

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Portland, Oregon  
Wednesday, April 27, 2016

## 1 PARTICIPANTS:

## 2 Members:

3 TED AMES  
4 Senior Advisor

5 TERRI LEE BEIDEMAN  
6 Chief Executive Officer  
7 Vast Array Corporation

8 JULIE BONNEY  
9 Executive Director  
10 Alaska Groundfish Data Bank, Inc.

11 DICK BRAME  
12 Director  
13 Atlantic States Fisheries

14 HEATHER BRANDON  
15 Coordinator  
16 Ocean Policy

17 COLUMBUS BROWN  
18 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

19 JOHN CORBIN  
20 Co-Chair  
21 Commerce Subcommittee

22 DAVID DONALDSON  
Executive Director  
GSMFC

RAIMUNDO ESPINOZA  
Environmental Consultant, Puerto Rico

ERIKA FELLER  
Program Director  
North American Fisheries

21  
22

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 LIZ HAMILTON  
Founding Executive Director  
3 Northwest Sportsfishing Industry Association

4 MICAH McCARTY  
Makah Tribe Chairman

5  
6 PETER MOORE  
Stakeholder Liaison  
Mid Atlantic Regional Association Coastal Ocean  
7 Observing System

8 JULIE MORRIS  
Chair

9  
10 MIKE OKKONIEWSKI  
Pacific Coast Seafood

11 JIM PARSONS  
Fish Biologist  
12 Owner, Troutlodge

13 HARLON PEARCE  
Owner and Operator  
14 Harlon's LA Fish LLC

15 HENRY SESEPASARA  
Vice Chair, Commercial Fishing Member

16  
17 PETER SHELLEY  
NEFMC

18 PAM YOCHER  
Chair  
19 Ecosystems Approach Subcommittee

20 NOAA FISHERIES STAFF:

21 PAUL DOREMUS  
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations

22

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 HEIDI LOVETT  
NOAA, Policy Analyst

3 JENNIFER LUKENS  
4 Director  
Office of Policy

5 ALESIA READ  
6 Office of Communications

7 EILEEN SOBECK  
Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

8 KRISTINA TROTTA  
9 Program Analyst

10

11 \* \* \* \* \*

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ITEM:	PAGE
3	Commerce Subcommittee	13
4	Strategic Planning, Budget, and Program Management Subcommittee	47
5	Advances in Electronic Monitoring	93
6	Protected Resources Subcommittee	156
7	Hatchery Genetic Management Plans	162
8	Draft National Bycatch Reduction Strategy	172
9	Resilience Working Group	181
10	Close Out: Review of Decisions, Action Items, Next Steps	212
11		
12	Adjourn	225

13

14

15

\* \* \* \* \*

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

2 (9:00 a.m.)

3 MS. MORRIS: Okay, welcome, everybody.  
4 Thank you for being here on time, and Paul would  
5 like to say something.

6 DR. DOREMUS: All right, before we get  
7 formally underway, I wanted to thank Mike for the  
8 great plant tour yesterday. It was wonderful to  
9 see your operation (Applause).

10 (Simultaneous discussion)

11 DR. DOREMUS: It's quite a business  
12 story that you did.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: We really appreciate  
14 the fact that you guys took the time to come over  
15 and Heidi and Jennifer, that you guys got the  
16 schedule rearranged so you could do it. We're  
17 obviously a little bit proud about what we do.  
18 But you know, it really means a lot to have you  
19 guys give it a positive review, I guess, so thanks  
20 a lot.

21 DR. DOREMUS: Well, thank you. It was  
22 very good --

1                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: I thank Liz for that  
2 wonderful dinner.

3                   DR. DOREMUS: Well, that was my next --

4                   SPEAKER: The seafood was great, winding  
5 that all up.

6                   SPEAKER: Yeah.

7                   DR. DOREMUS: That was fabulous. But  
8 let me say, I was really impressed with your  
9 husband's grillmanship.

10                  MS. MORRIS: Yeah. (Laughter) He likes  
11 that grill, doesn't he (Laughter)?

12                  DR. DOREMUS: Super fish, but superbly  
13 prepared, and you were so lovely to turn over your  
14 entire house to this gigantic crew --

15                                 (Simultaneous discussion)

16                  DR. DOREMUS: With this 55 foot long bus  
17 showing up in your driveway --

18                  MS. MORRIS: (Laughter) That was a  
19 blast. It was really --

20                                 (Simultaneous discussion)

21                  MS. MORRIS: But I have a funny story to  
22 share with you guys afterwards. One of the local

1 mill people was there that my husband used to work  
2 for, and everybody laughed. They were so  
3 impressed with you guys, because that's really  
4 rare hair (sic) you guys. (Laughter)

5 MS. MORRIS: No, he was just very  
6 impressed with all of the people.

7 DR. DOREMUS: Well, it was wonderful of  
8 you to host such a -- all of us. And it was an  
9 absolutely splendid dinner, and a nice opportunity  
10 to talk with people casually. So, thank you very  
11 much for that.

12 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. I loved having  
13 all of you.

14 DR. DOREMUS: So, thank you for the  
15 digression, but I really wanted to acknowledge the  
16 hospitality from you guys. Thank you very much.

17 MS. MORRIS: It was fun.

18 (Discussion off the record)

19 SPEAKER: But it also emphasizes how  
20 valuable and important it is to meet outside of  
21 Silver Spring.

22 SPEAKER: You guys ought to do it in

1 Alaska.

2 DR. DOREMUS: Oh, I've heard a lot of  
3 bad ideas (Laughter) about Alaska.

4 SPEAKER: You have. Right? (Laughter)

5 DR. DOREMUS: Puerto Rico is running  
6 pretty high on the list right now.

7 SPEAKER: All right.

8 SPEAKER: All right.

9 DR. DOREMUS: There's been a new member  
10 trying to get us all to realize that that's a --  
11 seeing different parts of the world.

12 SPEAKER: Where do we start now?

13 (Laughter)

14 DR. DOREMUS: More on that later

15 (Laughter).

16 SPEAKER: More on that later.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so this is what we  
18 have ahead of us today. We have about a half an  
19 hour of discussion about Congress appointed stuff,  
20 including some remarks from John about what the  
21 Aquaculture Task Force has been -- the report that  
22 they concluded.

1                   Then, we're going to spend about an hour  
2                   in a session led by Erika Feller about what the  
3                   heck should the strategic planning budget and  
4                   program management subcommittee be working on.  
5                   And that will start with a sort of review by  
6                   Jennifer of things that this subcommittee has done  
7                   in the past that have been valued by the agency,  
8                   and how those have kind of unfolded.

9                   And so, we'll be thinking about what  
10                  work -- kind of an initial work plan for this new  
11                  subcommittee that Erika is going to be -- this old  
12                  subcommittee that Erika will be leading for the  
13                  next period of time -- could do that would be  
14                  productive and valued.

15                 SPEAKER: Julie?

16                 MS. MORRIS: Yes?

17                 SPEAKER: Can you speak up just a little  
18                 bit? There's kind of a humming noise?

19                 MS. MORRIS: Oh, I'm sorry. And I also  
20                 spoke about -- do you want me to repeat what I  
21                 just said?

22                 SPEAKER: If it includes me, yes

1 (Laughter).

2 SPEAKER: And me over here, too.

3 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so we have a standing  
4 subcommittee on the strategic planning budget and  
5 program management. Erika is the new chair of  
6 that subcommittee, and she would like us to  
7 brainstorm a bit about what are the important  
8 things that that subcommittee should be working on  
9 for the next year or so.

10 And to kick that off, Jennifer is going  
11 to quickly review things that that subcommittee  
12 has done in the past that have been valued and  
13 important work. And so, that's just part of  
14 what's coming up this morning.

15 And then, we're going to have a  
16 presentation by Randy and one of his staff members  
17 about advances in electronic monitoring here on  
18 the Pacific Coast. And then, we'll have some  
19 report-outs from work that's been going on in  
20 subcommittees during this meeting, and that will  
21 include a report from Heather about the director's  
22 meeting and the protected resources subcommittee.

1 We're going to look at what Julie and Dick have  
2 pulled together from our discussion about habitat  
3 generic -- hatchery (Laughter) -- hatchery genetic  
4 monitoring plans -- measurement plans. I'm having  
5 trouble with my words this morning.

6           And then, I tried to distill our  
7 extended conversation about the bycatch strategy.  
8 Mike's currently reviewing my distillation of  
9 that, and we'll circulate that on email and show  
10 it to you. And that would be the intermediate  
11 step between our discussion on Monday and our  
12 potential comment letter that we would send in on  
13 June 3rd.

14           And then, Terry and Ted will report on  
15 what's going with the resilience working groups,  
16 and then we'll talk about what we're doing next,  
17 what we're doing between now and November and  
18 adjourn. So, the agenda shows us adjourning  
19 around 2:30. I know from past experience that  
20 people get kind of like oh wow, if we could leave  
21 early, we could not have to break for lunch and  
22 then come back, and then everybody could be on

1 their way in a quicker time.

2 But you know, we need to take the time  
3 to -- so, I'm going to adjust your expectations.  
4 We will be done by 2:30 at the latest. We might  
5 be done earlier, but I'm not going to push good  
6 work aside in order to race to end the meeting.  
7 Any questions about the day's agenda? Yes?

8 SPEAKER: Just one clarification about  
9 the bycatch strategy.

10 MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

11 SPEAKER: We, you know, kind of had a  
12 roundtable discussion and generated some comments.

13 MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

14 SPEAKER: So when we go to this next  
15 step, where we added a lot of the add --  
16 additional ideas to the pot, or are we just more  
17 fully flushing out what we talked about/

18 MS. MORRIS: In my distillation work, I  
19 was trying to condense, but yes, we're going to  
20 always add good ideas to the pot, and of course,  
21 they will be reviewed by everyone before we  
22 finalize the comment letter.

1                   Okay, so first agenda items. There's  
2                   this question that Michelle brought up in the past  
3                   -- on a conference call in the past three or four  
4                   months that we visited before, about whether the  
5                   commerce subcommittee should be reconfigured to be  
6                   a commercial fishing subcommittee, and an  
7                   additional aquaculture subcommittee. Right now,  
8                   those are sort of combined in one subcommittee.

9                   And so, let me open this discussion by  
10                  saying that the web pages say that the commerce  
11                  subcommittee reviews and advises on fishery  
12                  management and emergence socioeconomic issues such  
13                  as off shore aquaculture, seafood technology and  
14                  consumer interests. And it oversees the work and  
15                  assignments to the Aquaculture Task Force.

16                  And then, our charter says that we may  
17                  establish subcommittees with the approval of NIMS.  
18                  We can establish subcommittees or working groups  
19                  of its members as necessary, subject to the  
20                  provisions of FACA, and that MAFAC can establish  
21                  with the approval of NIMS, task forces consisting  
22                  of MAFAC members and outside experts as may be

1 necessary, subject to the provision of FACA; and  
2 that all subcommittees, working groups and task  
3 forces will report back to the parent committee  
4 and will not provide advice or work products  
5 directly to NIMS.

6           So, those are sort of the founding  
7 principles about our committees and subcommittees.  
8 We've had conversations about this split before  
9 and decided not to do it, so I'm just opening a  
10 conversation about whether we should stick with  
11 what we have, or whether we want to divide and  
12 have separate focuses for two subcommittees. Any  
13 comments?

14                           (Pause)

15           MR. RHEAULT: Dive right in, I guess. I  
16 find that cross pollination immensely valuable, so  
17 I would support keeping it together.

18           MS. MORRIS: Okay. Yes, Terri?

19           MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm going to say I would  
20 also support keeping it together. There's  
21 sometimes quite a workload, and having more hands  
22 is better and different perspectives. I don't

1       feel overwhelmed by aquaculture in that committee,  
2       and there's a lot of crossover, but I think our  
3       voices are heard for the wild fish fisheries,  
4       also. So, I don't -- I don't oppose it. I see  
5       new members that are in, you know, the wild fish  
6       center, which I think was Michelle's concern.

7                   MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

8                   MS. BEIDEMAN: It was becoming  
9       dominated. I don't feel that way.

10                  MS. MORRIS: Okay. Any other comments,  
11       any -- yes, John?

12                  MR. CORBIN: Yeah, I would just say I  
13       think it's worked well so far. I think having a  
14       diversity of opinions is a good thing, and the  
15       products are better than they were.

16                  MR. RHEALT: And if I may just add that  
17       it's not really a black and white situation.  
18       There's a spectrum of approaches. Really, there's  
19       a lot of gray areas where there is stock  
20       enhancement to improve wild harvest fisheries, and  
21       we collect wild spat to grow muscles. There's a  
22       lot of gray areas in there, and I don't think it's

1 helpful to view it as a black and white situation.  
2 There's a spectrum of activities that actually can  
3 be considered part aquaculture, part fishery.

4 MS. MORRIS: Yes? Jim?

5 MR. PARSONS: I would just add -- you  
6 know, I think we saw yesterday in the Pacific that  
7 you know, these -- both activities are being  
8 encompassed by single organizations, and I think  
9 that's an important thing to remember as we look  
10 at it. But the two aren't necessarily exclusive,  
11 and shouldn't be. I think we can learn from each  
12 other, and each part is necessary.

13 MS. MORRIS: Julie?

14 MS. BONNEY: So, as the co-chair of the  
15 Congress committee and also having Jeff in my ear,  
16 I think that one -- I agree with all of the  
17 comments up to this point, and I think that there  
18 is a lot of cross pollination. But I think it's  
19 really up to the chairs to figure out what issues  
20 need to be addressed.

21 And so, if there are -- so, I think it's  
22 important for either sector. Sometimes, things

1       come from on high down to the committee, and  
2       sometimes it's good to have issues come from the  
3       committee and move up. So, I think in the future,  
4       that might be a thing to -- on all of the  
5       committees, so we're doing that with Erika's group  
6       today.

7                   And maybe you can call this committee at  
8       some point should be thinking about whether there  
9       are issues wild or aquaculture, because  
10      aquaculture has had a big task force and a big  
11      effort. There really hasn't been any type of  
12      drive on the wild fish side. So, just to make  
13      sure we aren't missing anything, we should do  
14      that. But I agree that it makes sense to have the  
15      committee, as a group, and having different  
16      perspectives is good, and there is a lot of cross  
17      discussion. That would be my suggestion.

18                   MS. MORRIS: Harlon?

19                   MR. PEARCE: Yeah, you know, I'm new to  
20      this issue too, guys, on this discussion, and I  
21      can tell you that where I come from, including the  
22      commercial fisherman, not fisheries -- it's very

1 important in this thought process. The biggest  
2 problem we'll have in the Gulf is winning over the  
3 commercial fisherman's thought process. So, he  
4 has to be a part of that program and a part of our  
5 thought process and how to meld it all together.

6 Because a lot of what is going to be  
7 good about any aquaculture in the Gulf is that  
8 there's new jobs in the world for people that are  
9 in the industry already. And they can make it  
10 clear to these individuals that this isn't going  
11 to hurt what they're doing already. It's going to  
12 enhance what they're doing. Plus, it should  
13 support the development of a stronger fishery, not  
14 a weaker one. Their inclusion of the fisherman in  
15 that socialized aspect of it.

16 MS. MORRIS: Ted?

17 (No response heard)

18 MS. MORRIS: Ted?

19 MR. AMES: Yeah. I endorse Harlon's  
20 position, that the resistance for aquaculture is  
21 deep rooted in the fishing community, primarily  
22 because they feel as though they're losing access

1 to our fishing rights. And they really need to be  
2 part of the process to understand that it can be  
3 conducted in a way that benefits them, as well as  
4 the aquaculture industry.

5 I've struggled with this for some time,  
6 because of that obstacle, but the reality is, you  
7 need a table for everyone to hash out the  
8 complications and difficulties. We have that here  
9 in MAFAC, and if we are to go forward  
10 constructively, we have to have that rich debate  
11 that's got to happen in arenas like this, but  
12 also, with a place at the table for the fishing  
13 community.

14 MS. MORRIS: So, am I reading  
15 everybody's comments right, that at this point, we  
16 do not support splitting commerce into two, and  
17 that we think it's working well? And that if  
18 commercial fishing interests need to be amplified  
19 a little bit in that committee, that's a  
20 leadership decision that the chair of the  
21 committee should be -- kind of encourage more of  
22 that kind of activity. Is that a kind of summary

1 of where we are on that?

2 (No response heard)

3 MS. MORRIS: Any opposition to -- any  
4 voices that need to still be heard on this before  
5 we move on to the aquaculture report from John?

6 MR. RHEALT: I would only say from the  
7 fisheries' vantage point, it's very encouraging to  
8 hear the direction of your thinking on this. We  
9 fully concur when we think about the future  
10 sustainable seafood supply in the United States,  
11 that it would encompass the entirety of what the  
12 subcommittee do in all the ways that you have  
13 described. So, I'm very pleased to hear the  
14 direction of the committee in that regard.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Thank you. Thank  
16 you for that. John?

17 MR. CORBIN: Okay, thank you, Julie.  
18 The Aquaculture Task Force has completed its work  
19 on the initial two tasks, and we thought it would  
20 be a good idea to brief MAFAC with a completion  
21 report. And not only to reflect on what was done,  
22 but some of the results of the task force went

1 directly to NOAA and the Office of Aquaculture,  
2 and not through the MAFAC process that we would do  
3 that. So, that's what I'm going to do. I'm going  
4 to try and pull out some highlights of the report  
5 and the status of the issues.

6           So, these are the two tasks that were  
7 assigned to the Aquaculture Task Force. The  
8 review and the progress in the 10 year plan for  
9 Marine Aquaculture. This is something that was  
10 requested by MAFAC in 2000, and published in 2007,  
11 and we also were asked by the Office of  
12 Aquaculture to help in preparing the new five year  
13 strategic plan that will have efforts going  
14 forward.

15           Task two. We were asked to prove -- to  
16 work with the interagency working group on  
17 aquaculture. They have a regulatory task force,  
18 and develop a mock commercial project, and provide  
19 feedback on something called a draft coordinated  
20 permit process. Actually, the mock project idea  
21 actually came from MAFAC.

22           Task one will require three reviews.

1 The first was draft strategic priorities, and some  
2 of you may remember that we divided those to  
3 MAFAC, and MAFAC made some additional changes.  
4 Next, the Aquaculture Task Force reviewed this  
5 detailed progress report on the implementation of  
6 the 10 year plan, and the Office of Aquaculture  
7 really did a thorough job, and they looked at  
8 program structure. They looked at projects. They  
9 looked at what was accomplished or wasn't  
10 accomplished. And the task force provided very  
11 detailed comments on that, and provided those  
12 directly to the Office of Aquaculture.

13 And then lastly, we reviewed the draft's  
14 new plan -- actually, several drafts of the new  
15 plan, and provided comments to MAFAC, which MAFAC  
16 reviewed and forwarded to NOAA leadership and the  
17 aquaculture office.

18 I'm going to just mention the comments  
19 on the progress report, since MAFAC really didn't  
20 see those, and just the -- really the biggest  
21 concerns that we had. These are recurring  
22 challenges over the eight years that NOAA made an

1 effort to implement this plan. Members questioned  
2 NOAA's commitment to marine aquaculture  
3 development due to the lack of significant  
4 progress.

5 No permits were issued for the fish  
6 farming in federal waters, which was a primary  
7 goal. The Gulf rule to implement the Gulf  
8 aquaculture for marine aquaculture, which was  
9 finalized in 2009 was not adopted, and a permanent  
10 process was not it's not established. So, at the  
11 beginning of our ATF review, these things were  
12 very obvious.

13 In terms of the results of the three  
14 reviews, I think we can say that ATF and MAFAC  
15 recommendations did have some significant impacts  
16 on the content of the draft plan, the early  
17 drafts, pre public review. Goals were changed,  
18 and sections were rewritten. Action items were  
19 added and changed. More emphasis was placed on  
20 fixing the regulatory climate, which is a big  
21 concern of members, and particularly the  
22 regulatory climate and the federal waters.

1                   Regarding the current status, the new  
2                   plan has received public review, and the comments  
3                   are being dissassimilated by the Office of  
4                   Aquaculture, but it's not been published by NOAA  
5                   as yet, so the full impact of the MAFAC process  
6                   and the input really isn't know at this time.

7                   Task two was a mock project. This  
8                   action was really trying to take advantage of the  
9                   experienced fish farmers. There were probably  
10                  about six members that experience in citing and  
11                  operating fish farms, and we wanted to develop a  
12                  representative commercial project to run through  
13                  the process as defined by the rules. You can see  
14                  some of the project details.

15                  We came up with a name -- not very  
16                  creative, called Mock fish farm. Chose Red Drum,  
17                  because there is the commercial scale culture  
18                  techniques available -- hatchery particularly.  
19                  Production level is 12 million pounds, which is  
20                  the maximum allowed by the rule for any one farm.  
21                  The permit term is 10 years, and that's also the  
22                  maximum allowed by the rule. The site we chose is

1 33 miles off Texas. It would be 840 surface acres  
2 for 14 cages for build out.

3 I want to say a word about the coastal  
4 aquaculture planning and environmental  
5 sustainability program which is in the National  
6 Ocean Service. Really couldn't have done the  
7 characterizing of this project in such detail  
8 without them. They have tremendous resources in  
9 terms of marine spatial planning and GSI, and  
10 basically, we went from a list of 15 projects to  
11 looking at three project sites in detail, and then  
12 came down to this one that we actually filled out  
13 the application and so on. So, Cage Set is going  
14 to be a tremendous asset in aquaculture going  
15 forward in the Gulf and elsewhere.

16 MS. MORRIS: John, do you want to take a  
17 question, or do you want to wait till the end?

18 MR. CORBIN: Can we wait till the end?

19 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

20 MR. CORBIN: Yeah, let me just get  
21 through this. In terms of mock program, the next  
22 thing we did was look at a pre-application

1 checklist. The purpose of this was to guide  
2 applicants in gathering information and providing  
3 initial project and site descriptions for the  
4 regulatory agencies.

5 This was developed by the Gulf regional  
6 aquaculture coordinator. We went through a back  
7 and forth process in terms of detailing the kinds  
8 of information that we thought was needed. It  
9 includes species and production levels, feeding  
10 rates, source of root stock, site location and  
11 maps, site characteristics, depth currents,  
12 seasonal temperatures, a site plan and  
13 construction timeline. So, in the process of  
14 developing the final list, ATF made suggestions  
15 and comments to help improve the original draft.

16 The next step in this was simulated  
17 pre-application meeting, which the format was a  
18 conference call. I took this as being similar to  
19 a scoping meeting for environmental sessions and  
20 environmental impact statements. So, it basically  
21 was to present the preliminary project details to  
22 agencies and get feedback prior to filling out an

1 application.

2           The stakeholder agencies included NOAA  
3 fisheries, Environmental Protection Agency, the  
4 Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Energy  
5 Management, the U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
6 U.S. Coast Guard, the Bureau of Safety and  
7 Environmental Enforcement, which is another oil  
8 and gas agency, and the U.S. Fishing and Wildlife  
9 Service.

10           We did have some major concerns with  
11 this step, and the recent coordinator's role  
12 seemed to be limited to just facilitating the  
13 Miller Permit and not all three permits, and the  
14 various consultations. So, it appeared that there  
15 was really no overall coordinator for the  
16 coordinated permit process.

17           The conference call format, as I  
18 mentioned yesterday, really didn't seem to work  
19 very well. Of course, this was the first, and  
20 it's going to be a challenge to use that format,  
21 so we really asked them to look at exploring face  
22 to face kinds of meetings, rather than that. And

1 then, both the agencies and the applicants really  
2 needed to prepare more to get the benefit of that  
3 process.

4 In terms of the next step, NOAA  
5 developed a permits guide, about 25 pages. The  
6 purpose was really to lay out the process for  
7 applicants. ATF's role was to have experienced  
8 fish farmers to review that guide for clarity,  
9 completeness, usefulness, and really, our thought  
10 was this guide should give the user a working  
11 understanding of the process, the complexity, the  
12 information needs, time, cost and a sense of the  
13 risk involved in entering into the process.

14 Again, we did have some concerns. The  
15 Gulf regional agriculture coordinator really  
16 should provide overall process facilitation and  
17 leadership. That would seem to be the appropriate  
18 person to do that, since NOAA really is a lead  
19 agency for Marine aquaculture in the federal  
20 government. So, that stood out as really one sort  
21 of major concern.

22 Regarding the mock project, turning to

1 overall results, the ATF made numerous comments on  
2 the checklist and the agency meeting and the  
3 permits guide. The checklist was improved, I  
4 think, and made more complete. Agencies did get  
5 an introduction to an off-shore aquaculture  
6 project. It was sort of obvious during the call  
7 that some of them really hadn't been exposed to  
8 off-shore aquaculture in their job.

9 But there are a few changes in the  
10 permit guide, but very few. So, there's a big  
11 difference of opinion as to really, how much  
12 detail is needed in the permits guide for it to be  
13 effective for an applicant.

14 In terms of current status, as was  
15 stated during this meeting, the final rule was  
16 filed on January 11th, 2016, and a web site with  
17 all of the relevant information to apply for a  
18 site was launched in February. So, it's up and  
19 running, and we'll see how the industry responds  
20 to it.

21 In terms of conclusions, I think MAFAC  
22 and the ATF made beneficial suggestions, and there

1       were changes to the draft five year plan and  
2       permanent checklist. Regulatory agencies really  
3       complimented us for doing the mock project and  
4       getting them thinking about this before they  
5       received real applications.

6                We'd have to note that at the beginning  
7       of this process, there was no five year plan, and  
8       there was no process to get a permit for  
9       aquaculture in federal waters for the Gulf and now  
10      there are. So, we need to compliment NOAA for  
11      moving forward on those. There are opportunities  
12      -- I think in addition, there are opportunities to  
13      see if there -- for future MAFAC -- see if MAFAC's  
14      review impacted future aspects.

15               When the five year plan is published, I  
16      think we can hopefully see some influences. Also,  
17      during the implementation of the fiscal year '16,  
18      all -- and then the preparation of the fiscal '17  
19      budget. I think MAFAC should monitor those to see  
20      what changes have been made.

21               Lastly, in terms of measuring success,  
22      we wish to note a paper by Knapp and Rubino that

1 provides an opportunity for MAFAC to really  
2 benchmark the status of marine aquaculture  
3 industry as of 2016. Gunnar Knapp is a respected  
4 fishery and aquaculture economist with University  
5 of Alaska. Of course, Michael Rubino is the head  
6 of the Office of Aquaculture.

7           And this paper does a really good job in  
8 describing the current status of the industry and  
9 what's currently going on. It provides five broad  
10 strategies to address very critical issues, and  
11 those are listed here. MAFAC could use this paper  
12 and the five year plan for monitoring industry  
13 progress in years ahead, and in fact, in 2021,  
14 compare the status of the industry to the 2016  
15 status to see how far the industry has come.

16           And I'd just like to thank all the  
17 members of the ATF and the MAFAC staff for  
18 persevering with me through this process. It's  
19 had its ups and downs. And thanks to the MAFAC  
20 members for the support of the reports that the  
21 task force made known.

22           Thank you.

1                   MS. MORRIS: John, Harlon had a question  
2 or a comment.

3                   MR. CORBIN: Sure.

4                   MR. PEARCE: First off, I'm totally  
5 wowed, let's make that clear. I'm totally emerged  
6 in the wild fisherman world of the great state of  
7 Alaska. But I want to make it clear that I'm a  
8 very strong aquaculture proponent at the same  
9 time, because I think they will work together and  
10 can work together. But they have to be very  
11 cautious about how that mixes and how we make it  
12 work, and how we satisfy the concerns, not only of  
13 the commercial component, but of the recreational  
14 component as well, as part of this thought  
15 process, as you move forward.

16                   As I look at this and talk with Michael  
17 Rubino and Paul and the others about how I feel  
18 about the process, the protection of the wild  
19 industry is of the utmost importance for this  
20 committee. If we don't make them feel very  
21 comfortable, then what we're doing is not going to  
22 harm their market or their pricing structure,

1 industries or whatever or the rules within the  
2 states.

3 The way I look at it, everything here  
4 was done really well. The mock simulation and how  
5 it was put together. But I still see that mock  
6 addresses parts of that puzzle and starts putting  
7 it together. And Paul, if I may, I'm going to  
8 kind of talk about that.

9 DR. DOREMUS: Go ahead.

10 MR. PEARCE: I really believe that  
11 without the inclusion of other stakeholders, not  
12 only in the Gulf, but in this country, play a part  
13 in the development and the strength of an  
14 aquaculture program developments. Let me try and  
15 put in perspective to -- looking at 12 million --  
16 in the year -- I guess that's a year, the mock  
17 programs.

18 You're looking at over 48,000 filets a  
19 year. You're looking at about 80,000 pounds of  
20 filets at least that would come into a marketplace  
21 that's not there. Okay? It's not.

22 The way I view the agriculture of Red

1 Drums aquaculture right now is it's basically --  
2 and some other people may have an idea, but it's  
3 pretty much there only to keep price up, not to  
4 create volume. It's there to have cons (sic) --  
5 it's do the job and have to keep the market hungry  
6 enough to pay the higher price that they're going  
7 to get.

8 The program that we're talking about is  
9 not exactly that type of program. I don't see it  
10 out there. In order for us to do our job for the  
11 country and citizens of this country. We have to  
12 put a moderately priced protein on a separate  
13 plate across this country to make it work. At the  
14 same time, elevating the wild stocks to the level  
15 of copper (sic) or salmon or stuff like that.

16 So, the missing component, as I see it,  
17 and there are two or three missing components as I  
18 see it. First off, there's other entities in the  
19 Gulf that people like that are -- they don't have  
20 a place for people right now, but they want to put  
21 them up.

22 But the main component that's

1 interesting that is not there and we might issue  
2 is the major distributors across this country, if  
3 they would have a part in what goes on in whatever  
4 agriculture we start in the Gulf or anywhere, so  
5 that you don't make mistakes of the beginning  
6 salmon and the price and just go (indicating)  
7 because the markets are not there.

8           If you don't have a strong market base  
9 to do this, you're going in the wrong direction.  
10 You're going to lose. You're going to lose the  
11 stuff that commercial fisherman's (sic) -- and  
12 you're going to lose a lot of people for the  
13 length of time that you can get that straightened  
14 out.

15           So, I noticed that you were putting on a  
16 roundtable so as to gather with agriculture or so  
17 whatever and some suggestions that you made.  
18 Well, part of that discussion is going to happen  
19 including major distributors from this country  
20 like Costco. Mike, you'll always have a guide be  
21 here at that table so that they can hash out sort  
22 of where this is going; what levels the market

1 needs to be at so they can work nationally.  
2 Because you know what you're going to have to  
3 price-wise and that's going to supplant the  
4 imports.

5 We need to have better domestic products  
6 on the markets in this country for many, many  
7 reasons. But the inclusion of distribution, to  
8 me, is extremely important. And it really wasn't  
9 there as much.

10 The Chinese are very good at production  
11 and process. They're terrible at marketing. We  
12 need to learn our lessons from that.

13 The salmon guys had the same problem.  
14 So, we need not fall into that trap right now. We  
15 need to make sure that we have the whole idea laid  
16 out flat so that that commercial fisherman in  
17 Massachusetts, or anywhere, feels very comfortable  
18 with what we're trying to do help them. Actually,  
19 to help them with their jobs and to help their  
20 industry thrive at the same time.

21 Because I was very -- I couldn't be  
22 involved in the trainer/breeder program, the thing

1       that hurt us the worst in my area was loss of a  
2       place to tape and not having the privacy to do it  
3       reduction closures infrastructure -- whatever it  
4       was, and getting -- getting that place back to  
5       take on the jobs.

6                 With aquaculture, that won't be a  
7       problem. We'll have ways to fend that off and  
8       have those markets stable, as well as the  
9       aquaculture markets. We won't have that major  
10      situation that we would have. To me, it's like  
11      what Julie said, be proactive and not reactive.  
12      Be proactive by having great results and doing the  
13      job that you need to do.

14                But all segments of this market must be  
15      included in the development of this process and  
16      learn our lessons from the Chinese, learn our  
17      lessons from the other markets and have that  
18      market pretty much laid out at the same time we're  
19      laying out our land for the fishing. And I think  
20      that if we do that, we will put fish on the tables  
21      across this country. We will make the commercial  
22      fishermen happier. We will make the recreational

1 fishermen happier. There's so many things that  
2 will happen if we do these things right. If we  
3 just have tunnel vision and look at what we do,  
4 it's not going to work.

5 MS. MORRIS: So, Harlon?

6 MR. PEARCE: Yes.

7 MS. MORRIS: I think you've made your  
8 points. Am I right?

9 MR. PEARCE: Absolutely.

10 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. And we have  
11 time for a few more focused comments in response  
12 to the report from John. Mike?

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, what we're  
14 talking about is creating a supply chain, and  
15 people, including myself -- I'm not an expert on  
16 it, but I know I know enough now to know that what  
17 Harlon's talking about it absolutely essential if  
18 this program is not going to just go off the cliff  
19 at a certain point.

20 Per capita consumption is -- I think it  
21 goes between 14.5 and 16.5, somewhere in that  
22 area, for the U.S. And fresh fish is a whole

1 different ballgame from frozen fish. It's just --  
2 as we were expressing yesterday at the tour,  
3 timing is everything and marketing is everything.  
4 There is a job there just like catching or growing  
5 a fish is a job. And if they're not linked up  
6 from one point to the final point, you can have  
7 catastrophic economic failure.

8           And I think all of us want to see this  
9 succeed, not fall off a cliff. I know I certainly  
10 do, and I think it's a huge opportunity. We have  
11 to realize the per capita consumption. If you  
12 look at it just in those absolute terms, that  
13 means you've got to squeeze it in where something  
14 else was. We've got to grow per capita  
15 consumption, or you have to create export markets  
16 for all of the above. So, I mean what Harlon's on  
17 is right on (Laughter), spot on. So, I'll leave  
18 it at that.

19           MS. MORRIS: Any other focused comments?  
20 Yes, Pam?

21           MS. YOCHER: John, I'm wondering, and  
22 maybe Jim could comment on this, if you reached

1 out to NAA to see if there is -- are there people  
2 poised, you know, to move in, or do they feel like  
3 the risk is still too great? I know with the  
4 shellfish industry, you know, talking to Bob,  
5 permitting time went from two years to three  
6 months, and you know, the industry has just taken  
7 off.

8 And you mentioned the risk assessment as  
9 part of the evaluation. Just some feedback on  
10 what you're getting from investors.

11 MR. CORBIN: I guess I was say I don't  
12 know that people have examined the rule and the  
13 process from the Gulf a lot, but in my circles,  
14 there's interest. You know, investors are  
15 investing in Mexico. They're investing in Panama.  
16 And they would like to invest in the United  
17 States. And so, I think if the Gulf process is  
18 still being evaluated, people are aware. I mean,  
19 you read it. It's complicated. It's daunting.

20 Even though there is a coordinated  
21 permit process, there's three individual agency  
22 permits that are needed. I understand that

1       there's an MOU that will spell out how that will  
2       work. The ATF didn't have a chance to review  
3       that, but you know, it still needs to be  
4       coordinated. So, to answer your question, yes,  
5       there's interest. There's great interest, but  
6       this is only one region, and the idea is to use  
7       this, if it works in the other regions, which is  
8       -- you know, if it takes five years or nine years  
9       for each region, you know, this is not the way to  
10      go.

11                   So, NOAA itself, I think in its  
12      announcements has projected that the initial  
13      application may take two years. It's a long time.  
14      So, given the preliminary information that's  
15      coming out about this process and a review by an  
16      investor or someone, it's going to take some  
17      hand-holding. You know? Hence, our point about  
18      an overall facilitator from NOAA to hand hold  
19      through the --

20                   This is the way you do it at state  
21      level. Right? For state waters. For example, in  
22      Hawaii, our first off-shore farm took a year.

1        Basically, a similar permit situation. The second  
2        one took a little bit longer because of opposition  
3        in communities they had to work through. So, I  
4        guess they're going to need to see that NOAA wants  
5        this to happen, and they're going to need to see  
6        that they're sitting -- that they're facilitating  
7        and they're an advocate.

8                    And I would use that word -- you know,  
9        Bob used that word to talk to his group, and we  
10       really need advocacy for people to look at the  
11       risk and think that they can get through it.

12                   MS. MORRIS: Jim, did you want to say  
13       something?

14                   MR. PARSONS: Yeah, I just -- you know,  
15       I would kind of reiterate one of the points that  
16       John made, which is that people who are investing,  
17       particularly in fin fish are going to places that  
18       are more friendly towards -- the attitudes are  
19       more friendly. You've got Mexico, Panama, a lot  
20       of off-shore places that are wanting that  
21       business.

22                   And you know, with regards to the

1 consumption in the U.S. and the displacement of  
2 what's in the center of that plate, already, we're  
3 seeing that. You know? It's being displaced  
4 somewhat by certain aquaculture products, and  
5 they're not coming from the U.S. You've got  
6 salmon from Norway and Chile and tilapia from the  
7 globe.

8                   And you know, from a U.S. farmer's  
9 perspective, you know, that's where we begin to  
10 feel like hey, we're really missing the boat here.  
11 We shouldn't be forced to go somewhere else, when  
12 everybody else seems to be making this work and  
13 supplying fish to us. So, that's kind of I think  
14 where some of the aqua culturist come from.

15                   MS. MORRIS: Okay, Bob, then I'm hoping  
16 -- if you get my sense, I'm trying to wrap this  
17 up.

18                   MR. RHEAULT: Just a real quick comment.  
19 This production doesn't happen in a year. Gearing  
20 up with any project is going to take a few years  
21 to figure out to start. They're going to do it on  
22 a small scale. They're not going to jump in with

1 12 million pounds. They're going to figure out  
2 the bugs and ramp up, and that will allow the  
3 market to adjust.

4 MS. MORRIS: Last comment. Mike?

5 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just a short one.

6 MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I don't want my first  
8 comment to somehow be interpreted to mean that we  
9 don't support the development of this. We very  
10 much would like to see U.S. Production plan some  
11 of the outside export or import production. But  
12 doing it in a way that we can get the best results  
13 is, I think, very important.

14 MR. CORBIN: I would just add one -- the  
15 project that we defined for the mock project was  
16 an eight year phase. The phase-in to 12 million  
17 pounds. So, it does take time. The industry is  
18 aware that problems of scale and technology will  
19 need to be worked out along the way.

20 MS. MORRIS: So, John, I want to thank  
21 you for your leadership on this issue. I know  
22 that others here have worked hard on it, as well.

1 But you, in particular, have shown great patience  
2 and openness, at the same time as being very  
3 persistent and persevering about it. And I want  
4 to thank you personally for that, and I know that  
5 Irene recognized you on the first day, but I think  
6 we all appreciate the leadership that you've  
7 provided on this topic.

8 MR. CORBIN: Thank you.

9 SPEAKER: Excellent.

10 MS. MORRIS: So, ready to move on?

11 (No response heard)

12 MS. MORRIS: I know Ted wanted to say  
13 something. Bonnie wanted to say something. But  
14 it is time to move on to strategic planning.

15 SPEAKER: I just wonder what the future  
16 of the task force was.

17 MS. MORRIS: The task force has been  
18 continued. Right?

19 MR. CORBIN: My understanding is, you  
20 know, we voted that it should continue for a year,  
21 and part of that motion was that each member would  
22 be asked if they wanted to continue. To my

1 knowledge, that hasn't happened yet, but I have  
2 alerted the task force that there's records here.

3 SPEAKER: And so, do they have a charge?

4 MR. RHEAULT: We'll be touching on that  
5 shortly. They're weighing in on the aquaculture  
6 resiliency component that I'll be discussing  
7 briefly later.

8 SPEAKER: Okay.

9 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, yes, when we get  
10 to the --

11 MR. RHEAULT: Yeah.

12 MS. MORRIS: Yes (Laughter). Resiliency  
13 task force reports, you're going to chime in.

14 MR. RHEAULT: Briefly.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, next, we're  
16 going to hear from Jennifer as an introduction to  
17 the strategic planning budget and program  
18 management issue.

19 MS. LUKENS: Okay. Thank you. I had  
20 gotten together with Erika and Julie to talk about  
21 what -- for this session, to talk about how to  
22 define where this subcommittee is going to be

1 going, and I offered to give some reference points  
2 of what this subcommittee has done in the past  
3 just for context of your discussion this morning,  
4 and some strategic planning that's going on from  
5 the department level all the way down to the  
6 regional office and science center level.

7           So, here is a list of some of the  
8 selected things that this subcommittee has  
9 provided to NOAA in the past. There has been two  
10 versions of Vision 2020. One was first put out in  
11 2007. The second one was put out in December,  
12 2012. And that document really has been used for  
13 a variety of different purposes, but most likely,  
14 MAFAC's touching on the different components of  
15 NOAA fisheries and more of an educational  
16 document. I think MAFAC used it. Members have  
17 used it as they do some outreach materials in the  
18 past. It is also being used by NOAA fisheries in  
19 a variety of different ways since then.

20           Another thing, the second bullet there  
21 is MAFAC was involved in October of 2012 doing --  
22 running through budget prioritization exercise.

1       You see that timeline there? That's where we ran  
2       into a few little budget SNAFUs at the federal  
3       level, and looking at budgets really going down in  
4       sequestration and all of those conversations.

5               NOAA Fisheries really relied upon an  
6       exercise that MAFAC did looking at level funding  
7       -- a 20 percent decrease in funding and a 10  
8       percent increase in funding. They went through 10  
9       different categories that they wanted to invest;  
10      that they would choose to invest priorities for  
11      funding. That was provided to NOAA, and a lot of  
12      our own leadership counsel led by Paul. They are  
13      going through that exercise of what we would  
14      across a variety of different scenarios; funding  
15      scenarios, level and above and a couple of  
16      scenarios below current levels. So, that was used  
17      by NOAA.

18              Another several different types of  
19      comments have been submitted by this subcommittee  
20      to NOAA that we have used, looking at comments on  
21      the National Ocean Council's strategic action plan  
22      outlines, providing input to our next generation's

1 strategic plan. I believe that Paul came back and  
2 actually made a presentation to MAFAC on how that  
3 was used in 2010 when he was in his role as  
4 program planning and integration office that was  
5 responsible for that.

6 Also, provided comments things like the  
7 NOAA draft pet shares policy, which was used  
8 extensively by our staff as they were putting out  
9 the final version of that. And then also, for a  
10 transition from the first version of the Vision  
11 2020 document was used -- from 2007 was used to  
12 have been provided for information during the  
13 transition in administrations, from the past  
14 administration to the Obama administration.

15 So, just to give you a little snapshot  
16 here of all of our different layers of strategic  
17 planning that we have at NOAA fisheries, starting  
18 off with our largest parent agency, the Department  
19 of Commerce and what's in their strategic plan.  
20 There's a lot of different components of the  
21 Department of Commerce. We fit underneath one  
22 particular goal in their strategic plan, which is

1 the environmental goal which is fostering healthy,  
2 sustainable marine resources, habitats and  
3 ecosystems.

4 As NOAA and Dr. Sullivan went to  
5 identify what NOAA's share priorities are, or our  
6 strategic priorities for budget moving forward,  
7 there were four identified there, and they all  
8 tier underneath of the DOC's strategic plan.  
9 There's four that are at the NOAA level, which is  
10 looking at operational excellence, observing  
11 systems, evolving the national weather service,  
12 and the resilient communities. The work that NOAA  
13 Fisheries does fits underneath of that resilient  
14 communities shared priority.

15 And you can see the two sub-bullets that  
16 are highlighted there at the NOAA level about next  
17 generation stock assessment framework and making  
18 measurable progress on recovering protected  
19 species. We also can be found underneath of that  
20 level of organizational excellence. That is  
21 something that's continued into our next  
22 priorities.

1                   The next layer down, you get to NOAA  
2 Fisheries priorities, and you see there that three  
3 -- we don't have a particular strategic plan, but  
4 in the last few years, NOAA Fisheries has been  
5 creating an annual priorities document, and I'll  
6 go on to the next slide here, which is --

7                   This document is our annual priorities  
8 document. It really provides internal guidance to  
9 all of NOAA Fisheries' employees about executing  
10 our mission responsibilities and where our focus  
11 should be. You can see the three core priorities  
12 that are up there. I won't repeat those again,  
13 but I think it also is a good external document.  
14 So, with the wide variety of things that we focus  
15 on, these are our key messages to folks internally  
16 and externally what our core priorities are and  
17 what we're going to be focusing on in the upcoming  
18 year.

19                   The picture you see here is from our FY  
20 '16 priorities document. Right now, we are --  
21 I've been talking with our Office of Management  
22 and Budget who was responsible for pulling

1 together this priorities document. They are  
2 looking at making it even more -- this is their  
3 terminology -- meaner and means than it has been  
4 before. A lot of text to really get down to what  
5 the focus is.

6 In talking with them, Erika had wanted  
7 to know, and as we began to develop what our  
8 priorities document is for the next year, what's  
9 the timing; that MAFAC could provide some input on  
10 that. They're looking to get input by the end of  
11 June, as they start working on their FY '17  
12 priorities document itself.

13 Down from the actual fisheries level, we  
14 get to yet another level, because we are a  
15 bureaucracy (Laughter). But you see, they all  
16 make sense, I think, in the tiering. And about a  
17 year and a half ago, we at headquarters asked all  
18 of the regional offices, all of their science  
19 centers and the headquarters program offices to  
20 start developing their own strategic plan;  
21 something that hadn't been done before in the past  
22 -- ones that you know, tier off of what we have

1 set for in our NOAA Fisheries priorities document.

2 They are aimed at a five year period.  
3 They have been developed not all at the same time.  
4 They were kind of on a rotating schedule. I  
5 believe we are just finishing up all of the  
6 offices having completed strategic plans. They  
7 also included a public engagement and stakeholder  
8 input. They put out the public comment while they  
9 were working on this.

10 And if you look at them, they are all  
11 very unique and different in how each one of the  
12 offices approached them. Just for reference here,  
13 for those of you who aren't at non MAFAC in  
14 November when we last met, the Office of Habitat  
15 Conservation -- that was one of the things that  
16 they shared their draft strategic plan, and MAFAC  
17 did, in fact, provide comments on that that they  
18 used in a revision to get to their final process.  
19 So, just the timing was really right for that, and  
20 it linked up with our discussions that we were  
21 having on resiliency at our November meeting.

22 So anyway, just providing that -- this

1 snapshot of the different layers and the different  
2 timing of our how process is working with  
3 strategic plans and priorities setting, and then,  
4 a snapshot of how MAFAC has offered comments to us  
5 and provided input to us for this particular  
6 subcommittee that we're talking about today. So,  
7 that's the snapshot.

8 SPEAKER: Questions? Pam?

9 MS. YOCHER: Are you preparing a  
10 transition document for the administration?

11 MS. LUKENS: You know, that's a great  
12 question. President Obama, starting at the top  
13 there as a bureaucracy, put forward an executive  
14 order -- well, that's how we work (Laughter) --  
15 put forward an executive order to establish a  
16 formal transition team six months ahead, before a  
17 new team would come in. So, there is planning  
18 being done at that level, but there's certainly  
19 discussions at the NOAA Fisheries level and within  
20 fisheries.

21 What do we need to do to get ready to  
22 prepare to talk to the new incoming folks? I

1 think a lot of it is, what is the message of what  
2 we do and why it's important. And you know,  
3 educating them on what we do in case they're not  
4 intimately familiar with what our issues are.

5 But then, I think over the course of  
6 time, figuring out what -- they always have an  
7 agenda when they come in the door in figuring out  
8 how we are going to help them with their agenda.  
9 So, there's a variety -- I don't see us producing  
10 right now at this point in time, some big  
11 formalized transition document. I think it's more  
12 of a process.

13 But that is something that is an  
14 opportunity for outside folks to provide input to  
15 that incoming team as to what they think they  
16 should be focusing on. So, I don't know if I  
17 really answered your question, but (Laughter) --

18 (Discussion off the record)

19 DR. DOREMUS: Unfortunately, I have to  
20 get on a headquarters call right now, but I did  
21 want to make a point. Eileen and I have talked.  
22 There has been some discussion about comments from

1 the committee that would be relevant to transition  
2 teams, things of that nature. The general feeling  
3 from us is that it would be helpful to the extent  
4 possible, stay focused on drawing attention to  
5 existing priorities instead of creating some kind  
6 of new document.

7 I don't know if that was what was  
8 intended or not, but our general preference would  
9 be to have the committee, to the extent possible,  
10 reference and comment on areas where we've already  
11 drawn attention to strategic needs and areas that  
12 the committee thinks the new administration would  
13 be well advised to focus on. That could be very  
14 helpful.

15 But we wanted to caution against  
16 developing any kind of new set of priorities or  
17 suggested new direction at this point in time.  
18 So, that was the sort of general thing. I will  
19 leave things in the hands of John and Jen to  
20 represent fisheries leadership for just about an  
21 hour, if you will excuse me for just one minute.  
22 Thank you.

1 MS. MORRIS: Thank you.

2 (Pause)

3 MS. MORRIS: Anything else?

4 (No response heard)

5 MS. MORRIS: Erika, go ahead.

6 MS. FELLER: Okay. Well, we would have  
7 just you know, a few minutes of discussion to see  
8 you know, kind of in light of this -- we've looked  
9 at the MAFAC work plan. The Strategic Planning  
10 Subcommittee has nothing adds nothing on it to the  
11 list. This is a perfectly acceptable outcome, but  
12 I wanted to raise the question and see if there  
13 are things related to strategic planning within  
14 NOAA Fisheries that they would actually be working  
15 on; what kind of ideas you guys have.

16 And maybe before I can open it up to  
17 discussion, I want to say one of the things I'm  
18 really interested in -- I think you know, sort of  
19 at a moment time that happens every four to eight  
20 years, which is the transition to a new  
21 administration. And given the input that MAFAC  
22 has had in the development of this existing

1 priorities, we probably have an interest and maybe  
2 even a responsibility to communicate with the  
3 incoming administration about what we think they  
4 ought to be doing.

5 So, I'm pretty keenly interested in  
6 providing and developing some kind of transition  
7 advice to a new administration. But I'm also  
8 really open to a lot of other ideas and solutions  
9 that we should be focusing on.

10 (Pause)

11 MS. MORRIS: Peter Shelley.

12 MR. SHELLEY: Well, the one issue that I  
13 guess I have been harping on all day, and  
14 continued to be a fundamental stumbling block is  
15 data. I mean, the whole universe of data --  
16 collecting it, analyzing it, transparency. I  
17 mean, there's just a -- good data is a necessary  
18 condition of achieving virtually all of the  
19 objectives in this strategic climate.

20 And again, I come at this from a very,  
21 maybe distorted lens of New England where the data  
22 is particularly bad, and everyone thinks that,

1       regardless of what stakeholder group you come  
2       from.  Maybe it's better in the North Pacific.  
3       Maybe it's better, I don't know, in other places.  
4       I know that industry in the North Pacific uses  
5       real time data and it manages fisheries.  We're  
6       not even in that same ballpark, let alone having  
7       anything like that on the horizon.

8                   And then, you know, it connects to the  
9       importance of keeping the capital investments in  
10      the research fleet moving forward and recognized,  
11      exploring other technologies.  Study fleets, we've  
12      talked about.  I mean, there are a lot of tools  
13      that are out there that have been piloted or  
14      tested on having better data systems.

15                   I mean, it goes right through to the  
16      systems.  You know, how data can be compared  
17      between regions.  And I know that some of the  
18      science centers have looked at data issues in  
19      their strategic plans.  I'm not sure exactly what  
20      it is we could do, but if we could move the  
21      needle, even 10 percent on improving data on this  
22      country's fisheries, it would be -- well, if we

1       could help make that happen, it would be a  
2       tremendous accomplishment.

3                   And climate change, of course, just  
4       makes the importance of having accurate permit  
5       data, which would be very different than the  
6       historic databases that you know, we have going  
7       back 300 years. We're not looking at that weather  
8       anymore and those conditions.

9                   (Discussion off the record)

10                   MR. SHELLEY: So, you know, our modelers  
11       are kind of flying blind, and that's -- to me,  
12       it's no surprise that all of our models are --  
13       huge retrospective patterns and are not working.  
14       I'll stop with that.

15                   MS. MORRIS: Liz?

16                   MS. HAMILTON: Two things that I think  
17       about and we've discussed here already, is that  
18       part of it is this whole consultation unit. I  
19       mean, I've been really impressed with the changes  
20       within NOAA over the last 10 years, about thinking  
21       about their business services, and that really is  
22       a huge business service. And to have a beefier

1 area to do that, and you know, part of the agency  
2 that is more responsive -- I've used the word hot  
3 teams before, but this sort of -- to have a  
4 deployable unit that can go where the needs are,  
5 because it will change constantly; weather or  
6 HTMPs or what have you.

7 And then, the other thing, speaking of  
8 business services, is that my colleagues around  
9 the U.S. tell me that Magnuson is a magnificent  
10 vehicle to manager commercial fisheries, but it's  
11 not so great for managing rec fisheries. And so,  
12 put some thought into how Magnuson can serve both  
13 industries equally well, and NOAA can serve both  
14 industries equally well. I would love to see  
15 that.

16 MS. MORRIS: Harlon. Harlon wants  
17 people to speak louder.

18 (Simultaneous discussion)

19 MS. MORRIS: But you also wanted to make  
20 a comment. Right?

21 (No response heard)

22 MS. MORRIS: Harlon?

1 MR. PEARCE: Yes.

2 MS. MORRIS: Okay. What's your comment?

3 MR. PEARCE: Oh, my turn?

4 MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

5 MR. PEARCE: I will echo what was said  
6 before of course. But it's not just the data that  
7 we get. It's not how we get it, it's how we use  
8 it, how quickly we use it and how it's making a  
9 big difference. And so we use data instead of  
10 having to do -- and in the Gulf, I mean, Dick --  
11 and Dick will tell you how we can fight battles  
12 every day about how old that data is that we have  
13 to use.

14 The ability to take real time data or  
15 some sort of thing like that, that allows the  
16 science, allows NOAA Fisheries to move quickly  
17 based on real time data, based on data. And they  
18 have some measures in place that says hey, the red  
19 snapper size has been getting smaller. We've got  
20 to cut back. Or the red snapper size is getting  
21 bigger, so we can increase the quota, whatever.  
22 Some ways to get benchmarks based on the data that

1 we use that allows us to update quicker than we do  
2 now and not have to wait so long for new benchmark  
3 assessment to get done.

4           The other comment I have is part of the  
5 problem in the Gulf is the inability to take  
6 advantage of citizen data, citizen science. We  
7 need to have more of a collaborative approach to  
8 science in all of our councils that use the great  
9 institutions that we have to do some sustainable  
10 broad effect of science in our area, in the Gulf,  
11 wherever.

12           What do I mean by that? Right now,  
13 we've got \$10 million to put into -- or last year,  
14 \$10 million to put into appropriations. It's  
15 going to go to \$5 million to do a stock (sic)  
16 assessment on snapper, 5 million to -- I think to  
17 know what it is. But all that is going to give us  
18 is a snapshot in time about what snapper is doing  
19 right now.

20           But there's nothing behind it. There's  
21 no sustainability to what's our next step, or how  
22 do we make sure that we maintain a solid science

1 process -- thought process that's doing the data  
2 properly, that's doing a stock assessment  
3 properly; that's doing you know, all sorts of  
4 things so that we are completely -- become  
5 proactive with that thought process, rather than  
6 merely reactive. And that's how we are.

7 Proactive, we can keep it. In order to  
8 do that, you've got to know what you're talking  
9 about, and we can't depend on what's going on in  
10 the southeast science center. We've got to have  
11 help before that southeast science center that's  
12 more -- that's on time, right now, and tells us  
13 what we can and can't do with our fisheries. If  
14 not, we'll always be behind the eight ball.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, I need to ask  
16 sort of a process here, and I'm writing down the  
17 names of people who want to talk. But we're  
18 supposed to be trying to inform the work of the  
19 Strategic Planning Committee for the next period  
20 of time. And we're bringing up important topics,  
21 and they permeate through our coastal resiliency  
22 work and our bycatch.

1                   You know, there's a lot of consistency  
2                   of the things that are coming up right now and the  
3                   things that we've done, talking about under other  
4                   headlines during this meeting. So, in your  
5                   comments, please be thinking about how this topic  
6                   you want to talk about connects to a potential  
7                   thing that the strategic planning committee might  
8                   be working on, and if you like the subset of  
9                   preparing for a transition under that umbrella,  
10                  how the thing you're bringing up would fit into  
11                  that sort of -- Okay, so that's the process  
12                  comment. Mike?

13                  MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, the data -- in my  
14                  experience, there is -- I mean, you can have all  
15                  of the best new data that are out there. If it's  
16                  not allowable as a source to inform, it doesn't  
17                  make much difference. So, I think there's a  
18                  little bit of a challenge there, to figure out how  
19                  it is you infuse new data sources.

20                  And sometimes, they want -- I don't know  
21                  what -- three to five years of time before they're  
22                  going to use such a source. At least, I'm certain

1       they were.

2                   SPEAKER:  On certain times, there's  
3       certain times --

4                   (Simultaneous discussion)

5                   MR. OKONIEWSKI:  So, I mean, this just  
6       bogs the process down.  And I'm not saying that --  
7       you can't use the data unless it's defensible, and  
8       it's a clean source, I guess, or whatever you want  
9       to call it.  Not contaminated by something --  
10      whatever the scientific term is.

11                  But the point is, is there a way to get  
12      around that or to get through that to take new  
13      data?  And I think we keep hearing the term real  
14      time.  Maybe it won't get that far, but at least  
15      in closer proximity to real time.  So, there's  
16      that.  I've got two points.  That's one.

17                  The second point is that we're looking  
18      at identifying new operational fronts -- at least  
19      at the regional basis, pergomatic strategies  
20      intended to accomplish -- well, when I think of  
21      new, it's outside of the box.  Okay?  Not just the  
22      old tried and true, and not just putting a new

1 coat of paint on it and calling it something new.

2 So, I would say that I think we've  
3 talked about collaborative research; that effort.  
4 And I offer that. But we haven't, or what rarely  
5 gets talked about as far as collaborative  
6 management. And what I'm fearful of is we have  
7 spread out the task in front of NEPS and NOAA  
8 Fisheries and wherever it goes, all of the things  
9 they have to accomplish; that they're not getting  
10 much more funding to do these things.

11 And I believe we have to get creative  
12 about how -- I'll say industry, but the  
13 stakeholders are going to support that effort.  
14 And I think it actually goes down to funding,  
15 which is a no no in many respects, to take in  
16 outside money from you know, an industry group,  
17 for example, because it might be prejudicial  
18 information or whatever.

19 But I think we have to look beyond that,  
20 to that part of it on the research, but also, to  
21 collaborative management where it's been applied.  
22 And I would say AFA is a good example of that, but

1 in co-op systems. But I -- if the catch air  
2 system itself, individual accountability  
3 principles I think are not enough for what we have  
4 to do in the future.

5 And I believe that a greater amount of  
6 collaborative management, and call it what you  
7 will -- there's probably many definitions that  
8 could fit in under that, that would allow us to  
9 start thinking outside of this box as far as how  
10 to be more flexible and nimble to be more  
11 proactive, and to react -- excuse me -- to react  
12 with NOAA Fisheries in a way that we can achieve  
13 the goals that are outlined in the national  
14 standards and other areas. So, I think that's  
15 something worth consideration, anyway.

16 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so I'm going to ask  
17 everybody this going on out. How does that  
18 connect to work of the Strategic Planning and  
19 Budget Subcommittee?

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I guess in my  
21 mind, it's -- and I'm new to the process itself  
22 here, or relatively new. I'm the guy that usually

1 cuts through process more than I should. But the  
2 point being is that if we've got an idea that  
3 maybe we can flesh out in the future, maybe it's a  
4 future project or something, but when I look and I  
5 identify new operational programmatic type of  
6 strategies, I think that collaborative management  
7 would fit right in there.

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Dick?

9 MR. BRAME: This is something that's  
10 kind of running around), and I haven't completely  
11 thought it out, but it seems to me, what would be  
12 helpful for the administration and strategic plans  
13 would be -- you hear disparities in data between  
14 the regions. So, what is the standard, and how is  
15 each region meeting that standard?

16 I think NOAA Fisheries could really help  
17 by -- you know, you hear in Alaska they do 40  
18 stock assessments per year, and in the Gulf and in  
19 the South Atlantic, we're managing stocks where  
20 all the fish that are in the stock assessment are  
21 now data. We haven't done enough of the new stock  
22 assessments.

1                   So, there needs to be some of rating  
2                   system to show where the disparities are. I think  
3                   that would be very helpful in the illustration.

4                   MS. MORRIS: So, that would be an  
5                   element of a work product of the strategic  
6                   planning committee, to make a recommendation like  
7                   that?

8                   MR. BRAME: I would think so.

9                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. Ted?

10                  MR. AMES: Yeah. My comment is related  
11                  to getting out of the box, primarily. The second  
12                  bullet and the regional science plans and a  
13                  comprehensive strategic perspective.

14                  And one of the things that's bothered me  
15                  from square one about the approach we use is that  
16                  fisheries has lumped pelagic domicile fisheries  
17                  all in one bunch; oceanic and coastal fisheries in  
18                  one box. The end result is the approach has been  
19                  basically, how do you mine a coal mine? You dig  
20                  it fast and deep and make your profit, and then,  
21                  move on to another coal mine, if you can find one,  
22                  when in fact, what we need to be doing is

1 addressing it as how do we create more fish.

2 I mean, it's fine to go out and work on  
3 Alaskan Pollock and say, well, we've got this  
4 enormous resource. We don't have to worry about  
5 it. To a great extent, we don't, because they're  
6 truly oceanic pelagics. But when you go in the  
7 suite of other fisheries that are unique to our  
8 coastal shelf, we will use the same approach.

9 Let's nail them hard, clean it out and  
10 we'll move on somewhere else, instead of saying,  
11 how can we maximize the productivity of this  
12 region or this area or bay. And in order to do  
13 that, we've got to move in commercial fishermen,  
14 and somehow, NOAA needs to reach out with perhaps,  
15 smaller governance structures that allow this to  
16 happen, because nobody is going to invest time and  
17 energy in improving a resource, and then, having a  
18 factory shift pull out, clean it out and move on  
19 to find a batch of fish again.

20 NOAA really needs to evolve to another  
21 step where it is saying what can we do that's  
22 going to create more fish for the Gulf of Maine or

1 the Gulf of Alaska or Kodiak, et cetera, et  
2 cetera, and address the particular species that  
3 they're dealing with, rather than saying we've  
4 cleaned out the coal mine. We need to move on  
5 somewhere else.

6 I think there's tons of room for not  
7 only improving the fisheries we currently have,  
8 but I look at aquaculture and say, well there's a  
9 mechanism that will help. But at the same time,  
10 aquaculture could be focusing on species that are  
11 not commercial -- they're not -- commercial  
12 quantities don't exist. In fact, snapper started  
13 started with a -- salmon. Hasn't been a  
14 commercial fishery on the east coast forever, and  
15 there's an enormous agriculture process for it.

16 It's just a matter of -- instead of  
17 looking at it as how can we take more without  
18 investing the focus to create more within the wild  
19 system as well as, where the --

20 (Simultaneous discussion)

21 MS. MORRIS: So, are you suggesting this  
22 as suggesting that the committee could look at and

1 suggest as a new strategic direction for National  
2 Marine Fisheries? Is that your suggestion?

3 MR. AMES: I'm sorry to -- I'm sorry  
4 (Laughter). I'm trying to track from your well  
5 explained idea to work that the strategic planning  
6 committee could do. And I'm trying to suggest  
7 that maybe your connection is that you think MAFAC  
8 might recommend this kind of reorientation as a  
9 new strategic direction for NOAA Fisheries.

10 Am I understanding that right?

11 MR. AMES: Yeah, because the goal isn't  
12 to change the workings of the system. It's to  
13 change the perspective, so that fishermen who  
14 interact with NOAA Fisheries and currently feel --  
15 often feel disenfranchised, because they don't see  
16 where it's helping them, you create a situation  
17 where you're going and saying, okay, you guys.  
18 We're going to try to improve the fishery that's  
19 right here. You need to do it by protecting life  
20 stage bottlenecks for the species. And you're  
21 changing the --

22 (Simultaneous discussion)

1 MS. MORRIS: Okay. I think we've got  
2 it. I think we've got it. Columbus?

3 MR. BROWN: Okay, three items. First  
4 off, my mantra is change is normal. And we need  
5 to focus more on the types of management. We need  
6 to increase the capabilities to address issues  
7 associated with fishing populations and habitats.

8 The second one is, we need to  
9 incentivize new technologies and ideas that  
10 provide the efficiency in targeting species to  
11 harvest with less bycatch. And third, there needs  
12 to be increased collaboration across agency lines.  
13 When you go into the web and you look up the same  
14 topics that we talk about here, we find that there  
15 are a whole lot of other agencies that are doing  
16 things that are beneficial to our thought process  
17 that don't get acknowledged here.

18 MS. MORRIS: Julie Bonney?

19 MS. BONNEY: I'm trying to decide what  
20 we're trying to do (Laughter).

21 MS. MORRIS: Me, too (Laughter).

22 (Simultaneous discussion)

1                   MS. BONNEY: I mean, so the question in  
2 my mind is, is basically, we have a strategic plan  
3 that NOAA has put out, and so we could review that  
4 and see if we have other priorities that we would  
5 like to add to that, which I think a lot of people  
6 talked about right now.

7                   MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

8                   MS. BONNEY: But then, you also have the  
9 issue of the transition through a new  
10 administration, and being on MAFAC, I know that  
11 we've done some really good work in partnership  
12 with NOAA Fisheries. Example with aquaculture and  
13 the permitting process.

14                   Commenting on the national run  
15 guidelines in terms of Magnuson, EM, and the  
16 pressure to come up with technologies that do a  
17 better job that aren't human to deal with costs.  
18 So, to me, it would seem like we would want to be  
19 grabbing things that have happened and translating  
20 those in terms of successes to the administration  
21 where they would be continuing to foster those  
22 ideas into the next decade.

1                   And then, so -- versus building a whole  
2                   new list of packing, because I think that the goal  
3                   is to keep pushing on aquaculture. The goal is to  
4                   keep pushing on improved monitoring and data  
5                   collection. And there will be other things on  
6                   that list, but -- and so climate resiliency or the  
7                   community resiliency is another one, and climate  
8                   change ocean acidification.

9                   And so, if we could come up with a list  
10                  of successes and topics that need to continue,  
11                  then the next administration would be more  
12                  strategic to needs and trying to just create a new  
13                  list. And then, maybe we could figure out what  
14                  the holes are, and suggest that besides these  
15                  topics and these strategies that we're working on,  
16                  we would suggest that.

17                  So, that would be my suggestion.

18                  SPEAKER: Perfect.

19                  MS. MORRIS: Okay. Jennifer wants to  
20                  jump in, and -- but I still have Ray, Peter, him  
21                  and now John.

22                  MS. LUKENS: So, I just wanted to jump

1 in here and just try and help. I don't know if  
2 this will help your conversation or not. I think  
3 you all have -- I think what you just said, Julie,  
4 is -- that's getting close to what I'm going to  
5 say here.

6 I think that you had an opportunity with  
7 transition to give a message. And I think first,  
8 figuring out who your audience is, I would say  
9 that your audience will probably be NOAA Fisheries  
10 level administrator politicals coming in, and then  
11 also, you have a political coming in as the head  
12 of NOAA Fisheries. Those are two different  
13 targets that you want to have there.

14 And so, you're focusing on political  
15 appointees, and then you focus on them, you want  
16 high level key points, what you support, what you  
17 think needs to be done better. Exactly what Julie  
18 just said. I'm just giving you my strategy from  
19 D.C. and what I think would be useful for you. I'm  
20 not telling you what to do. This is what I do.

21 (Simultaneous discussion)

22 MS. LUKENS: Strategy (Laughter). And

1       so, keep it at that really high level. Another  
2       thing to think about is your audience. What  
3       administration is coming in? That may change what  
4       you're going to say and how you're going to say  
5       it.

6                   SPEAKER:  Yep.  It better (Laughter).

7                   MS. LUKENS:  You know?  So, you can do a  
8       lot.  You can do work up to a certain point, but  
9       you may want to think about timing, if you are  
10      going to input that, figuring out what you can do  
11      up to that point when you figure out who your  
12      audience is.  Or tiering, that you know you're  
13      probably going to have an administrator come in  
14      for a short -- or least some senior level advisors  
15      who don't have to go through confirmation  
16      targeting that, and then, knowing that you're  
17      going to have NOAA administrators 6 to 12 months  
18      later.

19                   So, I just offer that up, as you guys  
20      have a lot of great ideas, like Julie said.  But  
21      if that's something that you want to focus on,  
22      that's what I would recommend -- taking this

1 discussion, some of these idea and data and all  
2 that, and having that later.

3 (Simultaneous discussion)

4 SPEAKER: Can I ask you a question, just  
5 to try to sort of understand it better? So, if  
6 you aren't really clear who your audience is,  
7 because you haven't figured out how the  
8 administration's is going to work, would you just  
9 kind of build your work plan or your topic list  
10 and strategy, and then, flesh that out after you  
11 actually know --

12 MS. LUKENS: Cull it down after that.

13 SPEAKER: Okay.

14 MS. LUKENS: That's in my strategery  
15 world, that's what I would think would be a good  
16 -- and most value for you all, having your voice  
17 heard. So, anyway, I'm probably saying more than  
18 I should.

19 MR. RHEAULT: No, I don't think you are,  
20 but I would just like to add to that. You know,  
21 I've gone through a couple of transitions, and it  
22 was part of the last one -- and the transition

1 team that comes in, one of their main question is  
2 always what should we focus on.

3 MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

4 MR. RHEAULT: What should we do? So, I  
5 think that Jen said, having that short list, big  
6 topics that then, let's say I -- you know, I can  
7 have, because it's a small group. The last time,  
8 it was Lucian Hyde sat down with two other people  
9 on the transition team, and they said, what do you  
10 think about a work up.

11 And your idea about saying look, here  
12 are some things that have been started. Let's  
13 done (sic) reinvent the wheel. It's got to go --

14 (Simultaneous discussion)

15 MR. RHEAULT: So, Jen's right. Then,  
16 you have to then follow up once they start you  
17 know, planting the people. But that initial time  
18 in that transition could be really influential.  
19 They can get some things down and hand it to that  
20 new person and say, here's what we hope this is.

21 MS. MORRIS: Great. So, I'm thinking  
22 the work of the committee is going to be to work

1 with all of those ideas that are coming in and  
2 these conversations and all of the work that we're  
3 doing in all of our task forces and committees,  
4 and leading us in figuring out what that focused  
5 list of what are the important things that need to  
6 be worked on; what's the message to the transition  
7 team.

8 Yes, Erika?

9 MS. FELLER: Yeah, I mean, just to  
10 reflect what I'm hearing, I think what Julie said,  
11 I think really kind of encapsulates that approach  
12 for sort of gathering this input. Like you guys  
13 talk about a lot of issues. I think that they  
14 kind of represent things that MAFAC has been  
15 interested in, and every single one of them, I can  
16 probably name a point in NOAA Fisheries where Sam  
17 and Eileen have identified these things as a  
18 priority.

19 I mean, like talking about fish  
20 production -- I mean, you know, they're both  
21 really focused and interested in you know,  
22 including the role of the habitat, and kind of you

1 know, how do you supply. You have to have funding  
2 in places to work up to the fish productivity.  
3 Electronic monitoring for the data collection.  
4 This is also a priority for the agency.

5 I mean, just my sense of MAFAC's role is  
6 you know, we will persist. I mean, we are pretty  
7 much going to be here regardless of the new  
8 administration, and I think Jen's right. We want  
9 to be responsive to who those people are.

10 (Simultaneous discussion)

11 MS. FELLER: So anyway, we'll probably  
12 continue to exist (Laughter). So, I think we want  
13 to be responsive to who we're talking to, but I  
14 also don't think we want to be super political. I  
15 mean, our job is to be experts on what NOAA is  
16 doing and identify those issues that we should be  
17 working on, as Julie said. You know, figure out  
18 where the holes are, that maybe they want to come  
19 in and plug them.

20 But you know, recognize that we have to  
21 kind of maintain a discreet list. We have to keep  
22 it kind of high level. And I mean, I have kind of

1 a proposal about how to move forward, but I also  
2 know that some other people wanted to tal --

3 (Simultaneous discussion)

4 MS. MORRIS: Right. So, let's hear from  
5 Raimundo, Peter and Pam -- Peter Moore and Pam,  
6 and then turn back to you to sort of wrap it up.  
7 Okay, Raimundo.

8 MR. ESPINOZA: Thank you. So, one thing  
9 that I would suggest, especially since we've seen  
10 those annual plans and the larger strategic vision  
11 hasn't been there. If that happens again, annual  
12 strategies can change. So, that leaves a lot of  
13 accountability out there. Now, what happens to  
14 the changes in the strategies, if there is not a  
15 larger vision that can change annually?

16 So, I would say for the subcommittee, it  
17 would be something at least to begin to  
18 incorporate on the metrics and accountability for  
19 strategies. And I bring this because of a  
20 specific example, like you mentioned. Electronic  
21 monitoring has been our priority for NOAA. We've  
22 seen in the last K grants that electronic

1 monitoring has been priority. Overseas  
2 territories improving -- reporting on territories  
3 has been a priority, as well.

4           If you put that together, I mean, the  
5 electronic monitoring and overseas territories is  
6 a priority. We've seen that change, as well.  
7 We've been ready in the territories, the  
8 commercial fishing sector, the recreational  
9 sector. The local governments are moving forward  
10 with electronic monitoring without knowing,  
11 because NOAA is not ready to do it.

12           And so, we've decided to say we are  
13 going to move forward because the landings are  
14 done in state waters. This is where the landing  
15 is done. And so, since NOAA hasn't been ready to  
16 do it, the sector has decided to move on its own.  
17 And so, we feel that this is an accountability,  
18 because it was brought up by NOAA that this is our  
19 priority. And so, when the sector -- academic,  
20 NGO, state and fishing, come together to accept  
21 the priorities of our strategy to move forward,  
22 but we see that the accountability on the larger

1 strategic vision isn't there, there needs to be  
2 some follow up on that, as well, because something  
3 is not working. The communication isn't that.

4 So, that's something I feel that should  
5 be important. Again, if we take it to a larger  
6 level, not to focus on anything specific, but on  
7 the accountability of the strategies being  
8 implemented, because of course, if you look at  
9 this at a national level, we can see it in other  
10 regions, they are being implemented there and  
11 being supported. So, it is functioning.

12 So, we need to see how this fits --  
13 again, when it trickles to the implementing at the  
14 regional scale on site level. So, that's a --

15 MS. MORRIS: Thank you, Raimundo. Peter  
16 Moore?

17 MR. MOORE: I'll try and pull this  
18 together, based on Mike's suggestion of  
19 collaborative management. And in my opinion, it's  
20 a "new topic." But it's not really a new topic.  
21 I think it's the thread that we've all been hoping  
22 we can sort of embed in all of these different



1 MS. MORRIS: Okay, Pam.

2 MS. YOCHER: My points have been raised  
3 by others, so --

4 MS. MORRIS: (Gasps) God.

5 (Simultaneous discussion)

6 MS. MORRIS: And then, Terri wants to  
7 take her time, but she says she's going to be real  
8 short.

9 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah, I promise.

10 (Laughter) I agree, I think, with a lot of the  
11 discussion, and I'm not going to bring up specific  
12 things. Okay? Because I support most of the ones  
13 I heard -- all of the ones I heard. But I think I  
14 -- preparing a message for the transition team  
15 from MAFAC is a good idea. And I think as a first  
16 step, you know, we can gather these thoughts  
17 together.

18 But I was trying to think about you  
19 know, what would be like the ongoing role, because  
20 presumably, eventually, we will be transitioned.  
21 Right?

22 MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

1                   MS. BEIDEMAN: So, we create products  
2 here. You know, John spent a good amount of time  
3 giving us an overview of a project that took a  
4 long time and put a lot of work into, and I think  
5 that perhaps, one of the things as a committee --  
6 this particular subcommittee could do is kind of  
7 track what happens to the work that we do.

8                   Does it just get read and get like a  
9 presser in here. We delivered it to you and you  
10 received it. Thank you very much. You know? Do  
11 we see any movement on that issue? If it was an  
12 issue big enough for MAFAC to spend a good amount  
13 of time on, then maybe we need a little bit of --  
14 like someone following up. So, that would be my  
15 long-term discussion on perhaps a goal for this  
16 subcommittee, with the first one being seizing the  
17 opportunity to transition.

18                   MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Erika?

19                   MS. FELLER: So, here's kind of -- I  
20 mean, I think basically, the idea is that we want  
21 to develop transition by looking at incoming  
22 administration. I think the right timing for

1       having something like that, at least in terms of  
2       your final draft, would probably be about December  
3       of this year. So, after the election, but by the  
4       time like NOAA NIMS people get selected, it's  
5       usually pretty well into -- they're not the first  
6       appointments. Right?

7                 So, I think if we got something done by  
8       December, that would be good. It would have to be  
9       pretty high level. We're not writing a 47 page  
10       tome. We're writing a less than 10 page --  
11       possibly longer, kind of thing. I think you know,  
12       this discussion has been really good for kind of  
13       prevailing issues, but I think when you get some  
14       kind of exercise for identifying what are the  
15       things we want to focus on, and I think we need to  
16       basically -- I need help.

17                 I need people to want to be on this  
18       subcommittee, so that would be fabulous. But I  
19       also think we need to work really closely in line  
20       with what Paul said. You know, I don't think we  
21       help the incoming administration by going this  
22       way. And I don't think we have. Everything I'm

1 hearing you guys say is kind of in line with that  
2 ongoing conversation with the agency.

3 But I think you know, this subcommittee  
4 working closely with Jen and Paul needs to sort of  
5 narrow down what are those priorities and how do  
6 we kind of vet them, and then we sort of go into a  
7 go into a process of how we actually draft this  
8 thing out. Does that seem --

9 MS. MORRIS: Yes. And it seems like we  
10 should have something that's not final, but is  
11 pithy enough for us to have a good conversation  
12 about it by our next meeting, and that's going to  
13 be in November.

14 MS. FELLER: Okay. Can I have just one  
15 other thing that just kind of struck me about this  
16 --

17 MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

18 MS. FELLER: -- conversation and Jen's  
19 presentation? You know, from the perspective of  
20 working on the task under the climate resilience  
21 stuff on the communications, and Terri's point  
22 about what happens to the stuff that we do, I

1 actually think that process that Jen outlined of  
2 how NOAA -- how NIMS is kind of developing these  
3 strategic plans at the national and regional level  
4 going to the management -- going to the regions,  
5 going to science centers.

6           It hadn't hit me before, but I think  
7 being mindful of this process and how our input  
8 can fit into the agency's planning process is  
9 probably a pretty important idea that had not  
10 occurred to me before. Like how do we kind of  
11 deliver recommendations that the agency can  
12 actually use in their listing processes? So,  
13 that's probably occurred to all of you guys  
14 before. It's new to me, so I think everything we  
15 do has an impact on strategic planning at the  
16 agency, beyond just what is --

17           MS. MORRIS: Okay, so a last word from  
18 Bob, before we go to our break.

19           MR. RHEAULT: When I think of strategic  
20 planning, I sort of try and look at the big  
21 picture and global megatrends and the projections  
22 of FAL and World Bank for a 50 million metric ton



1       you met Dave last night. This is Mr. Dave  
2       Copeland. He handles all of our commercial  
3       activities for the commission, which means all the  
4       catch stuff for the west coast and Alaska, and two  
5       years ago, he started getting involved in  
6       electronic monitoring. So, we are a little bit  
7       head of everybody else. We've been asked to come  
8       and tell you what the potential for electronic  
9       monitoring really is. And so, Dave is going to  
10      look through and show you what we have learned  
11      since around 2011.

12                   MR. COPELAND: I don't know what the  
13      protocol is for presentations for you all -- ask  
14      questions later, ask questions during. I don't  
15      care, so I'm pretty easy.

16                   I am Dave Copeland, senior program  
17      manager here in Portland. Beautiful rose city.  
18      Welcome to our city. Thank you for letting me  
19      talk about electronic monitoring, or as I call it,  
20      the shiny project. Another name for it is the  
21      squirrel. When I say squirrel, my dog heads for  
22      the back door and doesn't think about dog treats,

1 doesn't think about food, doesn't think about  
2 anything but getting outside and picking up that  
3 terrible person or that terrible creature in the  
4 back yard.

5           The interesting thing, where that  
6 analogy works really well is, I think a lot of  
7 people that are putting in implementation are like  
8 my dog. She wouldn't know what to do if she  
9 caught a squirrel (Laughter). I think a lot of  
10 people don't know what they want electronic  
11 monitoring to do, and that means to -- if you  
12 don't know where you want to end up, you'll get  
13 there somehow, so that's the problem. (Laughter)

14           So, this is PSMC's portion of this. We  
15 are not alone in this. I want to recognize Dr.  
16 Friese and the people that work for him and I want  
17 to recognize the sort of council. We couldn't do  
18 this without them. We are a partnership.

19           This is the work that we did. As Randy  
20 said, we had this brilliant idea. Let's try doing  
21 this thing. It works up in BC, so we adopted BC's  
22 program. Archipelago Research is a company that

1 makes -- puts together hardware and puts together  
2 software for review. We adopted their program.  
3 It works, so we brought it down, and we have the  
4 planning vessels and three or four vessels -- was  
5 the company that we started working with 2012. We  
6 put a couple of folks on there.

7           2013 rolls around, and we added more  
8 boats. We have two reviewers, an analyst named  
9 Robin, and another company called Saltwater, who  
10 also does work on the AMR kinds of things. We  
11 brought them in, and we also built a storage unit.  
12 We started storing because we're starting to get a  
13 bunch of data, so we had a bunch of storage.

14           So, 2014 rolls around. The two big  
15 changes in 2014 were the Pacific council formally  
16 adopted EFPs for four applications -- five  
17 applications were submitted. They adopted four of  
18 them, which then went into effect in 2015 and then  
19 you started working in Alaska with small southeast  
20 -- small boats southeast of here. We started  
21 working with the NOAA Fisheries Service, Alaska  
22 Science Center. We've been working with them, and

1 I sit on the BM working group, and that's what  
2 it's called.

3 In 2015, and the EFP to the west coast  
4 goes into effect. About 30 percent of the fleet  
5 we brought -- we had two more reviewers because we  
6 had brought in Alaska and brought in many more  
7 boats. But they had the person to do data and to  
8 follow log books. And then, we decided this was  
9 getting serious, so we needed to have a more  
10 formal way of capturing the data, structuring the  
11 data and storing it.

12 An important role -- again, back to the  
13 squirrels. If you don't know what you're doing,  
14 you will get there. There's a difference between  
15 the goals of the two programs. On the west coast,  
16 we are doing the five month. John Stein has a  
17 quota, and he goes out fishing, and we are  
18 monitoring his compliance with those particular  
19 species. We are not doing science. Alaska thinks  
20 they're doing science, so I won't argue with them.

21 They're doing everything at the same  
22 time. We're really focusing on discards, because

1 we have the fish ticket on our coast. So, the  
2 fish tickets capture the retainings and they  
3 capture the scales, as opposed to me going, that  
4 looks like about 5,000 pounds of fish. So, we let  
5 the fish get to the retaining, and we do the  
6 discards with them. And again, Alaska's goal is  
7 they want to do everything. Retain them, discard  
8 them.

9           So, this is the program sort of in a  
10 nutshell. The important takeaway here is we have  
11 paper log books. I didn't ask to create an  
12 electronic log book, but I will probably do that  
13 by the end of the year. I'm not crazy about that  
14 idea, because it's been my experience that there  
15 are two kinds of people when it comes to  
16 electronic log books. There's people that love  
17 electronic log books and people that use  
18 electronic log books. And those are mutually  
19 exclusive, so it's (Laughter) -- and that lens is  
20 very slim and that overlaps, so it is usually  
21 pretty small, but I will build on because they  
22 want one.

1           So, a vessel is out fishing, and they  
2           send this electronic log book. What they do -- it  
3           actually is electronic, but they send a paper log  
4           book. They take a picture with a smart phone and  
5           they email it to us, because it's a state log  
6           book, and they have to hand it in to the state, so  
7           they have to do that regulatory. So, it is sort  
8           of electronic. It's a picture, so I guess that's  
9           electronic.

10           We capture it into a database. We also  
11           have electronic fish tickets database that the  
12           Pacific states run, and then that helps us  
13           understand -- oh, Heather just made a landing.  
14           Where is her log book? So, you can start to call  
15           skippers and we keep those two together.

16           And then nightly, we feed into a vessel  
17           account system and law enforcement has access to  
18           that. And that says Randy Fisher will not land in  
19           this many pounds of catch -- discard this much  
20           catch. So in our view, the log book is the  
21           record. That's the formal record. The fisherman  
22           signs that. That is what counts.

1                   So, we have a bunch of log books. And  
2                   these, I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time.  
3                   Because Oregon already had paper log books, so we  
4                   adopted and made these light changes. There was  
5                   already a required log book for trawlers, and it  
6                   was retained catch only, so we ended up having  
7                   another piece that said tell us about your  
8                   discards and have enough linkages between the two  
9                   documents that we can put them all together, so we  
10                  have a whole picture of what -- just the trawl  
11                  retained in this boat looks like.

12                  This is a very complicated slide, and  
13                  when I normally do this presentation, it takes me  
14                  six slides to get here. But you all are real  
15                  smart, so I'm doing it all at once (Laughter).  
16                  The day the log book comes in, we have to give  
17                  feedback to the vessel. You didn't report  
18                  something. We had four sets, and you only  
19                  reported three, or whatever the issue is.

20                  Video data comes off the log book. On  
21                  this coast, the skippers can pull the log -- they  
22                  can pull the hard drives. It's a plug and play

1 hard drive. They pull the hard drive and they  
2 send it to us. The hard drives are all encrypted,  
3 so they can't do much with it unless they're a 13  
4 year old computer kid. My kid can probably figure  
5 it out, but I can't.

6 So, they're encrypted. They pull them  
7 off. We put them on storage, and we have those  
8 three storage units. And then we have somebody  
9 doing the video review, and then that data goes  
10 into a database. This happens pretty quickly.  
11 These guys are required to send their log book in  
12 after they make their landing within 24 hours.  
13 The video -- it takes time to ship it. They're  
14 allowed to take a couple of different trips on it.  
15 It takes time for us to review it.

16 So, this is usually in the case first,  
17 and then after the fact, the EM data comes in. We  
18 compare the two, and depending on how those things  
19 compare on a species level, again, we're only  
20 looking at discards, we may send a new data feed  
21 to the vessel and then NOAA writes the log book.  
22 The rules are just simply, we start with the log

1 book. What you put in the log book is discards.

2           When this comparison happens, if you are  
3 within 10 percent of each other, then the log book  
4 stands. If we are 5 or 10 percent, then you  
5 report on the coast. And again, we're only  
6 looking at discarded fish.

7           So, we asked the fleet what they thought  
8 about logbooks and about EM, and this is the  
9 response that we got. This is one of your -- this  
10 is what we like (Laughter). We have amazing  
11 numbers of clips that highlight.

12           SPEAKER: Highlight (Laughter).

13           MR. COPELAND: This is a four minute  
14 annotation that is going to show you a whole lot  
15 of other things -- yeah, it's going to start.  
16 This is our screening, so these are my guys that  
17 are doing -- they're happy that we have this thing  
18 blocked out so it retains confidentiality, so you  
19 don't know what boat it is. But they are  
20 capturing the information metadata right now.  
21 There's a hall. These little squiggles are  
22 signatures either from a drummer sensor or a

1 hydraulic pressure sensor which triggers the  
2 cameras on and off.

3           So, accordingly, this process is what  
4 kind of gear is it, what kind of vessel is it,  
5 where they are fishing, what's the dates. And  
6 then, she's going to go in here and she's going to  
7 mark all of these things and say oh, there's a  
8 haul that started here and ended here, and there's  
9 a haul that started here and ended here.  
10 Basically, index the video. The video, what you  
11 see is still shots here for now.

12           All of this information and all of the  
13 four videos -- or three, you already counted one,  
14 are all getting ready. It makes it pretty easy.  
15 You can jump to a haul. She can sort of capture  
16 the data. Everything is happening at the same  
17 time. These things are -- you know, apparently,  
18 nobody is in that one. That cell is -- but these  
19 all happen all at once.

20           Then she can stop and start.  
21 Archipelago's software allows to review it up to  
22 16 times, so we're going to through the screens

1 really fast, and it lets you go down to, I think,  
2 half time. You can slow it way down. And of  
3 course, you can stop and say what was that species  
4 of fish.

5           So, this is it. This shows you sort of  
6 the power of their tool. This is -- I often call  
7 Archipelago's tool a bold one because it's not  
8 open source. National Marine Fisheries Service  
9 likes open source. They told me. They sent it to  
10 me in a Word document, which is in, of course, an  
11 open source piece of software that said we don't  
12 like the product or the software (Laughter). So,  
13 they don't like it.

14           This is the only one that works. One of  
15 the selling points I have, moving on later on is,  
16 we built a program on what exists. So, Courtney  
17 is capturing some data here down here with this  
18 guy. These are sablefish. Sablefish in a pot.  
19 They sit at the bottom of the ocean. The sand  
20 leaves will eat them up and you're only left with  
21 basically a bag of skin and bones.

22           They put it on that little -- we call it

1 the marley board, and then they measure it, and we  
2 get a length of fish, and then they can just go  
3 with this. Here's a trawler displaying fish so  
4 you can see what they look like through the  
5 trawler display.

6           What they're doing is they're showing us  
7 the fish so we can help identify the fish.  
8 Rockfish are hard to identify, but if they hold  
9 them up and turn them and give us a good view,  
10 they can identify them and say, oh, that's an OR  
11 rockfish. Look at that. So, he holds it up so we  
12 can see it. That fast. My guys can do that. I  
13 can't. But I don't even see the fish, but they  
14 do.

15           Whiting boats. This is what it looks  
16 like. Not a whole lot of information here other  
17 than to just give you a sense of what these data  
18 look like. So, Whiting is our industrial fishery  
19 on this coast. A hundred ton nets at a time for  
20 this guy. This guy is going to bring it shore  
21 side. He's dumping his net on the hole -- near  
22 the hole, going to hose it in the water. Whiting

1       guys are pretty simple. They're either dumping in  
2       the hole and coming home, or they're shipping it  
3       off to -- they're tying off the net and shipping  
4       it off to the processor.

5                 Here's the bottom product. This is the  
6       bane of my existence. As you can see, there's a  
7       lot of fish -- you know, 5 to 10 to 15,000 pounds  
8       hauls at a time. And it's just this mishmash of  
9       fish. So, these guys are sorting fish. All of  
10      these are the same picture. These guys are  
11      sorting fish.

12                My guys know the size of those. They  
13      know the size of all of these checker bins. So  
14      they can tell, oh, that checker bin was so big.  
15      It's a thousand pounds of fish, or whatever it is.

16                Halibut. Halibut is a species they have  
17      to discard. Same kind of thing, by putting on a  
18      board. We're looking at it and we're taking  
19      measurements for those -- weight/length  
20      relationships and say a halibut is this long, a  
21      sand fish is that long and weighs that much, and  
22      that's how it is done.

1                   One of the pots. They show us their  
2 buoy numbers, so they can we traffic the buoy  
3 numbers.

4                   (Simultaneous discussion)

5                   MR. COPELAND: This is the neighbor of  
6 the break dancer (Laughter). This one, I  
7 particularly like, if you point to the camera  
8 (Laughter/applause). So, it's fun what we get to  
9 see.

10                  (Simultaneous discussion)

11                  MR. COPELAND: So, the west coast's idea  
12 of how that happened. Here it gives you a sense  
13 of how many boats are we talking about. How many  
14 boats are in this EFP? Four different fleets.  
15 There's a bottom trough fleet. Those guys are  
16 dumping 10,000 pounds of all the mass. Trap  
17 boats, the pot boats, and then there's two whiting  
18 fleets, some that deliver mother ship and some  
19 that deliver shore side. Some of these boats are  
20 the same and they back and forth.

21                  So, the way to read this is there are 60  
22 boats in the EFP -- the bottom part of the EFP out

1 of 59 total. So, 60 boats total in the fishery,  
2 in the fleet. So, we're on 10 percent of the  
3 haulers. We're on 40 percent of the trap boats.  
4 We're on 62 percent of the whiting boats at sea,  
5 and then we're on about the same amount, a little  
6 less, of the short side whiting.

7 Just to give you a sense of what  
8 proportion of fleet we are on. And then this is  
9 the entire EFP fleet. So, it will give you a  
10 sense of -- we don't have a lot of activity to go  
11 through. We have quite bit of activity in the  
12 whiting boats. My expectation is the whiting  
13 fleet is going to go up to more like 80 or even  
14 more percent this year. We've had a lot of  
15 interest in those guys because of cost results.

16 Another way of looking at -- you know,  
17 how valuable is EM. So, all of the vessels of all  
18 four fleets. And then, I broke it down. So, the  
19 shore side, they have 27 IFQ vessels, 17 and 63  
20 percent. So, that's the way we read this thing.  
21 This is just all of the fleets combined.

22 How many fish tickets? Fish tickets are

1 landing receipts on this coast, so it gives you a  
2 sense of -- the shore side guys got 651 fish  
3 tickets. Of those, EM captured 481 or 74 percent.  
4 And then finally, pounds landed, 61 metric tons,  
5 48 metric tons so 80 percent of the catch, and  
6 about 75 percent of the revenue.

7           So, we're pretty engaged to get in the  
8 whiting boat. We're doing a pretty good job on  
9 the fishing boats. I expect to see more of them.  
10 Where we fall down, because it gets so hard to do  
11 is the bottom trawls. They're really hard to  
12 review, but they're not terribly engaged in this  
13 program. The interesting thing -- the irony of it  
14 is this started out as trawl rationalization  
15 program, and they're the ones that have the least  
16 representation.

17           Review time. So, I get a lot of  
18 questions about what does it take to review. So,  
19 these are the four years -- '13, '14 and '15. EFP  
20 actually started in May of '15, so the first  
21 couple of months of May were pre and then post.

22           The way to read this one is the blue is

1 actual time. I'm on a deck. I'm sorting fish.  
2 The camera's watching it and it takes me -- in  
3 2013, it took 132 minutes for them to sort their  
4 catch. Once the catch hits the deck and it's in  
5 this trawl out of here, we're all doing our job  
6 and we're sorting it, and the fish are all put  
7 away, a little over two hours. It took us 21  
8 percent higher than that, 160 minutes to actually  
9 review it, so, longer than real time to do the  
10 review.

11 And then you flip up to the other side  
12 on the whiting boats, on -- if it flips the other  
13 say, well, they got 55 minutes to put the fish  
14 away. You know, we're talking about 10 minutes,  
15 12 minutes to actually review the video. So,  
16 whiting is incredibly easy. That looks like about  
17 200 pounds of fish, and then we get speciation  
18 from the species count on the fish tickets.

19 So, it's just fast. All we're doing is  
20 saying how much fish are you getting for starters.  
21 We don't care retaining out here. But these guys  
22 have always been very quick. You know, the

1 relationship between the real time and the review  
2 time has been quick. And then fixed year, we're  
3 much faster than actual time.

4           And it got better. The reason these  
5 things went from this kind of number, you know, we  
6 were about half, way down, was when EFP started,  
7 they were restricted in doing discards, so they  
8 weren't allowed to discard as much as they used  
9 to. And so, with less discards, we have less  
10 work. We have less review. In 2014, we were  
11 doing everything. We were doing discards and  
12 retaining, so it took us a lot longer.

13           So 2015, as much as it's represented,  
14 this is what I expect to see moving forward. The  
15 discard rules are going to stay the same. The  
16 retention rules are going to stay the same. So, I  
17 expect these things to happen and these kinds of  
18 relationships to stay.

19           A question I get asked a lot is, does it  
20 work? Are we doing a good job? Are we missing  
21 everything? Are we capturing everything? So, we  
22 grabbed some of the bigger species for the fixture

1       boats and some of the bigger species for the  
2       bottom trawlers and the short side take.

3                 This is the pounds of retains and  
4       discards that the video sees. This is what the  
5       catch monitors. The person on the boat from 2014.  
6       You've got a person on the boat and a person at  
7       shore. In 2015, the person on the boat went away,  
8       so we've got to go back to that.

9                 So, you can see you know, this is the  
10      dash line to where we would like to be. We're  
11      pretty close on both of those things. You know,  
12      we're fairly close on -- I'm comfortable with  
13      these numbers. We get out the whiting paper and  
14      get great big numbers. We're spot on. So, this  
15      gives you a sense of how well we did we capture  
16      the data.

17                Can we speciate data? Can we speciate  
18      rockfish and can we speciate other fish. We don't  
19      have a problem with those. Again, this is a sense  
20      of -- and this is retained and discard both.  
21      These numbers get a little bit closer than this  
22      goes. It gives you a sense of does it work, are



1 we're seeing is 2015 -- again, the EFP is moving  
2 forward. Eighty-four percent of the video that we  
3 laid down are whiting boats or whiting trips.  
4 That's a huge amount of video. The reason it's so  
5 big is these guys go out fishing for three months  
6 at a time. Cameras are running 24/7. They're  
7 laying down a lot of video, whereas a fixed boat  
8 might go out for three days and come back and lay  
9 down for a week, they offload, they do other  
10 things, and then they go back out. They're doing  
11 much less, many fewer trips, many fewer days, they  
12 are a much smaller portion of it.

13 We have some changes in place to  
14 mitigate the whiting boats. Right now, a whiting  
15 boat goes out. It has four cameras on it. When  
16 they take their first haul, the cameras all come  
17 on. They all light up, and the room is lit up and  
18 we're watching this haul and getting all the  
19 pictures of all the bottom trawl and on the deck.

20 In 2015, last year, those cameras stayed  
21 on until they were done fishing, so they were  
22 basically on 24/7, three weeks in a row. That's a

1 lot of video, and a lot of video that we don't  
2 really need. So, moving forward in 2016, we  
3 worked with Archipelago on vessels. We changed  
4 the configuration, and now what happens is the  
5 hydraulic spike, because they're engaging it here  
6 -- cameras light up. The room is lit up.

7 We're watching everything. I think it's  
8 a two hour run on time. It typically came to  
9 about an hour, put it to bed. It's a two hour run  
10 on time. All four cameras stay on for two hours.  
11 At the end of two hours, three of the four cameras  
12 turn off and all you have is a deck camera looking  
13 down the middle of this vessel. And we're just  
14 watching the deck camera to make sure no one is  
15 going out and do something stilly and foolish.  
16 So, we have one camera instead of four. So these  
17 numbers will come down, we'll have a lower figure  
18 and still do what we need to do to monitor it.

19 This is the big enchilada here. This is  
20 the one that people ask me a lot about. How much  
21 does this cost? So, this is the 2015 EMP Fishery.  
22 How many days? How many sea days did they have

1 out of the four fishery types -- bottom trawl,  
2 trap, mother ship, catcher vessels and the short  
3 side trip vessels. So, how many sea days did they  
4 have?

5 I'll walk down the bottom trawls. Three  
6 and a half, 3.6 days per trip average. It took a  
7 little over 5 1/2 hauls per trip. The sort time.  
8 That's the time that they're actually on the deck  
9 and saying, I'm moving fish. I'm sorting fish.  
10 I'm putting fish to bed. 176 minutes on average.  
11 It took us just about two hours to review that, so  
12 less time. And 68 percent of the real time that  
13 it took us to review it. So, the average review  
14 of hours, butts in the seat, looking at a video,  
15 watching screens is about 11 3/4 hours. So,  
16 that's how long it takes us to review the average  
17 bottom trawl.

18 So, review costs. So, this is what it  
19 costs. About bucks an hour right now is our going  
20 cost. So for sea day, it costs them 163 bucks per  
21 trip. To cross all 3 1/2 days, it would cost them  
22 582.

1           Video costs. Video costs; again the big  
2 boogey man. Oh my god, it's going to crash the  
3 system. It's about 31 bucks a day for us to store  
4 video, with the caveat that this year, Alaska is  
5 buying one of those two video services. So, this  
6 one is really cut in half in terms of the west  
7 coast, because we can both work. So, we can share  
8 costs. The Pacific states are lucky because we do  
9 do work in both places, so we can share costs  
10 across.

11           So, 31 bucks a day, 112 bucks per trip.  
12 This is just storage costs. We laid it. We laid  
13 video. We laid terabytes on a storage unit. To  
14 give you a sense of the amount of video we had  
15 last year in 2015, we had about 120 terabytes of  
16 data in 2015. Again, that number is going to down  
17 as the whiting boats go down, but that gives you a  
18 sense of -- we're not talking about --

19           I looked up the Library of Congress. In  
20 2009, they laid down about 75 terabytes, so we  
21 were like we're bigger than the Library of  
22 Congress. But then I look at 2015 numbers, and

1       like everything else, they've grown with video.  
2       They're now at 6, whatever the next one is after  
3       terabytes, petabytes. So, I lost. I thought it  
4       was pretty cooler because I was bigger than the  
5       Library of Congress, but I'm not.

6                Archipelago does all the field services,  
7       We're not involved in field services. They  
8       contract -- both contract out of them. This is  
9       their cost. We just took their cost and said how  
10      many days would a fishing last across the peak,  
11      divide their annual costs and it's 110 bucks a day  
12      for those field services costs.

13               So, the total costs -- to the bottom  
14      line -- total cost per sea day for the bottom  
15      trawl is about 305. To put that in perspective,  
16      if they carry a body, they carry a human observer,  
17      so 500 bucks a day. Now, this is just review  
18      time. This is just the things that are missing,  
19      you know, so I'm not trying to school anybody. It  
20      costs about 12 grand to buy a camera system and  
21      put a camera system on your boat. Ten or 12  
22      grand, depending on the camera you buy.

1                   With the other pieces that are missing,  
2                   coincidentally, it takes about 12 grand to outfit  
3                   an observer. I'm shocked that I found that  
4                   number, so I could -- you can have an observer.  
5                   You can have a boat with a camera. Take your  
6                   pick. It's about the same costs.

7                   The fleet will be paying those costs  
8                   moving forward, because we did a lot of work over  
9                   the past years. We've provided them with cameras  
10                  in order to help them -- to sweeten the pot to get  
11                  them to come in and help us as a volunteer. So, a  
12                  lot of the boats right now already have cameras,  
13                  but those are costs of a new entry would have to  
14                  bear, 12,000 bucks. So, depending on how many  
15                  days you go fishing, it costs you 500 bucks a day  
16                  for an observer and you pay 12,000 for a camera.  
17                  I think it depends a lot on what makes sense for  
18                  them.

19                  Numbers, let's see. The whiting boats  
20                  -- those are really small numbers, and again,  
21                  that's a reflection of our EM costs are so cheap  
22                  -- four bucks a day, 11 bucks a day to do the

1 video review, because it's so fast. It's such a  
2 quick thing. It takes them nothing.

3 So, what I expect to see is the whiting  
4 boats will adopt -- again, we expect to see more  
5 of them come on the line. The trap boats will  
6 adopt it because it's less than half the price.  
7 The trawlers -- I don't know what they're going to  
8 do yet. I think everybody is going to different.  
9 It depends on how many trips they take a year.

10 I was asked to talk about resilience and  
11 small communities in EM. I struggled with this  
12 one. The best thing that I could say is there are  
13 difficulties, especially in some of the small  
14 ports getting compliance monitors. So, there's  
15 three of us in a port, and there's only two  
16 compliance monitors, and the weather clears.  
17 Somebody is not going fishing if you don't have a  
18 camera. So, that hurts the small ports, and it's  
19 typically the small ports where you see that.

20 Ports like Newport and ports like  
21 Astoria where there's a lot of boat, a lot of  
22 activity, there are a lot of things floating

1 around and you can go to sea. If you get in a  
2 port like Port Bragg, and again, there's one  
3 observer -- maybe not even one observer station in  
4 that port. It costs money. I have to pay money  
5 to bring an observer up from San Francisco or down  
6 from Eureka, wherever I am. There's some travel  
7 time, so it's additional costs to those guys.

8           So, the smaller ports are helped most by  
9 EM because it saves them that much more money.  
10 So, flexibility in trip planning -- again, three  
11 boats want to go out there's only two observers.  
12 If you have a camera, you just go out fishing.  
13 When the weather clears, you can go out. You  
14 don't have to wait for the observer to come up  
15 from San Francisco or down from where he's  
16 working, wherever they are. You have a little bit  
17 more flexibility than that.

18           What's next? 2017. West coast 2017.  
19 Whiting and fixture are going into regulations.  
20 So the EFP will be retired for those two fleets  
21 and there will be regulations next year. We're  
22 guessing on this one. 2018 for the bottom trawls.

1       They will extend the bottom trawls, they will  
2       either extend the EFP and they'll extend the  
3       regulations.

4                 There's been some talk -- I've been  
5       asked recently about putting cameras in processing  
6       plants, because what happens on our coast is, a  
7       boat goes out fishing and the boat has at sea  
8       observer.

9                 The boat makes a landing. The at sea  
10       observer gets off, takes off their shipboard hat  
11       and puts on their at sea hat, and they monitor the  
12       offload in the plant. The question is, if  
13       somebody carries EM there is no one to get off the  
14       boat. So now, there is no EM. What do we do  
15       again, especially in small ports? So, I've been  
16       starting some conversations about can you even do  
17       this.

18                MR. COPELAND: And beyond that, my  
19       crystal ball is not working. Alaska -- we've  
20       worked a little bit in Alaska. We're not as  
21       engaged there. They're talking about 2019 for  
22       regulations. I offered the EM working group a



1 is your EM's based on this card monitor. Right?

2 MR. COPELAND: For the west coast. Yes.

3 MS. BONNEY: And if you remove the  
4 observers in terms of product flow into the plants  
5 -- right? Because the vessel observer is  
6 following the plant observer. When you implement  
7 an EM program, how are you going to deal with  
8 dockside monitoring, because you're -- the EM is  
9 doing the discard, and then you need to match it  
10 with the retention side, which is the processing  
11 plant.

12 In the past, the observer did both. And  
13 so now you take the observer away on the boat, how  
14 are you going to deal with the plant side, if your  
15 cameras aren't there and functioning?

16 MR. COPELAND: So again, so the way it  
17 works now, forget EM. There is no EM. Pre-EM.  
18 You go out fishing, you can have a person on your  
19 boat. You come to my plant and you offload that  
20 person. It doesn't always have to be the same  
21 person, but 95 percent of the time, it's the same  
22 person who gets off your boat, comes into my plant

1 and monitors the offload.

2 Now, you start carrying the EM. The  
3 difference is, you don't have somebody on your  
4 boat. And that's the problem with the small  
5 community. If you don't have somebody on your  
6 boat, I, as the plant owner, as the person behind  
7 the process of the fish, I need to bring a  
8 compliance monitor for that, for that offload.  
9 I'm still required to do that.

10 The requirement is still that I have a  
11 monitor. If somebody comes in -- the difference  
12 being you just went on a three-day trip and paid  
13 500 bucks a day. I got somebody for four hours to  
14 offload a boat. I'm meeting that cost as a buyer.

15 MS. BONNEY: So, a portion of the cost  
16 is being transferred to the plants?

17 MR. COPELAND: And it always has been.  
18 So, it's always been, with or without EM, the  
19 plant is responsible to have somebody there to  
20 offload, and they pay that cost. So the plants  
21 have a contract with an observer provider, and the  
22 boats do. And typically, what happens is, you and

1 I and Harlon and all -- you know, you deliver to  
2 me all the time, and we would sit down with one  
3 provider and say we're coming in as a group, the  
4 three of us; me as a plant and you two with  
5 vessels, and we want --

6 You don't want to have different  
7 companies. You just get confused. It happens,  
8 but we typically work in a small port with one  
9 provider, and they provide short side and offload  
10 monitoring.

11 MS. BONNEY: And in Alaska, what we've  
12 done, and now the observer side, is there's no  
13 plan observers anymore.

14 (Simultaneous discussion)

15 MS. BONNEY: Right. So, you're saying  
16 that you have observers in the plant and on the  
17 vessels, now.

18 MR. COPELAND: West coast, yes.

19 MS. BONNEY: Okay, I missed that.

20 MR. COPELAND: Yeah, sorry. So you  
21 know, there are some differences.

22 MS. MORRIS: Any other questions or

1       comments? Terri?

2                   MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm pretty familiar with  
3       the EM systems that have been recently implemented  
4       a hundred percent on the pelagic long line fishery  
5       in the Atlantic.

6                   MR. COPELAND: Mm-hmm.

7                   MS. BEIDEMAN: And it's early on, and  
8       some of the contractors that you mentioned were  
9       involved in that. I'm wondering, did you have  
10      similar installation problems? Because I mean, we  
11      have like 135 boats that's outfitted, but it's the  
12      entire fleet that was eligible.

13                   And the government paid for the  
14      installation through a contract. But each one is  
15      a custom install, because every boat is different.  
16      The wiring is different. The setup is different.  
17      And you know, we had some snags along the way.  
18      Did you discover that you had problems with that?

19                   MR. COPELAND: So again, primarily, we  
20      worked with Archipelago. They were the one -- we  
21      did an RFP when we started this whole thing,  
22      because I can't just go willy nilly and make a

1 contract.

2 MS. BEIDEMAN: Uh-huh.

3 MR. COPELAND: We did an RFP, and they  
4 were the only ones who provided -- I think that  
5 responded and provided a proposal. So, my  
6 decision was easy. I had one proposal from only  
7 one company (Laughter). Even I could do that  
8 much. So, they have had a lot of experience with  
9 BC. They had been working in BC, British Columbia  
10 for 10 years before that. They're in Australia.  
11 They're in New Zealand. You know, they're in  
12 Europe, the European Union.

13 So, they've done a lot of work in  
14 different parts of the country and in different  
15 parts of the world on big boats, little boats.  
16 So, they have a lot of experience in doing  
17 installations. I'm not going to say they were  
18 problem free, but typically, our biggest problems  
19 we had with installations was the way the camera  
20 -- and they would take a still picture of the  
21 camera, and the way the camera shot and captured  
22 the deck -- you know, a still picture, yeah, that

1 looks like it will work.

2                   And then, once you see the crew actually  
3 fishing and actually moving around, you realize  
4 I'm missing this part here in here where there's a  
5 lot of activity. Go move the camera. It wasn't a  
6 re-install. They're just going and moving the  
7 camera and refocusing the camera at a different  
8 piece. But everyone is unique, and everybody  
9 boats differently.

10                   MS. BEIDEMAN: Right.

11                   MR. COPELAND: Everyone is different.  
12 We didn't have a lot of snags, but I've heard  
13 about a lot of snags. But I haven't been able to  
14 get a whole lot of information on the east coast.  
15 It's a black box out there (Laughter). I don't  
16 know what you guys are doing. We're pretty  
17 transparent, so I don't get it.

18                   MS. BEIDEMAN: Well, it's the HMS  
19 division.

20                   MR. COPELAND: There you go.

21                   MS. BEIDEMAN: That they are not a  
22 council. (Laughter) So, they aren't as

1 transparent in some ways. But I wanted to find  
2 out the average size -- are the boats that these  
3 are installed on or the range --

4 (Simultaneous discussion)

5 MR. COPELAND: The factory trawlers, the  
6 larger boats, the whiting boats, you know, they're  
7 in the hundred foot type class. And then, the  
8 boats, down to the pot boats where they are you  
9 know, 30 and 40s.

10 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. So, if the camera  
11 isn't functioning on our vessels, the vessel can't  
12 go. They must stay until it's repaired. And  
13 we're pretty geographically diverse. Obviously,  
14 it runs from Texas to sometimes Canada. So, those  
15 are factors you know, just to be considered, I  
16 guess. And we also had some problems with  
17 materials that were being used that were not  
18 Marine grade causing interference with other  
19 electronics on the boat.

20 So, I'm just raising -- I think it's the  
21 way it's going to wind up going. We did have a  
22 lot of resistance from the fleet, because it was

1 kind of foisted upon them. We had BMS all ready  
2 to do reporting. We've had observer coverage  
3 pretty heavy. And it was -- this is it. We're  
4 putting it on the boat, so you can't complain.  
5 You know?

6 MR. COPELAND: Right.

7 MS. BEIDEMAN: We're paying for it.  
8 They were already talking about you know, recovery  
9 costs, you know, and how we will keep handling  
10 that. But I just -- you know, I think some  
11 companies might be more skilled than others.

12 SPEAKER: Yeah.

13 MS. BEIDEMAN: That's so far, my  
14 experience --

15 SPEAKER: Right.

16 MS. BEIDEMAN: -- with it. But the  
17 fishermen buy in because they have not had to pay  
18 the cost of an observer aboard their boat. That  
19 was the discussion that we had with them all  
20 along, and you know, my role is okay, well the  
21 cost of a human person to be aboard your boat, if  
22 you had to bear that cost, which you haven't, and

1       these are --

2                   But it's really difficult, and I would  
3       challenge probably most of you not wanting to have  
4       a camera seated in your office all day, watching  
5       everything you're doing, So, I kind of get it. I  
6       understand the reasons why, but I also understand  
7       you know, the resistance.

8                   (Simultaneous discussion)

9                   MS. MORRIS: Are there other comments or  
10       questions?

11                   MS. BEIDEMAN: So it's --

12                   MS. MORRIS: Yes, Peter?

13                   SPEAKER: So, the logbooks are still the  
14       primary legal mechanism in terms of --

15                   MR. COPELAND: Yeah, those are state  
16       logbooks --

17                   SPEAKER: So the EM is just confirming  
18       that --

19                   MR. COPELAND: Right, confirming  
20       discards.

21                   SPEAKER: Do you see coming down the  
22       road the analytical capability of having some --

1       you know, like the IRS as flags on the returns --

2                   MR. COPELAND: Right.

3                   SPEAKER: -- saying you know, this -- as  
4       compared to everybody else, we want to --

5                   SPEAKER: -- we want to look at your  
6       film. So right now, you're looking at all the  
7       film, and it's expensive. I mean, it's you know,  
8       small ground fish boat and knowing what I paid for  
9       that, hopefully that they would not be able to  
10      fish, in some cases. So, do you see a flag system  
11      emerging from this over time, so that you were  
12      watching less than a hundred percent of the film  
13      and still feel comfortable that you are in a  
14      position to catch folks that aren't reporting  
15      accurately?

16                  MR. COPELAND: I can tell you how I see  
17      it being used. I'm not a law enforcement -- I  
18      look at it, and my perspective is, you're a clean  
19      player. I know you. You've been fishing. We can  
20      look at a calendar for 10 years, for 5 years, for  
21      2 years, whatever it is. We know who you are.  
22      You're a clean player.

1                   But Randy Fisher, that dirty rotten  
2                   bastard -- what has happened is -- so, let's say  
3                   it's decided that we're going to do a 20 percent  
4                   review. You may get one trip a year with me, and  
5                   I'm watching every one of Randy's (Laughter). You  
6                   know? It's a little like a speed trap. You know?  
7                   I know Randy's going to speed. I'm going to sit  
8                   outside the bar at 2:15 at night, because that's  
9                   where you're going to get the drunk drivers.

10                   I'm not going to be sitting outside that  
11                   bar at 2:15 in the afternoon. So you know, you're  
12                   smart about -- this isn't a science project.  
13                   We're not doing random sampling. This isn't  
14                   random. I know who all of you are. I know how  
15                   all of you fish. We'll be watching more of the  
16                   Randy's and less of yours.

17                   So, that's how I envision it will  
18                   happen. We'll still watch you, just to make sure  
19                   -- and then, I'll make sure I call you up and say,  
20                   well, wasn't that funny, the way you did this.  
21                   And I'll find something that's unique about that  
22                   trip, so you know I'm watching. You know, it's

1 sort of a big brother thing. But I think that's  
2 how we'll use -- it's not a science tool. It is a  
3 compliance tool. You know, we're the cops looking  
4 for the speeders.

5 SPEAKER: So the other numbers, the 500  
6 dollar or whatever it was, I was looking at the  
7 bottom trawl -- the 500 dollar component of  
8 watching 100 percent of the bottom trawl trips  
9 which are so complicated, that number could go  
10 down in the individual case --

11 MR. COPELAND: Sure.

12 SPEAKER: -- in individual cases.

13 MR. COPELAND: Well, right now, they're  
14 not paying me. So I mean, right now --

15 SPEAKER: Well I mean --

16 MR. COPELAND: Just down the road there  
17 --

18 SPEAKER: The others are kind of fixed.  
19 Right?

20 MR. COPELAND: Right.

21 SPEAKER: Those are kind of hard costs.

22 MR. COPELAND: These things are -- well,

1 the review costs, as you go down, this is where  
2 you'll capture that savings, if you're only using  
3 20 percent --

4 SPEAKER: Right.

5 MR. COLPO: -- this is where you'll  
6 capture that safely. If you're only reading 20  
7 percent and whatever the number is. I expect in  
8 the white -- with the caveat that I expect in the  
9 whiting fishery we will always watch 100 percent.  
10 And the reason is twofold. One, it's so damn fast  
11 and it takes you longer to skip around and watch  
12 every third one or whatever you want to do.

13 And two is as I've explained to the  
14 whiting fisherman and sort of the directors and  
15 the people that come to the Council, for 12 bucks  
16 a day you can say we demanded 100 percent  
17 monitoring damn it. We're not going with 10  
18 percent or 20. You get a little coup for 12 bucks  
19 a day. So I think they're going to go with that  
20 one.

21 Fixture, guys, I don't really know. We  
22 don't know what the number is but it is not a

1 science project, not random sampling. We'll be  
2 looking for specific people. I think that to the  
3 question/comment that you had earlier about  
4 cameras and I think cameras are obviously a very  
5 important piece of it. I used to have a graph  
6 that showed all the moving parts.

7           The moving part that never gets asked  
8 about is the software review. Where we found the  
9 most difference in terms of cost, in terms of our  
10 cost was in the review software because some of  
11 the software companies were -- it was essentially  
12 Windows Media Player and you scroll through the  
13 whole thing and you watch the whole video. Oh,  
14 there's a haul event and now let's stop and review  
15 it. Whereas, an archipelago system, Voldemort, we  
16 can jump right to the event. You can jump right  
17 to it based on the hydraulics and watch the  
18 process and jump really quickly in and out.

19           So it saves us so much time. Another  
20 company that we work with, who shall remain  
21 unnamed, I called it five times longer to review  
22 my PM -- my PBM review of trawl. So they're, you

1 know, instead of 50 bucks an hour it's 500 bucks  
2 an hour because he's doing 10 times more. So  
3 there's your, I mean, it just blasts the logs.

4 So I think review is way more important  
5 and software is way more important than the  
6 cameras. And down the road, we're going to have  
7 machine vision. I mean, I think that's going to  
8 happen. We do not, unlike Alaska; we do not take  
9 machine vision -- we started with what we had. We  
10 decided we were supposed to -- I was supposed to  
11 build a program today not five years from now. So  
12 we focused on the existing software, existing  
13 hardware.

14 Alaska is looking more forward and  
15 looking down the road five years. We're going to  
16 wait for them to invent it then we're going to go.  
17 I have no problem stealing from those people.

18 MS. MORRIS: Peter Moore?

19 MR. MOORE: Okay, that was my question.  
20 So this is institutionalizing a particular system  
21 and going -- how do because I'm familiar with  
22 those vision systems for fish processing, for

1 instance, and species ID. We had some -- it's  
2 incredible. And so what I'm wondering is, you  
3 know, you built this system around a particular  
4 hardware and software. And when something better  
5 comes along that probably will be a heck of a lot  
6 cheaper for the fishing industry potentially and  
7 cheaper for the data processing piece and probably  
8 feeding that information into, you know, John Shaw  
9 (phonetic) for instance. I know what I -- I guess  
10 what I would be curious or concerned about is, you  
11 know, who bears the cost for that, right?

12 And it's, you know, these people -- are  
13 these people all buying these camera systems so  
14 they can go fishing without an observer.  
15 Basically it's a trade-off right?

16 MR. COLPO: Somewhat.

17 MR. MOORE: Okay. So when a better  
18 mousetrap comes along, is that you just go through  
19 that process again of saying, I mean, I'm just --  
20 you know what I'm saying?

21 MR. COLPO: I do.

22 MR. MOORE: It's like how do you kind of

1 graduate?

2 MR. COLPO: Keep in mind there's two  
3 pieces, two components. There's the hardware  
4 which then lays down some video. So I end up with  
5 a video stream. And then, there's the review  
6 software that's plugged into that particular video  
7 feed. If something comes along that says I can --  
8 right now I have the EM that I've seen working and  
9 I have made -- you've seen much better than I  
10 have. My first question is can you tell me  
11 there's a fish? Forget speciation how big it is,  
12 how long it is. Just tell me it's a fish and not  
13 a rock.

14 And so far I haven't had success in --  
15 the answer is uh, no. So we -- they have --  
16 they're not there yet.

17 MR. MOORE: Yeah.

18 MR. COLPO: But then, when that time  
19 comes, we'll just take that video feed and feed it  
20 into whatever this camera vision is. Because  
21 there's nothing magic about the video feed. It's  
22 not, you know, it's just a video feed. We can

1 watch it with Windows Media Player so it's just a  
2 normal, I don't know what the -- I don't know AVI,  
3 I don't know what the video feed is. But then we  
4 would plug that into a computer vision software  
5 and walk away from the review software and just  
6 replace one with the other.

7 So I don't anticipate a problem. I mean  
8 there will be hiccups in making that transition  
9 because they're always interchanging systems. But  
10 again, I was asked, the flip side is I wait until  
11 computer vision gets perfected and then build a --  
12 and then institutionalize that one but that's  
13 going to move forward too.

14 MR. MOORE: So I guess what I'm getting  
15 at partly is this is an accountability tool right  
16 now, right?

17 MR. COLPO: Uh-huh.

18 MR. MOORE: Primarily?

19 MR. COLPO: Yes, yes.

20 MR. MOORE: So when you look at it from  
21 the stock assessment side of the picture, my  
22 suggestion would be that we're looking forward,

1       how do you do both? How can you give John what he  
2       needs on real time, right and --

3                   MS. MORRIS: John wants to respond.

4                   MR. CORBIN: Well, I mean, that's the  
5       third question but this is discarding what we're  
6       -- we are going to keep -- we will keep in place  
7       what I call a scientific observing. So we will  
8       put we to our funds, NOAA fisheries will have  
9       people on boats perhaps even with a camera. And  
10      then, they will be taking that additional  
11      information about, you know, getting ear bones,  
12      doing -- getting gut contents, doing other  
13      analyses. So that'll keep going.

14                  MR. MOORE: As observers?

15                  MR. CORBIN: As scientific observers.  
16      They're not there -- the camera's going to do the  
17      work. Now they don't have to work about that.  
18      They're there to really monitor the catch and get  
19      the biological information.

20                  MR. COLPO: And that will be at NOAA's  
21      expense?

22                  MR. CORBIN: That's at NOAA's expense

1 and that'll be roughly five, you know, it depends  
2 on the fisheries but, you know, roughly 20  
3 percent.

4 SPEAKER: Right. We used to do 20  
5 percent -- that's what they'll go back to.

6 MR. CORBIN: Excuse me, Randy?

7 SPEAKER: Yeah, well, it was 20 percent  
8 cut rate and then, you know, that's what they'll  
9 continue to do.

10 MR. CORBIN: So right. And then, and  
11 for the stock assessment, I mean, this will do it  
12 to the log book and that catch information will  
13 still come to us and from the discard information.

14 MR. COLPO: And the log books are  
15 electronic, right? I mean they're not --

16 SPEAKER: Well, that's my question that  
17 I was going to ask you. You said you didn't want  
18 to go with or you have your mixed feelings about  
19 electronic log books. So right now with the paper  
20 log books, how long does it take you to collect  
21 from the entire fishing fleet and get your total  
22 catch in?

1                   MR. COLPO: Right. About a year and a  
2 half ago I was pushed by the Pacific Council and I  
3 got a little irritated and I made the statement  
4 that I will have log books regardless of what type  
5 they are, I will log books in a queryable database  
6 within two days of receiving the log book. And I  
7 do. And actually I'm usually within one day.

8                   SPEAKER: Paper?

9                   MR. COLPO: Paper.

10                  SPEAKER: Can you cover the ink though?

11                  MR. COLPO: I can. You don't want me  
12 but I can. Yeah, so we have them and if the  
13 vessels -- so what happens is most of these guys,  
14 you know, they've been setting the routine. Don't  
15 even think about. They're done. You finish your  
16 log book. I take my smartphone. I hold it up. I  
17 take a picture. I email that picture to Dave or  
18 we have a box that's set up for it. I have guys  
19 that they print them and they sit in the shop and  
20 we share -- a couple of our programs share some  
21 data entry people.

22                  And within a day, two business days,

1 within a day or two that data is in a log book --  
2 in the system database that you can query. So --  
3 it's a bit faster but --

4 SPEAKER: Well, to your question, to  
5 stocks, ACLs and to real-time data and real-time  
6 management, that -- the beauty of or the why we  
7 were after electronic reporting for log books for  
8 the fishery statistics was because that's the  
9 information that can allow the industry to be  
10 dynamic on the management and you can do it with  
11 paper and you have. And like you said, it gets  
12 pictures. It gets done. It doesn't have to be  
13 mailed in, doesn't have to be taken in.

14 For example, some things take us four  
15 years. So four years ago you went over ACL, I  
16 remember. So I mean it's an issue but if you can  
17 do it with paper in two days, I mean, that's  
18 you're solving that issue to, you know -- I'm  
19 sorry.

20 MR. CORBIN: No and then we worked hard  
21 on turning around the observer data, the discard  
22 data because as you heard before there's some

1 boats that they got to know exactly what they have  
2 and so they can either trade with somebody if they  
3 need to or and we made some real progress. The  
4 guys really worked really hard to make that -- can  
5 you just pull up that Word document?

6 SPEAKER: It's just -- I am trying to.

7 MS. MORRIS: Trying to pull up a  
8 document? Liz? Were you raising your hand?

9 MS. HAMILTON: No.

10 MS. MORRIS: So the bottom trawls said  
11 when they seemed to -- it is -- yours -- the way  
12 you talked about it is resistance from the  
13 fisherman or is it just because it's harder to  
14 accomplish what you need to know at the EM for  
15 that fishery?

16 MR. COLPO: The rule of thumb that I  
17 have found have worked with the EM and with the  
18 fisherman and I don't care whether it's EM or  
19 whatever it is. The less a fisherman has to  
20 change their behavior the more accepting they are  
21 of that change. So what -- in the whiting fishery  
22 there is no change. They're doing exactly the

1 same thing whether it's a person or a camera. So  
2 there is zero and literally zero change.

3 The trap boats you saw those guys  
4 holding out the fish they get, a dozen rockfish --  
5 a small number. It's a minor change for them to  
6 have to do -- put fish on a measuring board, pull  
7 the fish up that kind of stuff. Show me finds  
8 like finds like shore finds -- it's a pretty minor  
9 amount of work for them to do.

10 So for them, you know, okay it's a  
11 little bit of change. I'm still open to that  
12 idea. I'll do that one. When you talk to bottom  
13 trawlers now because of this cargo requirements  
14 with carrying an EM and much more sorting that  
15 they have to do, they are the ones that are  
16 bearing the brunt of the -- everyone is bearing  
17 the brunt of the largest change from status quo  
18 because they are the most resistant.

19 Again, not judging them. Not good or  
20 bad. They are just the most resistant. I mean,  
21 I'm asking you to do way more than you used to do.  
22 Well, wait a minute, maybe 500 bucks a day isn't

1 so bad.

2 MS. MORRIS: You wanted to go to the  
3 Word document for some response?

4 MR. COLPO: I was going to -- I was  
5 asked why it was working on the West Coast. So  
6 this morning in the shower, I didn't type it in  
7 the shower. This morning in the shower I kept  
8 thinking about it and it -- if the group would  
9 like to hear it, I can tell you why I think it  
10 works on the West Coast and why it may be  
11 struggling in other areas.

12 So the Pacific Council was skeptical so  
13 we have -- but after they got there they embraced  
14 it. They realized that this is going to work so  
15 we have full support of the Council, staff time  
16 and Council time. We have Council decision time.

17 The Council, all of us, the Council, the  
18 industry, the PS industry and industry is  
19 underlined because industry has to be part of it;  
20 we all share a common vision of what success looks  
21 like. The other programs that I see when I talk  
22 to them there are three different visions of

1 success depending on who you are. And without  
2 that agreement, you're going to be stuck.

3 And we are also building with  
4 implementation in mind. I read a lot about a lot  
5 of pilot programs that are going up. Pilot  
6 programs are very nice and they end up with nice  
7 documents on the shelf. We were implementing.

8 We are different. Pacific states is  
9 different than Gulf states and Atlantic states. I  
10 love coast -- my sister commissions. I love them  
11 dearly. We're not better or worse we're just  
12 different. Maybe our -- I'm not sure. Maybe it's  
13 the relationships are better. I don't know what  
14 it is but we do things differently than the other  
15 two. And Atlantic states have a management body.

16 We don't have management authority so  
17 that makes us sort of Switzerland. We're not, you  
18 know, we don't manage fishermen. In Alaska, we do  
19 the review but we're not involved in any of the  
20 design implementation. So that's one I can talk  
21 about.

22 So Alaska is more like being in the Gulf

1 states and Atlantic states. We're not really  
2 involved. All we're doing is review. They don't  
3 need our help in designing it. They don't need  
4 our help in doing any of that stuff. We're just  
5 reviewers. Whether this is a coincidence? Why  
6 are you going into regs -- why are you a fixed  
7 year in 2017? Alaska to 2019 and I got verbiage  
8 that says it's 2020. And so there's two programs  
9 where I'm involved, sort of involved.

10 One not very involved at all and one  
11 extremely involved and those are the timelines.  
12 Is that the same? I don't know that that -- maybe  
13 it's a coincidence. Can you scroll up on the  
14 bottom?

15 We had a lot of infrastructure in place.  
16 So we had, you know, you saw some of the pictures  
17 with Pac-Man (sic), our Atlantic receipt system,  
18 electronic fish tickets. We run the compliance  
19 monitoring program. We have staff embedded in  
20 John Shaw for the observer programs. So we got  
21 bodies already in place.

22 We have programs already in place so we

1 don't have to create a lot of this stuff. It was  
2 really easy for us. We are doing a monitoring  
3 test on the West Coast. It's in the region. It's  
4 not in the science center. We're not doing  
5 science. We're doing monitoring and that's why  
6 Steve Friese has it and not John Stein.

7           Maybe that makes it easier, maybe it  
8 doesn't. I'm told it's easier if you're doing  
9 monitoring. It's not science and it's definitely  
10 not rocket science. The sense that I get when I  
11 talk to people around the country is oh my God,  
12 this is like brain surgery with two heads joined  
13 together. It's not. It isn't for us. We've been  
14 able to figure it out. I don't know why -- it  
15 seems like such angst about it.

16           Industry is supportive of a solution  
17 that costs less not costs zero. What I hear from  
18 other regions is I'm not paying anything. Well,  
19 if you have zero costs you're not going to get a  
20 program. You can't be zero. So what we have is  
21 we have a price point of 500 bucks a day that we  
22 have to beat. Can we beat 500 bucks a day? If we

1 can, it costs 600 bucks a day to do EM, it's not  
2 worth it.

3 So we know what we're trying to beat and  
4 the industry is supportive of that. We're trying  
5 to lower the costs. Again, we built a program on  
6 today's technology, not what's five years down the  
7 road. Camera vision is great. I haven't seen it  
8 work yet.

9 And then, finally, the very bottom one.  
10 And this is I'm probably going to get in trouble  
11 with this one. Two white guys built this. That  
12 one and this one. We don't -- we're far enough in  
13 our careers. I don't care who gets credit. I  
14 really don't care who gets credit and we don't  
15 have time to do pilots. I'm not going to live  
16 long enough to see a pilot come.

17 We built this thing with implementation  
18 in mind. So could it be two white women?  
19 Absolutely. Could we do black women? It could be  
20 two of any -- I don't care what it is but it's  
21 people who don't care about success, don't care  
22 about credit as much as success. We want this to

1 work. My boss wants this to work and we have  
2 support. Everybody's pulling in the same  
3 direction and that's why it's working so well  
4 here.

5 And I think we have a successful  
6 program. I mean, I think we have a -- it's going  
7 into the regs next year. And where it might be  
8 struggling in others, I don't know, the East  
9 Coast, I can't even find out what they're doing.  
10 So I think it's we're different and lucky us. I  
11 tell people I live in fish heaven because we have  
12 such a good group.

13 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so we have two more  
14 comments and then, we're going to move on to the  
15 protected resources report. And so that's Terri  
16 and then, Mike.

17 MS. BEIDEMAN: Oh, I just -- you  
18 mentioned the data storage, et cetera. So you  
19 retain possession of the data?

20 MR. COLPO: 100 percent so far. 100  
21 percent now. What we are moving to is we went  
22 back to 2011. The marching orders I have is I

1 keep three years at a time. So I have to keep the  
2 last three years. So I will keep '13, '14, '15  
3 now and so it'll be a little more than three  
4 because I have '16 backing up on it. So three  
5 years tops and I get to start again.

6 MS. MORRIS: And, Steve, did you want to  
7 comment too?

8 STEVE: You are wrestling with the data  
9 storage issue. Besides the sampling rate, when  
10 does a video come of record? So on our billion  
11 dollar row on the industry pays for the storage of  
12 the video. Then the video only becomes of record  
13 once we ask for that piece of video. The  
14 government costs of storage will happen.

15 But from the industry point of view,  
16 they're worried about things on the video they  
17 don't want the government to watch, can't control  
18 that but we're only going to be pulling less video  
19 from the industry than we are doing now because  
20 we're sensitive to when a record becomes a  
21 government record and then we have to do long-term  
22 storage on that stuff.

1 MS. MORRIS: Mike?

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I'm an old white  
3 guy, too. Dave has been referred to by somebody I  
4 can't recall as somewhat of an eccentric  
5 intellectual but he and his team --

6 MR. COLPO: I've been called worse.

7 SPEAKER: You've been called worse than  
8 that I guess.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm not going there.  
10 But I don't think there's anybody I've run into  
11 that doesn't appreciate what his team has done and  
12 the passion he puts into it. For an operational  
13 excellence guy he'd be perfect because he's always  
14 attempting to improve. So we owe him a lot I  
15 think on this coast.

16 I will say one thing to Julie's comment  
17 on the bottom fish. Right now I've talked to  
18 quite a few fishermen that support it on the  
19 bottom fish side. And I've talked to a lot of  
20 them that don't support it so that's going to be  
21 an interesting one. And so how you tackle that I  
22 don't know but --

1                   MS. MORRIS: So thank you. Thank you  
2                   for the presentation. It's very impressive,  
3                   thought-provoking, leadership, all those aspects.  
4                   Thank you, Randy and David.

5                   The next agenda item is a report from  
6                   the Protected Resources Subcommittee. Heather?

7                   MS. BRANDON: All right, thank you.  
8                   Hopefully I'm loud enough for everyone. And so as  
9                   folks know the Protected Resources Subcommittee  
10                  had completed, under Julie's guidance, a  
11                  retrospective analysis of several different  
12                  protected resources recovery plans around the  
13                  country. And we had to figure out where we wanted  
14                  to move after that with that work.

15                  So we decided to focus on two species  
16                  because they were also among the suite of the  
17                  species in the spotlight group. So those two  
18                  species are light abalone which is in Southern  
19                  California and Hawaiian monk seal.

20                  So for those two species we looked at  
21                  the species in the spotlight document that was  
22                  produced and I encourage all of you to look at

1       those because they're pretty -- they're just an  
2       excellent distillation of the most salient issues  
3       for those species and what needs to be done for  
4       recovery and identified partners to work with.  
5       And so they're just really excellent documents and  
6       we, frankly, love to see those for all species  
7       that have recovery plans.

8                 The discussion that we had at breakfast  
9       time was what else could MAFAC do to help. And  
10      we, at first we thought maybe helping protected  
11      resources develop new partners or solidify  
12      existing partnerships. But what we really need to  
13      have is a better understanding of what protective  
14      resources feels are the obstacles to  
15      implementation for those two species. Whether  
16      those are funding or permitting obstacles or is it  
17      really the partnerships that need to be pushed?

18                So we also, let's see. We also talked  
19      about would protected resources be open to  
20      creative or innovative solutions and one idea was  
21      why abalone was to develop a captive breeding  
22      program for commercial of white abalone that would

1 help with the funding. It would help generate  
2 funding.

3           So we recognize that that's a pretty  
4 creative solution. And so is that something that  
5 protected resources would like MAFAC to be  
6 generating or not? So the direction we've decided  
7 to go in would be that I would continue a  
8 conversation that we've been having with protected  
9 resources to discuss the best ways for MAFAC to  
10 contribute to the recovery actions that are  
11 identified for white abalone and Hawaiian monk  
12 seal and then, potentially expand that to other  
13 species in the spotlight.

14           And then, we had an overarching  
15 conversation and others who were at the breakfast  
16 should feel free to chime in. But the overarching  
17 conversation was about how protected resources  
18 cultivates existing partners and that they should  
19 do that in a more intentional way and in a  
20 consistent manner. And to -- if they would do  
21 that, that would show good will, acknowledge the  
22 value of all the partners and it would give the

1 partners a way to justify the work and to lobby  
2 and fundraise for the continuation of that work.

3           And where there were some examples where  
4 there were inconsistencies of acknowledging  
5 partners and that that was -- we'd like that to be  
6 worked on. One example was when industry is not  
7 referred to as a partner so maybe a Web site says  
8 partners and industry but so we'd like to have  
9 consistency that industry is a partner to avoid  
10 sort of an us versus them language.

11           And we would like to be consistent  
12 across all of the NMPS and outwards producing  
13 material so like on Web sites for example. So  
14 that is my report out. And I don't know if people  
15 that were at the breakfast meeting would like to  
16 add anything?

17           MS. MORRIS: Yes, Pam?

18           MS. YOCHER: I was just going to give an  
19 example. The bookmarks that Heidi put out for  
20 everybody, species in the spotlight. So this one  
21 is Hawaiian monk seal. I'm not sure what Nasmir  
22 Fisheries hopes for these, how widely they want

1       them distributed. But as an example, partners  
2       that have not been recognized, I can think of at  
3       least three oceanarium partners that have been  
4       very involved and are continuing to be very  
5       involved in some of the disease outbreak work.

6               The Marine Mammal Center is acknowledged  
7       but there are at least three that I can think of  
8       that have not been acknowledged. And those folks  
9       have a lot of outreach opportunities with guests  
10       who come into their park. So for example, if  
11       National Marine Fishery Service would like to give  
12       these to some of those partners and say could you  
13       distribute these for us, on the back is a Web  
14       site. If a guest were to go to this Web site  
15       would they see these organizations acknowledged?

16              And so I did some surveying of the Web  
17       site looking at all of the species in the  
18       spotlight and trying to hunt through and see where  
19       partners were acknowledged. And in some cases  
20       there are the chosen ones. For example, there was  
21       one situation where I know five different academic  
22       partners were involved and only one is mentioned.

1       And I understand there's an issue, like the  
2       example that I used was inviting children to your  
3       birthday party. Do you invite the whole class or  
4       a selective number?

5                   But I mean, frankly, coming from a  
6       non-profit organization, we struggle with this in  
7       terms of acknowledging donors. We figure out a  
8       way to make sure that everybody is thanked and the  
9       way to get funding or cooperation in the future is  
10      to acknowledge past cooperation.

11                   So I don't know what the answer is but  
12      that was something that really came through all of  
13      these documents for a number of us on the  
14      Subcommittee that NOAA Fisheries could do better.

15                   MS. MORRIS: Any other questions or  
16      comments about the Protected Resources  
17      Subcommittee report? Thank you, Heather. Thank  
18      you those who participated in the breakfast  
19      meeting.

20                   And let's move on to Hatchery Genetic  
21      Management Plans. And we have a draft document  
22      that's been emailed and can be projected, is that

1 right? So, Dick, do you want to introduce this?

2 MR. BRAME: Well, it's been emailed to  
3 everybody and as you might suspect having an East  
4 Coast guy write a letter about a Northwest issue,  
5 I mangled it pretty good. And Julie did a great  
6 job of making it better and then, Liz really  
7 cleaned it up. And there were suggestions from  
8 Mike that I thought were very good.

9 So what I'd like to do is if you'll look  
10 at it, rather than engage in a group edit process,  
11 you don't have any problem with the content of it  
12 and the intent of the letter, then delegate the  
13 authority to Julie Morris and I to edit as we see  
14 fit and submit it. If everybody's okay with that?

15 MS. MORRIS: So do you folks want to  
16 take just a minute to read it?

17 SPEAKER: You can put it just had lines,  
18 words, written down what you said some very  
19 wonderful stuff when the conversation was over but  
20 --

21 MS. MORRIS: Well, that's basically  
22 captured in the entire --

1 SPEAKER: Okay.

2 MR. BRAME: And if you do have some  
3 edits, you can put those down.

4 MS. MORRIS: Mike?

5 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Is there some reason  
6 you didn't put Alaska in there or was that outside  
7 of the -- just because of the presentation?  
8 Columbia Basin?

9 SPEAKER: Yeah, you don't have to do  
10 HTMPs do you in Alaska?

11 MS. MORRIS: It's connected to the --  
12 it's a take permit.

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Okay, that makes sense.

14 MS. MORRIS: So should we include Alaska  
15 or not? No? Okay, thank you. Just delete it.  
16 As reader -- I'm hearing a good job over here.  
17 Any content concerns?

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I've sent mine to Dick.  
19 Do we need a motion?

20 MS. MORRIS: Yes. And you should  
21 include delegating final editorial to --

22 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah, I'll move they'll

1 be a final delegate -- final editorial privileges  
2 to Dick and Julie after they receive additional  
3 comments from other members to move this on.

4 MS. MORRIS: Hear we have a motion. Do  
5 we have a second?

6 MS. YOCHER: Second.

7 MS. MORRIS: Seconded by Pam. Any  
8 discussion? Do you want to scroll down? There's  
9 more to the letter right? Can you scroll some  
10 more? There's even more. Thank you.

11 Okay, motion and second. Any  
12 discussion? All those in favor say aye?

13 ALL: Aye.

14 MS. MORRIS: Opposed like sign? Any  
15 abstentions? Okay, thank you for that.

16 If there's not an objection we'll move  
17 into the next report which is, I just lost my  
18 page, let's go to the report from the Resilience  
19 Working Group.

20 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. Well, we got to be  
21 I guess a working group of the whole yesterday  
22 with regard to at least one of six tasks, the

1 number six task item. And okay, can you hear me?

2 And we had some discussion about item  
3 five in the communication. So I wanted to call  
4 upon the other two task leaders to kind of give us  
5 a brief update. We have had meetings and people  
6 have been very helpful in staying up to date and I  
7 will be sending along a suggested date for yet  
8 another update to try to keep us moving following  
9 this meeting.

10 But if I could ask, Bob, if you would  
11 kind of give us an update on the aquaculture  
12 segment?

13 MR. RHEAULT: I'll try and be brief.  
14 When I was appointed to this group I sort of saw  
15 an opportunity for certain aspects of aquaculture  
16 to perhaps mitigate some of the challenges that  
17 are posed by climate change. And so I took sort  
18 of a passive approach and looked at the various  
19 potential, reasonably likely to occur hazards.  
20 Whether they're warming, sea level rise, and  
21 acidification and how they're supposedly going to  
22 affect our fisheries and stocks and what some of

1 the opportunities that aquaculture present and how  
2 they might help mitigate some of these.

3           And we've got a laundry list of  
4 different activities whether it's oyster  
5 restoration for habitat and shorelines  
6 stabilization or stock enhancement through  
7 hatcheries to mitigate for certain populations  
8 that might be hindered or in decline and certain  
9 potential activities that might impact  
10 acidification whether it's growing algae to  
11 sequester CO2 for local change in CO2  
12 concentration or putting out lime to or shell to  
13 sweeten acidified muds to improve larval  
14 settlement.

15           And then, based on a comment that Mike  
16 made yesterday I realized that really resiliency  
17 is about well-paying jobs and economic resiliency.  
18 And if we, as an aquaculture industry, we're also  
19 providing well-paying jobs on the water  
20 maintaining working waterfronts. Putting  
21 processing plants that were, you know, I've got --  
22 I had a conversation with Paul yesterday. He said

1 are shellfish farmers actually making money?

2           It threw me aback so much that I really  
3 didn't have an answer prepared but yeah, we're  
4 buying fish processing plants and turning them  
5 into shellfish processing plants. So once a few  
6 growers got together and bought a marina because  
7 there wasn't working waterfront. They didn't want  
8 smelly working boats in these fancy white yacht  
9 marinas.

10           So the fleet of purpose-built aluminum  
11 vessels in Rhode Island is quite amazing so yes,  
12 we are providing good paying jobs for people who  
13 know how to work on the water and allow them to  
14 shift laterally within the fisheries industry at  
15 large. So yeah, I think I'm going to talk about  
16 those opportunities a little bit because I think  
17 that the economic aspect of resiliency is huge and  
18 I hadn't really considered it until Mike brought  
19 it up yesterday so thanks for expanding my task.

20           And at some personal peril, professional  
21 peril and risk of delaying lunch, I just have to  
22 question if we're going to be advising the

1 fisheries community on how to be more resilient in  
2 the face of climate change impacts, I think it's  
3 really important that we know what those impacts  
4 are going to be. And when it comes to  
5 acidification, the impacts on the organismal level  
6 are not exactly clear at all.

7           And I've been really studying this  
8 literature heavily and I'm not necessarily  
9 suggesting we blow up this task but I'm very  
10 concerned about where we're going and with our  
11 limited resources and what our goals are and how  
12 we want to convey the level of uncertainty that we  
13 have to the fishing community. And you know,  
14 we're going to be advising them on what to do; we  
15 better damn well know what's going to happen and  
16 how it's going to roll out. And I'm reasonably  
17 confident with the temperature impacts and the sea  
18 level impacts. We can bracket those and make some  
19 broad sweeping generalizations about how it might  
20 affect fisheries.

21           But boy, I'm not ready to make any  
22 suggestions based on what we know about allay yet

1 other than yeah, there's going to be an increase  
2 in CO2 in our future sea level and seawater. And  
3 beyond that, I'm not going to make any  
4 recommendations on changing fishermen's behavior  
5 until we've got some better science to tell me how  
6 it's going to affect my organisms. And the  
7 science is not yet there.

8 So I'll shut up now.

9 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. Are there any  
10 questions?

11 SPEAKER: Thank you, Bob. And you were  
12 going to ask Julie to --

13 MS. BEIDEMAN: Uh-huh, next. Are we  
14 going to ask Julie if she'll give us a quick  
15 update.

16 MS. BONNEY: My task to serve or the  
17 Committee's task was to deal with socioeconomic  
18 data and honestly, it could be a lifetime to  
19 figure out what that data is and how to use it.  
20 What you need first, I guess, and then how it gets  
21 used as for other task folks.

22 I think the good news is we have a good

1 group of participants on the committee, Dan  
2 Holland from your shop is on our committee and  
3 then, we have Roger Griffiths from headquarters.  
4 And they're both heavily involved, that's what  
5 they do for a living. So they'll give us good  
6 advice.

7           They're going to be -- and then, we have  
8 Charles Colgan from the Climate Taskforce who this  
9 is his expertise on the committee as well. So  
10 several of us are going to this task workshop next  
11 week which I think will kind of build the football  
12 to understand how we might move forward.

13           On our last -- we tried on the original  
14 tasking to come up with the potential task to do  
15 some kind of, what, exploratory examples to try to  
16 give some definition on how to move forward.  
17 Based on the last teleconference, we realized that  
18 we need to define those more closely. So I'm  
19 hoping that after we go through the workshop we  
20 can have another committee meeting and kind of  
21 button down the direction that we're heading.  
22 Otherwise I think we'll be plodding in the ocean

1 for a decade.

2 So that's the goal. So they'll be more  
3 to hear about us and I have a feeling once we get  
4 into the summer we'll have a few more  
5 teleconferences at least that works better for my  
6 schedule.

7 MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you. Any  
8 questions? So, Jeff, I'm going to keep putting on  
9 the schedule periodic phone calls just to kind of  
10 keep progress notes and if anyone comes upon a  
11 snag where they need some help, they can contact  
12 me, Heidi, Julie, any of us. And people who are  
13 not already part of a particular task that may  
14 have an interest in one now are still welcomed to  
15 participate because many hands make lighter work.

16 MS. MORRIS: So thanks, Terri and Ted,  
17 for chairing this group and thanks everybody who's  
18 leading the effort on the working group. I think  
19 it's a very salient issue for all of us. It  
20 encompasses a lot of things that we care about.  
21 It's something that NOAA Fisheries is pretty  
22 interested in and the partnerships between the

1 staff that are supporting these working groups and  
2 the taskforce members and the MAFAC members has  
3 been very positive. And keep up the good work  
4 everybody. I think it's a really important and  
5 timely project for us.

6 Okay. So we have about 45 minutes of  
7 work left on the agenda. We're supposed to take a  
8 lunch break now. It's my belief that we would do  
9 that work better if we ate first but I'm open to  
10 whatever the group would like to do. Do you want  
11 to power through for another 45 minutes and be  
12 done or do you want to take a break and then come  
13 back? Yes, Mike?

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Take a break.

15 MS. MORRIS: Take a break? Take a  
16 break. Okay. So we're going to take a break.  
17 Please be back at -- is an hour the right amount  
18 of time? Please be back at 1:15 and we'll finish  
19 out our --

20 (Recess)

21 MS. MORRIS: Okay. The next agenda item  
22 is a set of bullet points that Mike and I have

1       been working on to sort of distill the broad  
2       ranging conversation about bycatch that we had on  
3       Monday into an outline of topics that we could  
4       address in a comment letter. And as I said  
5       before, there would be another step between today  
6       and submitting the comment letter on June 3rd  
7       which would be drafting an actual comment letter  
8       based on whatever we agree on here and then,  
9       circulating again for a conference call meeting to  
10      approve.

11                    So I made an effort at distilling. And  
12      then, Mike elaborated on some of those points and  
13      added some points and his elaborations are in  
14      yellow. And we've emailed it to everybody.

15                    SPEAKER: Yeah, everybody should have  
16      this.

17                    MS. MORRIS: Okay. And it's also  
18      projected on the screen. Did you want to say  
19      something, Mike?

20                    MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I didn't but I'm  
21      going to. Basically, I got this -- we had a  
22      little trouble with the interchange or exchange, I

1 guess. And so I got this and I was on the first  
2 subject material. I was sitting here typing stuff  
3 and I'm a very poor typist.

4 And so it partially shows here. So what  
5 I did is essentially just sprinkle this or shotgun  
6 it with some economic insertions or reference to  
7 economics.

8 MS. MORRIS: Amplified some of the  
9 emphasis.

10 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Emphasized, that's a  
11 good term. But it was kind of a clumsy attempt on  
12 my part. I think it can be written better. I  
13 know it can be but I think conceptually, I'm not  
14 saying one or two couldn't be removed from one  
15 spot or another but I just was hoping to get a  
16 consensus view that it is appropriate to mention  
17 this. It doesn't, I think, in any way lessen the  
18 idea of bycatch reduction as a mandate. And I'm  
19 not arguing that point at all.

20 But I am also injecting the fact that  
21 there are other objectives and the national  
22 standards in MSA as well. And I still see it as

1 kind of a counterbalancing mechanism going on  
2 here. So that's why I put those in and it is a  
3 little bit, like I said, it was kind of a clumsy  
4 attempt on my part but if it's -- I'm sure we can  
5 clean that up and there's a final last review  
6 anyway, right?

7 MS. MORRIS: Exactly.

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So --

9 MS. MORRIS: So just let's start from  
10 the beginning --

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Sure.

12 MS. MORRIS: -- and see if --

13 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And I wanted to thank  
14 you also before I shut up but for actually getting  
15 the whole thing, yes, for getting it very well  
16 organized before I stepped into it.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay. I'm glad that I was  
18 able to take that important step. And Harlon  
19 tried to eat breakfast with me this morning and I  
20 was really just not very friendly because I was  
21 working on this. And I apologized to Harlon.

22 MR. PEARCE: You've put me off before,

1 I'm used to that.

2 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So starting out with  
3 some general comments that it's basically good and  
4 it's logically connected to the different, I want  
5 to say ESA, MMPA, that we should -- that they  
6 should include some sense of how far we've come in  
7 terms of bycatch reduction in the preamble to the  
8 document to credit that we've made a lot of  
9 progress.

10 Recognize that it's impossible to fish  
11 without bycatch and that the economic impacts of  
12 not having enough allocation for bycatch are  
13 important to support the target fishery. Address  
14 whether the national bycatch strategy is  
15 consistent with the standardized bycatch  
16 methodology guidance. And then, I don't know how  
17 I feel about this OY but I think we should --  
18 there should be some conversation about that here.

19 And then, when we started the  
20 conversation there was a little bit of resistance  
21 like is this going to turn into a new mandate for  
22 bycatch? And I think the response from the agency

1 was that it's really a document to set priorities  
2 not so much to --

3 SPEAKER: Julie, could you speak up just  
4 slightly?

5 MS. MORRIS: Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm just  
6 reading the last bullet. So any comment on that  
7 group of -- anything we need to change or add or  
8 drop? Yes, Pam?

9 MS. YOCHER: For the second bullet point  
10 I remember that one of the things that was  
11 discussed, I can't remember if it was here or  
12 later, was besides recognizing past innovation and  
13 successes to make sure or to do a better job of  
14 acknowledging the non-NOAA partners.

15 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

16 MS. YOCHER: That were involved in  
17 making some of or putting forward some of those  
18 successes.

19 MS. MORRIS: So, Heidi, are you -- can  
20 you make notes on this?

21 MS. LOVETT: Yes.

22 MS. MORRIS: Okay, good. Anything else

1 on this section? Peter Shelley?

2 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, just let me -- the  
3 economic objectives of OY. I think that to me is  
4 a -- I'm confused by that phrasing because OY is  
5 MSY reduced by a whole variety of factors,  
6 environmental and other things. So I'm not sure  
7 calling -- I just don't think that phrasing is  
8 appropriate.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So what would you --  
10 how would you say it?

11 MR. SHELLEY: I'm not sure. I'll have  
12 to think about that. I mean, it just -- I'll have  
13 to think about that. You know, again, the  
14 national standard one is to achieve OY and that's  
15 already in there. I would be reluctant to just --  
16 to break out one component of OY which is the  
17 economic one and ignore all the other components  
18 of OY which are defined terms in the statute.

19 MS. MORRIS: So, Kristina, just make a  
20 note that we need to --

21 MR. SHELLEY: That makes -- I understand  
22 where you're trying to get but I don't think

1 that's the right phrasing.

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, like I say, I did  
3 this really quickly without a lot of thought.

4 MS. MORRIS: So, Kristina, make a note  
5 that we need to think more about how to make this  
6 economic point and why --

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: So what if we said  
8 something about --

9 MR. SHELLEY: I mean, I like  
10 utilization. I think that's really an important  
11 concept in there. I mean, you want to try to get  
12 maximum utilization which in some cases would be  
13 converting bycatch into product of some sort. So  
14 I mean that's how I -- so I like that -- if that's  
15 where you were headed with utilization, I like  
16 that.

17 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I've mentioned I  
18 think it's national standard one about that's  
19 where I got it from. And I don't believe that  
20 standard has any reference to bycatch. So I think  
21 in somewhere I heard over the last couple of days  
22 declining went away actually means. But the -- to

1 me OY has one implication. It comes down to  
2 economic incomes or income streams and if you  
3 don't catch the fish or achieve what I call OY in  
4 my definition, my world, optimum yield, then  
5 you're leaving something behind.

6 And that's balanced out by the fact that  
7 you have to constrain fisheries by -- for reasons  
8 of bycatch, habitat, whatever it is, there's  
9 constraints. But still that goal, I guess, is  
10 prevalent in at least one of the national  
11 standards. So I'm not --

12 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, it's just -- I'm  
13 just looking at that and that's a defined term OY.  
14 And it's broader in terms of its statutory  
15 purposes than just economic maximum. I mean, it's  
16 just -- so it's using that term in a way that  
17 isn't that I just don't think people will  
18 understand.

19 MS. MORRIS: So are you both comfortable  
20 with making that note and asking --

21 MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I'll make a note and  
22 think about it.

1 MS. MORRIS: -- us to work on it?

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm comfortable with it  
3 because we don't need to keep this discussion  
4 going.

5 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, it's an important  
6 discussion and we'll have to work on it in our  
7 redirect. Okay, so, Terri?

8 MS. BEIDEMAN: Just one thing. I guess  
9 I made it in my points when I was trying to say  
10 that each of those laws, those acts have a little  
11 bit different terminology in terms of bycatch  
12 minimization, bycatch reduction and I'm in favor  
13 of saying maybe they're logically connected to the  
14 objectives of them -- I would not want to see it  
15 homogenized, I guess. I don't know how to phrase  
16 that properly but I would not want to see, like,  
17 kind of homogenize it into one that would apply to  
18 all somehow. We would lose --

19 MS. MORRIS: So sort of make a note,  
20 Kristina, recognizing that they each -- each of  
21 these address bycatch differently.

22 MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you.

1                   MS. MORRIS: So then can we move on to  
2                   the suggested changes to the objective statements?  
3                   At the end of our discussion on Monday we went  
4                   through the objective statements and we made some  
5                   adjustments and I've tried to show those  
6                   underlined here. And I'm not sure I made the  
7                   right notes. So just look at these underlines and  
8                   make sure that those are suggestions that we want  
9                   to make.

10                  SPEAKER: How many underlines --

11                  MS. MORRIS: Of course. Strengthening  
12                  should be if you could help me -- by thank you.  
13                  Any -- if there's no comments on that let's move  
14                  on.

15                  MS. BONNEY: I have a comment.

16                  MS. MORRIS: Okay.

17                  MS. BONNEY: I'm trying to decide if  
18                  what I'm thinking is here.

19                  MS. MORRIS: Peter Shelley?

20                  MR. SHELLEY: If you're going to list  
21                  some things, I'd list study fleets, too, because  
22                  --

1 MS. MORRIS: So where would we put that?

2 MR. SHELLEY: Just where you're listing  
3 the log books observers.

4 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

5 MR. SHELLEY: Electronic technologies  
6 and study fleets.

7 MS. MORRIS: You would add what?

8 MR. SHELLEY: Study fleets.

9 MS. MORRIS: Study fleets.

10 MS. BONNEY: Study fleets?

11 MR. SHELLEY: I mean you're using it as  
12 an example and these other things. And the study  
13 fleets produce --

14 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, okay. And then,  
15 Julie you had a suggestion?

16 MS. BONNEY: Well, I'm still struggling  
17 at improve management measures as designed to  
18 reduce bycatch. So in many cases the managers are  
19 creating bycatch. And I don't know that they have  
20 focused on how to build management regimes that  
21 reduce it. And so and I didn't see that in any of  
22 the objectives that were in the strategy.

1           In other words, how do you get all the  
2 partners working to -- so it's not top down, you  
3 know, where you're putting pressure on a fleet to  
4 reduce bycatches. You got to build the  
5 regulations correctly to reduce bycatch, too. And  
6 so how do you partner that?

7           So a good example is maximum retainable  
8 allowances in fisheries where you're required to  
9 -- if you leak -- it's incidental in your target  
10 because it's a multispecies but if you exceed that  
11 percentage you have to throw it away. So you're  
12 forcing fisherman to throw away fish because of  
13 the way the regulation is structured and there's  
14 creative ways to get away from that. But it's too  
15 many trip limits is another one where you can  
16 force people to discard either trips limits by  
17 time or by tanking capacity or whatever and so --

18           MS. MORRIS: Okay, you're going into  
19 like incredible detail and --

20           MS. BONNEY: I know but I'm trying to  
21 get to the point of --

22           MS. MORRIS: Right, here's --

1 MS. BONNEY: -- how do you build an  
2 objective that says --

3 MS. MORRIS: How about improve  
4 management measures so that they are designed to  
5 reduce bycatch? Does that address what you're  
6 trying to get at?

7 MS. BONNEY: Improve management so they  
8 are designed to reduce --

9 MS. MORRIS: Are designed to reduce  
10 bycatch.

11 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, what about use of  
12 best management majors measures to because I think  
13 what -- the ones that aren't the best are probably  
14 creating more harm than --

15 MR. CORBIN: So we're talking about  
16 regulations or management measures?

17 MS. MORRIS: Management measures.

18 MR. CORBIN: BMPs. So I think the  
19 regulations have a huge impact on bycatch. We can  
20 focus on improving regulatory schemes that  
21 minimize bycatch or we can talk about best  
22 management practices which are industry-focused

1 approaches but I think both have a goal.

2 MS. BONNEY: That's what I'm trying to  
3 get to.

4 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So you want to say  
5 improve management measures and regulations so  
6 that they're designed to reduce --

7 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Nice.

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: And I'm not -- well, I  
10 might think about use of best practice or best  
11 management measures available or even create new  
12 ones that are better. I don't know what it is but  
13 I agree with Julie. There's a lot of these cases  
14 where you're in a box and you're actually getting  
15 to a point where you're creating more discards and  
16 unintended bycatch and what the regulation is  
17 telling you to reduce bycatch or telling you to do  
18 on the other hand. So I mean --

19 MS. MORRIS: So, Kristina, make a note  
20 about just put in parentheses BMPs and I'll get  
21 BMPs in there. Okay. So was there something else  
22 you wanted to add or adjust?

1                   Julie, you looked like you were about to  
2                   raise your hand.

3                   MS. BONNEY: I'm good because you got  
4                   the understanding the economic and social fabrics.

5                   MS. MORRIS: Okay.

6                   MS. BONNEY: Because you do have that --

7                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. So what about the  
8                   two bullets under data? Data needs to improve and  
9                   stock assessment estimates of bycatch need to  
10                  improve.

11                  Then let's move on to innovation.

12                  MS. TROTTA: Flexibility.

13                  MS. MORRIS: Say again?

14                  MS. TROTTA: Flexibility.

15                  MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry. Thank you,  
16                  Kristina. Flexibility.

17                  MS. BONNEY: So can I go back to the  
18                  data?

19                  MS. MORRIS: Of course.

20                  MS. BONNEY: So what is the definition  
21                  of improved? To me it's as much about time. So,  
22                  Raimundo, is that how you say your first name?

1 MR. ESPINOZA: Ray.

2 MS. BONNEY: Was talking about the idea  
3 that you didn't get log book data till four years  
4 after the fact. So bycatch data needs to improve  
5 in many fisheries. How are we improving it, I  
6 guess.

7 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So you want to add a  
8 timeliness there bycatch data --

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Quality and timeliness.

10 MS. MORRIS: -- needs to improve in  
11 quality and timeliness?

12 MS. BONNEY: Yeah, that would work for  
13 me.

14 MS. MORRIS: Terri?

15 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. And I don't know  
16 if this is addressed further down because I don't  
17 have but I had taken some notes of the previous  
18 conversation and I have clarified bycatch research  
19 needs and support research programs geared to  
20 technologies, it's avoidance, et cetera. And I  
21 don't know --

22 MS. MORRIS: Uh-huh. So add another

1       bullet about bycatch research? Address bycatch  
2       research needs.

3                   MS. BEIDEMAN: It was here.

4                   MS. TROTTA: Great, I know it was.

5                   MS. BONNEY: The other one under data  
6       would be sharing. So in some cases like for in  
7       Alaska, industry has access to data that they can  
8       use for themselves. And to manage the fisheries  
9       and I don't know that -- so it's the time, quality  
10      and access. So I'd add access.

11                  MS. MORRIS: Okay. Yes? Erika?

12                  MS. FELLER: Can I ask a clarifying  
13      question?

14                  MS. MORRIS: Sure.

15                  MS. FELLER: When we're talking about  
16      bycatch are we -- is that an inclusive term that  
17      refers to everything in bycatch including because,  
18      I mean, in term -- what I'm thinking of is in  
19      terms of improving quality access, timeliness,  
20      mortality estimates also because bycatch isn't  
21      necessarily mortality. And it's --

22                  MS. MORRIS: Okay. So we want to add

1 mortality estimates to the series there. Okay.

2 Are we ready to move on to flexibility?

3 Achieve a balance between economic  
4 goals, list the national standards and individual  
5 FMPs and bycatch reduction. Determine the extent  
6 to which bycatch reduction is practicable in  
7 specific fishery situations.

8 I think that determined to the extent is  
9 supposed to be another bullet. So just do a  
10 return there. Thank you. Any comment on that?

11 Yes, Peter?

12 MR. SHELLEY: I think this is the only  
13 place we mentioned practical and I suggest that  
14 the Agency try to give some thought to putting out  
15 some criteria on that. And how should Councils  
16 think about practicability and it goes to this  
17 question of how it fits in with other goals.

18 MR. OKONIEWSKI: That's exactly right.  
19 In my estimation it's just --

20 MR. SHELLEY: You know, it shouldn't be  
21 up to every individual FMP to define  
22 practicability --

1 MS. BEIDEMAN: Interpretation is --

2 MR. SHELLEY: Right.

3 MS. BEIDEMAN: The word is there but how  
4 they interpret it so.

5 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So what I was trying  
6 to do there was to recognize that it's very  
7 contextual. Practicability is very contextual.  
8 And so that it has to be figured out kind of in  
9 specific fishery situations.

10 MR. SHELLEY: It does but I think the  
11 same sorts of --

12 MS. BEIDEMAN: Standardized --

13 MR. SHELLEY: -- standard, you know,  
14 there's --

15 MS. BEIDEMAN: One Council interprets  
16 what's practicable differently say from the HMS  
17 division looks at it from another angle. And  
18 they're allowed to because they're the managers.

19 MR. SHELLEY: There are factors I guess  
20 that transcend individual fisheries.

21 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Kristina, add to  
22 this, you know, look for factors that transcend

1 individual fisheries. I mean, for now we've got  
2 the idea down and we'll figure out how to write in  
3 our comment letter.

4 Anything else on that? Okay,  
5 innovation? Geography, timing and technology are  
6 important to strategies. Need to collaborate with  
7 fisherman to develop innovations and incentivize  
8 proven innovations and then, there's a long list  
9 of things that people identified in their  
10 comments. And, you know, we have some things in  
11 there twice and we'll just take care of that and  
12 co-ops.

13 MS. TROTTA: Can you just speak up a  
14 little bit?

15 MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry, Kristina.  
16 Recognize that it can be difficult to scale up an  
17 innovation and that we need research permits so  
18 that innovations can be field-tested. Anything  
19 missing there? Anything that needs to be -- yes,  
20 Erika?

21 MS. FELLER: There's two things. I will  
22 try to articulate these. The first one is, you

1 know, somehow it's kind of creating an atmosphere  
2 that allows for continual improvement. There is a  
3 tendency to, if you fall short of perfect, to not  
4 even start. So how do you kind of encourage  
5 progressive work that may not necessarily meet  
6 what the goal is? Create space for that.

7           And then, the second piece is how do  
8 you, you know, this idea of mitigating the risk  
9 for fishermen to participate in these types of  
10 things. Because it's a lot of data you're asking  
11 them to share maybe well beyond what their  
12 accountability requirements are that does pose a  
13 lot of regulatory risk. And you've got to figure  
14 out how to mitigate that risk to get people to do  
15 that second thing.

16           MS. MORRIS: Okay. So cultivate culture  
17 of continuous improvement.

18           MS. FELLER: Yeah.

19           MS. MORRIS: And the next one would be  
20 mitigate -- wait till she -- mitigate --

21           MS. FELLER: Mitigate risk to  
22 participants.

1 MS. MORRIS: -- risk to fisher  
2 participants in innovation. Is that what you're  
3 -- is that, I mean, the English isn't good but is  
4 that what you're trying to say?

5 MS. FELLER: I can help with the words  
6 later.

7 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Mike?

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, when you're  
9 talking about using regulatory mechanisms to  
10 improve communications, I think you can only go so  
11 far. And there's probably limitations legally on  
12 what they can ask people to share. That's where,  
13 if you use a more cooperative, collaborative  
14 approach and you basically say we want to see you  
15 come up with a plan to reduce bycatch and the  
16 private sector gets involved, that they'll find a  
17 way to do it.

18 It's been proven that they can do it.  
19 But when you're regulated from on high and the  
20 first thing you've got to check the legality and  
21 everything else. That's where I think you've got  
22 a better opportunity, a needle mover that is

1       quicker to move a needle in the collaborative type  
2       approach or cooperative approach. That doesn't  
3       preclude you from maybe making some information  
4       sharing but I think that's a pretty tough ask on a  
5       regulatory basis. You're the attorney but you're  
6       nodding your head so.

7                 MS. MORRIS: So is there an idea that  
8       needs to be listed here or is there --

9                 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I don't know that there  
10      is. But --

11                MS. MORRIS: Okay, Peter?

12                MR. SHELLEY: Well, it's, I mean, I  
13      think it's a different -- private research and  
14      development is different than publicly funded  
15      research and development. And so it's missing the  
16      areas importance in value of government funding of  
17      innovation.

18                MS. MORRIS: Okay. Government funding  
19      to encourage --

20                MR. SHELLEY: Whether it's cooperative  
21      research or --

22                MS. MORRIS: Yeah, to encourage.

1                   MR. SHELLEY: To encourage innovation  
2                   and communicating the results. I think that's  
3                   also --

4                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. Peter Moore?

5                   MR. MOORE: Yeah, so I don't know if  
6                   they have them out here but we have these research  
7                   set-asides out of various fisheries. And so we  
8                   remove three percent of the quota, set it aside in  
9                   the research set-aside. It's a competitive  
10                  process.

11                  The fishermen will basically bid and  
12                  carry out various research projects with very  
13                  talented people. And it's in the scallop fishery  
14                  they've had tremendous success with that approach.  
15                  Where there's other fisheries that I think are  
16                  struggling with this bycatch reduction is in the  
17                  "less valuable or less profitable" fisheries.

18                  So I think that one of the things that  
19                  we ought to be sort of aware of is that last point  
20                  is probably pretty important or some other outside  
21                  source of funding is pretty important to get some  
22                  of the less valuable fisheries -- successful. So

1 --

2 MS. MORRIS: Okay. So we want to add  
3 the idea of research set-asides.

4 MR. MOORE: Well, that's, I don't know.  
5 Do you have that out here in the Pacific? Do you  
6 have like a research set-aside? No?

7 MS. BONNEY: In the North Pacific you  
8 can do what they call exempted fishing permits.  
9 And then, they will allocate the fish to those  
10 kind of projects. It's just a -- it's the same  
11 outcome just a different vehicle.

12 MR. MOORE: I see.

13 MS. MORRIS: And then, Kristina, for the  
14 government funding one just put government and  
15 non-government funding to encourage innovation.

16 MS. BONNEY: I would just -- I don't  
17 know research set-aside, access to fish to  
18 increase research maybe? Because it doesn't  
19 necessarily have to be a research set-aside.

20 MR. MOORE: No, that's -- use.

21 MS. MORRIS: Okay, so research  
22 set-asides and access to fish for research.

1                   MR. MOORE: Or if you prefer just to say  
2 access to fish for research that's fine.

3                   MS. MORRIS: It's fine. Both ideas are  
4 okay.

5                   MS. BONNEY: Yeah, it gets to the same  
6 place.

7                   MS. MORRIS: Just leave it. That's  
8 okay. And then, moving down to definitions.

9                   MS. BONNEY: So I have a question on  
10 this section.

11                   MS. MORRIS: Yes?

12                   MS. BONNEY: What's managed and  
13 unmanaged? What does that mean?

14                   MS. MORRIS: It came up in the  
15 discussion Monday that some bycatch is managed  
16 bycatch and some bycatch is unmanaged. And so --

17                   MR. MOORE: Unregulated species.

18                   MS. BONNEY: So they're not part of the  
19 FMP then or --

20                   MR. MOORE: Correct, uh-huh.

21                   MS. MORRIS: Yeah, maybe you don't have  
22 any of that.

1 MR. MOORE: Starfish.

2 MS. MORRIS: What?

3 MR. MOORE: Starfish.

4 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

5 MS. BONNEY: Ecosystem component.

6 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, anything that needs  
7 to be added to this definition section? And then  
8 there was this question that came up related to  
9 utilization that's kind of related to definition.  
10 Bycatch is utilized is it no longer bycatch?  
11 Doesn't quite fit this comment but go ahead.

12 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, there's a  
13 question to ask Eileen and I don't think she  
14 really gave me a definitive answer. If you're not  
15 -- if you're bringing in fish it's to the dock  
16 it's discarded, not being utilized. I said is  
17 that still bycatch? And/or would it become not  
18 bycatch if you utilized it? And the reason I  
19 asked that is because it's still dead fish and you  
20 may in some cases not want to kill that fish  
21 because it's, for whatever reason. You know,  
22 conservation reason.

1                   However, even if -- let's just say it's  
2                   a species that's overfished and if all of a sudden  
3                   you're utilizing it does it somehow make it  
4                   better? Well, we're all for utilization. So  
5                   that's a good goal in and of itself. But the  
6                   utilization to me seems to be something a little  
7                   different from reduction of bycatch. And I don't  
8                   know -- I'm not saying it's not a worthy goal.  
9                   But on the other hand it seems to be a little  
10                  one-sided bycatch reduction. And I was a little  
11                  confused how the two logically connected I guess.

12                  MS. BONNEY: Yeah, this opens up  
13                  Pandora's Box in my mind. I'd like to see that  
14                  whole topic deleted just because the two examples  
15                  for me is if you deliver fish and it ends up being  
16                  made into fish meal it's utilized. And so we  
17                  would have, at least in the North Pacific, that's  
18                  not considered bycatch.

19                  The other is the idea that you're  
20                  targeting a multispecies complex but your target  
21                  wasn't -- you caught 20 percent cod in a flatfish  
22                  target. So is that 20 percent cod a bycatch?

1       It's just -- so any fishery is going to take fish  
2       in what, multiple types of fish in a fishery and  
3       so long as it's all being utilized I don't see --  
4       that's not bycatch in my mind and I think we've  
5       been through that through the definition in  
6       Magnuson on the fish side. So I think that opens  
7       up Pandora's Box.

8                   MS. MORRIS: So you'd rather we didn't  
9       address this in our comment letter?

10                   MS. BONNEY: Yes.

11                   MS. MORRIS: And Mike seems sort of --  
12       thinks it's confusing to include it so we'll just  
13       delete it unless somebody wants to keep it?

14                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: We can take it out.

15                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. Then we get to this  
16       odd category called currency. And it -- this  
17       seems explanatory, right? Go ahead, Mike, explain  
18       it.

19                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: You want me to explain  
20       it, too? Well, what I was attempting to capture  
21       in the second piece that's highlighted is just the  
22       fact about the currency aspect. And at least

1 expand on it. It might not be necessary but at  
2 the time I just threw it in there.

3 So what I'm just saying is that you  
4 won't have some fisheries without some allowance  
5 of bycatch. In an absolute sense if you're just  
6 out to reduce bycatch without the economic  
7 implications coming in, now I'm not saying that's  
8 what they're attempting to achieve but a  
9 regulation written the wrong way will end up in  
10 court every time.

11 So I guess what I'm just doing is saying  
12 that it is of manifest importance that we have a  
13 certain amount. It doesn't take away from the  
14 idea we're still -- we're attempting to reduce  
15 bycatch. But on the other hand there's a  
16 recognition of the fact that it supports the  
17 fishery. The currency piece may be enough in the  
18 first sentence but at the time I thought it might  
19 not have -- hurt to have some language similar to  
20 what I added and it's your decision.

21 MS. MORRIS: So do people understand  
22 this equating bycatch to currency? Does that make

1 sense to folks?

2 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, it does probably  
3 to most of us but I'm not sure it does to  
4 everybody -- I got asked that question actually by  
5 somebody at this meeting what that meant. So  
6 that's why I thought maybe a little more language  
7 in there might point it out why --

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay, I'm not hearing any  
9 comment on it so bycatch species become choke  
10 species due to ACLs and then, remember that  
11 adherence to ACL is the primary goal and that  
12 bycatch reduction as a goal is mandated under MSA.  
13 However, if it's constricted too severely it can  
14 lead to fishery shutdowns.

15 SPEAKER: Well, that's a fact.

16 MS. MORRIS: That's a fact, right?

17 SPEAKER: I think those are both  
18 clarifying statements that help.

19 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

20 MR. OKONIEWSKI: Okay that's all I'm  
21 after. Not saying they can't be written a little  
22 better but they're --

1                   SPEAKER: Because I was taken aback by  
2 the use of the term currency there, too so it  
3 helped me understand it.

4                   MS. MORRIS: Right. Okay. And then,  
5 several people made the point that we need to  
6 periodically review areas that are closed to  
7 reduce bycatch. Anything that needs to be added  
8 there or subtracted?

9                   Okay. So with that comment and --

10                  MS. FELLER: Julie?

11                  MS. MORRIS: Yes?

12                  MS. FELLER: I'm so sorry.

13                  MS. MORRIS: Yes, Erika?

14                  MS. FELLER: I think there's kind of  
15 just on that last one, I think there's an  
16 overarching thought that sort of unites those two  
17 bullet points.

18                  MS. MORRIS: Okay.

19                  MS. FELLER: Which is that if you want  
20 spatial management to be effective at addressing  
21 bycatch you have to review it periodically because  
22 if you don't it, shuts out economic opportunity

1 and these spots are not always static. So I think  
2 something about that about like, you know, having  
3 -- if you want to make spatial management for  
4 bycatch effective these two things I would insert.

5 MS. MORRIS: So, Kristina, you capturing  
6 that?

7 MS. TROTTA: Uh-huh.

8 MS. MORRIS: You need periodic review.  
9 Thank you. Terri?

10 MS. BEIDEMAN: Okay. I guess one more  
11 thing. It's not necessarily related to reviewing  
12 the areas which I wholeheartedly support as you  
13 all know. But we had down also in discussion or I  
14 wrote down improve communication and engagement  
15 with, I would assume, the managed you know so I  
16 think we should put that in there somewhere.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

18 MS. BEIDEMAN: That's kind of an  
19 overarching theme that, you know, you better  
20 buy-in when you include. So to improve  
21 communication and engagement with the fishermen, I  
22 guess.

1                   MS. MORRIS: Okay, thank you. Anything  
2 else? Peter?

3                   MR. SHELLEY: I just want to put a  
4 footnote. I'm still sort of hung up on the  
5 utilization.

6                   MS. MORRIS: Okay.

7                   MR. SHELLEY: Issue. And when the final  
8 comes around I may -- the thought that I have is  
9 that whether it's worthwhile to say companies like  
10 Pacific Seafood, to understand or what the  
11 aspirations are with respect to marine life that's  
12 brought up in their nets. Obviously with the  
13 protected species we can talk about but other fish  
14 and should there be, the only thing I can think of  
15 is like with reducing wetland conversion is kind  
16 of a screen you go through of avoiding it. And if  
17 you can't avoid it, you mitigate it. And if you  
18 can't mitigate it, you utilize.

19                   I mean, you try to make economic value  
20 of what you can. I just wonder if there was some  
21 guidance to industry people about, you know, what  
22 should we be doing with this stuff that comes up

1 in our net. Is it a good thing to try to utilize  
2 it or is it a bad thing? Is it -- am I being a  
3 good fishing company by trying to figure out a  
4 fishmeal product that would actually turn a profit  
5 and turn this stuff that's otherwise dead or not.  
6 That's the only thought. I don't have any  
7 specific language of any -- maybe at a national  
8 strategy level some clarity or more clarity about  
9 that might be helpful.

10 MS. MORRIS: I've got Julie and Mike  
11 both want to comment. Go ahead.

12 MS. BONNEY: Well, I guess I don't have  
13 any objection of utilizing catch for on a national  
14 benefit to the nation. That's the goal. But I  
15 guess the way the question was written it  
16 redefines what bycatch is in my mind. And so  
17 having what -- and there was actually several  
18 comments in the strategy that talked about  
19 developing markets for trash fish and stuff like  
20 that which I'm all in favor of.

21 But so if it was -- if utilization here  
22 was more defined in terms of R&D development for

1 getting fish into the marketplace and finding  
2 utility for that fish, I'm fine with that. But  
3 the way I read this originally was I was thinking  
4 it was redefining what fish bycatch means.

5 MS. MORRIS: And you didn't want to do  
6 that?

7 MS. BONNEY: Right.

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

9 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I didn't mean to do  
10 that either.

11 MR. SHELLEY: I mean it's all getting up  
12 -- someone's eating it, right? No matter if you  
13 bring it home or not.

14 MS. MORRIS: Right. Harlon?

15 MR. PEARCE: Yes. I think I was the guy  
16 that asked Mike the question about what bycatch  
17 is. It's different for you guys than it is for  
18 me. It still is in that bycatch and trim trawl is  
19 clearly, as long as it's not red snapper and stuff  
20 like that, it's species that are not economically  
21 viable and there's quite a bit of it. Small trash  
22 fish and things you're talking about.

1                   So in my mind, bycatch is very different  
2                   than what you have when you've got a 2 or 4,000  
3                   ton -- 2-ton whatever quota on certain fish that  
4                   you can't go over. That's economically viable  
5                   species you're talking about. I'm not talking  
6                   about economically viable species. As long as  
7                   it's not a restricted species in the trawls in the  
8                   Gulf which there's plenty of them. The ability to  
9                   utilize that, if nothing else for the development  
10                  of fish feed or agriculture and things like that,  
11                  I mean, I think is important.

12                  So I think that and it's wasted but it's  
13                  not wasted. Like Peter said something's eating it  
14                  but still I think that the development -- you know  
15                  we've got problems in different areas that these  
16                  things could help solve. And so I think we don't  
17                  want to leave out the ability for us to say all  
18                  right, trim trawler guy we want you to bring that  
19                  in for these reasons. And it's quite a bit of it  
20                  in the Gulf in particular in warm water.

21                  So I think there's a difference in what  
22                  I think is bycatch and what you think is bycatch

1 clearly. We don't have usable bycatch. If it is,  
2 it's not bycatch. We're using it.

3 MS. MORRIS: Pam?

4 MS. YOCHER: Oh, I'm just looking at my  
5 notes from the discussion yesterday and there was  
6 an exchange between Ray and Eileen about the  
7 definitions, too. Maybe I didn't see if I  
8 captured this right. Maybe it's already been  
9 reflected but needing to have the differences  
10 between discard and bycatch spelled out, different  
11 definitions bycatch and bycatch that is discarded  
12 and then, Eileen saying that we wanted the  
13 strategy to be inclusive of everything to allow  
14 transfer from one category to another and so that  
15 was an intentional thing within the strategy.

16 And then, the other thing, maybe this  
17 goes back to acknowledging partners but Terri had  
18 a comment about the timeline that in fact it was  
19 the Atlantic pelagic longline fishery that was the  
20 first to test circle boats.

21 MS. BEIDEMAN: Yes.

22 MS. MORRIS: Mike? Thanks.

1                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, to Peter's, I  
2                   guess it was a question. Utilization is kind of a  
3                   philosophical view of things I think maybe much  
4                   more sort of an economic. Because sometimes if  
5                   you look at net economic benefit, utilization is  
6                   not the way to go. It's just a fact.

7                   Not saying it couldn't be and if meal  
8                   was available then, you know, as a consideration  
9                   and that maybe changes things. But we're -- I  
10                  wish I should have brought it over here to look at  
11                  the original strategy. Where I got kind of  
12                  confused and I remember now how it all came up is  
13                  reduction of bycatch is a goal. It's stated, it's  
14                  mandated under the engineering thing.

15                  But utilization seems to be a different  
16                  goal and conflating the two of them just doesn't  
17                  -- that's why I got a little bit confused. And I  
18                  think it also, to Julie's point, I think what  
19                  you're attempting to say is when you start looking  
20                  at them together, then it opens up Pandora's Box.  
21                  So I guess I'll just make that point.

22                  MS. MORRIS: So, Kristina, can we add

1 under utilization another bullet that says  
2 reduction is a different goal than utilization?

3 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think that might be  
4 good and I do have one more point before we get  
5 out of the bycatch --

6 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Because we're about  
7 to get out of it.

8 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I know. That's why I  
9 want to make the point. If we go back to the  
10 currency, it's not the bycatch limits that create  
11 the currency. It's the bycatch allocation and I  
12 --

13 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

14 MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- think value is  
15 probably a better term than maybe currency. It's  
16 more universal. It's understandable and it may  
17 not just imply money. So I just throw that out  
18 for consideration.

19 MS. MORRIS: Thanks, that's good. All  
20 right, so Mike and I will take this to the next  
21 step and circulate it for you all to provide  
22 comments on.

1                   So we are down to the point on the  
2 agenda where we close out and we --

3                   SPEAKER: Julie?

4                   MS. MORRIS: Yes?

5                   SPEAKER: Since there's -- it's time  
6 sensitive --

7                   MS. MORRIS: Yes.

8                   SPEAKER: -- do you want to set a date  
9 now for having that conference call because I need  
10 15 days in advance to make sure it's in the  
11 federal register.

12                   MS. MORRIS: Okay. So --

13                   SPEAKER: I think it was June 3rd is the  
14 --

15                   SPEAKER: It is June 3rd.

16                   MR. OKONIEWSKI: June 4?

17                   MS. MORRIS: No, no. Two week -- we  
18 need 15 days before June 3rd.

19                   SPEAKER: No, I -- you can choose  
20 whatever day. I need a minimum of 15 days to get  
21 a federal register --

22                   MS. MORRIS: I see what you're saying.

1       Okay.

2                   SPEAKER:  So it has to be at least, I  
3       would say at least 18 days from tomorrow because I  
4       need a few days to get it in the register.  So say  
5       8 -- yeah, no sooner than 18 days from tomorrow.

6                   MR. OKONIEWSKI:  Can we kind of use that  
7       timeframe and kind of put a digital poll or  
8       something out there?  Because I don't even know  
9       what my schedule is.

10                  SPEAKER:  That's fine.  I just wanted to  
11       bring it up.

12                  MS. MORRIS:  Okay.  So let's see.  The  
13       things that I'd like to talk about in the final  
14       minutes are when the next meeting is and I think  
15       we've heard clearly that it's going to be --

16                  SPEAKER:  October 31st, November 1st and  
17       November 2nd and it's going to be in Silver  
18       Spring.

19                  MR. OKONIEWSKI:  Silver Spring?

20                  SPEAKER:  Halloween, again, yes.  You  
21       can bring your costume if you want but that's  
22       literally the only week there isn't a Council

1 meeting or something else going on or --

2 MR. PEARCE: 31st, 1 and 2?

3 SPEAKER: Yes.

4 MR. PEARCE: Okay.

5 SPEAKER: And we will post that on the  
6 site when we get back.

7 SPEAKER: It'll be in Puerto Rico,  
8 right?

9 SPEAKER: No that's the Silver Spring  
10 one. The next one maybe.

11 SPEAKER: Well then we should have it in  
12 February or March.

13 MS. MORRIS: Okay, that's great. So  
14 let's review next steps from the agenda that we  
15 have accomplished in this meeting. It seems like  
16 we have on the Columbia Basin partnership we're  
17 kind of letting Barry lead on the next steps there  
18 in terms of assembling the working group or the  
19 planning group that he's working with but some  
20 MAFAC members will be incorporated there.

21 We know what the next step is on the  
22 bycatch reduction strategy. It's for a comment

1 letter to be drafted and then, a meeting for  
2 everyone to review that and approve it.

3 We have a letter that Dick and I have  
4 editorial possibilities on but pretty close to a  
5 final letter on the hatchery genetic management  
6 plans that we'll be sending in soon. It seems  
7 like protected resources is going to pursue some  
8 conversations about how to enrich partnerships and  
9 with protected resources about how we can move  
10 forward with that task and also send this message  
11 about an acknowledgment of partners.

12 The resilience tasks are all kind of  
13 unfolding with check-ins and targets and working  
14 groups underway. And we've kind of closed out a  
15 major task on aquaculture but they're still  
16 assembled and ready to help with the resiliency  
17 task that has to do with aquaculture.

18 And the Strategic Planning and Budget  
19 Committee is going to work between now and  
20 November on this pithy focused, these are the  
21 three things that the new leadership needs to  
22 know, MAFAC thinks are strategically important.

1 Did I miss anything in terms of next steps?

2 Yes, Heidi? Something occur to you?

3 No? Okay. Then the next thing I'd like to go

4 over is kind of who is on the various

5 subcommittees, not the taskforce and working

6 groups but the various subcommittees.

7 And those of you who are new, you know,

8 you haven't signed up for anything yet. And so

9 and people may want to adjust where they are and

10 where they want to land. And so I don't know if

11 anyone knows at this point in time if they want to

12 switch or they want to add something. And if you

13 do, now would be an easy way to articulate that.

14 And if you don't, we'll circulate the list for

15 further tweaking and signing up later.

16 So, Ted, are you -- you seem pretty

17 broadly assigned there. We can't see the

18 headings.

19 SPEAKER: Yeah, what are the headings?

20 MS. LOVETT: So it has been sent to all

21 of you as well.

22 SPEAKER: Oh, thank you.

1 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

2 MS. LOVETT: And Henry has already  
3 responded and updated his which is on here.

4 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. So, Ted, any  
5 changes? Any changes you want to make?

6 MR. AMES: I would probably scratch out  
7 of commerce.

8 MS. MORRIS: Okay.

9 MR. AMES: But leave the rest.

10 MS. MORRIS: Okay. We don't have Bob.  
11 Terri?

12 MS. BEIDEMAN: I think I've been kind of  
13 participating with protected resources as well so  
14 if I can hopefully stay both with commerce and  
15 protected resources while doing the resilience, if  
16 that's sufficient.

17 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Julie Bonney?

18 MS. BONNEY: I don't know that I was on  
19 the ecosystem approach committee. So I'd probably  
20 take that off. You can put a circle there.

21 MS. MORRIS: And circles present what?

22 MS. BONNEY: When there is a time

1 available as time available.

2 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Okay, great.

3 Dick?

4 MR. BRAME: He put an X on ecosystem  
5 approach.

6 MS. MORRIS: Great. Heather?

7 MS. BRANDON: I'm fine.

8 MS. MORRIS: Columbus has departed.

9 Thank you, John, again, for serving as co-chair.

10 And we may need a new co-chair of  
11 commerce if anyone wants to step up at this point.

12 MR. RHEAULT: Shall I see if I can  
13 replace John's ample shoes.

14 MS. MORRIS: So Bob will co-chair.

15 Thank you so much.

16 We don't have Dave or Phil here.

17 Raymundo?

18 MR. ESPINOZA: Yeah, so I will joining  
19 protected resources and ecosystems approach as an  
20 X. And you can add me to the commerce with a  
21 circle.

22 MS. MORRIS: Thank you.

1                   MR. ESPINOZA: You can mark me down with  
2 a circle. That's the other one I have as well.

3                   MS. MORRIS: Erika?

4                   MS. FELLER: I think I'm good.

5                   MS. MORRIS: Okay, Randy is not here  
6 anymore. Liz is gone. Micah.

7                   Peter?

8                   MR. MOORE: I want to talk to Gerhardt  
9 about taking on more but I'm good right now.

10                  MS. MORRIS: Okay.

11                  MR. MOORE: But you could put a zero or  
12 a circle by ecosystem.

13                  MS. MORRIS: Ecosystem.

14                  MR. MOORE: Yeah.

15                  MS. MORRIS: Mike?

16                  MR. OKONIEWSKI: So the resilience is  
17 actually four groups, right? Task groups?

18                  MS. MORRIS: Yes.

19                  MR. OKONIEWSKI: So I'm on two of those.  
20 Just for now I'll just leave it I think, please.

21                  MS. MORRIS: Jim?

22                  MR. PARSONS: Looks like recreational

1 fishing could use another body so --

2 MS. MORRIS: Great. Harlon?

3 MR. PEARCE: If there's room on commerce  
4 I'd like to do it.

5 MS. MORRIS: Okay. And Bob? You've  
6 added co-chair of commerce. Is there anything  
7 else? Any other adjustments you want to make?  
8 Peter Shelley?

9 MR. SHELLEY: A circle on strategic  
10 planning.

11 MS. MORRIS: Great. Pam?

12 MS. YOCHEM: And I'm happy with the mix.

13 MS. MORRIS: Great. Any evaluation  
14 comments? What did we do well? What could we do  
15 better in future meetings?

16 MS. BONNEY: I made one comment to Julie  
17 on the side which was in the past when we have  
18 subcommittees we kind of break out and we seem to  
19 do everything as a committee as of the whole  
20 except for the protected resources. So as we move  
21 forward it seems like we've got plenty on our  
22 plate to do some breakout meeting for the next

1 round.

2 MS. MORRIS: Right. And sometimes with  
3 a smaller group you can make more progress and  
4 then, bring it back to the large group instead of  
5 having all of the committee work done in the large  
6 group. So I think that's a good suggestion.

7 Other suggestions for continuously  
8 improving our meetings? Bob?

9 MR. RHEAULT: I'd still like to see how  
10 some of our previous products are being used or if  
11 not why.

12 MS. MORRIS: So some kind of  
13 accountability for the work that we do and whether  
14 it makes any difference. Okay.

15 MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'll second that one.

16 MS. BEIDEMAN: Well, would that be  
17 something that we would be putting under the  
18 strategic planning goals?

19 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, or we could just have  
20 a -- we can have a, you know, part of the meeting  
21 where we looked at things that we've recently done  
22 and we have a little bit of feedback on whether

1       they were helpful or not. I mean, I contacted  
2       Therese Conant before this meeting and said was  
3       our recovery -- how did our recovery report feed  
4       into the program review.

5                 And so, yeah, just knowing that would be  
6       good. It would be affirming. It would help us  
7       figure out how to be more effective in our  
8       advisory role.

9                 MS. YOICHEM: If you had a couple of  
10       pieces of that and I thought it was really helpful  
11       to have Jennifer's rundown of what we've done  
12       before and how it's been incorporated. And then,  
13       John did that for the -- for some of the  
14       aquaculture documents. So that made me feel good  
15       as a MAFAC committee member.

16                MS. MORRIS: Yeah. Other suggestions  
17       about continuously improving our meetings and our  
18       process?

19                MR. RHEAULT: Just that conference calls  
20       can sometimes be frustrating and maybe we should  
21       look at what -- GoToMeeting can be a more useful  
22       tool that allows you to share documents on the

1 screen. And I don't know if that's something that  
2 you would consider but it allows a little bit  
3 better communications.

4 MS. MORRIS: Uh-huh, okay. Anything  
5 that we did well this meeting that anyone wants to  
6 comment on?

7 MR. RHEAULT: Good job, Chair.

8 MS. MORRIS: I didn't ask that question.

9 SPEAKER: You did a good job.

10 MS. MORRIS: Now I thank you for that  
11 and I would say that the presentations by National  
12 Fisheries staff and the Pacific States were all  
13 really topnotch. It was great. I learned a lot.  
14 And having Paul and Eileen here is -- and just,  
15 you know, being accessible is very, very valued.

16 SPEAKER: And the annotated agenda and  
17 the presentations having those -- just the whole  
18 logistics of putting -- that really terrific.  
19 Just keep it up.

20 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, good job, Heidi.

21 SPEAKER: Nice job with this.

22 SPEAKER: Nice job.

1 SPEAKER: Yes.

2 MS. MORRIS: And the location of the  
3 hotel is good with, you know, not having to have a  
4 car and being able to walk to meet our needs.  
5 That's all really good.

6 MS. LUKENS: That's the rock star Heidi  
7 for pulling off that feat so.

8 SPEAKER: Hear, hear.

9 SPEAKER: And a big bus down a dirt  
10 road.

11 MS. MORRIS: Okay. Is there any other  
12 business? Any comments for the good of the order?  
13 A final thank you to John Corbin who won't be  
14 returning and --

15 MR. CORBIN: Thank you, Chair.

16 MS. MORRIS: Yeah, and welcome to our  
17 new members. We're very happy to have your  
18 expertise and energy and networks to serve our  
19 work. And thank you all.

20 (Whereupon, at 2:30 p.m., the  
21 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

22 \* \* \* \* \*

## 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

