

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

San Diego, California
Tuesday, April 28, 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
12 Bank, Inc.

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

15 HEATHER BRANDON
Ocean Policy Coordinator

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

17 PAUL CLAMPITT
18 Owner, F/V Augustine

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

21 DAVID DONALDSON
Executive Director, Gulf States Marine Fisheries
22 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
of Protected Resources, West Coast

21 THERESE CONANT
22 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 A G E N D A

2 ITEM: PAGE

3 Welcome, Roll Call, and Introductions of 6
4 New Members & Executive Director

5 KEITH RIZZARDI, MAFAC Chair

6 NOAA Fisheries Budget Outlook 29

7 PAUL DOREMUS, Deputy Assistant
8 Administrator for Operations

9 Reports from the State Directors Meeting & 98
10 Fisheries Commissions

11 DAVID DONALDSON, Executive Director, GSMFC

12 RANDY FISHER, Executive Director, PSMFC

13 Cooperative Research & Cooperative Management 130

14 HEATHER SAGAR, Senior Policy Analyst,
15 Office of Policy

16 Protected Resources - Recovery of Species 173

17 THERESE CONANT, Recovery Coordinator,
18 Office of Protected Species, Headquarters

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

22 * * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

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

2 (8:30 a.m.)

3 MS. MORRIS: Good morning everybody.
4 You'll probably realize that I'm not your
5 Chairman. I'm just the Chairman for the day.
6 Keith is delayed, he was supposed to give expert
7 testimony yesterday morning and some legal
8 proceeding in Florida and the case got delayed.
9 He's doing that this morning and he will be
10 joining us tonight here -- in this seat tomorrow
11 morning to chair the meeting. But I'm Julie
12 Morris and I'm here to welcome you all. I would
13 like to give you a couple of coaching tips about
14 the sound system in the room. These look like
15 microphones but they're not. They're really just
16 the way for Jackie, our court reporter to pick up
17 on the conversation that she is transcribing for
18 us. So you'll need to speak up, no soft voices
19 today, everybody has to be assertive and clear in
20 their speech so Jackie can hear them. And she has
21 a three second delay between what I say and what
22 she hears, so if any of you are about to say

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 something that you don't want recorded, you've got
2 three seconds to give Jackie a high sign to like,
3 cut it off. Is that right Jackie, is that, is
4 that --

5 And try to keep your laptops and
6 wireless devices away from the mikes because that
7 gives them a kind of a feedback. It makes it hard
8 for her to hear our words. We have sign in sheets
9 in the back and we'd like particularly all of the
10 guests to sign in at some point everyday so we
11 have a record of who's attending the meeting. If
12 you can navigate the network and the password and
13 connect to the meeting materials on the MAFAC
14 website you'll see an agenda there for the entire
15 meeting. And while you're getting there I'm going
16 to just take a minute to welcome and introduce the
17 new members who are joining us at MAFAC for the
18 first time in this face to face meeting.

19 First there's Terri Lee Beideman.

20 MS. BEIDEMAN: Good job.

21 MS. MORRIS: She's from New Jersey and
22 she's the Executive Director of the Blue Water

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Fisherman's Association and also the CEO of an
2 organization called Vast Array. She will give you
3 a card. And Terri Lee, would you like to just say
4 a few things?

5 MS. BEIDEMAN: Sure. Thank you for
6 inviting me to participate in this panel. I come
7 to marine issues from the coast of Maine where I
8 grew up. I was born in Bar Harbor, and met myself
9 a Maine maritime grad and ended up in New Jersey
10 on the coast. He always liked fishing more than
11 he liked setting in a running ship so he came back
12 and went fishing, and that was really when I first
13 learned about that, too many years ago to mention.
14 I have been involved in that association as an
15 assistant and also as the executive director, when
16 my husband died. And I started my own business
17 and I have a couple of other marine oriented
18 clients. And the business is Vast Array. But I
19 know some about East Coast Fisheries. I know a
20 little about other fisheries and I'm very anxious
21 to learn so, thank you again and I look forward to
22 working with all of you.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. MORRIS: Thank you Terri Lee. Next
2 is Heather Brandon who comes from Juneau, Alaska,
3 the other corner of the continent. She is the
4 Senior Program Officer with the World Wildlife
5 Fund's Arctic Program. And she's been working on
6 policy and marine resource management for a couple
7 of decades and please tell us a little bit more
8 about yourself, Heather.

9 MS. BRANDON: Let's see. Well I live in
10 Juneau, but I work on mostly Bering Sea fisheries
11 and in my current fishing resume, I work on Russia
12 and Alaska secret issues, including the harvests.
13 That's one of the main topics I work on now.
14 Before this position I worked with the Pacific
15 Fishing Management Council and before that I was
16 with Alaska Department of Fishing and Game. And
17 actually I worked at (inaudible) Silver Springs
18 for eight months as a contractor straight out of
19 grad school. Although I don't know too many
20 people there anymore.

21 MS. MORRIS: Now you'll get to know them
22 all.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. BRANDON: Yeah. I look forward to
2 participating in MAFAC and representing the
3 Conservation.

4 MS. MORRIS: Welcome Heather. Next is
5 Mike Okoniewski. How'd I do?

6 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Pretty close.
7 (laughter)

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay. From Woodland,
9 Washington, and Mike is General and Regional
10 Manager of Pacific Sea Food, a very large and
11 successful seafood company in North America. And
12 Mike, please introduce yourself a bit more.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Most people just call
14 me Mike O., nobody really knows my last name at
15 the company. It's a lot easier so, in any case
16 I've been in the business 45 years, I've seen a
17 lot of changes over that time. I've had two
18 stints in Alaska, done some sales overseas and
19 procurement. Just about everything I guess there
20 is to do, but primarily in production and
21 procurement, a little bit of time moving boats
22 around from point A to B. And I also split my

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 duties. I'm actually the Director of the Alaska
2 region which is pretty minor for us, I guess,
3 compared to the rest of the scale of what we do.
4 We're heavily involved in agriculture as well as
5 wild sea food. And have a distribution network as
6 well. But I'm also the policy and fisheries
7 management advisor to our company. So I'm
8 splitting my time, so it's actually like having
9 two jobs. And we're just kind of finally getting
10 into the full steam on that. But I've seen a lot
11 of changes I could say over the 45 years. And
12 I've been in Alaska back in the 1970s and 1980s
13 when it still pretty raw I guess. And I've spent
14 a lot of time on the west coast as well. Thank
15 you and I'm really honored to be here. Thank you.

16 MS. MORRIS: Welcome Mike, and then
17 fourth is Peter Shelley, who is joining us from
18 Marblehead, Massachusetts, and he's the Senior
19 Counsel, Vice President and lead voice on regional
20 and national issues for the Conservation Law
21 Foundation. He has had a lot of experience with
22 New England fisheries. And Peter, would you like

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to introduce yourself a bit more?

2 MR. SHELLEY: Sure, thank you Julie.
3 Conservation Law Foundation is a regional NGO
4 advocacy organization. I've been involved in
5 various marine issues since 1983 when I brought
6 the litigation between Boston Harbor as well as
7 oil and gas drilling issues off New England in the
8 1970's. I've been working on fisheries management
9 pretty intensively since 1990, mostly on a
10 regional level. But I'm also the Co-Chair of the
11 Marine Fish Conservation Network, which is a
12 network of environmental, aquaria, recreational
13 fishermen and commercial fisherman focused on the
14 Magnusson-Stevens reauthorization. I've also done
15 some work internationally in the country of
16 Kiribati, helping them set up the Phoenix Islands
17 Marine Protective Area in their country. I'm an
18 avid sailor and recreational fisherman.

19 MS. MORRIS: Welcome Peter.

20 MR. SHELLEY: Not very successful
21 recreational fisherman. Avid. (laughter)

22 MS. MORRIS: There are some people here

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 who would be happy to help you with that.

2 MR. SHELLEY: I'm sure I need it.

3 MS. MORRIS: So let's just go around the
4 table in the room and each introduce ourselves
5 briefly. And we'll start, we've already heard
6 from Heather and Mike -- so Paul?

7 MR. CLAMPITT: Paul Clampitt, a
8 commercial fisherman on the line from Seattle,
9 Washington.

10 MR. DYSKOW: I'm Phil Dyskow, I
11 represent recreational fishing.

12 MR. CORBIN: I'm John Corbin, I'm a
13 consultant in aquaculture planning and development
14 from the Pacific Islands, Hawaii.

15 MR. RHEAULT: Bob Rheault, I'm the
16 Executive Director of the East Coast Shellfish
17 Growers Association.

18 MS. BONNEY: Julie Bonney, and I'm from
19 Kodiak, Alaska and I work in the commercial
20 fishing industry.

21 MR. BROWN: Columbus Brown, I'm retired
22 from the US Fish and Wildlife service. I live in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Atlanta.

2 MR. MERRICK: Richard Merrick, two
3 scientists, no fisheries.

4 MR. DOREMUS: Paul Doremus, Deputy
5 Assistant Administrator for Operations.

6 MS. LUKENS: Jennifer Lukens, the
7 Director of Policy and Fisheries.

8 MS. MORRIS: Julie Morris, I work at New
9 College of Florida in Sarasota, Florida.

10 MR. SESEPASARA: I'm Henry Seseapasara,
11 from American Samoa. I was once a politician, no
12 longer there, but I'm a Special Assistant to the
13 Governor on Fisheries issues.

14 MR. BRAME: I'm Dick Brame, I work with
15 Coastal Conservation Association, recreational
16 fisherman.

17 MR. AMES: Ted Ames, retired fisherman
18 and founding board member of Penobscot Resource
19 Center, a small non-profit on the coast of Maine.

20 MS. MORRIS: Jackie says speak up.

21 MR. DONALDSON: I'm Dave Donaldson, the
22 Executive Director of the Gulf States and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Fisheries Commission.

2 MR. FISHER: I'm Randy Fisher, Executive
3 Director of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries
4 Commission.

5 MS. YOCHER: Pam Yochem, welcome to San
6 Diego. I'm based here in town working for
7 Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute on protective
8 resources. We also have a marine fish hatchery in
9 Carlsbad. You'll be hearing from my boss on
10 Thursday morning.

11 MR. MCCARTY: Micah McCarty, from Makah
12 Tribe and current Executive Officer for the
13 (inaudible) Council.

14 MS. LOVETT: Heidi Lovett, Office of
15 Policies on Fishes.

16 MS. MORRIS: We'll move to the people
17 around the walls, please introduce yourselves as
18 well.

19 MR. SLAPE: My name is James Slape and
20 I'm (inaudible).

21 MR. FOUNER: Hi, I'm Svein Fougner,
22 (inaudible)

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BARNES: I'm Nora Berwick's husband.
2 I'm up visiting from Guatemala.

3 MS. MORRIS: Welcome.

4 MR. TURNER: I'm Bob Turner, the
5 assistant regional (inaudible).

6 MS. BERWICK: I'm Nora Berwick. I work
7 with Protected Resources, out of Portland, Oregon.

8 MS. MORRIS: Thank you everybody, now
9 I'd like to introduce Jennifer Lukens. It's her
10 first face to face meeting with us and she is
11 going to introduce herself a little bit and then
12 we'll look at the agenda for the meeting and make
13 any adjustments we need to make.

14 MS. LUKENS: Thank you. Well I'm really
15 happy to join you for my first in person MAFAC
16 meeting. It's really helpful for me to put that
17 list of names that's hanging on my wall in my
18 office -- faces with those names. It's really
19 really helpful. And to have this, take this
20 opportunity to spend some time with you all to get
21 to know you, and hopefully the chance to get to
22 know me. I think I may have only met one or two

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of you before, some of you, a long time ago.

2 So just a little bit about me, and
3 because people keep asking where I come from, I am
4 the new Mark Holliday. I don't look like him.

5 (laughter)

6 SPEAKER: Thank goodness.

7 MS. LUKENS: But most people remark on,
8 I don't look like him. But I have been with NOAA
9 for a little over fifteen years, and prior to that
10 I worked for the State of Delaware Department of
11 Natural Resources. So I have a little bit of
12 state experience, a lot of federal experience, and
13 throughout the course of my career I started out
14 working for the National Ocean Service. I moved
15 onto the office of legislative affairs at NOAA and
16 also working for the undersecretary in their
17 policy office, before I came to fisheries about
18 three years ago working in the office of habitat
19 conservation. Just recently in December, my boss
20 here Paul hired me, and I became the Director of
21 Policy for Fisheries and took on the
22 responsibilities here. One of my main

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 responsibilities was working with MAFAC.

2 I have a lot to learn in my new job. I
3 haven't been in the fisheries world for very long,
4 and the world that I was in was primarily habitat.
5 So I have a lot to learn about the agency and
6 policy issues itself. So this is a great
7 opportunity for me to get to know fisheries, but
8 also the views and perspectives of those who are
9 our stakeholders and our partners and people that
10 we work with on a frequent basis.

11 Throughout my career I have engaged with
12 a variety of different advisory councils whether
13 it be a sanctuary advisory council, a protected
14 area SPAC, or the hydrographic services review
15 panel. But I've never served as a designated
16 federal official, so that's another thing I'm
17 learning about and Heidi is educating me on the
18 ins and outs and what we can do and what we can't.
19 So I guess my goal is -- I'm in learning mode
20 here. I understand that your plate, your work
21 that you're working on right now, is pretty full
22 -- from what I've gone through past agendas and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 recommendations and meeting minutes, and its I
2 think what my job at this meeting is to learn who
3 you are, how you work in the time-scope of scale
4 of things that you can work on effectively as a
5 group. And being responsive in two weeks is not
6 an easy thing to do for a large group like this,
7 working over conference calls and on emails, but
8 really my job to help think about what are some of
9 those issues to tee up and provide that
10 information for you as you deliberate over issues
11 and provide your expertise to us and thoughts and
12 comments on your operations on fisheries. So
13 that's a little bit of that.

14 Let me take a moment to cover what I
15 understand is happening kind of recently. Since
16 just before I came on board in September, it's
17 been really busy as I said, standing up at two
18 task forces -- the climate task force and the
19 aquaculture task force to look at some specific
20 tasks. It was pretty amazing to see the amount of
21 qualified applicants that came in for those two
22 particular task forces, got a lot of well

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 qualified people and I think that only speaks to
2 the importance of the work that you are doing now,
3 and the expertise and the diversity of the folks
4 that were interested in applying. And I know
5 there has been a lot of work going on. The
6 climate folks actually got to meet face to face
7 and I met with some of them briefly when they had
8 their only face to face meeting. And I know
9 there's been a lot of back and forth over email
10 and conference calls, so a lot of work. And that
11 is, primarily that work that is fueling a lot of
12 the agenda items that we're going to be talking
13 about over the course of the next three days.

14 I wanted to talk a little bit about past
15 work that you've done and how we've used that.
16 Tomorrow, the integration of the endangered
17 species act and Section Seven and
18 Magnusson-Stevens Act processes, you all should
19 have received word back in January that we --
20 Fisheries issued a policy directive that was a
21 direct result of the recommendations that you all,
22 MSECC provided relevant to integrating that cross

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Section Seven, bettering the council's work.

2 Also in terms of sustainable seafood
3 certification, the recommendations that you all
4 provided to us on that -- I believe Eileen spoke
5 to you all last fall about how those
6 recommendations were being used with the standing
7 up of the new president's task force on IUU. She
8 will be here tomorrow to talk a little bit more
9 about that and we can go into a little bit more
10 into the guidance of what we've done with that and
11 the future of IUU and the recommendations, the 14
12 or so recommendations that we're beginning to work
13 on implementation of.

14 So that is a little bit, I just want to
15 go over a few little administrative issues before
16 we'll kind of jump into the agenda items for the
17 next couple of days. Over the winter we
18 reinitiated the reappointment of the seven MAFAC
19 members to serve on their second term. That's
20 Julie Bonnie, Dick, Michelle, Micah, Vince, Bob,
21 and Pam were all reappointed in late January and
22 will serve until February of 2018. And just to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 note that the second term of four members is going
2 to be ending in late October after our next
3 meeting. So this summer we will be initiating a
4 new nomination process to fill these pending
5 vacancies. So we are going to need your
6 assistance in spreading the word and getting that
7 out and looking for applicants to apply and get
8 some strong potential candidates for those seats
9 that will be opened. And we'll be working with
10 you to let you know about when that goes out and
11 getting that word out.

12 As I said, the dates for the upcoming
13 fall meeting have been set for October 13th
14 through 15th in Silver Spring. I hear you all are
15 glad not to be having a meeting here today instead
16 of, there have been a lot in Silver Spring for a
17 long time so we will be back in Silver Spring in
18 October. And so that's a little bit of the
19 administrative issues. I don't know if anybody
20 has any questions before we kind of run through
21 the top level of the agenda.

22 MS. MORRIS: Questions for Jennifer?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Thank you so much for that update, where we are on
2 past projects and what's ahead of us.

3 MS. LUKENS: It's hard to report out on
4 something you haven't been terribly engaged and
5 coming into the middle of it, but it certainly is
6 a lot of work on your plate right now -- from my
7 perspective. Today we're going to have, after I
8 get done speaking, with Julie, we will be having
9 Paul Doremus providing a little bit of an outlook
10 on NOAA Fisheries' budget, along with reports from
11 the state director's meeting and fisheries'
12 commissions. We will be having a presentation
13 from Heather Sagar on the work that she and the
14 folks at NOAA have prepared on cooperative
15 research and cooperative management, the
16 development of that white paper and the
17 recommendations that they proposed for you all for
18 consideration and comments on those
19 recommendations.

20 Later this afternoon we'll be covering
21 -- sort of teeing up some information for the work
22 of the protective resources on the recovery of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species. We'll have Nora here who is here today
2 talking a bit about a presentation of recovery
3 plans and actions. And Therese Conant from the
4 Office of Protected Resources will be calling in
5 for that discussion. We'll have some time this
6 afternoon for our subcommittee meetings and then
7 at three o'clock we will all be convening at the
8 front of the hotel to get on a bus to take a ride
9 over to our new Southwest Fisheries Science Center
10 and get a tour of that center by Roger Hewitt who
11 is the Assistant Director for Southwest Fishery
12 Science Center. So that is what we have on the
13 agenda for the remainder of the day. Tomorrow our
14 assistant administrator Eileen Sobeck will be
15 joining us and she will report out as I said,
16 kicking our morning off. We'll also have Russ
17 Dunn and Craig -- I don't know how to say his last
18 name -- Heberer.

19 MS. MORRIS: It's Heberer.

20 MS. LUKENS: Heberer. Sorry. Be
21 talking a little bit about recreational fishing
22 and the new policy and its implementation. Then

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we have Dr. Merrick who will be talking about MRIP
2 and transitioning into the new survey. We also
3 will have Wes Patrick joining us from Sustainable
4 Fisheries in Silver Spring to talk a little bit
5 about National Standard One, and the revisions to
6 that and also three and seven and as going around
7 talking about that to everybody, that's part of
8 the agenda to reach out and have a conversation
9 with you all about that.

10 And then we'll be getting into more of,
11 after a brief public commentary, we'll be getting
12 more into climate change. And we will have Cisco
13 Werner, he is not here today but he is the
14 Director of the Southwest Fisheries Science
15 Center, really talking about climate change and
16 hopefully this will be a great opportunity to
17 learn a bit more as you deliberate on the
18 recommendations that will be presented to make
19 that on our science strategy for climate that
20 they've been reviewing and commenting on.

21 We'll move into the afternoon of
22 subcommittee meetings, with breaks as needed. And

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 then we will be having more of a get together
2 tomorrow evening at Nokos happy hour, Ken Frankie
3 has invited a lot of constituents in the area to
4 join us for a happy hour and it will be a good
5 time to get meet and greet and meet people and
6 catch up on things.

7 And we will conclude on Thursday with
8 Don Kent who is the director of Hub Sea World
9 Research Institute talking to us a little bit
10 about off shore aquaculture. And then we will be
11 getting our subcommittee report outs with final
12 actions throughout the remainder of the afternoon.
13 And then on Friday we do have an educational
14 recreational fishing excursion. I hope that most
15 of you can join us on that and if you are planning
16 on attending it and have not gotten your fishing
17 license, you should do so in advance. And Heidi
18 sent out some instructions on that via email
19 previously. So that is what we have on tap, a lot
20 of work to do and I am excited to be here and join
21 you all.

22 MS. MORRIS: Any questions, adjustments,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 suggestions, changes about the agenda? Yes,
2 Heidi?

3 MS. LOVETT: I think just, there have
4 just been a few questions about where materials
5 are.

6 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

7 MS. LOVETT: And I hope everyone has
8 been visiting the MAFAC website, which has the
9 annotated agendas for each of the presentations.
10 Most of the presentations are already there as
11 well, although a few will be loading today, if I
12 can do it remotely. And the, when you're on the
13 MAFAC main page, in the top right corner is the
14 word agenda -- it says draft, it's not draft.
15 When you click on that, it gives you the agenda
16 with the times next to it, which a few people were
17 asking. So it's the agenda in this form, versus
18 what's on the page in front of you, scrolling
19 down. So what's on the page is going sequentially
20 throughout the day.

21 MS. MORRIS: So is everybody able to
22 connect to the website and is anybody having

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 difficulty with the technology of connecting to
2 meeting materials? Everybody is good with that?
3 Okay great.

4 MS. LOVETT: And also because it's a
5 little confusing, the men's room is outside almost
6 directly -- right before you reach the stairway,
7 and the women's room is around to the other side
8 of the stairway, if anyone was wondering that.

9 MS. MORRIS: Okay, I think we'll delay
10 the chair's report on what he's been up to until
11 he appears tomorrow morning. And any other
12 questions about the general schedule for today,
13 any other logistics comments that need to be made
14 before we dive into the budget? Okay, if not --

15 MS. BONNER: One other issue.

16 MS. MORRIS: Yes, go ahead.

17 MS. BONNER: It's that typically we have
18 coffee in the meeting room. There's coffee in the
19 lobby upstairs, free coffee, so if some people are
20 missing their morning charge, you can go upstairs
21 and coffee is there.

22 MS. MORRIS: Thank you Julie.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. DOREMUS: Watch everybody get up --
2 (laughter)

3 MS. MORRIS: Is that something you need
4 to do Paul before we go into the budget?

5 MR. DOREMUS: I'll hold off until the
6 break --

7 MS. MORRIS: Because we could take a
8 break right now --

9 MR. DOREMUS: That's okay. I'm ready to
10 go.

11 MS. MORRIS: Okay then let's move into
12 the NOAA fisheries budget outlook -- Paul.

13 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you very much Julie,
14 thank you also for stepping into Keith's absence
15 and chairing, I'm going to send a special thanks
16 to all the new members just introduced.

17 MS. MORRIS: Speak up.

18 MR. DOREMUS: And -- that's not going to
19 help?

20 MS. MORRIS: Just speak more loudly.

21 MR. DOREMUS: All right, I'll put on my
22 scream at the teenagers voice. All right, it's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 good to be here. Eileen sends her regards, she
2 was not able to make it for our opening session
3 here today, but we do want to especially thank all
4 our new members. It's great to have the ability
5 to meet out here on the west coast for once. I
6 haven't been able to meet outside of Washington
7 for some time. I know many of you are accustomed
8 to travelling great distances to get to
9 Washington. This sort of a difference for some
10 and enables all of us to meet in a new location
11 and get a sense of what the world of fisheries is
12 from a regional perspective. And we have a
13 particular advantage to do that on Friday and
14 special thanks to Kent Frankie for setting that up
15 and making that introduction to everybody as well.

16 I have an opportunity here today to kind
17 of step through where we are in Washington. You
18 can't talk about Washington without talking about
19 the budget. I think that's pretty much 90 percent
20 of what we discuss. And I'll give you overview
21 where we are here, focusing a little bit at the
22 outset on FY15, our current execution year, having

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 a look at where the budget is for 2016. The
2 President's budget released in February -- very
3 strong budget for us is all detailed, but
4 obviously landing in a new congress, with a
5 different complexion. And we have a long way to
6 go. We spent a lot of time engaging them. We
7 have a long way to go before we see where they
8 actually land. More on that -- 2016 piece as we
9 move forward and we as always encourage
10 opportunity to address any questions you might
11 have.

12 As far as our top line look, we did get
13 our appropriation in December, back and forth on
14 spend plans as always, but we have a modest
15 increase in FY15 over 2014, about a 1.6 percent,
16 but most of what congress effectively did with the
17 FY15 budget, at the time, it was a transitional
18 phase for congress, dealing with midterms and the
19 like and the recomposition of the Hill and
20 committees and the like. They more or less moved
21 FY14 to the right. It's largely a continuation
22 budget, although there were few areas for us where

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we were provided modest increase in program
2 resources, that one was in the area of coastal
3 resiliency grants. We also were given specific
4 direction in electronic monitoring, as well as
5 with the Saltonstall-Kennedy program, so I want to
6 provide a slide each on those. Those are the
7 three areas where we really have different
8 resources and very direct direction from congress,
9 a very clear direction from congress on what it is
10 that they would like us to do, particularly with
11 electronic monitoring. There is in the FY15
12 appropriation language that we will focus on and
13 make available out of existing resources, the two
14 million for electronic monitoring and electronic
15 reporting technologies to be augmented through a
16 cost sharing arrangement with external partners
17 and a good portion of that to focus on the Gulf of
18 Mexico application. So that was, in a nutshell
19 the direction that we got, the specific language
20 is probably available. And we have moved forward,
21 and I'm disappointed that Tony Chatwin was not
22 able to make it to our meeting here today. A very

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 significant commitment to MAFAC, but also has
2 through his work been at central to how we have
3 here worked with that direction from congress to
4 cost share. We are looking at merging with them
5 and through a grant opportunity that they have
6 made available through the National Fish and
7 Wildlife Foundation to augment our two million
8 with two million from other funds so we have an
9 anticipated award level of four million in this
10 area, with some portion of which will go as much
11 as half to the Gulf of Mexico as directed by
12 congress. And we will be looking at the whole
13 program on the basis of a competitive analysis of
14 the proposals with a particular eye to the
15 regional fisheries' electronic monitoring and
16 electronic reporting plans that have been put
17 forward. That sort of sets our frame of reference
18 on need and we're looking in particular, or in
19 National Fish and Wildlife Foundation is through
20 this program and with our endorsement and
21 resources is looking at the best available
22 proposals that relate to those high priority needs

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 on a regional basis for electronic monitoring and
2 reporting. Lots of expectations in different
3 parts of the country about this capability, not
4 the grant so much as the overall possibility of
5 electronic monitoring and electronic reporting to
6 improve data -- speed, accuracy, scale, and scope.
7 A lot of, I think expectations in congress, about
8 what this might do and we are constantly, almost
9 every time we talk about electronic monitoring and
10 reporting, reminding people that we view this as
11 augmentation of existing abilities. It is not a
12 way to displace or replace human observation.
13 They collect different things in different ways
14 for different purposes, and what we'd like to do
15 is advance as rapidly as we can electronic
16 monitoring and reporting technologies as a blended
17 approach to getting the observations that we need
18 for physical and biological observations for
19 fisheries management. So that's a big piece of
20 FY15 and we're very grateful for the
21 collaboration, the very close and rapid
22 collaboration with the National Fish and Wildlife

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Foundation, and Tony in particular for getting
2 that out there. So those grants are in and under
3 review at this point in time. So it's very
4 exciting for us, and we have followed through in
5 FY16 as I'll talk about in a little bit on a
6 formal budget request to try to develop more of a
7 sustained program in this territory.

8 Saltonstall-Kennedy, as many of you may
9 know, is a component of the Promote and
10 Development Act which is established I think back
11 in the 1970s if I remember. And it is based on
12 tax receipts from secret imports and a range of
13 other products. It's actually a very extensive
14 product list if you ever look at it. And congress
15 every year has a decision on how to use those tax
16 receipts consistent with Promote and Development
17 Act. They have very often, and in some years
18 exclusively used it to offset our operations
19 research and management funding. This year and in
20 2014 they provided a substantial portion to go to
21 the Saltonstall- Kennedy grant program. We ran a
22 small program in FY13 and FY12 and FY11, very

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 restricted budget years. There was no SK grant
2 program provided by congress, but we combined
3 because of the very late appropriation in 2014 and
4 fairly rapid appropriation in FY15. We combined
5 those into one year. We have a very substantial
6 capability here with available -- a potential to
7 do awards up to 22 million. We received many many
8 applications. They are under review now and we
9 expect to be able to execute this by the end of
10 FY15. It has been a huge press and I want to
11 emphasize here one of the major differences over
12 FY13 and prior years is that we worked very
13 closely and also in consultation with
14 congressional representatives. We worked closely
15 with the councils and with the commissions to try
16 to effectively modernize the priorities and have a
17 much stronger regional flavor to the priorities as
18 we advanced this competitive grant program. So we
19 worked with the council's commissions. We looked
20 at council research plans for priority areas by
21 region, and completely revamped the priorities at
22 the front end of this, and we have also been

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 consulting with the councils and commissions in
2 the review process in the composition of the
3 constituent panels and ultimately in a check on
4 balance against the priority areas and by region
5 as we move this program through the process. It
6 is a competitive grant proposal but we want to
7 make sure that we hit all of the major themes in a
8 balanced way and that we're as balanced as
9 possible relative to the range of applications
10 that we got by region. So we have four priority
11 areas related to maximizing fishing opportunities
12 and jobs, improving the cost effectiveness and
13 capacity for observation. Observation is data
14 collection. There's electronic monitoring
15 opportunities there as well as with the prior
16 grant proposal. And third priority here,
17 increasing the supply quality, diversification of
18 domestic seafood and that includes aquaculture
19 focus. And then the fourth carries on a focus
20 area that we introduced for the first time in FY13
21 to improve the quality and quantity of fishery
22 information from U.S. Territories.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So we are in middle of all of that.
2 We're very grateful for the contributions that the
3 councils and commissions have made. It's a very
4 tight process to get this all executed, in a year,
5 sounds like a long time, but for all the
6 requirements of conducting a competitive grant
7 process and reviewing proposals -- so many, 285,
8 it has been a very substantial effort and we're
9 grateful for all the contributions that our
10 partners have made to making that happen. And
11 we'll look forward in our next meeting to talk
12 about what actually was funded and what the
13 breakdown is. We'll make that available when it
14 is finished.

15 Coastal resiliency grants is another
16 area that is very prominent for NOAA. If you have
17 had the opportunity to hear or read about the
18 administrator's priorities, Administrator
19 Sullivan, for all of NOAA, resiliency, and coastal
20 resiliency in particular factor very prominently
21 in NOAA's overall strategy and that came forward
22 in the form of a ten million dollar coastal

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 resiliency grants, five million through congress
2 in FY15, five million through fisheries for
3 coastal ecosystem resiliency grants and this is
4 focused on, as we have stated here on the ground
5 -- habitat restoration. We're looking in
6 particular at areas that relate to fisheries and
7 protective resources needs. On the NOS side, that
8 five million is under the same general heading but
9 resiliency in a different context, a little bit
10 more focused on coastal community resilience --
11 particularly in the face of hazardous weather and
12 long term coastal changes. And they are going to
13 be directing those resources more towards
14 policies, regulation standards, technical tools
15 and strategies, things of that nature, with a more
16 of a coastal protection flavor to resilience.
17 These two things are not unrelated. Habitat
18 restoration can improve ecosystem of functioning
19 that we care about from the fisheries, protective
20 resources side, can also serve these other
21 objectives as well, so we're very closely
22 collaborating with NOS to make sure that these two

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 grant programs are used in conjunction as
2 favorably as we can. And that was also by intent
3 in congressional direction.

4 So those are the three areas that are
5 somewhat new in FY15 but the overall story there
6 is continuity from FY14 and we await congress'
7 reception to the 2016 budget to get a sense of any
8 major program direction. All of our information
9 related to 2016 is publically available. There's
10 a link here to our blue book. Our entire
11 congressional submission is available online. And
12 I will be giving you just the highlights here on
13 the increase request, which is where the focus
14 often is. But I want to start by just --

15 MS. MORRIS: Paul --

16 MR. DOREMUS: Yes.

17 MS. MORRIS: Before you start, do you
18 want to take questions about those three
19 initiatives?

20 MR. DOREMUS: On fifteen? We could --
21 as you --

22 MS. MORRIS: That you just outlined. Is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that okay?

2 MR. DOREMUS: Sure.

3 MS. MORRIS: Oh would you rather just
4 barrel through?

5 MR. DOREMUS: As you please.

6 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Any questions on the

7 --

8 MR. DOREMUS: It's probably good to
9 pause at this point.

10 MS. MORRIS: The coastal resiliency, the
11 electronic monitoring or the Saltonstall-Kennedy
12 increases?

13 MR. DOREMUS: SK as we say.

14 MS. MORRIS: Henry.

15 MR. SESEPASARA: I have a question on
16 the -- on the coastal resilient --

17 MS. MORRIS: Speak up.

18 MR. SESEPASARA: Yeah, on the coastal
19 resilient grant talked about here out -- how is
20 that related to the coastal zone management
21 program? It seems to be something similar?

22 MR. DOREMUS: Yes, the NOS side is a

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 little bit closer, the coastal grants, the coastal
2 zone management program grants are a long standing
3 relationship with the states for coastal
4 management. And it's a more broad program that
5 NOS runs. It doesn't have necessarily this focus
6 on resiliency and long term changes. It's more
7 current coastal management programs, technical
8 tools, assistance, things of that nature. So
9 they're related, but it's more on the NOS side
10 than on the types of things that will be funded
11 for through this small program.

12 MS. MORRIS: Paul.

13 MR. CLAMPITT: Thank you, so is this --
14 there's two five million dollar grants. The two
15 grants and they need to be applied for as opposed
16 to -- is it going to go to those who -- states, or
17 is there any more detail there? Because I belong
18 to a resource division and I was talking to and
19 who was chomping at the bit and interested in
20 applying.

21 MR. DOREMUS: We will be putting out,
22 any time now, it's supposed be late April or early

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 May and we're pretty deep into late April. The
2 federal funding opportunity announcement, it will
3 go out, it's a competitive grant program. It will
4 certainly be open to states. And we can make
5 sure, and we can take a note of it here that all
6 members of the committee here can be apprised of
7 that federal funding opportunity as soon as it
8 comes out. It's a public announcement, broadly
9 available, but we can make sure that all the
10 committee members receive that when it comes
11 forward. It is likely they will be run as two
12 federal funding opportunity announcements -- two
13 separate ones, administered separately by Fish and
14 by NOS. But we'll be collaborating on them
15 closely in terms of review panels and things of
16 that nature. But its competitive process and
17 we'll make sure you get information about it,
18 detailed information about the federal funding
19 opportunity in days, it should be available in
20 days.

21 MS. MORRIS: Mike.

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: What type of policies

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and which level of government would you envision
2 or regulations for that matter, how would those be
3 propagated to -- I'm a little lost. Grants are
4 fairly easy to understand when you get into the
5 community, but when you talk about policy and
6 regulations, it sounds a little ominous I guess.

7 MR. DOREMUS: Are you speaking about
8 this, the piece on NOS?

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yes.

10 MR. DOREMUS: That's an area that I'm a
11 little less familiar with. I don't necessarily --
12 I'm not a in great position to speak to that here.
13 When that funding opportunity comes out, I think
14 you could look at that and see what it is that
15 they're talking about, there may be others, I
16 don't know if you have some more exposure to this
17 or others in the room who are aware of where the
18 focus is, but I think the general intent is to
19 find efforts to understand how state managers and
20 others interested in long term coastal resilience
21 can think about different ways to manage
22 shorelines, to manage various efforts to control

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 storm surge, sea level rise, or at least adapt to
2 those over time, may involve policy
3 considerations, land use considerations. But I'm
4 just speaking generally and it will be better to
5 reference both the federal funding opportunities
6 specifically but also other subject matter experts
7 on that topic.

8 MS. LUKENS: I think with respect to the
9 regulations and standards with the coastal zone
10 management program down that is run out of the
11 Ocean Service with this, it works collaboratively
12 with the states as they develop their regulations
13 presented to their coastal management program
14 that's approved by NOAA. So if the states do
15 decide through technical assistance, and to
16 develop their own regulations or standards, it
17 would be done through at the state level, most
18 likely not at the federal level. I think they're
19 talking more about technical assistance to those
20 communities in terms of citing where development
21 is and to make it more recently and using terms of
22 green infrastructure instead of hurting

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 infrastructure for our protection. That's more
2 physical resiliency in terms of anything.

3 MS. MORRIS: Julie Bonney's next.

4 MS. BONNEY: Yes, and so this is kind of
5 off what you brought up. I mean you talked about
6 basically three grant sources to meet certain
7 objectives.

8 MR. DOREMUS: Yes.

9 MS. BONNEY: But in terms of the overall
10 NIMS budget -- in the past we've seen where
11 congress has kind of went after particular
12 programs. So in terms of fiscal year 2015, did
13 you have the amount of money you needed for all
14 the different programs that we have in terms of
15 your employees, protected resources, the salmon
16 enhancement on the Pacific Coast, just kind of as
17 a general byline for what happened in 2015. I
18 mean we are comfortable with the funding we had
19 for all the different functions for the year, I
20 guess is my question.

21 MR. DOREMUS: We are never comfortable,
22 (laughter) with the funding level. It's a very

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 good question, and often in leading these
2 conversations -- I often point to the history we
3 probably should have to better address your very
4 good question Julie. We have had a long cycle of
5 budget reductions that we have dealt with. Our
6 history basically was one post Magnusson
7 reauthorization in 2006 of steady increases, very
8 strong support by congress, over the president's
9 request level until 2010-2011 and post -- that was
10 the FY budgets after the 2008 financial market
11 driven recession. That was a complete reversal of
12 that. Our budget dropped about 12 and a half
13 percent from FY10 to FY13. FY14 was a little bit
14 of an increase, but we have not made back anywhere
15 close to the level of reduction. It varies by
16 program area. We had a little bit less reduction
17 in our core program supporting Fisheries, Research
18 and Management, and proportionally greater
19 reductions in protected resources and habitat. So
20 where we are here today, FY15 just sort of carried
21 with about a one and a half percent increase,
22 carried a little bit of recovery forward, but we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 are still accommodating substantial program
2 reductions, particularly in protected resources
3 and habitat, but other areas as well.

4 We have had during this entire time
5 continuingly escalating mission requirements. So
6 you will see in the review of FY16 where the
7 administration is supporting a growth in a lot of
8 those areas, to in part recover from some of the
9 reductions that we've seen in recent years, but
10 also to address the changing composition of demand
11 for what we do. So it's a very good question and
12 that's a condensed version of our budget history
13 but we've got a long way to go to climb out of the
14 whole of the last three years is the bottom line.

15 MS. MORRIS: Peter.

16 MR. SHELLEY: Thank you, I'm really
17 pleased to see the focus on electronic monitoring.
18 It would be difficult to overstate how important
19 that is for certainly the commercial fishery in
20 New England and probably a lot of other places.
21 It's wonderful to see NFWF is partnering in on
22 this. It's still a very modest amount of money.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. DOREMUS: It is.

2 MR. SHELLEY: But I think it's really
3 critical to improve the accuracy and timeliness of
4 the data streams. I know Dr. Merrick has already
5 focused on this; the next challenge is putting
6 that data into a data management structure.

7 MR. DOREMUS: Indeed.

8 MR. SHELLEY: That would allow again the
9 rapid processing of data back to managers, so
10 they're working with as close to real time useful
11 and accurate information as they can possibly get.

12 MR. DOREMUS: Absolutely, I couldn't
13 agree more, Those are all considerations both in
14 FY15, and as we stepped into FY16 likewise with
15 the requests that we've made. The data
16 management, the data reporting and management side
17 is very important, and in many respects where some
18 of the earliest gains are best realized.

19 MS. MORRIS: Micah.

20 MR. MCCARTY: I'd like to just ask a
21 little bit about possible funding sources for
22 central fish habitat restoration projects like

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible) and the South (inaudible) Sound.
2 We're finding 90 percent mortality of outward
3 migrating smelts for steelhead and there's a
4 corresponding or perhaps a related phenomenon with
5 the decline in herring spawn in the same areas and
6 outward migrating smelt throughout the same size
7 as herring spawn, and so there's a really serious
8 issue here that we need a lot more attention and
9 focus on and it's going to require resources and
10 partnerships.

11 MR. DOREMUS: Indeed, the type of thing
12 that you are talking about, Micah, is very much
13 what this ecosystem resiliency grant program is
14 intended to do, where you can draw a connection, a
15 very direct connection between the coastal, the
16 estuarine conditions and stock data if you will --
17 the impact on managed species in particular, so
18 essential fish habitat pipe applications would be
19 very appropriate for this grant program,
20 admittedly small. It's not the only area, but
21 this is the one area where there is some focus on
22 new and additional resources over where are today.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MCCARTY: I guess the second part of
2 my question too would be, are there partners out
3 there that have advanced with experience in
4 actually doing some like eel grass restoration or
5 you know some of these others like that,
6 enhancement projects?

7 MR. DOREMUS: There's a lot of focus on
8 that in different parts of the country, on eel
9 grass restoration, we have funded some of that. A
10 lot of it has been cost leveraged with other
11 organizations. I can connect you with folks in
12 the habitat program who might be able to give a
13 broader review of how that's done in different
14 areas. I can't speak specifically to the area
15 that you're talking about. There may or may not
16 be a focus on that right now. This is at least an
17 opportunity for external grant applications that
18 could tend to that specific concern. But we can
19 field that question with our habitat folks and
20 give you a broader answer.

21 MR. MCCARTY: Thank you.

22 MS. MORRIS: Dave.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. DONALDSON: Paul, about SK, what's
2 the timing in terms of announcing the competitive
3 grants and the availability of those thoughts?

4 MR. DOREMUS: We just finished the phase
5 of the constituent panel reviews, so there's a
6 technical review, then there's a constituent panel
7 review -- the outcome from that will be rapidly
8 reviewed by Fisheries as well as by council
9 commissions for overall balance by thematic area
10 and by region. And we expect that we'll be able
11 to actually obligate the funds in the third and
12 fourth quarters provided the remainder of this
13 whole process goes smoothly as we expect it. It's
14 a very tight schedule. We just finished within
15 days, the constituent panel review. I have yet to
16 see the output from that. But that will be coming
17 forward for that broad balance review by council
18 submission shortly, and then we'll go into the
19 actual grant making process with our acquisition
20 and grant organization which takes some time. We
21 should see that all again executed by fourth
22 quarter.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. MORRIS: Okay so let's move then
2 into the full budget presentation.

3 MR. DOREMUS: Happy to do so. I'm using
4 up all of the chair's time.

5 MS. MORRIS: No, no, no, this is great.

6 MR. DOREMUS: Very good. So I wanted to
7 very quickly state, and then we'll do a review of
8 the particular areas where the president is
9 requesting additional resources in FY16. But I
10 wanted to show you quickly; a little hard to read
11 from here, but this six billion dollars is the
12 number for all of NOAA. Fisheries' request is
13 about 16 percent at 990 million. I wanted to make
14 sure, we're focused on this piece of the pie as it
15 were and in particular the areas where were asking
16 for increases in FY16, but I wanted to note that
17 we have a -- we're part of a larger organization.
18 There are a lot of other considerations that go
19 into congress's request. The request to congress
20 and their consideration of it, and there are a lot
21 of pieces of the rest of this where we have
22 significant equities in interdependencies. We

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 spoke briefly just a few minutes ago about our
2 collaboration with the National Ocean Service on
3 coastal resiliency type issues. We have very
4 strong research collaboration with Oceanic and
5 Atmospheric Research. Here's Ocean Service here,
6 Oceanic and Atmospheric Research here, heavily but
7 not exclusively on the climate front, a number of
8 other areas as well. And we have also very very
9 significant, inside this program support, that's
10 where our fleet is. And this budget request
11 includes a request, I think the number is 137
12 million for the next survey vessel; it's not a
13 fisheries vessel. It's an oceanographic survey
14 vessel for other purposes. It is the beginning of
15 a recapitalization program that scheduled and
16 timed and this FY16 request is particularly
17 critical to get on board with that. It's tied to
18 the navy's production schedule for a similar class
19 vessel. And if we get on that we'll be able to
20 keep our costs down as we do a long term
21 recapitalization that we need as our fleet ages.
22 So there's other pieces in this that we are very

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 concerned about, and I just wanted to mention
2 those in particular so that you realize that we're
3 part of a bigger organization and that we have
4 congress, we're talking to congress routinely
5 about those other pieces as well.

6 There's a big emphasis, as we all know
7 around the organization in making the most
8 effective use as we can with all of those pieces
9 and we're doing that very aggressively. So here's
10 the top line look at our 2016 budget request. It
11 is -- we were looking at about a 1.6 percent
12 increase in FY15 over 2014. And this is the big
13 number to focus on here, what we call core
14 programs. That's our operations research and
15 facilities line, plus the Pacific Coastal Salmon
16 Recovery Fund, is what we're calling here core
17 programs. So that's our operations research and
18 facilities line, plus the pacific coastal sound
19 and recovery fund is what we were calling here
20 core programs. So that's almost an eight percent
21 increase over FY15. It's a very substantial
22 growth in current environment. And what I want to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 focus on here is the request for program changes
2 which is to Julie's question, where are resource
3 needs the greatest, and where would we focus those
4 resources?

5 Before getting there, I wanted to state
6 briefly the overview and where we would focus and
7 what the basic logic is for our request. This is
8 effectively the strategy, the main strategy for
9 the increases that we've asked for. There are
10 substantial, and I'll detail, the substantial
11 increase request in protected resources that are
12 focused on what we've been calling core
13 consultation capacity. This is an area where our
14 budget has been constrained and in rapid growth in
15 demand. And we're very concerned about the
16 production capability and that's the core aspect
17 of that request. We'll detail about it shortly.
18 We have an increased that is focused on domestic
19 fisheries management and a number of pieces there
20 including electronic monitoring, aquaculture, and
21 continued focus on coastal habitats related to
22 fisheries and protected resources. And then we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 have a focus here anew, and quite in keeping with
2 the recent announcement of the president's
3 recommendations on illegal, unreported, and
4 unregulated fishing, this has been a big focus in
5 Washington, a quite substantial policy effort and
6 we are following through in this request for some
7 resources that are focused on enforcement aspects
8 of this problem. And we'll get into that shortly.

9 The overview, a lot to look at here I'd
10 recommend doing so later but this comma here shows
11 you the program changes, the FY16 program changes
12 and where they're concentrated. The strongest in
13 dollar terms, the strongest growth in protected
14 resources science and management, that part of our
15 budget saw a nearly 20 percent decrease from FY10
16 to FY13, so this helps us rebuild from that and
17 focuses on that core consultation capacity. It
18 would put our request level at 214.2 in a
19 protected resources science and management area.
20 We have about seventeen and a half increase
21 requests in fisheries science and management to a
22 total of 546. This request in enforcement of 3.9

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is the IUU related request. We have some
2 adjustments in habitat. So the subtotal program
3 increases for operations research and facilities
4 is just under 52 million, a very substantial
5 request. That's offset slightly by a reduction
6 off of our current level of 65 million for PCSRF.
7 This has been a very big budget swing between
8 congressional inactive and proposed requests. So
9 the level of difference between, the magnitude of
10 the difference between the congressional
11 expectations and president's request is much lower
12 than it has been in the past, which is a good
13 thing.

14 And then there is a ten million dollar
15 increase here that I'll just say now is a one
16 time. This is an unusual budget issue. This is
17 related to a request to recapitalize a buy back, a
18 loan program on the west coast. And the way it
19 would need to get executed, congress determined,
20 or the administration determined, required a
21 one-time budget offset of the anticipated future
22 return from that loan. It's a complicated story.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 This is not a program increase. We don't have
2 that money to spend on anything new. What it does
3 is offset the losses from accepting a lower rate
4 on a loan program. That's essentially what that
5 is. I could get into the details if you would
6 like, but it's a convoluted story. I just wanted
7 to point out that it's not a program increase. So
8 the main thing, bottom line here is this 51.7 and
9 we'll focus on what those pieces are here.

10 So starting with the Protected and
11 Managed Species Recovery, and one thing I should
12 note, I'm sorry to keep backing up here. This is
13 organized by these major account areas --
14 Protected Resources, Fisheries, Science and
15 Management Enforcement and Habitat. This is a new
16 budget structure proposed in FY16. I could spend
17 a little -- I will spend, I have some slides at
18 the end, but this display right here is a little
19 different than it would have looked in the past
20 because we're proposing a change in how our budget
21 categories work, to make the relationship -- to
22 basically clean up a lot of categories in our

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 budget and make the relationship between what we
2 are being asked to focus on statutorily. So
3 Magnusson, PSA, MMPA, to make our budget request
4 more cleanly align with our major programmatic
5 areas. I'll focus on the details later. We used
6 to have in this major line item area a big
7 category called other activities supporting
8 fisheries. It was a handful of many many
9 different and unrelated things. Some of them were
10 related to surveys, observations, aquaculture was
11 in there. Chesapeake Bay was in there. So those
12 got moved to mostly Fisheries, Science, and
13 Management but other areas as is warranted by the
14 basic program lodge.

15 This line here for enforcement needs to
16 be enforcement in observers. We're trying to get
17 all the observers and surveying and data
18 collection efforts focused in the right areas that
19 they actually support, Fisheries, Science and
20 Management et cetera. So that's a new book
21 program structure on all. I'll give you a little
22 bit more detail at the end but I wanted to let you

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 know that that's reflected in our table. All
2 right.

3 The increase, the 51.7 million increase
4 request, here are some major components of it.
5 Some of the largest ones, singularly, are right
6 here. This is the increased consultation
7 capacity. It has two dimensions; one is to
8 support ESA, basically Section Seven consultations
9 and a smaller component to support the Central
10 Fish Habitat. We have large backlogs in some
11 areas. We have insufficient staff. This would
12 essentially allow us to add staff capacity to
13 handle those fundamental statutorily required
14 capabilities in those two areas. So that's
15 catching up to reality if you will in our core
16 lines of business. If we don't do that, permits
17 don't get done on time, economic activity that
18 relies on those permits is delayed, federal,
19 state, private sector -- there's huge downstream
20 consequences if this function doesn't work well
21 and efficiently. That's a highly leveraged, it
22 seems like a lot of money, but a lot rides on it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and we believe it's a highly leveraged activity.
2 It's a required activity; only fisheries can do
3 it, or are required to do it. And we don't have,
4 literally do not have the staff to get the job
5 done as it exists today. So that's catching up to
6 reality. Species recoveries grants -- those of
7 you who have been following the budget for a
8 while, there has been a strong push by the
9 administration to try to broaden the mechanisms
10 that we have to support species recovery beyond
11 salmon. There's been a strong focus on salmon for
12 many many years. We want to retain that focus,
13 but also be able to open up to other areas. We do
14 have a big focus in our organization coming
15 forward and all of you will be focusing on that
16 during your time here, on protective resources and
17 where we want to direct our recovery efforts.
18 It's a substantial portion of our agenda here, in
19 these coming days. And this is -- this piece of
20 it is related to getting grant resources out to
21 states and tribal partners for priority recovery
22 of ESA species. So this relates to our subsequent

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 topic lines pretty significantly. And then on the
2 Atlantic and Pacific salmon program increase of
3 1.3, this is focused a little bit on ESA Section
4 Seven consultations on Pacific salmon, somewhat
5 labored as basic program logic for this
6 consultation capacity increase. And the Atlantic
7 side, this is largely focused on continued
8 collaboration with the State of Maine on Atlantic
9 salmon recovery such as it is. That's one of the
10 more in peril species out there. And we work to
11 provide a grant program to the State of Maine for
12 hatchery work, and some other related, habitat
13 related efforts. So that's that one.

14 And I'll move through these somewhat
15 quickly so we can take any questions. On the
16 Fisheries, Science and Management side here is
17 ecosystem based solutions for fisheries
18 management. This is focused on understanding, as
19 to Micah's question, understanding the inshore,
20 offshore connections, what happens in inshore
21 environment, how that connects to our offshore
22 ecosystem conditions and overall welfare of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species I guess you could say more generally. And
2 this is the science that's going to help us figure
3 out where best to put our habitat restoration
4 dollars. This is simply -- that's the way I think
5 of it. And that's again a modest increase, but
6 directed towards getting the science improved so
7 that we can use to the greatest effect our habitat
8 restoration funds, and the funds are able to
9 leverage through outside partners.

10 5.6 plus 1.5, this is the electronic
11 monitoring and reporting and then a smaller
12 portion, the 1.5 is towards the increased focus on
13 the regulatory advancements that are needed to
14 support electronic technology, so we want the
15 technology application to go at pace with our
16 council consideration of requirements for
17 electronic monitoring and reporting. So hand in
18 hand, those can progress and we can more rapidly
19 implement electronic monitoring reporting. So
20 this would be, we have a small effort leveraged
21 through National Fish and Wildlife Foundation this
22 year. And this would allow us to really get a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 more consistent programmatic emphasis on
2 electronic monitoring and reporting. Very
3 significant to us, modest request and again, we
4 think potential impact on fisheries can be quite
5 substantial. This is a small thing, distributed
6 biological observatory, that's a hold over from
7 our last budget. It didn't get supported by
8 congress. The administration asked again.

9 We are also continuing to advance annual
10 stock assessments, that's core business, as you
11 well know, and we're trying to focus on key gas
12 and stock assessments, continue to pursue our next
13 generation stock assessment framework. That's a
14 program that many of you should be well familiar
15 with and we're continuing advance that and are
16 hoping to follow with a strong record of support
17 from congress for improvements in our stock
18 assessment efforts.

19 National Catch Share Program, same
20 thing, 2.2 to continue the gradual process of
21 developing and implementing catch share programs
22 and strengthening the infrastructure that we have

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to make that program run as efficiently as
2 possible. So that's a modest increase there and
3 in that effort. There is in -- in the enforcement
4 side, I mentioned this, here's our IUU related
5 request for three million as well as an additional
6 piece of 0.9 focused on compliance and forensics.
7 That's dominantly driven by the increased emphasis
8 on illegal, unreported, unregulated fishing. So
9 this would give us greater enforcement capability,
10 both investigative and sort of at the dock,
11 uniformed ability to understand what's coming into
12 the country and be able to conduct (inaudible) and
13 enforcement work as detailed in the president's
14 framework, the president's implementation plan.

15 Very important to us is the request here
16 for two million for aquaculture. This is
17 complemented by an equivalent level in OAR,
18 through the Sea Grant Program. So there's a --
19 it's not as big a number as we would like to see,
20 but it is a very significant expression of support
21 by the department, by the administration,
22 recognizing the importance of aquaculture to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sustainable seafood, more broadly seafood supply,
2 and for the economic effects that we can get by
3 supporting continued production and domestic
4 production in aquaculture sectors. So that's very
5 exciting to us, supporting tools for rules is the
6 tag line that we often use here so that we can get
7 more expedient permeating of aquaculture
8 capabilities and more rapid production of
9 sustainable technologies that relate to
10 aquaculture such as feeds, things of that nature.

11 This is the 10.3 fishery finance
12 program. That's just a really an accounting
13 issue. Not a real program increase that I
14 mentioned before. I'm happy provide details if
15 you would like. We do have a handful of
16 decreases. These are not -- no programs are being
17 eliminated. These are adjusting to the size or
18 pace. We've gone back and forth for years on
19 Prescott grants. This is Marine Mammals Rescue
20 Assistance Grant Program. There are a lot of
21 external resources available for this. We
22 continue to think that this reduction can be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 offset by external funds. In the salmon
2 management domain, this is related to basically
3 the pace of the (inaudible) hatchery reform. So
4 this is continued. This is a small reduction on a
5 fairly large program and it relates to the pace of
6 hatchery reform efforts, is the bottom line there.

7 This five million is not really
8 reduction of the Coastal Resiliency Ecosystem
9 Grants. That other piece of the budget I talked
10 about, NOS, in FY16 the president proposes a 50
11 million dollar coastal resilience grant program,
12 so these resources essentially get moved over into
13 that comprehensive effort. And at an order of
14 magnitude higher than what we are executing here
15 in FY15, and then there's the reduction of pacific
16 coastal proposed reduction, pacific coastal salmon
17 recovery fund of a 58 million dollar level.

18 Again, lesser reproduction has been proposed in
19 the past, so we view that as progress of a sort.
20 We're right now executing in a 65 million dollar
21 level there.

22 I did mention before our linkages to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 other pieces of the budget, this is 147 million
2 dollars, I said 137, it's 147, for the ocean
3 survey vessel, and this gets us inline for the
4 fleet recapitalization plan; we're very invested
5 in that. I did not mention, but there's a small
6 increase. We're trying to get a study done in
7 Newport, Rhode Island so we can resolve the long
8 term fleet home porting issues on the east coast.
9 It's related to that, primarily the Bigelow, which
10 we would like to have home ported at Woods Hole,
11 but it's a complicated issue that relates to its
12 ability to physically get in the harbor at this
13 point in time. It would require a big dredging
14 effort and the sentiment seems to be to try to
15 make it more cost effective by locating it at
16 Newport. So that's being studied. I did mention
17 the budget restructure, all of that, that's the
18 closing piece of this presentation, but before
19 getting into that maybe we should pause here, like
20 in the prior section.

21 MS. MORRIS: Great. Great, great.

22 MR. DOREMUS: And take questions related

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to FY16. And Richard wants to add a comment
2 before we turn it over.

3 MR. MERRICK: Just in the other items of
4 interest, where we are, this fiscal year, they had
5 a one million dollar initiative on primary
6 fisheries. We matched that in part, one was a
7 grant program, and in FY16, we're asking for five
8 million for primary fisheries. And one million
9 this year was used basically for a northeast idea
10 that it was the (inaudible) program to go more
11 national.

12 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you.

13 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so we've got a great
14 overview, with good detail on the 2016 request,
15 questions about that? Julie.

16 MS. BONNEY: The one question I have is
17 I noticed we have two line items, one is the
18 national catch share program, and then the other
19 is the observers, and I know across the nation
20 there has been several catch share programs where
21 there is funding available for observers because
22 they have the 100 percent observer requirement.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And that seems to be phasing out on a lot of those
2 regions. With the catch share increase and the
3 observer program increase, is that being rethought
4 in terms of making more federal dollars available
5 to help offset that addition? I guess that's my
6 question.

7 MR. DOREMUS: My general answer, and it
8 could be answered better by others, Richard may
9 want to chime in here -- the general answer is not
10 really. There are observers -- basically
11 observing requirements, I think almost, if we got
12 this budget completely I think we're still going
13 to have struggles with funding observing
14 requirements that industry and councils would like
15 to see. It's a complicated story. We have some
16 elements of observing requirements that go along
17 with this program, but the more comprehensive
18 issue we feel will need to be managed through a
19 range of different efforts that include how we
20 decide to structure the requirement for
21 observations at the management level. It will
22 include electronic technologies that will be able

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to augment, we hope at, reasonable cost, existing
2 capabilities. And there are, as you well know,
3 different programs or different regulatory regimes
4 that have different levels of cost share and we
5 think long term that will likely need to be
6 thought about more closely as well. But the path
7 that we are on and have been on for some time in
8 my view, from a strategic point of view is not
9 sustainable. I think we have requirements for
10 observations for management and for scientific
11 purposes that have outstripped our funding levels
12 for some time. And we're going to have to deal
13 with that through a combination of all of these
14 things, including, I believe a more focused
15 discussion over time on cost share methods.
16 Richard, do you want to add to that at all?

17 MR. MERRICK: The cost sharing is a
18 major thing -- we cannot sustain continuing to
19 increase the (inaudible) coverage or even any
20 electronic monitoring in lots of fisheries because
21 we just simply don't have the money to do it. Yet
22 the councils keep asking us to have more

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible) coverage, so the only way to do that
2 is take the existing funds we have and to match
3 that up with what industry can help us with. The
4 long term goal, we have change.

5 MS. BONNEY: Just a follow up question,
6 we have the cost recovery, three percent of
7 changed (inaudible) nearest catch share program.
8 Is that funding going to be used -- how is that
9 augment into the national catch share program line
10 item and monitoring costs? I mean that would be
11 cautionary I guess in my view where the industry
12 is going to be taxed at three percent fee, based
13 on the catch share program so is that going to be
14 used in your view of what covers some of your
15 costs then?

16 MR. DOREMUS: Oh yeah, it's used,
17 absolutely. That's what it's required to be used
18 for. We do not have the option, and wouldn't use
19 it for other purposes.

20 MS. MORRIS: David.

21 MR. DONALDSON: Paul, this is a request,
22 and it would be awesome if we got all this money,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 but reality probably dictates that it's not going
2 to happen. Has there been any attempt to kind of
3 prioritize all these items so if we got
4 twenty-five percent of the money or fifty percent
5 -- have you guys looked at saying, well, if we get
6 X amount these are the top three things, top five
7 things? Have you guys done any of that or are you
8 planning to do that and get input from the various
9 regions?

10 MR. DOREMUS: Yeah. Very good question,
11 and that -- you're stealing my concluding slide.

12 MR. DONALDSON: Oh sorry. (laughter)

13 MS. MORRIS: Well we can wait.

14 MR. DOREMUS: Or my concluding point and
15 no, it's important to make it upfront and I
16 probably shouldn't have waited until the end of
17 the presentation. This is a request. It is a
18 request for a substantial increase in our budget,
19 and the likelihood of getting this is low. We
20 don't yet know and are following very closely that
21 congress is now deciding on the top line spending
22 levels for each of the major appropriations. They

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 have announced some of the appropriation levels in
2 other agencies, EPA, Interior, HHS, some others
3 are down from FY15, in terms of the top level.
4 These are multibillion, tens of billions of
5 dollars, much larger than ours. It looks like the
6 commerce justice state will be up a little bit,
7 but we don't know where that's going to apply. It
8 could be outside commerce, it could be in other
9 areas. So there's going to be a lot of
10 congressional debate and discussion. We remain
11 cautiously optimistic that elements of this will
12 be supported, but we don't which ones. In the end
13 of the day, the short end of your question is,
14 congress will direct these resources to specific
15 purposes. We don't expect to have latitude to
16 choose among them at all, and what we do expect to
17 do is have to carry on with existing resources to
18 handle all the pressures that these increases are
19 trying to address. And that we have been focused
20 on. We have been, throughout all of this
21 internally, asking all of our internal leadership
22 to be prepared for no increase. And that's going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to be very difficult for us to handle and will
2 change the discussion quite a bit.

3 We are looking forward to the
4 opportunity to discuss with congress. We often
5 have very short turn around where we'll get an
6 indication of what the budget level will be, an
7 opportunity to talk about the impact if we do not
8 receive or receive a different combination of
9 increases. We may be asked to make decreases in
10 some areas that we're not currently aware of. So
11 congress will determine where we need to focus.
12 How we execute that becomes the second order
13 question that we will subsequently need to take
14 up. A very good point, we are prepared to not a
15 substantial portion of this -- I should say not
16 happily, but we're expecting it to be
17 substantially less.

18 MS. MORRIS: Micah?

19 MR. MCCARTY: I just have a question
20 that you partially answered it with congress's
21 attention to some of the bigger budgets, but I was
22 kind of curious to know where the committees of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 jurisdiction are as far as reviewing what the
2 president's request is for NOAA?

3 MR. DOREMUS: We don't have any insight
4 into that yet. They have not even -- we are only
5 hearing about and don't have a top line level for
6 our agency at all. So it's very early in the
7 process. We have briefed extensively,
8 appropriations committees as well as interested
9 members. We've had dozens of meetings on the hill
10 to explain why we're requesting what we're
11 requesting and the reception has been from full
12 support and people actually trying to augment this
13 in some areas, to quite the opposite, where just a
14 very pragmatic focus on limited budgets, and
15 limited growth and having to make hard choices.
16 So it could be anywhere. I doubt that the extreme
17 where this budget will be augmented, maybe some
18 individual pieces of it would, but the receptivity
19 is across the board, so we don't really know at
20 this point.

21 MR. MCCARTY: I guess a follow up, so
22 there hasn't really been any significant

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 scheduling as far as hearings?

2 MR. DOREMUS: No there has not been.

3 Oh, there's hearings scheduled but I don't have it
4 in my head, but we don't know when the actual mark
5 ups will be yet.

6 MR. MCCARTY: Okay, thank you.

7 MS. MORRIS: Pam.

8 MS. YOCHER: I'm just wondering if NOAA
9 is doing any kind of internal review along the
10 lines of what NRC did for National Science
11 Foundation, the sea change, you know, the cable
12 survey for ocean sciences. I know the
13 recommendation that came out of that was to focus
14 less on internal -- building capacity internally,
15 and infrastructure and more on the core science,
16 the granting and so on. And some aspects of this
17 budget seems to be sort of in the opposite
18 direction. I just wondered if you have any
19 discussions about, you had mentioned the
20 capitalization, the emphasizing the fleet and what
21 NRC was recommending for NSF was kind of the
22 opposite, scaling back on some the ocean observing

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 infrastructure and to a lesser extent the fleet
2 but, and advancing more of the core science
3 granting programs and so on.

4 MR. DOREMUS: Yeah. That's again a very
5 big question that is worthy of a whole session in
6 and of itself. We have specific observing
7 requirements that we can't do without an ocean
8 going fleet, and while that set of considerations
9 from NSF are broad and look at oceanographic
10 sciences generally, when it comes to our specific
11 fisheries, scientific and assessment processes, we
12 need that type of ocean going capability. We
13 don't have technologies now to replace it and
14 there's nobody else out there who can do it. We
15 do use extensively charters where we can and where
16 we can get the reliability and quality and valid
17 data that we need to be able to contribute to our
18 assessment process, but that won't replace our
19 ocean going fleet, our white ships. So we don't
20 really have an alternative in our view for that
21 specific requirement, and it's -- when looked at
22 from the vast perspective of the nation's

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 oceanographic data collection needs that NSF is
2 looking at, it might be a boutique data collection
3 requirement, but it's central to us. Richard I'm
4 sure has some additional comments.

5 MR. MERRICK: So as a separate effort,
6 I'm one of the co-chairs for the Subcommittee of
7 Ocean Science and Technology. My other co-chair
8 is NSF, and we've been asked by OMB and OSTP to do
9 a general review of all federal fleet
10 requirements. So we're in the middle of that
11 process right now. We've actually done the base
12 line and we referred that out to OMB last week,
13 and now we're into the prioritization exercise.
14 But for NOAA the picture is that right now we have
15 a document in need for about 15,000 days at sea
16 for NOAA. And NIMS is very similar, not the scale
17 but in terms of the trend. Of those 15,000 days
18 at sea, we only asked for about 8000 because we
19 recognized that we don't have the funds to support
20 it, to staff it for the other 7000. Of those
21 8000, we get, on an annual basis we can provide
22 about 5000 days at sea, from the existing budget

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 for ONO and out of program funded days like which
2 is what NIMS does. So we're already running at
3 about a third of what our need is. The picture
4 for the federal fleet, is that if we don't begin
5 to build ships again, we're going to go for NIMS
6 anyway, from a 16 vessel fleet within a decade
7 down to about six vessels. And how we can provide
8 the capability to do fish surveys and do
9 hydro-surveys is not clear unless continue to
10 build ships. So that's the story we're trying to
11 tell them, at least OMB about the federal fleet
12 requirement. It's a little different from what
13 happened with NRC's review, NSF, but that's a
14 microcosm of it.

15 The other is that all our science
16 centers are reviewed on an annual basis on the
17 science they provide whether we're doing the right
18 stuff. So this year you're probably aware that
19 this is the year all of the protected species
20 programs are being reviewed. The last two years
21 were on fish stock data collection and those stock
22 assessments. We'll continue that process. And

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 what was coming out of that, is verification of
2 areas where independent external reviewers feel
3 we're weak or are putting too much effort into it.
4 So we are trying to use that to realign the
5 strategic efforts within each one of the centers,
6 and then they crosswalk over to the regional
7 office to make sure that the regional office needs
8 are also being met. The big charge for those
9 reviews are, not only is it the good quality
10 science but it's in meeting the needs of our
11 mandates, our drivers. So are we providing the
12 science that we need for stock assessments? Are
13 we providing the science we need for species
14 recovery? So we built that process into the
15 science side of the house, and the management side
16 is helping us with it.

17 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. John.

18 MR. CORBIN: You know it's encouraging
19 to have the increases in the aquaculture funding
20 even though it's modest compared to the need. You
21 can't help but wonder if the focus on tools for
22 rules is encouraging to the private sector. The

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 private sector tends to view rules as an
2 impediment. Perhaps the focus more on incentives
3 to encourage private investment would be something
4 to consider.

5 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you for that. I
6 know that there is, with the aquaculture committee
7 there's a lot of discussion about where our
8 funding priorities should focus. And that would
9 be a very good place to pick up that kind of
10 conversation, and gets the opportunity for
11 long-term advice from MAFAC on the composition of
12 our current and future composition of our support
13 for aquaculture.

14 MS. MORRIS: If there are no more
15 questions about the 2016 proposal, Micah, any
16 comment?

17 MR. MCCARTY: I just had a build on
18 question for John. I detected it in one of your
19 explanations of the budget in permitting, that the
20 office that handles permits and processors,
21 there's money that's been increased in that side
22 of it. Does that lend to perhaps private sector

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 applications for citing and permitting? Is that
2 something would fit?

3 MR. CORBIN: I don't know that I can
4 answer that question. I don't believe so. But --

5 MR. MERRICK: With intersections with
6 it. Most federal actions require a Section Seven
7 consultation.

8 MR. CORBIN: Yeah.

9 MR. MERRICK: And that consulting
10 (inaudible), particularly in the Gulf of Mexico,
11 with all the restoration programs going on as part
12 of restore. Almost everyone one of those projects
13 require some sort of permitting, some sort of
14 consultation. And I think a lot of this is going
15 to facilitate that process.

16 MS. MORRIS: Columbus.

17 MR. DOREMUS: It wouldn't necessarily be
18 targeted to aquaculture per se. But if it could
19 help when there are permit requests and
20 accelerating, is I guess why I hesitate. I'm
21 sorry.

22 MR. MERRICK: Okay.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. BROWN: How likely will there be
2 more funds available for monitoring and advanced
3 law enforcement in the marine protected areas?

4 MR. DOREMUS: Right now the president's
5 budget does not propose any increases for that.
6 That's part of an annual process of prioritization
7 on a regional basis. Our Office of Law
8 Enforcement has put out national and regional
9 priorities. But that's an ongoing challenge that
10 we have. Throughout the organization regionally,
11 we have a fairly small enforcement effort to cover
12 all of our requirements. It funds about 250
13 people for all of Magnusson, ESA, MMPA
14 enforcement, and the sanctuaries. So they're
15 really at this point -- we're pretty thin and
16 outside of our regional variation in focus areas.
17 There's not any national provision of new
18 resources for that specific purpose.

19 MS. MORRIS: Okay Paul, the final
20 chapter of your presentation.

21 MR. DOREMUS: I will do this quickly,
22 because this is not programmatic but it is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 informative. We did propose a change in our
2 budget structure for these basic purposes. It
3 follows in the wake of similar budget
4 restructurings that all the other lines have done.
5 And ours has been in many respects the simplest.
6 It is really an aggregation. We've taken existing
7 pieces that are the result of historical decisions
8 that have been made by congress, including some
9 from the glory days of ear-marking, and trying to
10 put the budget together in a more sensible way.
11 So if you want to know what we're spending on
12 observations and surveys, you can get to it in
13 this new structure a lot more efficiently than in
14 the past. So it's intended to have our program
15 emphasis and our budget structure better aligned.
16 And that gives us the ability to request I think
17 more coherent budget requests that allows us a
18 certain degree of operational efficiency when
19 we're managing programs and we have the resources
20 coming in a way that's better structured to the
21 actual programs themselves. And we will continue
22 under any event to always be able to describe,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 because a lot of what we're doing is just
2 aggregating categories. We're going to continue
3 to, as we always do, track our budget in
4 excruciating detail. And we can provide cross
5 logs to prior year's spending at any time in the
6 interest of maintaining transparency, which is of
7 importance to everybody. This is what I mentioned
8 earlier in a graphic form. Right in the middle
9 here, Magnusson, ESA, MMPA, that's what Congress
10 has asked us to do. And we're trying to structure
11 our budget in ways that you can more clearly see
12 Magnusson and Fishery Science and Management, ESA
13 and Protected Resources and MMPA, the habitat
14 that's required to support both of those, and the
15 enforcement that's required to support both of
16 those. And this shows you in a list the program
17 areas. This is the basic budget unit of PPA,
18 Program activity line basically. And these are
19 reduced from some 37 in the past. To a -- these
20 are all the PPAs here. So it's a much more
21 efficient budget. And here's a better way to look
22 at it. Here it was 37 to 10. This shows you the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 current structure, how many PPAs, and how it got
2 converted into a structure where we have a variety
3 of different things. The main thing here, there
4 are 11 PPAs in other activities supporting
5 fisheries, that has no programmatic coherence at
6 all. And we basically parsed those where they
7 belong programmatically into other pieces. Most
8 of them landed in Fisheries Research and
9 Management. We tried to keep some things that are
10 at PPA level, but programmatically really
11 significant and a big part of a budget, for
12 obvious reasons, things like our council and
13 commission line. We didn't break that apart and
14 move it, we couldn't. And that's still a PPA. So
15 that we're able to provide the right type I think,
16 of tracking over time but also aggregate things in
17 a way that makes sense programmatically. So you
18 can see all the pieces of what we need for our
19 protected resources mission, for Fisheries Science
20 mission, and the enforcement of habitat underlying
21 each. So we're getting to four major activities
22 with 10 budget groups. That'll take a budget

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that's parsed into 37 pieces and put in into 10 so
2 it's much more clear how we're trying to use the
3 composition of our funding to achieve our big
4 policy objectives that are represented at ESA,
5 MMPA and Magnusson. In a nut shell that is what
6 it's all about. If you have to put together a
7 budget you understand I think how much more
8 efficient this structure is, purely from a request
9 point of view. This was my slide where I was
10 going to make Dave's point -- a lot of steps
11 before we get a budget. And right now this is our
12 current execution level. And the message to our
13 organization, to all of our partners is, we've got
14 a strong base budget to deal with. And we can
15 create a lot of value with that 958 million and
16 we're continuing to focus on that. We hope that
17 some elements of this FY16 request are supported.
18 In the best of all possible worlds, all would be.
19 Even that would not even necessarily solve all of
20 our problems like the observing problem that Julie
21 was bringing up. But it would get us a long way
22 towards recovery from a very, very significant

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 period of compression in our budget. But we're
2 realistic and we realize that we may not get all
3 of this. And we're kind of battening down the
4 hatches as it were to prepare for some continued
5 rough budget letter in the future. So I will stop
6 there, and turn it back to Julia.

7 MS. MORRIS: Thank you so much Paul.
8 Heidi's working on getting this presentation on
9 our MAFAC website under this agenda item. So
10 it'll be there eventually once technical issues
11 are solved.

12 MR. DOREMUS: I'm sorry, I didn't
13 realize it wasn't, but we always have this
14 information and that link I showed you before
15 gives you access to all of our budget materials.
16 Anything you need of us.

17 MS. LUKENS: Yes, in the annotated
18 agenda there's links to the broader budget
19 materials for the presentation, which should be
20 out shortly.

21 MS. MORRIS: General discussion about
22 the presentation, any questions or comments? Pam?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. YOCHER: Just a comment about how
2 very useful this is. I always read the budget
3 information. And the way you have explained
4 things make that over the years that I have been a
5 member has been just hugely helpful. So thank you
6 very much for taking the time to give us this
7 presentation.

8 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you, very welcome,
9 that feedback and it's much appreciated. And if
10 there are anyways that we can make our interaction
11 with you about these broad budget development
12 issues more effective, we'd be happy to hear
13 those. Thank you.

14 MS. MORRIS: Yes? Bob.

15 MR. TURNER: So with the projection of
16 the rollback and the FAL period of 59 metric ton
17 global shortfall of (inaudible), are we hoping to
18 get more from our fisheries? Or aquaculture? Or
19 are we just hoping to buy more information?

20 MR. DOREMUS: This is one these multiple
21 choice questions where I always go to all of the
22 above. (laughter) We are hoping -- this budget

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 request does make a modest investment in
2 aquaculture. In our personal view for many of us
3 in fisheries can speak personally. I don't think
4 that that long term strategically that shortfall.
5 It just can't be met through wild caught alone.
6 We currently support our own domestic consumption
7 needs as all of you well know through importing
8 and largely aquaculture products. So I would like
9 to see our budget request is consistent with
10 growth in the marine aquaculture sector. I think
11 long term it's of great strategic significance to
12 the nation, for safe sustainable seafood. And all
13 of us would like to see a more aggressive effort
14 in the kind of climate that we're in now. The
15 request level is modest. We hope to be able to
16 find ways to work with the private sector, with
17 other nongovernmental groups, to be able to
18 improve our ability nationally to meet the very
19 challenge that you just outlined.

20 MR. MORRIS: Other questions or
21 comments? We have not -- we're going to take a
22 slow pause in case there are more. We've arrived

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 at our morning break time, but before we break,
2 the next item on the agenda is a presentation by
3 Heather on cooperative research and cooperative
4 management. There is a background document on the
5 MAFAC website. And I understand Heather; you want
6 MAFAC to focus on pages 40 through 43 of that
7 document and you actually want some constructive
8 comments back from MAFAC about, specifically about
9 those 3 pages of the document.

10 MS. LUKENS: That document was actually
11 emailed to all of you and isn't posted on the
12 website.

13 MR. FISHER: I thought we were next.

14 MS. MORRIS: Oh I am sorry. I am so
15 sorry.

16 MS. LUKENS: She's ahead of herself.

17 MS. MORRIS: I'm ahead of myself. I
18 just jumped ahead of myself. Are there any
19 background materials you all want us to look at
20 before your presentation? Okay then we are going
21 to take a break and come back at 10:30. Then
22 we'll hear from Randy and Dave. I jumped ahead.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. MORRIS: Okay so let's see, the
2 agenda has Dave going first. But we're open to
3 whoever wants to go first, Dave or Randy.

4 MR. FISHER: So what we'll do is, I'll
5 talk about the last Director's meeting. You'll
6 talk about the next Director's meeting and then I
7 guess each of us will tell you what we're doing
8 and why in our commissions individually. Does
9 that work?

10 MS. MORRIS: That's great.

11 MR. FISHER: So last September we had a
12 meeting of all state directors, we send out a
13 part, that meeting, a questionnaire to 27 marine
14 state directors around for their response to the
15 questionnaire to prepare for the meeting. We got
16 back a good number of those and the idea was to
17 try and focus the meeting and things that were of
18 concern to state directors. Long story short,
19 this is kind of a summary of what we found out.
20 State directors want to be more involved in the
21 next budget preparation, in the development of
22 their budgets. Because as you all know, they're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 probably working on 2018 now because 2017 is
2 probably done. And the state directors felt that
3 it's important that they have an opportunity to
4 chat about that. So the action items as a result
5 of that was that this science center and regional
6 managers or AAs were supposed to get a hold of
7 state directors and try and find out what they
8 were interested in. Second they also wanted to be
9 more involved in the listing process. There were
10 some concerns over how that was done in the past,
11 specifically for surging on the east coast, was
12 one of the examples. So there was an effort to
13 say that the state directors want to get more
14 involved in that process up front.

15 This thing was, there was a considerable
16 amount of discussion about the recreational
17 fishing policy that they were involved with at
18 that point. The final wasn't done and the state
19 director wanted to know what was going to be in
20 that policy and whether or not they had some more
21 input into that. And last, there was a fair
22 amount of discussion about the disconnect between

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the science centers and the regions. Some of
2 that's perception. Some of it's reality and it
3 depends on what part of the United States you're
4 in. The bottom line there is that the management,
5 at least the state directors felt that, some of
6 the sites that are not doing things that are
7 directly related to the management requirements,
8 that the states and the Council's half. Overall,
9 I think it was -- it's a positive. It was a good
10 thing to do and Mr. Donaldson will talk about the
11 next one.

12 MR. DONALDSON: Well, and one of things
13 that came up was, do we need to do these national
14 state director meetings more than every two years.
15 And I think the consensus was yes. Yearly might
16 be a little much, but maybe every 18 months. And
17 we just recently, we, the three executive
18 directors, and NIMS had a conference call to talk
19 about the next meeting and we're targeting early
20 2016 in the Gulf somewhere, possibly New Orleans.
21 We were looking at New Orleans. The problem is
22 that it's right around Mardi Gras and it might be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 -- it might be good, but not -- (laughter). We
2 might get a lot of people attending the meeting
3 but not very many actually at the meeting.

4 But anyways, we're looking at somewhere
5 in the Gulf of Mexico, first part of next year.
6 We're going to use a similar approach that we did
7 for this last one in that we set up a steering
8 committee of the three executive directors of the
9 commissions, NOAA representation as well as
10 representation from each of the regions, to help
11 identify the issues, agendas, and that seemed to
12 work really well. We initially developed a long
13 list of issues we wanted to talk about and then
14 narrowed it down to what we could cover in the
15 allotted time period.

16 Another issue that came up was two full
17 days might be a bit long. It's difficult for the
18 directors to get away, with travel and what not,
19 it works out to about four full days, so for this
20 one we're targeting a day and a half, that way
21 people can get out the afternoon of the second
22 day. But we've identified some initial items and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 we'll be getting the steering committee together
2 here in the near future to start working out some
3 of the details.

4 Randy mentioned the disconnect between
5 the science center and the regional offices, and
6 one of the things that NIMS did commit to was
7 having the Science Center directors at these
8 meetings. We thought the states thought that that
9 was very important and for this one coming up,
10 that there are plans to have as many if not all
11 the Science Center directors at this meeting, so
12 that's kind of where we're at with that.

13 MS. MORRIS: Anything else about the
14 State Directors' Meeting? Any questions or
15 comments from anyone about the State Directors'
16 Meeting? Yes, Phil.

17 MR. DYSKOW: Just a quick question.
18 Yeah, are they open to the public?

19 MR. FISHER: Yeah. I think so.

20 MR. DONALDSON: Yeah. Yeah.

21 MS. MORRIS: Other comments? Other
22 comments? Okay then let's move on to the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 commission reports.

2 MR. FISHER: Okay what I'm going to do
3 is talk a little bit about what we're doing in
4 recreational stuff, what we're doing in commercial
5 stuff, and then I have some handouts which I think
6 you may find a little bit of interest. Okay, in
7 terms of recreational stuff, this is part of the
8 good stuff. We just purchased 120 Samsung pads
9 for SAF which is the big recreational fishing
10 group down here. What they're going to do is,
11 they're testing those now and they will actually
12 replace paper log books that are currently
13 required from the fleet. So that's the good news,
14 because we'll get information much faster out of
15 those folks. We're purchasing another 24 that
16 will go to Northern California for Roger Thomas'
17 fleet.

18 In terms of our office, we handle all
19 the recreational data on the west coast. We are
20 moving from Oracle to Sequel Server, which means
21 that everything that we do will be faster, more
22 flexible and we'll be able to change the systems

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 rapidly. We have about a 30 day turnaround time
2 on the west coast between when our surveys are
3 done and when the information is available to
4 councils.

5 We're doing an RFP right now for fish
6 identification program for cell phones. That will
7 be done this summer so what you'll be able to do
8 on your cell phone is see these little critters as
9 you're out there fishing and be able to try to
10 recognize what they are. In the field, we've
11 tested iPads, iPhones and Androids and digital
12 pins. We're uploading information for stock
13 information, spawning counts, those sorts of
14 things. We have a number of people in the field
15 that are using these, about 84 percent of those
16 folks say they are much faster and accurate than
17 the current paperwork that we do.

18 On blue fin tuna, we're taking lengths
19 now. We have a grant from NOAA Fisheries that
20 will be paying into the fleet. The deck hands are
21 going to be starting doing taking lengths and
22 hopefully some weights for blue fin tuna, which is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 now a big concern on the west coast. We handed
2 out 800 cameras last year, small cameras. We
3 asked recreational folks to take pictures of what
4 they caught so we could try and identify whether
5 or not they could identify what they were
6 catching. By big categories they could figure out
7 what a halibut was, what a rock fish is, and what
8 a sand dap is but past that, it's pretty flaky,
9 because what we were trying to do is compare what
10 commercial fisheries head boats do versus what the
11 recreational guy does. We'd given out 3508
12 (inaudible) devices to the recreational fleet up
13 and down the coast, so those are actively being
14 used to try and reduce the mortality on rock fish
15 when they bring them up. These ID cards, this
16 particular thing, these are draft now. It's hard
17 to get really good pictures. We think that we've
18 got them. We will hand these out in mass, so that
19 folks can try and figure out what they are
20 catching.

21 Troubling stuff -- troubling stuff to us
22 is the fact that we've been flat funded and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 recreational fishing data gathering for the last
2 five years. NOAA fisheries said that you get
3 certification documents done then probably you'll
4 get more money. They have now changed that to, we
5 do now have to also have a recreational plan for
6 the west coast, so we will be drafting that and
7 presenting that to them. On the west coast, when,
8 you will hear more about this, we have a major
9 problem with sea lions. I know this always comes
10 around, but there are 3000 of them sitting in
11 Astoria on docks that are now being sunk, and I
12 was watching the news this morning and a guy was
13 bit here in San Diego, pulled into the water,
14 showed his hand, so, it is an issue. And it's a
15 serious issue. We have been to the (inaudible)
16 and they are munching down on steelhead, which are
17 listed, and also should have salmon that are also
18 listed. So that's an issue.

19 The last is kind of related to this, is
20 the management of expectations. I defy anyone in
21 this room, if you look at this particular thing,
22 to tell the difference between a black rock fish

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and a blue rock fish, when you're sitting on a
2 boat, or a yellow eye which we are very concerned
3 about, or a canary. So when you think about
4 management in the future, whether it's
5 recreational or commercial, when you start
6 managing down to the species level and to the fish
7 level, you're looking at things that are really
8 hard to tell the difference, and that's what
9 people are expecting. And it's going to end up
10 being a problem, especially in the recreational
11 fleet. If you think about recreational fisheries
12 on the west coast, it's managed well. It has been
13 managed well for a long time by the states and by
14 the Feds. But it seems to me that with the
15 recreational policy, we are creating sort of a
16 train wreck that's about to happen. And the train
17 wreck is when you manage against a specific type
18 of fish like this, and you are trying to get
19 everybody out there fishing, I'm going to create a
20 problem. And we already are. So I think you have
21 to be really careful about how we deal with the
22 recreational fishing policy on a national level.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Commercial stuff on the west coast -- we
2 have experimental fishing permits to carry cameras
3 on all the boats. I have four people in my
4 offices that are reviewing camera footage as we
5 speak. DFP will have 18 whiting boats, seven
6 fixed gear boats and there are seven trawlers on
7 the west coast carrying cameras and observers to
8 see what the difference is. In Alaska, we'll have
9 eight long line boats in Southeastern Alaska with
10 cameras on them. Those are being put on as we
11 speak. And Alaska Science Center is working on
12 speciation on the links of like stereo type
13 cameras. Electronic log books -- we are now
14 putting a web based log book in California for the
15 trawl log books and for fixed year stuff so all
16 the log books will be updated electronically.

17 Electronic fish tickets, that's on the
18 west coast as you know. Anyone that comes into a
19 processor, all of those now in Oregon, 98 percent
20 of the commercial fleet in Oregon are on
21 electronic fish tickets. California is not there
22 but we are working with the software now and we're

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 testing it in California, and Washington is
2 looking at our system also.

3 We, this year, we are still reimbursing
4 the fleet 108 dollars a day for observers. The
5 cost of observers on the west coast is around 500
6 bucks a day, so we have a grant from National
7 Fisheries Service to pay part of that cost. And
8 if we go to cameras, then we're trying to
9 calculate how much that will cost. In Canada it's
10 about 100 bucks a day. Our estimate is similar to
11 that.

12 Troubling, once again, in the commercial
13 things, is the same thing. Flat funding for us,
14 and that's a big issue. So I'd like to point out
15 a couple things on these graphs. This graph, or
16 this table, is basically the top 10, the top
17 species by each of the states by value. So on the
18 West Coast; the number one valued fishery in
19 Washington is Dungeness crab. Number two is
20 albacore. Number three is gooey dap. In Oregon,
21 number one is Dungeness crab. Number two is
22 Pacific shrimp, and number three is Pacific

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 whiting. It used to be albacore before whiting
2 this year. Northern California -- Dungeness crab,
3 Chinook salmon, Pacific shrimp. Central
4 California -- Dungeness crab, Marcus squid,
5 Chinook salmon. Southern California -- Marcus
6 squid, California lobster and red sea urchins.
7 The point of this is that all these value
8 fisheries are basically operated by the states and
9 not by the federal government or the council.
10 That's your take home. The other take home is
11 this. This particular graph is an interesting one
12 to me because what it shows, it's, this is the
13 quota for commercial fishery in 2013 and 2014. So
14 what it shows is that 100 percent of the quota is
15 on the right hand side, so Pacific whiting, they
16 are almost catching 80 percent of the quota,
17 Petrolli sole, close to 100, sable fish, close to
18 100. The rebuilding stocks, those that we're
19 concerned about at the council level, canary -- if
20 you add the canary and yellow eye together, you're
21 not even at 30 percent. So they're not even
22 coming close to catching the quota, but yet, we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 are spending a boat load of money trying to figure
2 out how many of these we're really catching. Same
3 with back fish, it shows you discarded and caught
4 flat fish and same with watt fish. So the take
5 home message here to me, seems to be, what are we
6 really worried about and how much money are we
7 going to spend to try and take care of some of
8 these stocks that we are not even coming close to
9 catching? That's basically it for me.

10 MS. MORRIS: Questions for Randy before
11 we move on to the Gulf? Go ahead Paul.

12 MR. CLAMPITT: Thank you. Randy, so you
13 said that the observers service was 500 dollars a
14 day is the cost and then you're subsidizing.

15 MR. FISHER: Yes.

16 MR. CLAMPITT: So the cost to the
17 fisherman is how much?

18 MR. FISHER: Well the fishermen are
19 paying the difference between the 500 and the 108.

20 MR. CLAMPITT: Okay. But last year it
21 was --

22 MR. FISHER: Last year it was more.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Every year it's been going down and September it
2 goes away. Period.

3 MR. CLAMPITT: Right, right. So
4 hopefully, the idea is that electronic monitoring
5 option will be more reasonable.

6 MR. FISHER: Correct.

7 MR. CLAMPITT: And hopefully we can get
8 it up and running before we have to --

9 MR. FISHER: Yeah, we're purchasing,
10 thanks to a grant from Paul; we are purchasing
11 cameras now for all of these EFP fisheries. And
12 we're going to be leasing some of the others, up
13 in Alaska, I think. So the first guys in line,
14 you get a free camera. After that, you don't.
15 And they're going to cost about 10,000 bucks.

16 MR. CLAMPITT: Yeah, okay. So how's the
17 progress? I mean, do you feel like by next year
18 that it will be mostly electronically monitored?

19 MR. FISHER: No.

20 MR. CLAMPITT: Or a year down the road,
21 or --

22 MR. FISHER: It's going to be a while

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 because the council has to decide. They have to
2 pass regulations and rules and regs, that would
3 actually allow that to happen. So we're going to
4 be running the EFP for a while and then make a
5 comparison to see whether or not there are still
6 concerns about what's going on. To me, it's an
7 issue of this, and we talked a lot with
8 (inaudible) about this whole thing. There's a big
9 difference between observers and cameras. My
10 feeling is that the camera stuff should be
11 compliance monitoring. It should be run out of
12 the region, not the science centers. The science
13 centers historically were monitoring about 20
14 percent of the fleet with observers. You know,
15 and somebody could say, well it should be 25, or
16 whatever. But seems to me that's the system we
17 need to go back to, so you're not so -- you're
18 cutting down the costs. You're still getting the
19 biological information and life goes on.

20 MR. CLAMPITT: You get the (inaudible).
21 And so we're talking about the cost of doing the
22 surveys and regulating for the species like

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 (inaudible) your point was, they're not catching
2 anyway so why are wasting that money? Is that
3 your point?

4 MR. FISHER: Well, if you look at what's
5 going on with, you know, now we've got 100 percent
6 observer coverage on all of the ITQ fishers. So
7 is that necessary? I mean --

8 MR. CLAMPITT: If busted, you can't go
9 inside of 125,000 anyway.

10 MR. FISHER: Right.

11 MR. CLAMPITT: Which pretty much
12 protects them. You can't go 125,000. Your chance
13 of catching them is --

14 MR. FISHER: Yeah. And the same with
15 recreational fishery. I mean, how much money are
16 we going to spend if you know, I'm not sure what
17 the number is, in terms of recreational for these
18 stocks. I mean, the council figures out what the
19 quota is going to be for the west coast, so then
20 we deal with that. But how much effort are we
21 really putting into it to really figure out the
22 quota, number one, and number two, how much are we

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 really worried about it? I mean if you talk to
2 some people, they're going oh my God, you know,
3 yellow eye are going to disappear. Well, this
4 doesn't show that, that's for sure.

5 MR. CLAMPITT: Thank you very much.

6 MS. MORRIS: Micah.

7 MR. MCCARTY: Yeah, I have a couple of
8 observations and comments relative to this sea
9 lion problem that you pointed out. A couple of
10 concerns and I'll preface this that I'm kind of
11 new to terminal area fishery, so being bad with
12 (inaudible). I'm learning a lot more about what
13 (inaudible) and river city traps are facing. But
14 the statistic about the steelhead recovery plan
15 and 90 percent mortality on outward migrating
16 smelts before they even get to the Narrows bridge,
17 or outside of Puget Sound, it's pretty boring, and
18 remount of predation on endangered species,
19 enlisted species and threatened species and
20 species in recovery is the elephant in the room
21 that we can't ignore. And we look at climate
22 change, and the resilience of the species with the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 genetic diversity that is being compromised
2 because they're being preyed on at such an
3 alarming rate. We're spending a lot of money on
4 salmon recovery and just noticed the budget cut on
5 salmon recovery. And so we have to deal with this
6 seriously and methodically. And there's an
7 imperative. We have a concentration necessity
8 that demands we do something. And with respect to
9 the Puget Sound, we also have rock fish problems
10 in Puget Sound. We also have resident Orcas that
11 have a problem. So I'm thinking about eco path
12 concept of looking at what are the inter species
13 dynamics in this important body of water that
14 compounds some of these problems. If we're
15 pouring all this money into the river systems and
16 city governments are doing all of this, but we're
17 ignoring something that's actually in Puget Sound,
18 the ripple effect that's going on, there could be
19 a lot of connections that need some real serious
20 science and people looking at this with more
21 expertise than myself. But from empirical
22 evidence and just looking at people that have seen

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the Puget Sound for years and years, longer than
2 I've been alive, it's a train wreck, what we're
3 watching. And I guess my point is, is you know,
4 when it comes to budget priorities and if we have
5 robust budgets for Office of Protected Resources,
6 why can't we put salmon in some of those
7 intentions, looking at how do we be more efficient
8 in partnerships and pulling expertise together.
9 Because, for one, out at Nina Bay, we had to pay
10 attention to Puget Sound because Puget Sound fish
11 swim past us. Now I'm working with the Puget
12 Sound and I'm seeing it even more plainly than
13 ever before. And I think the South Puget Sound's
14 in really bad trouble. And it's a good think that
15 the Nisqually Tribe just recently got 50,000
16 dollars to do a marine mammal survey in South
17 Puget Sound. But we need more partnerships. And
18 for a national example of ecosystem based
19 management with the user groups, stakeholders,
20 treaty resource trustees and co-managers, we've
21 got enough, I think legal mandate to pull
22 something together. But I guess I'm just

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 appealing to this group and our extended network
2 to see what we can do to think tank some
3 solutions.

4 MS. MORRIS: Mike.

5 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Comment on three things
6 that Randy had on. First the sea lions, I think
7 it's been pretty well expounded on but
8 interestingly enough, I've been around the Astoria
9 area on and off for the last 15 years or so. I've
10 never seen so many. But I've got two different
11 reports of people's dogs being eaten by sea lions,
12 chasing sticks out of the water, which it's
13 nothing I'd ever heard of before but they swear
14 it's true. On the Columbia, and they are coming
15 right up the tributaries now, pretty far up in
16 some cases, searching for food.

17 Second is on the EM, having followed
18 that on the Pacific Council process, it is bounced
19 all over the place it seems and some of the
20 people, the proponents are now but-ponents and
21 that's part of the reason it's taking so long to,
22 I guess, find a level where everybody can agree to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the idea. So I'm optimistic that that could cut
2 some costs for sure. But there are some fishermen
3 now that are not so sure that that's the way they
4 want to go, so if you get a divide in that, they
5 could make it even more complicated.

6 The last item on the, what we call choke
7 species, surveys and what not, part of the problem
8 is, why the fishery in the IFQ fishery is not
9 utilizing I guess some of these choke species if
10 they're allowed, is that the whole attainment
11 level in the fishery itself is about 30 percent,
12 has been for four years. And some of these choke
13 species are sitting around and accounts for the
14 back coming down. But they are going to be
15 important if this program ever catches fire, gets
16 launched. So I think from my opinion, knowing
17 that you got to, you can wipe out a fishery by
18 just catching too much of something that's claimed
19 to be overfished, there is value at least in
20 knowing how much of it is out there. If this IFQ
21 fishery and catcher program on the West coast is
22 going to be successful, there's probably going to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 be a higher take on the choke species. So far
2 it's not happening. But I do believe that there
3 will be an increase in what they're allotted as
4 they get more successful at getting the target
5 species out of the water. Because that's the
6 biggest reason it's not happening now.

7 MS. MORRIS: Yes.

8 MS. BEIDEMAN: And I'm probably asking
9 questions that I should talk to you in the margin,
10 but first I'll just make a remark about the
11 protected marine species and marine mammals
12 particularly, because we've protected them for a
13 pretty long time and we've had a fair amount of
14 success, but doing that, I know on the East coast,
15 we're having a resurgence and there's climate
16 change and changes in where they're located now,
17 and where they used to be. But certainly more
18 interactions with varieties of fisheries and I
19 guess the overarching problem is, how do we deal
20 with success? How do we deal with victory in
21 doing what the Marine Mammal Protection Act wanted
22 us to do? And I'm not saying everything is going

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to be levels approaching zero, but the ocean is
2 clearly showing us that there's a lot of them and
3 in some cases, too many, I would argue. So that's
4 just my comments on that, and I have interest in
5 that.

6 With regards to this document, and this
7 is where my ignorance shows. For the species that
8 are not being caught, primarily not filling their
9 quota, what is the status of those fish? Are they
10 overfished? Are they under fished? Or they're
11 good?

12 MR. FISHER: Yeah, I mean the status is
13 that, in theory, they're good, because otherwise,
14 the quota wouldn't be set that way.

15 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. So, does anybody
16 have like a theory as to why they're not being
17 caught?

18 MR. FISHER: He did mention some of it.
19 I mean, commercial fleet now is targeting on the
20 top three because that's where the money is.

21 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay.

22 MR. FISHER: And that's the basic why

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 there.

2 MS. BEIDEMAN: And they are required to
3 just throw out these if they want?

4 MR. FISHER: I mean, and the concern is
5 that, yeah, if you catch a lot of these others
6 that are in the rebuilding process they are going
7 to shut down the whole fishery.

8 MS. BEIDEMAN: Choke.

9 MR. FISHER: Yeah.

10 MS. BEIDEMAN: And, okay, and so the
11 discarding is for economic reasons? Official
12 size?

13 MR. FISHER: Yeah, mostly, economic.

14 MS. BEIDEMAN: Those types of things?
15 Okay. All right. Thank you for that.

16 MS. MORRIS: Are we ready for Dave?

17 MS. BONNEY: I got a question.

18 MS. MORRIS: Oh, Julie, I can't see you,
19 I'm sorry. You have to speak up.

20 MS. BONNEY: Okay, I'll just speak up.
21 And so, I guess I was looking at this. We brought
22 up two sets of topics. One is, issues that you

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 manage within your region, which is the
2 recreational harvest, monitoring, technologies and
3 what not. But you made several references to the
4 fact that your responsibilities continue to grow
5 but you're flat funded over a five year period.

6 MR. FISHER: Yes.

7 MS. BONNEY: And so the commissioners
8 are suggesting that they want to have more input.
9 I'm not really clear where you get your funding,
10 if you get some from states, and then some from
11 the feds, or if it would be dependent on the
12 federal appropriations but I guess from our
13 advisory role, with us seeing the need that we
14 wouldn't want to try to facilitate your capacity,
15 so that you can meet a lot of your objectives over
16 time. So I guess there's two questions. Where do
17 you get your money? And then how do you resolve
18 some of your funding issues?

19 MR. FISHER: Well you saw Paul's
20 presentation. We went and commented on that to
21 them, Paul and to Sam and the three commissioners
22 did. We are, the three commissions, are asked to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 go in front of the appropriations committees now
2 as a group, which we will. And we always say the
3 same thing, and that is, guess what? We've been
4 flat limit for at least five years and in the case
5 of PAC (inaudible) it's been more like ten. And
6 as a result of that, we're going backwards. And
7 in the president's budget, there's never been an
8 increase. And what we're trying to do is to try
9 and get some increase in those line items, the
10 FINS, for all of it. Because that money goes
11 directly to either, in our case, the states, or
12 you know, we're doing both recreational and
13 commercial monitoring of catch. So yeah, so there
14 are some things that we don't necessarily agree
15 with that are in the president's budget. And I
16 don't know how many of -- you know, you never know
17 who really wants some of that stuff, but if you
18 look at ecosystem planning, I don't think it holds
19 -- it doesn't hold the water to me to what we're
20 facing in terms of trying to just get the basic
21 action level information.

22 MS. BONNEY: So I guess this follow-up,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 how do you facilitate that between the agency and
2 the commissions to try to you know, get that so
3 that you can move forward. Because I think I've
4 heard this more than one budget cycle, the same
5 concerns.

6 MR. FISHER: Yes.

7 MS. BONNEY: Have you guys figured out a
8 path to try to bridge to that?

9 MR. FISHER: Well the path is, we go to
10 the hill and try to get it in the budget. That's
11 the path. Because if it's not in their budget,
12 then it's much more difficult. So the only thing
13 we can do is to convince the administration to put
14 some more money in the FINS and we haven't been
15 successful doing that. And that's why when; well
16 that's why the state directors were frustrated
17 over the budget process.

18 MS. MORRIS: Okay, I want to move on to
19 Dave's report.

20 MR. DONALDSON: Thank you Madame Chair.
21 In Gulf of Mexico, we're dealing with a, it's
22 really kind of minor species and I'm not even sure

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 anyone has ever heard about it, but the red
2 snapper. (laughter) And --

3 MR. DOREMUS: Does it look like anyone
4 of these?

5 MR. DONALDSON: It does. (laughter)
6 They're very easily identified because there are
7 lots of them. And really, but that issue of red
8 snapper has dominated the discussion in the Gulf
9 of Mexico for a number of years, and there has
10 been growing frustration amongst the states with
11 the way it's been managed and specifically the
12 recreational fishery. And in response to that,
13 the five state directors recently got together and
14 developed the Gulf States Red Snapper Management
15 Authority, which has caused a bit of discussion
16 amongst a variety of different groups but
17 essentially what it does, is it gives the
18 authority to the five Gulf directors for the
19 management of red snapper.

20 And as I mentioned, the impetus behind
21 it was because there was frustration amongst the
22 states that they needed more flexibility to manage

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 this resource, and the states felt that they were
2 better suited to manage the resources, versus
3 NOAA. So that's been the recent -- there have
4 been a variety of different bills that have been
5 introduced by a variety of different senators and
6 representatives in congress about giving authority
7 to the states, giving authority to the commission.
8 This particular initiative and authority does not
9 involve the commission directly. We're not -- we
10 wouldn't have an active role. We would provide
11 funding to the states for data collection, similar
12 to what we do now and also provide a forum to have
13 discussions. But the decision would be amongst
14 the five states. So we were talking last night
15 that if red snapper wasn't an issue, we'd probably
16 have two day Gulf Council meetings, but as it is,
17 we have five, at least a five day, and sometimes
18 seems longer.

19 So there are other issues in the Gulf of
20 Mexico, although sometimes it's hard to identify
21 them. You know, Randy mentioned electronic
22 monitoring, electronic reporting. NFWF provided,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 as Paul pointed out, provided funding. The five
2 states have submitted proposals. There have been
3 a couple other proposals that had focused on
4 implementing for hire, electronic monitoring,
5 electronic reporting. And that was in response to
6 the recent council decision to pass them in at 40,
7 which created a sector for our industry. And this
8 was in response to get a better reporting tool for
9 that particular industry.

10 Randy also mentioned level funding. The
11 commission's data programs have been level funded
12 for 10 plus years, and it's caused problems in
13 terms of the amount of information that we've been
14 able to collect. And this year we have been
15 collecting biological information, (inaudible)
16 fish and have been the main source of recreational
17 (inaudible) like feeding the stock assessments and
18 unfortunately because of the level funding, we're
19 not going to be able to conduct that activity this
20 year, which can have a severe impact, a
21 detrimental impact, on the future stock
22 assessments.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 And then I guess the last issue is just
2 kind of noting that the Gulf Commission and the
3 Atlantic Commission are meeting jointly later this
4 year, in November. We periodically do it when our
5 scheduled jive. We're going to meet in November
6 in St. Augustine, Florida. So everyone is more
7 than welcome to attend that. And that is just
8 kind of the nickel tour of what's going on in the
9 Gulf.

10 MS. MORRIS: Questions and comments for
11 Dave? Thank you both so much. Great reports. It
12 gets us right down to the ground level, or the
13 waterfront level, about what's going on with
14 Fisheries, Management and Research challenges.
15 The next presentation is -- yes please Paul.

16 MR. DOREMUS: I'm sorry for butting in
17 at the end. I did, from a fisheries management
18 point, also want to thank the two commission
19 directors for their views raised here before the
20 committee and acknowledge our interest and
21 concerns, particularly with the state aid
22 collection efforts. We are looking very closely

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 at ways that we can support those. We have, as
2 was largely conveyed in earlier sessions,
3 shortfalls across our budget, and hope to be able
4 to collaborate with the state directors, in
5 particular, on how we can use some of our grant
6 programs to better support long standing and as
7 was well pointed out, for long periods of time,
8 flat funded state data collection efforts. So I
9 just wanted to thank both of you for your
10 willingness to work with us in that respect, and
11 to let us know what your needs are.

12 MS. MORRIS: Dave.

13 MR. DONALDSON: And I appreciate that
14 Paul. And you mentioned state data programs. And
15 it's actually state federal cooperative programs.

16 MR. DOREMUS: Yes, yes.

17 MR. DONALDSON: Because the states
18 obviously benefit from the information, but the
19 feds do as well and I think that's an important
20 point to point out.

21 MR. DOREMUS: Absolutely. These are
22 collaborative efforts from the beginning. Thank

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 you.

2 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Yes, Terri Lee.

3 MS. BEIDEMAN: How well are you
4 communicating out to the masses in the Gulf of
5 Mexico because I've gotten some pretty alarmist
6 emails from individuals concerned about this move,
7 and looking at it as a potential allocated grab
8 for one sector or another. And I don't know
9 enough about it to know, but are you able to reach
10 the commercial and recreational? I don't know
11 also, what percentage is caught within state
12 areas, you know, percentages of red snapper is
13 caught within state versus outside the state?

14 MR. DONALDSON: Well, in terms of the
15 communication, the commission's not directly
16 involved in communicating with the state
17 constituents. But the individual states do a
18 fairly good job of talking with their folks, and I
19 think it varies by state obviously. But I think
20 each state tries to balance the various opinions,
21 various views from both the commercial and the
22 recreational side. In terms of the allocate state

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 costs caught or red snapper caught in state
2 waters, Texas and the west coast of Florida have
3 nine miles, so there's -- I don't know what the
4 percentage is but there's a -- it's less than 50
5 percent. But there is some percentage that is
6 caught in the state waters. For Louisiana,
7 Mississippi and Alabama, they only have three
8 miles of state waters and it's -- there's a fairly
9 small, there may be some, because the population
10 is growing. And in Alabama they're seeing more
11 red snapper in in shore waters, but it's a very
12 minor percentage.

13 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. Just a suggestion,
14 maybe a little more outreach, because there's a
15 lot of errant misinformation, disinformation
16 flying around and knee jerk reactions perhaps to
17 just the discussion over changing it and the
18 flexibility that you're seeking for, is not
19 necessarily to flex it away from one and get it to
20 another and I'm not sure that's coming across.
21 Just letting you know what I'm hearing back.

22 MR. DONALDSON: Thanks. I believe that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is a great suggestion. Because we've heard that.
2 We've heard that as well.

3 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay, good.

4 MR. DONALDSON: Thank you.

5 MS. MORRIS: Okay, before we move into
6 the cooperative management, cooperative research
7 discussion, Heidi needs to know how many of us and
8 our traveling partners would like to go to the
9 Southeast Fisheries Science Center this afternoon?
10 There will be a bus that can handle 37 people,
11 leaves maybe at 3:15 or 3:30, whenever we can get
12 people assembled.

13 MS. LOVETT: Right.

14 MS. MORRIS: Return, the bus will return
15 by about 6. So do you want to send around a list?
16 Do you want people to raise hands? What do you
17 want to do?

18 MS. LOVETT: Raise hands.

19 MS. MORRIS: Raise your hand if you're
20 planning to attend.

21 MS. LOVETT: Raise two hands for --

22 MS. MORRIS: Raise two hands if

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 somebody's coming with you. I will talk to you
2 about my plans. I'm not sure yet.

3 MS. LOVETT: Okay. Thank you. Okay,
4 that's great. The group will be split into two.

5 MS. MORRIS: For the tour, for the
6 actual tour.

7 MS. LOVETT: For the tour, so we just
8 wanted to -- Roger just asked for an approximate
9 number. That's good.

10 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Okay, Heather.

11 MS. SAGAR: Great, so I'm Heather Sagar.
12 And I know a lot of you guys in the room. I'm a
13 Senior Policy Advisor. I work for Jennifer. And
14 I'm here today to talk to you about cooperative
15 research and cooperative management effort that
16 I've been working on for oh, about a year now.
17 And so that you all know, I will be here all week.
18 And I'm happy to have any sort of side discussions
19 that you think will take a longer time than this
20 discussion. So anytime you want to chat with me
21 at a break or something, I'm here.

22 So cooperative research and management

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 has become a hot topic, and most recently we
2 received a letter from a series of stakeholders
3 and NGOs regarding cooperative research and
4 management and the letter focused on Section 318
5 of Magnusson and sort of indicated that that
6 section, if you know it, is titled Cooperative
7 Research and Cooperative Management, but is
8 followed by the Cooperative Research Program. And
9 there isn't a lot of cooperative management
10 direction in that section. And so, what they
11 indicated to us is that congress really wanted us
12 to sort of look at this aspect of cooperative
13 management. That's why it's in there. And what
14 they said is that, if we did this, we could
15 enhance NOAA's capabilities. We could improve
16 stakeholder relations, and we could possibly bring
17 new resources to fisheries management.

18 So about nine months ago actually, I
19 came out here to the West Coast Forum. I don't
20 know how many of you are familiar with those.
21 They are put on for the Councils and their staff
22 and they're public meetings. And we did a full

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 week session, actually out on Coronado, just
2 across the bay here, and talked about this effort.
3 I don't think anybody in this room was there. And
4 we had a great dialog at that. And between all
5 the interviews that I'll talk about in a little
6 bit and that meeting, what we really heard is that
7 early communication, transparency and
8 incorporation of our partners early is paramount
9 to the sake of effort. So what I've shared with
10 all of you is a draft, which is why it's not
11 online. It's been emailed to you. And we're
12 looking for as Julie said, comments based on the
13 interviews that we've done and your experiences on
14 the recommendations that have been provided on
15 page 40 to 43.

16 So let's see if I can work this.

17 MS. MORRIS: Is it on? Not responding.

18 MS. SAGAR: I'm sure it's user error.

19 Oh wait, online button, hold on. Yay, excellent.
20 So, this, the letter that I was discussing, was
21 brought to the leadership council. For those of
22 you that don't know, the NIMS Leadership Council

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is chaired by Eileen and Richard and Paul are
2 there, and Sam Rock as well, and what they said
3 is, let's take this and even look at it broader
4 than the letter suggests. Let's look at habitat.
5 Let's look at sustainable fisheries, and let's
6 look at protected resources. And we'd like the
7 policy office to take a look at this. And they
8 asked us to put a group together, comprised of
9 headquarters and regional folks and to look at the
10 successes and failures of cooperative research and
11 cooperative management programs and sort of look
12 at all the lessons learned from those.

13 So, when, all of you will remember Mark
14 Holliday, when he was still here, this was one of
15 the last things he did. He developed a terms of
16 reference for this effort. And what was decided
17 was that a white paper would be developed
18 summarizing the critical success factors of
19 cooperative research and management and document
20 an inventory of the examples, look at best
21 practices and then ultimately make recommendations
22 to leadership council.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 So this is where I came in, the white
2 paper development. I chaired a group of 19
3 employees from around the country, from science
4 centers, from regional offices, and from
5 headquarters programs, and that group did 50
6 internal interviews all around the country,
7 representing various different parts of the
8 fisheries service, habitat folks, protected
9 resource folks, sail and fisheries folks, and then
10 leaders -- a lot of AA's or I'm sorry, regional
11 administrators or science center directors were
12 also interviewed.

13 Sam and Richard held a round table with
14 the letter writers and had a discussion with them.
15 We did nine external interviews. We interviewed
16 someone in this group, but they're not here so I
17 won't point them out. And again, we went to the
18 West Coast Fisheries Forum. And all of these
19 factored into the white paper. The West Coast
20 Fisheries Forum had about 40 people at it, so it
21 was really a great discussion.

22 So this is where we get a little tricky

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 here. Our working group started by discussing
2 what is co-management and what is cooperative
3 management. And this was, with our 18 person
4 working group, a three month discussion. There
5 are so many definitions out there, and so many
6 thoughts on what co- management is, and so many
7 thoughts on what cooperative management is.
8 Ultimately, our working group determines that we
9 would reserve co-management for Marine Resources
10 with the states. So for example, the Atlantic
11 Commission, they do all the management for striped
12 bass so you would consider that the evolved
13 management of a species. And also, recognizing
14 our federal trust responsibilities is so important
15 and the unique legal relationships that we have
16 with travel governments. And that really is a
17 true co-management effort between two governments.
18 And that cooperative management, fisheries does a
19 lot of. And so some examples are the regional
20 fishery management council process, our
21 cooperative research where stakeholders are
22 working with us on data collection, take reduction

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 teams, in the marine mammal world, and then buy-
2 catch reduction studies.

3 So we looked at, based on the terms of
4 reference, we looked at what are these attributes
5 that makes some cooperative research and
6 cooperative management successful? And they were
7 a clear legal framework, an organized stakeholder
8 group with leadership, clear roles for partners,
9 stakeholders and NOAA fisheries. We heard clear
10 goals a lot. You know, knowing where the
11 information is going to be used, how's it's going
12 to be used, and sort of what format it needs to be
13 in to be able to meet those goals, was really an
14 important aspect.

15 Buy in, from partners and stakeholders,
16 and trust, we heard trust over and over again,
17 both sides, the fisheries service trusting the
18 stakeholders and the stakeholders trusting the
19 fisheries service. That again, our processes be
20 transparent and clearly understood in the decision
21 making process, regular, open, strong
22 communication, and then matching the scale of the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 cooperative management with the range of the
2 species, was also very important.

3 One thing we heard externally was the
4 use of the results for any sort of cooperative
5 research being used in our management decision
6 making. And I think a lot of that goes back to
7 the clear goals as one of these attributes. And
8 then funding, and we talked about funding a lot
9 today, and I'm glad that Paul went first. You
10 know fisheries service recognizes that we can't do
11 all of the management we need to do or look at all
12 the science we need to be doing in this
13 constrained fiscal environment that we're in right
14 now.

15 So we looked at ways that we could
16 advance cooperative management. And you'll see
17 the bold in the external, and on this slide and
18 the next slide, and that denotes where both
19 internally and externally we heard the same thing.
20 So internally, we heard, we need to build trust,
21 and again, between fisheries and the stakeholders
22 but the fishermen also with us. It's a two way

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 street. We need to be more collaborative, that
2 fisheries needs to have a culture shift for better
3 communication and listening and we need to be
4 doing it early and often, that we should be
5 looking at some sort of flexibility in our rules,
6 and working together on options for our rules, to
7 create flexibility. And we heard funding.

8 Externally we heard really similar
9 things. Communication, flexibility in rules,
10 funding, you know, it can be expensive for
11 external partners as well, when you move into
12 cooperative management. And again we heard from
13 our external folks that fisheries need to embrace
14 it more than we have.

15 Some other internal thoughts were that,
16 we talked about these necessary conditions, we
17 need to ensure that we're looking at these small
18 discrete fisheries that have some sort of
19 structure and a strong community aspect to them.
20 We've heard a lot about monitoring today. We
21 heard from folks that cooperative management needs
22 good monitoring and that cooperative research can

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sort of bridge the gap to co- management.

2 And we heard that there's a lot more
3 work that could be done on the protected resources
4 side, so I'm glad to see that MAFAC is taking on
5 some unprotected resources at this point. So to
6 advance cooperative research, what we heard was
7 that we need to be more deliberate in finding
8 opportunities to collaborate, including
9 communication and building relationship and trust.
10 We need to be setting goals and creating standards
11 to ensure that it feeds into management and that
12 there's a common understanding of why we're
13 collecting this data and how it will be used.

14 We heard internally that attitudes need
15 to be changed. We heard that we need to assess
16 where it's been beneficial before and show what
17 allows for success, so what works, what doesn't
18 work, and how do we take those lessons learned and
19 put it into future cooperative research funding.
20 We have heard this over and over again.

21 One thing that was unique to cooperative
22 research was that internally we heard the need to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 increase leadership, and we need to be promoting
2 it more often and have a clear strategic plan for
3 cooperative research, and we have heard a lot of
4 the same things, which is good, internally and
5 externally, have sort of the same view of where we
6 could make some progress in these efforts.

7 Fashion collaboration from an external
8 perspective, we heard that we need to be sure that
9 we are looking from a recreational as well as a
10 commercial aspect, but we need to define and
11 communicate our research goals more
12 collaboratively, and for leadership, they said we
13 need to increase leadership, that good leadership
14 is constantly checking back in, and that may be
15 something we could look to in improving the
16 program.

17 Something unique that we heard
18 externally was we need to streamline the EFP and
19 grant process, that when people go to our website,
20 they don't call and they can't figure where they
21 have to apply, and they don't know what's
22 available. We need to work on that. So, you will

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 see that in the recommendations.

2 While we focused on cooperative
3 research, and you will see it in the
4 recommendations, we sort of looked at what are the
5 other grant programs, how do we align with SK, so
6 some of that you will see in the recommendations
7 as well.

8 You all have a copy of the
9 recommendations. They begin on page 40 of the
10 document you have all been e-mailed.

11 I think important topics that came out
12 of all these interviews that we did, by
13 communication, cooperative management policy,
14 cooperative research, and that also includes some
15 of the other grant programs, and then Metrix. How
16 are we going to show that we are moving in the
17 right direction with this type of effort, and the
18 process of sharing.

19 Again, transparency, letting you guys
20 know what we are up to, getting your input. This
21 has been sent not only to MAFAC but also to CCC
22 and the Marine Mammal Commission for their

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 comments on the recommendations. Then we will
2 begin finalizing it based on all the comments we
3 receive.

4 I'm going to leave this part up to the
5 group. I think there are 18 or 19 different
6 recommendations. I'm sure most of you have read
7 them before. Given the time that we have left, we
8 could do some comments or some questions on some
9 of the recommendations.

10 MS. MORRIS: Let me intervene a minute
11 here. We have time scheduled this afternoon for
12 the Strategic Planning, Budget & Program
13 Management Subcommittee to meet and focus on a
14 response to this. Julie Bonney is going to be
15 chairing that session. This period of time should
16 probably be focused all on all of MAFAC, raising
17 topics that we would like the subcommittee to work
18 further on this afternoon. I think this afternoon
19 is the only subcommittee meeting for them. They
20 will come back to us on Thursday with whatever
21 progress they have been able to make, following up
22 on this topic for this meeting for all of MAFAC to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 discuss again.

2 If we are done, if we know what our
3 response is going to be at that point, we can
4 reduce it to pro's and send it in or the
5 subcommittee may continue to work on it between
6 the end of this meeting and the June 26 deadline.

7 I think good use of our time now is to
8 get some general responses from all of MAFAC that
9 would be then worked on in a more focused way by
10 the subcommittee this afternoon.

11 Does that make sense?

12 MS. SAGAR: That sounds like a great way
13 forward.

14 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Julie?

15 MS. BONNEY: Can I just ask two
16 questions? I think what you are laying out is a
17 good process. Are we the first ones to take a
18 stab at it?

19 MS. SAGAR: I sent them all the same day
20 to all three groups. I spoke with Rebecca Lent at
21 length about this, because I won't be in doing a
22 presentation with her. I have spoken to her and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 she's working on her comments right now for the
2 Marine Mammal Commission.

3 You are the first group I've spoken with
4 about this. The CCC meeting, the next CCC meeting
5 ends on June 26, which is why this date is June
6 26. I'll be speaking with them in a similar
7 manner I think next month.

8 MS. BONNEY: Just one other thought, the
9 original group of signatures on the letter is
10 pretty substantial.

11 MS. SAGAR: Correct.

12 MS. BONNEY: I was just wondering if
13 they have actually had an opportunity to review
14 this.

15 MS. SAGAR: That's a great question. I
16 sent a draft over to the lead for that group. It
17 has not been shared with the full group, but the
18 lead person that is sort of working with
19 everybody.

20 MS. BONNEY: Who is that person?

21 MS. SAGAR: It's Erica Filler. She and
22 I are going to have a follow up discussion next

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 week to see what their thoughts were. We talked a
2 lot about that. You know that letter has quite a
3 few other aspects to it, and we have various
4 different working groups working on some of those
5 other issues, for example, electronic monitoring
6 and confidentiality, and they have met with those
7 working groups as well, Richard and Sam, in some
8 of those efforts.

9 MS. BONNEY: Based on that, the letter
10 talks about cost recovery, a lot of issues. This
11 is just one element of the broader picture.

12 MS. SAGAR: Absolutely. We have a
13 working group for each one of those other things.
14 I don't think we would have made nearly as much
15 progress if only one group was taking up all these
16 different efforts.

17 I look at this paper as sort of laying
18 the foundations that provide the better dialogue
19 to help those other things move forward. Does
20 that make sense?

21 MS. BONNEY: It does. That helps a lot.

22 MS. MORRIS: Micah?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. McCARTY: Yes, I just have a
2 suggestion and also it's in part based on a
3 question about process regarding Executive Order
4 -- I don't know the number, but it's travel
5 consultation, government.

6 MS. SAGAR: 1386 something.

7 MR. McCARTY: Yes, thank you. I just
8 wanted to reflect on the late Billy Frank's effort
9 to pull together -- there are three unique treaty
10 groups in the United States, and you're aware of
11 them. They did a lot of work in the transition
12 discussion leading into this last Administration.

13 It seems that with a lot of the folks
14 I've engaged with and just asking questions about
15 this cooperative research and cooperative
16 management white paper concept, there really isn't
17 a whole lot of understanding.

18 And just bear in mind we have multiple
19 government to government engagements, the PFMC
20 process just got over, and then there is this
21 other process the tribes are engaged in with
22 intertribal discussions. I know the process is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 difficult for the bandwidth, but I think it is
2 prudent on our behalf and the Leadership Council
3 to have a significant consultation session over
4 this issue, particularly, I think, pursuant to
5 U.S. vs. Washington.

6 Washington State and treaty tribes have
7 a co- management responsibility, and stakeholder
8 groups, and while the process is one thing, but if
9 it's coming to a centralized point of view and
10 there is a specific treaty trust responsibility
11 between the tribes and the Federal Government,
12 then there is a crossroads here that I think needs
13 to be further explored and maybe invest in some
14 outreach to the tribal governments.

15 Each tribal government has a structure
16 for management, and tribal governments have more
17 flexibility to manage their bandwidth because
18 tribal leaders to a certain degree know exactly
19 what their programs are doing, and then they have
20 the flexibility to move.

21 I think a letter to tribal leaders,
22 specifically to the ones that have treaty trust

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and state relationships, so I'm talking about
2 NWIFC, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, and
3 the Intertribal Fish Commission for the Great
4 Lakes.

5 It's not a huge audience, and I'm not
6 meaning to exclude any of our Alaskan Native
7 brothers and sisters or other Native constituents
8 or user groups.

9 There is a specific legal relationship
10 here that I'm wanting to have addressed under the
11 consultation and pursuant to the Executive Order.

12 I have done some outreach and I've heard
13 some feedback from a number of different groups
14 that yes, they have a narrow attention on this
15 with their existing bandwidth challenges, but they
16 are concerned and would like to have a deeper
17 conversation.

18 I think we had some internal
19 conversations, but I'm just putting it out there
20 also for the benefit of the MAFAC, that there is
21 maybe an emerging interest in some of the issues
22 that we raised earlier today with respect to inner

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species, dynamics, and ecosystem based management.

2 I think we have a lot to add to the
3 conversation, and I think being consistent with
4 government to government obligations, there is
5 another process I'd like to add to this effort
6 before the deadline, or at least get a placeholder
7 in.

8 MS. SAGAR: Okay. I don't know if you
9 know this, I'm a Fisheries Service tribal liaison,
10 so I do a lot of work with the tribes. This
11 particular paper doesn't change the way we work
12 with tribes, because we have continued to have
13 tribal relations be co-management, where this is
14 talking about cooperative management.

15 I'd love to have a side discussion on
16 how we could clarify that, and what we could do to
17 add to this. Also, a little plug for our recently
18 issued tribal handbook from NOAA that talks all
19 about consultations and our requirements and how
20 we should be working better. If you haven't seen
21 it, I'd love to give you a copy of that as well.

22 MR. McCARTY: Thank you.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MS. SAGAR: Great. Let's have a side
2 conversation, too.

3 MS. MORRIS: Pam, you prepared some
4 written comments that have been forwarded to
5 Julie. Do you want to reprise those here in this
6 conversation?

7 MS. YOCHER: Sure. These comments
8 reflect number five on page 42, which is the
9 desire to push for statutory language to seek
10 private donations, and there is very strong
11 concerns about this in a number of communities.

12 I will kind of highlight them or sort of
13 summarize them. One is that we have heard a lot
14 about funding constraints and the concern for
15 external partners, states, tribes, academic
16 institutions, that compete for extramural funding.

17 When funding is tight, these external
18 partners always suffer the most, so there will be
19 times when internal funding increases and external
20 funding decreases. Seeking to attract funding
21 from the private sources that are used by these
22 other entities to try to make up that slack is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 adding insult to injury.

2 I'm kind of paraphrasing from the
3 National Association of Marine Laboratories'
4 testimony to Congress on this issue, which I will
5 provide a copy of.

6 That's one issue, this sort of
7 competition. Of course, that is not a level
8 playing field if you are an academic scientist
9 going to seek funding from industry or an
10 environmental NGO versus a resource management
11 agency in terms of what your costs would be and so
12 on.

13 Another concern is conflict of interest,
14 if a resource management agency is seeking funding
15 from entities on either side of an issue, so for
16 example, industry groups express concern about
17 funding for let's say a stock assessment or
18 something like that that would be provided by an
19 environmental NGO and vice versa, an environmental
20 NGO might be concerned about NOAA taking funding
21 from an industry group to sponsor research.

22 The other concern that has been

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 expressed is the concept of mission drift, if NOAA
2 is seeking funding outside the appropriations
3 process, there is concern that scientists or
4 agency personnel would be spending time on
5 projects that are not as directly related to the
6 mission as they should be.

7 Those are some of the concerns that NAML
8 and the Consortium of Ocean Leadership and some
9 others have expressed with this concept of seeking
10 private donations.

11 MS. SAGAR: Okay. I'm going to give you
12 an example of something that I heard through this
13 process, and maybe we can talk about how we can
14 modify language. Another project I'm working on
15 that this could help with, it is very different
16 than the angle that you're coming from, and then
17 maybe Paul may have some things to add.

18 In the cooperative research arena, when
19 we were doing the interviews, we heard from one
20 specific person that was doing an EFP with
21 fishery, and they wanted to be able to do real
22 time monitoring, but our folks didn't have a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 laptop that they could bring with them to be able
2 to do real time monitoring, bring it right in and
3 downloading it.

4 They had to get off the boat, go take it
5 all in, then download it, and then go back out.
6 So, these particular fishermen wanted to buy four
7 laptops so they could have real time monitoring.
8 We could not take those laptops.

9 Those are the types of things that we
10 think could help us to be able to be better
11 partners and make things more timely and working
12 together. That's one example.

13 Another aspect is permits. We have
14 heard a lot about backlog of permitting. If we
15 could charge for a permit or people could pay us
16 to be able to do some of that work, that would
17 really reduce backlog.

18 Just two examples from my effort. Paul,
19 do you want to add anything?

20 MR. DOREMUS: From a broader policy
21 point of view, I'll just make two comments. One
22 is I do think it is unfortunate this is viewed in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 some quarters as a zero sum game. We're looking
2 here for authorities comparable to other Federal
3 agencies to work as flexibly and with as greatest
4 reach as possible across sectors.

5 In areas, there are small examples,
6 large examples, where we have had the possibility
7 and interest by private industry to collaborate to
8 achieve certain types of research results, or not
9 research results, research enterprises, such as
10 baseline ecosystem assessments, for one example,
11 where we have distinctive capabilities.

12 There are not available funds to do
13 that, in the Federal Government, that is. There
14 is a strong broad industry interest in achieving
15 that state of baseline and system knowledge that
16 we need that is not specific to any one individual
17 firm's interest.

18 There are ways to manage the concerns,
19 understandable, related to the acceptance of
20 private funds. Other Federal Government agencies
21 deal with this all the time. There are ways to
22 manage it so you don't get into problems of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 mission drift or things of that nature. We're not
2 looking for a broad license to go out and find
3 money from anywhere for all purposes.

4 It is to be able to have the flexibility
5 to work productively with industry on mission
6 central work that we can't conduct in any other
7 way at this point in time.

8 I think these are all very important
9 policy discussions to have. We think they are
10 manageable issues. We share the concerns, but
11 don't view it either as a zero sum game or as an
12 issue that's going to drive us off our mission.
13 In fact, quite the opposite. We are working very
14 aggressively top to bottom, and that has been one
15 of the aspects of our response to constrained
16 budgets.

17 The direction, in fact, of our
18 organization is to work as closely and effectively
19 as we can with all parties, not just with private
20 industry, but all parties, that have equities in,
21 resources in our mission objectives. This would
22 just give us a broader array of tools to do that,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 but within the constraints obviously of our
2 mission and statutory responsibilities that we
3 have to execute it.

4 I think they are manageable issues. I
5 think they are good concerns for us to address and
6 we look forward to working with those who have
7 those concerns to make sure we can move forward on
8 these types of collaborative funding arrangements
9 and collaborative work arrangements that other
10 Federal agencies have been able to execute very
11 effectively.

12 MS. MORRIS: Ted?

13 MR. AMES: My observation is really a
14 structural one. Some of you may not be aware but
15 National Marine Fisheries Service has had a
16 terrible reputation in New England and
17 particularly in Eastern Maine. Looking at the
18 programs that have been successful and interacting
19 with them at various levels, it invariably ends up
20 fishermen who are involved in management processes
21 and/or who are participating in research very
22 often feel as though they are peon going in front

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 of the king.

2 There is not an equality of status or
3 consideration. The programs that have worked
4 especially well have been those where the state
5 has also been involved, so there is an
6 intermediary or third party involved in the
7 process.

8 I really think it would resolve a lot of
9 the conflict that's occurring in the area, in
10 Maine anyway, if you could engage this way. I
11 think it would be helpful.

12 MS. SAGAR: Thank you.

13 MS. MORRIS: I have some comments from
14 Keith that he shared with me yesterday that I'll
15 just introduce into the discussion here, Julie, so
16 you can work on them this afternoon.

17 His perspective is that maybe the best
18 thing that MAFAC could do would be to look at the
19 recommendations on pages 40 through 43 and sort of
20 figure out which are high priority, which are
21 medium priority, which are low priority in terms
22 of the perspective of MAFAC.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 He and I were both sort of taken aback
2 that so much of the report focused on the fishery
3 management councils as an example of
4 co-management. I guess when I think of -- I'm
5 sorry, cooperative management. When I think of
6 cooperative management, I didn't think the
7 regional fishery management councils were a core
8 cooperative management.

9 I can see how it fits the definition,
10 but both Keith and I felt like the other -- maybe
11 you could reduce the focus on that in the white
12 paper and that would create more focus on some of
13 the other things that you address there.

14 There seems like there is a tradeoff
15 between the accuracy and reliability of
16 cooperative research data, like sometimes the
17 agency has been reluctant to have a lot of
18 cooperative research data because they didn't feel
19 it was as reliable and accurate as data gathered
20 by official fishery science centered programs,
21 that there is some kind of tradeoff there that
22 should be addressed maybe a little bit in the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 document.

2 MS. SAGAR: For the councils, it's very
3 interesting. I went back and re-read the paper
4 again on the plane on the way here. It's very
5 interesting when you read through the five core
6 questions that have the analysis done around them.
7 It's back and forth. When you look, it will say
8 eight people out of 50 believe that the council
9 process is not co-management, and again, that is
10 why we reserved it for states and for tribes.

11 Many people thought there was some sort
12 of cooperative aspect to it. I'm interested in
13 hearing more from you guys about that.

14 MS. MORRIS: Mike?

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Cooperative management
16 and cooperative research is something we have been
17 as a company been promoting for some time. One
18 thing I was a little surprised at, I don't see
19 where there is any mention of the idea of gaining
20 efficiencies or maybe there is and I missed it.

21 It seems like the funding for NOAA
22 Fisheries is finite somewhat, and it is not

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 growing by leaps and bounds in any case. The task
2 that you are responsible for seems to be
3 increasing quite a bit. There are largely
4 different frameworks for how we manage ecological
5 concerns, habitat concerns, the rest of it. They
6 all require resources to be dealt with properly.

7 It seems to me only natural that there
8 is an opportunity there, but the stakeholders, the
9 fishermen and processors, we like to think of
10 ourselves more as stewards many times than just
11 being stakeholders.

12 Our investments, at least for our
13 company, are long term, and if things don't work
14 out, you know, short term doesn't get it for us,
15 so good stock assessments, those kinds of things
16 are terribly important to us.

17 Yet in my experience of being around the
18 council process and what not, it seems like things
19 are more complex and more difficult to derive
20 decisions.

21 Then I look at some areas in Alaska,
22 which I have been exposed to more in the last

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 eight years, six years, I see where some of their
2 programs are actually using cooperatives as an
3 approach, and seem to have very good results, and
4 also reduced the level of management expenditure
5 of resources and money, I think, too. They worked
6 very close hand in hand. The cooperative's in
7 many cases do manage to control buy-catch and
8 other things, and they bring higher value in many
9 cases to the fisheries.

10 I have had two experiences with
11 cooperative research. One was an independent
12 aerial survey we developed for sardines, and the
13 second was the survey which Dr. Werner and Dr.
14 Stein participated in, and we the FORUM STAR,
15 which is a catcher processor vessel, which did
16 some sampling in order to speed the process up.
17 We donated in kind but did not in actuality send
18 any funds to anybody. Nonetheless, it had good
19 positive results as far as we were concerned.

20 I think these opportunities need to be
21 developed and looked at. There are a lot of other
22 pieces to it, but I'm concerned primarily around

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the fishing aspects or harvest aspects, buy-catch,
2 and the rest of it that affect our ability to
3 extract the resource, and do so in a sustainable
4 manner.

5 I really think this is an opportunity
6 that we need to focus on more and really form a
7 partnership.

8 We are also involved with Canada,
9 Canadian fisheries, with DFO on the West Coast and
10 Canada. They have a very flexible system. What I
11 have seen in many of our fisheries, it seems like
12 we are becoming more inflexible. That is a
13 problem. It really takes that much more energy
14 just to break down a barrier sometimes to get into
15 the areas where you can cooperate.

16 DFO, for example, on the West Coast, in
17 the IFQ Fishery up there, has meetings up to four
18 to five times a year. They change quota
19 allowances in the individual vessel accounts and
20 do all kinds of fancy things that we have to go
21 through a whole council process and all the
22 sub-panels and everything else involved in order

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to get that done. What they can do in one
2 afternoon seems to take us years.

3 I'm not saying we should adopt that
4 system but I think at least we should be aware of
5 some of the flexibility they have gone to, and is
6 there a model where we can still keep our
7 framework of management under Magnuson-Stevens,
8 maybe go after similar results so we can develop
9 that flexibility.

10 Right now, I think we are wandering
11 farther away from the ability to do so. I'm an
12 old timer and been around a while, but it seems
13 like we are in some cases going the wrong way, but
14 I do have a high respect for the people in the
15 science centers, and I know a lot of those people
16 would like to work with us on a more cooperative
17 basis.

18 MS. SAGAR: Thank you. Those are really
19 helpful comments.

20 MS. MORRIS: Ted?

21 MR. AMES: I wanted to clarify my
22 earlier comments. I was talking about fishermen

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 to management, cooperative management has been
2 rocky there. What has worked well has been the
3 arrangement -- I used the laws of fishery as an
4 example, but where you have states functioning
5 within ASMFC, functioning with NOAA. It has
6 worked beautifully.

7 The collaborative research in our area
8 has worked incredibly well, and quite frankly, it
9 has been a pleasure in the projects we have been
10 involved in, and I think that is true probably
11 throughout the industry in New England.

12 The co-management component is the one
13 that has been the problem. I sometimes wonder if
14 in the preparation for delegates to the council
15 system if somewhere they were not charged with the
16 responsibility for making proposals that improves
17 the fishery rather than it being how can I get a
18 larger share.

19 It seems like a subtle thing but at the
20 same time, it changes the focus. It can work if
21 it is in the right arena.

22 MS. MORRIS: Peter?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. SHELLEY: I think about successful
2 cooperative research and cooperative management as
3 being really based on long term relationships more
4 than the specific research even. So much of the
5 program, when you read through the paper, you sort
6 of get this choppy thing, where relationships form
7 and disappear over a particular research project
8 and the information gets lost or goes into
9 hibernation somewhere and doesn't get shared.

10 Actually, I grew up on a dairy farm, so
11 I come at some of this from the land grant
12 extension agent kind of model. I look at the
13 National Sea Grant program. I don't know if I'm
14 wading into a mine field or not, I probably am.
15 It's like \$62 million, on that order. At least in
16 New England, the Sea Grant program strikes me, and
17 I may be speaking out of turn here a little bit,
18 as driven strongly by the research interests of
19 the people, MIT or UMaine. Their research
20 interests tend to dominate where their Sea Grant
21 programs go in the different states. They are all
22 going in different directions. They are all

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 purposed on different stuff.

2 I just wonder how you all think about
3 the Sea Grant program and where are these
4 relationships going to live over time? For
5 example, Bob Steneck in Maine is a lobster
6 researcher. He has been working with lobster
7 fisheries for decades.

8 They asked him, what do you think about
9 this or that, and he will give an opinion and they
10 respect the opinion because they have this long
11 relationship with him.

12 It seems to me until we get some
13 capacity to have those relationships live over
14 time, we are going to continue to lose just a
15 tremendous amount of value from them.

16 That is a very broad set of comments.

17 MS. SAGAR: You will see that exact
18 relationship issue in the recommendations. I
19 think it is a core piece of both building trust,
20 cooperation, having those long term relationships.
21 I personally think you just nailed it.

22 MR. SHELLEY: It is hard to find it in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the council. The council is really not set up to
2 nurture.

3 MS. SAGAR: Relationships; absolutely.

4 MR. SHELLEY: They have a lot of stuff
5 going on legally, regulatory. It seems to me it
6 has to be somewhere else, I don't know if the
7 science center, the Sea Grant program.

8 MS. SAGAR: A couple of thoughts. We do
9 have the cooperative research programs in the
10 science centers. The Sea Grant recommendation is
11 actually my responsibility. I have been working
12 and having meetings with them to sort of look at
13 those issues that you talked about.

14 Actually, some great things have just
15 happened with S&T and the Sea Grant program, our
16 Science and Technology Group. We now have a
17 person from Fisheries that works for Sea Grant,
18 and we have in the past, and that person, I think,
19 has moved on and retired, and now is working in
20 that program.

21 I think that will help make some of
22 those connections. Richard, I might butcher this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 so help me out here. We are also doing a
2 cooperative exchange program with Sea Grant in
3 some of the regions. That's a brand new effort by
4 Ned Cyr in Science and Technology.

5 I think those two efforts will really
6 help some of the pieces you are talking about, and
7 then in addition, me as a policy person working
8 with their policy people, how are you setting your
9 priorities for the year. You have Fisheries'
10 priorities, can we help align them with some of
11 ours.

12 Richard, did you want to add anything to
13 that? Did I butcher it too much?

14 MR. MERRICK: Coming out of an
15 university with a strong Sea Grant program in
16 Oregon State, it impressed me that they knew a lot
17 more about what was going on the docks than we
18 did. One of the things we have been trying to
19 develop with OAR, the other part of NOAA, the ones
20 that actually house the Sea Grant program, is a
21 closer relationship with them than we have had in
22 the past.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Part of that will involve us rotating
2 Sea Grant staff into the centers, center staff
3 into the Sea Grant institutions on a rotational
4 basis annually, and get our people more in that
5 situation, understanding what they are hearing
6 from industry, getting more of a dialogue here and
7 vice versa, and the Sea Grant advisory agents
8 understanding better what we are doing for
9 science, an educational process.

10 We have long had a person in the Sea
11 Grant Office, but they were doing other sorts of
12 things, and now this new individual we are
13 rotating, one of the things he is going to focus
14 on is building that relationship. I agree totally
15 with what you are saying.

16 MS. MORRIS: Randy is going to make a
17 comment, then I'm going to make a comment, and
18 then we are going to have lunch.

19 MS. SAGAR: I'm going to be here all
20 week, free feel to talk to me.

21 MS. MORRIS: Randy is next, then
22 Columbus, and then me. Go ahead.

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 MR. FISHER: I just want to be clear
2 about something. I'm assuming MAFAC will make a
3 recommendation that would say something like go do
4 it, because there is nothing required in any
5 regulation or anything to cooperative research or
6 cooperative management; correct? You didn't find
7 anything that said we have to change something to
8 do this?

9 MS. SAGAR: That was the interesting
10 thing about this effort. I really thought we were
11 going to go in and have to be like oh, we have to
12 amend Magnuson, we have to make changes to MMPA.
13 We don't. We have the authority.

14 No, we have the ability, we have the
15 authority.

16 MR. FISHER: When I first started
17 reading this thing, I'm thinking to myself, well,
18 you could be setting yourself up for failure,
19 which you could be because certain people used to
20 think cooperative research was a good thing, and
21 we did some on the West Coast and it didn't work
22 worth a damn.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 There was a question then of what are
2 you really going to do, I mean are we going to say
3 we're going to go and do all this stuff, or are
4 you setting yourself up as an agency for failure
5 to some degree?

6 MS. SAGAR: I think that if you have
7 clear goals and expectations and you are
8 communicating well with each other when you go
9 into a cooperative research program, and you are
10 communicating constantly, it is not what are you
11 going to do, did you know that means the data has
12 to comport with this, you know, you might want to
13 think about getting it peer reviewed, and having
14 that type of a discussion ahead of time, checking
15 back in.

16 I don't know that we can fail across the
17 board. There may be some that fail. I think that
18 is a huge step forward. Maybe I'm just really
19 excited about this.

20 (Laughter)

21 MS. MORRIS: Columbus?

22 MR. BROWN: One thing I noted in this

 ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
 706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 document is it doesn't really reflect the breadth
2 and importance of management as well as research
3 activities with other government agencies, because
4 there is a ton of money that's being spent out
5 there. There are a number of cooperative
6 agreements between the various agencies. I'm not
7 sure the left hand knows what the right hand is
8 doing in terms of our partners related to the
9 councils and commissions on those kinds of
10 activities.

11 I think it is always important to
12 understand the suite of things that are being done
13 in the Federal community and how those could be
14 brought better to bear on some of the problems
15 that we are facing.

16 MS. MORRIS: Great introduction to the
17 topic, Heather. Great comments from the MAPAC
18 members. Those of you who want to continue this
19 discussion this afternoon at 2:00, you should join
20 the Strategic Planning, Budget and Program
21 Management Committee that Julie will chairing.

22 It is 12:15. I would really like to be

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 back by 1:15. Anybody have any tips about lunch?
2 Go out on the street and see what we can find?
3 (Laughter)

4 MS. LOVETT: Kent recommended pretty
5 much any restaurant on Fifth Avenue, just two
6 blocks that way. There are lots of restaurants
7 there and they are well known. There is lots of
8 variety right there. You can go left or right
9 when you get to Fifth Avenue.

10 MS. MORRIS: When we come back at 1:15,
11 we will be having some presentations that move us
12 down the road on our recovery action tasks that we
13 started on last October.

14 Thanks, everybody. Great meeting, great
15 productive morning meeting.

16 (Recess)

17 MS. MORRIS: Let's get started on the
18 afternoon agenda. We are going to have two
19 presentations that are integrated with each other
20 about recovery plans and recovery actions.

21 The first part is going to be presented
22 by Therese Conant. Therese was at our October

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 meeting of MAFAC. Many of you met her there. She
2 is phoning in from Silver Spring for this part of
3 the presentation. Nora Berwick is here from the
4 Portland Office of the Office of Protected
5 Resources. She is going to focus more on one
6 particular recovery plan and recovery actions in
7 it that the subcommittee will be focusing on later
8 this afternoon, the Middle Columbia Rivers
9 steelhead trout.

10 MS. CONANT: That is correct.

11 MS. MORRIS: We have two presentations
12 for this next hour, and then Q&A and commentary
13 about that. The goal is to try to understand more
14 completely recovery plans and the specific role
15 that recovery actions play in them, because that
16 is the focus of our MAFAC work this year, the
17 recovery actions, how to design them so they work
18 better.

19 Are you ready, Therese?

20 MS. CONANT: Yes, I am. Thank you,
21 Julie.

22 MS. CONANT: As Julie mentioned, my name

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 is Therese Conant. I am the National Recovery
2 Coordinator for the Office of Protected Resources
3 in Silver Spring, Maryland, and I've been working
4 with Julie as well as Heidi on what I am going to
5 call the "MAFAC recovery project."

6 For my outline today, I'm going to
7 briefly go over the Endangered Species Act
8 recovery process and also what's required of
9 recovery plans. Then I'll go into greater detail
10 on MAFAC's recovery project, but I'll also speak
11 to two other efforts that are related to the MAFAC
12 recovery project. One is the ESA priority species
13 initiative, and then the recovery program review.

14 Recovery is defined both in the
15 Endangered Species Act but also in our recovery
16 planning guidance. In the Act, it's defined as
17 improvement in the status of listed species to the
18 point at which listing is no longer appropriate
19 under the criteria set out in Section 4(a)(1). I
20 will mention those criteria again in a slide.

21 It is also defined in our recovery
22 planning guidance as the process by which listed

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species and their ecosystems are restored, and
2 their future is safeguarded to the point that
3 protections under the ESA are no longer needed.

4 Those are the definitions and the end
5 goal is to get the species off the ESA list.

6 We do have some requirements for
7 recovery in the Endangered Species Act, Section 4.
8 One is we must develop and implement recovery
9 plans for conservation and survival of the listed
10 species, unless such plan will not promote the
11 conservation of the species.

12 A good example of that would be for
13 example we have 125 listed species under our
14 jurisdiction, of which 38 are totally foreign
15 species. For example, if a species exists only
16 within the territory of Indonesia where we don't
17 have influence or authority over actions on the
18 ground there, we may want to consider just
19 international instruments and agreements in terms
20 of recovery planning rather than developing a
21 recovery plan where we have more influence over
22 the outcome of actions.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Right now, of the 125 species, we have
2 50 that have recovery plans, so we have made
3 determinations for some species to not do a
4 recovery plan. Once we make a finding that a
5 recovery plan would benefit the species, we must
6 give priority to the species that is most likely
7 to benefit from such plan, and we should also
8 consider whether it is in conflict with
9 construction or other development projects or
10 other forms of economic activities.

11 In a later slide, I will go into more
12 detail about that recovery priority that we
13 developed in 1990.

14 We also have services of the appropriate
15 entities that develop and implements the plan,
16 recovery planning teams are exempt from FACA. We
17 want the experts to help inform and develop and
18 implement the recovery plan.

19 We also provide public notice and
20 comment and must consider all information prior to
21 finalizing the plan. That includes also by policy
22 that we provide our draft recovery plans for peer

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 review before finalizing.

2 Every two years, we report to Congress
3 on the progress of our recovery planning status.

4 In recovery planning, we must consider
5 the biological and ecological constraints of the
6 species that we are considering. We have the five
7 factors. The next five bullets are the criteria
8 that I mentioned earlier that are in the Act and
9 there is a requirement upon which we make a
10 decision on whether to list the species, but also
11 this is how we do our recovery planning. We
12 outline these five factors in our recovery plans.

13 They are the present or threatened
14 destruction, modification or curtailment of the
15 species' habitat or range, whether it is used for
16 commercial, recreational, scientific or
17 educational purposes, the inadequacy of existing
18 regulatory mechanisms, and other natural and
19 manmade factors affecting its continued existence.

20 We also consider in our recovery plans
21 conservation efforts that are ongoing because that
22 helps inform whether we are addressing the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 biological constraints or whether we are
2 minimizing and alleviating some of the impacts of
3 the threat in the other five criteria mentioned
4 above.

5 What is a recovery plan? It is not a
6 regulation. It is a planning guidance document.
7 It's a road map, sets the framework out for where
8 we need to go, how we are going to get there, and
9 what's the most efficient way to do that.

10 It also serves as an outreach tool
11 because it articulates to all the interested
12 stakeholders about why the species is in the dire
13 straits it is, and what kind of recovery actions
14 we need to help address the situation.

15 We also use the recovery plan to guide
16 us in other ESA actions such as habitat
17 conservation planning or in our Section 7
18 publications with other Federal agencies. A good
19 recovery plan helps provide a foundation and
20 information for Julie's other functions.

21 It also sets the stage for how to
22 implement off listing monitoring once we get the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 species off the list, we want to make sure we have
2 a good plan in place so it doesn't end up back on
3 the list.

4 There are only three major elements that
5 are required in a recovery plan. The first is it
6 must contain an objective measurable criteria
7 which when met will result in removing the species
8 from the list. It must also contain site specific
9 recovery actions as necessary to achieve the
10 plan's goal, which is recovery. Finally, it must
11 include costs and time to carry out those measures
12 needed to achieve the plan's goal for recovery.

13 What is a recovery action, what should
14 it look like? It should be relevant to meeting
15 the recovery criteria I mentioned, either related
16 to the species' biological needs, we refer to
17 those as demographic recovery criteria, or
18 relevant to eliminating or reducing the threat,
19 and we refer to that as threat based criteria.

20 The recovery action should be site
21 specific, it should be action oriented, and it
22 should have a concise description. It should

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 identify responsible parties and it should be
2 prioritized by either one, two, three, in terms of
3 whether the action is necessary to prevent
4 extinction or to prevent a significant find short
5 of distinction.

6 For the MAFAC recovery project that we
7 have been working with you all on, there are just
8 two phases. The first phase is the retrospective
9 analysis of the recovery actions, and then based
10 on that retrospective analysis, the subcommittee
11 would work with us to build partnerships to
12 facilitate completing the recovery actions that
13 are more focused on fisheries' related actions.

14 It is two phased, first the
15 retrospective analysis and then helping us build
16 partnerships.

17 With 125 species that we have
18 jurisdiction over, and recovery plans, the idea of
19 going through 50 recovery plans is absolutely
20 daunting. We came up with a set of criteria in
21 order to narrow down the subsample five and make
22 this a more doable project.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 The four criteria that we established is
2 we want a mature recovery plan, we felt that
3 anything that was less than a year old probably
4 would have all not started or very few concerted
5 actions.

6 We wanted recovery plans that were
7 solely under our jurisdiction, because if it was
8 joint with Fish and Wildlife Service, then we
9 would have to have a process in terms of getting
10 their involvement.

11 We wanted the species that represent
12 diverse tax and ecological niches, and we also
13 wanted to make sure the recovery plans represented
14 all of the regions, so we got a broad
15 administrative coverage for the recovery actions.

16 What you have there on the slide are
17 seven that were chosen, and the North Atlantic
18 right whale is administered by the Greater
19 Atlantic Regional Office. Smalltooth saw fish is
20 administered by the Southeast Region. The sperm
21 whale is administered by the headquarters office
22 in Silver Spring. It is globally distributed in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 all hemispheres.

2 The white abalone is administered by the
3 West Coast Region. The Middle Columbia River
4 steelhead trout, I am not going to talk about that
5 because that is what Nora is here for. Steller
6 sea lion, a western population segment
7 administered by the Alaska Regional Office. The
8 Hawaiian monk seal, we see more in subtropical
9 waters around Hawaii, in tropical waters and
10 islands and submerged reef.

11 Those are the seven that were chosen on
12 the criteria that the subcommittee is examining.

13 In order to conduct the retrospective
14 analysis, the subcommittee is dividing these
15 recovery actions, and it will either be all the
16 recovery actions in the recovery sense, for
17 example, the white abalone, we only have 40
18 recovery actions. There are some recovery actions
19 such as Nora's steelhead trout had numerous
20 recovery actions. Based on that, we selected a
21 subsample within the recovery plans based on the
22 status categories for each recovery action.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 I am giving you the definition for each
2 of the recovery action status categories, and then
3 I pulled examples of the recovery actions for each
4 of those definitions.

5 The point of the slides are not to
6 discuss why those recovery actions are the way
7 they are, because that is part of the
8 subcommittee's work when they interview all the
9 recovery coordinators later. I would not be the
10 best person to address questions about those
11 particular actions. I'm just giving them to you
12 as examples.

13 The first definition, "not started," no
14 planning or implementation work has been done, and
15 there are no plans in place to begin work, but it
16 is still necessary. An example of that is for the
17 while abalone, in enhanced wild populations and
18 selecting sites.

19 "Ongoing current." That is an action
20 without a specified endpoint. They are conducted
21 continuously or periodically through the recovery
22 process. A good example of that is your

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 population monitoring efforts. The action is
2 considered necessary for recovery, and it is
3 currently being successfully implemented but needs
4 further work before it is considered complete. An
5 example of that is the Hawaiian monk seal for
6 emergency response teams to treat seals that have
7 been injured.

8 "Ongoing not current" is the same as
9 ongoing current. The only difference is it is
10 behind schedule. A sample of that is the Hawaiian
11 monk seal, which is to continue annual population
12 monitoring.

13 "Partially complete." This action
14 happens at three endpoints, for example, three
15 years. The action has been partially completed,
16 but further work is needed. An example of that is
17 the smalltooth sawfish where we call for up to two
18 years of population viability assessment or other
19 models.

20 "Complete." This is self explanatory.
21 No more work needs to be done. It is complete. I
22 pulled one of Nora's. She will go over this in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 more detail the actions.

2 "Planned" actions or "further" actions,
3 in the initial planning phase but implementation
4 has yet to be done. An example of that is from
5 the sperm whale where they are trying to develop
6 platforms.

7 "Discontinued." This is an action that
8 had some work done but it is out of date or
9 unsuccessful. We still feel it is necessary for
10 recovery, but we do not have current plans to
11 resume the work. Another example of that comes
12 from sperm whales where we wanted to do a generic
13 analysis of preserved samples.

14 "Update." This is an action that is not
15 necessary to recovery.

16 Based on the recovery action categories,
17 there is going to be organizing these recovery
18 actions, and looking at some common
19 characteristics that help understand what is
20 successful and what is not successful in terms of
21 a recovery action. We attempt to do this by
22 interviewing each of the recovery coordinators for

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 each of the seven plans that were identified.

2 The process would be results of a set of
3 recommendations for future recovery actions based
4 on what has worked in the past and what we can do
5 in the future.

6 I put on this slide just some things to
7 consider just based on my knowledge, to think
8 about whether the recovery actions were clearly
9 described and appropriate responsible parties
10 engaged, or the recovery actions really represent
11 realistic practical and usable actions, both
12 scientifically and technically founded. To what
13 degree do we have authority, and do we have
14 adequate resources, staff and funding, to fulfill
15 the recovery actions, the level of resources,
16 because that will affect the outcome.

17 Once the retrospective analyses is done
18 on a recovery action, the second phase of the
19 MAFAC recovery project was to help us through
20 partnerships to facilitate those recovery actions
21 that have not been completed yet, focusing on
22 those that are related to fisheries, understanding

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that MAFAC really does have an unique position in
2 helping us build these partners, and the hope is
3 the subcommittee can suggest some alternative
4 strategies in terms of getting these actions done,
5 possibly some additions or clarifications if
6 needed.

7 I put two examples of fisheries' related
8 actions. They are not necessarily the ones the
9 subcommittee will take up, just putting them up as
10 a demonstration of what kind of recovery actions
11 we have related to fisheries.

12 One is smalltooth sawfish, in which we
13 are asking to work with partners to come up with a
14 plan to mitigate the effects of lost fishing gear,
15 and for the North Atlantic white whale, develop
16 and implement fishing practices to reduce
17 entanglement.

18 I talk about the MAFAC recovery project,
19 and it has two other efforts that it intersects
20 with that are going to be important. The first
21 one is ESA priority species initiative. This is
22 an internal initiative in which we wanted to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 create a short list, if you will, of the most at
2 risk species of those 125 that are under our
3 authority, because we felt that having a short
4 list, you could really have more targeted efforts
5 to stabilize the declines in populations and then
6 guide agency actions.

7 The first one is that the species must
8 be endangered, cannot be threatened under the ESA.
9 Populations cannot be stable or increasing, it has
10 to be declining. It must be assigned a recovery
11 priority.

12 This goes back to my earlier slide when
13 I said priority to species that most benefit, so
14 we came up with a policy matrix and definition on
15 how to assign those recovery priorities. If you
16 look over on the right column --

17 MS. MORRIS: Wait just a minute,
18 Therese. We are trying to get the presentation.
19 Just wait a minute.

20 MS. LOVETT: Therese, I apologize,
21 continue.

22 MS. CONANT: You should have a matrix

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that shows a table with priority numbers. Do you
2 have that slide?

3 MS. MORRIS: Yes.

4 MS. CONANT: That is based on three
5 criteria for this recovery prioritization. It is
6 the magnitude of threat, recovery potential, and
7 whether the species is in conflict with economic
8 or development activities.

9 In order to be applying the highest
10 priority number, which is one, the lowest being
11 12, you must have a high magnitude of threat, and
12 that distinction is almost certain in the
13 immediate future because of a rapid population
14 decline or habitat destruction.

15 It also must have a high recovery
16 potential, and that means we must know what the
17 limiting factors are for that species, the threats
18 they have. We must understand what management
19 actions are indicated, and those management
20 actions must be tried and true. We must know they
21 have a high probability of succeeding. Again, the
22 species should be in conflict with economic

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 activity.

2 That is the foundation of our
3 prioritization process for recovery planning but
4 also part of the ESA priority species initiative
5 that we just started last year.

6 The ESA priority species, we identified
7 eight species. I can't give you those eight
8 species yet because the roll out is to occur in
9 the next couple of weeks, and we will inform you
10 when we are allowed to. Just know that of the
11 seven recovery plans that the MAFAC recovery
12 project is covering, several of the species on our
13 ESA priority species are also in the recovery
14 plans we are looking at.

15 I think that the MAFAC recovery project
16 is going to be very informative because in the
17 next five years, we are asking recovery
18 coordinators to be thinking about action plans,
19 that they be developed based on the recovery
20 actions that have already been identified, and it
21 is to help focus our efforts and mobilize our
22 partners and stakeholders.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Any kind of report that we get from
2 MAFAC on what constitutes a successful recovery
3 action will be informative in terms of what we do
4 in the next five years for the ESA priority
5 species initiative.

6 The intent is that in 2017, when we are
7 required to report again to Congress, we will
8 evaluate this initiative and how well we are
9 doing.

10 The final effort that relates to MAFAC
11 is what we are calling the deep dive, a recovery
12 program review. The program offices like Habitat
13 and Protected Species, Sustainable Fisheries,
14 Science and Technology, we have not undergone
15 panel reviews of our programs. We have been asked
16 to start doing that, just as our centers have
17 done.

18 We felt the ESA recovery program would
19 be an excellent first example. We have never had
20 a comprehensive evaluation. We have a lot of
21 interested sectors in recovery planning. We just
22 felt a review would really be beneficial at this

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 point. We feel that such a review would ensure
2 priorities and implementation align with our
3 mandates, and enhance and align our management and
4 provide transparency in the operation of such
5 programs.

6 The more specific objectives for the
7 recovery program review is to determine whether
8 our current planning processes result in recovery
9 plans that are targeted, useful, and result in
10 progress towards recovery. What we would do is
11 have a panel of reviewers in which we will task
12 them to review our program and provide advice on
13 what kind of recovery program is needed as we go
14 forward.

15 A part of forming the panel of
16 reviewers, we will provide background materials in
17 terms of our recovery planning policies, guidance,
18 and practices. The results of the MAFAC
19 retrospective analysis on the recovery actions
20 will also be provided to the panel of reviewers,
21 because it will certainly help inform any
22 recommendations for the overarching programs in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the years to come.

2 The timing on that, we have a meeting
3 scheduled next month with the Protected Resources
4 staff, the program offices and the centers to
5 review the draft. In August of this year, we will
6 have a national recovery planning workshop in
7 which all the recovery coordinators I hope can
8 attend, and we are going to ask them to help us
9 flush out the review questions for the programs.

10 The schedule is that in April of 2016 to
11 actually conduct the recovery program review, do a
12 draft report by September, and a final report in
13 December, with recommended actions to take in
14 2017.

15 With that, I will open it up for
16 questions. Thank you.

17 MS. MORRIS: Thanks, Therese. This is
18 designed to give us sort of the broad background
19 on recovery actions, and then Nora is going to
20 take us directly into some sort of case history of
21 what is going on with the steelhead trout in
22 Middle Columbia River. I'd like to move to that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 if we could, but if there is a burning question we
2 need to take up right now on Therese's
3 presentation, we will take it. (No response)

4 Nora?

5 MS. BERWICK: Thank you everyone for
6 listening to this presentation. I am going to
7 talk this afternoon on how we did our recovery
8 plan for the Middle Columbia River steelhead, and
9 how we are going about implementing the plan.

10 Before I really get into this all, I
11 want you to pay attention if you could to that
12 bottom line. Those are the people that actually
13 worked with us in making the recovery plan, and
14 then those are the local people and the tribal
15 people and the state people, the effort we had in
16 the Middle Columbia has been one of collaborative
17 effort at the local level.

18 Probably my favorite symbol of all is
19 that one, those are the local land owners.
20 Without them, we would not be implementing as well
21 as we are right now.

22 To begin with, to give you some

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 perspective of the size of what we are dealing
2 with out here on the West Coast is a picture of
3 all of our salmon recovery domains. The one that
4 we are going to be focusing on today is the Middle
5 Columbia. That is one of our little domains,
6 except it is not so little. It occupies a good 20
7 percent of the State of Washington and a good 25
8 percent of the State of Oregon.

9 What I wanted to do to also give you an
10 introduction is to give you an idea of where we
11 are in our recovery planning process. I have it
12 for the Northwest region and then our West Coast
13 region is so big, I've divided this up into two
14 slides.

15 We are well along our way in getting our
16 recovery plans done on salmon and steelheads. In
17 the south, this is where we are. We are only
18 short three recovery plans, which are still in
19 development, but the rest are done.

20 The way the plans have been put
21 together, there are different ways of going about
22 implementing our recovery actions, and that is

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 part of what I'm going to be talking about this
2 afternoon.

3 Taking a look at the Middle Columbia
4 steelhead distinct population segment, we have, I
5 believe, 28 listed salmon and steelhead in the
6 West Coast, and 11 of those are steelhead. There
7 isn't just one species of steelhead out there. We
8 have this one DPS, which is the Middle Columbia
9 River steelhead trout, and that is the one I'm
10 going to be talking about today.

11 We have Upper Columbia River steelhead.
12 There is Snake River steelhead. We are going to
13 focus on the Middle Columbia River steelhead. I
14 want you, if you could, to pay close attention
15 because this is going to be part of what I will be
16 talking about, note the slight differences in
17 color here. These are examples of multiple
18 population groups within the one species or DPS.

19 When we prepared our recovery plan, we
20 had a problem because we had two states and we
21 had, if we go back, multiple population groups
22 that are crossing the boundaries of the two

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 states. Let me go back. I missed something here.
2 Getting back to the steelhead DPS,
3 listed as threatened in 1999 and again in 2006, we
4 have 17 extant populations in two states. We are
5 not dealing with one population of steelhead,
6 we're dealing with 17 of them.

7 The way the hierarchy of the population
8 structure is, we have the DPS level, which are
9 then divided up into multiple population groups,
10 and then we have the independent population groups
11 on the bottom. Those that are genetically similar
12 get grouped into one population group.

13 MPG1, the populations in that group are
14 more closely related than are the populations
15 between down here, MPG2 and 1. To give a picture
16 of what this looks like if we are looking at
17 Middle Columbia River steelhead DPS, we have all
18 those different populations, and we have to figure
19 out how to write a recovery plan for this.

20 There are 20 populations, 17 extant,
21 three of them are extirpated. In the State of
22 Washington, we have a multiple population group in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the Yakima Basin, and that group of populations
2 are more closely related than are the group of
3 populations in the Cascade Eastern Slope Tributary
4 multiple population group, which is one of our
5 bi-state multiple population groups. There is the
6 John Day multiple population group, which is
7 totally in Oregon, and then we have another
8 multiple population group that is bi-state.

9 Now getting to the multiple population
10 groups, this is what they look like on a map. We
11 have to figure out in writing our plan how to do
12 this, who were going to be the players, how would
13 we do it given there are administrative boundaries
14 that we needed to deal with. How do we get a
15 recovery plan written.

16 Now, what we did was we had four
17 different management units. A management unit is
18 not like a fisheries management unit. It is
19 simply the unit that we used so that we could
20 write the recovery plans.

21 It was easy, if I back up, let's take
22 the Yakima management unit, if you back up and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 take a look at the previous slide, that is easy.
2 That Yakima multiple population group, that was
3 easy. That could be written by one writing unit,
4 that management unit.

5 However, we had to figure out who are we
6 going to work with in the State of Washington and
7 in the State of Oregon in order to get a plan
8 together that would address the Eastern Slope
9 Tributaries MPG. The big question is how do we do
10 this. This is all very relevant in figuring out
11 how we then wrote the plan and came up with our
12 actions.

13 For the Oregon management unit, we had
14 ODFW and an Oregon Sounding Board writing the
15 document. For the Washington Gorge management
16 unit, that was a management unit that I was in
17 charge of pulling together, and again, if you look
18 back at this slide, the Washington Gorge is just
19 this. That is a very small area in the State of
20 Washington.

21 We had the Oregon folks writing this
22 portion over here, in addition to the John Day, in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 addition to the Oregon portion of the Umatilla
2 Walla Walla multiple population group.

3 The idea in the end is to have a plan
4 where all of this gets knitted together. These
5 are what our management units look like. The
6 management unit for Yakima, that's easy. Now,
7 Southeast Oregon, not so easy. It is a portion of
8 a multiple population group, which means we have
9 to knit the pieces from the State of Oregon that
10 belong to that multiple population group in with
11 the group that is working on Southeast Washington,
12 and then there is the Washington Gorge, which
13 again involves some knitting and thinking and
14 working together, and that is why in making these
15 plans, it was very, very important to make sure we
16 had a collaborative process.

17 That is just another slide of the two
18 multiple population groups that cross state
19 boundaries.

20 What is in these recovery plans?
21 Explanation of steelhead biology, recovery goals
22 and criteria, assessments of current status of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 limiting factors and threats, recovery strategy
2 and site specific actions, estimates of time and
3 cost to implement, research, monitoring, and
4 evaluation.

5 Our biological criteria all the way
6 through was based on four different parameters,
7 productivity, abundance, spatial structure, and
8 diversity.

9 In order to figure out how do we get to
10 a viable Middle Columbia River steelhead, we had a
11 group called the technical recovery team, TRT.
12 The TRT came up with these criteria. That was
13 another part of writing this plan, trying to
14 figure out we want to have steelhead viable, what
15 does that mean in terms of populations, and also
16 what does that mean in terms of groups of
17 populations or those multiple population groups.
18 How are we going to be setting the bar for a
19 viable distinct population segment of Middle
20 Columbia River steelhead.

21 It was our technical recovery team that
22 came up with the overall goal for DPS viability,

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 and all four MPGs had to be viable, which is a low
2 risk status. We also had to have representation
3 of all the major life history strategies that were
4 historically present, and we had to have
5 representation of abundance, productivity, spatial
6 structure, diversity, required for long term
7 persistence, which in our case was 100 years.

8 This slide is when we are trying to
9 apply the TRT criteria and viability. What this
10 slide shows is we had to determine which of the
11 populations were viable, which were not viable,
12 which were high risk, and right off the bat, you
13 can see a lot of red, and the red is high risk.

14 This is a high risk area here. That is
15 up in the Yakima. This is a high risk here down
16 in the Deschutes area. We have also an area in
17 Eastern Washington terribly high risk.

18 You get an idea of the spread of the
19 risk of the different populations within the
20 multiple population groups.

21 What this slide does is do an overlay of
22 the major population groups and overlaid on top of

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 that are the writing teams for Washington Gorge,
2 Oregon, Southeast Washington and the Yakima Basin,
3 so the folks that were involved in working up
4 information and writing the plan and implementing
5 for Washington Gorge was the Washington Gorge
6 implementation team. For Oregon, we had ODFW and
7 the Oregon Mid-C implementation team which is a
8 group of about 50 to 60 local organizations,
9 watershed councils, a lot of local effort, but
10 that one huge number of over 50 individual
11 organizations, including NGOs, that has been
12 grouped into an overarching sort of umbrella group
13 called the Oregon Mid-C implementation team. It
14 was also the writing team.

15 For the Yakima Basin, what we had there
16 was a recovery board, the State of Washington has
17 recovery boards, and in Yakima, we have the Yakima
18 Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board.

19 Similarly, in the State of Washington, we have
20 another recovery board over here, and that is the
21 Lower Snake River Salmon Recovery Board. There
22 are two recovery boards. There is one here

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 sponsored by the State of Washington and there is
2 one here.

3 There is no recovery board for the
4 Washington Gorge, so part of what I'm going to
5 also show you -- these are all these layers of
6 complexities that we had to sort of work through
7 to pull everything together.

8 MS. MORRIS: Are you going to get to the
9 recovery actions soon?

10 MS. BERWICK: That's coming up. I want
11 to show you how we got to the actions because it
12 is not easy.

13 What we did was essentially in order to
14 get to writing the plan and implementing it was
15 look at what was already existing out there, so in
16 the Washington Gorge, what we had was the Yakima
17 Nation, we had ODFW, those were our harvest and
18 hatchery co-managers. We also had habitat
19 managers. The Yakima Nation plays a big role in
20 that. Then there are state and local habitat and
21 watershed programs which also are the habitat
22 managers.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 What we did where we had no board was
2 use existing processes in order to pull something
3 together where everybody could sit around the
4 table and come up with a consistent set of
5 actions.

6 This is a slide that shows you how we
7 actually set it up. We were coordinating it. We
8 had co-managers, and we had Federal, state, and
9 local entities. What we did was rather than
10 create something where we didn't have it, we used
11 efforts that were already ongoing, and just got
12 everybody to sit down at the table.

13 Essentially what we did to get to the
14 implementation part is we did have to work with
15 the co-managers and counties, and we set up an
16 even larger forum. We had to deal with the four
17 different management units, each one of those
18 management units is made up of a lot of individual
19 little smaller groups who are already implementing
20 actions.

21 What we ended up with was a Middle
22 Columbia River forum. We also have a Middle

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Columbia steering committee, which informs the
2 forum. There is a Middle Columbia science team,
3 then there are state technical and support teams
4 at the individual level.

5 The centerpiece of our recovery
6 implementation is our Middle Columbia forum, and
7 there is no formal membership. It consists of all
8 the people who have been involved in coming up
9 with the plan, and that is spelled out, I believe,
10 in chapter 11 of the Middle Columbia steelhead
11 plan.

12 There is more here on the Middle
13 Columbia River forum. This is what the forum
14 does, coordination and communication with all of
15 the entities. It advocates. It provides
16 recommendations for resource prioritization across
17 state lines, across all different jurisdictions,
18 and it provides a scientific interface with the
19 Mid-C science team, which is a newly formed team,
20 and coordinates and synthesizes the efforts and
21 activities.

22 However, the Mid-C forum was too large a

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 group to work with on a regular basis, so we have
2 a Mid-C steering committee which essentially were
3 the ones who sit, roll up our sleeves, and pull
4 things together. This is a list of who is on our
5 Mid-C steering committee. These are the real
6 entities that are doing the work.

7 What we do in the steering committee, we
8 monitor implementation progress and we coordinate
9 the MPG level recovery efforts, and that is really
10 important because what we don't want to see
11 happening is the individual parts of the larger
12 plan, we don't want to have those individual
13 parts, a lot of little implementation efforts
14 going on. There are actions. There are 964
15 actions in the Middle Columbia steelhead plan.

16 We want to make sure that when we are
17 implementing those recovery actions that the focus
18 is on those that are going to give us the biggest
19 bang for the buck. There are a lot of wonderful
20 actions out there in the plan, a lot of them are
21 wonderful do good actions, but the idea of having
22 a recovery action in a recovery plan is to get to

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 the recovery of the species, which means you have
2 to think about those recovery actions and how to
3 prioritize them in terms of the viability
4 parameters that our science team set up for us.

5 We have our science teams. These are
6 the members. We have NOAA, the states, the
7 tribes, and we have our local people. In addition
8 to this, each state and recovery board has its own
9 supporting technical teams, and there is a focus
10 on specific needs of parent agencies and boards.

11 For the Middle Columbia forum, what I
12 have listed here are the types of efforts that we
13 do as a group. We share information. One of the
14 things we did this last year was we came up with
15 an Excel spreadsheet that we figured we would use
16 for the data input for our five year status review
17 that is coming up this year, and that format for
18 our data input is now being used over the entire
19 Northwest region.

20 We had another initiative, the Army
21 Corps of Engineers is one of the Federal agencies
22 that actually has some actions in the Middle

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 Columbia River steelhead, and what we did for the
2 Army Corps of Engineers is we presented them with
3 a list. We sat down and we prioritized our
4 recovery projects, and which ones had Army Corps
5 of Engineers' label on it, and then made a
6 determination as part of the steering group to
7 prioritize certain of those actions that we felt
8 the Army Corps could really help us implement.

9 Another effort that came out of this
10 Mid-C forum and steering committee effort, the
11 Middle Columbia overshoot phenomenon, which is a
12 phenomenon where the fish overshoot their streams
13 on their way back from the ocean. That is
14 something that we don't know much about, but that
15 phenomenon is happening apparently all over the
16 Middle Columbia River.

17 That effort, by having a workshop on
18 that, has led to a real science team effort on
19 more monitoring and research, which is something
20 that we needed to do in the Mid-C.

21 MS. MORRIS: Nora, I'm going to break in
22 here. Our agenda calls for us to divide into

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 subcommittees at this point. I think we will save
2 the rest of your presentation for the Protected
3 Resources Subcommittee which will start as soon as
4 we can split into subcommittee groups.

5 MS. BERWICK: Right, this goes right
6 into what we need to talk about this afternoon.

7 MS. MORRIS: Great. Who can tell the
8 various subcommittees where to meet?

9 MS. LOVETT: You walk out into the
10 hallway and you go towards the stairs, you will
11 see an open door, and in that room there are two
12 sets of tables set up for breakout. One is going
13 to be the strategic planning group with Julie.

14 MS. MORRIS: If people want to go to the
15 science center tour, where should they meet and
16 when?

17 MS. LOVETT: I would say the bus should
18 be here by 3:15, before 3:15. We were planning on
19 leaving at 3:30. Everybody should take their
20 computers back to their room, and we need to get
21 our computers up to the room. I would say if we
22 could meet by 3:25 at the front door, that should

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 be good.

2 MS. MORRIS: Everybody know where they
3 are going next and where they need to be before
4 3:30 in order to go on the tour? We will
5 reconvene back in this room at 8:30 tomorrow
6 morning.

7 (Whereupon, the PROCEEDINGS were
8 adjourned.)

9 * * * * *

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

2 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

3 I, Carleton J. Anderson, III, notary
4 public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia, do
5 hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was
6 duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under
7 my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell
8 the truth under penalty of perjury; that said
9 transcript is a true record of the testimony given
10 by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for,
11 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
12 the action in which this proceeding was called;
13 and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or
14 employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
15 parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
16 interested in the outcome of this action.

17
18 (Signature and Seal on File)

19 Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of
20 Virginia

21 My Commission Expires: November 30, 2016

22 Notary Public Number 351998

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100