and EPA goes,
7 okay, I guess we got to do NEPA, but we don't know
8 how to do it -- and the Army Corps goes, you know,
9 we put stuff in the water, and all these other
10 ancillary concerns that folks have -- we
11 appreciate them, but we don't have the expertise
12 to deal with them.

13 And when you look at the long list of
14 things, and you look at water quality, and you
15 look at habitat protection, you look at marine
16 mammal interactions, you look at interactions
17 between fisheries and aquaculture -- what agency
18 is really responsible for most of that? It's the
19 agency that you guys are all trying to advise
20 right now.

21 And so the real leadership role I see in
22 this would be for NOAA to step up and go, "Hey, we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 got this." Now I'm reticent to do that, because
2 in my humble experience with working with NOAA
3 sometimes, it looks like a dog that's chasing its
4 tail. I mean, there's a lot of factions within
5 NOAA that have to be kept happy. But at the same
6 time, they've developed a lot of the tools that
7 would be available to work on this. They've
8 developed an expertise, and they're the
9 organization the agency chartered with the
10 advancement of seafood in our country on a large
11 level. They have the organizational structure.
12 They worked with the state agencies. They have
13 councils. They have regional structure and that
14 sort of thing.

15 So, at one point, I'd like to see that
16 process really well-defined, but at the same time
17 -- and is NOAA really the right group to do that?
18 At the same time, though, I don't see anybody else
19 stepping up to do it. And I think that's the real
20 opportunity for the agency -- is, they keep
21 saying, "We need more money to develop
22 aquaculture." But until you start having farms,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Congress is going to look at it and go, "Okay, you
2 want \$30, \$40 million a year to develop
3 aquaculture capability. What's the end product of
4 that going to be? How many tons of more seafood?
5 How many jobs are going to be produced?

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Don, I'm going to
7 make an observation that picks up on Mike's point
8 and his concern about the regulatory hurdles --
9 and yours on NEPA. NEPA may be an opportunity for
10 you, because NEPA has this thing called the
11 no-action alternative. And in the no-action
12 alternative, you're supposed to look at what
13 happens if the status quo remains. What happens
14 if we keep doing what we're doing right now? What
15 rate of degradation will continue? What's
16 reasonably foreseeable?

17 And I want to draw an analogy here. The
18 State Department had to wrestle with the NEPA for
19 the Keystone XL Pipeline. And they began with the
20 premise that, well, if we don't do the pipeline,
21 carbon emissions are still going to occur from
22 other energy. And energy demand is actually going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to go up. And we're going to have to meet that
2 energy demand somehow. So, if we don't do the
3 pipeline, we're going to have rail, or we're going
4 to have tankers, or we're going to have these
5 other things.

6 And then they looked at the carbon
7 footprint from all those other things. And in the
8 end, they said, "Wow, if we don't do the pipeline,
9 it will be worse than all the other things that
10 would happen."

11 So, the no-action alternative led the
12 State Department to conclude that the pipeline was
13 in the national interest.

14 Now let's take that same logic to
15 aquaculture. We know that protein demand is going
16 up. We know that we need to meet the protein
17 demand. If we don't do aquaculture, what are the
18 alternative ways? Cow, pig, wild fish, foreign
19 aquaculture? Now let's look at the environmental
20 consequences of all those things, and compare them
21 to the proposed project.

22 Wow, when you look at it through that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 lens, suddenly the no-action alternative teaches
2 you that aquaculture is in the national interest,
3 because it's better than all the alternatives.

4 MR. KENT: What do you do for a living,
5 (inaudible)? No, I know that. Thank you for that
6 perspective.

7 You're spot-on.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: But that needs to be
9 in the NEPA analysis. And if NOAA's going to take
10 charge of the NEPA analysis, I hope that NOAA
11 quotes the State Department when it does their
12 review.

13 So, when you feed that to the agency --
14 and when you're doing the project description, and
15 you're doing the no-action alternatives -- I mean,
16 this analysis needs to be in there.

17 MR. KENT: In essence, the way the
18 process -- we think -- will work is that the EPA
19 will take responsibility for NEPA, but NOAA will
20 be the cooperating agency.

21 And the reality is, the person that
22 writes the documentation -- whatever that's going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to be -- an environmental (inaudible) -- will be
2 written by a third- party consultant that I write
3 a check for.

4 But they'll do it under the supervision
5 of this consortium of NOAA, EPA, and Army Corps.

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'm available.

7 MR. KENT: And that becomes a very
8 public document, of course. But I think that in
9 doing this -- and the argument that you're making
10 -- once we get that all down on paper, that
11 becomes a template for the next guy that wants to
12 do it. It becomes a public document.

13 So, eventually, down the road -- if we
14 can do this here, we can do something down in the
15 Gulf. We can get something going on the East
16 Coast, out in (inaudible) and that sort of thing,
17 I think we can create a template for this -- at
18 which time, (inaudible) it's an organic,
19 legislatively-mandated process by which we, one,
20 move this thing forward -- and we can base that on
21 the experience that we now have -- the regulatory
22 agencies have on the farms that are actually

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 operators. And I've always talked about
2 demonstration farms.

3 Some people might think that means we
4 want the government to pay us to put a farm in.
5 No, we want investors to pay to put farms in. We
6 want the permits to do it, but we want them to be
7 available to get past the regulatory inexperience
8 that exists right now.

9 MR. CORBIN: I'd just like to say, you
10 know, I don't think the case of why aquaculture
11 can be made any better than (inaudible) it's so
12 important for this project to go forward, to
13 demonstrate on a commercial scale aquaculture in
14 federal waters -- because there's a lot of private
15 investment that's watching it.

16 And I hope that MAFAC will continue to
17 get progress reports as you proceed, because I
18 think this body recognizes that aquaculture is
19 going to happen, and it needs to happen -- and it
20 needs to happen now. And I think that would
21 (inaudible).

22 MR. KENT: Well, and we certainly would

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 be happy to keep -- what I'd really like to do is
2 form an advisory group -- sort of a taskforce,
3 made up of regulators, as well as other advisors,
4 that we would then interact with. And it might be
5 interesting to have a MAFAC member on that
6 committee so that there'd be direct lines of
7 communications. We can do talks like this if
8 we're invited back again for updates.

9 But there's a lot of experience out
10 there that already exists, and there's a lot
11 available in academia. It's impossible for one
12 group to keep up on. But if we were to form that
13 sort of relationship with advisory groups or with
14 academia and that sort of thing, there'd be this
15 flow of information on a very transparent level
16 that would keep the work moving forward, keep the
17 advancement occurring.

18 The big thing about sustainability, in
19 my mind, is, it isn't -- I just crossed the
20 sustainability line. It's always something you're
21 chasing. You're always looking for better fuel
22 economy. You're always looking for a better

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 return on the investment. Sustainability is all
2 about, hey, this looks really good now, but what's
3 the next thing we can do to make it even better
4 down the road?

5 And that's where we want to be able to
6 have the working model out there, and then be able
7 to go back to academia and say, "Hey, we've got a
8 real limitation on our feeds here. We need some
9 help with that."

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Peter, Bob, and then
11 back to Mike.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Don, Peter Shelley -- I
13 head a conservation organization in New England.
14 And we've had a lot of experience with
15 aquaculture, good and bad -- and particularly in
16 the finfish side.

17 You know, I think you're going to get
18 your permit, and I think your presentation is
19 really impressive.

20 MR. KENT: Oh, thank you.

21 MR. SHELLEY: You've capitalized this at
22 the right level. I mean, it's a very impressive

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 project. And, you know, if you can permit an oil
2 and gas rig in California, you ought to be able to
3 --

4 MR. KENT: Well, we're not doing that
5 anymore. I don't know if you noticed or not.

6 MR. SHELLEY: Well, you still got some
7 out there.

8 MR. KENT: Yeah.

9 MR. SHELLEY: You ought to be able to
10 put some, you know, cages with some living
11 organisms. So, a couple things -- comments and
12 maybe questions.

13 I'm interested in what your relationship
14 is with the oil and gas industry. I mean,
15 obviously, a blowout could have a big impact on
16 you, and whether you've thought about that.

17 The second thing I just wanted to
18 mention -- I think in terms of your presentation,
19 I didn't completely pick it up. I think, you
20 know, from our perspective, a lot of the stuff
21 with aquaculture are engineering issues -- at
22 least from my perspective -- except for the fish

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 meal forage issue, which I think it sounds like
2 you're making some really fascinating progress on
3 other sources of protein -- which would be a
4 breakthrough. I mean, I think it would just clear
5 out a lot of logjams from the conservation
6 community if that was successful.

7 One thing I wanted to sort of bore in on
8 was this notion that, you know, these will be the
9 same -- or maybe the suggestion -- if these will
10 be the same fishing jobs that are getting lost --
11 because at least in New England, the wild
12 fishermen tend to think of it as kind of a
13 zero-sum game. You know, you're taking bottom.
14 They're not interested in being farmers. You
15 know, they're cowboys. They want to go out and
16 catch wild fish. And, you know, that's a
17 psychological dimension.

18 And so I'm interested whether the wild
19 fishermen in Southern California see this as part
20 of their employment future in an enthusiastic way.
21 And to the extent that they don't, have you
22 thought about how to think about your project sort

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of hand-in-hand with wild fisheries? I mean,
2 you're supporting infrastructure on shore that
3 might disappear otherwise. I mean, potentially,
4 you could think of them as equity partners at some
5 level. I mean, I'm sure you don't want to share
6 any of that hard-earned profit, but, you know,
7 giving them some skin in the game, even if they're
8 not using their boats to service your operation,
9 might be valuable.

10 And so I'm just sort of interested in
11 what your relationship is with wild fishermen.

12 MR. KENT: Well, we had quite a range of
13 discussion. Fishermen -- yes, we have diets now
14 that are -- all the protein in them is from soy.
15 And we've tested that on our yellowtail, and put
16 it into USDA-certified taste- testing laboratories
17 at the University of Washington, and they couldn't
18 discriminate between the yellowtail grown on a
19 fishmeal diet and the yellowtail grown on soybean.

20 Now that has to be tested on a grander
21 scale, of course, not from an eight-foot pool, but
22 from, you know, an 11,000 cubic meter cage. But

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 progress is being made.

2 And just because fish don't have soy
3 available to them in the wild doesn't mean they
4 can't forage on it, they can't grow from it. And
5 there are many more alternatives. I don't like
6 the idea of soy from the standpoint I don't want
7 to have to bring it in from Nebraska. I'd rather
8 find sources that are within 100 miles of us that
9 we could bring in on rail -- or something that's
10 going to the landfill already, and that's what
11 this agricultural waste (inaudible) comes in.

12 As far as the -- I understand
13 (inaudible) fisherman kind of thing. You know, I
14 saw "The Perfect Storm." I understand it. But
15 the reality is, when we're -- I bring 50 fishermen
16 from the community in here. One guy will stand up
17 and go, "Well, how are you going to compensate me
18 for the fact that my drift gillnet can't fish that
19 area anymore?"

20 And it's like, okay, well, I don't know
21 how you -- you know, I don't have an answer for
22 you. But how many fish are you actually catching

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 in that little bit of area that the net drifted
2 through? You try to quantify it, and I'll try to
3 come up with an answer, but the reality is, we're
4 only bringing in \$8 million of product, and we're
5 not bugging you lobster guys.

6 And when we put those 50 fishermen in
7 the room, they come up to me afterwards, and they
8 go, "My dad was a fisherman. I'm a fisherman, but
9 this isn't what my son's going to be able to do.
10 Perhaps he could do what you're talking about."

11 My guys aren't going to be out on these
12 boats. Our guys are going to be back working on
13 diets, you know, solving disease problems, coming
14 up with new species to grow. It's going to be the
15 fishermen that do it. And the guys that are in
16 Mexico that are doing it right now are all Long
17 Beach or San Diego fishermen that are in Mexico
18 taking the technologies we've developed and using
19 them in Mexico right now.

20 And as far as the equity goes, the Cuna
21 del Mar group have reserved all of the common
22 stock for Rose Canyon Fisheries, for use in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 profit-sharing with the folks that are actually
2 operating the farms. So, we'll have a very strong
3 profit-motivating incentive -- and just like if
4 you're a share fisherman on a boat.

5 And then as far as the share utilization
6 I get, I'm on a bunch of different groups in San
7 Diego. There's one, the Marine Technology -- or
8 Maritime Alliance. It's, like, in a marine
9 technology industry here in San Diego. And they
10 wanted me to form an aquaculture group. I said,
11 "It's got to be seafood, because what we need is"
12 -- the threats that are facing the fishermen right
13 now are the same things that we don't want to see
14 disappear.

15 You know, you've got guys that want to
16 build Hyatt Regency. I grew up in San Diego. The
17 skyline looks a lot different than when we had
18 tuna boats down on the water. And you take a
19 beautiful chunk of water with a nice dock next to
20 it, and you say, "Hey, I've got to support an \$8-
21 million seafood industry." People go, "Hey, I get
22 that in hotel taxes from one hotel in a year. So,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 I got other ways to get money out of that
2 property."

3 If we can raise the tide, so to speak,
4 and raise all the boats in the rising tide, so to
5 speak, that's the advantage of the fisherman, as
6 well. It's that, as we have a larger industry --
7 if we can turn this into a \$500-million industry
8 that centers out of San Diego, all of a sudden,
9 there's going to be no question what's happening
10 on those commercial docks. We need them. We need
11 them for the fishermen, because I can't grow
12 lobsters; I can't grow swordfish. We also need
13 them for all the other products that's being grown
14 and brought in.

15 The people who want to build a Charger
16 Stadium in San Diego Bay drives me crazy, because
17 we don't need to have the Chargers -- if we even
18 get to keep them -- down on the water. They can
19 be anywhere. But we need the fishermen. We need
20 the boat landings. We need the Navy. They're the
21 ones that need the space next to the water.

22 MR. SHELLEY: Can I make one just -- the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 other thing that just -- you know, ocean planning.
2 A lot of us are having trouble making the case for
3 ocean planning. You made a powerful case for
4 ocean planning. I don't know if you were speaking
5 up politically -- because there are a lot of
6 politicians who don't get it.

7 MR. KENT: No, I'm not -- you know, I've
8 sat in on a bunch of marine spatial planning
9 meetings, and you spend the first day and a half
10 trying to tell people what it is. And until you
11 actually go out and get a permit, you don't
12 realize -- nobody's going to lay out a map like we
13 do for land planning and say, "Well, you want to
14 put a high-rise apartment building, that's where
15 you put it -- because that's where we said. You
16 want to put in an auto plant. Hey, that's in the
17 industrial sector over here. Don't put this next
18 to a school" type of thing.

19 There's no way you're going to go out in
20 the ocean and say, "Well, here's all the spots we
21 can do aquaculture," and expect that that's going
22 to speed the process by which you get your permit.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 You're still going to have to go in, evaluate the
2 site; look at all alternative uses.

3 So, I look at it as a big discussion
4 that really doesn't speed the process. If I could
5 look at a marine spatial planning map and speed
6 the process to get a permit from a full-blown EIS
7 to a (inaudible) then I'd say, hey, there's some
8 value to that. But nobody's suggesting that.

9 MR. SHELLEY: That's why you need to
10 hire Keith -- because that's all doable.

11 MR. KENT: Right. At the same time,
12 though, when you look -- FOA did an analysis of
13 all the nations of the world -- the coastal
14 nations of the world -- and they came up with an
15 analysis that said the U.S. not only has the
16 largest EEZ in the world, it also has the largest
17 section of coastline that would be acceptable for
18 both finfish and shellfish aquaculture. That sort
19 of marine spatial planning that says, "Hey, here's
20 what's available there; this is where you could do
21 it" -- I think that's of value.

22 But you can't sell people on the idea

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that, hey, this is going to make your permitting
2 easier -- just not going to happen.

3 MR. RHEAULT: Very impressive, John. I,
4 for one, am really looking forward to not
5 developing technologies that get exported to other
6 countries so they can ship the fish back to us --
7 because NOAA's been doing a great job developing
8 all these great techniques.

9 John, we're reminiscing that we've been
10 working on offshore permitting and regulatory
11 frameworks for about 15 years. And one of the
12 questions Julie had for me was, "How does the
13 Council fit into this?" And we had recommended 15
14 years ago that the Council should be advising on
15 conflicts with fishermen and that's about it.
16 What's your view on the role of the Council, and
17 the coastal consistency aspect of the state, and
18 how that all fits?

19 MR. KENT: Keith, I'm over time here. I
20 don't think --

21 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'm aware
22 (inaudible) the last two folks' comments, and then

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we would move on.

2 MR. KENT: All right. I mean, I love
3 the sound of my own voice, but you guys might
4 (inaudible).

5 I went two weekends ago when the Council
6 met at (inaudible) Park, the habitat committee. I
7 got to stand in front of the Habitat Committee and
8 walk them through -- there was recently a
9 shellfish farm -- Kazi Farms or Catalina something
10 -- that was permitted off of Long Beach.

11 And they went about it wrong. I mean,
12 quite honestly, they said, "Well, we're going to
13 put it here, and that's going to be it." And they
14 didn't talk to the squid fishermen. The next
15 thing you know is, Don McIsaac, the Executive
16 Director, and the Pacific Council's writing
17 letters to the Coastal Commission saying that,
18 "Wow, we have real concerns here. We don't think
19 the fishing community's been spoken to, probably."

20 I went to the Habitat Committee to
21 explain what we're going to do, show them a lot of
22 the presentation you saw, and told them that we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 have a very long, involved process, and the
2 concerns of the Committee and of the fishing
3 community would be taken into account.

4 We've tried to do a lot of frontend work
5 here. There are organizations that won't want us
6 to do it -- groups like Food and Water Watch,
7 Oceanic, groups like that that don't want
8 aquaculture. Their only suggested alternative is
9 you put farms out in the middle of the desert and
10 grow your fish out there. It's great if you want
11 a \$25 a pound dinner, but I think we need to feed
12 more people than we can with that.

13 But when it comes to the Council, I
14 think we'd go to them. If one of the species we
15 wanted to grow was managed, we'd be required by
16 law to get a permit from them.

17 But beyond that, I'm talking to groups
18 that have no permitting authority at all, and what
19 I'm trying to do is just make sure that they hear
20 the story from us first, that they have their
21 input, they know that their input will be listened
22 to, and that I'm available, and our team's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 available to answer any questions they may have.
2 And that, I think, is an invaluable role for the
3 Council.

4 Down the road, as I mentioned, if we had
5 some sort of organic law that brought all of us
6 together, the Council, on a regional level, should
7 probably play an important role.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Mike and Julie, can
9 you be quick?

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: First, Don, I'd like to
11 thank you. This is really a great presentation,
12 and opened up my eyes.

13 I saw another presentation -- I can't
14 remember who did it, but they were looking out to
15 2050, I believe -- and looking at the land usage
16 that would be necessary just to feed and increase
17 the population; this is worldwide. But they were
18 talking about an area the size of South America --
19 pretty impressive. And they said, well,
20 aquaculture would take something much, much
21 smaller.

22 MR. KENT: Vermont. We just got to get

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 those damned maple syrup people out of there.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, that's United
3 States. But we're talking the whole world -- so
4 State of Oregon or something.

5 But is there a metric or a measurement,
6 I guess, of just how much land it takes to
7 generate, like, the same amount of protein or just
8 a simple --

9 MR. KENT: There is. And one of the
10 things I tried not to do is demean any other
11 source of -- I mean, there's a lot of talk about
12 what goes into cattle right now. I mean, I read
13 "The Union Tribune" the other day -- 1,800 gallons
14 for a pound of beef -- 1,800 gallons of water. If
15 you use that map and carried it forward, we need
16 something like 1.7 trillion gallons of water just
17 to feed Californians all the beef. That's
18 something like Tahoe Lake. You know, we need a
19 Tahoe Lake every year.

20 Those are the kinds of things -- I'm
21 going to let somebody else make that argument.
22 All we can really do is say -- and the bottom line

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is, we have demand. We need more seafood. This
2 is a way to do it. And I don't want to demean
3 beef, chicken, or commercial fishing, or imports,
4 or anything else. I just want to make the
5 arguments on, hey, I think this is a very stable
6 way for us to grow some food and provide it to our
7 marketing; create jobs here without doing that on
8 the backs of some other guy who's trying to make a
9 little --

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Julie Morris?

11 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. And this is
12 really a question for NOAA. When we were talking
13 about aquaculture in the Gulf of Mexico with NOAA,
14 we worked out that there needed to be a fishery
15 management plan that was adopted by the regional
16 fishery management council in order for that
17 product to be grown in the EEZ and brought to
18 land.

19 So, I'm a little confused about -- is
20 the Pacific Council getting the same advice --
21 that there needs to be a fishery management plan
22 for this activity in the EEZ in the Pacific, or --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MERRICK: (inaudible) sort of the
2 same question -- whether you think that having an
3 (inaudible) council would facilitate this.

4 MR. KENT: You know, I've sat in a lot
5 of discussion groups, you know, advising as they
6 try to move forward the regulatory development of
7 the plan for the Gulf. And when you talk to guys
8 like Icicle Seafoods that grow a lot of salmon --
9 when you start setting limits -- which is the
10 management process for managing a fishery, and you
11 start setting limits of, like, 30,000 metric tons,
12 it makes the commercial investors go, "That's
13 nuts. We need 2 million metric tons." And the
14 Gulf is one of the biggest bodies of water we
15 have. Why are we limiting ourselves to 30,000
16 metric -- you're automatically taking the
17 investment groups and saying, you know, "This
18 really isn't the way to go."

19 I personally think that any step forward
20 that raises the discussion is of value, and you
21 can always raise the limit. But the other
22 limitation, as I understand it, is that the FMP

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 only applies to federally-managed species, like
2 red drum, and red snapper, things like that. So,
3 if I wanted to grow striped bass off of Louisiana,
4 I may want to follow the template of what the FMP
5 details needs to be done, but I don't actually go
6 to the Council to do that.

7 MR. MERRICK: It does not, though,
8 necessarily have to be restricted to that. It
9 could be (inaudible).

10 MR. KENT: Pardon?

11 MR. MERRICK: It could be (inaudible).
12 So, my question wasn't whether the flaws of the
13 Gulf FMP are a problem; it's whether you think
14 that having a process through the Council with an
15 FMP would facilitate the permitting process.

16 MR. KENT: I think if you have a
17 process, that's fine, but when you try to adopt a
18 fisheries management process, it requires a
19 maximum sustainable yield to be set; then you're
20 trying to manage a square peg with a round hole.

21 MR. MERRICK: I don't think -- as I
22 understand that FMP, (inaudible) I'm looking at

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the facts right now -- that does not seem to be
2 the case. MSY would not be --

3 MR. KENT: Well, my understanding is,
4 they've set an upper limit. They require you to
5 redo your permits after 10 years. There's a lot
6 of factors in there that the commercial industry
7 has --

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Don, the next item
9 is the Aquaculture Subcommittee Taskforce. And
10 what you guys have just set up is an issue that I
11 think should get explored at the subcommittee
12 level. And maybe down the road, we need to be
13 having a conversation about, should other regional
14 fishery management councils be looking at the Gulf
15 model, and can the Gulf model be improved? And
16 would it help folks like Don and his group?

17 MR. KENT: And my final note, before you
18 take your leave, would be that any well-defined
19 process would be quite a bit different than what
20 we have now -- and have the ability to have --
21 well, I mean, that's the reality of it. You have
22 agencies that want to live within the bounds of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 what they're allowed to do, and we're asking them
2 to do something they don't have a comfort level
3 with. So, I think that's one thing we want to do
4 -- is give them that comfort level.

5 The other is, give them the tool they
6 need to decide what that process ought to be,
7 through experience.

8 Thank you very much. It's been very
9 interesting.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay, John Corbin --
11 Co-Chair of the Commerce Subcommittee, reporting
12 out on aquaculture.

13 MR. CORBIN: Okay, I have (inaudible) --

14 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Absolutely,
15 absolutely.

16 MR. CORBIN: (inaudible) is passing out
17 is the second part of what we're going to discuss
18 this morning, and that is the strategic priorities
19 that were developed by the NOAA Aquaculture Office
20 that have been through a couple of iterations of
21 comments and through the filter of Bob, and I, and
22 Christina, we have selected what we thought

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 represented (inaudible).

2 MR. RHEAULT: John, you want to give a
3 little bit of background what we're doing? We got
4 multiple tracks going in this taskforce -- or do
5 you want to just --

6 MR. CORBIN: Well, that illustration --

7 MR. RHEAULT: Okay.

8 MR. CORBIN: Yeah. Well, I guess just
9 let me say that the taskforce was formed earlier
10 this year, and Bob and I were assigned to be
11 liaisons to the taskforce. So, we're going to be
12 presenting a progress report on the taskforce, and
13 we're also going to be asking the committee for
14 comments on the draft strategic priorities
15 prepared by the NOAA Aquaculture Office.

16 These were discussed earlier by the
17 Commerce Aquaculture group. They also were
18 discussed by the Aquaculture Taskforce
19 (inaudible).

20 Okay, here we go. So, MAFAC created the
21 taskforce to provide additional and diversified
22 aquaculture FMPs for two requests that were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 received from the Aquaculture Office.

2 Task one has two parts. And the first
3 part is a progress report on the current marine
4 aquaculture 10-year plan.

5 As background, in 2007, when that plan
6 was reported, aquaculture was being pushed.
7 Secretary of Commerce Gutierrez had made some
8 strong statements pro- aquaculture (inaudible).
9 He had chaired an aquaculture summit -- industry,
10 academia, and government -- that was very
11 well-received. He even made a field trip out to
12 Hawaii and visited Kona Blue Aquaculture's
13 offshore site, and the industry had a chance to
14 make a presentation to him.

15 On top of that, there was a bill in
16 Congress that would give NOAA authority to permit
17 aquaculture in the EEZ. So, there was a lot going
18 on, and industry felt the stars were aligning, and
19 things were going to happen.

20 This task is to review the progress made
21 with that 10-year plan.

22 Imports at that time were about 80

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 percent -- something like that. So, fast forward
2 to day -- imports are 91 percent. And the
3 Aquaculture Office thought it timely to update the
4 2007 (inaudible) take a look at new ways to try to
5 encourage this industry. And MAFAC and the
6 taskforce are being asked to provide input into
7 the development of that draft plan before it goes
8 out for public review.

9 So, task two relates to the work done by
10 the Gulf Fisheries Management Council (inaudible).
11 And you'll recall that MAFAC recently commented on
12 the pending rules for that process, and
13 (inaudible) comments to NOAA.

14 And, as Don pointed out, it's actually
15 three permits that are required. There's a NOAA
16 permit from the Council. There's the EPA permit
17 -- the discharge. And then there's the core
18 permit.

19 So, what is happening is, the regulatory
20 taskforce -- another taskforce -- of the
21 Interagency Working Group on Aquaculture -- used
22 to be the Joint Subcommittee on Aquaculture -- is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sort of (inaudible) is working on a coordinated
2 permit process for the three permits for the Gulf.
3 And the MAFAC taskforce will come up with what we
4 call a mock representative commercial project to
5 test it and identify problems. So, that's the
6 concept.

7 The taskforce was appointed in January
8 2015. There were, I think, 24 very well-qualified
9 people that offered to serve -- really, we were
10 just floored by the qualifications of everybody
11 that did submit their resumes.

12 Ultimately, MAFAC and NOAA selected 11
13 people. All have extensive experience in various
14 aspects of aquaculture research policy, commercial
15 aquaculture, farm development, that sort of thing.
16 Many have 20 or 30 years of experience -- you
17 know, just a wealth of experience.

18 And we wanted to ensure a wide variety
19 of prospectives -- so from academia, from
20 government, from the commercial sector, especially
21 -- but we also wanted to have diversification in
22 terms of regions, because we're all talking about

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a national plan.

2 So, I think we've succeeded. We have a
3 good regional distribution. Many of the states
4 involved are leaders in U.S. aquaculture. And we
5 were really pleased with that.

6 Last week, April 21, NOAA provided us a
7 suggested schedule, proposed schedule of work for
8 the planning task. And this project's going to be
9 a challenge. These are proposed -- because both
10 the new plan and the integrated permit application
11 are works in progress. So, the idea is for the
12 taskforce to work with the agencies as these
13 products are being developed. Unlike the Climate
14 Change Taskforce that presented the documents for
15 review, this is a little different animal. So,
16 it's going to be a challenge. Some flexibility on
17 those dates is probably going to be needed.

18 I'll point out that there's a short fuse
19 on two items -- the MAFAC formal comments on
20 strategic priorities, which the office would like
21 to add -- and will take up after I finish this
22 presentation -- and then the informal comments of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 ATF to the Commerce Subcommittee and, ultimately,
2 to the Office of Aquaculture.

3 And I would imagine that date might flag
4 also. Otherwise, MAFAC can expect the finalized
5 findings and recommendations on the planning task
6 sometime in August. So, you will be seeing a
7 strategic plan at some point in the summer.

8 In terms of the mock project, the ATF
9 has to develop representative commercial projects
10 by mid-May. We've done a little bit on that, and
11 I'll say a little bit more about that later. The
12 commercial guys on the taskforce have identified
13 one project area that they're familiar with, and
14 we're trying to describe that in terms of
15 oceanography, and species, and technology.

16 There will be more detail once the
17 taskforce gets the application checklist, which
18 the Interagency group is coming up with, as the
19 first step towards the coordinated permit process.
20 So, once they get that, I think we can move into
21 trying to describe a project such that we can then
22 fill out an application.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 The hope is that the application can be
2 filled out and processed by the agencies, to some
3 extent, even though it probably won't be
4 completed. And feedback can be received on the
5 process itself (inaudible) from the commercial
6 people particularly, but from the taskforce in
7 general.

8 And you might find areas that need more
9 clarity -- areas that the review can be
10 consolidated. You know, I don't know (inaudible).
11 But that is the concept.

12 Status of the tasks really haven't
13 progressed a lot -- in fact, a couple conference
14 calls and a lot of email exchanges.

15 Strategic priorities are under review,
16 and hopefully we can finalize those today. They
17 will be part of the strategic plan, so I think
18 they still will be on the table for further
19 manipulation and change. But for right now, what
20 the office is interested in is getting (inaudible)
21 are these the kinds of things we need to be
22 thinking about? And the 10-year plan is under

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 review.

2 The mock project -- working on two
3 project ideas and two regions in the Gulf. And
4 we're awaiting the checklist of information from
5 NOAA to propose the project details.

6 And this is where project one, so to
7 speak, is located -- about 50 miles off Texas.
8 We're thinking about and evaluating a project off
9 the Panhandle in Florida. So, this'll give us two
10 projects in two different core districts in two
11 different EPA regions. And that could be, I
12 think, a good test, and bring out some issues.

13 So, that is my presentation on the
14 status. And I can proceed with the priorities or
15 take questions now.

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Are there questions
17 from the members? (inaudible).

18 MR. CORBIN: Okay. What you have is the
19 strategic priorities. Let me say a little bit
20 about how we got here. As I mentioned, the Office
21 of Aquaculture has begun work on the new strategic
22 plan. It's a five-year time horizon -- five-year

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 plan. They've drafted vision, mission statements,
2 and goal statements to share with MAFAC. And the
3 Aquaculture Taskforce at our conference call last
4 week had a chance to -- had a give-and-take with
5 the (inaudible) on that.

6 Now at this meeting, the Commerce
7 Committee had a chance to look at the revised
8 strategic priorities, and revisions came out of
9 the interchange between the taskforce and NOAA
10 (inaudible). And we had a lot of good comments
11 from Commerce Committee people that participated
12 in that.

13 So, Bob, Christina, and I took the notes
14 from the conference call and the notes from the
15 Commerce Committee discussions, and made some
16 judgments and so on, and revised the statements so
17 they were more descriptive, I think -- more
18 descriptive with the intent of what the Office had
19 in mind. And the Office did provide some examples
20 of the kinds of activities that they would
21 conceive of under those. So, we had some
22 information that's not here right now.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, the Aquaculture Offices wants
2 MAFAC's input and endorsement of the broad
3 guidance statements to move forward. We are
4 recommending endorsement of the revised
5 statements. The original statements are also
6 there for your reference.

7 With your approval, we will add some
8 narratives supporting the changes, and clean up
9 all the comments that we received, both from the
10 taskforce and the Commerce Committee. The idea is
11 to present those two items in a transmittal letter
12 to the Office so that they have MAFAC's and the
13 taskforce's comments and opinions on the
14 (inaudible).

15 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, the final letter
16 would include the revised vision statement/mission
17 statement goals.

18 MR. CORBIN: Right.

19 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: And an additional
20 paragraph explaining why those --

21 MR. CORBIN: The change from the
22 original to a few sentences.

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: And then as an
2 attachment, all the material that was submitted
3 from the taskforce.

4 MR. CORBIN: I thought that was the best
5 way to proceed.

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So, the
7 members understand what we're being asked to do as
8 a body is to ratify the revised items that are on
9 this sheet, and then to transmit all the comments
10 that we've received from our taskforce members.

11 MR. CORBIN: I would say that is it, and
12 I would be happy to answer questions and respond
13 to anything.

14 Bob, is there anything to add to --
15 either of you -- the presentation or the strategic
16 priorities?

17 MR. RHEAULT: No. I think you've done a
18 wonderful job presenting this -- sort of the
19 smallest task that we've been asked to look at.
20 This is the 30,000-foot view that's the front page
21 of a much larger document that's going to be
22 developed.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any other member
2 comment? Julie?

3 MS. MORRIS: This is fine. Back to the
4 earlier presentation -- I think it's brilliant to
5 do a couple of mock permit proposals in specific
6 locations, and try to figure out where the
7 friction points are. I'm sure you'll find lots of
8 friction points. And that'll help everything move
9 forward, and figure out what to do.

10 But I really am confused. I mean, I
11 felt like the advice that we got from the agency
12 when we were working on aquaculture in the Gulf of
13 Mexico was that there had to be a fishery
14 management plan or it couldn't happen. And the
15 presentation today suggested that if they chose
16 species that weren't managed species, they didn't
17 have to work with the Council process at all.
18 There wouldn't have to be an FMP.

19 And so is that a change in advice from
20 the agency, or do we have a choice that we didn't
21 know about when we were working on the Gulf plan?
22 I'm really confused about this.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. CORBIN: My understanding is that --
2 and I've spent some time with the Gulf plan and
3 rules -- is that species need to be under
4 (inaudible) somewhere, it needs to state that the
5 species is managed; then it can be used as an
6 aquaculture for a NOAA permit under the rules.

7 But as I said earlier, right now in
8 federal government, there's really two pathways to
9 target a permit (inaudible) and discharge permit.
10 If you have a fisheries management plan or
11 (inaudible) put an RFP out to amend their
12 fisheries plans for aquaculture as we speak.

13 So, there's two processes that
14 (inaudible) does that help any?

15 MS. MORRIS: You're saying that you
16 could do core process and not do the fishery
17 management plan --

18 MR. CORBIN: That's my understanding.

19 MR. RHEAULT: For species that are not
20 managed --

21 MS. MORRIS: That's not my
22 understanding.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. RHEAULT: So, if we want to do
2 mussels in the Gulf, there's no requirement for a
3 Council --

4 MS. MORRIS: So, these are the mussels
5 that are native to the Gulf of Mexico?

6 MR. RHEAULT: That was a hypothetical.

7 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Julie -- so I don't
8 think we're going to get the answer today
9 (inaudible). What's become clear to me is, thanks
10 to Don's presentation, this issue has doubled up.
11 And I think we should be putting this on the
12 agenda for the Aquaculture Taskforce. And I think
13 we need to tease our way through. I think Mike
14 Rubino needs to talk to us about these issues, and
15 we need to figure out what has to happen; what's
16 optional.

17 And since you're already going through
18 this effort of figuring out in the Gulf of Mexico,
19 what's a draft permit look like -- what can also
20 come out of that is the wisdom of what's working
21 and what's not, and the potential for a
22 recommendation to be made for, should other

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 regions be looking at this type of approach and
2 developing an FMP? And if they do, here are the
3 lessons we've learned from what happened in the
4 Gulf process, and how we can do it better in these
5 other regions.

6 That would be the perfect task for us to
7 give all these great folks that we've got now.

8 MR. CORBIN: And I think all of that is
9 possible, with some work and some real
10 communication between the agency --

11 MR. MERRICK: So, clearly, you can do
12 offshore aquaculture without an FMP. That's going
13 on, okay? And so the issue is whether having an
14 FMP facilitates the process. And the issue about
15 federally-managed species, that's in the eye of
16 the beholder. The FMP defines what a federally-
17 managed species is, and we continue to add species
18 that are federally managed.

19 I'm looking at, actually, the Federal
20 Register notice from 2014 on the FMP. And they
21 have defined in here what species they are
22 considering as being managed out of this.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. CORBIN: For the Gulf.

2 MR. MERRICK: Yeah, for the Gulf. So,
3 it's up to them, and they could save mussels.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Pam?

5 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. Basically, that was
6 what I was going to say. I mean, the process on
7 the West Coast is obviously going forward with the
8 full participation of NOAA, and the Office of
9 Aquaculture, and Mike Rabino, and this Interagency
10 Taskforce for Aquaculture, and all of that.

11 So, the clear understanding, I think, is
12 that there are two processes for, you know,
13 federally-managed species and
14 non-federally-managed species. And the Gulf is
15 trying it one way with the federally-managed
16 species, and there's an understanding that this
17 other process can move forward on the West Coast.

18 So, it's not, you know, a rogue
19 activity. Obviously, it's something that's been
20 happening for, as Don mentioned, decades,
21 basically, in consultation with both the regional
22 aquaculture coordinators for NOAA, as well as the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 national aquaculture coordinator for NOAA. And,
2 as I said, this Interagency Taskforce has been
3 developed and briefing the Councils on all sorts
4 of things.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So, I
6 think we've got some direction for the Aquaculture
7 Taskforce and the Subcommittee. Do you have a
8 motion you want to make, as far as --

9 MR. CORBIN: Well, yeah. And what we
10 need is this to be approved, so that we can send
11 it.

12 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Joy?

13 MS. BONNEY: So, are we talking about
14 (inaudible)?

15 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Yes.

16 MS. BONNEY: I guess I just have one --
17 I think you've done a really good job cleaning it
18 up, honestly, and making it more clear, and adding
19 some details. I guess the only question I have is
20 on (inaudible) and whether -- I promote
21 environmental stewardship and the sustainability
22 in the marine aquaculture sector versus encourage

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 responsible marine aquaculture, using the best
2 available science and technologies -- I mean, to
3 me, goal two, the first one, seems a little more
4 laurel -- I don't know what the right word --
5 optically more appealing, versus the other, which
6 seems more lasered and not quite so high level.

7 So, I was just looking for a rationale
8 for why you moved from the original goal to the
9 revised goal. Otherwise, that's my only question
10 (inaudible).

11 MR. CORBIN: Well, the -- and, Bob,
12 correct me if I'm wrong -- the industry really has
13 been shying away from sustainable and really looks
14 at responsible, because they think they can put
15 some characteristics and measures on responsible,
16 as well as the sustainable.

17 And we just felt that stewardship and
18 sustainability -- you know, they're common.
19 They're almost buzzwords -- but that responsible
20 marine aquaculture is really where we wanted to
21 go.

22 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, John, just for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 clarity -- did the original goal as written come
2 from the taskforce, and you and Bob have composed
3 the changes?

4 MR. CORBIN: Comes from the Office.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Comes from the
6 Office of Aquaculture, as opposed to the
7 taskforce.

8 MR. CORBIN: Right, right.

9 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

10 MR. RHEAULT: Yeah, we just -- every
11 time I'm in a meeting and the word
12 "sustainability" comes up, someone immediately
13 demands that you define it, and there's 15
14 different definitions in the room. So, we're
15 trying to get away from the use of that. It's not
16 that we don't support the goal; we're trying to
17 find a different vernacular that describes the
18 same goal.

19 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: And is "stewardship"
20 the same problem? Because I guess if it is, then
21 so is "responsible," isn't it?

22 MR. RHEAULT: You can make the same

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 argument about all of these terms, yeah.

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, I mean, as a
3 person who teaches environmental sustainability, I
4 sure like that word. I mean, I'm not going to
5 resist this over that issue, but I think Julie's
6 made an interesting point here. I mean, we have
7 taken what was something that had a little bit
8 more of a lofty aspirational statement to it, and
9 reduced the magnitude of the aspiration.

10 MS. BONNEY: And I'd just say that, you
11 know, from a commercial fisherman's point of view,
12 a lot of the environmental stewardship and
13 sustainability are the same standards that we live
14 under. And, actually, you know, just looking at
15 the practical ability of the revised goal two is a
16 little more lasered and not quite so lofty.

17 So, I'm just asking why (inaudible)
18 would have a less lofty goal than a commercial
19 fisherman does.

20 MR. RHEAULT: I predicted this
21 discussion when we had this conversation, and I --
22 you know, I'm not going to die on a cross for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 this. I'm willing to fall back. I did want to
2 include, you know, the words "best available
3 science and technologies" as guiding light.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, how about
5 "encourage sustainable and responsible marine
6 aquaculture"?

7 MR. AMES: Well, (inaudible) of Bob and
8 John's choosing to drop sustainability -- you can
9 sustain a population of fish, but when you're in a
10 grower situation, what you're doing is, you're a
11 production unit. Sustainability just depends on
12 how much feed you're putting in, how many critters
13 you've put into the system. If you're doing it
14 responsibly, it doesn't matter what the scale is
15 you're doing, as long as it's -- sustainability,
16 as is usually implied in fisheries, clearly
17 doesn't apply to (inaudible).

18 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Oh, I think it would
19 apply to the ecosystem -- to the location where
20 you're growing the fish. You want the ecosystem
21 to remain sustainable. So, as Don was presenting,
22 you don't want too much fish food falling to the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 bottom, or you don't want too much of the deposits
2 from the fish, you know, altering the ecosystem.

3 So, there are concepts of sustainability
4 that could work. And, again, I'm not going to
5 make this the end- all, be-all. I'm just saying
6 there is room for a higher aspiration here, and
7 what it's been reduced to is simply encouraging
8 responsible aquaculture. And it's a very
9 business-like kind of statement. And is there any
10 possibility of putting something a little bit more
11 lofty in there?

12 MR. CORBIN: Yeah, I think Bob and I are
13 saying fine. What would make the group
14 comfortable with it?

15 MS. BONNEY: So, could I make a
16 recommendation?

17 MR. CORBIN: Sure.

18 MS. BONNEY: What if you just take the
19 original goal, and add your "using best available
20 science and technology" at the end?

21 MR. RHEAULT: That was actually my
22 suggestion, but we were trying to balance the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 comments and considerations of a wide variety of
2 inputs. But I am perfectly happy with that
3 suggestion. I second that motion.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Or accepted as
5 friendly, right? Yeah.

6 MS. BONNEY: I think (inaudible).

7 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: John?

8 MR. CORBIN: I can accept it, sir.
9 Let's move on.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any other member
11 comments on any of the revised goals before -- all
12 right, seeing no further comments, all in favor of
13 adopting the revised vision statement, revised
14 mission statement, and revised goals with the one
15 modification to goal two -- please say "aye."

16 MULTIPLE: Aye.

17 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any opposition?
18 Okay, passes unanimously.

19 MR. CORBIN: Thank you.

20 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you, John.
21 All right. So, we have -- we're a little bit
22 overdue for our break. We're scheduled for a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 15-minute break. Let's make it 10, and we'll
2 reconvene at 10:25.

3 So, as I look over the agenda, depending
4 on how long these next couple of subcommittee
5 reports take, we might have the opportunity to
6 work through lunch and get out a little early, and
7 go have the meeting done in time to go do lunch.
8 But we'll see how long the reports take.

9 Julie, you're up next for the
10 subcommittee report on protected resources.

11 MS. MORRIS: Yes, I am. So, it's a very
12 short report, and we can talk about any aspects of
13 it that you'd like to discuss further.

14 So, I wanted to remind the group about
15 what the purpose of our Protected Resources
16 Subcommittee project is regarding recovery
17 actions. So, that's on the screen.

18 Our purpose is to conduct a
19 retrospective analysis of a subset of Endangered
20 Species Act recovery actions by status category,
21 and identify characteristics that may increase the
22 likelihood of recovery action success to help

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 inform development of future recovery actions.

2 And so we had two presentations
3 yesterday for the full committee and then followup
4 discussions with Nora Berwick in the subcommittee
5 meeting, and again at breakfast yesterday morning.
6 And if you could scroll down a little bit, Heidi.

7 So, what we learned from the
8 presentations at this meeting were that, first of
9 all, our task will be way more complicated than we
10 thought it would be. And for steelhead -- which
11 was the focus of Nora's presentations -- they
12 really need a strategy to prioritize the actions.
13 There's a lot of recovery actions in the plan. A
14 lot of them seemed to be loaded into the plan
15 because they were ongoing projects, so they're
16 responding to the project, but there wasn't really
17 a good analysis of whether the action was going to
18 benefit the viability of the different
19 subpopulations of a species.

20 And so I think they're in the process
21 now of trying to prioritize actions that will more
22 directly improve the viability, and they also need

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to be thinking about the sequencing of those
2 actions so that they build on each other in a
3 logical way to be effective.

4 It seems unclear in the steelhead
5 example of who's really responsible for the
6 overall coordination of the recovery actions which
7 has led to this kind of chaotic sequencing of the
8 actions. And Nora really, really wanted us to get
9 the message that positive and effective working
10 relationships among the different entities and
11 then kind of social capital that you build in the
12 process of working on recovery with other people
13 in other organizations are very, very important.

14 So, some of those were not in our
15 original scope of the kinds of questions we
16 thought you should be asking about these recovery
17 actions. And so that was very beneficial, to work
18 through that difficult and complicated case to
19 kind of define some of these other things that are
20 going on.

21 So, we have -- if you could scroll down
22 again -- these are the next steps for our work.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 We're going to take our impressions from our
2 meetings here, and revise a kind of draft list of
3 factors that we think may be influencing the
4 success of recovery actions. And that's going to
5 turn into kind of an interview guide.

6 And we're going to develop an interview
7 guide and then sort of a template for recording
8 the results of those interviews. We've divided up
9 the seven plans among the committee members, and
10 everybody is going to be taking lead on one of
11 those plans. Heather's currently taking the lead
12 on two -- not you, Heather (inaudible). And so we
13 might convince Pam, if her work ever gives her a
14 break, to take on one of those. But I haven't
15 asked her about it yet.

16 And so we have seven plans. We have a
17 lead committee member for each of the plans --
18 Therese and Heidi are going to connect us with the
19 correct Protective Resources staff person who is
20 most responsible for leading on that recovery
21 plan, and we'll conduct interviews over the
22 summer. Hope to have all those interviews

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 complete by mid- August.

2 We'll compile what we learned from those
3 interviews into a document that we'll bring to the
4 October MAFAC meeting for review, and then once we
5 review that with all of you and with the
6 subcommittee, we'll try to form a final report.

7 This list of tasks doesn't really
8 address the other part of the purpose, which is to
9 identify potential partnerships and interagency
10 relationships that could help to move the recovery
11 actions forward, but we think it'll be an
12 iterative process, and those things will come up
13 in the interviews, and we'll flag them. So,
14 that's our plans (inaudible). Any questions?
15 Anybody else from the subcommittee want to
16 embellish? Paul's looking forward to talking to
17 people about sperm whales.

18 MR. CLAMPITT: Yeah, it's going to be
19 fun.

20 MS. MORRIS: Ted's going to lead on
21 northern white whale. I'm going to lead on
22 steelhead trout. Who did I -- and Heather's going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to take on both stellar sea lions and (inaudible).
2 And Columbus is going to lead on the (inaudible).

3 Did I miss anything? Yes, go ahead.

4 MR. SHELLEY: I just had a question.

5 You know, after the presentation yesterday -- I
6 was involved in earlier discussions about this,
7 and, you know, the importance of picking a
8 recovery plan that illuminates some of the
9 analytical questions we're trying to get at.

10 Do you feel that the seven recovery
11 plans are still -- have been selected with that in
12 mind, given what we learned about -- I mean, some
13 of these recovery plans become so complicated so
14 quickly that it's hard to answer those questions
15 without doing a lot more work than they have time
16 to do.

17 So, I'm just putting that out there as a
18 question, I guess.

19 MS. MORRIS: You know, I think one of
20 the reactions to Tuesday's presentation could have
21 been we're not going to be able to make any
22 progress on this issue; just decide to do

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 something else. But I think the spirit of the
2 committee is to move forward, and see what we can
3 learn. It's possible that we'll miss something
4 really big and important because we didn't have
5 the right recovery plans. But I'm sure the ones
6 that we've picked will lead to some insights that
7 will be useful to share.

8 And our sense of talking with Nora, too,
9 was that she was really kind of motivated, and
10 energized, and grateful for the opportunity to
11 talk with a group of people who are outside
12 Protected Resources about the kinds of obstacles
13 and successes that she's seen; pretty interested
14 in sharing that. And we're hoping to find that
15 same -- we're hoping to have a very positive
16 interaction with the lead staff people, and have
17 that same kind of response -- not that they need
18 to defend where they are with the plan, but that
19 there are some real gained wisdom there about
20 what's working and what's not working, and some
21 eagerness to share that with a group like us, but
22 would be helping to make everything work for her.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: Well, it certainly seems
2 from your sort of takeaway -- the bullets up above
3 there -- that you actually expected some
4 interesting (inaudible). And I think it'll be
5 good as you go into it to come up with some
6 (inaudible) hypotheses that everyone could use in
7 the different plans so there's some commonality
8 across the interviews.

9 MS. MORRIS: Yeah. Well, that's why
10 we're having a common interview guide, and we have
11 factors that we identified might be operational.
12 We didn't talk about in terms of hypotheses, but
13 that's a good way to think about it. We're
14 testing some initial ideas about why some recovery
15 actions might be moving forward, and some not.
16 And we may find out that, yeah, we were wrong
17 about some of these things -- or we may say, hey,
18 this is really interesting.

19 MR. SHELLEY: I'm trying to think of all
20 the species. We don't have a recovery plan
21 associated with a species that's recovered and
22 hasn't gotten off the list, which is an issue that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a lot of people raise, right? I mean, we don't
2 have (inaudible).

3 MS. MORRIS: Well, we think the sperm
4 whale --

5 MR. CLAMPITT: Yes, yes, because talking
6 to Mr. Richard Merrick, he told us that now that
7 they've pulled discrete segments from the humpback
8 whale law that their next task was sperm whale.

9 MR. SHELLEY: Perfect.

10 MS. MORRIS: So, yeah -- maybe. We'll
11 see.

12 MR. SHELLEY: That's great.

13 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Any other
14 comments? Well, and it has been -- Ted was giving
15 some testimony about -- they've learned a lot
16 about (inaudible) and how to avoid entanglement
17 interactions spatially, right? Yeah, there's been
18 a lot of very pivotal work on (inaudible) and it
19 makes it possible in the criteria for evaluating
20 the effectiveness of a recovery plan such as that
21 is -- you have a starting point, a checkpoint in
22 the middle, and the activities that are involved.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And it allows you to evaluate how effective the
2 approach used there was compared to some others.
3 I think we'll see a whole spectrum of
4 effectiveness in this (inaudible).

5 MR. RHEAULT: So, I hate to complicate
6 things, but what do we do when we fail -- in other
7 words, when a species go extinct? We used to have
8 a lot of Atlantic salmon in Connecticut. It's
9 never coming back. It's on the verge of being
10 extinct in most of Maine -- unless the warming
11 trend is reversed. It's likely to go away. What
12 is the action that the managers use when that
13 happens? Is it forever listed?

14 MR. AMES: Well, Yogi Berra summed it
15 up. When it's over, it's over. If a species is
16 extinct, it's gone -- at least in today's
17 technology.

18 If there's a vestigial population, you
19 have a chance to bring it back. And that's the
20 case in the Gulf of Maine. The right whale was
21 down to about 90 specimens. And over a 35-year
22 period, it has come back to a credible number.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 They're getting sustainable average reproduction
2 for the last several years of about 70 pups per
3 year. And they've got a whole plethora of
4 regulations in that protect them during their
5 migration.

6 So, I look at it and say, you know, it's
7 really been painful from a fisherman's
8 perspective, but it's been effective, too. And if
9 you had that situation in a salmon run, there's a
10 good probability that you can restore it
11 (inaudible) too -- personal opinion.

12 MR. BROWN: Unfortunately, I missed the
13 meeting yesterday. But I think one of the things
14 that's been brought up in some of the discussions
15 that we've had is, a lot of times, you're dealing
16 with various species at the same time that are
17 endangered. And so how you wrap your head around
18 that -- and we had the benefit of looking at
19 opportunities where you can have multispecies
20 plans or multispecies environment.

21 And I think that's something that might
22 be helpful as we go through this.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you,
2 Julie.

3 MS. MORRIS: Thank you.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, I just have an
5 observation for Heidi and Jennifer on this, as we
6 continue forward. And this is one of the many
7 projects that MAFAC's been working on that I think
8 the goal is to have some transparency and give
9 some visibility to. I'd like to see us put things
10 like the terms of reference on the web pages. And
11 as we develop documents down the road, make it so
12 that members have access to some of this stuff
13 more easily. You know, I know we've gotten things
14 by email, and they're there, but it would be great
15 to see some of this be posted and become part of
16 the whole effort to generate public dialogue and
17 make some of this transparent, because I think
18 this is an important debate.

19 MS. MORRIS: We have a great -- on the
20 members- only site -- is that where it is, Heidi?

21 MS. LOVETT: Yep.

22 MS. MORRIS: We have a very overwhelming

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 set of documents for Protected Resources posted
2 there.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Exactly -- for the
4 members- only site, right? So, one of the things
5 we need to think about is, what things do we need
6 to move from there, and put into the public site?
7 You know, and I'm not prejudging which things
8 should go there; I just think it's something we
9 need to internally talk about. I'm just flagging
10 the issue.

11 All right. Thank you, Julie. All
12 right. Next item on our agenda is strategic
13 planning, budgeting, and program management.
14 Julie, thank you for taking it over in Tony's
15 absence. And I know you had a good discussion on
16 cooperative research and management. I know I
17 gave you some comments on -- but appreciate you
18 taking the leadership on this one.

19 MS. BONNEY: I sent Heidi an email with
20 an attachment. I'm assuming she got it.

21 MS. LOVETT: Let me check -- oh.

22 MS. BONNEY: Yeah?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Okay. You just sent it?

2 MS. BONNEY: Yeah. So, just to kind of
3 overarching start the discussion -- Mike and I
4 were the only ones that really showed up for the
5 committee process, because there was too many
6 other conflicts for other people's interest. I
7 got some input from Pam, and I got some input from
8 Keith.

9 And so, really, we have eight different
10 recommendations. Three of them are broad, in
11 terms of the overall whitepaper, and then five of
12 them are really dealing with the recommendations
13 that were on page 40 through 43 that we're
14 revising the text to add clarity or additional
15 content to those recommendations in the
16 whitepaper.

17 So, the first issue is -- if you read
18 the whitepaper, there's this discussion of a
19 letter that came from a wide group of
20 stakeholders, and that really initiated the
21 process for trying to define what comanagement,
22 cooperative research, and cooperative management

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is. But there's no copy of the actual letter in
2 the whitepaper, and if you actually look at that
3 letter, it has a broad scope of things, and the
4 agency's parsed out several tasks within that
5 letter. So, this is just one.

6 So, those folks that sent the letter,
7 both NGO and non-NGO stakeholders, are going to be
8 seeing this whitepaper -- don't have any context
9 of where their letter is and how everything else
10 is moving. So, the idea would be to add a copy of
11 the letter, and give those stakeholders a status
12 in terms of all the other issues that are outlined
13 in the letter. So, that's the first
14 recommendation.

15 Then the second recommendation is, if
16 you actually -- and I don't know if you want to
17 look at pages 40 to 41, but there's really no
18 crystal definition of comanagement, cooperative
19 management, and cooperative research. And so what
20 we're suggesting is that those clearly need to be
21 defined.

22 So, now if you move down from there, one

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of the cooperative policy statements number one
2 is, there's this mixture of comanagement and
3 cooperative management. Well, comanagement is
4 really reserved for the shared management with
5 states and tribes that have similar authority.
6 Cooperative management is a completely different
7 animal.

8 So, we're trying to make sure that it's
9 clear what the difference between comanagement is
10 and cooperative management is. So, this -- now
11 we're actually revising the text and the
12 whitepaper to make clarity, in terms of the three
13 different terms. And so the underlined portions
14 is the edits that we're making within the
15 recommendations in the document.

16 So, I don't know if people want to read
17 through it, or if they have any questions -- but
18 maybe if you can scroll down farther, Heidi, you
19 can see. So, basically, they're trying to define
20 the differences between the three topics, and then
21 we actually put some additional information in the
22 definition of comanagement that was in the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 original whitepaper.

2 From a North Pacific perspective, when
3 you do cooperative management, you're sharing
4 tasks between the agency and the stakeholders, in
5 terms of managing the fishery. So, that's why we
6 put that additional text in, just to add that
7 other utility for cooperative management. Okay,
8 so if you want to continue to scroll down.

9 MS. LOVETT: You want me to (inaudible)
10 or --

11 MS. BONNEY: So -- and then these are
12 all just text changes. And it's just, like I
13 said, for clarity, more than anything else.

14 MS. LOVETT: Next one?

15 MS. BONNEY: Yep. And then this is the
16 one that there's going to be some discussion
17 about. Pam had given me some suggestions. I was
18 getting feedback from others that didn't
19 necessarily agree. So, I think that we, as a
20 group, need to decide what we want to do with the
21 number four recommendation. Basically, it's
22 suggesting that the agency should be pushing for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 statutory authority to allow acceptance of private
2 donations.

3 Pam has raised the concern that there
4 could be a conflict of interest, in terms of who's
5 giving those donations. It could create
6 competition between those that are soliciting
7 private donations for funding. And so how do you
8 control that animal?

9 Paul originally suggested that there may
10 be a way to put in some kind of guidelines with
11 regard to that. And so, really, I think it's
12 really a group decision on how you want to
13 approach that issue.

14 I think that on Pam's -- what she had
15 sent me -- she would like to see that a lot
16 tighter -- and maybe say instead of private --
17 make the private donations more in kind than
18 dollars. And I guess I can turn it over to Pam,
19 in terms of what other issues you'd like to raise
20 on that particular issue.

21 I guess we're looking for guidance, in
22 terms of how you may want to tweak that -- if

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 people are happy with that, or it needs to be
2 together to address her concerns.

3 MS. YOCHER: No, Julie. I mean, I think
4 you raised the issue -- is that rather than this
5 sort of blanket permission to -- first of all, if
6 the committee feels it's a good idea to have this
7 be possible to accept contributions of whatever
8 kind, that it not be a blanket situation, but
9 rather, you know -- the examples given yesterday
10 were things like ship time and, you know, laptop
11 computers -- so sort of in-kind contributions of
12 goods and services, as opposed to this concept of
13 actually going out and seeking cash donations, and
14 competing with the private sector in doing that.

15 That would likely make it potentially
16 less likely, I guess, that you would have some of
17 the conflict of interest concerns -- at least from
18 the fishing industry's perspective, if they were
19 the ones providing the vessel time and so on. I
20 think you would still probably hear from
21 environmental NGOs that would be concerned about
22 those contributions as being the potential for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 conflict of interest.

2 So, anyway, I'm raising what, you know,
3 my -- it's my own personal views, but it's also,
4 as I mentioned, the view of a lot of members of
5 the community that have consortium (inaudible)
6 leadership and national association marine labs
7 and so on who've provided testimony to Congress on
8 this topic. So, I'm trying to convey that, as
9 well.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Julie, both Mike and
11 Columbus (inaudible).

12 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I didn't bring it up in
13 the -- because the paper had already been
14 constructed. But I think there's something else
15 that's kind of on the boundary on this, and that's
16 assessments that you can impose -- either on
17 landings or -- you know, there's different ways to
18 go about it. And they do it in Canada, for
19 example.

20 In other words, when you deliver and you
21 pay the assessment, there's no control beyond that
22 point. It's just a funding mechanism entirely.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, it becomes neutral in that aspect.

2 But how it's used from there, you know,
3 in cooperative management situations, you can help
4 make that determination. But stakeholders can
5 have involvement. It's stakeholders, not just
6 industry.

7 But for research purposes, I'd really
8 hate to close the door entirely just because some
9 people think it might have a prejudice or a bias
10 towards how we do conduct the research or that
11 type of thing, when the funds are sometimes
12 necessary to explore, you know, different avenues
13 or different approaches. EFPs is another example.

14 MR. BROWN: Okay, Tony's not here, but I
15 think one of the avenues that could be used is
16 through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.
17 I know (inaudible) often has monies that can go
18 into there and be used for specific purposes. And
19 that can perhaps effectively be able (inaudible)
20 issue that Pam has mentioned.

21 MR. BRAME: This is especially prevalent
22 in Maine. On the one hand, I'd love to have 30

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 assessments done (inaudible) every year and some
2 money to do it. And I've seen where private
3 (inaudible) where it caused some consternation in
4 the stock assessment process -- albeit a stock
5 assessment process that's more sacrosanct.

6 And this is a step down the road to
7 having people pay for parts of it, and thereby
8 calling it into question.

9 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, can I just ask a
10 clarification issue?

11 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

12 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Was this statement
13 intended to dictate that they must do it, or is it
14 simply trying to open an option?

15 MS. BONNEY: Well, it basically is one
16 of the recommendations. So, the recommendation in
17 the document is on page 42, and that
18 not-underlined text is what the recommendation is.
19 So, it's changing statutory authority.

20 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just wondering
21 if we can finesse this and be more open-ended
22 about it. And I'm looking at this, saying, well,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 could we say that NOAA Fisheries leadership and
2 NOAA Fisheries management budget should determine
3 the proper guidelines regarding these private
4 funds, and seek statutory language needed to
5 accept private donations, where appropriate -- and
6 leave the issue with some discretion -- because it
7 seems to me, even in this dialogue, there are some
8 circumstances where maybe it's reasonable, and
9 there are some circumstances where it's not. And
10 maybe we have statutory authority, and maybe we
11 don't.

12 If the point that MAFAC is trying to
13 make is to direct NOAA to go find that where we
14 need to, great. And if we can not have the big
15 debate over, which things are we going to fund
16 privately, and which ones are we not today, then
17 I'd like to kick that can down the road.

18 MS. BONNEY: Go ahead, Pam.

19 MS. YOCHER: I think the concern and
20 some things I've heard expressed by Congressional
21 Research Committee members, as well, is that -- or
22 Resource Committee members -- is, you know, part

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of their concern is that this is NOAA seeking
2 funding outside the appropriations process, which
3 they're not happy about.

4 But the issue that Dick raised -- you
5 know, what I've heard from some industry folks --
6 you know, I'm mostly getting into the research
7 side of things, because that's the community I
8 hang out with the most -- but the concern with the
9 industry folks would be a group like PETA, for
10 example, that objects to fishing -- having them
11 fund some activities.

12 And so it's seen as just a slippery
13 slope of this broad permission for NOAA to seek
14 private donations. And without some very
15 restricted -- like I said -- good and services, or
16 ship time, or something that's really targeted to
17 a management objective that fits in with the
18 comanagement scheme -- or, you know, in the case
19 of contributions, things that people are
20 comfortable with, I think, are things like Sea
21 Grant, Saltonstall-Kennedy. You know, we heard
22 about NIFWIF.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Those processes involve, you know, a
2 competitive application process, an evaluation --
3 not only of the management implications of the
4 work, but also the technical competence of the
5 proposal, things like that -- so there's some sort
6 of vetting process that happens with regard to the
7 use of those private funds.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So, I'm
9 still left asking, does the "where appropriate"
10 concept help, or are you still resisting that?

11 And the second point I'll make is, even
12 if we were to say nothing here, the reality is
13 that private money still gets used for private
14 research, and that research and the findings from
15 that research still get used by the agency.

16 When we have a consultation on an
17 endangered species, they're reaching into the
18 literature, and they're using that information.
19 And best available science is best available
20 science, no matter who funded it.

21 So, the work is out there. And now the
22 question is, through this concept, can NOAA

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 somehow work more collaboratively with other
2 entities, and can we find a way to bridge the gap?

3 And it seems to me a "where appropriate"
4 leaves it open, but would give potentially more
5 authority to NOAA, while still giving us the
6 opportunity to have those ethical debates down the
7 road, where if it's a mission-critical thing, and
8 we don't want private money paying for stock
9 assessments, that point can still be preserved.

10 I'm just trying to move the ball
11 forward, and I see the bigger picture here.
12 Somebody's paying for the research, anyway.

13 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, but somebody's paying
14 for the research, but they're not paying NOAA.
15 So, they're not buying off the regulator, if you
16 will. They're funding an academic institution to
17 do it. There's a purity process -- all of that.
18 Just saying, these are the objections that come
19 up.

20 And the "where appropriate" -- who's
21 going to make that decision? NOAA would, right --
22 make the decision of what's appropriate and what's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 not? So, that's still, you know, in -- so the
2 concerns are still there.

3 On the other hand, I'm only one member
4 of MAFAC, so I don't want to hold up the process
5 of this committee, you know, based on these
6 concerns. So, I think I've said all I'm going to
7 say on the topic, and I'll let the committee move
8 forward with its recommendation (inaudible).

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, having gone
10 through one of these processes before at the
11 Southwest Center when we -- well, it's a long
12 story, so -- the short version is, we were seeing
13 huge numbers of sardines in Canada, the West
14 Coast. The ship and the scientists did not
15 believe they were there. We couldn't get them to
16 do traditional aerial-type survey- type stuff they
17 used to do.

18 And so we set up our own survey, and we
19 had a CIA review, and went through the whole
20 process, and we got (inaudible). I'm not thinking
21 so much -- although I have seen it used for stock
22 assessments. I think either the (inaudible) folks

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 did it a few years back, in the late '90s, I
2 believe.

3 But it has to pass the same standards
4 and tests that any information source would use --
5 or the same modeling exercise would use. But, I
6 mean, we went through some pretty rough times
7 convincing people we actually had sardines in the
8 Northwest, even though we're catching them. I
9 mean, I'm serious.

10 And it gets a little frustrating when
11 you can't convince people that -- and then you do
12 go out. And we spent a considerable amount of
13 money from industry to put this together, and then
14 to have it just summarily rejected because, you
15 know, we can't do that because it's a private
16 donation.

17 If it passed the same criteria and goes
18 through the same rigorous testing, and
19 examination, and evaluation, then I think it
20 should be acceptable.

21 And in this case, I think if you're
22 going to donate actual money, an income stream, to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 NOAA in a cooperative management effort, the
2 stakeholders would be involved in that
3 decision-making. And it's either permissible
4 legally or it's not, but I think the idea of just
5 saying it shouldn't be is -- it's going to leave
6 us short in some cases.

7 MS. BONNEY: I have Ted next.

8 MR. AMES: Well, it would seem that if a
9 proposal (inaudible) NOAA was made, and there was
10 to be outside funding, that that would be part of
11 the application. And (inaudible) could put
12 whatever criteria it wanted on it. So, it could
13 basically become an assessment using the same
14 criteria as NOAA, but allowing a private entity to
15 contribute money to that end.

16 That gives NOAA the option of accepting
17 or refusing it, rather than having it built in as
18 a hotspot. That would've worked for you, Mike,
19 right?

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, I think.

21 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'll just point out,
22 NOAA already has some discretion anyway to do

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 this. They've already received a legal opinion
2 that says they have some discretion. So, there
3 may be some boundaries that haven't been fully
4 tested. There may be some issues that need to be
5 explored, you know, but some of this is going to
6 happen.

7 MS. BONNEY: So, Jennifer.

8 MS. LUKENS: So, I was just going to
9 say, I think we have concerns over making sure --
10 and us as an agency adhere to the rules of the law
11 -- appropriations law -- and not violating what
12 we're not authorized to do.

13 And, certainly, what I think is also
14 important is protection issues. You don't want it
15 to be viewed if you're getting funding from a
16 certain source that your (inaudible) you certainly
17 wouldn't want to do that, I think.

18 We do have some authority to do this,
19 and I think I would welcome the thoughts that the
20 committee has here. But, again, that's something
21 that we're already applying to ourselves
22 internally, and it's to go into our General

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Counsel and asking what we are authorized to do,
2 and what we aren't.

3 So, we do -- Dave recently -- since
4 these recommendations were first developed, we got
5 some additional clarification under the Fish and
6 Wildlife Coordination Act what we are allowed to
7 do and not -- similar -- DOI uses it quite
8 frequently.

9 So, it's just an involving process here.
10 And the whole goal is to be able to accomplish our
11 mission and management of our resources. So,
12 that's kind of the lens that we're looking
13 through.

14 I appreciate, though, the concerns of
15 (inaudible).

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'm still trying to
17 get a sense -- is this an issue where we just
18 don't even have consensus? With due respect, is
19 Pam the only dissenter? I mean, I just don't
20 really know where we are on the issue as a body.

21 MS. MORRIS: I see the addition of
22 proper guidelines as being good, and, you know,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 communicating that if there is statutory language
2 to accept private donations, that there also have
3 to be guidelines to guard against the kinds of
4 problems that we're raising.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

6 MR. RHEAULT: I could argue this both
7 ways, so I'm internally conflicted.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I mean, just as an
9 observation, it does seem that the inserted
10 underlined language helps to make the point that
11 we are aware that there are the ethical issues.
12 We want NOAA to be thinking about these issues. I
13 know it doesn't go quite as far as Pam would like
14 us to go, but I'm just trying to figure out, do we
15 have enough consensus to go forward with this?
16 I'm seeing a lot of heads nodding, so maybe we can
17 kick this down and vote on the whole thing at the
18 end, Julie.

19 MS. BONNEY: Okay. All right. So, now
20 we're onto number five, which is basically -- so
21 basically, many times when you do cooperative
22 research, if you don't have the goals and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 objectives set upfront, then the agencies working
2 for it are dissatisfied. So, we just added
3 clarity language to make sure that the goals and
4 objectives of the cooperative program are set up
5 upfront, so everybody understands what the
6 outcome's going to be.

7 In terms of recommendation number six,
8 we felt that these are the metrics. There's two
9 metrics that they're going to be looking at, in
10 terms of how they're rolling forward with
11 cooperative research and cooperative management.
12 And so this one, it seemed to me, needed more
13 clarity and content, and so we added, you know,
14 not only -- because originally, it was just,
15 determine how many of them led to management
16 decisions, right? So, we've added better-
17 informed, facilitated improved management
18 decisions (inaudible) it just makes it more
19 expansive. Then, in terms of the conclusion, it
20 was comanagement and the reality is, we're really
21 talking about cooperative management and
22 cooperative research. So, we're making that more

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 clear.

2 Then the final recommendation is
3 basically, you know, saying that there needs to be
4 a good conclusion about both cooperative
5 management and cooperative research, and maybe to
6 put kind of a framework in the document that
7 explains what both are, so that the public can
8 kind of -- and the agency can kind of understand
9 when you might use either one.

10 So, I don't know if people want to read
11 those, and see if you agree with them, but it
12 basically -- cooperative management allows aspects
13 of NOAA's responsibility to be delegated to
14 stakeholders, but may require those stakeholders
15 to incur the burden of investing additional
16 resources or incurring additional costs, as a
17 general cooperative management should be pursued
18 when NOAA and the stakeholders gain mutual
19 benefits and the legal authority of permits.

20 And then the next one is, define what
21 cooperative management is, and when both NOAA and
22 the stakeholders might be willing to interact

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 together to get to an end goal.

2 So, really, the key to me is, NOAA
3 should consider how best to be a partner and
4 facilitator to create a positive environment for
5 cooperative research projects.

6 So, those are the recommendations that
7 we have.

8 MR. MERRICK: Can we go back up? Can I
9 see seven again? And six?

10 MS. SAGAR: So, seven is actually --
11 just one comment on this one -- in the conclusion
12 -- I know that, based on the paper, this is
13 correct, but if you're quoting the letter, the
14 letter actually did say comanagement. So, there
15 is that nuance there.

16 So, it depends on how you want us to
17 revise. So, I think it's fine to leave it like
18 this (inaudible) I just want you guys to be aware
19 because you don't have a copy of the letter -- the
20 actual letter, they use the word "comanagement."
21 But based on the way that the whitepaper is
22 written, the way Julie has made this change is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 correct.

2 So, I'll just take away the letter.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Right -- because one
4 of the first points was, we need to distinguish
5 between comanagement and cooperative management.

6 MS. SAGAR: Exactly. I just want to let
7 you know this is a little nuance. So, when I
8 respond to it (inaudible).

9 MS. BONNEY: And I realize that as you
10 incorporate the recommendations, there's going to
11 have to be kind of embedded in the whitepaper to
12 make it all flow correctly, right?

13 MS. SAGAR: Right.

14 MS. BONNEY: So, okay.

15 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any other discussion
16 on the last three items?

17 MS. SAGAR: I interrupted Richard
18 (inaudible).

19 MR. MERRICK: I just wanted to review
20 those once -- in five, five --

21 MS. BONNEY: I think I did forward it
22 all to you (inaudible).

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MERRICK: Yeah, just a comment, if I
2 may.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Please.

4 MR. MERRICK: Five is probably, from the
5 science centers, the thorniest of all these. And
6 it's not -- I suspect that the science centers
7 don't want to incorporate the proper research in
8 the stock assessments. I don't think it's
9 (inaudible). But this is always the biggest
10 tension. And if you guys had additional thoughts
11 about that -- from your perspective, how to do
12 that -- that would be helpful.

13 I know some examples where it's worked
14 well. In the Northeast, where we had the
15 Northeast Consortium, that project series that was
16 funded three or four years through the University
17 of New Hampshire Sea Grant really seemed to work
18 well, and there was a lot of cooperation there
19 between our community, the industry, and the
20 agency. When that went away, we lost all those
21 ties. But I think there's probably other examples
22 around the country, and if you could -- it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 wouldn't hurt if you had ideas of how to do this
2 better (inaudible) we're looking from the agency
3 out, saying, "You guys in the industry need to do
4 your job better; get the science better integrated
5 into research (inaudible)" but that's not a good
6 answer.

7 MS. BONNEY: And the only example I have
8 is in the North Pacific, where they had
9 (inaudible). So, basically, the crabs -- because
10 of the climate change -- the crab had moved more
11 into Russia, and they had a stratum that they'd
12 done over time, in terms of simulated (inaudible).
13 Industry self-funded an expanded survey. And when
14 they sat down and talked about that, the agency
15 basically said, "We need X amount of time," and
16 they actually helped develop the additional
17 survey.

18 And then what the expectation of that --
19 everybody realized they were going to spend \$1
20 million a year for three years to get that
21 information before they even started to address
22 (inaudible) environment.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So, when you're talking about setting
2 goals and objectives, if you have that
3 conversation upfront, I think everybody's expect
4 -- in other words, there could've been no
5 conversation done one year, and the stakeholders
6 saying, "We just spent \$1 million; you didn't do
7 anything with the data."

8 MR. MERRICK: Now you tell us you need
9 three years of data.

10 MS. BONNEY: Yeah, exactly. So, that's
11 the kind of thing that I was thinking when you're
12 talking about that -- because people can start
13 complaining about the way the net's coming through
14 the water, and whether they're catching all the
15 fish, and what kind of research are you going to
16 do? How are you going to implement that new
17 information if your selectivity is wrong, compared
18 to the base survey?

19 So, if we have that conversation
20 upfront, then the expectation is going to go a lot
21 better than somebody just going out and saying,
22 "See, I told you the selectivity was bad."

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MERRICK: Or different, anyway.

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Julie or Richard, in
3 light of this conversation, I'm wondering if we
4 can make today sort of the beginning of this
5 dialogue. And I'm wondering if maybe we can put
6 this on the agenda for our strategic planning
7 group to come and revisit this particular point
8 and give some additional direction -- because what
9 I heard in this discussion, from Pam's concerns on
10 an ethical and principle level, Dick's concerns on
11 an issue of which programs do we allow to get
12 outside funding and which ones shouldn't -- you
13 know, it may be that this would be a topic where
14 MAFAC could give better direction. And if we
15 spent some more time on this issue, give some more
16 detail about what we think appropriate boundaries
17 are. When should they do it; when shouldn't they
18 do it?

19 And, you know, what I'm wondering is,
20 can we approve what we've got today, but then
21 continue the dialogue in the strategic planning
22 committee?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Terri?

2 MS. BEIDEMAN: I have a little concern,
3 because I've been involved personally with
4 administering cooperative research -- and, also,
5 (inaudible) program at -- the results were test
6 devices, and it didn't have anything to do with
7 stock assessments. And that last sentence kind of
8 -- it doesn't say "if." You know, if this data is
9 going to be used for that; it kind of infers. And
10 to test the line-cutting device on fishing boats
11 doesn't require a stock assessment analysis and
12 design and all of that extra, and it kind of
13 infers that that would apply to all of them.

14 So, I have some concerns where --

15 MS. BONNEY: Well, and I think the
16 reality is, there's a whole group of
17 recommendations on your cooperative research, so
18 your other constructs are in those other
19 recommendations.

20 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. Just seeing it
21 like that, I was like, well, I don't think the
22 line-cutting device (inaudible) needs stock

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 assessment analysis.

2 MR. MERRICK: Well, frequently, we do
3 (inaudible) research that eventually is meant to
4 go onto management --

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: Right.

6 MR. MERRICK: -- or regulatory process,
7 and wouldn't fit that, either.

8 MS. BEIDEMAN: Well, and BREP happened
9 to be mentioned up there (inaudible) engineering
10 is not stock assessment.

11 MS. BONNEY: So, I guess just to kind of
12 wrap up, then -- I think, as long as people are
13 okay -- so it sounds like if we approve the
14 recommendations, and that we further investigate
15 both the cooperative research number three,
16 recommendation number five, and also think more on
17 the one up above, Heidi, which is how to address
18 the issue of accepting private donations, and what
19 the proper guidelines might be, and take that on
20 at our next meeting.

21 And then otherwise, I think we're good
22 to go. I guess the only question I would have for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Heather is that you're going to get additional
2 comments from the CCC and the -- what is it --
3 MMC. So, if that's the case, how timely do we
4 need to be, in terms of giving more guidance on
5 those two particular topics?

6 MS. SAGAR: Well, so a couple things. I
7 think that the way you have this recommendation
8 right now is fine for the whitepaper. We wouldn't
9 probably make that -- we wouldn't probably go to
10 that level in this document -- like, what level
11 should or should not be looked at; I think the way
12 you have this right now is broad and general
13 (inaudible). I don't think we drill down any
14 further, anyway.

15 So, I think that -- if you did something
16 like that, it would be sort of a separate effort,
17 and maybe you'd be advising Paul or Brian Pollack
18 in the Budget Office on that merger effort.

19 So, that's the first thing. I think
20 your second question was about -- so on the 26th
21 or 27th -- whenever these are due -- I'll take all
22 of the comments from the Marine Mammal Commission,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MAFAC, and CCC, and, you know, figure out how they
2 all fit together and if they're conflicting --
3 edits, or changes, or, you know, ways forward --
4 I'll probably call on Keith or you, and we can
5 have a separate dialogue about the intent from
6 whoever said something that may conflict.

7 But, you know, I'll just incorporate
8 them into the document, and then we'll finalize
9 them. Is that helpful?

10 MS. BONNEY: So, Columbus, where do you
11 want to put that issue?

12 MR. BROWN: That was under comanagement.
13 I think we need to add other federal agencies. We
14 have states and tribes, and there are a number of
15 instances where USDA, Interior have
16 comanagement/overlapping responsibilities, and it
17 would be beneficial for that to be there, also.

18 MR. BRAME: The classic one's Atlantic
19 States Marine Fishery Commission (inaudible).

20 MS. BONNEY: So, I think that's good
21 clarity. So, that would be (inaudible).

22 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Pam, did you have

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 your hand up again?

2 MS. YOCHER: No.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: No? Okay. So,
4 Julie, I understand that the motion you're
5 presenting is to approve these recommendations
6 with these insertions.

7 MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

8 MS. LOVETT: I'm sorry -- just for
9 clarity -- was that last addition to go in
10 somewhere specific, Columbus?

11 MR. BROWN: It was up further, where we
12 had added tribes and states, under comanagement.

13 MS. LOVETT: Here?

14 MR. BROWN: Yes.

15 MS. LOVETT: Okay. So -- sorry
16 (inaudible). Okay, I'll just add it there. So,
17 the four states -- federal partners?

18 MR. BROWN: Yeah, other federal
19 agencies.

20 MS. LOVETT: Other federal agencies --
21 okay (inaudible). Okay.

22 MR. BRAME: And are we going to put in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that this is a work in progress, or with the
2 understanding that this -- that we're going to
3 continue to work on this, as you suggested?

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I've already sort of
5 passed them to Jennifer and said, let's make sure
6 this is on the agenda for October for the
7 subcommittee. So, I'm already planning on
8 integrating that into the next meeting dialogue.

9 MR. BRAME: Because we missed final
10 vote; I don't know if we're going to keep working
11 on it. I think it's worthwhile (inaudible).

12 MS. BONNEY: So, just to be clear, I
13 think my view is, we're going to get more input
14 from the other (inaudible) to see how that merges
15 into the whitepaper, and then also investigate the
16 two recommendations, in terms of better clarity.

17 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. Thank you,
18 Dick, for following up on that point. Any other
19 discussion?

20 Well, actually, I guess, Julie, this is
21 a motion, right?

22 MS. BONNEY: Am I making a motion?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah.

2 MS. BONNEY: Okay, that's the motion.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: All right. So, do
4 we have a second?

5 SPEAKER: Second.

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: All right. Any
7 further discussion? We beat this one up pretty
8 good. All right. All those in favor?

9 MULTIPLE: Aye.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any opposition?
11 Love it when we have consensus. All right. So,
12 11:20 -- thank you, Julie, for working us through
13 that, and thank you for taking up that issue in
14 Tony's absence.

15 So, the next item is recreational
16 fisheries. Ken is not here, but Phil has agreed
17 to ably fill in for him. And I know we've got two
18 items to work our way through for the rec
19 fishermen.

20 MR. DYSKOW: Thanks (inaudible). Heidi,
21 we have a slide -- just a bullet point slide. If
22 you don't have it, that's fine.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Yep. No, I do.

2 MR. DYSKOW: The main focus of our
3 subcommittee at this meeting was to discuss the
4 recreational fishing policy regional
5 implementation plans. That's the last step in
6 this process. We have a rec fishing policy. We
7 have a national implementation plan, and the
8 Assistant Administrator has charged us with a
9 timely rollout of an implementation plan at the
10 regional level.

11 So, that's what we've talked about. We
12 had two items within that. The first was, as many
13 of you know, we currently have a recreational
14 fishing working group. It has 26 members, and
15 there's a minimum of two members from each region.
16 And they provided input on the rec fishing policy
17 and some input on the national implementation
18 plan. So, this body is going to be asked to
19 provide input assistance in the development of the
20 regional implementation plans within some context
21 or framework that Russ Dunn is going to put
22 together.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 This will probably be the last project
2 for that working group, and it's going to be a
3 project that we'll do electronically. In other
4 words, we're not going to have a face-to-face on
5 this; we're simply going to ask them to provide
6 input to the development of these regional plans
7 electronically, by phone, and by email -- or
8 however is most efficient.

9 We're going to revisit this working
10 group at our October meeting, because, as you all
11 know, these working groups are envisioned to be
12 put together for a specific task. And when that
13 task is done, the working group goes away. So, we
14 will revisit the future of the recreational
15 fishing working group at our October meeting;
16 since these regional plans are somewhat
17 fast-tracked by NOAA, they may possibly be done
18 prior to that meeting, with providing that input
19 and assistance. And if so, we will decide at that
20 time what the future of the working group is.

21 Any questions on that? Pretty
22 straightforward. The next part -- I would like to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 put -- I should say our committee would like to
2 put before the full MAFAC Board a recommendation
3 that will be in the form of a motion after
4 discussion, regarding regional rec fishing
5 coordinators.

6 We currently have three regions that
7 have or will have fulltime recreational fishing
8 coordinators. The other regions do not. So, it's
9 going to be very difficult for them to put
10 together an implementation plan or provide the
11 oversight over time of the implementation, if they
12 don't have anybody to do them.

13 So, what we are putting to the full
14 MAFAC Board in the form of a motion is that each
15 region have a fulltime recreational fishing
16 coordinator. And, obviously, there'll be some
17 discussion on that, and I guess the next step
18 would be to go to that discussion.

19 But just to restate the current
20 situation -- three of the regions already have or
21 are in the final stages of adding the rec fishing
22 coordinators; the others are not, and we would

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 like to provide a recommendation to MAFAC that all
2 the regions have a rec fishing coordinator.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: That's your motion?

4 MR. DYSKOW: That is my motion, but we
5 have discussion.

6 MS. BONNEY: I have a couple questions.
7 So, can you tell me who has a regional coordinator
8 right now?

9 MR. DYSKOW: The current regional
10 coordinators -- the Pacific does, the West Coast
11 does, and the Southeast does (inaudible) and the
12 others do not.

13 MR. DUNN: So, if I can just clarify --
14 so those three regions have dedicated -- it's a
15 fulltime one person who does that job. The other
16 two remaining regions (inaudible) have part-time
17 people who split their responsibilities, and so it
18 falls under the "other duties as assigned."

19 So, currently, the (inaudible) region
20 has one staffer who covers both regions part-time,
21 and he essentially is a regulatory person
22 (inaudible).

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Alaska -- there is a similar situation
2 with a part-time person who splits their time.

3 MS. BONNEY: So, I guess, to me -- like
4 Alaska -- a lot of the recreational is more of the
5 state authority than federal authority.

6 MR. DUNN: Right.

7 MS. BONNEY: And so they're honestly --
8 you know, I can't really answer the question, but
9 to me, I don't know if they need a fulltime
10 dedicated person. Isn't NMFS the one that would
11 decide whether they have enough responsibility to
12 require a fulltime versus just saying "thou shall
13 have" --

14 MR. DYSKOW: Again, we're not ordering
15 NMFS to do this; our recommendation is that they
16 have a fulltime rec fishing coordinator in each of
17 the regions. The ultimate decision, of course, is
18 with NMFS, not with us. Does that answer your
19 question?

20 I agree with you; Alaska is a difficult
21 one, because we're basically talking halibut. And
22 is there enough activity for a regional

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 coordinator in Alaska? And if there isn't, I
2 think the assumption would be that NMFS would make
3 the appropriate decision as to have or not have
4 that individual.

5 But in the other regions, there clearly
6 is a task that needs to be accomplished, and there
7 isn't enough resource to accomplish that task.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Paul and Terri Lee
9 have both had their hands up.

10 MR. CLAMPITT: Yeah, I just wanted to
11 make a comment. In Alaska, they actually have a
12 voting councilmember that's a recreational
13 fisherman representative.

14 MR. DUNN: All of the councils --

15 MR. CLAMPITT: So, I don't know. You
16 know, I mean, it looks like you're interested in
17 being a representative.

18 MR. DUNN: That's an entirely different
19 beast. The council is completely separate from
20 the agency. This would be an internal -- as I
21 understood (inaudible) --

22 MR. DYSKOW: No, that -- I was going to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 say the same thing. Paul, the region of councils
2 are all supposed to have a rec fishing
3 representative on them. But, again, that's a
4 whole separate issue. The council develops
5 regulatory issues; the NMFS regional staff would
6 work on policy, like implementing this action plan
7 for recreational fishing. It's not the voting
8 council that implements that. We're not stepping
9 on their turf. So, there's two separate, you
10 know, responsibilities.

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Just for clarity --
12 this is about NOAA fisheries at a regional level
13 having a fulltime Russ Dunn at each of those
14 offices.

15 MR. DUNN: Under regional control.
16 These aren't staff that I manage. I mean, I would
17 coordinate with them. They would be under the
18 regional administrator. And I think that's the
19 way that (inaudible).

20 MR. DYSKOW: Yeah, but the way this
21 process was discussed by the committee -- we have
22 a national recreational fishing policy. We have a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 national implementation plan, and NMFS has been
2 charged with the responsibility of developing
3 regional plans. There has to be somebody to do
4 that; otherwise, it's just words on a piece of
5 paper. And they've recognized that, and they
6 filled some of the positions -- with the possible
7 exception of Alaska.

8 Those remaining regions that don't have
9 the coordinator are going to have difficulty
10 accomplishing anything, because those part-time
11 people get pulled in lots of directions.

12 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Terri Lee and Mike.

13 MS. BEIDEMAN: So, you're essentially
14 asking for an additional staff person, not these
15 office -- to do this fulltime dedicated
16 recreational regional coordinator. I'm assuming
17 they're not going to be something else besides.

18 MR. DUNN: It could be either an
19 existing staff person converted, if you will, to a
20 new position. I don't mean that in the "amen"
21 sense (inaudible) or it could be a new staffer
22 added -- a new FTE added. It would depend on --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 frankly, this would depend on the availability of
2 resources in any given region, since I don't
3 believe headquarters would be providing any
4 dollars for it.

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. Well, that would
6 be part of the issue -- is, you know, who can pay
7 for that? And does it require fulltime? I mean,
8 is there sufficient work to -- I mean, maybe in
9 the beginning.

10 MR. DYSKOW: With the exception of
11 Alaska, where we're talking about a halibut
12 charter fishery, as opposed to this broad fishery
13 that the other regions experience, I think it
14 would.

15 You know, again, the recreational
16 fishing policy is new. You know, it's on the
17 table, and I think it requires fulltime oversight
18 to properly roll it out and implement it.

19 MR. CORBIN: And you're talking about
20 one person for North Carolina (inaudible).

21 MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm just trying to see --
22 is this long, ongoing, or is it project-oriented

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 --

2 MR. DUNN: If I -- I mean, unsolicited
3 here -- I think there is plenty of work. One of
4 the things that we have heard regularly -- and
5 from folks on the subcommittee and elsewhere -- is
6 that NOAA Fisheries has done a decent job at the
7 national level, but at the regional level, there
8 hasn't been the same level of engagement,
9 commitment, et cetera.

10 And my personal opinion is that that has
11 been a result, largely, of the fact that we have
12 had part-time staff that, you know, get pulled in
13 multiple directions. So, they might start on
14 something, and then it's over here, and then they
15 disappear from the community for four, five, six
16 months, and then suddenly they're back in; they're
17 doing a project.

18 MS. BEIDEMAN: So, I don't know. The
19 purpose is to implement this regional plan -- or
20 to begin it or whatever -- gather the resources
21 (inaudible) movement or --

22 MR. DUNN: I would say coordinating it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- you know, coordinating its implementation,
2 working with all of the offices within a given
3 region -- Habitat, Protected Resources, et cetera
4 -- to make sure that projects are identified, and
5 then tracked, and implemented, and then -- my
6 guess is, based on what, for example, Craig
7 Heberer -- who was here yesterday -- and the folks
8 in Hawaii have done, a significant portion becomes
9 outreach to communicate better with the rec
10 community.

11 So, we'd probably expand beyond -- it
12 wouldn't just be implementation; it would be
13 communications (inaudible).

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think you answered
15 part of my question; however -- and I think this
16 person could be a valuable asset; don't get me
17 wrong. But what authority do they have, and where
18 do they have to go to other authorities when you
19 start -- I mean, it's one thing to coordinate just
20 what's confined, but all these policies, whether
21 it's commercial or whatever it is, there's always
22 these allocation boundary lines and whatnot that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 get kind of murky at times -- or people are asking
2 for more or something.

3 MR. DYSKOW: Just remember, once again,
4 the regional councils are one thing; his regional
5 offices are another. These people would be
6 adjuncts to the regional office. They don't
7 direct the council, unless the council asks for
8 input. They don't get involved in rulemaking, or
9 quotas, or any of that. That's not their role.

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Thank you. I didn't
11 think that that was the case, but, on the other
12 hand, they might be a valuable asset to give
13 guidance.

14 MR. DYSKOW: Yes, absolutely.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And I think that there
16 is probably -- we suggest that maybe in the West
17 Coast (inaudible) there might be such a person
18 that could be -- or people that could be utilized
19 the same way. But that's getting off track.

20 I guess what I want to do is kind of
21 figure out what authorities they have. And if
22 it's just, I guess, information gathering, and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sharing, and data collection of sorts or whatever
2 it is --

3 MR. DUNN: I think you hit on it there.
4 If that were adopted in NMFS, the resource to
5 execute it, and it followed the current model of
6 my initiative -- and the two that are already
7 established, and the one that may be -- they would
8 have this much authority. There's zero authority
9 there; really a coordinating entity who speaks
10 with the regional -- and they typically provide
11 advice to the Director of the Office of
12 (inaudible) Fisheries and regional leadership by
13 the input of -- this is the rec community
14 perspective.

15 But there's no authority there. If you
16 want to give me some, I'd be happy to have some.

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Perhaps. But just as
18 the last point, I think that they could provide a
19 valuable -- like a report to the council or
20 something on occasion. It seems like that would
21 be a natural -- but --

22 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: We're spending a lot

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of time on this item, and we've got another one
2 after this. So, if there's more discussion that
3 needs to be had, I'm not going to stop it; I'm
4 just trying to make people aware that this is
5 taking a long time. Julie?

6 MS. MORRIS: Well, it seems like a
7 different kind of request or motion than MAFAC
8 usually puts on the table for discussion. I think
9 that's why there's some uneasiness about this. I
10 mean, it seems like we went through a major
11 high-level exercise to figure out if we were going
12 to shift the percentage of budgets for the whole
13 agency -- and in different directions to emphasize
14 something else -- what would we do? And it was
15 really hard for us to grapple with that.

16 So, an idea that we need additional
17 staff to accomplish a particular task that's
18 important to the Recreational Subcommittee -- out
19 of the context of all of the other staff needs of
20 the other programs that we're working with at the
21 agency -- seems not timely and not well- supported
22 at this point. I mean, it seems like the agency

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 needs to figure out how to implement the policy,
2 but that they may have a different strategy to
3 implement the policy than to put people in each of
4 the regional offices.

5 So, I think we need to leave those
6 choices. I mean, we need to put pressure on them
7 to implement, but defining exactly how they should
8 step up to implement seems a little bit out of our
9 policy advisory role, and I'm uncomfortable with
10 that.

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: If this language
12 were simply changed to say that NMFS consider
13 whether its regions should maintain -- would that
14 be a concern?

15 MS. BONNEY: I guess I agree with Julie.
16 I mean, I really think that our message should be
17 that NMFS needs to move forward with the regional
18 recreational initiative, and then it's up to them
19 to decide how. And so maybe in one region, they
20 need three people because it's a long coastline,
21 and in Alaska, they only need a half -- or maybe
22 they're going to do it some other way that's more

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 efficient, but it still meets the objectives of
2 the rec policy.

3 So, just deciding how many people need
4 to make something happen versus just saying "make
5 this happen" seems to me to be cleaner. But I
6 don't know what they've actual -- how to tweak the
7 language to get to that.

8 MR. DYSKOW: Well, I guess, let me back
9 up for a second. This isn't some Machiavellian
10 plot on the part of our subcommittee to get more
11 rec people at the regional level.

12 We asked how we could help to implement
13 the regional recreational policy plans, and one
14 suggestion was, utilize the rec fishing group
15 which is already in place. And they have a
16 regional focus. They have broad representation
17 across the rec fishing community, and they're
18 there.

19 The other comment we heard back was, "We
20 need people to do this." So, we were encouraged
21 to consider a recommendation that would give them
22 the resource they need to implement the planning.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 You know, it's not some clever idea that we came
2 up with to get more staff. We didn't even start
3 with that, you know, direction.

4 What can we do to help implement the
5 plan? Those were the two strongest inputs we got
6 as to how we could help. And, you know, one of
7 the wonderful things about a democracy is, if we
8 don't agree, we simply deny the motion and move
9 on.

10 So, if there is more discussion, we can
11 have that -- to your point, Keith. If not, we can
12 call for the vote, and if it doesn't pass, we move
13 on, and NOAA finds another way to accomplish the
14 rollup -- because I'm sure there are other ways,
15 as you point out.

16 MS. BONNEY: Well, and as Paul just
17 brought up, like aquaculture. I mean, there's an
18 aquaculture policy. We've been trying to get
19 aquaculture to go forever, so why not NMFS also
20 put a fulltime dedicated recreational regional
21 coordinator and an aquaculture coordinator for
22 every (inaudible)? I mean, I don't know.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. DYSKOW: Simply to keep this on task
2 -- you have the authority to end the discussion
3 and call for a vote. And if it doesn't pass, we
4 move on. So, you decide how you want to do this.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: We've got a motion
6 -- and the second?

7 All right. So, anybody calling the
8 question -- or do I have to just do it (inaudible)
9 I'm just going to call the question and say -- all
10 right, all those in favor?

11 MULTIPLE: Aye.

12 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Opposition?

13 MULTIPLE: Aye.

14 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: The motion fails.

15 MR. DYSKOW: Thank you.

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Mr. Subcommittee
17 Chair, do you have another item?

18 MR. DYSKOW: I don't.

19 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: You don't have
20 another item?

21 MR. DYSKOW: Those were the two items.

22 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I thought we --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 well, okay (inaudible) be more specific. I was
2 under the impression that we were moving on the
3 regional coordinator. Is there a motion on the
4 first part?

5 MR. DYSKOW: No, because that working
6 group reports to the Chair of the Rec Fishing
7 Subcommittee. So, that was just an action item
8 within the Subcommittee.

9 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay, I understand.
10 So, let me confer here with Jennifer. Do we need
11 to -- I understood that NOAA asked the
12 Subcommittee to consider the potential dissolution
13 of the working group.

14 MR. DYSKOW: Right. And as I said in
15 the notes, we're willing to vote at that level at
16 the October meeting. But since they haven't
17 finished the complete task that we empowered them
18 to do -- the implementation (inaudible) is the
19 last item -- we would like to get their input on
20 that development before we cut them loose.

21 Again, to your point, I'm glad you
22 brought that up. It's our intent to not burn up a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 lot of funds that may be earmarked elsewhere.
2 We're going to have this communication
3 electronically -- whatever template we put
4 together as far as how we get that information.
5 But I get, you know, that there's not a lot of
6 money here, and we don't intend to burn up any
7 money.

8 And I think that it would be appropriate
9 at the next meeting to have that discussion --
10 because these working groups, regardless whether
11 it's aquaculture or rec fishing or whatever, the
12 intention is that they exist for a finite period
13 of time, and then when the task is done, they go
14 away. My opinion is, the task isn't done yet.
15 But it could possibly be done by October.

16 MS. LUKENS: So, I just want to clarify
17 -- and I haven't read it in a while, but charge to
18 the working group -- if this task that you have
19 here -- I thought that all of the tasks had been
20 completed at the working group. And would we need
21 to modify that a little bit in order to address
22 this with that finite timeline on there -- or more

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 specificity? Again, I don't know if there's --

2 MR. DYSKOW: They're still working on
3 the rec fishing policy rollout. We've added this
4 -- you know, again, we didn't add the task. The
5 Assistant Administrator added the task of the
6 regional action plans. So, that's the task we're
7 asking them to provide input on.

8 And was it part of the original charter?
9 No, because this element didn't exist at the time
10 of the original character.

11 MS. LUKENS: So, that's what I'm saying,
12 in terms of -- and, again, since I'm new to all
13 this, I'm going to be asking Heidi to comment on
14 this, just in terms of the rules that we need to
15 abide by under the (inaudible). Is there anything
16 about that or not?

17 MS. LOVETT: I would suggest that it's
18 wise to inform the taskforce that this potentially
19 is the last task that they might be considering,
20 and let them know very clearly that the original
21 terms of reference have been completed; we're
22 going to potentially add this task to them, and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that we envision -- or that you all envision,
2 because it sounds like that's what you're
3 promoting -- that their tasks will be completed,
4 and working group will be dissolved sometime in
5 the fall or later this year.

6 It's just so that they have a heads-up,
7 too -- and that it's a courtesy for them, I would
8 say. And that way, it's really clear for
9 everybody. That would be my recommendation.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, everybody
11 understands -- the Subcommittee had been asked,
12 following up on the conversation we had at our
13 prior MAFAC meeting, about voting on the
14 dissolution of the working group. The
15 Subcommittee did not make that recommendation.
16 So, now we're here as a body, and I'm raising the
17 issue, and the Subcommittee has said what they
18 would like to see done is for the working group to
19 remain in place simply so that the people who are
20 already there can work with the regions, and help
21 the regions roll out their implementation plans on
22 a rec fish policy implementation plan.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 We're anticipating that's going to
2 happen over the next few months. The working
3 group people are already there. They've stayed in
4 communication electronically, so there would be no
5 meetings and no expenses. And then at our next
6 meeting, we will take back up the question of
7 whether or not to dissolve the working group, all
8 right?

9 But for today, there's just no action
10 needed. I'm just trying to make it clear for the
11 record. Russ?

12 MR. DUNN: One complicating factor -- so
13 we will begin -- the regions will begin
14 development of the plans over the summer. The
15 charge from Eileen to the regions is for the
16 regional plans to be developed and rolled out by
17 the close of the first calendar year quarter in
18 '16. So, that would be the end of March of '16.

19 So, the existing working group would be
20 able to, under what you just referenced --
21 potential dissolution in October -- would be sort
22 of in the midst of that process. I mean, they

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 could participate up to that point, and we could
2 continue to work with them as individuals.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, the reality is
4 that we're probably taking up the question of
5 dissolution one year from now, instead of in
6 October.

7 MR. DUNN: What is the advantage --

8 MR. DYSKOW: It all depends on what
9 tasks we give them. If they're completed by
10 October, we could still bring it up at the October
11 meeting.

12 MR. DUNN: Or you could -- could you put
13 together a motion or whatever it is to say at the
14 completion of this, it's --

15 MS. LOVETT: That way, you could vote on
16 it in October, and have it happen potentially
17 prior to our next meeting, which is usually April
18 or May.

19 MS. BEIDEMAN: So, completion would be
20 for the implementation plans to be completed.

21 MR. DUNN: To be completed and rolled
22 out; correct. Like, developed and released to the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 public.

2 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay, all right.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I think we've heard
4 the staff recommendation. Is there any motion by
5 a MAFAC member on this?

6 MS. BONNEY: I so move.

7 SPEAKER: Second.

8 SPEAKER: What motion are we --

9 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I agree. I don't
10 think there's a motion. I think Julie --

11 MS. BONNEY: So, I'll let Russ
12 articulate it, but basically it's the development
13 of the regional plans and rollout, and then after
14 that occurs, then that's when we revisit whether
15 the Subcommittee should --

16 MR. DUNN: Or you could put it together
17 right now and say the motion is, this is the final
18 task of the rec fish working group; upon
19 completion of that task, they are formally
20 dissolved, so to speak.

21 MS. BONNEY: That works for me.

22 MR. DYSKOW: As a point of order, since

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the working group reports to the Chair of the Rec
2 Fishing Committee, who isn't here, this isn't
3 probably appropriate for a motion for the full
4 Board. It's not a full Board report, and we've
5 already agreed on how we want to do this
6 (inaudible) NMFS to participate in that defense.
7 So, I'm just trying to defend the turf of my
8 Subcommittee Chair, who's not here at the moment.

9 MS. BONNEY: Well, so what would you
10 recommend, Phil? I mean, basically, the way I
11 read that, you were basically saying we'll get the
12 process started, and then in October, we'll
13 revisit whether or not the committee should
14 continue.

15 What Russ is putting on the table is,
16 we're going to complete that process, and that's
17 when the committee would --

18 MR. DUNN: I'm not really putting it on
19 the table. I'm just trying to articulate the
20 discussion (inaudible).

21 MR. DYSKOW: NMFS is desirous of ending
22 this working group's task in a timely manner so

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that it can use any potential funding for somebody
2 else, whether it's an aquaculture working group or
3 whatever, and we get that, and are willing to work
4 with them on that constraint, but they're there.
5 We need their help, and we would be willing to ask
6 for that help and receive it in a timely function
7 so we can revisit that at October -- which
8 shouldn't disrupt any plans.

9 And that was the discussion that we had
10 at our Subcommittee meeting. It didn't make sense
11 to dissolve a working group in the middle of a
12 task. This regional implementation plan was added
13 in stream, in process by the Assistant
14 Administrator after we already appointed this
15 working group. So, they're in the midst of trying
16 to finish the rec fishing policy, and an
17 additional task was developed midstream. That
18 would be the regional implementation.

19 MS. YOCHER: So, am I understanding you
20 to say that you would hope that a motion such as
21 Julie's would not happen at this meeting, but
22 rather at the October meeting?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. DYSKOW: Well, I don't know that
2 it's even a motion for the full Board, because
3 they report to the Chair of the Recreational
4 Fishing Subcommittee; they don't report to MAFAC.

5 MR. DUNN: But they were formed through
6 a full committee --

7 MR. DYSKOW: Okay. So, in that case,
8 I'm asking for a point of order from our Chair.
9 Do we need a motion and vote of the full Board to
10 resolve it?

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I think that MAFAC,
12 as a Board, could take up the issue independently
13 if it chose to. If the committee wanted to take
14 action, that's democracy. I think we could table
15 this matter until October and revisit it then. I
16 think you could stretch this and try to come up
17 with a motion now that said they're going to
18 automatically phase out in a year. I'm just
19 trying to see if I can navigate my way through
20 (inaudible).

21 MR. DYSKOW: And I think we're
22 comfortable with any of those choices, other than

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the fact that we have this task that we need to
2 complete, and we need resources to do it. And
3 they're a resource that's here now.

4 MS. BEIDEMAN: Well, then I'll move that
5 we table it until October, and, you know, we might
6 see that things are moving quicker than expected
7 -- or maybe not -- but, anyway, we'll have more
8 information by October.

9 SPEAKER: Second.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: And I think that
11 becomes a priority motion, so all those in favor
12 of the motion to table?

13 MULTIPLE: Aye.

14 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any opposition?
15 Hearing none, thank you. Okay. So, it is 11:54.
16 Pam, how long is your report out likely to take?

17 MS. YOCHER: I think it depends on how
18 much discussion there is; how much time people
19 have spent with the draft that was posted, you
20 know, 10 days ago or so. I mean, I think we can
21 get started, and my thinking is that we'll go
22 through what the subcommittee did, and MAFAC

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 either will or won't be comfortable making a
2 decision today. And I don't know that it would be
3 different if we stayed until 3:00 talking about
4 it.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah, because we
6 have an hour and 15 slated on the schedule for
7 discussion of this matter. And I'm looking kind
8 of for your judgment as, is this -- maybe there's
9 a first half-hour chunk and see what happens, and
10 then if we need to keep going, we do -- or is
11 there a point in the future where we could start
12 now and see where it goes?

13 MS. YOCHER: Yeah. I think the report
14 itself will be pretty brief. So, yes, maybe --
15 Heidi, would you agree, given that you've got the
16 report to post?

17 MS. LOVETT: I'm not sure; depends on --
18 let me pull up your first image you wanted to
19 show, because I haven't had a chance to read it
20 (inaudible). It will take a good half-hour, at
21 least.

22 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Pam?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Okay.

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: We'll plow forward,
3 and see how far we get. And we'll get to a point
4 where we'll make a go/no-go decision as to where
5 the dialogue is -- if we break for lunch or if we
6 try to finish up.

7 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Thank you. First of
8 all, I wanted to mention that shortly after
9 accepting the Chair of the Ecosystems Approach
10 Subcommittee, my work responsibilities changed a
11 great deal, and so I want to give a special thank
12 you to Keith and to NOAA staff. They've really
13 done the lion's share of the work on coordinating
14 the work of the Climate and Marine Resources
15 Taskforce of MAFAC over the past several months.

16 Just as a quick reminder, this taskforce
17 was created as a communication conduit for
18 stakeholder input to MAFAC -- and, subsequently,
19 to NOAA leadership on the production, delivery,
20 and use of climate-related information in
21 fulfilling NOAA Fisheries mission activities.

22 The first task that was put forward to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the taskforce was to review the NOAA Fisheries
2 national climate science strategy. And so these
3 are the activities that have occurred since the
4 last MAFAC meeting. Of course, the taskforce
5 itself was formed. We've got a really impressive
6 group of members on this taskforce with a wide
7 range of experience on climate change and related
8 issues.

9 NOAA staff established a Google site
10 that allowed us to work collaboratively on the
11 efforts of the taskforce. There was a kickoff
12 webinar, and some conference calls, and then an
13 in-person meeting.

14 As far as the results today, the
15 taskforce produced their recommendations on the
16 national climate science strategy, and that
17 document was circulated and posted by Heidi prior
18 to this MAFAC meeting.

19 Yesterday, the Ecosystems Approach
20 Subcommittee met, reviewed, and made some
21 revisions to the recommendations developed by the
22 taskforce. And we'll put that up in a moment.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And then that revised draft was emailed to MAFAC
2 members last night.

3 A couple of other thank yous -- the work
4 of the Subcommittee yesterday cut into the
5 evening's social event, and so a thank you to the
6 Subcommittee members who stayed behind -- also,
7 Heidi and our court reporter -- so that we could
8 get all the way through that document.

9 And I also personally wanted to give a
10 special thanks to Peter Shelley and Columbus
11 Brown, two MAFAC members who have actually been
12 more involved in the work of the taskforce than I
13 have been. Their input and insight yesterday was
14 really helpful.

15 So, as far as the Subcommittee
16 recommendation -- and, Heidi, you can help me --
17 or Keith can help me -- wordsmith this language a
18 little bit, but short of -- the Subcommittee would
19 like staff to take a final look at the draft,
20 reviewing it for typos and maybe some grammatical
21 polishing -- but basically, the version that
22 Heidi's going to present in a moment reflects the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Subcommittee's recommendation to MAFAC.

2 So, basically, it's taking the taskforce
3 recommendations or review of the climate document.
4 We made some minor modifications to that, and then
5 that's what we're putting forward to MAFAC as
6 MAFAC putting forward their comments on the
7 climate science strategy.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Just so I understand
9 procedurally -- are we putting forth the
10 recommendation that kicks direction back to the
11 taskforce, or are we taking the taskforce's work,
12 and now the direction is with these changes, take
13 the document to NOAA -- it's the latter. I'm
14 seeing heads nodding on the latter.

15 MS. YOCHER: Yes. And so that's where I
16 think we'll need feedback from MAFAC -- whether
17 they're comfortable enough with what the taskforce
18 and the Subcommittee has done to accept this. How
19 many pages long is it -- the comments?

20 Yeah, 11 pages -- so it's quite a bit.
21 So, if committee members haven't had a chance to
22 really go through that -- I think it's beyond the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 scope of an hour or two discussion to --

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Absolutely. So,
3 just as a point of information for the members --
4 at this point, what's happened is, the group of
5 folks who are on our taskforce have already
6 convened, had multiple meetings, worked their way
7 through the 60-odd page document generated by
8 NOAA, presented their comments on it. That
9 information has gone to our MAFAC Subcommittee.
10 Our Subcommittee has worked over the comments that
11 they received from the taskforce.

12 And now what you're seeing representing
13 the ultimate goal of synthesizing the taskforce
14 comments and the Subcommittee comments into a
15 final document that will be transmitted to NOAA
16 that represents our comments on their draft
17 climate change strategy.

18 MS. YOCHER: Thank you. And I would say
19 what would be within the scope, maybe, of our
20 discussion here would be for the Subcommittee to
21 go through what we've changed, basically, and the
22 taskforce recommendations -- but probably not to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 go through the entire 11-page document in detail.

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you. Julie?

3 MS. BONNEY: I guess my question is,
4 what happens to the taskforce after the comments
5 are then (inaudible)?

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: This is the first of
7 a series of tasks that are expected for the
8 taskforce to help us. And climate change is going
9 to take us a little while to work our way through
10 before we'll be having a discussion about
11 dissolution of that taskforce.

12 Heidi?

13 MS. LOVETT: I'll just remind you also
14 that you all did look at the framework of a terms
15 of reference, and it was recommended that this
16 taskforce be stood up for three years when you all
17 discussed it last September, because of the series
18 of tasks that were being planned and coming
19 forward.

20 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: And I'll also point
21 out on that -- a point of information -- one of
22 the next items on the list of tasks for the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 taskforce is the development of the climate change
2 strategy at a regional level -- so much the same
3 logic that we just went through on recreational
4 fishery and this notion that the taskforce should
5 have some role or engagement in helping the
6 regions develop the regional implementation plans.
7 That is exactly the same logic that is reflected
8 in our climate change taskforce document, and that
9 is the next task on the agenda for them.

10 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Heidi, if you pull
11 that up -- so, again, this is the document that
12 the taskforce produced. And I'm going to have
13 Heidi just, I think, scroll down to where the
14 comments were. There's sort of an opening
15 statement, and then there are a couple of
16 sections.

17 The first section is general comments,
18 sort of overarching comments on the signing
19 strategy, and then the second part is more
20 specific comments on individual objectives. So, I
21 guess, Heidi, maybe scroll down to the first
22 change that the Subcommittee suggested.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Do you want me to just
2 highlight the titles or --

3 MS. YOCHER: Sure, okay. So, again, the
4 first section is the comments on the entire scope
5 of the proposed strategy. The first section was
6 urgency and risk, communication issues regarding
7 how climate science results are communicated, some
8 general comments about socioeconomic dimensions, a
9 comment about linking objectives to management
10 questions and decisions, and then we had a section
11 where there was some discussion among the
12 taskforce and some disagreements, I think, among
13 the members about whether the climate science
14 strategy adequately reflected habitat concerns.

15 And so this was our attempt to harmonize
16 that -- the original taskforce comments and then
17 some subsequent comments by taskforce members.

18 Another general comment was on
19 resilience and risk -- feeling that that could use
20 some more focus in the document -- and then some
21 specific examples.

22 This one, I believe the main change here

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 was that the first section that you see underlined
2 there was originally set up as footnotes instead
3 of text, and we thought that was awkward, so we
4 just moved it up from a footnote to part of the
5 text.

6 And then the other concern was that
7 although the comment mentioned that both data and
8 modeling are important, and that only modeling is
9 discussed here, we wanted to make sure that the
10 point is made that data collection -- that it's
11 important to continue and prioritize the
12 collection of data that's necessary to support
13 robust modeling. And this just goes through some
14 specific suggestions with regard to modeling.

15 With regard to partnerships -- there was
16 a concern that the language -- these entities
17 should also be consulted for their ongoing
18 scientific climate expertise, and in the
19 development of scientific priorities -- so
20 recognizing that some of this communication and
21 involvement is already happening. And then some
22 suggestions that, without getting too specific,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 new climate challenges are going to require a new
2 way of working with partners.

3 There was some concern about the concept
4 of a global database. Who would administer this?
5 Who would protect it from hackers and so on? And
6 so rather than being a database that the entire
7 world might share, the suggestion was that the
8 wording be a little bit vaguer, and we just talk
9 about shared databases as a way to expedite
10 sharing of information.

11 MS. MORRIS: Pam, I'm over here.

12 MS. YOCHER: Yes.

13 MS. MORRIS: You said "consulted for
14 their ongoing scientific climate expertise," but
15 it says "enterprise." What did you intend there?

16 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, I think that was
17 meant to be activities -- so things that they're
18 already doing -- that they'll just be
19 acknowledged, and that they continue to be
20 incorporated into the planning. Does that sound
21 right, Heidi?

22 Yeah, thank you. Thank you.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. LOVETT: Should I continue again?

2 MS. YOCHER: Yep.

3 MS. LOVETT: Well, so -- this -- I just
4 didn't know if you wanted again (inaudible).

5 MS. YOCHER: Oh yeah, keep going. Yes.
6 Okay, so the -- another general comment was to
7 make the climate strategy operational, not just
8 aspirational. So, it's not just another document
9 that sits on the shelf.

10 There's a discussion about capacity and
11 limitations. And I think, again, there's more
12 specific information in the second section of the
13 document on that.

14 Then there was this comment about the --
15 in the climate-changed world. I believe the
16 original wording was that historic data are
17 obsolete or not useful. And so the thinking was
18 that the usefulness of historic data can vary.
19 Sometimes it is useful; sometimes it's not. And
20 so that wordsmithing occurred. And there was also
21 a desire to incorporate, wherever possible, new
22 technologies and efficiencies. So, that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible) was added.

2 Now we drop down to the more specific
3 comments, objective by objective, and, again, I
4 didn't attend the in- person workshop, but I heard
5 from the MAFAC members and staff who did that
6 there was a lot of concern about some of the
7 graphics in the document -- that they were linear,
8 and that climate change is more of an iterative
9 process, and that things should be circular and so
10 on. And so I think you'll see several comments
11 that try to make that point.

12 The other discussion here has to do with
13 these climate-based reference points. And there
14 was some thinking that perhaps this was getting
15 down too much into the weeds -- a lot of
16 specificity here, and that this wasn't all
17 necessary -- all these specific examples -- but
18 that it would be helpful to have the process
19 described, with regard to how these biological
20 reference points are defined. And then, also, the
21 comment that some of the most useful reference
22 points might not be linked to immediate management

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 objectives, but might be something that would be
2 useful farther down the line or for future
3 projecting.

4 So, again, a lot of these were thought
5 to be too specific. And if you start to specify
6 what reference points should be developed or used,
7 that would put too many constraints on NOAA. It's
8 as if we're saying, "These are the ones that you
9 should develop, and you don't need anything else."

10 Objective number two -- different rate.
11 Again, you see this concept of the nonlinear --
12 that we need to talk about continuity,
13 periodicity, and so on. I think this was mostly
14 -- the changes that we made mostly here were
15 trying to make this a little bit more clear that
16 there was some redundancy within the comment that
17 we tried to eliminate with these edits.

18 This one -- I think one of the concerns
19 here was the "consider strategies for local
20 communities to identify and protect." That
21 sounded a little bit too top-down to the
22 Subcommittee -- that this would be as if NOAA were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 telling the local communities what to do. And so,
2 rather, it would be that we would encourage
3 scientific strategies to identify and protect as
4 you see critical habitat, rather than focusing on
5 NOAA directing the local communities in particular
6 actions. And I think, again, the thinking was
7 that these real specific examples probably weren't
8 needed -- or went beyond the scope of what we'd
9 been asked to do.

10 MS. LOVETT: It was also more
11 restoration-focused versus science-focused, was
12 your conversation.

13 MS. YOCHER: Yep, thank you. Okay,
14 adaptive decision processes -- that actually looks
15 nearly the same to me.

16 MS. LOVETT: Yeah. One comment during
17 the version that was posted where there was a
18 difference of opinion between a couple of
19 taskforce members was whether that first bullet
20 should be in or out, and you all decided you
21 thought it was fine to maintain that bullet. So,
22 I had to retype it.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Thank you. So, that first
2 strikeout reflects the comments of one member of
3 the taskforce after the consensus document had
4 been developed. But that should be struck out.
5 Other members of the taskforce disagreed, and the
6 Subcommittee also disagreed. So, Heidi put it
7 back. Thank you.

8 This other one is sort of a minor
9 wordsmithing -- where you would put the initials.

10 And then, again, the thinking was that
11 dialogues are already happening and should be
12 maintained, rather than created.

13 And some minor changes here. So,
14 objective four -- we didn't have any changes
15 there. Objective five -- I'm not reading these
16 out loud.

17 We can do back, and I'll do that if you
18 think Heidi is scrolling too quickly.

19 This one -- objective six -- was the
20 issue with disease. We thought that was an
21 important example of a type of indicator that
22 could be developed, but the way it read, it was a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 little bit too specific. And so we redrafted it
2 to say "identify key indicators to track and
3 monitor," and then gave as one example changes in
4 occurrence or prevalence of diseases in wild fish
5 docks. And then there was a further suggestion to
6 incorporate input or collaborate with other
7 federal agencies that were looking at this factor.

8 Science infrastructure -- I don't think
9 there'll be any comments there -- and a typo fix.

10 And then there were some -- the third
11 section has to do with comments on the
12 socioeconomic research to meet the strategic
13 objectives. And I don't remember much discussion
14 or editing of this section.

15 MS. LOVETT: I don't think there was any
16 editing. There was no editing.

17 MS. YOCHER: Okay. So, that's the
18 report from the Subcommittee. And as you can see,
19 it's not a clean document yet, so there would
20 still need to be some time by NOAA staff to clean
21 it up, and deal with grammatical issues, and so
22 on. So, I think the situation now is whether the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 full committee wants to act on this, or wants to
2 consider it and have more discussion -- and table
3 it for the next meeting or interim fall or
4 something.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I don't think we're
6 going to have the luxury of tabling. I think this
7 is on a timeline that we're going to have to
8 proceed.

9 MS. YOCHER: Right. That's right.

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Go ahead, Paul.

11 MR. CLAMPITT: What was it you just
12 said? I couldn't --

13 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: We don't have the
14 luxury of tabling.

15 MR. CLAMPITT: So, we have to do
16 something here today?

17 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Yes, we need to do
18 something. And I want to remind the members that
19 a month before this meeting, I sent out an email
20 telling everybody, "Hey, this is on the agenda."
21 And one of the things that's happening to MAFAC
22 is, we're growing up. We're getting bigger

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 assignments. We're getting bigger tasks. And
2 we're getting bigger documents. And it does mean
3 that we, as members, have to read those documents
4 ahead of time.

5 And it creates a challenge for us,
6 because now we're left with this kind of beefy
7 feedback in the context here like we have today.

8 So, Paul -- yes, sir?

9 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I appreciate that,
10 and I have read the documents.

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I know you have.

12 MR. CLAMPITT: And I made some notes,
13 and I didn't participate in that Subcommittee
14 because I felt my table's full, anyway. So, I've
15 been kind of waiting to take a look at the
16 finished document here, which isn't quite
17 finished. And so, you know, it's big. It's
18 cumbersome. I feel like I'd like more time.

19 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I understand. So,
20 my question is, would it help if we take a lunch
21 break, so that people can absorb some of these
22 comments and take some time during the lunch break

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to review them, and then come back for a
2 discussion?

3 MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Unless the members
5 feel like we can proceed with approval of this, I
6 don't really see any other way for us to go.
7 Julie?

8 MS. BONNEY: Just a process question --
9 so the Subcommittee sent this to MAFAC
10 Subcommittee. They kind of were the -- some
11 issues were a little bit debated. You kind of
12 made a policy call in what direction to go.

13 So, we have two options. One would be
14 to go ahead and approve this, and send it on, and
15 then inform them about what the final product
16 looked like -- or to actually pass it back through
17 them, and have them comment on those decisions. I
18 mean, I don't know --

19 MS. YOCHER: No, I don't think that
20 going back to the taskforce is --

21 MS. BONNEY: -- the right way to go.
22 So, basically, then MAFAC would just go ahead and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 make the recommendations, and then the final
2 comments that go to NOAA would circle back to
3 them, so they'd see what the final piece looked
4 like.

5 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Yeah. I suppose
6 that one outcome here could be that MAFAC approves
7 the work product of the Subcommittee, and that
8 gets forwarded on. The other possibility is, we
9 simply don't put our mark of endorsement on
10 anything, and still forward the comment on to
11 NOAA.

12 But the issue that NOAA has is, they're
13 working on this document, and they've got to keep
14 moving forward. And now we have obtained lots of
15 comments from the taskforce and lots of comments
16 from our Subcommittee. And what I'm hoping we can
17 accomplish before the day's end is have some sort
18 of consensus on forwarding a document to NOAA.

19 But the escape route would be if we're
20 unable to approve something, we could simply
21 forward it on, saying, "This is what was compiled,
22 but MAFAC takes no position." And we did that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 once before with a document that came through a
2 similar process with the rec fish group, where we
3 weren't able to agree, necessarily, on what was in
4 that document that came from the taskforce, but we
5 were at least able to refer those comments onto
6 NOAA so that they could take action on them.

7 Julie?

8 MS. MORRIS: Well, I would prefer to
9 have MAFAC comment on the work and not just pass
10 it through.

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I agree.

12 MS. MORRIS: And if you, as Chairman,
13 told me, based on what you know now, vote it up or
14 down, I would vote yes. There's things that I
15 found that I went through the document that aren't
16 really featured in the comments, so I'd like to
17 know more from the people who participated in the
18 process about, you know, whether there was any
19 discussion about those issues.

20 And so if we had more time to talk about
21 it, I would bring those up. But they're not the
22 kinds of things that I need to talk about before I

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 can say I support those comments.

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay.

3 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, and I would just say
4 that was one of the thought processes that the
5 Subcommittee went through, as well -- is one of
6 the things that we tried to focus on most when we
7 got the document back from the taskforce was
8 whether we saw any glaring issues that we just
9 felt we couldn't live with -- or huge gaps that
10 had not been addressed at all.

11 And, as you see, the changes were mostly
12 small ones, I think. We didn't think that there
13 were big holes.

14 I defer to you, Mr. Chairman. Should we
15 break for lunch, and come back and continue the
16 discussion?

17 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I've heard -- Paul
18 seems to desire the chance to look over this
19 document and spend some time. Julie, I'm thinking
20 I'm hearing you say you'd be willing to vote right
21 now and give it a vote of approval.

22 I'm looking for some other dialogue from

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 other members as to what the preferences are --
2 because, I mean, in my view, if we can get this
3 done, I'll get it done. You know, there's been a
4 lot of smart people that have worked on this
5 document and given a lot of really thoughtful
6 comments. And I'm willing to accept the warts
7 that come along with it, and pass it on as
8 something that meets a decent quality standard.

9 Now can we make it better? I'm sure we
10 can. But it's the price of time and investment of
11 our effort to make it a little bit better
12 document. That's what I'm wrestling with. And
13 I'd like some perspective from other members.

14 Do we plow forward, or do we take a
15 break?

16 MS. YOCHER: I mean, is there anybody
17 but Paul who has some language maybe that you
18 would like to see added -- or how extensive are
19 your comments?

20 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I don't think
21 they're extensive. I guess I could get going on
22 it.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Any other members want to
2 weigh in?

3 MS. LOVETT: Paul, are your comments
4 potential edits to this document?

5 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I suppose. I mean,
6 under number one -- urgency and risk -- I felt
7 that the original document spelled out there was
8 plenty of urgency and risk, you know.

9 I think, you know, from thinking about
10 climate change and the potential for damaging the
11 ecosystem -- the notes I had -- you know,
12 precautionary principle -- you know, it works both
13 ways. I mean, it works better if, you know,
14 you're looking at -- there's also the potential of
15 damage of doing too much. I mean, you know, you
16 give up -- if you're going to throw in these
17 models, then it's going to -- you're going to say,
18 well, you know what? In 20 years, we're going to
19 have a little problem in the single-fish fishery
20 because of ocean acidification or whatever, so we
21 better cut back half right now.

22 And you're giving up something, you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 know, that the nation needs on a prediction that
2 may or may not happen in the future. So, I mean,
3 it works both ways.

4 I think, you know, the original document
5 -- I don't think needs to add any more urgency or
6 risk to it.

7 And I guess I looked at the document. I
8 think it's page 39 -- and I don't know if this --
9 and in your document, you don't really address
10 this, but it says -- page 35, line nine -- it
11 talks about the fact that these climate models
12 don't deal very well with short-term problems
13 three to five years out.

14 And I think that's an issue we're going
15 to happen. I mean, and I like the fact that --
16 you pointed out that immediate data is still
17 necessary. I saw that you picked that up. But I
18 think maybe that should be stressed, especially if
19 you're a commercial fisherman; you depend on stock
20 analysis, and you depend on accurate, timely data.
21 And what I fear is, you know, unsure predictions
22 on climate in the future could influence that.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Now there's some areas where it works,
2 like sardines. Obviously, you know, you go back
3 many years, and you can see there's a relationship
4 -- but other things, not so much. And so I think
5 that really needs to be stressed -- that these
6 climate models are fine, and it should be
7 developed and used for predictions you can come up
8 with -- but I think it can be overstated, and that
9 we need to have accurate, timely -- we can't give
10 up on accurate, timely data.

11 And just to finish -- Eileen -- I asked
12 her, are we going to give up this immediate stock
13 assessment in favor of these climate models? And
14 she started to say, "Well, yeah, you know, that'd
15 be very handy, because it would be cheaper." And
16 then Richard kind of said, "Oh no, wait a minute.
17 We're going to continue using our data that we
18 have." And that made me feel better -- but I
19 think she's your boss.

20 So, that kind of bothered me a little
21 bit, and so we're dealing with this huge document
22 -- 81 pages, by the way. And those are my -- I'm

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 not so sure I trust the total predictability of
2 these climate models. I mean, if you looked at
3 Cisco's amazing presentation -- wow. They're
4 going to take a climate model, and they're going
5 to suggest that (inaudible) going to collapse.
6 And that's going to affect the market for feed in
7 Asia. I mean, really? Is that what we need to be
8 doing as a resource manager? I mean, do we have
9 to worry about Pacific anchoveta?

10 I mean, I worry that so much effort's
11 going to go to these expensive models that we're
12 going to lose the ability to do our timely and
13 important stock assessments and other research
14 that we need to operate our fisheries.

15 And I'm done.

16 MS. YOCHER: Okay, thanks for your
17 comments, Paul, and I think your comment about not
18 just focusing on models to the exclusion of adding
19 new data, and the idea of incorporating new
20 methods of data collection, data efficiencies, and
21 so on as we develop them -- I think that my
22 understanding is the taskforce noticed that, and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 thought that they had addressed it in the
2 document, and then the Subcommittee went a little
3 bit farther, and even tried to address it further.

4 And one of the things was, like I said,
5 putting data back into that section on modeling.
6 It was there, but making the point that although
7 we're going to discuss modeling, we have to
8 continue to have the data inputs -- and then also
9 this concept of there's not an inexorable march in
10 one direction, you know, with the linear approach
11 to making evaluations and so on -- that there's
12 feedback loops, and needs to be more circular, and
13 things like that.

14 Is that -- those of you -- Columbus, and
15 Peter, and Heidi -- who were part of the
16 discussion -- and Keith -- who were part of the
17 taskforce and Subcommittee discussion -- do you
18 agree that this is something that the taskforce
19 considered, as well?

20 MR. BROWN: Yeah. And, Paul, to your
21 point, I think that many of us -- and I think the
22 flavor of the discussion within the taskforce was

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that we're not just limiting ourselves to
2 decisions based on models. And models are not the
3 only tool that are necessary to get us to where we
4 need to get to.

5 We also mentioned that there are a lot
6 of ongoing activities and reports that have been
7 developed by other entities that NOAA has been
8 participating in that have lent a lot of credence
9 to your concern and the problems that decision
10 makers have with using models to make decisions.

11 So, I think (inaudible).

12 MR. MERRICK: You may not realize this,
13 but NOAA has its own (inaudible) it's called the
14 NOAA Science Advisory Board. They also have a
15 climate working group (inaudible) and I
16 specifically did not want to go to them for advice
17 on our climate strategy (inaudible) because of
18 that, exactly -- because what they'd be telling us
19 to do would be, we need to have better downscale
20 models. And that's the kind of advice we get from
21 them. And I don't need that advice. What I need
22 is the advice that Paul's giving us -- keep us on

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 track and making sure that we're trying to balance
2 both short-term needs and long-term needs.

3 So, I encourage you to keep (inaudible).

4 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I'm not on the
5 Subcommittee, but I sat in yesterday, maybe just
6 belonging to show up, I guess. But to Paul's
7 point, it's the exact point I was attempting to
8 drive into this.

9 We need empirical data to show, is
10 everything a stressor in this model? I don't
11 think so. I think some changes are going to be
12 good for certain types of species, and some are
13 not.

14 But you see that in ocean conditions
15 that change all the time. This one may be
16 something we can develop a trending pattern -- but
17 until we do, and we see the results of the
18 empirical data to support the prediction, I'm
19 really remiss to start making decisions about how
20 we manage our fisheries preemptively, so to speak.

21 And so I agree pretty much totally with
22 what Paul's point of view is, and that's one

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 reason I interjected a little bit in there about
2 the importance of not just the modeling but the
3 data collection. I think it's even more important
4 than it has been in the past.

5 And oceanographic-type work is going to
6 have to complement just the stock surveys in a way
7 that maybe you can start making some connections
8 that we haven't been able to so far. But I really
9 -- like Paul, I have a certain reticence to just
10 jump off a cliff and find out if we got our
11 parachute packed or not, because our businesses
12 depend on fish -- catching it or producing it in
13 aquaculture or whatever it is. There's no doubt
14 in my mind that climate change is going to have
15 some impact on that, and understand it is very,
16 very important.

17 But to outguess it -- no matter how
18 intelligent we are or how good of computers we've
19 got -- I think is not within our means quite yet.

20 MS. YOCHER: Heidi, could you go to
21 number seven under Section A? I think that's
22 where, Mike, some of your comments were

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 introduced. Again, this first part is just the
2 footnotes moving up. Do we need to -- scroll back
3 up a minute.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: The very last
5 sentence (inaudible).

6 MS. YOCHER: Yeah, right. Do we need to
7 strengthen that comment and provide some more
8 specific examples?

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, from my point of
10 view, you couldn't stress it enough. But I think
11 I said at the end there that I was comfortable --
12 once we had it embedded in there -- that I was
13 willing to let you come up with the language.

14 And I think I'd like to see it a little
15 stronger myself, but just whatever the Committee
16 here is willing to do.

17 MS. YOCHER: We get some insight, maybe,
18 from NOAA staff? I mean, I take your point that
19 this talks about data collection necessary to
20 support robust modeling. But what I'm hearing you
21 say is there are other reasons for data collection
22 besides just robust modeling -- to continue to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 support stock assessments and other short-term
2 management objectives.

3 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I don't want to see
4 support for robust modeling overshadow the need
5 for robust stock assessments that we have that are
6 on immediate time scales, not 30 and 20 years from
7 now.

8 MR. SHELLEY: I think that phrasing is
9 perfectly consistent with the taskforce
10 discussion.

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'm still trying to
12 figure out where I'm going to go. I allowed the
13 conversation to take place a little bit so I can
14 get a flavor of, where are we as a body?

15 I have (inaudible) Paul, do you have
16 specific comments that you have on the document
17 that we could add into --

18 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, like I said, I was
19 going to see this finished document, and I was
20 going to put something together. And if we were
21 going to break for lunch, I was going to sit in
22 here, and I was going to --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: And do some written
2 comments.

3 MR. CLAMPITT: Yeah.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay -- because I'm
5 wondering if there's a way to get additional
6 written comments at some point, even if it's just
7 attaching them to the document.

8 And I think this conversation is helping
9 me understand -- and what I want our body to
10 digest is, in the future, we're going to have this
11 problem again and again. We're starting to
12 develop bigger documents. We're starting to
13 tackle bigger tasks. We've got a taskforce that's
14 doing work and bringing it to us.

15 So, what we're going to need to start
16 developing are some new practices, where members
17 are going to have to send specific comments when
18 they have them ahead of time, so that they can be
19 processed at the Subcommittee level. And the
20 stuff that comes out of the Subcommittee that then
21 is brought back to the full committee is going to
22 be in a much more packaged format. While there

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 may be some room for discussion and some
2 negotiation, I don't think we're going to have the
3 same luxury that we've had in the past of going
4 through, line by line, all the different things
5 that get generated by all the subcommittees --
6 because as we start doing more work, we just don't
7 have enough time in the space that we have.

8 So, looking ahead -- just keep in mind
9 that members' comments should come as early in the
10 process as you can. Send text to the subcommittee
11 chairs so that they can digest things, and then
12 bring that back to the full committee for
13 discussion.

14 And I also want to encourage the members
15 to please communicate with me even after today's
16 meeting. Give me your suggestion and ideas on how
17 we can better operate our meetings. And should we
18 have telephone conference calls ahead of time when
19 we have these kinds of documents working their way
20 through?

21 The challenge I've got is, I know NOAA
22 staff has got a 2:30 deadline. They've got an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 all-hands meeting, and I'm trying to help some of
2 them make their meeting. I know some of us are
3 hungry and want to get to lunch, and I'm still
4 trying to figure out, what can we get done with
5 all the work that's taken place to date so I can
6 get a meaningful document to NOAA that reflects as
7 many comments as possible?

8 Paul, I don't want to discount your
9 comments at all. I want them to be considered. I
10 want them to be part of the package in some
11 appropriate way.

12 Heidi, did you have your hand up where
13 you were trying to offer something -- or was it
14 Mike?

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I did. I think in one
16 quick sentence, it's, the downstream impacts are
17 the immediate impacts that the changes are create
18 -- if we lose track of those impacts, I guess --
19 or how they're interacting -- then I think we're
20 just looking at the climate in general and making
21 assumptions about what those impacts are.

22 That's where I think the empirical data

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is more necessary than ever -- and probably going
2 to demand more ship time and other things that
3 nobody's prepared to pay for.

4 MR. MERRICK: That's an important point,
5 and having your support for that is key, because
6 I'm having an ongoing battle with the science
7 staff about whether we should just do fish
8 surveys, or whether we should balance that more
9 with some ecosystem surveys. They don't
10 understand some of these other issues (inaudible)
11 underlying information.

12 MR. AMES: The changes that are
13 occurring are occurring at different rates in
14 different places. Current tide is a very complex
15 -- Gulf of Maine is a horror story for trying to
16 project -- you might be able to project 100 years
17 ahead, but because of the confluence of current
18 tide that's in the area, there's a very good
19 chance that whatever model you come up with is
20 going to be way out in left field.

21 So, if you don't have ongoing monitoring
22 of the system, you can't tell when the changes are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 going to occur. If you continue relying on
2 empirical data, then you can come out ahead of the
3 game. You know, the long-term (inaudible) trend,
4 and it will be different south of the Cape than it
5 is north. But you'll know where you're at in that
6 changing process. Paul's right on.

7 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Bob and Julie?

8 MR. RHEAULT: So, shellfish have been
9 the poster boy for ocean acidification for some
10 time. I've testified in front of Congress on this
11 and given many talks. I have some qualms about
12 the portrayal on page 14. It's just not quite
13 scientifically accurate. I would like to have the
14 chance to do a little bit of wordsmithing and make
15 it proper. And I don't think I can do that --

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I understand. Bob
17 wants a little bit of time. Paul wants a little
18 bit of time. I'm seeing -- can we do 45 minutes
19 for lunch? Will that work for everybody -- give
20 some folks a chance to do what they have to do?

21 Okay, let's take a 45-minute lunch
22 break.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (Recess)

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Just something I
3 realized I needed to clean up for the record was,
4 we had a public comment period that was on the
5 schedule yesterday, but there was nobody in the
6 room at all. So, I just wanted that to be
7 officially on the transcript to reflect that --
8 that at 1:00, we had that time. Ken did the
9 introduction (inaudible) on Friday at that point,
10 but there was no public comment.

11 And I'll note again that there's nobody
12 from the public here today, either, so I just
13 wanted to make sure that was clear on the
14 transcript.

15 I know that people had a chance to go
16 back during the break here, and try to create some
17 language. Paul, I saw you were banging away at
18 the keyboard; that's great. Pam, you were doing
19 the same. And, Bob, I think you had done the
20 same. I've heard already some feedback from
21 folks, and I think down the road, when we have
22 these kinds of big issues that are happening,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 maybe one thing that we can do is try to have a
2 discussion as a body even before we go to
3 subcommittee, and give folks a chance to help the
4 subcommittee get some sense of the body before
5 they break out.

6 And eventually, what we may evolve to is
7 a process where day three -- today -- subcommittee
8 creates their final work product, that gets
9 presented to the committee, and then there's a
10 discussion and just an up or down vote, rather
11 than going through the way we've done this
12 historically, with continuously trying to edit.

13 But that said, I'm trying right now, as
14 best I can, to accommodate everybody's feedback.
15 I'm still striving to achieve a consensus
16 document, and get something over the finish line,
17 and I'm curious to hear what happens. So, let me
18 say Pam first, and then Paul, and then Bob.

19 MS. YOCHER: Heidi is just doing a
20 last-minute change. I think she now has a
21 document that reflects Paul's comments, with help
22 from Julie and Mike, and then Julie Morris's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 comments, and, also, Bob's comments -- so if we
2 can just go through those.

3 This first one -- there was a concern
4 that the urgency statement makes it seem like we
5 need to make changes in management right this
6 minute. And so since this is a science strategy,
7 the suggestion was that we change that to "the
8 risk of inaction is in moving climate science
9 forward." And then towards the end of that
10 paragraph, one of the things that was added by the
11 Subcommittee was an example of the risk of
12 inaction, which is the opportunity costs.

13 And so Paul et al's suggestion was that
14 we also add a comment that there is risk to
15 premature action. Can everybody read that and see
16 that?

17 And then, Keith, what do you think would
18 be most productive? Should we just go through
19 these changes, or make -- sort of get a decision
20 from the group one at a time whether they can live
21 with them or not?

22 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: This is stuff that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 you got direct feedback from both of them on.

2 MS. YOCHER: Yes.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, let's try to go
4 through all of them, and see where we end up.

5 MS. YOCHER: Okay. All right. So,
6 that's the first one.

7 There were two different groups that
8 wanted to make changes to this section. And I
9 think the highlighted part is Paul, Mark, and
10 Julie, and the underlined one is Julie Morris's
11 comment.

12 MS. LOVETT: I couldn't get rid of the
13 highlight; I'm sorry. I cut and pasted from the
14 email.

15 MS. YOCHER: Okay. But, basically,
16 these are two new additions. So, Julie Morris
17 suggested this language. These new approaches are
18 discussed, but they're difficult to understand,
19 and it's not clear how this transition is going to
20 happen between the existing management practices
21 and processes that are more informed by climate
22 science.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And I think, you know, one of the
2 general overarching comments of the document
3 previously was that it needs to be -- you know,
4 the whole document needs to be easier to
5 understand. And so maybe that's part of that.

6 And then the highlighted section is
7 attempting to get at comments made by a couple of
8 people that Dick said were important, which is, we
9 don't want to throw the baby out with the
10 bathwater, in the sense of we don't want to
11 abandon current activity, empirical data
12 collection like fish surveys, because those are
13 needed for these shorter timescale decisions, than
14 some of the new approaches that operate on larger
15 timescales.

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I gather that Mike
17 and Paul contributed to that.

18 MS. YOCEM: Yes.

19 MS. LOVETT: This is one, also, that
20 (inaudible). It relates to the same comment.

21 MS. YOCEM: So, this was something that
22 happened before we broke for lunch. Okay. Scroll

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 down. I think that now we're getting to Bob's
2 comments.

3 So, Bob had some comments about the box
4 on page 14 that talks about links with shellfish
5 and ocean acidification. And we thought this
6 might be a place to insert that, because it's
7 talking about new experimental tools, and this is
8 a specific example where more information is
9 needed.

10 And then a further comment to address
11 Bob's concerns is in section three, the
12 socioeconomic piece. You want to scroll down to
13 -- I think it was the first item on that.

14 MS. LOVETT: (inaudible).

15 MR. BROWN: I have a concern. It's
16 almost like you're saying, well, maybe ocean
17 acidification is not that important, and we need
18 to do these other things. And I think instead of
19 either/or, it needs to be more of an and/or type
20 situation.

21 MS. YOCHER: Well, perhaps we could say
22 instead of all contribute, we could say may also

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- or do also contribute -- yeah, also instead of
2 all. That's probably what we meant to type.

3 MR. BROWN: Yeah. I think when you put
4 the other than --

5 MS. YOCHER: Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: -- I think we need to just
7 make it clear that additional areas such as
8 (inaudible) and so forth.

9 MS. YOCHER: Okay. Then scroll down to
10 the section C. There we go.

11 So, the first piece is vulnerability
12 analysis. And Bob noted that he's often asked for
13 vulnerability analysis for the shellfish industry,
14 and his concern is that he doesn't have enough
15 information about the organism-level impacts to be
16 able to talk about industry-wide impacts. So, we
17 thought this was a place we could put that
18 comment.

19 And I believe that encompasses Julie,
20 Bob, Mike, Paul, Julie, and -- who else
21 contributed to the comments -- Ted, maybe -- and
22 -- I'm sorry -- Mike. This was the work that we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 did during lunch for the people who wanted more
2 time to add comments to the document.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: I'm just going to
4 note that this is exactly the kind of MAFAC
5 feedback that we should try to continue to
6 preserve. You know, one of the benefits of having
7 this entity is, we all have our niches of
8 expertise, and when these kinds of documents come
9 through, it's a chance for all of us to contribute
10 individually.

11 And as Chair, I'm stuck with this
12 dilemma. On the one hand, I'm trying to get a
13 document through, a finished work product that I
14 can hand over to NOAA. And on the other hand, I
15 want to make sure that I've embraced the feedback
16 of all the members, if possible, and I'm trying to
17 do it in a limited window of time.

18 So, these were great comments, and I
19 appreciate everybody's contributions, especially
20 in such a short period of time.

21 Now are there other outstanding issues
22 that we need to dialogue about, above and beyond

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 what's already been changed?

2 Mike, you had your hand up.

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, it's just that
4 the line of thinking which I was attempting to do
5 is almost identical to what is in that sentence
6 that's underlined about the vulnerability and
7 understanding of the impacts. So, you match up as
8 you go, rather than just kind of keep a disconnect
9 between what's assumed and what a model might
10 produce, versus actual (inaudible) to find out the
11 impact implies understanding of what it actually
12 is.

13 So, I like it a lot better this way.

14 MR. CLAMPITT: Well, the only comment I
15 had -- there was a section here about -- I guess
16 it's right there -- it was about oral histories,
17 and it was important to collect oral histories.
18 You know, I also (inaudible).

19 I'm just wondering where that came from,
20 because we talked earlier about how the world's
21 changing, and so old data isn't of use anymore --
22 which I don't necessarily agree with. But was

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that put in --

2 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: That was edited.
3 That very sentence that you're talking about was
4 one of the ones that was edited by --

5 MR. CLAMPITT: Oh, it's gone.

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Right. Now it says
7 some data --

8 MR. CLAMPITT: Okay, okay, perfect. All
9 right, all right.

10 MS. LOVFETT: Yeah, I'm sorry. That was
11 --

12 MS. YOCHER: That was something that we
13 did yesterday.

14 MR. CLAMPITT: Okay, all right. I'm
15 good.

16 MS. YOCHER: Any other comments?

17 MR. RHEAULT: Let me see the highlighted
18 -- part that was highlighted (inaudible).

19 MS. LOVETT: Yep.

20 MR. RHEAULT: As long as industry means
21 both the recreational and commercial, it'd be
22 better. There seems to be this assumption that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 it's going to affect the commercial industry.

2 SPEAKER: Say fisheries, which
3 theoretically encompasses aquaculture, too.

4 MS. YOCHER: Fisheries, plural, instead
5 of industry?

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Fisheries management
7 depends --

8 MS. LOVETT: Do you want (inaudible) or
9 fisheries?

10 MR. CLAMPITT: I like management. That
11 sounds better to me.

12 MS. YOCHER: Fisheries management
13 depends -- any other comments?

14 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: That was a
15 productive lunch break. Peter?

16 MR. SHELLEY: I just -- it's a minor
17 point -- that change then -- I don't know if it
18 was up or down -- about the robust modeling and
19 not overshadowing -- and I think maybe there needs
20 to be an adjective in there -- robust
21 climate-change modeling or something. I mean, the
22 stock assessments need to be robust (inaudible)

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 too.

2 I think you're talking about the
3 importance of developing these robust
4 climate-change models -- shouldn't overshadow or
5 take away from the importance of empirical data
6 collection needed for stock assessments, which are
7 also models.

8 MS. YOCHER: Does that address your
9 concern?

10 MR. SHELLEY: That's it.

11 MS. YOCHER: Okay. I think that's what
12 was meant.

13 Okay. Any other comments?

14 MR. SHELLEY: I'm just curious about
15 what protocols with this group and (inaudible) of
16 individuals to put in their own comments on
17 request for comment types of situations like this.
18 I don't know if you've done it often, but have we
19 had any discussion about that topic?

20 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: This is the
21 challenge of agenda planning, and we're going
22 through a learning curve as we're starting to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 tackle these kinds of bigger documents.

2 One of the lessons that I'm taking away
3 from this experience is, we should strive to get
4 documents out to members earlier, give members a
5 chance to submit individual comments ahead of time
6 to a designated person, try to create an
7 opportunity in the committee meeting, before the
8 subcommittees break out, to have some level of
9 group dialogue over the issue, and then let the
10 subcommittees go and digest the comments and the
11 group commentary as they work on the final
12 document that comes out.

13 And if we could figure out a way to do
14 all that on the frontend, then what we'd be able
15 to do is, when we get here on day three, and we've
16 got a work product that comes out, we can have it
17 presented to the members, we can have a discussion
18 of it, and then we can vote up or down.

19 MR. SHELLEY: And to what extent is my
20 organization's ability to comment on the draft
21 climate change strategy constrained or not by
22 whatever we agree to as a group?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: This is (inaudible).

2 MR. SHELLEY: I wouldn't want anyone to
3 be disappointed by anyone else saying, hey, wait a
4 second. When you signed onto this language here
5 --

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Absolutely. And
7 that goes to --

8 MR. SHELLEY: (inaudible) we don't trust
9 you anymore -- that sort of --

10 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Exactly. And, see,
11 that goes to consensus, right? At what point do
12 we accept the document as consensus, and at what
13 point do you say, no, I can't even accept that
14 portion of the document at all -- and that's when
15 you dissent?

16 Everybody tends to have something in the
17 document that reflects a compromise -- maybe they
18 don't necessarily agree with -- but sometimes we
19 all just say, you know what? This is a pretty
20 good reflection of what all of us think. And then
21 there are other times when we have had very strong
22 dissent, and we've had to submit minority reports.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And I think in the future, as we tackle
2 projects like this, that's going to happen again,
3 too. And I think we're learning how to negotiate
4 and debate these kinds of documents, and what
5 kinds of outputs we can generate. And I think
6 we're just going to need to continue to tweak the
7 process.

8 And I encourage you -- give me a phone
9 call after the meeting; let's see how we can
10 continue this planning process, to get better at
11 this. I'd like to discuss this with the
12 leadership, so when we have a telephone call for
13 the subcommittee leaders -- and I'm open to
14 feedback on this.

15 But, certainly, I think what's happened
16 today has been helpful. And, Pam, thank you very
17 much for steering us through this, and using that
18 lunch break so effectively.

19 MR. RHEAULT: And just in regards to
20 that process -- in support of that, you know, you
21 get these documents, and you think, well, I'll
22 deal with that when I get to the meeting -- and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 then the reality hits that you're actually in a
2 subcommittee that doesn't permit you to engage.
3 And so doing it in advance, I think, is --

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Thank you. Heidi?

5 MS. LOVETT: To Peter's point -- I was
6 just going to reiterate that as a FACA committee,
7 you are all appointed as individuals, and even
8 though you have certain expertises and you
9 represent different stakeholder groups, it's not
10 like that group is sitting here at the table. So,
11 you always have -- and usually for things like
12 this, this climate science strategy, you were
13 notified, along with a lot of other stakeholder
14 groups, of the opportunity to comment. And,
15 certainly, that's a great individual opportunity
16 for you and the organization you might come from
17 to submit comments back to the agency independent
18 of what MAFAC is doing.

19 So, we always try to keep you informed
20 of those opportunities.

21 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Great point.

22 Thanks, Heidi. Henry?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SESEPASARA: Yeah, I have a question
2 here on the subsistence issue.

3 MS. LOVETT: What page is that on?

4 MR. SESEPASARA: I'm looking at --

5 MS. LOVETT: Section C?

6 MR. SESEPASARA: (inaudible) yeah,
7 section C. It's just one word here that it kind
8 of questioned my mind here -- on the word native
9 versus indigenous -- because most of our current
10 issues handling in the Pacific insular area --
11 we're talking about indigenous community rather
12 than native communities. It's just that one word
13 there -- just to make it more consistent with what
14 we are doing down in the Pacific insular area
15 (inaudible).

16 MR. BROWN: There's two lines of thought
17 -- and we have to be careful that we don't miss
18 them. And the tribes did not give up their
19 hunting and gathering rights -- which go beyond
20 geographical land-based or reservation-based
21 thinking. And I think we have to be sensitive to
22 that, in terms of how we craft that language.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And the other part is that -- well, I
2 think that pretty much covers it, because, you
3 know, we're moving through the community level as
4 a (inaudible) type discussion when you talk about
5 indigenous communities, whereas tribes have --
6 members of tribes have hunting and gathering
7 rights that are not limited to their community.

8 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, Columbus, are
9 you suggesting that this should say tribal and
10 indigenous? I'm just trying to figure out, how do
11 I capture your concepts?

12 MR. BROWN: I think what's happening is,
13 as we start changing this, we're losing some of
14 the thought that went into it earlier from the
15 Subcommittee.

16 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, did native --

17 MS. YOCHER: And indigenous.

18 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Just help me with
19 the wording, because I think I understand your
20 point. But if you're objecting to the deletion of
21 the word "native" because that loses the tribal
22 community, then that's fine. If we need to say

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 "tribal" specifically (inaudible) is the
2 indigenous community, but if "native" captures
3 Columbus's point (inaudible).

4 MR. SESEPASARA: I have no problem with
5 native and indigenous, just to address the concern
6 that Columbus had here.

7 MR. BROWN: Yeah. And I think this is
8 something that was brought up sometime in a
9 previous meeting, whereas the native or indigenous
10 (inaudible) and so forth in the Pacific is
11 different from the tribal within the continental
12 United States in those treaties.

13 I think we need to give NOAA some
14 (inaudible) those tribal responsibilities.

15 MS. YOCHER: So, then, with the
16 exception of that minor wordsmithing, and
17 grammatical, and typo, and so on, does the
18 committee feel that we have a consensus document
19 that we could vote on?

20 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I move that we
21 support this document as a consensus position in
22 MAFAC to the agency.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Julie seconds --
2 okay. Discussion, Mike?

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just one small point --
4 it says continental U.S. -- I think maybe entire
5 U.S.

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: That's a good point.

7 MR. MERRICK: You don't have to worry
8 about the working (inaudible).

9 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Right, because,
10 remember, at the end of the day, what we're
11 proposing here is the commentary on the NOAA
12 document. They will be going back and making
13 changes to their own document. So, it's not like
14 this language is what's going to be reflected as
15 the ultimate public position. We're giving
16 feedback to NOAA that they will adapt and
17 incorporate into their document.

18 I think there's been a lot of thought
19 and effort that's gone into this, and really
20 appreciate the feedback.

21 Any other discussion? Okay. Seeing no
22 further discussion, all of us in favor, please say

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 aye.

2 MULTIPLE: Aye.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any opposed?

4 Congratulations, everybody. That was a big
5 effort. Well done. Thank you, Pam. All right.
6 So, we get to wind down now. We have a fishing
7 trip scheduled for tomorrow that will include all
8 sorts of great opportunities to learn about how we
9 pick and release fish, and how (inaudible)
10 appropriate release can let them have increased
11 survival rates. And I'm looking forward to seeing
12 that technology in action.

13 I know some of us need to go get our
14 permits taken care of and go get some things, but
15 we've got some basic housekeeping, and I want to
16 walk through that before we adjourn.

17 So, Heidi --

18 MS. LOVETT: It would be good to get a
19 clean, new headcount of who's participating
20 tomorrow, because we were going to order some
21 taxis to be here for people at 5:45 in the morning
22 -- because Ken suggested we be at the docks at

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 6:00. So, if we could get that -- or come up to
2 me after, or raise your hands -- that way we can
3 be clear.

4 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: So, hands up if
5 you're going fishing tomorrow.

6 MS. LOVETT: And, Heather, are you --
7 oh, you're not going to go (inaudible)?

8 MR. SHELLEY: I'm going, but I won't
9 need a taxi. So, you're only doing a taxi count,
10 right?

11 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, but I am going.

13 MS. LOVETT: So, 13. You're going to be
14 on your own. So, there's 17 people tentatively;
15 we have two others, too.

16 MR. SESEPASARA: Right, and we'll be
17 driving there, too, if we can get the address.

18 MS. LOVETT: H&M Landing is my
19 understanding, so I'll have to go back -- yeah.

20 MS. LUKENS: It's in the email that she
21 sent out last week that --

22 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I'll resend that to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 everybody. So, you're going to (inaudible)?

2 MR. SESEPASARA: Yeah, they're both
3 here.

4 MS. LOVETT: They're both here. Okay --
5 and to go in the taxis, too?

6 MR. SESEPASARA: No, no, we'll --

7 MS. LOVETT: You're driving yourselves?

8 MR. SESEPASARA: Yeah.

9 MS. LOVETT: Got it. Okay.

10 SPEAKER: And (inaudible) will drive
11 ourselves.

12 MS. LOVETT: Okay, show of hands that
13 might need a taxi in the morning? That'll be
14 better -- sorry -- to be clear here.

15 Nine -- okay, that'll be good. I'll
16 just let the front desk know. They're going to
17 assist. Thank you.

18 MR. SESEPASARA: Yeah. How do we
19 (inaudible)? How's the weather out? Is it cold?
20 I'm from a very warm area (inaudible).

21 MS. LOVETT: I would suggest jackets.

22 SPEAKER: Layers are always good --

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sunscreen (inaudible).

2 MS. LOVETT: All right. So, another
3 point of order -- since three people have asked me
4 -- after we're done, we can go up to the lobby,
5 and I'll help people who still need to get a
6 permit, because I've been told you can print out
7 in the lobby. And I'll help direct you for that.
8 I think there's three of you so far.

9 SPEAKER: Well, I've got to do it, but I
10 know how to do it. I'll figure it out.

11 MS. LOVETT: Okay, thank you.

12 MS. SAGAR: Do you need a headcount for
13 how many people are actually going to be on the
14 boat?

15 MS. LOVETT: No, I think Ken is
16 perfectly fine. He has a rough idea there'll be
17 around 20-ish now, with a few people inviting
18 guests. And then there's plenty of room, he keeps
19 saying.

20 MS. SAGAR: It's a 90-foot boat.

21 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, lots of room.

22 MS. SAGAR: And it looks like

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible).

2 MS. LOVETT: Great; thank you.

3 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So, we've got
4 transportation taken care of. We've got permits.
5 People can see Heidi afterward.

6 As far as getting from the dock to the
7 airport, for some of us who have tight schedules
8 -- I don't think I'm the only one -- can --

9 MS. LOVETT: I suggest Uber. Uber or
10 taxi would be my suggestion.

11 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Okay. So, we need
12 to do that individually?

13 MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I'm not clear about
14 everybody's schedule.

15 SPEAKER: Some of us are coming back
16 here.

17 MS. LOVETT: Yeah.

18 MS. LUKENS: So, what we can do is
19 (inaudible).

20 MR. CORBIN: So, what time will we be
21 back here?

22 MS. LOVETT: So, the boat will be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 landing at 12:30. And we can do that. We can
2 bring a number of the cabs that kind of came and
3 met us, and ask them to meet us at, say, 12:40,
4 giving us time to get off the boats -- or 12:45.
5 So, we should be back here by 1:00, approximately.

6 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: All right. More
7 questions on the fishing trip?

8 All right. Next meeting -- we are
9 scheduled for October 13, 14, and 15 in Silver
10 Spring (inaudible) please mark that one on your
11 calendar.

12 MS. SAGAR: And we'll get that up on the
13 website (inaudible).

14 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Of course, there
15 will be opportunities for folks to participate in
16 various things over the course of the summer. I
17 am anticipating there's going to be a couple of
18 conference calls. I'm certainly going to be
19 putting out a Google poll for the leadership and
20 the subcommittee chairs to all gather together to
21 talk about next steps.

22 I think we also heard from Eileen

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 yesterday with this Presidential Taskforce --
2 moving forward with the IUU issue, and identifying
3 traceability, and how that (inaudible) some of the
4 stuff that MAFAC previously tackled. I spoke with
5 Julie Bonney about this yesterday, and she and I
6 were going to help try to take MAFAC's comments
7 from last year on sustainability and traceability,
8 try to make them responsive to the Presidential
9 Taskforce document, and then convene some sort of
10 telephone conference meeting for MAFAC to take a
11 revised version of that document, and see if we
12 can get a consensus agreement so that they can be
13 submitted, because we can't wait until the October
14 meeting.

15 So, that's one item that I am
16 anticipating will take place over the summer, in
17 addition to the other items associated with the
18 Aquaculture Taskforce or the Climate Change
19 Taskforce, and any of the other initiatives that
20 subcommittee chairs have tackled, including Julie
21 Morris and the recovery efforts.

22 So, things are not going to be quiet

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 between now and October. There will be more
2 things for folks to do. And please keep your eyes
3 out for the various email correspondence on all of
4 that.

5 Jennifer?

6 MS. LUKENS: Just a reminder, again,
7 that we're going to be looking for new members,
8 and we will be asking for help to spread the word
9 later this summer with that (inaudible).

10 MS. LOVETT: No, usually the call is out
11 for 45 days, so it would probably be early summer
12 that we'd send the notice out -- because there's
13 time to process.

14 MS. LUKENS: And I just (inaudible) I
15 just want to say thank you to you all for making
16 me feel welcome here and taking the time to chat
17 with me. I didn't get to speak to everybody
18 individually (inaudible) tomorrow, but I really
19 appreciate it. I'm learning a lot, and this is
20 really helpful for me.

21 The charge that has been given to me by
22 Paul and others in leadership is really to make

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the best use I can of MAFAC, and really help craft
2 agendas for you all, and to get that information
3 so that you all can work as efficiently as
4 possible.

5 So, I'm open to ideas and suggestions on
6 running a meeting, and process, and efficiency,
7 and that type of thing, in addition to the policy
8 issues that we talked about.

9 So, thank you -- and thank you to Keith
10 and to (inaudible) for stepping in on my first day
11 -- and also to Heidi, and Heather, and Christina,
12 who have done -- and you don't see a lot of the
13 stuff that they do, but they make it so I can sit
14 here (inaudible) up and around. So, thank you
15 all.

16 MR. DOREMUS: Likewise, on behalf of the
17 NOAA leadership team, I thank the work of the
18 committee, the Chair and Co-chair in particular.
19 I'm very excited about the direction that you're
20 taking with the working group effort. These are
21 (inaudible) the strategic issues that fisheries
22 leadership, headquarters and in the field, are

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 focused on, and we're going to benefit enormously
2 from your views and consideration. So, we're very
3 excited about the agenda you've set out on, and
4 thank you in particular, Keith and Julie, for
5 leading us through the last couple of days.

6 I hope you all have a wonderful
7 experience tomorrow. I'm sorry I'm going to miss
8 it. I have to get back to D.C., but we're really
9 looking forward to our followup meeting
10 (inaudible) as you all press forward.

11 Our leadership council is meeting next
12 month, and we're constantly aligning the work, to
13 the best extent we can, of our longer-term
14 thinking on priorities and strategy with the work
15 of the committee. And that's what, indeed,
16 (inaudible) speaking to there. So, we're very
17 pleased to see the focus that you all have taken,
18 and are looking forward to seeing (inaudible).
19 Thank you.

20 CHARIMAN RIZZARDI: Any further member
21 business? Okay, this meeting is adjourned.

22 (Whereupon, the PROCEEDINGS were

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

adjourned.)

* * * * *

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