

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
MID-ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

COUNCIL COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING
(Via Webex)

Annapolis, Maryland
Wednesday, May 18, 2022

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 CAROLYN BELCHER
South Atlantic Council

3
4 RICK BELLAVANCE
New England Council

5 TONY BLANCHARD
Caribbean Council

6
7 MERRICK BURDEN
Pacific Council

8 JOHN CARMICHAEL
South Atlantic Council

9
10 JANET COIT
NOAA Fisheries

11 KELLY DENIT
NOAA Fisheries

12
13 MARC GORELNIK
Pacific Council

14 MARCOS HANKE
Caribbean Council

15
16 JON KURLAND
NOAA Fisheries

17 DAVE WITHERELL
North Pacific

18
19 MIKE LUISI
Mid Atlantic Council

20 JARAD MAKAI AU
NOAA Fisheries

21
22 JACK MCGOVERN
NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 CHRIS MOORE
Mid Atlantic Council

3
4 TOM NEIS
New England Council

5 BRAD PETTINGER
Pacific Council

6
7 SAM RAUCH
NOAA Fisheries

8 ERIC REID
New England Council

9
10 MIGUEL ROLON
Caribbean Council

11 CARRIE SIMMONS
Gulf Council

12
13 KITTY SIMONDS
Western Pacific Council

14 ARCHIE SOLIAI
Western Pacific Council

15
16 GREG STUNZ
Gulf Council

17 WILL SWORD
Western Pacific Council

18
19 WES TOWNSEND
Mid Atlantic Council

20 BILL TWEIT
North Pacific Council

21
22 RYAN WULFF
Sustainable Fisheries

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

C O N T E N T S

ITEM:	PAGE
Climate Change and Fisheries	
• East Coast Scenario Planning Initiative - Update (Kiley Dancy)	
• Pacific Council Scenario Planning - Lessons Learned (Merrick Burden)	
• North Pacific Council Climate Change Taskforce - Update (Bill Tweit)	
• NOAA Fisheries Climate Change Initiatives (Kelly Denit)	
America the Beautiful/Area-Based Management	
• CCC Area Based Management Subcommittee Update (Eric Reid)	
- Draft report and maps of existing fishery conservation areas	
• NOAA Fisheries Update (Samuel Rauch)	
Recreational Fisheries Management	
• Report from 2022 National Saltwater Recreational Fisheries Summit (Russel Dunn)	
• Brief presentations on recreational-related Council actions and projects of interest	

1 - MAFMC Recreational Reform Initiative

2 (Julia Beaty)

3 - North Pacific Council halibut allocation

4 update (Bill Tweit)

5 Management Strategy Evaluations

6 • Use of MSEs by the Councils and NOAA

7 Fisheries (Brandon Muffley, Jon Hare)

8 • Discussion: How were the outcomes of MSEs

9 used in management? What lessons were

10 learned, from a process or fisheries management

11 perspective?

12 National Seafood Strategy (Paul Doremus)

13 • Update on NOAA Fisheries National Seafood

14 Strategy

15 Other Issues (Kitty Simonds)

16 • Responding to misinformation or

17 mischaracterizations of U.S. fisheries by

18 third-party certification programs or other

19 organizations

20 Public Comment

21 Adjournment

22 * * * * *

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

2 (9:01 a.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Good morning. We're
4 going to start the meeting in about two minutes.
5 So, if everyone can start to take their seats, and
6 maybe somebody from staff, maybe, Mary, or
7 somebody, if you could just make the announcement
8 in the hallway to get people to their seats?
9 Thank you.

10 All right, I'd like to call this meeting
11 to order. Today is day two of the May 2022
12 Council Coordination Committee. We have a full
13 agenda, during the day today. And we're going to
14 start out with a presentation -- a number of
15 presentations from around the country, regarding
16 climate change and fisheries.

17 This is something that a lot of you have
18 talked to me, and I think there's going to be a
19 lot of interest in the direction that the Councils
20 are going, as well as information from the
21 Service. So, we have an hour and 45 minutes for
22 this agenda topic this morning. And we have three

1 present -- four presentations.

2 We're going to start with Kiley Dancy,
3 who going to give us -- she's with Mid-Atlantic
4 Council Staff. She's going to give an update on
5 the East Coast Scenario Planning Initiative.
6 Kiley will probably go into it, but this is an
7 initiative that we are working with the South
8 Atlantic Council, the New England Council, the
9 Mid-Atlantic Council, and the Atlantic States
10 Marine Fisheries Commission, have been working on
11 this, as well as folks from the Service as well,
12 so. Kiley, if you're all ready to go, I'm going
13 to turn it over to you, and take it away.

14 MS. DANCY: Thank you. Good morning,
15 everyone. I'm going cover an overview of the East
16 Coast Climate Change Scenario Planning Initiative.
17 So, as Chairman just said, this initiative being
18 conducted by a number of different East Coast
19 Fishery Management entities, including the
20 Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the
21 -- all three East Coast Fishery Management
22 Councils, as well as NOAA Fisheries.

1 This is the core team -- there is also a
2 core team of representatives of staff, from each
3 of these organizations, working to move this
4 initiative forward, working with a contracted
5 facilitator, who's actually the same facilitator
6 that the Pacific Council used in their climate
7 change scenario planning process, as well. So,
8 oversight for this initiative is being provided by
9 an expanded version of the Northeast Region
10 Coordinating Council, with representation from the
11 South Atlantic Council, in addition to the NRCC
12 Member Organizations.

13 There are two main objectives that we've
14 identified for this project, and the first is to
15 explore how East Coast fishery governance and
16 management issues will be affected by climate
17 change in fisheries, with a particular focus on
18 changing stock availability and distributions.

19 The second objective is to advance a set
20 of tools and processes that are going to provide
21 flexible and robust fishery management strategies,
22 continuing to promote fishery conservation in

1 resilient fishing communities, and also,
2 addressing uncertainty in an era of climate
3 change.

4 So, scenario planning, in brief, is a
5 tool for planning and action, in the context of an
6 uncertain future. So, there are a lot of
7 predictions and forecasts about what might happen
8 with climate change, and to East Coast fisheries
9 as the result of climate change, but also a lot of
10 uncertainty about what will happen, how fast it
11 will happen, what will happen in different areas?
12 So, the basic premise of scenario planning is
13 asking the question, if we knew that certain
14 condition would occur in the future, what would we
15 do now to prepare for those conditions?

16 And so, for example, we're asking a lot
17 of questions about different drivers of change in
18 this process. For example, what happens if
19 species distribution changes accelerate or the
20 frequency and intensity extreme weather increases?
21 What happens to social and economic factors, such
22 as, you know, if recreational fishing effort

1 increases or decreases substantially? What if
2 consumer, you know, seafood preferences and demand
3 change substantially? So, we're looking at a lot
4 of different factors, which I'll get into a little
5 bit later. But, as noted in the objectives, you
6 know, the changes in species distribution and
7 availability are a major focus of this initiative.

8 So, scenario planning, then allows us to
9 consider different possible combinations of future
10 conditions and ask which management actions and
11 governance strategies are likely to be beneficial
12 under a range of different future conditions. And
13 then, on the other hand, which actions and
14 strategies should we avoid, because they might
15 reduce flexibility to adapt, or they might
16 increase the difficulty of adapting to future
17 conditions.

18 All right, just a second here. It's
19 important to note that scenario planning is not a
20 method of prediction, and it's not a forecast.
21 It's a framework for allowing us to explicitly
22 consider uncertainty in future conditions. And

1 it's meant to stimulate creative and innovative
2 thinking and to avoid a trap that we might fall
3 into, where we might get overconfident in our
4 vision of the future, and focus on, you know, one
5 most likely possible future, and focus too
6 narrowly on that view. So, scenario planning
7 allows us plan for multiple possible futures.

8 And so, for the East Coast initiative,
9 there are six major phases planned for this
10 project, and three of which we have completed
11 already. So, after first defining the project
12 objectives, we conducted a scoping phase, last
13 summer and fall, followed by an exploration phase
14 that we just completed this winter. That was to
15 analyze factors that are driving changes in
16 fisheries in greater detail. So, I'll talk more
17 about the later phases in a bit. But first, I'll
18 just touch on some of what we did during scoping
19 and exploration.

20 So, our scoping activities included
21 preparation of some introductory materials,
22 including a website and brochure and a series of

1 videos. We held three introductory webinars,
2 introducing the initiative and seeking some
3 initial feedback. And those were attended by over
4 250 people. And finally, we opened an online
5 questionnaire. We received 383 responses, and
6 that asked for feedback on experiences that East
7 Coast stakeholders are having with climate change,
8 and what major drivers of change they viewed as
9 important, or most uncertain, or most potentially
10 surprising to consider through this process.

11 So, a couple of highlights from the
12 scoping process that we saw. There are pretty
13 high levels of interest in these issues. A lot of
14 examples were given by stakeholders that
15 participated in scoping, about how they're already
16 seeing effects of climate. There are a couple of
17 examples shown on this slide, but we heard things,
18 you know, like observations of shifting species,
19 changes in fish productivity and size, shifts in
20 timing or frequency of spawning, habitat, food web
21 changes, and a lot of examples, as well, about how
22 these factors are influencing human communities,

1 including things like business realigning to adapt
2 to new species distributions and things like sea
3 level rise and storms impacting boat access and
4 infrastructure.

5 So, in addition to kind of these
6 specific changes that folks are seeing already, we
7 were able to have scoping participants identify
8 sort of a range of broader drivers of change in
9 oceanographic conditions, biological conditions,
10 and social and economic factors, that they would
11 expect to see influence change in fisheries over
12 the next 20 years.

13 So, for the next phase, which was the
14 exploration phase. We used that feedback from
15 scoping and the commonly identified drivers of
16 change to inform a series of webinars, with the
17 goal of digging into, in more detail, what factors
18 are expected to cause change in fisheries, over
19 the next 20 years. So, we held three webinars in
20 late February, early March, where we provided some
21 overview materials and held panel discussions on
22 Oceanographic, Biological, and Social and Economic

1 Drivers of change, including all the subtopics
2 here, listed on the slide.

3 We heard a lot of great insight from our
4 Panelists on these issues and these issues, you
5 know, range pretty broadly, in the ways that they
6 might impact fisheries, as well as in their
7 predictability. So, these drivers of change will
8 inform -- they will serve as, basically, the
9 building blocks of the next step of the process,
10 which is the scenario creation phase.

11 So, now I'll briefly talk about the next
12 phases planned for this project, including our
13 next step. Next month is the scenario creation
14 workshop, and then application and monitoring,
15 which are planned for later in 2022 and early
16 2023.

17 The next phase is the scenario creation
18 process, which will be conducted over a
19 two-and-a-half-day workshop, in-person, this June,
20 in Arlington, Virginia. This will involve
21 approximately 75 workshop participants,
22 representing a balance of different stakeholder

1 groups and regions along the East Coast. And we
2 do plan to partially stream this, by webinar, for
3 the portions of the workshops that are in plenary
4 and excluding the breakout sections. But the
5 scenario creation discussions will be mostly
6 limited to the in-person participants.

7 So, as the workshop participants will
8 create three to five different scenarios to
9 consider how climate change might impact East
10 Coast fisheries over the next 20 years, using
11 different possible combinations of the drivers of
12 change, that I discussed a couple of slides ago.
13 And so, again, these are not meant to be
14 necessarily predictions, but they're supposed to
15 be plausible, relevant, and challenging, and
16 memorable stories about what conditions we might
17 face, over the next 20 years.

18 The -- following the creation of the
19 scenarios, we have the applications phase, where
20 we will use the scenarios as a platform for
21 discussion about future fishery governance and
22 management issues. So, the previous steps aren't

1 intended to focus necessarily on solutions or
2 possible changes. They are arriving at a set of
3 scenarios, which are a means to an end, and those
4 scenarios then allow for productive and creative
5 conversations about what actually needs to change
6 with East Coast governance and management. And
7 that ultimately will help us to decide on tools
8 and processes that should be advanced.

9 So, the applications phase, will involve
10 three steps. First is a scenario deepening
11 process, where we expect to hold about three to
12 four webinars, this summer, to refine and add
13 detail to the scenarios before they are finalized,
14 and that would help, you know, get us additional
15 input from East Coast stakeholders that may have
16 not been involved in the workshop.

17 And then second, we'll have a series of
18 implications conversations, later this fall.
19 These we expect to hold in conjunction with
20 Council and Commission meetings, that are already
21 scheduled for September through November, and we
22 plan to use the scenarios as a platform there, for

1 each management body, to discuss challenges,
2 opportunities, and recommendations, in response to
3 the scenarios.

4 And then, finally, we plan to have a
5 Summit Meeting, hopefully in early 2023, to have
6 representative from the various participating
7 organizations come together and review the results
8 from the previous steps and compile ideas and come
9 up with a final set of recommendations and
10 outcomes. At the end of the process, we intend to
11 have this list of project outputs. I'm not going
12 to read them all, specifically, but they include
13 both the set of scenarios and some more specific
14 outputs, including policy and management
15 recommendations.

16 So, there are still some unknowns about
17 exactly how these outcomes and recommendations are
18 going to be structured, since we haven't gotten
19 through the process yet. But we do intend to have
20 these concrete outputs from this process,
21 including a set of policy recommendations, a list
22 of data gaps and research needs, and monitoring

1 needs, and then a framework for ongoing
2 conversations about these issues.

3 But that's a brief overview of the
4 process, and lastly, I'll just point out that we
5 have a website for this initiative, which has a
6 lot of additional information and documents, as
7 well as recordings of all of our previous
8 webinars, and you can also feel free to contact
9 any of the Core Team Members listed here. So,
10 that's all I have, thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thank you very much for
12 the presentation, Kiley. I failed to mention
13 before we started, but my plan this morning will
14 be to keep the discussion at the table, at this
15 time, for questions and comments. And then if
16 there's an opportunity, if we have time, after
17 NOAA presents -- does their presentation, we'll
18 open it up to the public for questions and
19 comments, if there's time -- if the time allows.
20 But does anyone have any? Does anyone have any
21 questions or comments for Kiley, at this time?
22 Chris Moore?

1 DR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One
2 of the issues that we've been talking about, as
3 we've been here this week, with our NMFS partners,
4 is timing. Can you put up the slide that details
5 timing? There's another one, Kiley, that has the
6 meeting in January. Yeah, so, I want to emphasize
7 this for folks, basically, to indicate exactly
8 where we're at, with this particular project.

9 And it's not like we're just starting.
10 It is -- we are deep into it. We have meetings
11 scheduled next month for the scenario discussion,
12 all right, with 75 stakeholders. And then we're
13 entering into the scenario deepening phase, that
14 begins in July, takes through August, implications
15 following that, and there's some meeting scheduled
16 for January of 2023. So, I think, that's a pretty
17 ambitious timely schedule, that gets us where we
18 need to be, early in 2023. And I just wanted to
19 emphasize that. Thanks.

20 CHAIRMAN LUISI: That's a good point,
21 Chris. I appreciate that. Any questions,
22 comments for Kiley? John Carmichael?

1 MR. CARMICHAEL: Yeah, thank you. And
2 thank you, Kiley, for that. I just wanted to
3 point out that, you know, when they're planning
4 for the workshop that's coming up, one of the
5 things I was interested in is how interested the
6 fishermen would be, and they were work -- reaching
7 out to various folks. And I was really amazed,
8 honestly, by the turnout, particularly from our
9 region, the South Atlantic.

10 There's huge interest in this, and many
11 fishermen, and our advisors, and others are
12 willing to come to this workshop and really want
13 to be engaged in this process. See, the -- so
14 often, we do think that we're having to twist arms
15 to get people to show up, and that has not been
16 the case with this at all. So, it's been very
17 encouraging.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks John, I
19 agree. Okay, Paul?

20 MR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
21 just, as a practitioner of scenario planning for
22 many years, I just wanted to compliment the effort

1 here. The methodology is fantastic, and, I think,
2 perfectly suited for the issues that we're
3 collectively trying to address. So, I just wanted
4 to acknowledge the sophistication of this
5 approach, and in particular, the extensive
6 stakeholder engagement, great to hear of the
7 strong participation, as is key to making it all
8 work well. But this is an incredible work, from
9 my vantage point, from a strategy and planning
10 point of view, and I really look forward to seeing
11 the outcomes as you get deeper into it.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thanks, Paul.
13 Janet Coit?

14 MS. COIT: I agree with Paul. And thank
15 you, Kiley, excellent presentation. What comes
16 next? So, the Summit Meeting will generate ideas
17 and options. And then, I know, you talked at the
18 REC Fish Summit about subsequent phase. Could you
19 or -- could you describe that?

20 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Kiley?

21 MS. DANCY: Yeah, so, I think, from the
22 Summit Meeting, you know, we expect to have some

1 kind of report or set of outcomes, following that,
2 in the couple of months following that, and that
3 will include some monitoring recommendations. So,
4 monitoring is sort of the final phase, as -- that
5 sometimes gets forgotten. But I think that's
6 going to be lumped into, kind of, the follow up
7 from the Summit Meeting.

8 So, once we have a set of
9 recommendations, those, I think, our approach is
10 going to be that those recommendations are going
11 to include some recommendations for continued
12 monitoring of what we might need to continue to
13 watch in the future. Is that what you were
14 asking?

15 MS. COIT: I didn't know the answer.
16 But I was asking what comes next. I think,
17 ultimately, the goal is, right, finding triggers
18 and doing the planning towards new governance
19 mechanisms, that would address what you're seeing
20 in the monitoring.

21 MS. DANCY: Yeah, I think, as the result
22 of the applications phase and the monitoring

1 phase, which are -- which will sort of be combined
2 a little bit, I think we will have a -- and I'll
3 go back to the, you know, the outcomes that we
4 hope to have by Spring 2023 including a set of,
5 you know, near-term, long-term management
6 priorities, policy recommendations, a list of data
7 gaps, research needs, and monitoring needs, and
8 then, you know, a better understanding of the
9 challenges that we face. So, I think these are
10 the outputs that we expect to have, roughly, in
11 the Spring of 2023.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks, Kiley.
13 And I think, you know, Chris just mentioned to me,
14 you know, there are going to be some action items
15 that come out of the Summit, that we continue to
16 work on, and that's something that I know our
17 Council is looking forward to, getting that
18 feedback from our stakeholders, so. Tom?

19 MR. NIES: Yeah, just quickly. I think
20 it's important to remember that this talking, you
21 know, two bullets there. One is governance
22 changes, and one is management priorities and

1 changes. And, of course, the management
2 priorities and changes are going to have to feed
3 back through the council process through actions.
4 So, that will be following on, as well.

5 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks, Tom, for
6 that. Okay, seeing no other hands at this time,
7 Kiley, thank you for your presentation. But
8 before we move onto the next presentation, I
9 wanted to recognize Dale Diaz, who joined us later
10 -- late yesterday afternoon. Dale, do you want to
11 introduce yourself?

12 MR. DIAZ: Sure. Thank you. I
13 apologize for being late. I had -- I just
14 couldn't get out of the airport. I had some
15 mechanical issues with the plane. But I did want
16 to introduce myself. So, I'm Dale Diaz. I'm
17 currently the Chair of the Gulf of Mexico
18 Fisheries Management Council. I'm from the State
19 of Mississippi. I retired from the Mississippi
20 Department of Marine Resources, in about 2013.

21 I was involved with the Council, prior
22 to 2013 and I've been an at-large member for six

1 years now. So, I've been around commercial
2 fishing, recreational fishing, marine law
3 enforcement, a whole bunch of things that I think
4 helps me understand the Council. But it amazes me
5 that it's very difficult to manage fish. So, it
6 amazes me. But thank you for the time, and I
7 appreciate it, and I'm glad to be here this week
8 and look forward to participating.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, we're glad you
10 were able to make it, Dale. Thanks for the
11 introduction. And I also see Russ down at the end
12 of the table. Do you want to give a quick
13 introduction?

14 MR. DUNN: Sure, thanks Mike. I'm Russ
15 Dunn. I'm the National Policy Advisor for
16 Recreational Fisheries, at NOAA, NOAA Fisheries,
17 and I suffered the same fate as Dale, being stuck
18 in the airport. So, glad to be here, thanks.

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, we're glad you
20 made it. Okay, Kiley, thank you very much. We're
21 going to go ahead and move on to the next
22 presentation. So, our next presentation is going

1 be the Pacific Council Scenario Planning Lessons
2 Learned. We have Merrick Burden, from the Pacific
3 Fishery Management Council, he's the Executive
4 Director of the Council, and, Merrick, if you're
5 ready to go, I'm going to turn the mic over to
6 you.

7 MR. BURDEN: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman. And Kiley's going to make my job really
9 easy, after following her presentation. So, thank
10 you, Kiley. Before I get started, I'm going to
11 maybe just preface our talk here, with a couple of
12 thoughts.

13 So, one is, you know, climate change is
14 a very important issue for us to be addressing.
15 And we think of this in terms of, you know,
16 there's a lot of things coming together. There's
17 science, there's management, and there's a lot of
18 risk and uncertainties facing us, as we embark
19 down this road. And the Pacific Council's
20 experience with the scenario planning exercise was
21 driven by the view that climate presents a lot of
22 risk and uncertainty, and that it's a tool that

1 can be used to help us suss (phonetic) through
2 what's facing us and how we might respond.

3 So, let's see, with that, our climate
4 scenario work came out of what's called our
5 Fishery Ecosystem Plan Initiative Process. So, we
6 have a FEP, that is structured to focus on cross
7 FMP issues, in relation to the ecosystem. And
8 periodically, our Council will take up
9 initiatives, and these initiatives are intended to
10 help advance our FEP goals and improve our
11 capabilities at doing and implementing at doing
12 and implementing ecosystem-based fishery
13 management.

14 And within that context, is where we
15 came to the issue with climate change and the
16 issue of using climate-based scenario planning to
17 help us explore what we might do in response to
18 our changing climate. So, as Kiley indicated,
19 scenario planning is a way of looking at and
20 evaluating a series of outcomes and possible
21 responses in the face of risk and uncertainty.
22 And as we think about this, we think one of the

1 key issues is that it enables us to be proactive,
2 rather than reactive. And we think that's a
3 really important aspect of dealing with climate
4 change, and will continue to be, as we move
5 forward.

6 So, like I said, climate change presents
7 a lot of risk and uncertainty. These risk factors
8 and their -- what they look like, present a range
9 of possible outcomes and responses that we could
10 take as management entities and as stakeholders in
11 response, and so, the first question then is, what
12 do we want to do, in the face of these different
13 types of outcomes, that we think are possible, as
14 our climate changes?

15 And so, as I've already indicated,
16 scenario planning was viewed by us as a way to
17 systematically capture the range of possible
18 climate effects and outcomes in our fisheries, and
19 then how we might go about dealing with them. And
20 so, as the -- some of the East Coast folks are
21 doing, we also engaged in a broad public
22 participation exercise. And this resulted in a

1 lot of discussion, and a lot of awareness among
2 the Pacific Council family, regarding climate
3 change and its possible effects, and that added
4 some tremendous value in our opinion.

5 And the resulting work product, which
6 you seen a preview of already, was the creation of
7 four fairly high-level scenarios describing the
8 future of West Coast fisheries, under a climate
9 change future, and those scenarios range from
10 optimistic to pessimistic, and things in between
11 that were a mixed bag.

12 So, as the previous presentation
13 indicated, we, too, looked at the drivers that
14 were going to be spurring change over the coming
15 years. Climate change is one of those, of course,
16 but that takes place alongside many other factors,
17 and that was important in envisioning what the
18 future could look like, as you bring together all
19 those factors and consider the effect on West
20 Coast fishing communities.

21 And the outcome is captured in this
22 diagram here. And so, the vertical axis shows

1 species abundance and availability. And so, some
2 of our scenarios envision those going up. Some of
3 those envisioned those going down. And then, we
4 thought about climate and ocean conditions, in
5 terms of variability, essentially. So, were
6 things going to be a steady change, or were things
7 going to be increasing in variability in the
8 future? And within all of those axis were our
9 four scenarios that we envisioned.

10 So, there you see the titles of Fortune
11 and Favor, which was our most optimistic. So,
12 species abundance is going up in a stable
13 direction, and that was viewed as a positive. And
14 the other side, you see the Hollowed-Out scenario,
15 which was much more variable conditions, and
16 general declines in species availability. And the
17 other two were mixed bags.

18 So, our scenario planning exercise came
19 to an end, several months ago, maybe about a year
20 ago. And so, it's given us some time to think
21 about what we would do today, if we had to do it
22 all over again. So, undoubtably, our experience

1 with using scenario planning in the way that we
2 used it was a positive. It created a lot of good
3 discussion. It created some awareness. And all
4 of that is a positive for our council family.

5 The draw back here is that when we take
6 a step back and look at what we came up with,
7 we've been unable to date to turn that into
8 actionable -- something that's actionable by the
9 Council. In other words, the scenarios appear to
10 be rather broad and theoretical and difficult to
11 translate into some sort of regulatory policy.

12 So, a couple of ideas have come about,
13 as we thought about how we might do this
14 differently, if we were to do it over again. But
15 I don't think we will. But in hindsight, if we
16 were to, what would it look like? And so, one
17 idea here is that we would use a mix of
18 quantitative and qualitative scenario exercises.
19 So, this might look like starting off with a
20 quantitative analysis that uses the representative
21 concentration pathways of six, and 8.5, and maybe
22 others and use that to forecast what the future

1 would look like.

2 We have models already, that do this,
3 and they predict where species are going to go.
4 They predict how species might fare, in terms of
5 abundance and productivity. And that starts to
6 give us some granularity, perhaps, in what the
7 future could look like for our managed fisheries.
8 And that start to help us with strategic planning
9 for those fisheries, in the future.

10 We can then envision coupling that with
11 qualitative scenario planning exercises, using
12 workshops that ask management staff, for instance,
13 what would you do if you saw your fisheries
14 changing in this way, and then asking
15 stakeholders, how would you respond if you saw
16 your fisheries changing in this way? That becomes
17 a set of scenarios that we can start to respond
18 to.

19 So, as I quickly wrap up this brief
20 presentation. So, again, climate change is a
21 really important thing for us to be grappling
22 with, and we are in the stage now, where we're

1 struggling to come up with management responses.
2 Climate change can be viewed through the lens of
3 risk and uncertainty, and because of this, we can
4 use scenario planning as an effective tool. And
5 our experience with this was undoubtably valuable.
6 However, like I said, it's been difficult to take
7 our experience and translate that into actionable
8 policy.

9 And so, if we were to do it again, we
10 would lay out perhaps these four steps in a
11 sequence that starts with science, moves through
12 management expertise, moves through stakeholder
13 responses, considers the feedback between all of
14 those things, and that helps us with a broader
15 strategic plan perspective on how we might be able
16 to go about managing for a changing world. So, I
17 will stop there. Happy to take questions at your
18 discretion. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Merrick, thank you very
20 much for the presentation. Does anyone have any
21 questions that they'd like to ask, any comments?
22 Chris Moore?

1 DR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 have a comment. I just wanted to thank the
3 Pacific Council for all their hard work. We stole
4 your idea, and certainly built on it, and I think,
5 as a result, we're going have a better product.
6 So, I appreciate everything that you guys did.
7 Thanks.

8 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, and I'll add to
9 that, and say thank you, for the work that you've
10 done. I hope that while we kind of get to the end
11 result of the work that we're doing here, on the
12 East Coast, that maybe learn from what you have
13 reported out, as far as being able to make certain
14 -- your last comment was that there's been
15 challenges in making actionable policy decisions
16 in management, based on the work that you did, and
17 hopefully we can learn from some of the things
18 that you guys have done and try to put that into
19 play here, on the East Coast.

20 Anyone else have any questions or
21 comments before we move on? Okay, seeing none at
22 this time, we're going to go to our third

1 presentation. We have a presentation from the
2 North Pacific Council, a Climate Change Taskforce
3 update, and we have Bill Tweit, with North Pacific
4 Council. He's the Vice Chair and will be
5 providing us that presentation this morning. So,
6 Bill, whenever you're ready.

7 MR. TWEIT: Thanks, Mr. Chair, and good
8 morning, everybody. I'm also Chair of our
9 Ecosystem Committee, and as such, I've kind of had
10 a front row seat now, for a while, on our efforts
11 to implement EBFM, and as well, try to understand
12 how we can cope with and adapt to the impacts of
13 climate change.

14 We also have one handout that's attached
15 to your agenda, as well. Our update on Bering Sea
16 Fishery Ecosystem Plan, just a -- it's our one
17 pager on what our Climate Change Task Force is
18 doing, and free (phonetic) to that as well.

19 Our basic approach shares many features
20 of both the East Coast efforts and the Pacific
21 Fishery Management Council efforts, that you've
22 heard about already. And the main one is that we

1 also rely on a scenario planning approach. I
2 think there's a really good reason for why we've
3 all settled on that. And certainly, as we thought
4 about the risks that the increasing levels of
5 uncertainty pose to us, and our ability to
6 continue our stewardship and our track record of
7 sustainability in our fisheries, it's those risks
8 that climate change poses that I think trouble
9 most of us most. And the scenario planning
10 approach really seemed like the only option,
11 really, for giving us the tools that would be able
12 to address that. Like our sister council, the
13 Pacific Council, we also are working within our
14 fishery ecosystem plan framework, for at least
15 these initial steps in understanding the impacts
16 of climate change.

17 We're focused -- our terminology differs
18 a little bit from what you've been hearing, in
19 that we're sort of focused on our vulnerabilities
20 is the term of art we're using. But I think it's
21 actually very similar to the focuses of the
22 scenario planning efforts that you've heard about

1 already. This was -- as we thought about
2 implementing our fishery ecosystem plan, climate
3 change, adapting to climate change, and assessing
4 our vulnerabilities, to our ability to adapt to
5 climate change, was one of our two highest
6 priorities for immediate implementation of our
7 Bering Sea FEP.

8 We thought the FEP was the appropriate
9 vehicle for a variety of reasons. One of the
10 primary ones is that the Fishery Ecosystem Plan
11 really supports us, our ability to be able to
12 provide policy direction to the scientists who are
13 working with us on this, the scientists from the
14 Alaska Fishery Science Center, as well as the
15 scientists who are working in partnership with the
16 AFSC. And that's worked very well for us.
17 They've welcomed the policy guidance, the
18 organized structure with which we're providing the
19 policy guidance, and it's allowed them to, I
20 think, move forward more confidently on their
21 efforts to develop the analytical tools that we
22 all are so dependent on.

1 We focused on the Bering Sea, even
2 though we actually have three large marine
3 ecosystems within North Pacific Council waters,
4 the Artic, the Bering Sea, and the Gulf of Alaska.
5 We focused on the Bering Sea for a couple of
6 pretty practical reasons. We're seeing --
7 obviously, we're seeing the impacts of climate
8 change across all three. So, it wasn't an issue
9 of urgency. They're, all three, sort of equally
10 urgent.

11 But the Bering Sea was handy because we
12 had this newly developed Fishery Ecosystem Plan,
13 with a specific emphasis on climate change. And
14 that was built because we just received the
15 results of a five-year in-depth study of the large
16 marine ecosystem that is the Bering Sea, the
17 Bering Sea Integrated Ecosystem Research Project,
18 which was a large scale multi-agency effort to
19 develop a really fine grain scientific
20 understanding of the oceanographic -- the physical
21 oceanographic processes of the Bering Sea, the
22 biological communities of the Bering Sea, the

1 fisheries in the Bering Sea, and the fishing
2 dependent communities of the Bering Sea.

3 That effort has culminated in some very
4 sophisticated models, one of which I'll refer to a
5 couple of times, ACLIM. And that's a climate
6 impact model, that's going to be our basic
7 analytical tool for the scenario planning efforts
8 that we're undertaking. And it allows us to
9 downscale from the range of global climate change
10 projections and bring those -- scale those into
11 the Bering Sea, specifically, and give us a set of
12 very specific different futures for the Bering Sea
13 that we can then work with in our scenario
14 planning.

15 We established the Task Force then, with
16 this set of initial priorities that you see up on
17 the screen, to assess our -- both our
18 vulnerabilities, as well as our resiliences, and
19 equally, at the same time, develop the protocols
20 for incorporating local knowledge, traditional
21 knowledge, and subsistence information. And we're
22 expecting that that evaluation to ultimately lead

1 to a strengthening resilience in our fishery
2 management capabilities. And I'll talk a little
3 bit about how we're expecting that. And you can
4 see our overarching timeframe is really the next
5 several years.

6 We got off to a slow start, thanks to
7 COVID, which was frustrating to a lot of folks
8 because they were feeling a real urgency to get
9 going. But things have really sped up, over the
10 last year and a half. And we're feeling like
11 we're still reasonably on track. And what did I
12 just do? Obviously, I pushed too hard on some
13 button, which I'm good at. I have no idea what's
14 going on. I didn't touch it, I swear. See if I
15 can find a -- all right.

16 So, we're preparing what we call a
17 climate ready synthesis. And we're hoping to have
18 that available later this year. And again, as I
19 said, at this point we're on track. And that
20 evaluation, we're hopeful, will provide us with a
21 sense of both where we seem to have some
22 resilience already, when where we will need

1 adaptation and begins -- and then next phase of
2 making this more actionable by providing at least
3 a set of near-term recommendations, what things we
4 could start to work on right away, that seem
5 fairly obvious.

6 We are also expecting to be able to
7 address the long term, but their first charge is
8 to give us near term, so, based on the scenario
9 planning efforts. As I mentioned already, we are
10 interfacing this with our efforts to incorporate
11 LK and TK. And that is our other highest priority
12 in implementing our Bering Sea FEP. Our objective
13 there is to be able to understand the knowledge
14 that Alaskan Natives hold, that dates back for
15 millennia, about the state of their ecosystem and
16 the variations they've seen over time and what
17 those have looked like, how those have impacted
18 them, and some insights into maybe why those
19 variations have occurred, as well. We're hoping
20 to understand, that in order to be able to use it,
21 and refer to it in combination with our own
22 scientific efforts, such as the Bering Sea

1 Integrated Research Plan, to understand, then, the
2 impacts of climate change on the fisheries that
3 are most important to them, as well as the
4 fisheries that we manage.

5 So, in order to broaden our
6 understanding, many of their fisheries occur in
7 freshwater areas. But, again, because they're
8 fishing on anadromous stocks, it's the anadromy
9 that ties those together. And we're all dependent
10 on the Bering Sea Ecosystem, and in recognizing
11 that common dependency, we've come to understand
12 that it's extremely important to also be able to
13 understand their knowledge of it and their
14 perspectives on it. And so, between this effort
15 here, in terms of climate change, but equally our
16 other task force, which is working on integrating
17 traditional knowledge, local knowledge, and
18 subsistence information, into our management
19 process.

20 So, our next steps are two-fold. When
21 our initial set of scenarios are ready, when our
22 climate change synthesis is in front of us, we

1 intend to move on to identifying indicators. From
2 everything -- from the discussions that have
3 occurred about indicators, to date, we expect it
4 to be a pretty lively discussion about what types
5 of indicators we'll choose. I think most people
6 grasp just how important the choice of indicators
7 is, to understand whether or not the things that
8 concern them the most about climate change will
9 actually be factored into how we're approaching
10 it.

11 And so, there's a lot of concern from
12 folks, they don't want to get left out. But
13 equally, they also don't want to be tied to things
14 that may or may not affect them that much. And
15 so, I think this is -- it looks pretty simple. I
16 think it's actually going to be pretty complex. I
17 think it's going to reflect a lot of different --
18 very different policy values, as well.

19 And then, our step that moves on towards
20 actionable. And I would note that as I looked at
21 the timeline that the East Coast laid out, in the
22 remaining steps, this feels very similar, slightly

1 different vocabulary, but it's basically the same
2 approach as the East Coast is laying out. It --
3 generating advice will also be lively. We're
4 anticipating this will -- everybody's voices will
5 be heard in this part of our process, as well.
6 But again, we're hoping that we can help keep it
7 at a constructive discussion through the strength
8 of our analytical tools, and particularly, the way
9 ACLIM has been built so far.

10 It's intended to incorporate the full
11 range of concerns we've been hearing about climate
12 change and provide users with very different
13 experiences and very different perspectives, the
14 sense that their issue are being examined, through
15 this scenario planning tool, to the same extent as
16 the other interests, or sort of what we regard as
17 the traditional interests that have been in front
18 of the Council. Our sense is that this is the
19 step that will then lead back to the Council
20 deciding whether and what kinds of actions may be
21 needed to modify our Fishery Management Plans.
22 Our Fishery Management Plans, themselves, are the

1 vehicles that we expect to ultimately need to
2 modify, in order to be able to adapt to climate
3 change.

4 So, I guess, just in closing, two things
5 I'd like to note. One is I'd really like to
6 acknowledge our appreciation for the efforts of
7 our Climate Change Team. It's a very diverse
8 team. We're really pleased about that. We had a
9 lot more interest than we were able to have slots.
10 And that's a good problem to have for this kind of
11 an effort. And so, we were able to comprise a
12 team of council staff, agency staff, both resource
13 managers and scientists, Alaska Natives,
14 environmental NGO representatives, as well as
15 fishing industry representatives, many of whom
16 also speak for the fishing communities, as do the
17 others. And so, we feel as if we've been able to
18 pull together a team that's going to be able to
19 give us -- provide us with robust advice, and it
20 leads to, we're hoping, that that level of
21 diversity, incorporating that level of diversity,
22 from the beginning, both in terms of people, but

1 also in terms of how robust our tools are because,
2 ultimately, it'll lead towards being able to
3 address the challenge that one our council members
4 laid for us, as we talked about climate change.
5 And the words were, if we are going to survive
6 this, we have to learn to trust each other. And
7 we're hopeful that this process will help build
8 some of that trust. Happy to take any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks a lot,
10 Bill, for the presentation. Let me look around
11 the table and see if anyone has any questions or
12 comments they want to ask of Bill now that he's
13 getting up from the table. Any thoughts? I
14 appreciate you sharing that with us Bill.

15 We have one more presentation, before we
16 turn this into a discussion, a robust discussion
17 around the Council table. And I'm going to
18 recognize Kelly Denit, Director of NOAA's Office
19 of Sustainable Fisheries, who's going to give us a
20 presentation on the NOAA Fisheries Climate Change
21 Initiatives. Sam was on the hot seat earlier when
22 I walked in. He said you were having a little

1 tough time getting here this morning, but we're
2 glad you're here. And I know Sam's even more
3 happy that you're here, so. Kelly, whenever
4 you're ready, you can go ahead and get started.

5 MS. DENIT: All right, great, thanks,
6 Mike. Yeah, I'll just give him a second to get
7 the presentation up. Yeah, it's a little traffic,
8 a little siren call from my daughter at 3:15 in
9 the morning, best laid plans never work out with a
10 six-month-old, so. Sorry, Kiley, I missed the
11 first 10 minutes of your presentation.

12 All right, so, we'll jump right in. I'm
13 really going to cruise through this first slide
14 because, thanks to the first three presenters, I
15 think we've covered a bit of information already
16 on what's happening at the respective Councils.
17 And certainly, with Jon Hare's presentation
18 yesterday, as well, on climate, I think you guys
19 are well aware that there are a number of
20 activities going across the Council Regions, as it
21 relates to climate, and they're all in different
22 stages, but there's a lot of activity happening.

1 I also wanted to highlight the Climate
2 Science Strategy. Again, Jon touched on this
3 yesterday. So, I'm not going to run through a
4 repeat, but I think you all are familiar with
5 efforts that we have been undertaking to advance
6 our science in this area, and in particular, the
7 Regional Action Plans that are out right now for
8 comments, that identify the specific places where
9 we're trying to target.

10 So, I'm going to jump right into this
11 kind of last bullet, which is our focus moving
12 forward is how do we further advance our efforts,
13 as it relates to management needs? And so, one of
14 those is related to climate governance, which has
15 just been touched on in the two scenario planning
16 presentations.

17 So, I wanted to take a second and talk a
18 little bit about Magnuson Section 304(f), for
19 those who do not sleep with Magnuson Stevens Act
20 under their pillow, because I definitely slip into
21 just referring to 304(f), and then I can see
22 people glaze over, and they're like, what the heck

1 is that? So, this is the specific authority, that
2 the Secretary has for fisheries that extend beyond
3 the geographical area of any one council. The
4 Secretary has the authority to designate whether
5 that FMP or that stock is going to be managed by
6 one council, jointly by two councils, or if it
7 might be one council and cover different areas, if
8 it's going to be broken up by -- whether it be by
9 genetic information, or other scientific bases,
10 those types of situations.

11 We have extensive experience in this.
12 We just put out a tech memo, I think it was last
13 year, that summarizes how we have used this
14 authority already, across multiple FMPs. We have
15 examples of all of those different options, where
16 one council is leading an FMP for other councils,
17 where we have joint management, et cetera. So,
18 what we are focused on, for this particular
19 project that we are talking to you about today, is
20 what we're dealing with now, in terms of shifting
21 stocks. So, really, it's reviewing those
22 governance decisions that we have made and are

1 those still the best choices or not?

2 So, in particular, as we're dealing with
3 more stocks that are moving, we're having emerging
4 fisheries in different areas. Our focus is on
5 trying to provide more transparency around the
6 process, that the Secretary would use under this
7 304(f) authority. So, specifically, we want to
8 look at when and how the Secretary would review
9 when governance would need to change. When would
10 we need to look at the -- our Federal Management
11 and evaluate a stock that might be under multiple
12 jurisdictions?

13 So, very briefly, I'll touch on the key
14 components of the policy guidance. The first is
15 the criteria, and we just heard a couple of
16 different references to triggers, in different
17 presentations, and that is one of the first steps.
18 You can think about what criteria would trigger a
19 need to revise governance. And that's very broad
20 categories that we put up here, as examples.

21 Should there only be biological
22 indicators? Should there be social and economic

1 indicators? Should it be some combination with
2 other indicators? Should we be using as triggers,
3 for when a review of governance should occur, as
4 the Secretary?

5 The second is the criteria that the
6 Secretary would use to decide the appropriate
7 governance, so, making decisions around, again,
8 whether that should be a single council that's
9 leading the effort? Should it be jointly managed?
10 Should we have one council that's lead, but it's
11 covering the entire breadth of the scope of where
12 the stock is occurring? All of those -- and we
13 need to think about those criteria, as well. And
14 again, that could be in different categories. Is
15 it economic? Is it biological? Thinking about
16 equity issues. How and what criteria should we be
17 taking into account as part of those decisions
18 around governance?

19 And finally, thinking a bit about those
20 elements needed to ensure the successful
21 implementation of the determination. And so, in
22 fact, we're moving forward with a change in

1 governance from on council to another, or from one
2 council leading to joint management, thinking
3 about how does that regulatory transition happen,
4 whether to make that smooth as possible.

5 So, next, I'll step you through the
6 proposed timeline. And I am grateful for Chris
7 Moore's very diplomatic pointing out of the
8 scenario planning time. So, as you will see here,
9 in this proposed timeline, we are striving to
10 align our work with the outcomes of that scenario
11 planning effort. And also grateful for Merrick's
12 presentation on the Pacific Council and knowing
13 that they have their information in hand and
14 they're now grappling with how they go that next
15 step.

16 So, for us, our proposed timeline,
17 essentially, is this summer, to use as a scoping
18 period, present this to you all here today, get
19 your initial feedback, and any other feedback you
20 would like to provide, over the course of this
21 summer. Ideally, hearing from you by July. And
22 then our plan would be, at the October Meeting, to

1 provide an update to the CCC on what we found as
2 part of the scoping, around those three areas that
3 I just stepped you through.

4 I've highlighted in here the East Coast
5 Scenario Planning and our expectations, that is
6 wrapping up at least the phase of their work in
7 early 2023, and that we would be targeting to have
8 a draft policy for more formal CCC comment, by
9 Spring of 2023. So, we would be able to take into
10 account the next steps that's happened for the
11 East Coast Scenario Planning, as well as the
12 what's happening on the Pacific and North Pacific.
13 And then, you can see the rest of the timeline
14 there, with the idea to hopefully have a finalized
15 policy, by 2024 (phonetic).

16 So, a couple key questions to just get
17 the ball rolling. If there are any major gaps
18 that you see in those elements, that I stepped
19 through, or if you have questions around the
20 timeline, feedback, we welcome that. Also,
21 appreciate your feedback on what opportunities or
22 challenges we foresee in the development of this

1 policy guidance. Certainly, I've already heard,
2 based on the presentation versus comments, the
3 concern about the timing, and how we make sure
4 that we're not getting crosswise in our efforts
5 with, in particular, the East Coast Scenario
6 Planning. So, with that, Chair, I will welcome
7 questions, comments.

8 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thank you, Kelly.
9 I think you kind of hit the nail on the head
10 there, at the end, your last statement. I know
11 that we have concerns about how this initiative
12 would interact with the work that we're already
13 doing, and, you know, it's the timing that kind of
14 overlaps, and I think if there is a lack of
15 coordination between the different groups, it
16 could create some problems in advancement of our
17 scenario planning exercise. So, I'll just put
18 that out there on the record. But does anyone
19 have any questions for Kelly at this time? Tom
20 Nies, and then I'll come back to you Chris. Go
21 ahead, Tom.

22 MR. NIES: So, Kelly, could you back up

1 a couple of slides, to your timeline? So, a
2 couple times you've mentioned scoping, but I don't
3 see anything in their slide, which says when you
4 expect scoping to take place on this and what you
5 mean by scoping? Who do you intend to go out and
6 talk to?

7 MS. DENIT: Yeah, thanks, Tom. I didn't
8 put that specific word on the slide. But
9 essentially, that's the summertime period, between
10 June and October, and seeking feedback from the
11 CCC by July. That's the timeframe where we were
12 looking for input from the Councils on any initial
13 thoughts to this outline, in particular, those
14 three areas that I've highlighted. And so, I'm
15 not using scoping in the sense of like our NEPA
16 kind of context.

17 MR. NIES: Right, but -- so, it looks to
18 me like you're looking for all the CCC comments by
19 the end July, and then you're done? Then you go
20 out and make your plan, or do you have intentions
21 of going out to other stakeholders or members of
22 the public, at some point?

1 MS. DENIT: We would plan to do that,
2 once we get to the draft policy, in the Spring of
3 2023.

4 MR. NIES: Okay.

5 MS. DENIT: So, of course we would
6 welcome any comments that come into us, between
7 now and then. But that October timeframe is when
8 we would provide an update, followed by -- in
9 Spring would be the opportunity that we would seek
10 broader input on the actual draft that we have.

11 MR. NIES: So, you're not seeking any
12 input that would help you design the draft?
13 You're going to wait until the draft is done, and
14 then look for reactions to the draft?

15 MS. DENIT: So, that's what the
16 summertime fixed period is, if you have initial
17 input, that you want to provide.

18 MR. NIES: Yeah, but my understanding is
19 the initial input's only coming from those
20 Councils and the CCC?

21 MS. DENIT: Correct.

22 MR. NIES: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Sam Rauch?

2 MR. RAUCH: I do want to clarify
3 something that Kelly said earlier. We have just
4 put out a tech memo that talked about how we have
5 done this throughout the time period. So, I don't
6 want to leave the impression that there is no
7 preexisting work product that has gone into our
8 thinking on this. There's a lot of thinking that
9 we know the kind of criteria. We are particularly
10 interested in the Councils' input. But it is not
11 as if we have no experience doing this or anything
12 like that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks, Sam. You
14 know, something I just thought of, based on Tom's
15 questions, you know, I think one of the challenges
16 that we'll face is that, you know, Thursday
17 afternoon, I'm going to get in the car and drive
18 home. But a lot of people are going to get on
19 flights, and go all over the country, and if the
20 input that we need to provide needs to be
21 coordinated, it's just that it's an added
22 challenge for the CCC to try to coordinate those

1 comments, you know, to provide you that input this
2 summer. It's just the timing is a little -- it's
3 just a little quick and, you know, we all have
4 other priorities and, you know, that we're working
5 with our own Councils on. And, I think, it's just
6 going to be a little bit of a challenge.

7 MS. DENIT: Yeah, understood, Chair, and
8 certainly, well, as we have always, individual
9 councils can submit comments, and if we get
10 comments via the CCC, as well, that's fantastic.
11 But understood, yup.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. I had a couple
13 of hands. I'm going to go to Chris Moore. I'll
14 come down to John, then we got Marcos. I'll just
15 go down this side of the table, and then we'll
16 come back on the other side. So, go ahead, Chris.

17 DR. MOORE: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 As you might expect or suspect, Kelly, I have a
19 number of concerns. I'm all about being
20 diplomatic. So, I'll be very nice, and ask you a
21 couple of questions, and I have a comment as well.

22 If you're a stakeholder that's been very

1 interested in our East Coast Scenario Planning
2 Project, you might think that NMFS is preempting
3 the results of that project. Not only has NMFS
4 picked a scenario, but they've picked a solution.
5 So, if you think about, you know, just that
6 reaction and the confusion that the proposal that
7 you presented today might cause, that really
8 should make you step back and think about it,
9 right, in terms of how is all this going to work?
10 As Tom indicated, you know, as he does, he
11 referenced his question in your timeline, it
12 overlaps. We're going to be in the middle of all
13 this stuff this summer, and you guys are going to
14 be pushing forward with this particular proposal,
15 this policy. And it's going to create a lot of
16 confusion. So, I have a suggestion, we'll talk
17 about that after we go around the table. But
18 certainly, that's one of my major concerns.

19 The other concern is that I really don't
20 see, in your timeline, how the Councils can be
21 involved. And who's actually putting the draft
22 together? Getting back to Tom's statement. I

1 think that's another question. I'm still confused
2 by that. So, it seems like, I think, I remember,
3 like, you know, you talked about regional teams,
4 or a group of folks at headquarters, and them
5 putting together the draft.

6 You know, if you think about it's, you
7 know, wouldn't you want to have the Councils that
8 have been actively involved in this, for over 40
9 years, involved in drafting that particular
10 document? Again, that would be something that you
11 should think about. I have more questions, more
12 concerns, but I'll leave it at that for now and
13 you can come back to me.

14 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right, thanks,
15 Chris. John Carmichael?

16 MR. CARMICHAEL: Yeah, thank you. And
17 thanks, Kelly, for the presentation. And I
18 definitely echo the concerns of Chris, and Tom, as
19 well. I think making sure the Councils are
20 engaged. When I saw this slide, my thought there,
21 in the June through October section there, where
22 it said engage with regional staff, Councils

1 aren't included there, and you go through the rest
2 of it, Councils are commenting. And to me, that's
3 treating us as constituents, not as partners, as
4 we discussed yesterday.

5 And I think along the lines of what
6 Chris was just saying, June to October, we should
7 be included in that initial development stage, so
8 we can head off a lot of issues. I just think
9 it's very difficult to have something this
10 critical, and certainly it's a big issue with the
11 Atlantic Councils, you know, because you've got
12 one coast with three Councils. So, arguably four
13 because the Gulf is not that far removed from us.
14 So, I think, we're going to be where a lot of
15 issues lie.

16 And I think we should be engaged as part
17 of that regional discussion on it, so that we can
18 address the many concerns. Just like the others,
19 I have a lot of questions about the details. And
20 then, just initially, my thought is, like, where
21 is the description of the problem? You know, I'm
22 just not sure that there is a governance issue to

1 be solved at this point. I think, like Chris
2 alluded to, when we go through the scenario
3 planning, which we three Councils are working on
4 together, we may come up with some issues, and we
5 may decide that there's some problem with our
6 current governance structure and our abilities to
7 respond to it that we can apply.

8 But when we were approached by the GAO,
9 when they were studying climate, one of the
10 questions they asked, I presume all of us
11 Councils, was about this issue and how we work
12 with our neighboring Councils. And we could give
13 them a half dozen examples of different ways we,
14 at the South Atlantic work with the Gulf, the
15 Mid-Atlantic, the Mid- Atlantic and New England,
16 on even things like dolphins.

17 So, it seems like, so far, we've been
18 able to find ways, within current Magnuson
19 governance, to deal with this. So, I'm just kind,
20 you know, of wondering where is the big problem?
21 And do we really need this? And, I think, maybe
22 let's see where we end up and see if there really

1 is a problem.

2 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right, thanks for
3 that, John. I don't know, Kelly, if you had a
4 response or? Okay, yeah, we can do that. Let's
5 go -- we'll keep tabs on some of the concerns.
6 I'm going to go next to Marcos Hanke.

7 MR. HANKE: Good morning, everyone. I
8 am listening to all the presentations related to
9 climate change. I wait until the right time to do
10 this presentation. For sure, the Council
11 participation is very important, especially in the
12 Caribbean, on the Islands, to give our
13 perspective. For example, the climate change
14 approach present today, mostly addressed variables
15 to understand latitudinal movement of the species.
16 North and South shifts, in our case, they don't
17 have a place to go, they go deeper.

18 And the variables and the analyses are
19 not really contemplating that with the same
20 strength or intention on the plans that was
21 presented, and this is very important for our
22 region because, like, Red Hind Grouper are going

1 deeper and mixing with the Silk Snapper, have a
2 big implication on our fishery management
3 decisions. For the territorial islands, we need
4 to address the vertical shifts, like shallow area
5 species moving to the deeper. The Caribbean need
6 to promote data collection for this species.

7 And I like, very much, the presentation
8 with indicator species, and we are lacking of
9 stock assessment for many species, I think, is
10 another reason in which we need to put more effort
11 and money, using this opportunity, now, it's
12 climate related. If we identify in the indicator
13 species, to understand more about those species,
14 and have that baseline to take better decisions on
15 the future. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thank you, Marcos. Is
17 there anyone else from the East Coast or the Gulf
18 before I hop over? Carrie?

19 MS. SIMMONS: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
20 Chair. Thank you for the presentation, all the
21 presentations. I think one of the major
22 challenges, and some folks have already touched on

1 this, that we have, especially in the Southeast,
2 is just all these data poor stocks we have and
3 really trying to map what our baseline is, as, you
4 know, has been discussed. And do our fishery
5 independent surveys cover enough of our stocks?
6 Are they long enough time series? Are they robust
7 enough to quantitatively say some of these changes
8 are from climate change? Or is it changes in
9 technology? Or is it changes due to other
10 management drivers?

11 And I think that's going to be a major,
12 major challenge for us, and I have not reviewed
13 the tech memo closely, and maybe some of that's
14 discussed in there. If that could be provided to
15 us, that would be helpful. Somehow, I guess, we
16 missed that. But I do think, in order for us to
17 decide if these triggers are met or not, if we
18 don't have this baseline that's been discussed,
19 it's going to be very difficult to make informed
20 decisions. Thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, Carrie,
22 for that. Let me go across the table to the other

1 side, to the Pacific. Kitty, I saw your hand come
2 up. Did you have any comments? I don't see
3 anybody else, down at the other end of the table,
4 so I think you're up.

5 MS. SIMONDS: Well, I was just going to
6 say, that I'm so glad that we won't be involved in
7 this exercise because of our geography because
8 you're talking about within the EEZs, right? And
9 80 percent of our fishery, our big fishery, is on
10 the high seas, so, maybe people longlining off of
11 California, you know, but I doubt that we'll be
12 involved in this exercise.

13 We were, in the very early years, when
14 we wanted to be the lead council for pelagics. In
15 the '80s, we were trying use 304(a), but the
16 Pacific Council didn't want us to be the lead.
17 And Alaska agreed for us to be the lead. And
18 anyway, we've ended up the way we've end up. So,
19 right.

20 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right, thanks,
21 Kitty, appreciate that. Anyone else at the table
22 have any comments or questions that Kelly and

1 folks from the Service can help address? Okay,
2 seeing none.

3 What I would like to do, Toni Kerns is
4 our Interstate Fishery Management Plan Coordinator
5 for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
6 Commission. They are a partner with our Councils,
7 on the East Coast, in the work that we do. I
8 mentioned it yesterday, we share a lot of our
9 species jointly, with the ASMFC.

10 And Toni has her hand up, she's on the
11 webinar. She couldn't join us today, but I
12 thought I'd offer her an opportunity to ask any
13 questions or comments. So, Toni, if you can -- if
14 you're with us, I want to turn it over to you.

15 MS. KERNS: Thanks, Mike, and thanks for
16 the presentations on these topics. I think
17 they've been really helpful and enlightening.

18 Kelly, I had a question. You know, the
19 East Coast presents itself a very unique
20 management structure, as Mike just alluded to,
21 where the Commission has several joint management
22 plans, where we move in lock step with the

1 Council, or management plans where we are
2 complementary and work together to create
3 fisheries that are sustainable, for the Coast.

4 And on this timeline, I don't see any
5 engagement with the Commission or recognition of
6 this unique management structure we have. And I'm
7 wondering if there are plans to engage with the
8 Commission, at least on the Atlantic Coast? You
9 know, we're making really great headway. I'm a
10 member of the core team with Kiley, with the East
11 Coast Scenario Planning, and, you know, I think
12 that process has set us for some great work
13 together, with all of the partners. And so, just
14 wondering how this will work?

15 MS. DENIT: Yes --

16 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, Toni, thank you.
17 Yeah, I'm sorry, Kelly, I didn't mean to cut you
18 off. I just wanted to thank Toni. I think we've
19 exhausted the questions at this point. I don't
20 know if you or folks in the Service have any
21 response to some of the questions that -- maybe we
22 take that on now, and then I'm going to go back

1 Chris. He has one last -- a couple extra
2 questions and then another comment that he would
3 like to make.

4 MS. DENIT: No problem, sounds great,
5 Mike. And certainly, Janet and Sam can add in.
6 So, I'll start with Toni's. Yeah, thank you,
7 Toni, for that feedback. Certainly, we were
8 anticipating the input of the Commission coming
9 through the East Coast Scenario Planning
10 activities would be one avenue to get your
11 feedback, well, the Commission's feedback.

12 But certainly, we can figure out some
13 additional ways to make sure that we're engaging
14 with the Commission, as we move forward with our
15 development. Obviously, we're focused on the
16 Secretary's authority, as it relates to Federal
17 FMPs, but clearly, there are the connections with
18 the jointly managed stocks with the Commission.
19 So, thank you for that, that feedback.

20 To step through some of the other
21 comments. Just to clarify, yes, right now, we are
22 envisioning a Headquarters Group with input from

1 our Regional Offices to help put together the
2 draft plan. And we welcome the input from the
3 Councils here over the summer. If I made a faulty
4 assumption, that you all have a lot of work going
5 on, in terms of how we wanted to solicit your
6 feedback and get your input as part of what I was
7 describing as scoping, that's how I was
8 envisioning the Councils being able to frontload
9 your input into the process. So, certainly we can
10 talk more if that approach that I put forward is
11 not satisfactory. But that was what I was
12 envisioning.

13 Some of the other comments, in terms of,
14 why do we need this? I think that as you alluded
15 to, John, I mean this been a very ad hoc process
16 in the past. And I think what we're seeking is to
17 bring some transparency and some rigor to it. And
18 that doesn't mean that what we have done in the
19 past was wrong, or anything like that. It's just
20 trying to provide some clarity of how are we going
21 to move this -- how are going to address these
22 situations, as they're coming up? Because we know

1 they're coming up, and as we all know, our wheels
2 turn a little bit slowly. And so, we need to get
3 started. And so, that's really the impetus for
4 that.

5 And, Carrie, I appreciate your comments
6 around the baseline. I think that lines up, also
7 with what Marcos was pointing out. We do have
8 situations where it's going to be really challenging
9 to figure out what those triggers really should be
10 because we may not have as much information to
11 determine what is actually climate driven or some
12 other aspects of -- that's driving the change.

13 But nevertheless, I think our
14 perspective is we need to start somewhere, and the
15 science is never going to be perfect. So, how do
16 we figure out, at least, getting going on
17 identifying what might be, again, some of those
18 categories of indicators. I don't expect that
19 we're going to come out of this exercise with, you
20 know, for Lane snapper, or, you know, any
21 particular, you know, for bluefish, here's the
22 specific trigger. It's going to be more general

1 than that and then up to the Councils and the
2 Secretary to think about what specifically would
3 be relevant for a specific situation.

4 And I think that was the main points
5 that I heard, Chair, but if there are others that
6 I missed, I'm happy to repeat, and if Sam or Janet
7 wants to add.

8 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, I think, you
9 covered it, Kelly, very well. Thanks for your
10 responses. We do have some time on the agenda,
11 so, I'm going to turn to the public, at this time,
12 to see if anyone from the public or anyone on the
13 webinar would like to ask a question or provide
14 any comment, regarding this discussion here this
15 morning. Okay, so, I see no hands on the webinar.
16 So, I'm going to bring it back to the table. Is
17 there any last comments or questions that may have
18 come to mind, over the last few minutes? John?
19 Then, I'll come back to Chris.

20 MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, just briefly, I
21 think it would be good to consider, like, the IPT
22 process we use in the Southeast for developing

1 FMPs. You know, it's accepted as part of the
2 process that we use. GC's fine with it. But it
3 allows council staff, and the regional office
4 staff, and Science Center staff to all work
5 together on developing management plans. And I
6 think that's the only way that the June to October
7 step is really going to be successful. So, I hope
8 you guys will consider looking into that as a way
9 to really get us to the table.

10 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, John.
11 All right, I'm going to come back to Chris Moore.
12 Dr. Moore?

13 DR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
14 thank you, again, Kelly, for your comments. I'm
15 still concerned, as you might expect. Certainly,
16 one thing that you didn't address is the
17 communications aspect of this, which is -- right?
18 So, we have this, we have this project that we're
19 involved with on the East Coast, and now we have
20 this policy guidance document that NMFS is rolling
21 out. Folks are going to get very confused, if we
22 don't handle that correctly, right? So, that's

1 something that I think we need to talk about.

2 When you say, you know, the Council has
3 been involved in sort of an, and hopefully I
4 capture this correctly, an ad hoc approach to
5 climate change in fisheries management and
6 governance over the last whatever. I think that's
7 incorrect, right? It may seem a little ad hoc,
8 but at least, from a Mid-Atlantic Council
9 perspective, we've been involved in climate change
10 issues, management issues for over 10 years.
11 We're the ones who -- that had a governance
12 workshop. We had a science workshop. We support
13 science activities in the Northeast. We have
14 folks, like Malin Pinsky, involved in looking at,
15 you know, changes in stock distribution. We've
16 been exploring this topic for a long time. Ten
17 years is a long time.

18 We've put in place management, you know,
19 things, right? So, we've had changes in
20 committees to deal with changing stock
21 distribution, allowing folks in the New England
22 Council to be on various committees when we have

1 -- yeah, yeah, we've been involved in allocation
2 decisions that have allowed -- or shifts in
3 allocation in the Northern States. So, we've been
4 actively involved in this. So, that's why when I
5 made my earlier comment, in terms of my concerns,
6 you know, I'm aggravated. You know, I rarely get
7 aggravated but I'm aggravated. Just thinking
8 about, you know, where this could lead, right?

9 You know, it may be that I don't truly
10 understand what this policy guidance document is
11 going to look like when you guys are done with it.
12 What is it? So, that may be it. But given all
13 that, Mr. Chairman, when you're ready I have the
14 motion I would like to make.

15 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right, thanks,
16 Chris. Yeah, Chris rarely gets aggravated, but as
17 he gets older, he's just getting grumpier and
18 grumpier.

19 DR. MOORE: That's true. That's really
20 true.

21 CHAIRMAN LUISI: That's just part of the
22 aging process, I think.

1 DR. MOORE: Yeah, nature.

2 CHAIRMAN LUISI: So, go ahead, Chris, if
3 you have a motion you'd like to make.

4 DR. MOORE: Mary, could you put it up,
5 please? That's a great motion.

6 CHAIRMAN LUISI: It'll be easy enough.

7 DR. MOORE: I don't know why you made it
8 red, Mary. People are all excited. Anyway, no,
9 no, that's fine. I'm just teasing you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUISI: This shows your
11 aggravation.

12 DR. MOORE: That is to show my
13 aggravation. So, I move on, on behalf of the CCC,
14 to recommend that NOAA Fisheries postpone further
15 development of the council governance policy
16 document, until after completion of the East Coast
17 Climate Change Scenario Planning Initiative.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right, thank you,
19 Dr. Moore, for your motion. Let me look around
20 the table to see if I can get a second. We have a
21 second by Tom Nies.

22 MR. NIES: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Chris, did you want to
2 speak to any additional rationale for the motion?
3 And then, Tom, I'll give you a shot.

4 DR. MOORE: Not at this time. Thanks,
5 Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Tom, did you want to
7 speak to rationale for the seconding?

8 MR. NIES: No. I think that the Council
9 discussion laid out the rationale pretty clearly.

10 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thank you. Is
11 there any discussion on this motion? Sam?

12 MR. RAUCH: So, under Kelly's scenario,
13 we weren't going to provide a draft to the
14 Council, until after completion of the East Coast
15 Climate Change Scenario Planning. Although, that
16 is a little vague, as we just heard. I think
17 there's going to be a Summit in January, followed
18 by some amount of time to think about
19 recommendations, followed by a very unclear time
20 to actually do anything about the recommendations.
21 But, you know, so, if that is their argument, that
22 you'd like us to delay the draft policy until

1 then, that was the proposal.

2 If your argument is you would like us
3 not to seek input from the Council, but just to
4 give you a draft proposal in January, or in the
5 Spring, I don't think that's the intent, but that
6 seems to be the intent, is that the Councils are
7 declining to participate in the scoping process
8 that may lead up to that draft. But the draft, I
9 mean, the current schedule does have the draft
10 coming out, after the conclusion of the East Coast
11 Climate Scenario. So, I'm not exactly sure what
12 the purpose -- what the Council, CCC, intends to
13 get by this, unless what the CCC is saying is that
14 they do not intend to participate.

15 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Bill?

16 MR. TWEIT: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I guess
17 I'm reading it a little differently than Sam. I'm
18 really reading postpone further development as
19 meaning exactly that. No internal or development
20 with partners. And the reason that that makes
21 some sense to me, as a West Coast observer of the
22 whole thing, is just the sense that they're -- it

1 seems to me that one of the things the East Coast
2 Climate Change Initiative could lead to is some
3 developed recommendations about governance changes
4 that would come, essentially, through a very
5 public, very open, transparent process, that would
6 be rigorous.

7 I mean, what we heard described about
8 the initiative is clearly a public process, and it
9 clearly has some rigor to it. And the -- I just
10 see the risk of conflict between whatever internal
11 draft the Agency has developed and a set of
12 recommendations from the Councils that will have
13 been already essentially representing a common
14 understanding and a common set of objectives about
15 governance under climate change.

16 And that just -- to me, that's the good
17 government approach. That's the approach that --
18 as you use the council process to weigh all of the
19 factors, both administrative, as well as how they
20 relate to the National Standards and where the
21 stakeholder interests lie. And so, I'm -- that's
22 why I assumed that it was simply postponing all

1 development, and it wasn't just a question of
2 whether or not the CCC wanted to be engaged. It
3 was a question of how the work is being budgeted
4 and what other issues could be worked on instead.

5 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks for that,
6 Bill. I think I read it in a similar vein to the
7 way you're reading the motion. So, I would agree
8 with that. Tom Nies?

9 MR. NIES: Yeah. I mean, if you look at
10 the timing the Agency proposed, just to use my
11 Council as an example, if I want to have some kind
12 of council input on what sort of input we give the
13 Agency by July 29th, my Council has to do that at
14 our Council Meeting at the end of June, which is
15 literally only a few days after the scenarios are
16 developed under the Scenario Exercise Program, or
17 not -- no, that's the workshop, anyway. And so,
18 my Council is going to be preparing comments and
19 telling you what we think should -- the policy
20 should address, without any -- the benefit of any
21 input from what comes out of the Scenario
22 Exercise, later that year, or, you know, because

1 there's steps after the workshop that have to be
2 completed, that aren't going to be done by the end
3 of June.

4 And so, you know, we're essentially
5 telling the public, come participate in our
6 process, but we're already telling the Agency how
7 we want this done by the end of July, you know,
8 what our input is. And it sort of torpedoed, like
9 Bill says, the whole idea of why we're doing this
10 effort and seeking public input. We're trying to
11 seek public input on how we should react to it,
12 and you're asking us to tell you by the end of
13 July what we think should be in the policy. I'm
14 not going to know yet. I realize that's not the
15 final word. But, you know, that's the initial
16 response that we'll be giving you, that you're
17 saying you're going to use with your regions to
18 develop the draft, which we see some time in the
19 future.

20 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, Tom, and so,
21 we're challenged, as well, in the Mid -- our
22 meeting's early in June, before the -- and that

1 agenda's already been set. So, this would have to
2 be something, if we wanted to get the full Council
3 feedback, our next meeting wouldn't be till
4 August. So, we'd be challenged by the timing on
5 that, as well. John Carmichael?

6 MR. CARMICHAEL: Yeah, thank you. In
7 support of what the others said, and we have a
8 similar timing problem. Our meeting is early in
9 June. We've -- the Federal Register notice
10 already submitted. So, we really don't have an
11 opportunity to even run this by the Council. But
12 I think, looking back at what this motion does,
13 pushing the giving comments, et cetera, back until
14 after this means that we will probably have very
15 different comments. I feel like the comments I
16 would give you now could be very different than
17 what I may give you next March, after we've gone
18 through this process.

19 I feel that, rather than this resistance
20 you're experiencing, we may discover some things,
21 as a result of this process, where we say, there's
22 a governance issue that we face, that we can't

1 solve with what we have in the Magnuson Act or
2 with the guidance that it exists today. And would
3 you please, do this policy and address this issue?
4 That would be a very different relationship than
5 what we're experiencing right now. That -- it may
6 not happen, but it very well could happen. And
7 given that there's not a statutory deadline for
8 this, there's not a current problem to go out and
9 solve, I just don't see what is lost by tapping
10 the brakes on this a little bit. Let us work
11 through this. Let the Councils that are most
12 likely to be bearing the brunt of these governance
13 issues have a chance to work on this, along with
14 the Commission, and follow through this process
15 that already is going to get a lot of input from
16 constituents, and let us work through this system,
17 and then come to you with much more informed
18 comments. I think the comments you're getting now
19 are going to be extremely critical. And we're not
20 going to have the benefit of running this through
21 our Councils and our public process, and that
22 continues to be a frustration with so many of the

1 policies that come to NMFS.

2 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
3 John. Janet Coit?

4 MS. COIT: Thanks, all. And this is
5 very interesting. We have a partnership, and you
6 are asking us not to work on the most
7 consequential issue that we face right now, which
8 is climate change and the variability in the
9 degree of changes. I also find -- I see that you
10 feel aggravated and maybe even threatened. If
11 Kelly puts that schedule up again, I believe the
12 draft was for all of 2023. And I think the work
13 that needs addressed -- you can put up. I think
14 the work -- I think you're very pessimistic. I
15 think the work you're doing on scenario planning,
16 Bill, yours was up through 2025, Mike, you're
17 getting to options and ideas in January. I mean,
18 I think it can all read very nicely into this, and
19 we'll have a lot of interaction, you can be sure
20 of it.

21 But the work that you're doing in the
22 North Pacific and the Pacific, along the East

1 Coast, is exactly what is going to help inform
2 this. And the questions that you're going to be
3 considering at your Summit, in January, are the
4 same kind of trigger questions. I think we don't
5 want to wait for the problem. What's the problem?
6 Look at the DisMAP tool that we talked about
7 yesterday.

8 So, I don't think we want to wait for a
9 problem. We want to be proactive. We have
10 emerging fisheries in places that haven't had
11 those stocks prevalent before. We've seen the
12 rate of change in the last 20 years. So, I think
13 these -- and I'm thrilled that the scenario
14 planning is going on with the public input, but we
15 have a whole bunch of expertise, and authority,
16 and responsibility, as well, in this partnership.
17 So, I see that we can accomplish -- I think we
18 should think more about the input, in terms of how
19 you participate, but I think we can benefit from
20 the work you're doing. We can incorporate that.

21 In terms of scoping, you all have an
22 awful lot of expertise, and you just made the

1 point that you've been thinking about this for
2 decades. I don't think it's that difficult for
3 you to give a -- what you think the scope of this
4 exercise should be, but a lot of the specifics
5 around what would be a trigger, how do we handle
6 it, I think that you're actually considering. And
7 I think our timelines have the opportunity to
8 incorporate that, and we have, you know, every
9 intention of working with the Councils and the
10 CCC. The thought that we would stop all work on
11 this, it'd send a pretty odd signal.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks for
13 those comments, Janet. Is there anyone else at
14 the table that has anything they'd like to offer,
15 regarding the motion at this time? Okay, before
16 we vote, I'm going to go back out to the public.
17 We have a motion on the floor. Is there anyone on
18 the webinar or in the public, in the audience,
19 here today that would like to offer any comment on
20 the motion? Okay. Seeing none, at this time, I'm
21 going to bring it back to the CCC. Does anyone
22 need time to caucus with their group on this? Do

1 you need a minute just to discuss, amongst
2 yourselves, before we vote? Let's do that. Let's
3 take one minute. Discuss it amongst yourselves.
4 As a reminder, each Council gets one vote on the
5 CCC. And so, go ahead and discuss, and I'll come
6 back, read the motion into the record, and we'll
7 call the question. Thank you.

8 (CCC Caucus)

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Hopefully everybody had
10 enough time to discuss. We have a motion before
11 the CCC. I'm going to read that motion into the
12 record. There's been a lot of discussion on this,
13 concerns by members of the CCC, as well as NOAA
14 Fisheries. We had a robust discussion, and I
15 think it's time to vote. So, the motion is moved
16 to recommend that NOAA Fisheries postpone further
17 development of the Council Governance Policy,
18 until after completion of the East Coast Climate
19 Change Scenario Planning Initiative. As a
20 reminder again, each Council gets one vote. All
21 those in favor of the motion, please raise your
22 hand. That's eight in favor. With only eight

1 Councils, that is it. There is no opposition.
2 The motion carries unanimously, eight to zero,
3 with no abstentions.

4 Is there anything else that needs to
5 come before the CCC? Chris, I'll ask you, is
6 there anything else that you wanted to bring
7 before the CCC, at this time, on this topic?
8 Okay. It's 10:35. We are scheduled for a break,
9 for 15 minutes. So, that takes us to 10:50. Why
10 don't we take a 15- minute break, and we'll
11 reconvene with the America the Beautiful
12 Area-Based Management Discussion. Thank you.

13 (Recess)

14 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right, everyone,
15 this is your two- minute warning. If everyone can
16 start to take their seats again, we'll get started
17 on our next item on the agenda in two minutes.

18 Okay. Welcome back, everyone, from the
19 break. We have one more item for -- on our
20 agenda, for this morning, before we break for
21 lunch. We're going to start with a presentation.
22 It's a CCC Area-Based Management Subcommittee

1 update. Chairman Eric Reid, from the New England
2 Council, is going to provide us that update. And
3 so, Eric, if you are ready to go, we have until
4 noon. And then we'll break for lunch, before we
5 start our afternoon session. So, Eric, whenever
6 you're ready.

7 MR. REID: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair,
8 and thank you, Mr. Pearson, in advance, for
9 helping me out without making me use the clicker,
10 so. Well, thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning,
11 everyone. The Subcommittee appreciates the
12 opportunity to provide an update on our work, as
13 tasked by the CCC. This report represents the
14 shared interests of all eight Councils, who, along
15 with the Secretary of Commerce, manage fisheries
16 in the EEZ. It is intended to set the baseline
17 and recommend and justify existing conservation
18 areas for inclusion into the American Conservation
19 and Stewardship Atlas. Next slide, please.

20 So, as you know, each Council
21 volunteered -- volunteered, I suppose, yeah, a
22 member to the team, as well as three members from

1 NOAA, who also volunteered. And it was truly a
2 team effort, and we've come a very long way, as
3 you will see. And all the materials, all 1,059
4 pages of materials, are in your briefing book for
5 your reading pleasure. Next slide, please.

6 I'm sorry, Mike. Is that better? Okay.
7 Just as a reminder of our terms of reference, they
8 are, one, assist the CCC in reacting to 30 by 30,
9 prepare this report, discuss pros and cons of
10 area-based management, and consider the objectives
11 and the expected benefits of area-based management
12 as one of many very effective tools available
13 under MSA, and then, lastly, prepare a journal
14 article, based on the findings of the team. Next
15 slide, please.

16 The Subcommittee has met six times since
17 October. The minutes are in your materials. And
18 we are already scheduled to meet again, next week,
19 to react to your guidance today. Next slide,
20 please.

21 So, what's in the report? Basically,
22 what's the table of contents? Items 1 through 8A

1 are included in the report, itself. Item 8B is
2 the detailed justification and qualifying metrics
3 for each and every one of the 600-plus areas in
4 the Atlas. And please, pay particular attention
5 to Sections 2 and 3 because those are
6 groundbreaking and innovative in nature. And the
7 team really went outside the box in developing
8 this criteria. Next slide, please.

9 Introduction, I don't think anybody
10 needs an -- any introduction into the process.
11 The purpose of this report, comparing the 10
12 National Standards of the MSA with the eight key
13 principles for conserving and restoring U.S. lands
14 and waters, as outlined in the America the
15 Beautiful Effort. And the team found that these
16 two presented very similar goals of science-based
17 decisions, strong collaboration, and measures that
18 support both job creation and the communities.
19 And to note, the same cannot always be said about
20 other area-based management measures, like MPAs,
21 or monuments. Next slide, please.

22 So, back to the beginning. As you may

1 recall, no definition of a conservation area, no
2 real guidance existed at the outset of our task.
3 So, our first challenge was to develop the
4 definition on which to focus our work. That
5 definition is an established, geographically
6 defined area with planned management or regulation
7 of environmentally adverse fishing activities that
8 provides for the maintenance of biological
9 productivity, biodiversity, and ecosystem function
10 and services, including providing recreational
11 opportunities and healthy, sustainable seafood to
12 a diverse range of consumers. Next slide, please.

13 So, once we developed our working
14 definition of a conservation area, the first
15 important action was to develop the criteria to
16 examine the existing actions and areas under MSA.
17 This is Section 2, that I referenced earlier. We
18 also used the Executive Order 14008 and
19 incorporate "other effective area-based
20 conservation measures," OECMs, which were defined
21 by the IUCN. We then included steps specific to
22 the America the Beautiful principles. And if an

1 area met all four steps, then it qualified. Next
2 slide, please.

3 So, this is the staircase. These are
4 the steps. We used Step 1: Does it meet our
5 definition? Step 2: Is it managed and by what
6 entity? Step 3: What is the objective? Is it
7 ecosystem conservation, year-round fisheries
8 management, or seasonal management or other
9 measures? And Step 4: Does it align with the
10 eight America the Beautiful principles? And if
11 so, which ones? And you will note that the color
12 coding, yellow, blue, and green, categories carry
13 through to the tables for easier reference. And
14 they are also in Appendix B. Next slide, please.

15 In addition to the four steps and in
16 order to fully analyze each area for inclusion in
17 the Atlas, the Subcommittee also developed an
18 evaluation process for candidate areas, using two
19 separate tools. The tools are also designed to be
20 used by the people and groups that will be --
21 ultimately be responsible for identifying areas
22 for inclusion in the Atlas. We have the

1 worksheet, which is Table 3, and the checklist,
2 which is Table 4, which have the metrics listed
3 here. Finally, the team went a step further, a
4 step forward, to support ironclad rationale and
5 effectiveness, and also by suggestion,
6 improvements to seasonal or other areas that could
7 be made even more effective in the process. Next
8 slide, please.

9 So, here's the process, itself. These
10 are the templates we developed for the evaluation
11 of each area. On the left, Table 3, the
12 worksheet, which we use to solidify and
13 rationalize, and on the right, Table 4, which is
14 the test relative to the America the Beautiful
15 principles. All in all, they represent at least
16 16 different decision points for each area. Next
17 slide, please.

18 So, after applying the criteria on the
19 last two slides, here is what made the cut. In
20 yellow, ecosystem conservation areas, there's 491,
21 year-round fisheries management, 75, and seasonal
22 or other measures, 49, 615 areas so far. Next

1 slide, please.

2 So, what's the number? One thousand
3 dollar -- Kelly only used \$1,000. I think it's
4 supposed to be \$64,000 question, but. So, what's
5 the number? Well, pending finalizing this draft
6 and getting GIS support in order to accurately
7 account for the overlap and dissolving areas, the
8 total percentage of the EEZ, under MSA
9 jurisdiction that is already a qualifying
10 conservation area, using our extensive evaluation
11 process, is greater than 54 percent. Next slide.

12 This Table 6 shows year-round coverage
13 by gear types, all bottom tending gears, trawl
14 gear or dredge gear only, and other gears, just
15 for your reference. Next slide. Here's the same
16 calculation for seasonal coverage or other areas
17 that might be close to a specific fishery or for a
18 particular species for a period of time. Next
19 slide, please.

20 So, the remaining sections, or the
21 balance of the report, not including Appendix A,
22 the pros and cons, they're on page 26, the summary

1 is on page 27 of the report. The cons are, as
2 we've heard many times already, that the biggest
3 long- term threat to marine biodiversity are
4 climate change and other factors that are beyond
5 the authority of MSA. However, the pros, the
6 Councils have a tremendously diverse range of
7 effective and innovative management tools, in
8 addition to area-based management measures. Now,
9 while the focus of this report is conservation
10 areas developed by the Councils, the most
11 effective means to address fisheries' conservation
12 and challenges today and in the future is
13 continued development of effective fisheries
14 management measures through the MSA and the
15 Council and NOAA Fisheries collaborative process.
16 The Council process is in clear alignment with the
17 ATB principles.

18 In fact, through this process, reviewing
19 the evaluation criteria, the Subcommittee
20 discovered that some types of conservation areas,
21 such as National Marine Monuments, appear to be
22 less consistent with ATB principles, when compared

1 to the areas developed by the Councils. The
2 Council employs a highly engaging and regionalized
3 process during development of management measures,
4 including conservation areas and their boundaries.
5 The Council uses best available science and can
6 adapt those boundaries to meet emerging
7 conservation challenges, such as climate change.
8 The Councils are also equipped to make decisions
9 with respect to tradeoffs that occur around
10 fishing access and enhancing opportunities for
11 fishing communities, the public, and the benefits
12 of the Nation. Next slide, please.

13 So, here it is. A picture is worth
14 1,000 words, or, in this case, it's 1,000 pages,
15 or so. Appendix A is included in the report. And
16 Appendix B, the worksheets, and the checklist used
17 to assess and qualify each areas has its own
18 separate extensive file. Next slide.

19 This is the area summaries by tables. I
20 know it's a little hard to read, but you can
21 certainly look in the materials and read it at
22 your leisure. But this example shows details by

1 area, and each region has its own set included in
2 the appendices. Next slide, please.

3 So, here's a visual. It's a little bit
4 shorter. This is the Cliffs Notes version. You
5 can all look at it. And this is what each area
6 looks like. You're certainly welcome to look at
7 your own and see what your neighbors have done
8 over time, as well. Next slide, please. It's the
9 same thing, just different areas. Next slide.
10 So, next slide.

11 Next steps for us, the next steps in the
12 task, depending on your guidance today, is, one,
13 to complete the regional maps and area
14 calculations for the final report at our Fall 2022
15 Meeting. But we need GIS support to accurately
16 portray our findings. Two, we expect to continue
17 to coordinate with our NOAA partners, as needed.
18 And, of course, three, we would support the CCC on
19 any position statements they'd like to develop,
20 so. And lastly, in order to effectively inform
21 other entities outside the CCC, such as Congress,
22 the USDA, USDOC, DOI, CEQ, and others, we feel

1 it's critically important to prepare a journal
2 article on the use of area-based management
3 through MSA for U.S. fisheries management and
4 conservation. And with that, I'm happy to try to
5 take any questions. And about half the team is
6 here in the room, so, if I fumble a little bit,
7 maybe I could phone a friend, so. Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: It's always good to
10 have a phone by your side. Yeah, let's see if
11 anyone has any questions for you, Eric, regarding
12 the presentation. Is there anyone at the table
13 that wants to make a comment or has a question?
14 John Carmichael?

15 MR. CARMICHAEL: Yeah, thanks. And
16 thanks, Eric. That's an important group. It's
17 interesting to see how much has been accomplished
18 already. In the summary, you mentioned that
19 council process is consistent with the ATB, and
20 you compare it to like monuments a little bit.
21 And I was just wondering like are there some
22 specifics on what you see that MSA works well, and

1 I guess that maybe our use of constituent advisors
2 and our very robust public input process, so, but
3 -- is that correct, or are there some other things
4 you had in mind?

5 MR. REID: Well, thank you, Mr.
6 Carmichael. I appreciate the question. Of
7 course, there's the council process, itself, which
8 we all know, and I don't have to go through again,
9 but I'd like to quote the most famous Rhode
10 Islander in the room, that would Madame Coit, and
11 she said, yesterday, the brilliance of the
12 Magnuson-Stevens Act and the National Standards.
13 And I could have stopped at that, but basically,
14 you know, the council process, it's an extensive
15 -- it's an extensive development of anything we
16 do. Stakeholder engagement is all through that
17 entire process, including the day we make a final
18 decision.

19 We've got NEPA and all of the other
20 stuff that has alphabet soup in front of it.
21 We've got general counsel review. We've got best
22 available scientific information. We've got NOAA

1 review, council deeming process. We've got final
2 information developed, what, in my opinion, is a
3 flexible living document that is adaptable to
4 changes in our environment, whether it's fisheries
5 or climate. And, you know, honestly, no take
6 zones are -- have been proven that the outcomes
7 are not the best thing for the Nation. So, it --
8 hope that answers your question. Okay, boss.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, Eric.
10 Thanks, John. And I guess if Eric thinks you're
11 famous, Janet, you've elevated to a high level.
12 Bill, go ahead.

13 MR. TWEIT: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I wish I
14 had a Tweit quote to also throw into the mix, but
15 just a couple of comments, no questions. One,
16 when we kicked this effort off, really not that
17 long ago, I -- at least there was one person,
18 didn't quite know what to expect, and I certainly
19 didn't -- I'm really surprised, pleased, and very
20 supportive of the work the Subcommittee did. It's
21 just really thorough. It's really systematic.
22 And further, it actually, I think, moves all of us

1 forward a little bit, in terms of how we think
2 about how we use those -- these tools and helps us
3 introduce a little more rigor into it. And so, I
4 think, just from -- viewed from those angles, it's
5 already, just internally, I think, helped us,
6 collectively, use this tool better to advance our
7 goals. And I really appreciate the Subcommittee
8 sort of, I think, in a lot of ways, going above
9 and beyond.

10 We initially formed it, really, more,
11 though, for external reasons. And I think it's
12 going to be extremely useful for that, as well. I
13 definitely strongly encourage the Subcommittee to
14 finish the job of preparing the journal article.
15 And I think that's something that the Councils and
16 the ED should really prioritize, that it's -- I
17 think it's going to be critical to, in terms of
18 the credibility of our voice, to have a
19 peer-reviewed publication in a scientific journal.

20 And finally, I also think, as we think
21 externally, too, I'd recommend that the
22 Mid-Atlantic, since you are our glorious leaders

1 at present, on behalf of the entire CCC, to issue
2 a press release on this draft report. I don't
3 know exactly when the appropriate time is, and I'm
4 not trying to suggest that, at this point. But
5 I'd like us to begin consideration of that. I
6 think it can highlight. But the participatory and
7 the open public process used by Fishery Management
8 Councils, who we were just talking about, that
9 Eric was describing, really, so well, particularly
10 with that wonderful quote, and as well, that
11 aligns with -- what we've discovered as we work
12 through this is that it aligns very well with the
13 ATB principles, the America the Beautiful
14 principles, as well. And -- but our ability to
15 highlight the collaborative inclusive approach
16 that we take to conservation, science-based, and
17 that -- and remind folks that we do this and
18 create both jobs and support healthy communities,
19 as part of the press release. I think we'd also
20 go a long ways towards helping inform the public
21 about the value of what we've done and -- but I
22 think we could also talk about how this has been

1 an opportunity for us to really adopt some more
2 discipline and rigor to our process for how we use
3 area-based conservation measures as one of our
4 many tools for achieving our objectives.

5 But again, thank you very much to the
6 Subcommittee. I know this was a huge amount of
7 work. Appreciate the Agency's involvement in it,
8 and -- as well as the Council's involvement. I
9 think the collaboration has really been fruitful.

10 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks, Bill.
11 And in discussing with Chris, your recommendation
12 for some type of release of information, press
13 release, is something we can certainly work with
14 the New England Council and Eric on, try to get
15 something out, on behalf of the CCC. So, thanks
16 for that. Is there anyone else that has any
17 questions? Marc?

18 MR. GORELNIK: I thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 First of all, I wanted to congratulate and thank
20 Eric and the Subcommittee. This is really an
21 excellent report. It's thorough. It's
22 transparent. And it is -- just really stands in

1 stark contrast to what we have seen in the State
2 of California, on a similar state-based process.
3 One recommendation I have, there's been one large
4 difference between the process we went through in
5 California, and what we see here, and really what
6 we see, generally, at the Federal level, is some
7 stakeholders in the Environmental Community
8 wouldn't -- would criticize this on the basis that
9 these are not enduring measures. So, I have a
10 recommendation that that -- the topic of whether
11 these are enduring or not be addressed in some
12 way, at some point in time. I believe they're as
13 equally enduring as any regulation, at the state
14 level. But apparently, some folks don't agree.
15 And so, I think that's something that might be
16 addressed. But again, thanks very much. This is
17 a great body of work.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Marc. I'm
19 going to go to Eric Reid.

20 MR. REID: Yeah, thank you for that
21 comment. I -- you know, honestly, flexibility and
22 adaptability equal durability. That's where I'm

1 coming from, so.

2 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, Eric.

3 Archie?

4 MR. SOLIAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 also want to echo the sentiments shared by my
6 colleagues, with respect to showing its
7 appreciation to Eric and the Subcommittee for the
8 great report. I think you all know that the
9 Western-Pacific, you know, carries the lion's
10 share of fishery closures, with more than 50
11 percent of our EEZs goes to commercial fishing.
12 And that was way before this new initiative, 30 by
13 30.

14 But two points I wanted to make out is,
15 you know, I thank you all for coming out with the
16 definition of conservation areas. I think that's
17 very important as we move towards this, that, you
18 know, I recommend if the CEQ doesn't have a
19 definition that we adopt the definition that was
20 -- that the Subcommittee had come and put forward
21 in the presentation today. And also, I think we
22 all need to -- the CCC needs to assert what

1 strongly protected really means, so that it's not
2 a complete prohibition of fishing or whatever that
3 is. But I think we need to assert in the
4 development of these initiatives, that we develop
5 what that is, so that we can have some input for
6 the Agency, as we move forward. Thank you, Mr.
7 Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thank you, Archie.
9 Sam?

10 MR. RAUCH: Yeah. And in following up
11 on, I think, Archie's comment, and I will say a
12 little bit more because I'm doing a presentation
13 next about the role of this. But I did have one
14 question, Eric. And if I could go back to the
15 definition slide of that definition. So, I
16 recognize that this definition works very well for
17 fishery management areas in the ocean, but to the
18 extent that we are proposing, or you would be
19 proposing, to have the CEQ adopt this definition
20 for all management areas, nationwide, because this
21 deals with land-based and other kinds of things, I
22 was wondering, Eric, if you could share -- if you

1 have any thoughts about how this might be adapted
2 for areas that are not necessarily fishing areas,
3 but like areas on land or things like that,
4 because there's some parts about this definition
5 that are focused on fishing, if we were to adopt
6 this or something like this, nationally and across
7 the board, for conservation areas. How could this
8 definition be amended, perhaps, to do that?

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Sam. Eric?

10 MR. REID: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Rauch, I
11 appreciate it. Well, you know, I'm in the fish
12 business, and we're all in the fish business.
13 That's the way I see it, so. But basically, you
14 know, when we -- it's kind of nice when you make
15 your own rules, right from the beginning, to be
16 honest with -- it's a unique opportunity, I
17 suppose. But, I mean, to your question, if you
18 look at the definition that we came up with, if
19 you take out of Line 2 the word fishing and you
20 remove from Item 3 what is in parentheses, those
21 are the two specific things to the fishing -- to
22 us Fisheries Managers, and to the fishing

1 industry, and under MSA. That definition, in my
2 opinion, and hopefully the Subcommittee and you
3 all share that with me, is that would be a pretty
4 good definition for a blanket use across different
5 areas or topics. Does that answer your question,
6 Mr. Rauch?

7 MR. RAUCH: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks for that,
9 Eric. Any other questions or comments for Eric?
10 Okay, Eric, I do have a couple of notes. One of
11 the things that you -- I think the Subcommittee
12 was asking for was GIS support. Is that something
13 we want to get a little bit more into, as far as
14 getting confirmation from the CCC, on that
15 support?

16 MR. REID: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
17 Chairman. Yeah, I've been pretty clear about
18 that. I mean, it's -- you know, if you look at
19 some of our tables, the numbers aren't completely
20 accurate. I mean, they're pretty close. But, you
21 know, we -- I mean, the best example that I can
22 give is like the Mid-Atlantic and New England. We

1 have, in one particular area on the Coast, we have
2 Tilefish GRA, the -- which is Mid- Atlantic. We
3 have the New England Coral Zone. We have the
4 monument, the Atlantic Monument, all in the same
5 area. And, you know, as far as shared management
6 areas, New England and the Mid-Atlantic are unique
7 in that. Most of the other Councils don't overlap
8 too much.

9 But in order for us to accurately, I
10 mean, accurately, give you the numbers by square
11 mileage because we're talking about percentage,
12 that's what it's all about, 30 percent of whatever
13 the number is, we need to be able to coordinate
14 the effort of all eight Councils into one
15 document. And, you know, although the -- some of
16 the Councils have GIS capability, you know, and
17 John Froeschke from the -- from down South, he's a
18 pretty sharp guy, and there's a few other ones
19 that are pretty good at it. But in order to give
20 you, you know, one-stop shopping that is all --
21 everything is coordinated, everything is done
22 exactly the same, we need somebody that can

1 dedicate some time, which we do not have, as
2 individual Councils, to come up with a unified
3 picture of an Atlas. We can do the writing, but
4 somebody's got to do that for us, so. And that --
5 honestly, that's -- I've been talking about it a
6 lot, but that decision, you know, we're working
7 for you, the CCC. So, it's really up to this
8 group to decide how they want to handle that.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Does anyone have any
10 thoughts on that? Bill?

11 MR. TWEIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At
12 your pleasure, I could just cut to the chase and
13 offer a motion on this. Thanks, Mr. Chair. I
14 move that NOAA Fisheries provide special funding,
15 as soon as possible, to contract GIS work needed
16 to consolidate and complete the work of the
17 Area-Based Management ATB Subcommittee. With a
18 second, I can speak to that.

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
20 Bill. So, we have a motion. Do I have a second?
21 Marc? Go ahead, Bill.

22 MR. TWEIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank

1 you, Marc. First off, just to cut to the chase,
2 it's about \$50,000, we think. And it's not a
3 gigantic amount of money, but the Subcommittee has
4 already pretty carefully surveyed the individual
5 Councils. And none of the individual Councils
6 really have the bandwidth or the resources to
7 accomplish that. A couple of the Councils do have
8 some bandwidth to do it, or we've also talked to
9 Pacific states, and they've definitely got the
10 expertise. They stand ready to take it on if we
11 wanted to work with them directly.

12 So, it's not a large amount of money,
13 but it's a really big deal, as Eric was
14 describing. I think we're really close on a lot
15 of this. But you saw those tables. Ultimately,
16 it's, you know, greater than 54 percent. Well,
17 what the heck does that mean? It's really hard, I
18 think, for us to actually take this, that final
19 step, and have it go through the peer-review
20 process and be published in a scientific journal,
21 if we can't say that the foundation is a GIS
22 foundation. And I think the first thing that's

1 going to happen in a peer-review process is
2 they're going to point out we're not sure you're
3 adding together apples and apples, and, in fact,
4 some of your math has -- lead us to believe that
5 you're still trying to add apples and oranges.
6 GIS provides that certainty of consistency, so
7 that scientists and others can be assure that the
8 numbers we're adding together are numbers that are
9 meant to be added together because it's all done
10 in GIS language, at least that's as much as my
11 understanding of GIS goes.

12 But this also builds for the future.
13 And I think that's equally important. A National
14 GIS Database on EEZ conservation areas would be
15 very useful to the Councils, themselves. It's
16 going to be very useful to the Federal Government,
17 as a whole. It's going to be very useful to NOAA
18 Fisheries. It's going to be a tool that's going
19 to be used a lot in the future.

20 The one obvious benefit of that is
21 having the maps in one place, and in one format,
22 and in one currency, one denominator. It's going

1 to be useful to bring forward in the international
2 arena, as well. And domestically, again, I think
3 we've talked at length about the importance of
4 this to the current initiative, the America the
5 Beautiful, but we certainly think these kinds of
6 discussions will continue to be the focus of
7 future initiatives under future administrations.

8 And we think it can be done pretty
9 quickly, as well. And it's such a small ask, just
10 help us get over the hump. We've done a huge
11 amount of work to get it to this point. We really
12 have looked pretty hard in the mirror. We just
13 flat out don't have it. We need a -- just this
14 bit of help. We think we can finish it up. And
15 we think it's -- the result's going to be a
16 product that we're all going to find extremely
17 useful, so.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, Bill.
19 Marc, I'm going to go to you, as the seconder of
20 the motion. Do you have any additional rationale
21 you'd like to provide?

22 MR. GORELNIK: No, I don't. I think it

1 was well stated.

2 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thank you.

3 Discussion on the motion. Tom Nies?

4 MR. NIES: Thank. Just -- this is
5 perhaps a little bit in the weeds, but, well,
6 can't -- could this motion be worded as a request
7 to the Agency to provide funding? Because it's
8 not, right now.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: I don't know if the
10 maker of the motion would consider that.

11 MR. TWEIT: Certainly. At the front, I
12 could have asked -- inserted please, as well,
13 because, really, it was meant respectfully and
14 politely. It is a request.

15 CHAIRMAN LUISI: So, maybe move that the
16 CCC request that NOAA Fisheries, something like
17 that? Marc, you okay with that? Okay, great.
18 All right. Further discussion on the motion? Any
19 further discussion? Okay, seeing none, I do have
20 a hand in the audience on the webinar, so -- we
21 have -- we still do have -- we have some time
22 still left on the agenda, and I know Sam has a

1 presentation to give us. So, let me go to Peter
2 Auster. Peter, if you can keep your comments or
3 questions just to a minute or two, that would be
4 great.

5 MR. OSTER: Sure, yes. Thank you for
6 the opportunity and thank you for everyone who
7 contributed to this work. My question isn't about
8 the motion, per se, but about whether there will
9 be the Council -- each Council will provide an
10 opportunity for stakeholder engagement on the
11 report and product, at the council level?
12 Because, I mean, the -- you know, the whole
13 council -- you know, MSA process was lauded as a
14 very collaborative stakeholder engaged enterprise,
15 I mean, which I agree with, and wonder if the
16 findings here generated by the Subcommittee --
17 there will be an opportunity at individual
18 councils to provide comment and feedback?

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, I'd say, Peter,
20 that that's a possibility, but I'll look around
21 the table to see what some of the Councils think
22 about that. Maybe I'll go to you, Eric, as Chair

1 of the Subcommittee.

2 MR. REID: Thank you for the question,
3 and thank you, Mr. Chair. I mean, honestly, the
4 Subcommittee was tasked by this group. We're
5 responsible to you. This is a public meeting
6 today. All the materials have been on the website
7 for some period of time. When the final report is
8 done for our October meeting, I'm assuming
9 there'll be additional time for public comment
10 there. So, that would be where I'm coming from.
11 But like I said, the Subcommittee reports to the
12 CCC and doesn't make those ultimate decisions on
13 public input.

14 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, Eric.
15 And thanks, Peter, for your comment. Bill?

16 MR. TWEIT: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Speaking
17 for -- just for the North-Pacific Council, we've
18 worked this through some public process and have
19 some more in mind, primarily the addition will be
20 through the Ecosystem Committee. But we informed
21 the public of our participation in this, shortly
22 after -- at the next council meeting, following

1 the CCC formation of the -- of this Subcommittee,
2 and how we were intending to participate, and the
3 kinds of information we were attending to
4 learning. And then, we've kept the public
5 informed about the progress that the Subcommittee
6 has made and that -- reiterated each time that
7 we're not introducing any new areas. There's no
8 new -- this is an index of existing and also,
9 reminded the public that each of those existing
10 areas was formed through a public process, as
11 well.

12 I'm not going to claim that all of our
13 stakeholders are feeling totally informed about
14 this, but we've done the best we can to make sure
15 that at least our stakeholders have been informed
16 and apprised as we work our way through this. And
17 it's certainly our intent that there's, in terms
18 of what we've provided, that there's no surprises
19 anywhere in there, that all the information we've
20 been working with has been publicly available for
21 a long time. And then, I think, David can, if
22 necessary, can speak a little bit more to what we

1 still think we may do, as next with our Ecosystem
2 Committee, but in terms of additional public
3 exposure, if there's any questions about that.
4 But, I mean, I don't think we're done, but we also
5 think we've really engaged the public all the way
6 through.

7 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. I
8 appreciate that, Bill. Tom Nies?

9 MR. NIES: Yeah, much like the
10 North-Pacific Council, we've been advising the
11 Council that we're working on this, at just about
12 every council meeting since it started. The fact
13 that the Subcommittee Chair is our Council Chair,
14 or -- he brought this up a number of times. We
15 also, much like the North-Pacific Council,
16 published a three-meeting outlook, and, at least
17 with our Council, we are planning to give a
18 briefing on this, at our June council meeting.
19 So, we are presenting that information, and, you
20 know, we'll have the documents available. Much
21 like they were available for this meeting, we'll
22 have the documents available. But I don't know

1 that I'd go so far as to say we're seeking public
2 input on what should be here, but we are keeping
3 the public advised.

4 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, Tom, thank you.
5 I think we've covered the question from the
6 audience, from Peter. And so, I think, at this
7 time, what I'd like to do -- I'm going to read the
8 motion into the record, and I'll call the
9 question. Move that the CCC request, with a
10 pretty please and a cherry on top, that NOAA
11 Fisheries provides special funding, as soon as
12 possible, to contract GIS work needed to
13 consolidate and complete the work of the ABM/ATB
14 Subcommittee. Looking around the table, is there
15 any objection to this motion? Seeing no
16 objection, the motion carries by unanimous
17 consent. Eric?

18 MR. REID: Yeah, I have another motion
19 if you don't mind, Mr. Chair. And so, during the
20 development of this whole thing, there were three
21 public input sessions that were made available to
22 the public. I think you can -- I can't remember

1 if it was one minute or three minutes, or whatever
2 it was. So, I spoke twice. The third time, I get
3 bumped because I had spoken twice already, so.
4 But, at that time, you know, I -- when I spoke to
5 the Chairman of the New England Council, I
6 strongly recommended or some other -- after Dr.
7 Moore, some polite language, I think I used polite
8 language, about getting a meeting with CEQ on this
9 topic.

10 And during one of our subcommittee
11 meetings, one of the NOAA representatives said you
12 got what you asked for, which as, you know, you
13 know what they say about getting what you asked
14 for. But in any case, it does -- there doesn't
15 seem to be -- no date has been set. The details
16 are getting a little fuzzy for me.

17 So, I'd like to move that NOAA convene a
18 meeting with CEQ and the CCC Subcommittee
19 Representatives to discuss the draft report, in
20 time to be used in the development and
21 deliberation of the definition of conservation.
22 That's my motion. And if I get a second, I don't

1 think I need any additional rationale. But I
2 think it's important to engage with CEQ, if it is
3 at all possible.

4 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks, Eric.

5 And I appreciate your motion. I'm going to look
6 around to see if anyone would second that.

7 Marcos, are you going to second that? Do you want
8 to add any rationale to what Eric already
9 provided?

10 MR. HANKE: Yes, I -- yes, Chair, what
11 he just explained, and it's something that, for
12 me, will allow me to make better decisioning for
13 my people on the Council. I think it's a good
14 effort and a good meeting, and that is needed.

15 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
16 Marcos. So, Mr. Reid, let me ask you, you
17 mentioned that the -- this would be a meeting of
18 the CEQ and the CCC, all CCC Subcommittee
19 Representatives, those that could be made -- those
20 that could be available, or did you want to
21 identify certain individuals that would be -- that
22 would represent the CCC at this meeting?

1 MR. REID: Well, Mr. Chair, you're the
2 Chair. I, you know, I would suggest you join us,
3 to whatever extent you would like. During our
4 subcommittee meetings, the two names that came out
5 of the hat, one was my own name, and one was Dave
6 Witherell's. And whether or not anybody else from
7 the Committee would like to do that, I'm unclear,
8 but. I've met with CEQ before on other things and
9 walking in with a big group is not always so
10 effective. I mean, we can talk it over with the
11 Subcommittee, the motion's to the CCC, itself.
12 So, if you want to change it to say whatever you
13 want, Mike, that's fine with me, but you're the
14 Chair, so. It's really -- it's your pleasure,
15 what you want to do.

16 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, and I love
17 spending time with you, Eric. So, any time I have
18 an opportunity to spend time with you, I'd be
19 happy to do that. Dave, are you okay with
20 representing and serving with Eric on the CCC,
21 during this meeting? Is there any objection to
22 the recommendation from the Subcommittee that Dave

1 Witherell and Eric Reid would represent, along
2 with me, CCC, at this meeting? Everyone's okay
3 with that? Okay, good. All right. I'm going to
4 read the motion into the record. Oh, well, let me
5 ask, is there any other discussion on the motion?
6 Sam?

7 MR. RAUCH: I -- just to comment that I
8 do think that they've already agreed to have this
9 meeting. So, I will follow up if there's some
10 uncertainty about it. I don't know that it is set
11 yet. But I do think there was a commitment at the
12 meeting, and we'll follow up on that one.

13 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, and I think this
14 just puts it on the record, and that we also
15 wanted to have the conversation about who's going
16 to represent us. I think that was good. Eric?

17 MR. REID: Yeah, it did. Thank you, Mr.
18 Rauch. Yeah, I -- you know, I take everybody at
19 their word. They said that the meeting was going
20 to happen. That's great. But, you know, when
21 they tell us on the Subcommittee, I really thought
22 that -- I was unsure of the etiquette, but I

1 thought it would be proper that the CCC said,
2 yeah, okay, you know, instead of just going in
3 there, and me and Dave walking in there, and you,
4 too, Mike, because I like hanging out with you, as
5 well. I didn't think it was proper etiquette to
6 not make this motion, so.

7 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thank you. All
8 right, no -- seeing no further discussion, I'm
9 going to read the motion into the record. There's
10 no pretty please or cherry on top on this one,
11 but. I move that NOAA convene a meeting with CEQ
12 and the CCC Subcommittee Representatives, Eric
13 Reid, Dave Witherell, and Mike Luisi, to discuss
14 the draft report, in time to be used in
15 development and deliberation of the definition of
16 conservation. Is there any objection to the
17 motion by members of the CCC? Seeing no
18 objection, the motion carries by unanimous
19 consent. Thank you. Eric, anything else?

20 MR. REID: Yeah, if we're all done with
21 business, which I believe we are, I just wanted to
22 point out a couple of people that are on the

1 Subcommittee, themselves. You know, the
2 Subcommittee's really been -- done a lot of work.
3 But Dierdre Boelke, from the New England Council,
4 she was instrumental on where we are today, but
5 she's made a decision to move on into a new
6 chapter in her life, and I just wanted to thank
7 her, in front of everybody here. She's a great
8 ally to me, and I really appreciate all the work
9 she's done on this, and I wish her the best of
10 luck. She's going to be replaced by Michelle
11 Bachman, who is the Lead Staffer on our Habitat
12 Committee, and Michelle is equally as capable as
13 Dierdre.

14 And since you, Mr. Chairman, and Dr.
15 Moore are the Home Council here, I really wanted
16 to thank Jessica Coakley, because the document you
17 have in front of you today wouldn't have happened
18 if it wasn't for her. So, she really deserves a
19 special pat on the back, or a couple of cookies,
20 or whatever. But it's -- no joke, if we didn't
21 have her, I don't know what we would have in front
22 of you. I mean, really, just a fabulous job. So,

1 credit where credit is due. So, thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thank you, Eric.
4 And I'm always blown away about the -- by the
5 talent that we have on our staffs around the
6 table, around the Councils. It's just amazing to
7 me. I work for a state agency, and we have
8 fantastic people there, as well, but the level of
9 work that gets done at the Councils with the
10 Council staff is just unbelievable, and so, I
11 think, with your comments, Eric, I'd like to offer
12 a round of applause for Jessica who is sitting
13 back, right behind Eric. So, thank you very much,
14 Jessica. And if Dierdre's listening, the best of
15 luck on your new endeavors and thanks for all the
16 work that you did for that, on this work. Janet?

17 MS. COIT: I just want to commend you,
18 Eric, for leading this, and thank you. And I
19 think that meeting with CEQ is a very good idea.
20 It's nice to see the CCC and this group engage at
21 that level. So, great work.

22 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thanks, Eric.

1 We're going to move onto the last section of our
2 agenda before lunch. We're going to have a
3 presentation. It's a NOAA Fisheries update, by
4 Sam Rauch, who's the Deputy Assistant
5 Administrator for Regulatory Programs. So, I'm
6 going to turn the mic over to Sam. Whenever
7 you're ready.

8 MR. RAUCH: Yeah. Thank you. And I do
9 not have a presentation. So, I'm just going to
10 give an oral report here. And so, I'd like to
11 join with Janet in congratulating you for all the
12 hard work that went into that report and the very
13 constructive engagement that the CCC has had since
14 the very beginning of this effort.

15 I'm going to provide a brief report on
16 where the administration is, but let me just step
17 back a little bit, for those of you who are not as
18 intimately familiar with this. This all started
19 out of an Executive Order issued, I think, on the
20 first day of this administration, calling for us
21 all to work together to enhance our economy, our
22 health, our wellbeing, by conserving, connecting,

1 and restoring at least 30 percent of our lands and
2 water by 2030. That's the 30 by that we've been
3 talking about. This is encapsulating an
4 initiative that we call, shorthand, the America
5 the Beautiful, the initiative.

6 And NOAA has a role that extends beyond
7 the Fishery Service. We're going to -- I'm going
8 to talk a little bit about the Fishery Service
9 here. But just bear in mind, NOAA has quite
10 extensive leadership in place-based conservation,
11 ocean conservation. This does talk about land and
12 water. There are a number of other Federal
13 agencies particularly dealing with the land-based
14 area. But on the water, particularly on the ocean
15 part of it, NOAA has a great deal of leadership
16 that extends much further beyond just the fishery
17 service. And it extends to some of the things
18 that Janet talked about yesterday, in terms of
19 NOAA's priorities about advancing environmental
20 stewardships, sustaining economic development, a
21 new green economy, providing authority to climate
22 data, information services to all Americans, and

1 integrating equity. All of that is part of the
2 initiative.

3 When the President has talked about 30
4 by 30, the goal is not necessarily just to create
5 a number on a map that's 30 percent. The goal is
6 to use that tool to achieve three -- to address
7 three overarching threats, the disappearance of
8 nature, climate change, and inequitable access to
9 the outdoors. So, when we look at what we are
10 trying to conserve for, that's what we're trying
11 to conserve for. There's different -- many
12 different ways that you can be engaged in
13 conservation. The ways that contribute to
14 addressing those three threats are the ways that
15 the administration is looking at this, primarily.

16 So, a little bit about the public input
17 process that we have run. We ran, that NOAA ran,
18 a federal register notice, which closed in
19 December of 2021, looking at all of the input from
20 all of our various partners and stakeholders into
21 this process with the formal public comment
22 period. We received 370 comments with multiple

1 signatures, some of those were signatures on
2 letters, 8 writing campaigns containing 34,000
3 signatures. We did nine listening sessions, in
4 which we got 100 unique comments out of that.
5 Some of the common themes that we heard is
6 generally support for the 30 by 30 effort, a split
7 on whether fisheries should count with those that
8 prefer fully protected areas only, a loss of
9 support for new monuments or sanctuaries, and
10 better or stronger use of essential fish habitat
11 as -- was a common comment.

12 In addition to the comment process that
13 we ran, CEQ, the Council on Environmental Quality,
14 ran a process through the Department of Interior
15 on the Atlas, itself. And I'm going to talk about
16 the Atlas in more detail. Obviously, the CCC
17 report was intended to feed into that Atlas. But
18 there was a comment period on the Atlas, itself,
19 on what kinds of things should or should not be
20 included in that Atlas. That closed on March 7th,
21 for the Interior Department. They received more
22 than 18,000 comments posted on their docket and 24

1 hours of verbal comments. We have received copies
2 of the CCC letter and other letters from
3 individual councils that are feeding into our
4 process. Some common themes from the council or
5 CCC comments that we got, one was a working
6 definition of conservation area, which is the one
7 that we were just talking about, advice that, for
8 fisheries management related actions, the data
9 sources that we use to inform the Atlas should be
10 those approved or adopted by the Councils, or
11 NMFS, or the Federal agency with authority over
12 living marine resources, that states, Tribes,
13 territories, local jurisdictions should provide
14 information for the Atlas on conservation areas,
15 under their jurisdiction, that the Atlas should
16 utilize the database prepared by the CCC, which
17 was one of the things we were just talking about,
18 and there was a recommendation that the Atlas
19 include certain attributes, in addition to what we
20 typically see. We typically see boundary area
21 management authority, but the recommendation was
22 that we also look at things like degree of

1 research and monitoring in the area. Some of
2 those things are covered by the CCC report.

3 In terms of the Atlas, the
4 administration's taking into -- all that into
5 consideration, including the CCC report, which we
6 made sure they have. They're going to work on a
7 beta version of the Atlas, which they expect to
8 release in December. It is unclear to me, at this
9 point, exactly how that is going to be organized.
10 I think that it will include either a definition
11 of conservation area or elements of a conservation
12 area that could be applied. I think that it will
13 either include a suite of areas that are examples,
14 or it might include a more definitive list, where
15 they try to look at all the different proposals.
16 I think that that is going to be difficult to do,
17 when the CCC just gave them 615. Other people
18 gave them a whole lot more. What -- it wouldn't
19 surprise me to see that, if there are
20 representative samples of things, that they apply
21 the definition to or evaluate under the elements.
22 But we're still working on that. There is a lot

1 of information to go through, and it's not exactly
2 clear. I do believe that there might be
3 additional public comment opportunities, public
4 input opportunities, but those haven't been set
5 out yet. We'll continue -- if there are, we will
6 make sure to let you know about that. But I do
7 expect that there will be a beta version out in
8 December on that one.

9 In addition to that, a NOAA-specific
10 action that you should be aware of, and many of
11 you knew -- know that we used to have, within
12 NOAA, a Marine Advisory Committee on Marine-
13 Protected Areas, that was largely Chaired -- that
14 was administered by the Ocean Service, although we
15 played a key part in that. That was disbanded
16 under the last administration. We are not
17 recreating that group. But instead, we are
18 creating a similar group, based on a lot of work
19 that that group has done, called the Marine and
20 Coastal Area-Based Management Federal Advisory
21 Committee. And we will soon publish that notice
22 and solicit nominations for membership.

1 The one significant -- in addition to
2 this altered scope, this one is not just
3 administered by the Ocean Service but will also be
4 co-administered by the Fishery Service. So, we
5 will have a much stronger role in that Committee
6 than the old MPA Committee. It is intended to
7 advise the Secretary of Commerce on science-based
8 approaches to area-based protection, conservation,
9 restoration, and management in coastal marine
10 areas between the Great Lakes. And I believe that
11 Council, CCC, report, that we were just talking
12 about, will be very influential in their
13 discussions, given that the idea of that report is
14 not just to inform the America the Beautiful
15 process but to provide a tool or resource for the
16 Councils, going forward, as they look at
17 area-based management, and things that are good,
18 and things that are bad. And the mandate of this
19 FACA Committee is also broader than just the
20 America the Beautiful report. And so, I do think
21 that those things align well.

22 The -- as I said, it will be co-led by

1 fisheries and Ocean Service, and we encourage
2 individuals to apply to that membership as soon as
3 we announce that. So, that is where we are right
4 now. As I indicated, I do believe, although we
5 may not have set the date, and we may need to nail
6 that down, I do believe that we are trying to work
7 with you, and I think there has been a commitment
8 to meet with NOAA and CEQ leadership on the
9 report. I know from speaking for NOAA leadership,
10 we are very excited to see the report, and we do
11 believe the report will be very helpful, trying to
12 craft out only the definition of conservation, and
13 not only an analysis of those different areas and
14 what they look like, but also, the way that we
15 think about conservation in the ocean.

16 There is a whole another side of that
17 equation, which we have to look at, in how we deal
18 with conservation on land. And so, there are many
19 other partners and stakeholders that are engaged
20 in that process. There are some things that are
21 easier to do in the ocean, and to think about some
22 things that are harder. But we have to have sort

1 of a common National approach to this. And so, it
2 is very helpful, what the Council, the CCC, has
3 done, and we do look forward to that. And I think
4 the constructive approach, the very thoughtful
5 approach, that the CCC has presented, is going to
6 be very useful, as we work with the other Federal
7 agencies and the White House on not only just the
8 beta version but the America the Beautiful
9 campaign for the future. So, I'm happy to stop,
10 take questions or comments, if the CCC has any.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
12 Sam. I appreciate your report. Any comments?
13 Tom?

14 MR. NIES: Thank you, Sam. That was
15 very interesting. Since I like to use acronyms,
16 I'm going to ask if the MCAFAC is going to have --
17 it's the Marine Coastal Area Federal Advisory
18 Committee, you know, anyway, all right, yeah. So,
19 anyway, is the membership of that going to be --
20 will it have slots, do you know, or is it going to
21 be wide open? And related to that, the first
22 question is, if there's slots, is there going to

1 be a slot for representatives in the Fisheries
2 Councils? If there are not slots, presumably, a
3 member of the Fishery Management Council would be
4 considered for membership under whatever criteria,
5 if they met the criteria that you establish,
6 right?

7 MR. RAUCH: Well, I did just encourage
8 you all to apply. So, I just want to be clear.
9 But I do think that you'll be considered. Whether
10 there's slots or not, I think that, like every
11 Advisory Council, we are trying to get a diversity
12 of viewpoint on the Council. And so, we are
13 interested in hearing from fishing organizations,
14 other kinds of entities, like the Councils. But
15 we have to balance who applies with those kinds of
16 criteria. So, there are a suite of people that
17 we're looking at to try to get a broad spectrum
18 with this process. But, yes, we do clearly want
19 participation from the Councils, groups of -- or
20 members of the Councils. The fishing industry is
21 all kinds of different people. That's why I
22 asked.

1 MR. NIES: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thank you for
3 that. Anyone else at the table? Are there any
4 questions or comments for Sam? Bill?

5 MR. TWEIT: Just a comment. I'm not
6 sure what it took to get that restructuring of the
7 Advisory Committee, and I'm pretty sure I don't
8 want to know, but I really appreciate it. I think
9 it both, in the larger perspective, fixes one of
10 the weaknesses in the previous Committee and --
11 but also, I think, at least within the regions I
12 know well, both the West Coast and Alaska, could
13 go quite a ways towards fixing some of the schism
14 that exists between those two groups, when we
15 could be sort of working together. And so, it's a
16 good move, and I just, at least, wanted to express
17 appreciation for whatever it took to get there.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
19 Bill. Anyone else at the table? Okay, we have a
20 couple minutes. Is there anyone from the audience
21 or on the webinar that would like to offer any
22 comment or ask any questions? Greg DiDomenico?

1 MR. DIDOMENICO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 Can you hear me okay?

3 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yep.

4 MR. DIDOMENICO: Just a quick question
5 directed to Mr. Rauch. How does the Agency intend
6 to implement the goal of increasing outdoor
7 access, especially in the marine environment?
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Sam?

10 MR. RAUCH: Well, if you look at our --
11 you know, when you look at outdoor access in a
12 number of different ways, one clearly -- making
13 sure that our recreational fisheries have access
14 to important fishing areas is an important thing
15 that we work on, through the Councils, through
16 everybody else, and we're trying to look at that
17 issue. When we are dealing with fisheries, we are
18 often dealing with -- you know, this group is
19 dealing with fisheries three miles off the coast,
20 mainly. But we do need to need to consider, as we
21 are developing management structures, are we
22 allowing those communities to continue to access

1 important resources? Do -- that also is important
2 for commercial fisheries, as well, although we
3 often don't quite think about it the same way.

4 But when we are looking at areas that we
5 manage or close, we look at can communities that
6 rely on these fishing resources continue to rely
7 on them, or, you know, if you do a closed area,
8 are you precluding opportunity? That is a common
9 analysis that we do. So, we think that looking at
10 access to fisheries, whether it's translated very
11 directly in some of our recreational approaches,
12 or whether it is imbedded in Council or Agency
13 decisions looking at the effects of various
14 management measures, and what they have on the
15 fishing industry, the communities that the fishing
16 industry was housed in. We think that aligns very
17 well, in terms of taking that into account.

18 In -- if there is a desire, through this
19 process, to increase access in any particular
20 area, the President has reiterated that he does
21 not intend for us to be creating new mechanisms,
22 but he intends to work through things explicitly

1 like the Councils who are mentioned in the initial
2 report that we did last year, that if there is a
3 desire to do more, the view is we should use these
4 existing structures that have done us so well to
5 get to this point. And we should work through the
6 Council's other local entities, you know, if it's
7 in other places on those things but not recreate a
8 top-down approach to doing anything like that.

9 So, it's not claiming exactly what more, if
10 anything, we may need to be doing, in terms of
11 access. But what is clear is if we are talking
12 about that, we are going to be talking about that,
13 through the Council process, so not through some
14 other process. At least that's the way the
15 initial report is set up.

16 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks, Sam. And
17 thanks for the question, Greg. Anyone else from
18 the public on the webinar? Okay, seeing no hands
19 at this time, I want to bring it back to the
20 table. Any last thoughts before we take a break
21 for lunch? Okay. Seeing none, thank you both for
22 your presentations. That concludes our business

1 under this item on the agenda. We have a
2 one-and-a-half-hour lunch break. So, we're going
3 to reconvene at 1:30. And we'll see you then.
4 Thank you.

5 Oh, let me ask -- so, Shelly, or -- can
6 people leave their -- can we leave our computers
7 and things in the room? Okay. Yeah, somebody
8 will be here to keep an eye on your electronics if
9 you want to leave them in the room. See you at
10 1:30.

11 (Recess)

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Welcome back, everyone,
13 from the break. We're going to go ahead and jump
14 into our afternoon agenda. First item on the
15 agenda this afternoon is a discussion regarding
16 Recreational Fisheries Management. We have three
17 presentations, and the first one is going to be
18 given to us by Russ Dunn who is the Policy Advisor
19 to Recreational Fisheries from NOAA Fisheries.
20 He's going to give us a presentation on the
21 Recreational Fisheries Summit that occurred --
22 Russ, what was that? About a month ago? About a

1 month and half ago?

2 MR. DUNN: End of March. The end of
3 March.

4 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes. And I'll just
5 say, you know, I had the privilege of being able
6 to attend the Summit for about a day and a half.
7 I wasn't able to stay the whole time, but I took a
8 lot away from it. And I think Russ is going to
9 give us a lot more information about what NOAA
10 Fisheries took away from the Summit. And so,
11 Russ, if you're ready, I'll turn it over to you.

12 MR. DUNN: Ready. Thanks, Mike, I
13 appreciate it. As Mike said, I'm Russ Dunn. I am
14 the Policy Advisor of Recreational Fisheries at
15 NOAA Fisheries. And I'm just going to give you a
16 quick overview of what we heard at the Summit, as
17 well as a little bit of information on some
18 habitat work we are doing to engage anglers.

19 So, again, as Mike noted, at the end of
20 March, March 29 and 30, we co-hosted what is now
21 the fourth Saltwater Recreational Fisheries
22 Summit, March 29th and 30th, with the Atlantic

1 States Marine Fisheries Commission. They've been
2 our partner in all four summits up to this point.
3 Had about 175 people in the room, about 90 or so
4 online each day, and we were guided by a steering
5 committee of anglers and fisheries commission
6 staff. They developed the agenda topics which,
7 you can see onscreen there, were Climate,
8 Balancing Ocean Uses which is code for wind and
9 aquaculture. And then, the perennial favorites of
10 Data Collection and Management Flexibility. This
11 time, we added OY to it, Optimum Yield.

12 So, with Climate, we jumped in, we
13 basically got an overview of the state of the
14 science out there. We heard from anglers about
15 their experiences and observations on the water.
16 We heard about some habitat tools and investments
17 that are related to climate-resilient fisheries.
18 And we heard about the council climate scenario
19 planning work from Kiley, just like you did this
20 morning. We then broke in the plenary, and -- or
21 had a plenary and breakout group discussions. And
22 what we really heard was that changes on the water

1 are becoming obvious. It's undeniable now at this
2 point, that there are different impacts in
3 different regions, and that there are winners and
4 losers. As you well know, some species are
5 expanding, providing new opportunities for anglers
6 in other regions. And some places are suffering
7 the effects of, for example, decreased water
8 quality.

9 We also heard, as you can see onscreen,
10 the real concerns about impacts in natural
11 resources, what that means for accessing the
12 fisheries. There was a real concern about not
13 having a sufficient scientific baseline to really
14 understand the climate changes in full, either in
15 short or long term. And one theme that recur, we
16 will see that theme recur, we'll also see the last
17 bullet there under concerns recur, where there is
18 concern that the pace of change is outstripping
19 the management system and the science process to
20 keep up.

21 So, what did we hear from them? Well, a
22 bullet you'll probably really appreciate after

1 this morning's conversation that Kelly Denit led
2 that there was interest in NOAA leadership on,
3 we'll call it, council governance issues. And to
4 answer Chris Moore's question, what did that
5 really mean? Well, the real issue that was raised
6 at the Summit by participants was the issue of
7 inter-council allocation and jurisdictional
8 issues. We heard calls over and over for
9 regulatory and scientific nimbleness, essentially
10 being able to adjust more rapidly to the changes
11 to, in this case, climate-driven changes. And
12 there was interest in additional climate
13 engagement and education. And I was a little
14 surprised on that but now, having seen the climate
15 scenario planning presentation and the other
16 conversations here where there was so much
17 interest by anglers, I guess it fits right into
18 that pattern of anglers are interested in and want
19 to be engaged on climate.

20 Ocean Uses, as I said, what this really
21 was, was a discussion of the expanding fields and
22 new fields of aquaculture and wind energy. And we

1 had presentations from BOEM and industry on the
2 development process and planning process and how
3 anglers can be engaged in that. We heard about
4 anglers' experiences on the water, and in the
5 planning room, particularly a pilot program up in
6 Rhode Island were being developed and constructed.
7 And we heard from states about their experiences
8 in developing the wind fields, in dealing with the
9 developers, and how they engaged anglers. What we
10 heard overall was a lot of concerns about impacts
11 to target species, other natural resources, and
12 access, what does this means for access over and
13 over.

14 We, again, as I mentioned before, heard
15 a concern that there's a lack of baseline
16 understanding about the conditions out there, and
17 what that means in terms of our ability to monitor
18 impacts short and long term during construction,
19 during operation. And let's see, and finally, I
20 think there was a real recognition that there is a
21 limited amount of recreational data out there that
22 can be used for planning and development.

1 Primarily, I guess, we're talking about geospatial
2 data. Where is the catch and effort occurring?
3 So that can be fed into the planning and
4 development process.

5 So, we heard the interest in increased
6 monitoring for short- and long-term impacts. That
7 stakeholders want to be involved in every stage of
8 project development. There's interest in trying
9 to identify sort of secondary or downstream
10 benefits of this new infrastructure. Are there
11 ways to derive some additional value of this new
12 infrastructure that's going to be put in the
13 water? And then, for those folks who were
14 comfortable with infrastructure in the water,
15 primarily the folks down in the Gulf, there was
16 immediate interest in how can we maintain these
17 structures long-term after they're decommissioned,
18 given their potential for being an fishable
19 habitat.

20 Recreational Data, we have presentations
21 there from NMFS and Commission staff and State
22 staff. And basically, what we did was we provided

1 sort of a 101, or a 102, really, a little more
2 than a 101, on data collection to develop a shared
3 understanding of everyone in the room for how
4 those data are collected and then, how they're
5 applied in assessments as well as in management
6 for monitoring purposes. We then broke into a
7 plenary discussion, and what we really heard loud
8 and clear was the lack of trust and confidence in
9 sort of the federal data system. We heard there
10 was a lack of confidence when the data don't match
11 what anglers are seeing on the water, their
12 perceptions, when there's large confidence
13 intervals associated with the data when they feel
14 it's being used beyond its capabilities, and they
15 also expressed that they felt their concerns were
16 not being heard or addressed. And ultimately,
17 another one I was sort of a little bit surprised
18 to hear, but there was interest in the room in
19 finding additional funding, that there was a
20 recognition that there was inadequate funding to
21 support what is needed to obtain the data needed
22 for management and that additional funding is

1 needed. There were calls among participants
2 themselves to try and go out and support efforts
3 to obtain more funds.

4 We saw -- so, there was interest in more
5 and better fishery-dependent data, more and better
6 fishery-independent data. There was interest in
7 trying to understand how to incorporate data
8 collected by anglers into the process. They felt
9 that would provide them with a little bit more
10 confidence in the data if they knew that their own
11 data was going in. And there was some frustration
12 out there where there had been some cooperative
13 research projects and in at least one case, those
14 data were not able to be used in an assessment.
15 And there's a lot of frustration that they had
16 taken their time and effort to collect those data
17 and they weren't able to be used. And then,
18 finally, there was an expressed interest in
19 greater engagement in data collection,
20 application, and really understanding more the
21 results of collecting and using that data. What
22 did the data that they provide ultimately result

1 in? Oops. Jumped over one, sorry.

2 We finished up the last session on
3 recreational management and OY. We have
4 presentations from the South Atlantic Council on
5 their alternative management working group from
6 the Mid on rec reform, from the Pacific Council on
7 approached used out there. From Alaska, we heard
8 about the catch-sharing plan that's in place as
9 well as the RQE, sorry, the recreational quota
10 entity. And finally, we got from the anglers
11 their perspective on the concept of flexibility
12 and reform. And what we learned first and
13 foremost was that those concepts are highly
14 variable by individual. As Barry Thom said one of
15 my favorite quotes there was, that we were
16 extremely flexible with our definition of
17 flexibility.

18 So, what we heard was a mix. We heard
19 support for being more flexible, but that was
20 coupled with concerns over ensuring that we
21 understood as managers and scientists what the
22 risks are of this potential flexibility. Same

1 thing with the need for increasing speed and
2 responsiveness, so, we're getting back to the
3 nimbleness statement that we started out this
4 discussion with. But again, there was concern
5 over moving too fast and a desire for appropriate
6 backstops to make sure we don't misstep or to
7 minimize any issues associated with the misstep.

8 And finally, there was sort of, what to
9 me, was a break down between for-hire and private
10 sectors between flexibility and stability where
11 you had interest on, behalf of primarily, the
12 private boat guys' interest in the flexibility to
13 maximize their fishing opportunities versus
14 stability for business planning purposes from the
15 for-hire side. We then, concluded with a
16 discussion of optimum yield where we had NOAA
17 staff, Gulf council staff, and academia speak, to
18 their understanding, of OY, how it's been applied,
19 and what it is. And the thing that jumped out to
20 me was that this is an extremely difficult
21 conversation to have as a large group. It is both
22 weedy and nebulous at the same time. And it was

1 -- it made it on the agenda in large part because
2 the National Academies study which came out last
3 year made a recommendation that NOAA and the
4 Councils begin a conversation with anglers about
5 how to use OY as a tool to better guide
6 management. And so, we thought, hey, what better
7 place to sort of kick this off and just
8 essentially, set up those potential conversations.

9 What came out of that, primarily, I
10 felt, was that there was a recognition of the need
11 to better understand and account for human
12 dimension's effects of fisheries. As well as
13 concerns over fish being left in the water being
14 seen as a negative, being seen as not maximizing
15 the value of the fishery, or as failing to achieve
16 MSY, in which case, there were some concerns about
17 those fish potentially being reallocated over to
18 another sector.

19 So, next steps, where are we going from
20 here? Well, we are in the middle of hosting
21 internal agency discussions trying to figure out
22 what are our next steps, what were their offices,

1 what were the takeaways of various offices. The
2 second bullet there, actually, has been completed.
3 We have a website up that gives a quick summary of
4 the Summit and a few next steps. We are working
5 with a contractor right now on the Summit Final
6 Report which we expect to be delivered on June
7 30th, which we'll then make available to the
8 public. We are beginning discussions with our
9 external partners, which include all of you.
10 We've talked to the Commissions at this point,
11 following up with them. And we'll be reaching out
12 to your staff who are engaged in this Summit to
13 try to understand what their primary takeaways and
14 thoughts are about how to move forward with
15 findings of the Summit. And then, I guess I would
16 take in the last two bullets in reverse order.

17 One of the things that we recognize is
18 that the Saltwater Rec Fish Policy, which some of
19 you may remember we did in 2015, it was published.
20 It's time to review that and potentially amend it.
21 One of the things that is not in it is climate
22 change. It doesn't address climate change at all.

1 So, we thought taking the Summit findings and
2 beginning to figure out how to incorporate those
3 into the policy, it's good timing. And then, we
4 will use the discussions on trying to update the
5 policy as a tool to help us plan a new multiyear
6 Rec Fish strategic plan for the Agency. So, let
7 me stop there and ask, there are a number of you
8 here who were at the Summit, if you have any
9 additional thoughts, comments that you want to
10 make. I know Mike was there and he mentioned it
11 already. But let me just open up to you if you
12 have any questions or thoughts or inputs about
13 this summit, major takeaways I might have missed.

14 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Russ. We can
15 do that before you hop -- jump into the next
16 section of your presentation. So, does anyone
17 from the CCC want to offer any comment or have any
18 questions for Russ regarding the Summit? Rick
19 Bellavance?

20 MR. BELLAVANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 Thanks, Russ, for your report. I don't really
22 have any questions other than just I agree with

1 your report and your picture of how things went
2 and the ideas that came out of the Summit. It's
3 pretty accurate from my recollection as well. And
4 thanks for you and the team for putting it on, and
5 NOAA supporting recreational fisheries, and ASMFC
6 for hosting us. Thanks.

7 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah. Thanks, Rick.
8 Tom Nies?

9 MR. NIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Thanks, Russ. You know, one of my staff went. I
11 understand, there were a lot of very excellent
12 made at the Summit. Are those going to made
13 available on the Summit webpage?

14 MR. DUNN: Yes, they already are. So,
15 all the Summit presentations are available. And
16 then, they will also obviously be incorporated
17 into the final report as well.

18 MR. NIES: Do you know where they are in
19 the webpage?

20 MR. DUNN: I can send you that. I don't
21 know offhand what the URL is.

22 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah. We'll make sure

1 to get that around to everybody. Marcos?

2 MR. HANKE: Thank you very much for the
3 invitation to attend the Summit. And I think it
4 was very important especially being a member of
5 the Council and for the general public that was in
6 there participating to understand what is going on
7 around the Nation. And to focus the effort to
8 represent recreational fishing and to focus on
9 requesting for the funds and different other
10 things that was addressed during the meeting. I
11 think it was an excellent entity. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Marcos. Any
13 other comments? We'll stay on this side of the
14 table, go to John, and I'll come over to you,
15 Will.

16 MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Yeah, as another attendee, Russ, I want to offer
18 my thanks to you guys for putting that together.
19 I think I've been to all of them or at least a lot
20 of them, and it is always a great opportunity to
21 learn about -- more about recreational fisheries
22 around the Nation. So, I really appreciate you

1 guys doing that. I thought this one was
2 interesting, the first two topics you showed on
3 the first day, and it seemed like there was, you
4 know, people that wanted to comment, had the
5 chance to comment. Not surprisingly, when we got
6 to MRIP and started talking about data, the
7 comment queues lined up and we got through a
8 fraction of them. We probably could've spent a
9 week letting everybody share their own personal
10 frustrations. Which wasn't all together
11 unexpected. But I think the breakouts worked
12 really well and allowed people to share a lot of
13 ideas. So, looking forward to see what comes out
14 in the report and moving into those couple of next
15 steps.

16 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, thanks, John.
17 I'll concur with you. I think the breakouts, to
18 me, that was the most productive part. I mean,
19 aside from the presentations, there were a lot of
20 really wonderful presentations, but those breakout
21 groups, especially for someone like me who works
22 for state government, Fisheries Director in

1 Maryland, just to hear people, you know, talking
2 about what's happening in the Mid-Atlantic and
3 bringing their issues to the forefront, I think,
4 is -- was a really good part of that. I don't
5 remember there being breakouts in previous Rec
6 Summits, but there may have been. I haven't
7 always been able to attend all of the entire
8 summit, but I would suggest continuing in that --
9 with that strategy for future summits because I
10 think it really -- it was really a good plan.
11 Will?

12 MR. SWORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
13 want to thank Russ very much for putting these
14 summits on for our recreational fisheries because
15 it's really important. I'm really sorry I missed
16 it. We were in lockdown especially on the
17 islands. That's a tough think even in Guam and
18 Saipan from our regions. So, basically, the
19 Hawaii fishermen got a chance to participate. But
20 I think it's a great opportunity for everyone to
21 share their ideas and especially the changes
22 coming on Magnuson-Stevens. I think it was a good

1 effort to put together ideas to make it work for
2 everyone. I think it's really tough for us, too,
3 because on the Guam and Saipan, they were, like,
4 15 hours ahead of the East Coast. One suggestion
5 is perhaps the next time, we can have on the West
6 Coast, if not, in Hawaii. But at least we can get
7 to be somewhere in the middle so we can get more
8 participation from our different fishermen.

9 The other question that I wanted to ask
10 is there was a push at this for forage fish,
11 climate change, and ecosystem concerns which is
12 three issues being reviewed in the MSA
13 legislation. So, what do you think is the role
14 the Summit plays in influencing these legislative
15 pieces as you can see it?

16 MR. DUNN: Well, from the Agency
17 perspective, I know -- you know, we can't go to
18 Congress and advocate without you know, the
19 President's support. And so, from our
20 perspective, it probably won't change much, but I
21 think what it does to it is it allows the
22 constituents to recognize these are broader issues

1 that are of concern across the country, and that
2 allows them to then go the Hill on their own with
3 an understanding of where else that is -- any of
4 those issues are of concern, and what those
5 concerns are. So, I think it has the potential to
6 reach the Hill through constituents. Obviously,
7 the Hill will also get a copy of the final report
8 from it, so they'll be able to see the issues as
9 discussed there at the Summit as well. So, it can
10 elevate their awareness of those issues.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
12 Russ. In the interest of time, I think, you know,
13 we've got some good feedback from around the table
14 for folks that participated in the Summit. I
15 think I'll ask at this time if you want to move on
16 to the next section of your report. We still have
17 a couple of presentations to go.

18 MR. DUNN: Sure. Yes. This is very
19 quick. So, coming out of this in the 2018 Summit,
20 one issue that was important to us or one focus,
21 was engaging recreational fishermen through
22 engagement on habitat issues, habitat restoration

1 and conservation. And it has really been, I
2 think, a win-win across the board. And so, what
3 we have done is teamed up with our office of
4 habitat to offer fairly limited pots of money in
5 order to advance habitat conservation and
6 restoration through direct involvement of the
7 recreational fishing community.

8 And you can see from the slides, it's
9 limited pots of money. We've been able to grow it
10 each year. This past year was down, frankly,
11 because I had to pay for the Summit, but we've had
12 a lot of success. And so, I'm just going to
13 touch, sorry, I am just going to touch on a couple
14 from 2021. In Louisiana, we were able to fund a
15 project where charter boat captains engaged high
16 school students, taught them about the importance
17 of habitat, and then, worked on black mangrove
18 restoration. And Maryland here, there was a
19 project we were able to fund to construct reef
20 balls and provide some education materials in
21 multiple languages. And Puget Sound, we were able
22 to fund a project to re-flood some portion of the

1 Puget Sound Estuary which had been cut off for a
2 number of years. And then, finally, up in Alaska,
3 through the Western Native Trout Initiative, there
4 was a project to map a distribution of coastal
5 cutthroat. And why that's important is that when
6 those data are accepted by the State, and gets
7 added to a registry, those streams get automatic
8 statutory protection. So, it's a great way to get
9 a better understanding as well as provide some
10 immediate level of protection.

11 So, this is just a quick map that shows
12 where these projects have occurred as well as a
13 couple of habitat workshops that were conducted
14 with anglers in the last three or four years. And
15 that is really it. So, I will open it up. With
16 the Chair's incurrence, any questions or comments?

17 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah. Let's see if
18 anyone has questions or comments for you. Is
19 there anyone at the table that has questions or
20 comments for Russ on this part of the
21 presentation? Seeing no hands at this time, is
22 there anyone in the audience or on the webinar

1 that might want to ask a question of Russ before
2 we turn over to the next presenter? Seeing no
3 hands on the webinar, Russ, thank you very much
4 for your report. Looking forward to talking with
5 you about future endeavors on the recreational
6 fisheries stuff.

7 And so, next, we are going to go to our
8 second presenter. Julia Beaty from the
9 Mid-Atlantic Council staff is going to give us an
10 update on the Mid-Atlantic Council's Recreational
11 Reform Initiative. Julia is participating with us
12 today virtually. And so, Julia, you want to just
13 do a mic check, and then, I'll turn the mic over
14 to you for the presentation.

15 MS. BEATY: Okay. How's that? Can you
16 hear me, Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, we can hear you
18 now. That's great. So, whenever you're ready,
19 Julia, you can go ahead and get started. Nothing
20 is showing up on the web. The presentation is not
21 on the webinar yet.

22 MS. BEATY: Okay. Can you see it now?

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: There we go. Okay, we
2 all see it now. Thank you.

3 MS. BEATY: All right. Thank you.
4 Sorry, I couldn't be with you all in person today.
5 I'm going to give a presentation on the
6 Recreational Harvest Control Rule Framework and
7 Addenda which is an action of the Mid-Atlantic
8 Fishery Management Council and the Atlantic States
9 Marine Fisheries Commission. This action
10 addresses all four recreational species that are
11 jointly managed by the Council and the Commission.
12 This includes summer flounder, scup, black sea
13 bass, and bluefish. This is an ongoing management
14 action and the Council and the Commission's Policy
15 Board will consider taking final action next
16 month. Where did the mouse go? Here we go.
17 Okay. So, this action was developed in response
18 to several challenges with the current process
19 including concerns related to uncertainty and
20 variability in the recreational fishery data, the
21 need to change the bag size and/or season limits,
22 sometimes annually, based on those data. And

1 we've also struggled with the perception that
2 measures are not reflective of current stock
3 status. In addition, management measures have not
4 always had their intended effect on overall
5 harvest. So, the goal of this action is to
6 establish a process for setting the recreational
7 bag, size, and season limits that prevents
8 overfishing, is reflective of stock status,
9 appropriately accounts for uncertainty in the
10 recreational data, takes into consideration angler
11 preferences, and provides an appropriate level of
12 stability and predictability in the changes from
13 year to year.

14 So, there's five primary alternatives
15 under consideration that would use different
16 approaches for setting the bag, size, and season
17 limits. And key differences between these
18 approaches include the information that's
19 explicitly considered when setting the measures
20 and the circumstances under which the measures
21 would change. And I'll describe that in more
22 detail in the next slide. Each alternative

1 defines a process for setting the measures, but
2 none of them would implement specific measures
3 because they're just defining the process and the
4 measures themselves would be established and
5 modified through separate future specifications
6 actions. So, these are the five primary
7 alternatives under consideration and I will try to
8 summarize each of them briefly as I can. Some of
9 them are fairly complex. So, bear with me here.

10 First is the no action option, of
11 course, which is the current process as defined in
12 the fishery management plan. The primary goal is
13 to prevent overages of the recreational harvest
14 limits, and we have a lot of flexibility in how we
15 can do that because the specific methods are not
16 codified in the FMP. But typically, what we do is
17 we look at a recent year average of the MRIP
18 harvest data and we compare that to the upcoming
19 recreational harvest limit or RHL. And then, we
20 decide, based on that comparison, can we leave the
21 bag, size, and season limits unchanged? Or do
22 they need to be modified with the goal of allowing

1 harvest to meet but not exceed the RHL? So, if
2 there is a difference between what we expect
3 harvest would be and what the RHL is, then, we
4 determine what's the percentage change in harvest
5 that we would need to either increase or decrease
6 to meet but not exceed the RHL, and then, we
7 modify the measures to meet that percentage
8 change.

9 So, the box at the bottom of the screen
10 here shows five different sources of information
11 that drives the decision-making of what measures
12 are under each alternative. And under the no
13 action alternative, the primary driver is what do
14 we expect harvest to be under status quo measures
15 and how does that compare to the RHL. And for the
16 other options, it will highlight what the
17 different primary sources of information are.
18 Next is the Percent Change option which adds on an
19 additional consideration of biomass compared to
20 the target level when determining what percentage
21 change in harvest are the measures aiming to
22 achieve. So, under this option, it's described

1 best in this table, but there's a lot going on in
2 the table. So, I'm going to kind of take it into
3 few different chunks instead of showing it to you
4 all at once.

5 So, the first step is we consider what
6 do we think harvest will be under status quo
7 measures. And we also, under this option, we have
8 to consider a confidence interval around that
9 estimate. And then, we determine if the upcoming
10 RHL is within, above, or below that confidence
11 interval, and that defines rows A, B, and C here.
12 So, basically, what this is saying is if we leave
13 measures alone, how likely do we think it will be
14 that we will be close to the RHL, or above or
15 below the RHL. And then, the next decision is, or
16 the next comparison is what is biomass compared to
17 the target level. And there's three categories of
18 that, basically, representing very high, moderate,
19 and low, and it's the same categories across rows
20 A, B, and C. So, the combination of those two
21 factors, how do we expect harvest would compare to
22 the RHL in upcoming years. And then, what biomass

1 compared to the target level that determines the
2 outcome in terms of do you change your measures or
3 not, and if they're changed, they're aiming to
4 achieve a percentage liberalization or reduction
5 in harvest that varies depending on biomass
6 compared to the target level. And then, there's
7 some sub-options in here for when you're outside
8 of the confidence interval around your harvest
9 estimate, and I'm not going to walk through the
10 details of it here because that would take too
11 much time.

12 But the gist of it is that when biomass
13 is high, you're allowing for greater
14 liberalizations and lesser restrictions than you
15 would otherwise need compared to if biomass is low
16 where you're more precautionary. And it's meant
17 to kind of mirror things up and down here so that
18 you have liberalizations on one end and reductions
19 on the other end, depending on which side of the
20 confidence interval you're on.

21 Next is the Fishery Score option which
22 combines four metrics into one score. You can see

1 the metrics on the screen here are expected
2 harvest under status quo measures, biomass
3 compared to the target level, fishing mortality,
4 and recruitment. So, there's a formula for this
5 which is actually a pretty simple formula, but
6 each of these four metrics is given a ranking from
7 one to five, and there's details in the document
8 about how that would be assigned. And it's kind
9 of categorizing things in terms of if these
10 indicators you know, are showing something very
11 favorable or very poor, and it's assigned a
12 numerical value based on that. And then, they're
13 all combined into one overall fishery score. And
14 each metric can be assigned a different weighting
15 in this formula. So, if you think some of these
16 factors might be more important than others, you
17 can give them a higher weight, but there's
18 limitations to how you could change those weights
19 so that you're not totally down weighting one.
20 And this is the first option in the document that
21 would place the stock in the one to four
22 management measure bins. So, the bin theme will

1 carry through for two alternatives after this.

2 So, under this option, you can see that
3 the fishery score would range from one to five.
4 And then, it's grouped into four categories with
5 Bin 1 having the highest fishery score
6 representing really good conditions, and you can
7 have the most liberal measures. And you can see,
8 as you get lower fishery scores, you get more
9 restrictive measures. And again, binning things
10 into just four categories so there's four sets of
11 measures. And the idea behind these binned
12 approaches is that the first time we go through
13 the specifications process, we would assign
14 measures to all of these bins. So the next time we
15 go through this specifications process, we're just
16 updating the inputs, in this case, in terms of how
17 do you calculate your fishery score. So, if your
18 score changes from like a four to a three, you
19 move down from Bin 1 to Bin 2, but there's already
20 measures assigned to Bin 2, so, you already know
21 what those measures would be. And unless you have
22 an indication that those measures are no longer

1 appropriate, you would just implement those
2 measures.

3 Next is the Biological Reference Point
4 Approach which is also a binned approach. This
5 one's a little bit more complex because there's
6 primary metrics and then, secondary metrics that
7 are only considered during the second
8 specifications cycle which I'll explain in more
9 detail in the next slide. And there's 13 sets of
10 pre-determined measures for this one. So, first
11 I'll explain how this would work during the first
12 specifications cycle. In the first time around,
13 there's two sources of information that determine
14 which bin you are in. So, you can see on the left
15 column the one indicator is biomass compared to
16 the target level grouped into four different
17 categories. And then, the other indicator is
18 fishing mortality and it's only two categories, is
19 overfishing occurring or is it not. And that
20 combination of those two factors puts you in bins
21 1 through 7. And each bin has a default set of
22 management measures. Again, assigned the first

1 time through the specifications process, assigned
2 for all the bins.

3 So, the first time that you're in a bin,
4 you get the default measures. And then, if you go
5 through the next specifications cycle, and if
6 there's a change in fishing mortality or biomass
7 compared to the target level, that could move you
8 to a different bin. And the first time you move
9 to the next bin, you get the default measures.
10 But if you stay within the same bin after updating
11 those input metrics, then you consider these other
12 secondary metrics which are trend in biomass,
13 recent recruitment, and you're only considering
14 your expectations about harvest compared to
15 harvest limits if overfishing is occurring. And
16 based on those secondary metrics, you can either
17 stay at your default measures, or you can get
18 slightly more liberal or slightly more restrictive
19 depending on which bin that you're in. So, the
20 idea behind this is that if you move from one of
21 these bigger boxes to the other one, you're making
22 a big change in measures. So, this allows for

1 kind of fine tuning if you stay within the same
2 bin. So, potentially, more frequent changes in
3 the fishery score which only have four bins, but
4 when those changes occur, they might be more
5 incremental which have trade-offs for that.

6 Next is the Biomass Based Matrix option
7 which is relatively simple. It's another bin
8 approach. It only has two indicators that drive
9 the selection of the bin. That's biomass compared
10 to the target level, and trend in biomass, is it
11 increasing, stable, or decreasing. And you can
12 see on the slide here how you would use those two
13 factors to put the stock into one of six bins,
14 again, with management measures that would be
15 assigned for all bins the first time we go through
16 the specifications process. So, under all
17 options, there's considerations for all the bins.
18 How do we actually set the measures for each bin?
19 How do we determine what's the most appropriate,
20 you know, most liberal measures or most
21 restrictive measures and all the bins in between?
22 There's options in the document to say that there

1 would need to be a target for each bin. And
2 depending on the option selected, that target is
3 either based on dead catch, harvest, or fishing
4 mortality. And those targets would be based on
5 assumptions about what's the appropriate level of
6 any of those things for the stock conditions
7 associated with that bin. So, if your target is
8 based on catch, dead catch in the recreational
9 fishery, we could be making an assumption about
10 what an appropriate recreational ACL is for that
11 bin. And because each bin would represent a range
12 of conditions, the appropriate target is not going
13 to vary up and down with the same fine scale of
14 changes as, like, the ACL can move up and down.
15 So, we would set one target that's appropriate for
16 that range of conditions, and then, when you meet
17 the threshold to move down to the next bin, then
18 you have a different target. And there's a table
19 on the screen here as an example of what would be
20 representative of biomass level that could
21 assigned to each bin. And then, we would make
22 assumptions about how could we base an ACL, for

1 example, off of that biomass level with the
2 information available to us. And you can see
3 that, you know, this is supposed to represent the
4 entire range of stock conditions, and we're
5 intending to set management measures for all of
6 the bins the first time we go to the
7 specifications process. So, we'll need to make
8 assumptions about, you know, what's going to be
9 appropriate for a biomass level that's very
10 different from the current level. And in the
11 interest of time, I'm not going to read over
12 everything on this slide, but I just wanted to
13 point out that we have thought about
14 accountability measures because, obviously, those
15 are super important for councils. And with the
16 binned approaches, because we're not aiming to
17 pinpoint an RHL or an ACL each year, that the
18 accountability measures would need to be modified
19 to fit within that framework. And we have some
20 considerations for how that would work, and you
21 can read the details in the document. In some
22 cases, it might mean that instead of where you

1 might have had a pound-for- pound payback in the
2 past, maybe under a binned approach, you're just
3 moving down to a more restrictive bin than what
4 you would otherwise be in. But again, I can
5 answer questions about this if desired, but I just
6 wanted to highlight that we have thought about
7 accountability measures and how that would work
8 under this. And I'll think I'll leave it at that
9 for now and happy to take any questions. Thank
10 you.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Julia. So,
12 what I'd like to say is that there's been a lot
13 of, and I've mentioned this during my opening
14 remarks yesterday, there's been a lot of work in
15 the development of this. And it's something that
16 I certainly am excited about as a new approach to
17 coming up with measures for recreational fisheries
18 including other metrics other than just MRIP and
19 harvest and landings. So, I've heard this
20 presentation maybe a dozen times and I'm still
21 trying to figure it out a little bit. So, if some
22 of it kind of went flying over your head, you're

1 in the right place. You belong here. It just
2 gets a little complicated and a little confusing
3 sometimes, but I certainly have a lot of
4 excitement about the possibilities that this work
5 could allow for in our region. So, with that
6 said, Julia, thank you again for the presentation.
7 I'll go to the table to see if anybody has any
8 thoughts, any questions or comments for Julia
9 regarding what she presented. Bill?

10 MR. TWEIT: Thanks, Mr. Chair. And I
11 was really encouraged a little bit by your
12 comments because I may have missed this. Because
13 things were going past my head, too, during the
14 presentation. But what I didn't catch, and it may
15 well have been in there and I just didn't catch
16 it, so please, bear with me, was how these kind of
17 bin approaches deal with the big steps problem.
18 When you move from one bin to another bin,
19 particularly where there's significantly different
20 stock productivity conditions and then, therefore,
21 significantly different conservation concerns, how
22 do you avoid making that step be a very dramatic

1 step in terms of on the water regulations that are
2 felt? It seems to me that that makes it more
3 difficult to achieve some of the stability
4 objectives that I heard you describing at the
5 beginning. And so, I'm just wondering how you are
6 able to achieve the kind of stability that
7 certainly is really important to recreational
8 businesses, at the same time you're making these
9 kind of often pretty big steps in terms of what
10 management framework you're adopting.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Bill, and I'll
12 go to Julia in a second, but I think I can address
13 part of that question. Where the stability comes
14 in has to do with the use of assessment
15 information on more of a cyclical pattern to make
16 management adjustments. Right now, we have
17 considerations for management adjustments on an
18 annual basis. And those steps can often be quite
19 large on an annual basis. And this, some parts of
20 this process allow for establishing measures for
21 multiyear basis between assessments before those
22 changes have to be made. So, that's where the

1 stability comes to play. And I'll go to Julia,
2 maybe she might have another thought on that.
3 Julia?

4 MS. BEATY: Yeah, thank you. That's a
5 good question. And yes, like the Chair said, all
6 options, except of the no action option, would
7 have measures that are in place for two years at a
8 time because for these four stocks, we anticipate
9 that we'll get stock assessment updates every
10 other year. So, we're hoping that in the interim
11 year, we can just leave measures unchanged under
12 these new alternatives unless we get any
13 information to suggest that measures are, like,
14 majorly inappropriate and need to change. But
15 beyond that, it would aim to set measures for two
16 years at a time.

17 But I think the point that you made is
18 an important consideration about the trade-off of,
19 you know, stability in measures versus
20 responsiveness to changing conditions. So, there
21 is different -- some of the alternatives in this
22 action will kind of put you more in one side or

1 the other. So, I put the fishery scores table
2 back up on the screen here to highlight that
3 there's just four bins on this one, and this is
4 intended to represent the entire range of possible
5 stock conditions. So, the measures would probably
6 be pretty drastically different across these four
7 bins. So, you might stay in the same bin for a
8 long time which will give you stability. But when
9 you do need to change, it could be a much bigger
10 change than something like the Biological
11 Reference Point option where you have 13 sets of
12 measures counting the default and the more liberal
13 and more restrictive measures within each bin.
14 So, I think that's something that will be
15 important for the Council and Policy Boards to
16 consider when they're taking final action, you
17 know, where are the appropriate trade-offs there.

18 Another challenge that we've had in
19 communicating, some of this was that, for a number
20 of reasons, we have not gone through the process
21 of saying what are the actual measures for each of
22 these, and that makes it you know, harder to kind

1 of imagine, like, how big of a change might be
2 across some of these options. And again, like I
3 said, those measures will be implemented through
4 the specifications process after final action.

5 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks,
6 Julia. Mike Pentony is with us virtually, and I
7 just got a message from Mike. He wanted to speak
8 to the stability question from Bill. Go ahead,
9 Mike.

10 MR. PENTONY: Yeah. Thanks, Mr.
11 Chairman, and thanks, Bill, for the question. I
12 didn't get to introduce myself yesterday because
13 I'm virtual. This is Mike Pentony, I'm the RA for
14 GARFO. We've been pretty heavily involved with
15 the Council and Commission on this harvest control
16 rule process. And I think, Bill, your question is
17 a really good one. And I think in part, and Julia
18 touched on this, is the trade-off that we're
19 looking at. You know, the trade-off being that
20 instead of changing, tweaking the management
21 measures almost every year because we're chasing
22 an MRIP estimate, instead, as long as the stock

1 stays in one of those boxes, we leave the measures
2 alone and provide that stability you know, to the
3 recreational fishery. But then, the trade- off
4 for that is, as you suggested, if we changed the
5 box we're in, there might be a more substantial
6 shift in the measures than we would have if we
7 were tweaking them every year.

8 But again, under the current process,
9 and Mike Luisi just mentioned this, you know, even
10 under the current process where we're adjusting
11 the measures every year, sometimes we have pretty
12 significant changes from one year to the next just
13 because of how the MRIP estimate shakes out
14 compared to the next year's RHL. So, it's a
15 reasonable question. It's certainly an issue, but
16 I believe it's part, as I said, part of the
17 trade-off that we're trying to achieve here.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thank you
19 for that, Mike. In the interest of time, I'm
20 going to move on to our last presenter. Julia,
21 thank you for your presentation. And if anyone
22 has any follow-up questions, certainly, let me

1 know or let Chris know, and we can get Julia to
2 communicate back to you on the actions that we're
3 taking. We're planning final action on this in
4 June at our June council meeting. So, stay tuned
5 for updates as we make our way through this
6 process.

7 Our last presenter under the
8 Recreational Fisheries Management is Bill Tweit.
9 The North Pacific Council Halibut, my glasses,
10 these are the wrong glasses. I left my good ones
11 upstairs. So, these are, like, my little
12 restaurant glasses I'm trying to read with. The
13 North Pacific Council Halibut Allocation Update.
14 And so, Bill, if you're ready, you can go ahead
15 and get started on that.

16 MR. TWEIT: I am. Should I have the
17 clicker or does somebody want to operate it for
18 me? I'm fine either way.

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: I think we can probably
20 advance the slides.

21 MR. TWEIT: Great.

22 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Just say next slide,

1 and we'll move it along.

2 MR. TWEIT: Okay, fine. Thank you.

3 Along with this presentation, we have also posted
4 on the agenda sort of a short four-page summary of
5 this particular allocation review. And I'm going
6 to talk about a little bit about the review as
7 well as a little bit about the next steps that
8 arose from the review. Next slide, please. So,
9 this is actually the third allocation review that
10 we have undergone at this point, but this is the
11 first one that has actually involved recreational
12 commercial allocation issues. The previous two
13 have just been allocation between different
14 commercial sectors. So, a little bit new ground
15 for us in terms of that, and of course, adding in
16 the recreational commercial allocation aspect
17 always makes it a little more "enjoyable".

18 It's also important to note that this is
19 not the entire recreational sector that we're
20 addressing here. This is just the charter
21 industry. Our catch-sharing plan that was the
22 subject of the review here does not include, does

1 not extend to covering recreational harvest by
2 private anglers who are fishing off their own
3 vessels, nor does it include subsistence harvest
4 which is also fairly substantial, too. But
5 because both those are relatively stable, have
6 been relatively stable, knock on wood, we've just
7 really focused it on the two sectors. They really
8 are pretty dynamic in terms of catch history.

9 It's an abundance-based allocation. So,
10 we did some binning along the lines of what you're
11 looking at there. And also, I just want to flag
12 for everybody that even though halibut are
13 actually not -- don't fall under the Magnuson-
14 Stevens Act because the provisions of the Halibut
15 Treaty between the U.S. and Canada which then lead
16 to domestic laws, our Halibut Act, govern our
17 management framework, but the council made the
18 decision to, for the purposes of this review, to
19 actually utilize the allocation policy that was
20 developed by the service for us under the Magnuson
21 Act. And that framework worked pretty well for
22 us, we think. So, I believe we'll probably

1 continue to do that. So, it doesn't affect the
2 review itself, but it certainly affects how we
3 take action under that. Next. Oh, wait. I've
4 got it.

5 Now, this is as I mentioned, this is our
6 third review and we've really been sort of
7 refining what we call the metrics dashboard
8 approach to undertaking these allocation reviews.
9 They're intended to be a standardized snapshot of
10 the fishery and give us a sense then or give us a
11 way of measuring how the performance of the
12 fishery measured in different ways is, how well
13 it's matching up to our objectives for that
14 fishery, where we're succeeding and where we may
15 be falling short in meeting our objectives. It's
16 proven to be a valuable tool for us through these
17 three -- it's -- the Council finds it quite
18 useful, our SSC really appreciates this approach,
19 and the stakeholders themselves have found this
20 really informative also. So, while we continue to
21 refine it a bit, we like the basic recipe pretty
22 well. And our intent is then to when each one of

1 these that we've reviewed cycles back up for
2 another review our intent is just be able to
3 continue to use this tool, but albeit with a
4 different timespan. So, hopefully, it gives us
5 some continuity through these allocation reviews
6 as well.

7 So, we developed one set of metrics for
8 the commercial fishery that reflect the parameters
9 that are important to understanding the health of
10 the fishery as well as the levels of
11 participation, the range of participation. And
12 similarly, we have a set of metrics for the
13 charter fishery as well. And what we found in the
14 review is, first off, some interesting things that
15 everybody can see, for instance, the effect of the
16 pandemic in 2020, and that sudden drop in
17 participation. And this is the fishery that very
18 much depends, particularly the Southeast Alaska
19 portion of this fishery, very much depends on
20 out-of-state, non-residents participation. The
21 Central Alaska areas, some get a little bit more
22 in-state, but it's so really subject to the

1 fluctuations in the travel industry and the
2 tourism industries, and you can see that showing
3 up here. But it's also as we came to really see
4 through this review, when you're that dependent on
5 the tourism industry, stability, again, is really
6 important. And I think most have similar
7 experience from their perspectives of that. That
8 when you're selling trips a year out, as we often
9 do in the tourism industry, knowing what kind of
10 opportunity, what kind of regulations will be in
11 place, is extremely important. So, going back to
12 some of the issues that were raised in the
13 previous presentation, those hold true for us as
14 well.

15 And so, what we found through this is
16 that we weren't meeting our objectives in several
17 pretty key areas for both fisheries, for both the
18 commercial and the recreational, but in
19 particular, missing some pretty important
20 objectives in the recreational fishery, and one of
21 them is that regulatory stability issue. So, I
22 asked that question and I asked in the previous

1 presentation out of self-interest. In order to
2 try to avoid that big step problem, we've been
3 trying to use this sort of control rule for the
4 allocations and it hasn't worked that well for us.
5 And so, we accepted the review as complete. We
6 found that it was very useful. And we couldn't
7 think of any more that needed to be done relative
8 to the review itself, but we realized that the
9 message from the review was we need to take
10 another look at our catch-sharing plan itself.
11 And so, we did the review itself led right
12 directly to initiation of an analysis to consider
13 revisions to some of the provisions of the
14 catch-sharing plan to see if we could address some
15 of those stability issues that were coming up.
16 And so, we just got that initially sketched out
17 and obviously, we'll take a look at adjusting
18 allocations in both directions in order to have a
19 full range of alternatives for analysis. But
20 either way, there's considerable pain as you look
21 at moving allocations in either direction. And
22 so, there is -- we sort of poked all the dragons

1 in the room simultaneously, but we also indicated
2 an interest in addition to changing that basic
3 sort of control rule approach. Also, just looking
4 at some of these other options about that might
5 also deliver stability.

6 I think the binning approach that
7 Mid-Atlantic is looking at may well be informative
8 for us, also, in terms of trying to generate
9 restrictions that, you know, at a bare minimum, at
10 least remain the same for two years at a time as
11 Mid-Atlantic was discussing. So, we're just
12 starting on that. I don't have a lot more to say
13 about that, but I do want to bring up, we would
14 vastly prefer an alternative approach to the
15 traditional just reexamination of allocations and
16 essentially, forced reallocation. When we've been
17 working hard to try to develop this alternative
18 approach, we really wish it had been completed and
19 ready for action because that would've been the
20 logical next step for us after this five- year
21 review. And that's called our compensated
22 reallocation approach.

1 It's held up really on its very last
2 step. It's in through the council process, it's
3 got pretty strong buy in from all the sectors, and
4 what we now need is just the funding mechanism.
5 Because it's compensated reallocation, it requires
6 development of a pool of revenue in order to
7 actually compensate those who are being
8 reallocated from. But it's intended as well, I
9 don't mean to make it sound like that in any way
10 participation would be mandatory. It is a
11 voluntary program. Those who are ready to sell
12 their shares in the commercial fishery would have
13 a choice of whether they want to sell it to other
14 commercial fishers and keep the commercial side or
15 whether they want to sell it to a recreational
16 quota entity that would exist solely to hold quota
17 on behalf of the recreational fishery. And the
18 purpose of the holding the quota is to hold enough
19 quota to stabilize regulations over time. And
20 what we're waiting for at this point is
21 congressional action to give us the authority for
22 the fee collection and to designate NMFS as the

1 authority that they can do that on behalf of the
2 RQEs. We thought we had it through Congress once.
3 But because of what it was linked up with, the
4 previous administration vetoed it, so, we have to,
5 back to going through Congress. But if we can do
6 this, we think we have a much better set of tools,
7 hopefully, maybe even in time to respond to this
8 five-year review, but certainly, we would strongly
9 desire to have it in place before the next
10 five-year review.

11 I'd be happy to answer questions about
12 this. I don't want to dive too deeply. I believe
13 we've described this for the CCC in the past to
14 some extent. But to us, it still looks like a
15 very workable approach and a way to really ensure
16 longer-term stability for the charter recreational
17 sector at least, so with that, I can take
18 questions.

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah. Thanks for the
20 presentation, Bill. Given the interest of time,
21 we're a little bit over our agenda time limit for
22 this topic, but I'll go ahead and entertain a

1 question or two, or a comment or two from the CCC.
2 Does anyone have anything to ask Bill about? All
3 right, seeing none. Bill, you did a great job.
4 You answered everybody's questions already.
5 Perfect.

6 Okay. We're going to dive right into
7 the next item on our agenda before we take a break
8 in about an hour. The next item is the Management
9 Strategy Evaluations discussion. Brandon Muffley
10 with Council staff is going to facilitate this
11 discussion and introduce the speakers. Brandon is
12 not -- was not able to be with us today, so, he'll
13 be participating virtually, and I'll be calling on
14 CCC members around the table for questions and
15 comments. Brandon, if you want to do a mic check,
16 and I'm going to turn things over to you.

17 MR. MUFFLEY: Good afternoon, Mike. Can
18 you hear me all right?

19 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yup, we hear you great.
20 It's all yours.

21 MR. MUFFLEY: Great. Thanks, Mr.
22 Chairman. I am certainly disappointed I couldn't

1 be out there this week in person, but I wanted to
2 start by thanking the Council leadership and the
3 CCC for supporting and bringing this topic up and
4 making time on the agenda to talk about Management
5 Strategy Evaluations. I think it's a really
6 timely discussion given that the Councils are
7 really beginning to utilize or consider Management
8 Strategy Evaluation in the future, and NOAA
9 Fisheries is really continuing to invest and build
10 capacity to support that work. And so, I'm
11 looking forward to this discussion and see where
12 we, you know, collectively may be headed with
13 Management Strategy Evaluation. And you'll
14 actually hear a lot of the issues that you've been
15 talking about all day today, like, climate change,
16 and distribution shifts, and recreational
17 management are all sort of tied together into the
18 Management Strategy Evaluation topic we'll talk
19 about. So, next slide, Steven.

20 And so, with that, I'll jump right in.
21 There's a lot of things I'd like to cover.
22 There's so much sort of happening within

1 Management Strategy Evaluation, but really planned
2 to just start with a high-level overview of
3 Management Strategy Evaluation. I'm certainly not
4 an expert in it, but I've learned a lot going
5 through the different processes we've done in the
6 Mid-Atlantic Council, and really, looking to just
7 try to set the stage for everyone so that we're
8 all on the same page and why the Councils might
9 want to consider using them in the future. So,
10 I'll cover some general takeaways from the
11 National Scientific Coordination Subcommittee
12 Workshop that was held in 2018 on Management
13 Strategy Evaluation, and sort of the relevant
14 guidance and areas of consideration that SSC have
15 identified at the time. I'll take some host
16 council liberty to go over some of the
17 Mid-Atlantic Council experiences and some of our
18 approaches with Management Strategy Evaluation. I
19 won't go into details of some of those things, but
20 I just want to focus on where we incorporated the
21 feedback that I heard from other Councils and
22 stakeholders regarding their recommendations or

1 concerns about utilizing Management Strategy
2 Evaluation. And I'll provide a summary of the
3 feedback I received from the other Councils on
4 their engagement and the types of topics that
5 Councils are considering using the Management
6 Strategy Evaluation for. And I'll turn it over to
7 Tom Nies to talk about the experiences in New
8 England and they have quite a few of them. And
9 then, to Dave Witherell from the North Pacific to
10 talk about their areas of engagement and how they
11 may have changed over time. And the, we'll hear
12 from Dr. Jon Hare on the NOAA Fisheries
13 perspective and how and where NMFS and the
14 Councils maybe can collaborate and engage more
15 often on Management Strategy Evaluation projects.
16 And then, finally, I'll have a sort of a final
17 summary of the feedback I received from the other
18 Councils on the challenges they're experiencing or
19 the impediments that they're facing in regarding
20 to starting or conducting Management Strategy
21 Evaluation and sort of what topics might be right
22 for a future Management Strategy Evaluation

1 development. And I asked them with some questions
2 that I hope can kick start some discussions with
3 the group on where we can improve and advance
4 management Strategy Evaluation within the council
5 process. So, next slide.

6 Again, so, a really high-level of
7 introduction on what MSEs are. In all the
8 literature I've read or the presentations that
9 I've listened to about Management Strategy
10 Evaluation, they really highlight that this is a
11 process and I have a simplified conceptual figure
12 there to sort of show you the steps through the
13 Management Strategy Evaluation process. But more
14 than anything, you know, it's really clear that
15 with management strategies, that we can evaluate
16 and compare their performance to addressing
17 different management objectives. And really, the
18 key point here is we can evaluate those before we
19 actually implement them. And so, the process
20 allows one to ask though a Management Strategy
21 Evaluation if we manage the system, like, Option
22 X, how and what are the likely consequences

1 compared to managing Option Y or Z? And so, we
2 really get a sense of what those trade-offs are
3 across our different management strategies that we
4 might consider.

5 And so, in management strategies, we
6 typically use quantitative models you know, to
7 help us understand the consequences of different
8 management alternatives by modeling the population
9 or the populations of interest, the ecosystem in
10 which those sort of fisheries operate, and the key
11 uncertainties like distribution shifts or data or
12 changes in the stock productivity, and then, how
13 all of these components interact with one another
14 and what those implications might be.

15 So, it's likely that our Management
16 Strategy Evaluation isn't going to specify sort of
17 the single best you know, outcome or alternative
18 because we have a lot of different goals that we
19 may be trying to achieve. And sometimes, those
20 goals may be competing goals. So, it could get us
21 sort of suite of alternatives that would work best
22 across all of the different you know, trade-offs

1 that we're considering. But Management Strategy
2 Evaluations are definitely a good at highlighting
3 those alternatives that perform poorly and don't
4 meet our management objectives, so, they would be,
5 therefore, we wouldn't consider. So, they're good
6 at throwing out management strategies that we
7 wouldn't want to consider because they just don't
8 meet what we're trying to achieve. So, next
9 slide.

10 And so, given that very high-level basic
11 framework, why might the councils consider a
12 Management Strategy Evaluation or what benefits
13 could be derived by going through this extensive
14 process? And so, I really think that the first
15 two bullets on this slide really get at why I
16 think it's important because they can provide
17 information that's typically not provided or
18 available to management when making sort of
19 traditional decision that councils need to make.
20 And so, the ability to really evaluate and
21 quantify and consider trade-offs. I think, can be
22 extremely helpful and identify truly important

1 considerations when you won't be able to maximize
2 or realize all of the objectives equally. We were
3 just talking about trade-offs in the last
4 discussion, and I think Management Strategy
5 Evaluation really allows you to sort of quantify
6 what those trade-offs may be.

7 In addition, you know, through different
8 operating model configurations, you can also test
9 how robust are different management strategies
10 might be for these uncertainties. And so, do
11 management strategies perform well across all of
12 our different uncertainties, or do they only
13 perform well under certain circumstances? And so,
14 typically, you know, the Management Strategy
15 Evaluation process also allows us to evaluate
16 things through the entire management process. So,
17 we can see how a management alternative or a
18 different operating model configuration might
19 change stock conditions, and how those stock
20 conditions might change reference points, and
21 then, how those reference points lead into catch
22 limits. So, it's a really unique way of really

1 being able to see how you can push the management
2 system and what those implications are on the
3 stock.

4 And hopefully, in the -- through the
5 alternative Management Strategy Evaluation, we
6 don't wind up like the picture on the bottom right
7 there where we have planes sort of crashing into
8 trees, where this allows us really to sort of test
9 strategies and do a lot of simulations. It's okay
10 to burn and crash a lot of computer airplanes, but
11 it's really expensive and it's really you know,
12 problematic when you actually implement something,
13 and it doesn't end up working out. And the
14 Management Strategy Evaluation allows us to
15 evaluate those sorts of what make work and what
16 may not work.

17 But this process certainly doesn't make
18 decisions any easier. We typically use Management
19 Strategy Evaluation to address our bigger issues
20 and sort of more complex topics, but hopefully,
21 the process helps and offers a sort of avenue for
22 dialogue between managers, stakeholders,

1 scientists in terms of what's been happening.
2 And, like I said above, sort of provide some new
3 and different information that you typically don't
4 get when you're making a decision. And hopefully,
5 if you set up everything appropriately, at the end
6 of your specific Management Strategy Evaluation,
7 you'll have tools and models available for future
8 use and other priorities. And so, hopefully,
9 that's something you'll be able to take away as
10 well.

11 And so, this slide really here in
12 regards to the outcomes from the National SCS
13 Workshop in 2018, is really -- I just want to
14 focus on those areas that I felt were relevant for
15 council consideration. The proceeding document
16 has lots of details in regards to case studies and
17 sort of recommendations, but this is where some of
18 the areas where I felt we could take home for the
19 Council. So, the SSCs really focused on
20 stakeholder engagement and how important that is.
21 However, there's a lot to that, too, so,
22 understanding what everybody's roles and

1 responsibilities are, not just stakeholders, but
2 managers, the analysts involved, and everybody
3 that engaged in the process. And once you start
4 this process, you need a commitment to be engaged
5 throughout.

6 Clear communication of results is really
7 important as well. There's a lot of information
8 that comes out of a Management Strategy
9 Evaluation, so, providing simple consistent
10 results is really important. And there's a lot of
11 ways to sort of highlight uncertainty, right?
12 There's uncertainty in our results, there's
13 uncertainty into the inputs that go into the
14 Management Strategy Evaluation, and there's
15 uncertainty under these underlying mechanisms that
16 may be driving stock dynamics. And so, how do we
17 present and show those uncertainties is really
18 important as well. And then, there's lots of
19 roles and responsibilities that can take place.

20 The SSC recommended that Management
21 Strategy Evaluations consider including economists
22 and social scientists. So, not just only focusing

1 on the biology, but some of these other components
2 of Management Strategy Evaluation as well. They
3 supported the use of independent facilitators and
4 I'll talk about that a little bit later. And they
5 have indicated that the lead analyst shouldn't
6 lead the project. Right? Their focus should be
7 on the modeling framework, but sometimes, they're
8 maybe not the best at communicating those kind of
9 information and the results. And you really want
10 to limit the complexity in terms of the modeling
11 efforts that the leading analysts are undertaking.
12 So, next slide.

13 So, I'll start by getting into some of
14 the Mid- Atlantic's experience with Management
15 Strategy Evaluations. And I'm really just
16 starting off here by highlighting that there are
17 differences in how Management Strategy Evaluation
18 can be conducted, and you really want to sort of
19 tailor the type of Management Strategy Evaluation
20 for the scope and the need of the issue that
21 you're working on. And so, these are my technical
22 terms for the types of Management Strategy

1 Evaluations. So, one would be a Desktop
2 Management Strategy Evaluation which is more sort
3 of analyst-focused that's developing the
4 simulation models built to address a particular
5 problem or topic with some interaction between
6 council and council staff and maybe the SSCs. But
7 these sorts of Management Strategy Evaluations
8 tend to be, you know, use more straightforward
9 topics and generally, can be done a little bit
10 faster versus a full-blown MSE that really
11 utilizes a much more extensive stakeholder
12 engagement process, more interaction between the
13 analyst, the Council, staff, and the stakeholders
14 that are working through a very deliberative
15 process. And so, these types of Management
16 Strategy Evaluations tend to take a lot more time
17 and used, generally, to look at more complex, less
18 straightforward sort of issues.

19 And the Council has used Desktop
20 Management Strategy Evaluations on a number of
21 occasions and the last one is in regards to the
22 Council's risk policy. I'm not going to go into

1 the details of the changes to the risk policy, but
2 I just want to highlight the types of information
3 that our Management Strategy Evaluation can
4 provide. And so, when the Council revisited its
5 risk policy in 2019, there was not only interest
6 in looking at the biological considerations of the
7 risk policy, but also, the economic and social
8 factors. And so, when you look at that figure on
9 the upper right-hand side there, which looks at
10 the probability of overfishing across all the
11 different alternatives that were considered under
12 a range of different scenarios, I just want you to
13 focus on the green bars on the right hand side
14 which simulate the status quo risk policy, and
15 then, the yellow bars next to it which represented
16 you know, one of the alternatives that made a
17 slight tweak to the risk policy.

18 And so, the alternative in yellow may
19 have resulted in a slightly higher risk of
20 overfishing compared to the status quo, but it
21 remained well below the legal maximum of 50
22 percent. But when you look at catch, both

1 short-term and long-term, in the bottom figure,
2 the yellow alternative resulted in much greater
3 benefits and higher catch to the fishery compared
4 to the status quo alternative. And we even built
5 in an economic model within this Management
6 Strategy Evaluation, and the results from that
7 model had indicated that by utilizing that risk
8 policy in yellow, we increased the economic
9 welfare in the summer flounder fishery alone by
10 \$7.2 million in the first year and \$36 million
11 more to the fishery over the first five years of
12 implementation.

13 So, it's in this kind of information
14 that the Council was able to see that looking at
15 and revising the risk policy and they actually
16 made a change to the risk policy back in 2020
17 based off of this information. They didn't go
18 with what was exactly there in yellow, but they
19 went with something fairly similar to that. And
20 so now, we're going through a full-blown
21 management Strategy Evaluation right now. This is
22 our first one and we're about two years into the

1 process, and we're coming to the end with the
2 final results that are expected to be presented to
3 the Council in August. And we're focusing on
4 recreational summer flounder discards and I'll
5 step through those details in the next slide.
6 There we go.

7 Yep, there we go. So, Management
8 Strategy Evaluation is actually built into the
9 Council's EAFM guidance document which seeks to
10 more fully account for and incorporate ecosystem
11 factors in consideration into the Council's single
12 species management process. And again, I'm not
13 going to go into the details of our EAFM guidance
14 document, but just really utilizing this
15 structured decision process that we have in
16 regards to addressing some of the Management
17 Strategy Evaluation recommendations and feedback
18 that I have received prior to starting this
19 project. So, the first step in this decision
20 framework is conducting a risk assessment across
21 all of our managed fisheries, and we look at about
22 two different -- two dozen different indicators

1 and the relative risks to achieving our management
2 objectives across all of those indicators. And
3 so, coming out of that original risk assessment in
4 2017, summer flounder had the greatest number of
5 moderate-high or high-risk factors. So, given
6 that information, the Council decided to move on
7 to the next step in this process which is
8 Conceptual Model Development for summer flounder.
9 So, next slide.

10 And so, we've used this conceptual model
11 process to map out the entire summer flounder
12 ecosystem. So, both within the population and
13 within the fishery and we identified sort of the
14 key linkages throughout the ecosystem. And these
15 linkages between elements of the summer flounder
16 ecosystem are sort of captured there on that
17 figure there on right-hand side. And that figure
18 on the right-hand side is actually sort of an
19 interactive tool where you can play around with
20 the different linkages, and you can see the
21 different components of the ecosystem are actually
22 connected to one another. And so, we used this

1 conceptual model to identify a number of different
2 priority management questions and issues that the
3 Council may want to consider through a Management
4 Strategy Evaluation.

5 And the Council ultimately use this
6 information to decide on the project that would
7 evaluate the biological and economic benefits to
8 minimize summer flounder discards. And then, how
9 we can convert those discards into landings and
10 identify management strategies to realize those
11 benefits. So, you know, the Council thought that
12 this was a good opportunity to align the work that
13 we've done through the EAFM process within their
14 sort of traditional fisheries management process.
15 But we wanted to keep the project focused you
16 know, within the ecosystem, so, certainly, some of
17 those uncertainties we plan to evaluate in the
18 Management Strategy Evaluation are looking at you
19 know, sort of potential bias in recreational catch
20 and effort data or stock distribution shifts and
21 how those things may be impacting discards. And
22 so, we utilize those first two steps of our EAFM

1 process to really identify a fishery at risk and
2 then, identify a problem or issue on which to
3 focus our resources. And so, to this slide, we
4 really built this Management Strategy Evaluation
5 to focus on a strong stakeholder engagement
6 process.

7 So, one, we wanted to do that because we
8 wanted to inform our stakeholders about what
9 Management Strategy Evaluation is and why it might
10 be beneficial, and to try to alleviate some
11 concerns about conducting Management Strategy
12 Evaluation. Some people in our region have been
13 involved in some other projects who felt that
14 conducting management Strategy Evaluation might
15 not be most appropriate. So, we started those
16 initial conversations with an outreach with our
17 relevant advisory panels. And then, we wanted to
18 sort of capture the diversity of opinions and
19 considerations in the recreational community.
20 There's a really diverse, you know, there are --
21 we have very diverse sectors that fish for summer
22 flounder, and we have different experiences across

1 all the different states from Massachusetts to
2 North Carolina. So, really getting their input
3 was important to driving this process, too.

4 And lastly, we wanted to develop a
5 process in which we could find a small core group
6 of stakeholders that would be committed to the
7 process in order to help provide focus, input, and
8 direction on the project. And so, we set up all
9 of the things, the amount of feedback and sort of
10 response that we got for the project was really
11 you know, quite surprising to me. In regards to
12 the online scoping feedback that we put out, we
13 had over 800 people respond to that. And when we
14 were trying to identify members to the core
15 stakeholder group, we had over 400 people that
16 expressed interest in serving on that core group
17 and we had spots for 15. So, trying to whittle
18 over 400 people down to 15 was quite challenging,
19 but just the amount of interest and the amount of
20 input that we received through all of this
21 stakeholder input was really quite encouraging.
22 And so, next slide.

1 And sort of related to this, we also
2 spent a lot of time in this process sort of
3 working in collaborative arena between the core
4 stakeholder group that I just mentioned and the
5 technical work group or modeling team that we
6 have. So, these two groups met together, well,
7 will have met together through five different
8 workshops over the course of a year. So, these
9 workshops primarily focused on refining,
10 clarifying, and prioritizing project objectives,
11 metrics, you know, our performance metrics,
12 management scenarios, and trade-off weightings.
13 And so, the core stakeholder group would provide
14 their input on different components of the
15 management Strategy Evaluation, and then, their
16 feedback and recommendations would be presented to
17 the Council for their review and approval, and
18 they'd also be considered by the technical work
19 group.

20 And so, the technical work group would
21 go back and sort of look at the feedback that the
22 core stakeholders group was providing and think

1 about what areas do we actually have data for, and
2 what can and can't we model given the sort of
3 structure of models that we have, and what are our
4 uncertainties. And so then, at a subsequent
5 meeting, the technical work group would present
6 sort of all of this information, what's been done,
7 and how the core group feedback has been addressed
8 or not. And we sort of continue this iterative
9 (phonetic) process of engagement and feedback
10 between the two groups that I think has really
11 served us well, and I think, generally, has led to
12 support for the process. And we'll see, the
13 outcomes aren't exactly there yet, but, you know,
14 how those outcomes, might be and certainly, at
15 least how the outcomes were developed and
16 considered. So, I think it's been a good process
17 to go through that. So, next slide.

18 So, as I indicated earlier, we're not
19 quite done with this project, but we're close.
20 And I certainly have some early takeaways and
21 perspectives, and these are my own and maybe not
22 of the other core group or the technical work

1 group that's been engaged. And so, I think
2 timelines certainly are important. They are
3 important to all of our work. But I also realize
4 that timelines -- some timelines help keep us on
5 task with things, but I also realize that they
6 need to be flexible because things aren't going to
7 go as planned, thinking about you know, running
8 all of these workshops through a hybrid approach,
9 given COVID, and all of those things, so, things
10 take -- have taken more time. So now, you need to
11 be flexible, you need to add on more time because
12 it takes longer than you think to get some of this
13 work done.

14 Facilitation, which is one of the
15 recommendations by the SSC's, we've utilized here,
16 and I think has been really helpful, and we did
17 use somebody independent. So, they're outside of
18 our region. They don't have any stake in the
19 game, they don't really even know all that much
20 about the summer flounder fishery, but they do
21 have a lot of expertise in Management Strategy
22 Evaluation and structured decision-making which

1 has been really helpful to get as much information
2 out of our core group as possible.

3 And defining clear objectives, and
4 that's why I sort of when through the process of
5 our EAFM guidance document. We used that process
6 to identify our priority issue. And that helped
7 keep us focused because as we are going through
8 this process, people had other interests and maybe
9 we should be focusing on something else, but we
10 had a process that we went through, the Council
11 was really interested in addressing this discard
12 issue. So, we're able to pull people away from
13 other areas that they might be interested in and
14 keep them focused here.

15 Another really critical component of
16 this is the future utility of the work that you're
17 developing right now. And so, we have models that
18 I think we're creating here through this
19 Management Strategy Evaluation that are not only
20 going to be really helpful to this project that
21 we're working on, but I think are going to have a
22 lot of potential application after the fact. That

1 can make things a little bit harder because people
2 are thinking about how we can utilize these models
3 in other ways, but I think it has helped increase
4 buy-in in regards to seeing how these models and
5 how this information can be used going forward.

6 We've kept this project separate from a
7 very specific management action. Clearly, one
8 connection to a management issue or concern, but
9 we didn't want it tied to a specific amendment or
10 framework action because then, we'd then feel sort
11 of pressured to have this work wrapped up by
12 specific deadline at the end. And you know,
13 that's a double- edged sword, right? You don't
14 want the process to extend too long either. You
15 want to make sure you wrap it up and it's still
16 useful, but not being tied to a specific
17 management action, and I think that was actually
18 helpful. Now, hopefully, management action will
19 come out of the project, but it's not tied to a
20 specific action. And then, Commitment, and I mean
21 commitment to everybody's time, the Council's
22 commitment in investing in doing Management

1 Strategy Evaluation, and committing to the
2 process. This work takes a lot of time. It's not
3 always intuitive in terms of where we're going
4 with this project and understanding what the exact
5 outcomes will be and how it's going to be applied
6 to management. So, sticking with it and being
7 committed, I think, is really important. The next
8 slide.

9 And so, when the CCC agreed to have this
10 topic on the agenda, I started pestering the other
11 science folks at the other Councils to get their
12 perspective on their Management Strategy
13 Evaluation. So, I sent questions to each of them
14 and asked them to respond with their regional
15 perspectives. And so, we'll get some additional
16 details from Tom and Dave in a little bit, but I
17 just wanted to offer a quick summary of some of
18 the feedback that I did get. So, thanks to all of
19 the Council staff out there that provided me some
20 responses here. And what I found in the feedback
21 that I did get, that there's certainly a wide
22 range of sort of utility and use of Management

1 Strategy Evaluations and how the different
2 Councils have actually gone about sort of working
3 with the science centers in creating that. And
4 so, most of the you know, feedback that I did get,
5 many councils are considering, but not all of them
6 have conducted management Strategy Evaluation yet.
7 And some of the projects have been in Council lead
8 with Science Center Support which is the sort of
9 project we're working on, but some Management
10 Strategy Evaluations have been where the Science
11 Centers in their regions have led them with some
12 or no council engagement. They've also been used
13 by councils by bringing on contractors, there's
14 somebody in academia to help support particularly
15 within the modeling framework.

16 And the topics that the folks are either
17 utilizing them for or considering, it was really
18 interesting to get some of that feedback and
19 thinking about now prohibited species, catch
20 limits, and how that might be impacting you know,
21 applicable fisheries, allocations. We were just
22 talking about some of the allocations in the

1 previous discussions, and allocations across a
2 variety of different ways, regional allocations or
3 spatial considerations, allocations across sectors
4 or within different fleets, and so, utilizing
5 Management Strategy Evaluation to look at those
6 lots of different areas across recreational
7 fisheries issues, changes in seasons, or
8 addressing discards or some of these multi-
9 fishery interactions that may be taking place, or
10 potentially, using -- utilizing Management
11 Strategy Evaluation with our different objectives
12 across management entities. So, it was really
13 neat to see the different perspectives that are
14 taking place. And so, next slide.

15 I'm going to stop talking for a little
16 bit. I'm going to turn it over to Tom Nies to
17 talk about some of the New England Council
18 perspectives.

19 MR. NIES: Thank you, Brandon. Next
20 slide, please. The New England Council basically
21 has used Management Strategy Evaluation on five
22 different -- we've actually used it on three

1 different things. We just issued an RFP used it
2 on a fourth, and we're considering using it on a
3 fifth issue. I'm really only going to focus
4 primarily our use of MSE to develop a control rule
5 for the Atlantic herring FMP. The second and
6 third items there that we completed or really,
7 that I would characterize using Brandon's term as
8 a Desktop MSE, they were used to identify
9 management alternatives for our ground fish plan.
10 Next slide, please.

11 So, there was interest in the Council in
12 developing an ABC control rule for Atlantic
13 herring that explicitly considered the role of
14 herring as forage fish in the ecosystem. So, to
15 do that, we decided to use the Management Strategy
16 Evaluation, and to do that, and as Brandon pointed
17 out, it can take a long time. It took us really
18 about almost four years for the whole process.
19 With the development of the MSE approach, would be
20 about two years. The development of the operating
21 model and the MSE structure was work that was done
22 almost entirely two center scientists working with

1 our herring plan development team and a few other
2 people. But the bulk of that technical work was
3 contributed on this effort by the Science Center.

4 I would refer to this as what Brandon
5 called a full or full-fledged MSE. We had
6 extensive meetings with stakeholders to identified
7 the desired objectives, figure out how to present
8 information, and help to narrow the alternatives
9 that were examined in that. There was a lot of
10 interaction through a series of workshops with the
11 scientists that had developed the MSE. There was
12 a need to do a lot of education of stakeholders
13 right at the beginning. And I'll get into the
14 stakeholder concerns in a little bit in a minute.
15 And in addition to extensive support from the
16 Center, we used a lot of council staff time and
17 regional office staff time as well. In addition,
18 we spent about \$65,000 on various contractors to
19 help support the project. Next slide, please.

20 One of the questions Brandon asked us to
21 identify was were the results used? Yes, they
22 were. They led to amendment toward our herring

1 plan which adopted an ABC control rule that
2 basically came out of the MSE process with a
3 slight modification by the Council with final
4 action. We used it to identify the specific
5 alternatives that were considered. We used it to
6 compare them and ultimately, select the final
7 action. This led to two journal articles that
8 were published. One was published primarily on
9 the technical aspects of the MSE. And the other
10 journal article that was published, more I would
11 call it, on the process that we used with the
12 stakeholders. We developed a -- I guess we called
13 it a debrief of the MSE process with interviews
14 and questionnaires to develop some lessons
15 learned. We also made, what admittedly, is a
16 somewhat a nebulous commitment to try and update
17 the MSE in five years. Next slide, please.

18 What did we learn? We found that
19 periodic updates with the process to the Council
20 helped us. It got the Council to approve the
21 milestones, it helped increase participation and
22 understanding. We found the use of the outside

1 consultants critical. The consultants were used
2 really in two ways, facilitation of the
3 stakeholder meetings. But in addition to that, we
4 brought in some consultants to help us try and
5 figure out ways to present the information so that
6 the public can understand it. If you've had
7 experience with MSEs, you know that the scientists
8 have great ways that they like to put together,
9 these radar plots and other things that many
10 people find almost incomprehensible. And so, it
11 was very helpful to try and work with someone who
12 can try and take that and try and make it
13 understandable to the public.

14 We had a subpanel peer-review, the MSE.
15 It helped us to validate the models, it lent to
16 some credibility to the models with the public,
17 and also increased the Council's confidence in
18 using it. During the development of the MSE, we
19 were working on two things, an ABC control rule
20 and the idea that we might have some areas where
21 midwater trawling was prohibited. And at a lot of
22 the initial meetings, the public was asking us to

1 try and incorporate both of those ideas into an
2 MSE, and that's not what we intended to do and we
3 resisted that. We stayed focused on the specific
4 problems in the control rules. That didn't
5 necessarily go over very well, but I think it
6 helped us improve the timeline on the MSE which I
7 said was really not all that fast to begin with.
8 One of the other things we learned is that
9 overall, we need -- there's a need to develop more
10 MSE capacity in the region. I'll talk about that
11 in a minute when I talk lessons learned. Next
12 slide, please.

13 I'd like to talk briefly about the
14 request for proposal that we just released last
15 night. You can read it on our webpage if you
16 really want to. We were working on an ecosystem
17 -- I'm sorry, an example of fisheries ecosystem
18 plan for the Georges Bank Ecosystem Production
19 Unit. We've been working on it for a number of
20 years and we're at the stage now where we're
21 planning to use a Management Strategy Evaluation
22 to try and demonstrate how well it works and to

1 explore how well this approach may work.

2 Described but different I think that many of the
3 other Councils have done in their ecosystem
4 approaches to fisheries management are trying to
5 incorporate ecosystem principles into their single
6 species management. If this were to be followed,
7 if this needs to be followed all the way to the
8 end, they could completely revamp how we manage
9 fisheries on Georges Bank and replace it with this
10 fisheries ecosystem plan.

11 So, the goal of this MSE is to compare
12 our approach with the existing primarily single
13 species management system. And in particular,
14 another important part of this is to try and show
15 whether and how the proposed strategy would have
16 biological outcomes that are consistent with the
17 Magnuson- Stevens Act's National Standard I
18 requirements.

19 In my opinion, this is going to be a
20 much higher level of complexity than the MSEs that
21 we've already done. The economic modeling
22 involved, for example, is going to have to account

1 for the possible targeting of high-value species
2 in the stock complex where the catch limits are
3 based on the stock complex rather than the
4 individual species level. As I said, we're just
5 issuing the RFP, we're hoping to get this started
6 sometime in July after we award the contract.

7 Next slide, please.

8 So, some general comments. Just at the
9 high level, I think it's important when you do MSE
10 to try and manage the expectations. When we did
11 the Atlantic herring FMP and were exploring
12 interaction of forage fish, one of the problems we
13 had is we really did not have a lot of data on how
14 much herring things eat. You ask how much herring
15 do seals eat, you don't really get a good answer
16 because no one really knows. And so, you wind up
17 using some sort of proxy to examine that in the
18 MSE. And then, in addition to that, we really
19 don't have any feedback links on the link between
20 predators and prey, and the consumption rates, and
21 how those two interact. So, you have to kind of
22 manage your expectations on what you're actually

1 going to be able to model. The other thing we
2 learned and we are leaning is we have a lot of MSE
3 approaches and the fact is that the Science Center
4 cannot support them all. They can't support all
5 of ours and we remember that our Science Center
6 supports two councils, and I don't doubt they can
7 support all the ones in the Mid either. You know,
8 we all are already having problems with the
9 inability of the Science Center to do the full --
10 to fill scientific positions due to budget
11 constraints. It's leading to short falls in our
12 stock assessment output, and it also clearly
13 limits how well they can respond to our MSE
14 initiative.

15 So, what this means is that we wind up
16 looking for external contractors. And we've been
17 lucky we have some contractors in the region who
18 can do this, but they're not cheap and they're not
19 fast apparently. We did our two desk top MSEs
20 that I mentioned. Those, to be honest, were
21 relatively straightforward MSEs. Now, examining
22 control rules is something a lot of people have

1 done. And the other one, where we're looking at
2 changes in -- changing trend in the inaccuracy of
3 catches that's going to stock assessments, is
4 another one that is relatively straightforward to
5 look at. Each of the two of those, not each of
6 those. The total price for the two of those was
7 about \$150,000 and each took about a year to get
8 completed. And there's not a lot of stakeholder
9 engagement or anything else in that, so, that was
10 a pretty simple one. I think when you're
11 developing an MSE, because of some of these
12 limitations, you have to decide upfront, is this a
13 one-time effort or are we making a commitment to
14 do this periodically? I mentioned on Atlantic
15 herring, we all recognize some of the shortfalls.
16 We all said let's come back in five years and try
17 and try and redo it and update and see if we can
18 do a better job the next time around. It remains
19 to be seen whether we're going to have the time
20 and resources to do that.

21 Our herring process took two years
22 which, you know, in Council time, is like

1 overnight, I guess. But you know, two years was
2 kind of a long time to complete something like
3 that. We wanted to get it done in two years
4 because it was tied to a management action, and
5 many people said it felt rushed for all kinds of
6 reasons when we were done. We got a lot of
7 complaints that we actually went too fast.

8 The last thing I'll mention is
9 stakeholder engagement can be kind of tricky. If
10 you look at the Mid- Atlantic's -- Brandon's
11 presentation, he goes into this a little more than
12 I will, but you got a lot of questions you got to
13 ask. If you're holding a workshop, everybody who
14 walks in the door or is it a select group. Our
15 approach was to let anybody walk in the door to
16 participate in the workshop. It's free. We got
17 people in the door who literally knew nothing
18 about fisheries management. They were bird
19 people, and birds eat herring, so, they wanted to
20 show up and talk about it. But they had no idea
21 how fisheries management worked, and they wanted
22 to know how come this wasn't going to be done

1 tomorrow. Right? So, you have got to -- you have
2 to weigh those things, you know? How do you
3 control that?

4 The other thing that is a little bit of
5 an issue with stakeholders is that you want to
6 bring them in the room, you want to have them help
7 you identify issues, you want to help them help
8 you identify alternatives, but the fact is they're
9 not the decision-makers. So, you get this package
10 from the stakeholders and you take it to the
11 Council, and the Council either narrows the
12 alternatives down, and makes a decision. And some
13 of the stakeholders go, you didn't pick my
14 alternative as one of the ones you're going to
15 look at, and why should I bother coming in the
16 door again tomorrow? And that's something that's
17 difficult to deal with. And the other think I'll
18 mention just briefly, I've already talked about it
19 a little bit, is you can get so much information
20 out of an MSE that trying to figure out how to
21 present it in a way that people can digest it can
22 be very difficult. And that concludes my

1 presentation. I don't know if Brandon's going to
2 switch it over or who it goes to.

3 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes, Tom, thanks. I'm
4 going to go back to Brandon. And I think what
5 we'll do with time in mind, we'll just go through
6 all the presentations and then, offer an
7 opportunity for CCC members to ask questions and
8 provide comments. So, I think the next, Brandon,
9 I'll just turn it back to you to call on the next
10 Presenter.

11 MR. MUFFLEY: Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chair.
12 So, next we have is Dave Witherell from the North
13 Pacific Council to sort of run through some of
14 their experiences as well. I'll turn it over to
15 you, Dave.

16 MR. WITHERELL: Thanks, Brandon. I
17 don't have a fancy slideshow presentation, but I
18 just want to relay our experience with MSEs. The
19 Science Center conducted several MSEs in the late
20 2000s starting with single species MSEs to
21 evaluate our control rules, moving ahead towards
22 multi- species, multi-fisheries MSEs, again,

1 evaluating our control rules in that system. And
2 because there weren't any management changes
3 necessary, the Council was basically unaware that
4 these MSEs were being conducted, and they were
5 really only discussed by the assessment authors
6 and, to some extent, our SSC. The Council's first
7 real experience with an MSE came when we were
8 evaluating changing bycatch limits established for
9 our ground fisheries, specifically our bycatch
10 limits for halibut.

11 And the Council and SSC had kind of been
12 convinced that an MSE for this situation could be
13 developed in concert with our typical analyses in
14 about six months and you know, give us the answers
15 that we needed. On what are the effects on the
16 stock? What are the effects on the different
17 sectors of the fishery? Well, after three years,
18 the SSC was still arguing about different
19 parameters. And in the end, the SSC advice that
20 the MSE could not be used as a basis for
21 management action by the Council because there was
22 so much uncertainty relative to some of the key

1 parameters, that you couldn't rely on the results
2 the MSE for decision making. So, part of that is
3 a mismatch. I echo every general comment that Tom
4 made. There's a real mismatch in timing and
5 expectations. Like I said, we thought it was
6 going to done quickly. It took over three years
7 to pull together. It was what you would call a
8 full-blown MSE with a lot of stakeholder input and
9 a lot of different meetings.

10 In the end, it wasn't useful, and we
11 went back to the typical way we evaluate the
12 impacts of say bycatch limits on fisheries and the
13 population. And I think that's something to bear
14 in mind in the future. It's an experience we've
15 had and probably won't wait and do that again.
16 The Council typically likes to take an action,
17 evaluate typically a high-profile action and take
18 action in a relatively quick manner. This took
19 over five years to finally get to final action
20 because there was a lot of development of the
21 alternatives. The other MSE that pays huge
22 dividends is the one that Bill mentioned in his

1 climate discussion, and that is the development of
2 the Alaska Climate Integrated Modeling project,
3 ACLIM. And what that does is kind of provide
4 information to the Council on the implications of
5 climate change on fisheries, on management, and
6 evaluate the effects of climate change on the
7 multispecies system that we have in the Bering
8 Sea.

9 And so, instead of looking at current
10 conditions, it's meant to shed light on how
11 management might change to address future
12 scenarios. And they brought in all of pieces that
13 Brandon mentioned of not just the biology, but
14 also the economics and the social economics. And
15 it's really going to be a nice tool, I think, for
16 us to move ahead with our climate readiness
17 scenarios.

18 So, in summary, that's really where we
19 see the use of MSEs rather than trying to address
20 specific management actions or to further evaluate
21 climate control, I mean, harvest control rules.
22 So, that's my summary.

1 MR. MUFFLEY: Great. Thanks, Dave.
2 That was really great. So, now, I'll turn it over
3 to Dr. Jon Hare from NOAA Fisheries to provide
4 their thoughts particularly from the NMFS
5 Management Strategy Evaluation working group which
6 I actually didn't even know existed until I
7 started putting this topic together. And I speak
8 to the co-Chair of the workgroup probably every
9 week on all sorts of different things and she's
10 actually a member of our technical workgroup on
11 our Management Strategy Evaluation. And again, I
12 didn't even know that this workgroup had even
13 existed. So, I learned lots of things just
14 putting this agenda item together. So, with that,
15 I'll turn it over to you, Jon.

16 DR. HARE: Thank you very much, Brandon.
17 And it's good to know there are still some
18 mysteries out there for us to reveal at meetings
19 like this. That's nice to know. Next slide,
20 please.

21 So, there is a fisheries MSE working
22 group. It's the MSE individuals that you all know

1 from your regions who get together regularly and
2 work to coordinate and share information
3 nationally, sort of share across regions. And we
4 recognize that there are two types of MSEs. We've
5 heard about them here today. There's MSEs that
6 are requested by management bodies and developed
7 in collaboration with councils and with industry.
8 And the examples that we have here that we heard
9 about. The albacore, hake, we didn't hear about.
10 But Atlantic herring and summer flounder, we did.
11 Then, there's the research MSEs, or I think Tom
12 referred to them as Desktop MSEs. This idea that
13 sort of start on conversations and begin to
14 understand the different types of uncertainty and
15 the consequences of them. They're not -- they
16 don't involve whole stakeholder engagement, but
17 they use the MSE tool. And so, the working
18 groups, we've talked about both types of MSEs and
19 works to coordinate nationally. Next slide,
20 please, Brandon.

21 So, in terms of, you know, from an
22 agency perspective, thinking about the challenges

1 around Management Strategy Evaluation, there is --
2 we see the sort of decision- making process of
3 when to initiate is a little bit ad hoc. And you
4 know, clearly, there's an important link,
5 important partnership between councils and the
6 agencies and executing a Management Strategy
7 Evaluation. And so, there needs to be this close
8 partnership and an alignment of resources to be
9 successful. And when we were working largely
10 Council to Science Center, Regional Office, we're
11 working regionally, and we do think that there
12 needs to be some sort of overall national
13 coordination of improved planning to make full use
14 of the resources that we have to conduct
15 Management Strategy Evaluation.

16 Another piece you know, is uncertainty.
17 Tom pointed out that the spider plots are
18 difficult to interpret. So, how do we communicate
19 uncertainty? I think that's a challenge that
20 scientists have in general, and it's certainly a
21 challenge that we have in communicating Management
22 Strategy Evaluation to our stakeholders. So, we

1 need to work in how we quantify uncertainty and
2 how we communicate uncertainty.

3 Another challenge that we see is on the
4 analytical side. Many of the MSEs that have been
5 conducted to date are, in essence, kind of
6 building their own tools, and that is in part
7 where the time comes from. Scientists start
8 working on an MSE, they need to develop the
9 operating model, they need to develop ways to pull
10 data from the operating model, and those
11 activities are being repeated.

12 So, there aren't really many shared
13 tools. There's no MSE toolbox to date. And we
14 see that as a challenge and something which could
15 be worked on and improved in an agency, national
16 level. And then we have just the legal challenges
17 that we're all aware of, the Magnuson-Stevens Act
18 constrains some of the control rules that can be
19 considered. And you know, Tom talked about the
20 individuals come in to an MSE with no experience
21 in fisheries management and they may not
22 understand the legal constraints that fisheries

1 management operates under. So, that the legal --
2 communicating the legal bounds within which we
3 work is also a challenge. Next slide, please.

4 What we're suggesting is that we knew
5 they need to strengthen our collaborations, the
6 Science Center, the Regional Office, and the
7 Council working together within the region. And
8 then, science centers, councils, and regional
9 offices coordinating and sharing resources to an
10 extent at the national level. And I think this
11 would help us clarify the vision for how we can
12 use Management Strategy Evaluation to be most
13 helpful. It can help us develop regional
14 prioritization plans so we can sort of look
15 nationally across regional priorities and then
16 sort of you know, determine where to expend our
17 MSE resources. This is somewhat similar to the
18 stock assessment prioritization process which we
19 went through several years ago.

20 So, MSEs are maturing. And they're
21 becoming tools that are similar to stock
22 assessment. I think it's time to prioritize our

1 MSE plans within region.

2 The other point is the need to go, need
3 to have further education about the MSE process,
4 MSE outputs, you know, you have a lot of
5 uncertainty coming out of MSE. So, there's
6 certainly a lot of room to continue our
7 understanding training around Management Strategy
8 Evaluation. And then again, then this final
9 point, I have made it already, but we need to
10 strengthen our partnerships in working together.
11 It is a tool by which to help us get to question,
12 but we need to be working together and using those
13 tools together, agreeing on the questions
14 together, and then working towards the answers
15 together. So, I think that's my last slide
16 Brandon. Thank you very much. Is that my slide?
17 No, your slide.

18 MR. MUFFLEY: Yes. Thanks, Dr. Hare. I
19 appreciate it. And this is my last slide before
20 questions. And so, again, just to sort of bring
21 in back in terms of communication that I got from
22 all the different Councils, and to me, that really

1 sets the stage where we go from here. And so,
2 what I heard from the Councils when getting their
3 feedback in regards to the limitations and needs,
4 is you know, there is just a lack of data in some
5 of the regions to support some of these MSEs,
6 right? So, then we talked about these sort of
7 operating models and demands and the data demands
8 associated with them and they don't have any data,
9 or the data is really uncertain. Sort of, how do
10 you utilize that information then? So, certainly,
11 data is an issue. This mismatch in timing and
12 council needs, Dave and Tom talked about this in
13 regards to how long some of these Management
14 Strategy Evaluations can take and when the Council
15 is anticipating utilizing that information to take
16 action. And so, there is some of these
17 disconnects between the two processes.

18 And then, the council priorities, their
19 time and their capacity, these things are always
20 changing, right? Every year, the Councils are
21 reviewing their priorities and they're allocating
22 what time they have, and they're thinking about

1 their capacity needs. And what we've heard, so
2 far, is these tend to take a lot of all of those
3 things. They tend to take a lot of time, they
4 tend to take up a lot of capacity. And so, the
5 Council thinking about, you know, the Council
6 committing to starting this process and seeing it
7 through to the end while things are always
8 changing in regards to priorities.

9 And then, how do we take that
10 information? There is some concern about actually
11 utilizing the information that comes out of the
12 Management Strategy Evaluation and how that gets
13 actually integrated into the management process.
14 So, those are the sort of bigger take home
15 pictures that I was getting back from folks across
16 the country in regards to what some of the
17 limitations or issues might be. And what I saw in
18 regards to future areas, this certainly isn't
19 limiting to this, but you know, where I was
20 getting a lot of sort of feedback from across the
21 different regions, we're looking at the
22 implications of climate change. So, can we

1 understand what some of those uncertainties are?
2 Looking at distribution shifts or changes in stock
3 productivity or changes in the habitat, what do
4 all of those potentially may mean, and how those
5 may influence our management structure.

6 So, looking at those and then,
7 Recreational Fisheries Management and the
8 associated challenges that go along with that, our
9 project is certainly focusing in on summer
10 flounder, recreational summer flounder that I
11 think it could have application across all of our
12 different recreational fisheries. And I've
13 certainly heard from all the other regions about
14 some of these recreational management challenges,
15 and Russ talked about that in his presentation
16 earlier today. So, these are some of the areas
17 that may need some focus for future Management
18 Strategy Evaluation. So, next slide.

19 And this is it. I promise I will stop
20 talking after this. I just throw up some slides
21 for some general discussion. I know we're short
22 on time. So, we won't be able to get into all of

1 this, but you know, I think we learned -- I
2 certainly learned a lot hearing from what the
3 other Councils are doing and how they handle
4 particular areas. And so, how can we utilize this
5 discussion today to improve Management Strategy
6 Evaluations going forward? How can the Councils
7 utilize them in their management process through
8 informed decisions and sort of what's the best way
9 to go about doing it? So, these are some
10 questions for you to ponder as we have some
11 discussion. Thank you. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah. Thanks, Brandon.
13 And thanks to all the Presenters. A lot of really
14 good information, work that's being done, lessons
15 learned. I thought that was a good session for
16 exchanging information between the Councils. We
17 are a little short on time. I'm going to look
18 around the table to see if anybody has any
19 questions or comments at this time. And if I
20 don't get a whole lot at this point, I think what
21 we can do is maybe the Councils could go back, and
22 with these questions in mind, and communicate some

1 answers back to Brandon and perhaps, we could
2 follow this up at our October CCC meeting with
3 some information that's coming from the Councils
4 regarding the questions for Brandon. So, let's
5 just take a minute and see if anybody has any
6 thoughts at this time or any comments you'd like
7 to make.

8 Okay, I don't see any at this point. I
9 will say in closing that if you want people in
10 your office to think you're smarter than you are,
11 you should print out the conceptual model that was
12 developed for the Mid-Atlantic Council. I believe
13 that there's a way you can time travel if you
14 somehow can jump through it. It's pretty amazing.
15 And but if you just put one on your desk, you put
16 a picture of it on your desk, people think you're
17 a lot smarter than you are.

18 Well, I will thank you, for everyone,
19 for your presentations. Brandon, thank you, for
20 moderating the discussion and providing us with
21 all that information. We're going to break for 15
22 minutes. We'll come back at 3:45 to pick up on

1 our last item on today's agenda. Thank you.

2 (Recess)

3 CHAIRMAN LUISI: I think we're going to
4 get started back with the presentation, the next
5 item on our agenda in two minutes. Take their
6 seats we're going to get started here in just a
7 minute. Okay. I'd like to get things started
8 again. Sorry. I ran a couple of minutes late.
9 I'm a little out of touch with traveling, I -- my
10 basement doesn't have a card key in it, so I think
11 I might have five or six card keys up in my room.
12 I keep forgetting to put it in my pocket. So, I
13 was dealing with the front desk, plus my wallet is
14 up there. And so, I have no ID other than my name
15 tag, but they didn't want to -- they didn't really
16 think that that was all that important.

17 Okay. So, we have one last item on our
18 agenda for this afternoon, and then for the public
19 that are listening, there will be an opportunity
20 to provide public comment at the conclusion of
21 this agenda item. We have an hour for this item,
22 it's the National Seafood Strategy. We're joined

1 by Dr. Paul Doremus, Deputy Assistant
2 Administrator for NOAA Fisheries, who's going to
3 give us an update on NOAA Fisheries National
4 Seafood Strategy. And then, we also have, Kitty,
5 who is going to bring up a topic for further
6 discussion. So, Paul, we're going to start with
7 you whenever you're ready.

8 DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, much
9 appreciated. And I will be referring here today
10 to a document that you have and is available
11 online, which is an outline of our National
12 Seafood Strategy. And that's fundamentally what
13 we are talking about. And using this as an
14 opportunity to hear from members, their views at
15 this early stage in the development of this
16 document. So, we have had some roundtables with
17 industry, other forms of stakeholder engagement.

18 I'll give you a sense of what's been
19 coming out of that and overall, I want to move
20 through this relatively quickly so that we have
21 time to discuss and get the benefit of your views
22 as well as cover the topics that Kitty would like

1 to cover. We did note right up front that this is
2 about what we intend to do with our current
3 capabilities and authorities over the next five
4 years. As always, resources are a pacing factor,
5 but this isn't a set of objectives that we have no
6 capability to execute on. We have variable levels
7 based on resources, and we can talk about that as
8 it comes up. And as mentioned, we have had a
9 series of roundtables as well as engagements with
10 the tribal authorities and non-profit
11 organizations and others. And we will -- this is
12 all in the early stages.

13 As we kind of map out the fundamental
14 components of this strategy, we will be developing
15 a full document and putting that out for broad
16 public input through the Federal Register Notice.
17 So, there's layers of engagement, if you will, and
18 certainly, an opportunity to review the full
19 document as it goes forward. So, this is built
20 around we step back and looked at the state of the
21 industry. This is one of the major strategic
22 threads that we stepped back and looked at.

1 You've been hearing about others, our Climate,
2 Ecosystems and Fisheries Initiative is a major
3 thread that's been a topic of yesterday and today.

4 Our ability to address offshore wind and
5 other blue economy related issues is part of that.
6 Our environmental justice and equity
7 considerations, which will be discussed further in
8 coming sessions. That's part of the major set of
9 strategic initiatives that are all sort of part of
10 our responsiveness to the current circumstances
11 that we see in the world. This work was developed
12 previous to the transition -- was started prior to
13 the transition, and to prepare for and advise the
14 new administration on major strategic needs
15 related to the Agency's mission. And then, it has
16 subsequently been developed in the context of new
17 leadership.

18 So, it's built around these four goals,
19 two on the supply side, and then, two related to
20 competitiveness considerations in a classic trade
21 sense and infrastructure matters. So, let me give
22 you a real brief overview of each of these, to --

1 just to kind of rekindle and set the context for
2 your observations. Wild capture fisheries is the
3 area, goal one, where we're seeking to optimize
4 sustainable production of U.S. wild-captured
5 seafood. That is the business we all are in. And
6 many of the things that we are noting here in our
7 very brief characterization of this goal are among
8 the topics that have been discussed during the
9 course of your proceedings, both on the science
10 and management side, the major driver being
11 climate, how we get the data systems developed,
12 the modeling developed, the decision support tools
13 and the information into actual management
14 practice is a core element of this.

15 We also have a note here, apropos of our
16 discussion of offshore wind on fisheries and the
17 blue economy to ensure that our seafood sector as
18 a whole can thrive in an environment where there's
19 increasingly dense and complicated usage of ocean
20 space. So, a lot of work needed there, and we
21 have an objective on habitat restoration, which
22 it's the relationship to the health of our

1 fisheries. There is no explanation here. So,
2 that's the sort of essence of our first goal, to
3 be complemented by the second goal on aquaculture.
4 And this is an area where we've had some emphasis,
5 we've had conversations for a number of years
6 about this. Our goal characterized in here as
7 increasing domestic aquaculture production and
8 establishing the U.S. as a global leader in
9 sustainable aquaculture.

10 In my way of thinking of things, I think
11 a good vision for the future of the aquaculture
12 component of U.S. Seafood sector would be to get
13 to where we are in the wild capture side in terms
14 of a stable policy architecture, Magnuson, and a
15 very sophisticated set of institutional mechanisms
16 for ensuring the sustainable use of the resources,
17 sustainable development, and the balance that we
18 have in all of our mission areas of supporting
19 economic opportunity and environmental stewardship
20 at the same time. And I think the relatively
21 uncontested state of that policy architecture is
22 what we should aspire to do on the aquaculture

1 side. So, a couple of the goals there.

2 And the third and the fourth, the
3 objectives, I should say, in the aquaculture side
4 have to do with moving in that direction, both in
5 terms of national policy with Objective 2.4
6 around, working with the administration in
7 Congress and looking at how we can establish a
8 stronger policy architecture for aquaculture,
9 working as we -- as I do personally and a number
10 of folks supporting me on an interagency basis to
11 make sure that the federal capability set that we
12 currently have is working as effectively as
13 possible through the National Science and
14 Technology Council Subcommittee on Aquaculture.

15 We are developing a whole of government
16 National Aquaculture Development plan called for
17 in the 1980 Act. Only been done once in 1983, and
18 we're two-thirds of the way towards producing
19 that. That's a key piece of this, but the other
20 two really are around the science underpinnings
21 for a successful and growing and thriving and
22 competitive aquaculture sector. And first and

1 foremost, advancing our aquaculture opportunity
2 area agenda as resources allow.

3 We have started, as you know, in
4 Southern California, Gulf of Mexico and can work
5 out further from there and look forward to
6 continued collaboration with all of you as that
7 process unfolds. So, that's the other opportunity
8 to essentially, expand and grow sources of supply
9 in the United States. We are also noting for goal
10 three the need, and has been recognized for quite
11 some time, to continue our work to constrict and
12 push back illegal, unreported, unregulated fishing
13 activity in different parts of the world, and to
14 make full use of our authorities and our ability
15 to collaborate with other agencies in that overall
16 international agenda.

17 And we also here want to advance the
18 seafood sectors, industry, industries' needs as a
19 whole on the international trade environment. We
20 went pretty far towards the National Trade
21 Strategy up to November 2020. A lot of those
22 recommendations that came out of a lot of

1 consultation with industry at the time still
2 pertain, and we are noting here the need to pick
3 up and implement some of those capabilities,
4 including as we have in Objective 3.3, our foreign
5 market access, it's a highly global industry. And
6 we're looking at ways, opportunities to ensure a
7 level playing field and competitive opportunity
8 for the U.S.-based seafood sector.

9 And last, we have an unusual in some
10 respects, and I think a very positively received
11 so far goal around promotion, infrastructure, and
12 workforce development to strengthen the entire
13 seafood sector through collaborative marketing,
14 infrastructure modernization, and workforce
15 development. This goal is heavily affected by our
16 experience during the pandemic, where there was
17 friction in the supply chain, how that played out
18 for the U.S. food sector, and what that means in
19 terms of developing greater resilience and
20 competitiveness in the future.

21 So, we broke that down into several
22 pieces, kind of soft and hard infrastructure of

1 the soft part being about pre- competitive
2 collaboration on marketing and promotion. This is
3 following up from work that our Marine Fisheries
4 Advisory Committee has advanced and advised us to
5 consider. And the second objective on seafood
6 infrastructure is the piece that I think was --
7 really came through loudly over the last couple of
8 years as we've seen the effects of underinvestment
9 in modernization throughout the seafood supply
10 chain, from vessels, an aging fleet, through all
11 the supply chain components, port and dock
12 facilities, cold storage, processing, you name it.
13 We have an aging infrastructure and it showed
14 during the pandemic and that's raised a lot of
15 attention, drawn a lot of attention.

16 Similarly, workforce development
17 considerations have come through fairly loudly and
18 other parts of the Department in -- of NOAA, such
19 as the National Sea Grant College Program, that
20 has a huge ability to help us think through and
21 shape the pipeline of people into various
22 components of the seafood supply chain, including

1 on the production side with harvesting and with
2 farming, huge needs there. And lastly, a small
3 but mighty objective around market and economic
4 analysis. Well recognized in Magnuson on wild
5 capture side, we need to extend that to the
6 seafood sector as a whole and do a better job of
7 understanding how markets are evolving. What some
8 of these pressures ranging from climate to
9 different sorts of market developments and
10 external exogenous impacts on the industry, how
11 those play out and how we can think through and
12 advise industry broadly on market development
13 opportunities both domestically and
14 internationally.

15 So that's the core concept that that we
16 are -- have laid out. And we had a series of
17 industry roundtables, as I mentioned, and I just
18 wanted to very quickly note that, we got a broad
19 array of input through this process that we're
20 going to be using, along with input from all of
21 you today to help modify the document as we move
22 into its full form and put it out for broader

1 public comment in the summer.

2 One is just noting a great deal of
3 appreciation that we have, kind of an
4 industry-facing all-of-seafood sector strategy in
5 development here. That was very broadly
6 appreciated, as well as recognizing the role of
7 the seafood sector in the context of an evolving,
8 growing, more robust, blue economy and what kind
9 of potential that holds for the United States.
10 The effects of climate on the entire sector, not
11 just the harvesting side, but all the way through,
12 were broadly noted and as well and consequently
13 really a big emphasis on the need to continue
14 investment in our science enterprise and ability
15 to understand these changes and advise management
16 and advise the industry broadly on adaptation
17 strategies.

18 So, those were some of the very strong
19 signals we got and as well as strengthening areas
20 where we may have under attended, at least in the
21 skeletal outline, particularly the impacts and the
22 relevance of rural and tribal communities as we

1 think about the entire seafood sector and what a
2 stronger resilient sector looks like, what
3 communities benefit in what ways. And similarly,
4 recreational fishing and the sort of complexities
5 around working waterfronts were also noted in that
6 regard.

7 Interesting discussion point, and it's
8 an evolving discussion in industry, but we're
9 certainly hearing a lot about the need to deal
10 with knowledge gaps. Broadly speaking, around
11 seafood, around sustainability, around how and
12 what kind of choices consumers face and what kind
13 of considerations go into the development of the
14 seafood products that they have access to.

15 That's why goal 4.1 is there, 4.2 or 4.1
16 on seafood marketing and promotion and drew a lot
17 of attention, as well as challenges in the global
18 markets, as well as labor supply markets and
19 overall trade considerations. So, these were all
20 areas where we got a lot of feedback, largely
21 reinforcing, but adding nuance to the pieces that
22 we have in this strategy. No observations around

1 major gaps yet, just refinements and attention to
2 the particular components of each of them.

3 So, we're putting on the table for today
4 for the CCC the same set of questions that we've
5 been asking everybody all the way along. What,
6 from your perspective, are the most critical
7 aspects of this strategy or most critical actions
8 that you think NOAA Fisheries should be paying
9 attention to? What do you think should be avoided
10 if anything? Either that's in here or that isn't.
11 And what in the context of this framework, what is
12 most important from your perspective? And of
13 course, we always welcome any open-ended
14 information, comments or advice that you would
15 like to provide us. I want to note here two key
16 pieces of information, which are the email
17 addresses to our staff, Sarah Shoffler and Laura
18 Diedrick, who are helping us compile, who are
19 dialed in to all of these sessions and are helping
20 us compile the input and respond to the input in
21 the subsequent development of our draft.

22 So, we won't be able to cover

1 everything, I don't think, in our short session
2 here today, I hope to hear your views to the
3 extent that time allows. Those are the two points
4 of contact for further advice or follow-on
5 commentary if you'd like to provide that way. So,
6 Mr. Chair, back to you, and thank you for the
7 opportunity to raise this topic with the CCC
8 today.

9 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes, thanks, Paul. And
10 I think it might be helpful. I don't know if it
11 was Stephen or Mary, if we can, go back one slide
12 with the questions up on the screen. So, these
13 are things that that we're being asked as the CCC
14 to provide feedback on. And I'll look around the
15 table to see if anybody has any thoughts or has
16 any questions for Paul regarding his presentation.
17 Eric Reid?

18 MR. REID: All right. I'll go first.
19 The last time we had this conversation, I wasn't
20 all that thrilled about it, Dr. Doremus, and my
21 position really isn't changed that much you know,
22 to me, marketing is a stable supply, sustainable

1 and stable supply, and a reasonably stable price
2 of raw material. That really has not changed.
3 But I'm just I want to be a good partner. I want
4 to be -- try to be a team player. So, in order to
5 really answer your questions, I have questions.
6 So, you know, as a seafood processor, we have this
7 form, the processed food products form we have to
8 fill out every year. And I'd be interested to
9 know if you've analyzed those forms from all the
10 processors in the country which are required to
11 fill out that form. You know, you've got to give
12 the ultimate consumer what they want. So, what
13 you know, the days of people going to a fish
14 market, a retail fish market and buying a whole
15 fish and taking it home and fileting it or do
16 whatever they want to it, is really changed quite
17 a bit.

18 You know, people don't want to do that
19 anymore, but I'd be interested to know if you know
20 what you know, what's the trend in consumer demand
21 for, what product form. You know, are they
22 looking for, ready to eat, you know, filets or

1 IQF, frozen products, which are you know, you take
2 them out of the freezer, you throw in a pan, and
3 you get dinner, I suppose, so.

4 So, I guess that's a question that I
5 have, because it'd be interesting to understand,
6 you know, what do you need to sell at the end of
7 the line? And I'm in a position that I'm not at
8 the end of the line in most cases because we sell
9 a lot of raw material, but I just -- in order to
10 build up infrastructure and see what people want,
11 they'd be interested to see what the consumer
12 trend is in that -- and I think that's my first
13 question, I think. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes, thanks, Eric.
15 I'll turn to Paul.

16 DR. DOREMUS: Thanks. And we could
17 spend the rest of -- the balance of our time
18 talking about that. I'll suffice it to say, we
19 have seen, and it's been broadly documented,
20 pretty substantial changes in consumer interest
21 during the course of the pandemic, much greater
22 attention to health, much greater attention to

1 sustainability and looking and receptive to
2 different product forms as you're talking about.
3 And these are the areas, I think, where we can, in
4 a precompetitive way, share more information. The
5 precompetitive marketing promotion is designed to
6 sort of capitalize on those trends, slightly
7 rising interest in eating seafood at home and more
8 so externally and do that in a way that allows us
9 to diversify product streams, product forms, as
10 well as available species, which can meet multiple
11 goals. So, not easy to answer your question very
12 comprehensively, but I think a lot has changed and
13 that presents a lot of opportunities, and we need
14 to look collectively at the friction points, one
15 of the ones being the difficulty of changing
16 product form quickly.

17 So, when we saw that aggregate numbers
18 in terms of pandemic impacts, imports bounce back
19 way faster than domestically harvested fish, in
20 part because they were able to more rapidly meet
21 those changing interests and product form largely
22 shelf stable.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Eric?

2 MR. REID: So, my follow up to that is
3 you know, the -- when you talk about the entire
4 seafood sector, you know, you've got guys who work
5 in small boats, maybe, you know, they catch a few
6 fish, or you know, they're pot fishing, or
7 something like that. And, you know, this
8 sea-to-table or, you know, certainly is a new
9 component of the market. And it's actually I
10 think I don't know what the expansion of that is,
11 but it's pretty substantial given COVID.

12 But so, you know, you have somebody like
13 that who wants to maybe go to farmers' markets or
14 something of that nature. But that means, yes,
15 they have obviously the permits to harvest those
16 fish. He has to have a dealer permit to buy his
17 own fish and then sell those fish and probably
18 whatever health department stuff, including a
19 HACCP plan.

20 So, you know, those guys or that
21 particular supplier is going to need a little bit
22 more high maintenance and there's a lot of them.

1 So, you know, just the sheer numbers of
2 entertaining that that development of, you know, a
3 very, very small, vertically-integrated business
4 is one component of the supply chain, the market.
5 But then you've got businesses like let's, you
6 know, I think Trident, because they're a giant
7 company and what they need is something entirely
8 different. So, I'm trying to understand when you
9 talk about entertaining, that this development
10 throughout the entire seafood sector, what does
11 that really mean?

12 DR. DOREMUS: All of the above. Yes,
13 and certainly Trident and companies in that you
14 know, large, vertically- integrated companies are
15 dealing with some of these infrastructural
16 pressures around fleet modernization, around
17 modernizing their processing capabilities. That's
18 been aptly covered in the press recently. And
19 likewise, just very, very exciting developments in
20 terms of local regional markets that are more
21 conducive to smaller scale operators. It's both
22 the challenging -- challenge and the great

1 opportunity of the sector.

2 It is wonderfully diverse, and I think
3 could be strengthened through increasing
4 diversity. So there really isn't a -- in my mind
5 a bias here towards any particular segment. It's
6 about how we can maximize the opportunity to
7 produce and get to market U.S.-sourced seafood for
8 the benefit of U.S. consumers. And it's really up
9 to industry to figure out how best to do that.
10 And it's up to us on the policy side to provide a
11 good enabling conditions.

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Go ahead, Eric.

13 MR. REID: What's the total budget for
14 this project?

15 DR. DOREMUS: Right now, as I mentioned
16 earlier, this is all predicated on --

17 (Audio drop)

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, I think we're
19 good. So, go ahead, Paul. If you had anything
20 else you want to go on.

21 DR. DOREMUS: Oh, I just want to thank
22 again, all of you all, for the insights on both

1 the labor market and the marketing issue. I will
2 note that there's huge industry effort and even a
3 breadth of an alliance that we haven't seen before
4 around the notion of precompetitive marketing and
5 promotion for seafood as a whole. Consumer-facing
6 seafood is good for you, start there and that
7 creates a nice umbrella for regional specific
8 marketing and promotion, like, all -- like a --
9 so, I think that ideas they could be nested, so,
10 complementary.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thank you. I'm
12 going to go across the table to Bill next.

13 ("Bill" sounds like from North
14 Pacific, Council member so Chair or
15 Vice Chair?)

16 MR. TWEIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two
17 different questions. One of them is about some of
18 the insights. And there's the slide that talks
19 about the fisheries being a more prominent part of
20 the blue economy, discussions and priorities. And
21 then, one of the other bullets is the importance
22 of seafood to rural and tribal communities, should

1 we consider them. And I'm trying to figure out
2 what's in the blue economy and what's not like,
3 for instance, the offshore sector, because it's
4 not mentioned specifically, I'm assuming it's kind
5 of rolled into the blue economy or the traditional
6 onshore and processors part of the blue economy.
7 But somehow subsistence, rural and tribal
8 communities aren't necessarily. Is there some
9 kind of distinction there that would be helpful to
10 me at least understand?

11 DR. DOREMUS: Yeah, I don't make a fine
12 distinction along those lines of, to be honest,
13 and I think generally speaking, it's a fairly
14 encompassing term that connects any communities
15 that are benefiting from the use of ocean and
16 coastal resources. And that could be all those
17 communities that you mentioned. Thank you.

18 MR. TWEIT: Thanks. And then, as I sort
19 of think about that goal one, we're, you know, as
20 one council member, I sort of more comfortably
21 live thinking about optimizing wild capture. One
22 of the -- I think one of our barriers still to

1 optimizing wild capture is regulatory discards.
2 And there's still a, at least in the North
3 Pacific, still a fair amount of edible seafood
4 that's going overboard as a result of regulatory
5 discards.

6 We did a sort of an initial cruise
7 through our regulations a couple of years ago, an
8 agency-initiated effort to take a look at
9 regulations. And we got it a few, but it was kind
10 of a short timeframe and we threw a couple of the
11 easy ones in. I'm wondering if as part of this,
12 is the Agency contemplating sort of another round
13 of urging councils to take a look at regulations
14 that may be really the root of discards of edible
15 seafood that we might be able to think about
16 restructuring or to in order to put more edible
17 seafood into the stream, into the seafood stream?

18 DR. DOREMUS: That's the type of thing
19 that I think would be an action consistent with
20 this objective and certainly, the type of thing
21 that we want to work with the Councils on doing.
22 How can we make sure within quota levels that

1 we're getting maximum use of the resources that we
2 can sustainably harvest? And there is, I think, a
3 lot to be said for that strategy and other ways
4 that we can get both a broader utilization of
5 fisheries resources, as well as more extensive use
6 of all the components of the fish that are brought
7 on board as well. So, that is definitely an area
8 that we would want to work with the Councils on in
9 the future.

10 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thank you for
11 that, Rick Bellavance?

12 MR. BELLAVANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
13 And thank you, Dr. Doremus, for your presentation.
14 I was looking at the list of items that you had
15 gotten from your fisheries roundtables, and I
16 noticed recreational fishing in there and the
17 seafood production that that could bring to the
18 general public. And then when I read through the
19 seafood strategy, I didn't really sense a direct
20 connection to the recreational fishery in the
21 document. So, I just my question is, is that
22 still kind of like fair game in consideration of

1 the for-hire fleet, the head boat fleet, providing
2 seafood to the public? You know, they may catch
3 on their own instead of buying in their store, but
4 they're still eating it. And the different needs
5 from infrastructure to regulatory issues, that
6 that would help to promote that industry as well.
7 Just trying to get the connection, if it's part of
8 it or something different.

9 DR. DOREMUS: That certainly was not
10 clear in the initial draft that we shared with
11 you, and that's been a fairly broad theme in the
12 feedback that we've gotten. So, we're definitely
13 trying to address that in our next round.

14 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thank you.
15 Carrie, you're up next and then, Archie, I'll --
16 we'll wrap up with you.

17 MS. SIMMONS: All right. Thank you, Mr.
18 Chair. Thank you, Dr. Doremus, for the
19 presentation. I think it's a great start, great
20 draft some of these objectives, you know, we
21 really look forward to working with you in
22 operationalizing them. I think they're high

1 objectives that you're going to need a lot of help
2 trying to achieve, and I do hope that we can get
3 some more resources to help us do these things in
4 here that you have outlined. Did I understand
5 correctly that you said you would be taking some
6 written comments if we provided those to the staff
7 members you had up on the slide and that you would
8 try to address some of these comments prior to
9 publishing this information in the Federal
10 Register? Did I understand that correctly?

11 DR. DOREMUS: Yes, you did. And thank
12 you for your comments.

13 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thank you.
14 Archie?

15 MR. SOLIAI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Oh,
16 thank you, Paul. Great presentation. I just
17 wanted to highlight and provide a few
18 recommendations from our part of the country, our
19 region. The U.S. Pacific Territories are
20 competing every day against international
21 fisheries. The Continental U.S. Competes
22 collectively, but in our part of the of the

1 Pacific, we see it and experience it first-hand
2 with all the foreign fisheries that are in our
3 waters and they're fishing right on the outskirts
4 of our EEZs.

5 Sometimes, you know, there's a lot of
6 incursions. But what we need to do is increase
7 U.S. quotas to reduce the disproportionate burdens
8 to the territories. And national management needs
9 to recognize that the virtues of our U.S.
10 Management regimes ensures it is good practices to
11 show that we are good stewards of the resources.
12 Most of our -- most if not all of our Pacific
13 Island GDPs are heavily dependent on the
14 fisheries, and especially, in American Samoa,
15 where U.S. Flag tuna vessels supply the U.S.
16 Cannery that's there. And you know, in 2018 there
17 were 38 U.S. flagged purse seine vessels and now,
18 there's 13. In contrast to China, they increased
19 their fleet by about 500 percent over the last 20
20 years. And the U.S. fleet, you know, they didn't
21 go out of business, they just reflag because it's
22 more economical for them to fish in other Pacific

1 islands or fly flags of other countries.

2 So, we would offer the strategy to be a
3 more holistic approach and agenda to benefit the
4 U.S. fisheries as well as the international arena
5 as well. Secondly, we recommend that the seafood
6 strategy emphasize reducing both domestic and
7 international restrictions and that can keep U.S.
8 Pacific Territories operating and sustaining their
9 fisheries in order to keep their economies alive.
10 In American Samoa domestic and international
11 regulations are keeping the U.S. Flagged
12 purse-seiners from optimal operations and
13 supplying local canneries. Open access to our own
14 EEZs will reduce fishing competition with foreign
15 fleets and I think we need to remove or minimize
16 barriers to free trade of domestic seafood.

17 Thirdly, and again, we'll submit these
18 comments to the emails that you provided. I think
19 that you know, it would be -- we recommend that
20 the seafood strategy replicate the USDA support of
21 U.S. farms and farmers. Fishermen feed local
22 economies and especially, in the Pacific Islands.

1 I think that's a good model that we can use in
2 this arena.

3 And lastly, our National Seafood
4 Strategy needs to include fishery councils like
5 the CCC, make sure that we have all our FIACs and
6 our APs (phonetic) and SCCs to provide proper
7 advice and guidance as the strategy is developed.
8 And again Paul, we'll provide the written comments
9 for your input as well. Thank you.

10 DR. DOREMUS: Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thanks, Archie.

12 Thanks, Paul.

13 MS. SIMONDS: I'd just like to add
14 something that what Paul and Archie have brought
15 up, falls under the U.S. Goal to expand supply.
16 If you think about it, everything that he said
17 that it applies to that large goal. So, thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes, thanks, Kitty.

19 Chris Moore?

20 DR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the
21 interest of time, I'll ask my question offline.

22 Thanks, Paul.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Sounds good. Okay that
2 concludes that -- go ahead, John. We've got time.
3 Go ahead.

4 MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 I appreciate your indulgence. Our Council has
6 talked a lot about this and most things have been
7 addressed. One that wasn't was the idea came up
8 about truth and labeling and consumer protection.
9 Would that be part of the strategy or is that
10 somewhere else?

11 DR. DOREMUS: Short answer. It is not
12 at this time we have not, functioned as a
13 consumer-facing agency at this point. Those are
14 real issues, and we can advocate for solutions.
15 And in fact, some aspects of this strategy,
16 particularly in Gulf where will rely very heavily
17 on us working with other agencies, such as I
18 mentioned already, USDA, for just one example.
19 But that's an important issue and one that might
20 not be one that we would execute on, but we could
21 advocate for good solutions. It could be executed
22 elsewhere.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thanks, Paul.
2 Thanks, John. All right. That does conclude that
3 item on the agenda. We have one more thing to
4 cover before we break for the evening. In my
5 notes, I have Kitty Simonds, who's going to be
6 providing some information. In my notes I have
7 responding to misinformation or
8 mischaracterizations of U.S. fisheries by
9 third-party certification programs or other
10 organizations.

11 MS. SIMONDS: Great. You gave my
12 report.

13 CHAIRMAN LUISI: There we go. It's all
14 you, Kitty.

15 MS. SIMONDS: I call your attention to
16 three slides up there. And the reason we're doing
17 this is we brought this up in 2020 and then, we
18 asked the service to consider, you know, fish
19 watch. And so, Paul very nicely responded and
20 said the Congress would not allow the government
21 to do third-party certifications and ratings. And
22 so, this slide, you can move it to the next. So,

1 what I'm saying is that, you know, this of course,
2 that certification is like the Marine Stewardship
3 Council. You know, they certify fisheries that
4 are beholden to certain standards, like healthy
5 stocks, fair and equitable supply chains. And
6 these certifications are expensive, but most U.S.
7 fisheries already qualified for MSC certification
8 standards and are already certified. So, why
9 should we pay so much if we're so compliant and
10 manage our fisheries so well?

11 MSA standards like our national
12 standards exceed most third-party certifications
13 and so unable to use Fishwatch to certify maybe
14 let's not talk about certifying, maybe, we should
15 be talking about labeling. And so, what we're
16 thinking here is that the National Seafood
17 Strategy and MAFAC could develop a labeling
18 alternative for MSC-managed seafood that come from
19 our healthy stocks and supply chains. Next.

20 So, these ratings are made by so-called
21 independent experts to compare fisheries and
22 stocks. So, for example, Monterey Bay Seafood,

1 and we have had to work with them to improve their
2 rating of our Hawaii Tuna Inspection Strategy
3 rating. This took us like six months to work with
4 the scientists, our scientists and theirs, because
5 there was misinformation there. But what I
6 understand from Witherell that he was called by
7 Monterey Bay, because they're ready to, I guess,
8 publish the same sort of information that they did
9 for us. And so, they're about to review their
10 certification. And I hope it's approved. So our
11 SSC actually reviewed that Minderoo Foundation
12 Global Fishing Index. And there's a lot of
13 misinformation in there. And so, oh, yeah, the
14 bad thing about this is that was that they rated
15 our fisheries on par with Indonesia and the
16 highest ratings anybody got was a C. So, we
17 wonder about A and B, I mean, can anybody ever get
18 to A and B? Because we're the best managed
19 fisheries in the world. Right? And so, we got a
20 C.

21 So, yes. So, the last bullet is we
22 think that there needs to be some kind of an intro

1 paper or marketing strategy, a strategy to
2 highlight the efficacy of the MSA and
3 Council-managed fisheries relative to other
4 foreign alternatives.

5 Although I guess we do have to remember
6 that some of our small markets depend on foreign
7 fish. So, you know, we think we need to be
8 sensitive to them as well. So, I guess the ask is
9 for you all to see if you could manage to develop
10 something, you know, with MAFAC or in your seafood
11 strategy. And so, we're not calling that a
12 certification. Right, some sort of labeling of
13 us. It's very important.

14 Oh, and my last slide is just to show
15 off again how well managed we all are. And
16 repeating the slide that you had earlier, Janet,
17 on, you know, status of the stocks and all of
18 that. So, what can we say? We make the case for
19 something. Thank you very much.

20 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes, thanks.

21 MS. SIMONDS: Everybody is available to
22 answer questions --

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Of course.

2 MS. SIMONDS: -- you might not answer.

3 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yes, let's see if the
4 service has something they want to... some
5 feedback and then I'll look around the table for
6 any other comments or questions regarding what you
7 presented. Go ahead, Paul.

8 DR. DOREMUS: Just a few general things.
9 Thank you, Kitty, for making the case here. And
10 it is something that has come up in our
11 roundtables and our engagements with industry,
12 pretty much all aspects of the observations you
13 made, the challenges of the existing system, and
14 the overarching question can we not get greater
15 benefit from the effectiveness of our
16 sustainability practices? That nationally, there
17 may be a lot of ways that that can get done, and I
18 think that is something we need to look at and
19 figure out how to do. But I just want to
20 appreciate your recognition of the need. And that
21 many others were saying similar, making a similar
22 recommendation and noting the same problem.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay, thanks for that.
2 Let me look at the look around the table to see if
3 any other councils want to weigh in on this. Have
4 any questions or comments? Chris Moore.

5 DR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Also,
6 I was wondering if you guys are aware of an issue
7 that we recently had with MSC certification of
8 spiny dogfish? You guys heard about that? So,
9 this is particularly relevant to the conversation
10 today because if in fact we lose that MSC
11 certification, it's going to negatively impact
12 economic opportunity for U.S. fishermen in
13 overseas markets. So, it's a little complicated,
14 but not that complicated.

15 And I think we have in the Mid-Atlantic,
16 six MSC species managed fisheries including spiny
17 dogfish. Recently, MSC proposed some changes to
18 their standards and basically said that any
19 species on certain conservation lists would be
20 ineligible for certification. So, there's an
21 appendix two of the Convention on the Conservation
22 of Migratory Species of Wild Animals that lists

1 the entire Northern Hemisphere stock of spiny
2 dogfish. And we are, obviously, not concerned
3 with the entire Northern Hemisphere.

4 And we pointed that out in a letter back
5 to the MSC folks that said, basically, we're
6 involved with the Northwest Atlantic population,
7 which is distinctly separate from the depleted
8 Northeast Atlantic population, which I think they
9 are referencing. And so, we could use your help
10 checking that out and see what you can do from the
11 NMFS perspective. But again, it's an important,
12 important issue for us because we could lose the
13 MSC certification for that species.

14 DR. DOREMUS: Thank you, Chris, for
15 pointing that out I'm not familiar with that
16 specific instance, but I appreciate you bringing
17 that to our attention. And I just had a little
18 bit of a sidebar here with Sam Rauch on some of
19 these issues related to certification. So, he has
20 some additional comments. Sam?

21 MR. RAUCH: For me, I just wanted to
22 remind the Councils, it's been a long time since

1 we've talked about third-party certification.
2 There is an existing 2005 policy on private sector
3 certification of fisheries, which says that it's
4 NMFS' policy to neither endorse nor participate
5 directly or indirectly in the private-sector
6 certification of fisheries. Now that being said,
7 we will respond to requests for information if the
8 fisheries would like us to help them. And we --
9 and I know I personally have signed letters that
10 indicate the management status of fisheries and
11 those kind of issues.

12 Oftentimes, third-party certification
13 are asking for things beyond the capacity of the
14 National Fisheries Service to control. But we are
15 happy to work with the fisheries supplying and
16 articulate from the U.S. Government's perspective
17 why we think it's well-managed. But we will not
18 apply on behalf of the fishery nor participate
19 directly beyond that. That's at least -- that's
20 our policy. We can discuss whether that should
21 change or not. That is the existing policy has
22 been since 2005.

1 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Okay. Thanks, Sam.
2 Eric Reid. And then, I'll go to you, Tom, later.

3 MR. REID: Yes, I'll be quick. I do
4 agree with Sam that there is a mechanism to get
5 support. But the one thing that Chris didn't
6 mention is this is extremely time sensitive
7 because that certification is in, I would say,
8 imminent danger. Would you agree with that,
9 Chris? It's going to be rough. And if the
10 European markets go away because of it, that that
11 industry is going to be in big trouble. So, just
12 so you know.

13 CHAIRMAN LUISI: All right. Thanks for
14 pointing that out, Eric. Tom Nies?

15 MR. NIES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd
16 like to move a little bit away from third-party
17 certification to CITES listing. And there's
18 currently petitions being made to list Winter and
19 thorny skates added to the appendices under CITES,
20 Fish and Wildlife Service was soliciting comments
21 on that proposal. We've written a letter in
22 opposition to listing it, which appears to be the

1 tentative U.S. position, to oppose listing because
2 it doesn't meet the criteria. But I would -- just
3 would hope that the Fisheries Service would weigh
4 in on this as well. And maybe you have already,
5 and I just don't know it.

6 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Sam or Paul?

7 MR. RAUCH: Yes. So, as you know, the
8 U.S. position is ultimately the United States
9 position, but we do work very closely with Fish
10 and Wildlife Service in trying to develop the
11 United States' position. We are aware of the
12 views of the Council and others on this, but I'm
13 not at liberty to say what the U.S. position will
14 ultimately be when we get to that convention.

15 DR. DOREMUS: Okay. Thanks for that.
16 Is there anyone else at the table that wants to
17 offer any comments regarding this subject matter?
18 Okay. Seeing none we'll go ahead and move on to
19 the last item on our agenda, which is a public
20 comment session. So, if there's anyone from the
21 audience here in the room or anyone on the webinar
22 that wants to provide public comment regarding any

1 of the topics that we discussed today, now's the
2 time to do that. I do see one hand on the webinar
3 showing up as M. Duenas. Yes. I'm sorry. Okay.

4 MR. DUENAS: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

5 Yes. This is Manny Duenas. Hello, Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Yeah, we can hear you.

7 MR. DUENAS: Okay. I just want to -- I'm
8 speaking as a fisherman from Guam, and I'm deeply
9 concerned regarding the issues surrounding our
10 island and all the federal intervention causing a
11 demise of our coastal fisheries, just want to
12 emphasize that the American Samoa and the Hawaii
13 fisheries have been our model fisheries for many,
14 many years, and that these fisheries have not
15 gotten the support but rather have been trumped by
16 every action conceivable under ESA, MPA and every
17 other federal entity on coral reefs and
18 everything. So, I'm deeply concerned that we're
19 going through all this discussion and exercise on
20 how to promote our fisheries when we can't even
21 take care of our own fishermen.

22 And at the end of the day, just to share

1 information, as you speak, of international,
2 Thailand has 20 canneries but doesn't have an
3 existing fishery. And I think the U.S. State
4 Department and NOAA Fisheries and its
5 international negotiations should have greater
6 input on our domestic fisheries. The consumers in
7 Hawaii, for example, are suffering from high
8 prices because all of our EEZ is practically
9 closed to domestic fishing and our fishing vessels
10 have to fish further and further. Now they're
11 talking about establishing a blue corridor.

12 We're protecting our false killer
13 whales, dolphins, sea turtles, where no other
14 country in the Pacific is doing the same thing.
15 So, we're punishing ourselves and our fishermen
16 and not recruiting any benefit from these actions
17 by the Federal Government. And someone mentioned
18 in the discussion regarding the small boat guys in
19 recreational. You've got to remember, you've got
20 to change one regulation that's in the books. The
21 Coast Guard regulation says you sell one fish, and
22 that boat is automatically considered commercial

1 and has to deal with commercial safety
2 requirements.

3 If you guys can address that, you guys
4 would actually benefit from the recreational and
5 small-scale fisheries guys who don't have to spend
6 4 to \$5000 a year for commercial safety equipment.
7 And I think that has to be surely addressed
8 because our fisheries on Guam, is purely no larger
9 than the swamp people in Louisiana. And to have a
10 \$5,000 SOLAS pack on our boat is ridiculous. So,
11 you know, these regulations that are small in
12 part, but you guys need to look at that at a
13 national level to rectify the problem. And I
14 thank you for the opportunity.

15 But I just want to mention one thing
16 very clear in the Pacific, before you guys all
17 woke up to the issues of climate change, we've
18 been talking about that in the Pacific with the El
19 Niño and La Niña. So, we're not behind, and just
20 to share with you and my culture on Guam and Samoa
21 (phonetic), we have no pronoun for male or female.
22 We consider a person, a person. So, at the end of

1 the day, what I'm saying to you is that, please,
2 listen to us out here, because we are the advanced
3 civilization and we are advanced in your theories
4 and thoughts. Thank you very much.

5 CHAIRMAN LUISI: Thank you very much,
6 Manny, for your comments. Let me go back to the
7 webinar or the audience. I see -- I don't see any
8 hands in the audience and there is nothing showing
9 up on the webinar screen. So, with that, we'll go
10 ahead and conclude public comment at this time.
11 Before we recess for the evening, I'm going to
12 turn over to turn the mic over to Chris Moore, who
13 has some information about our reception this
14 evening. Chris?

15 DR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
16 folks that have registered, we have our dinner
17 tonight. It is across the into Eastport, not too
18 far away, but about an hour walk, so don't walk.
19 We do have shuttles. So, there'll be a shuttle to
20 leave the hotel, down to lobby by 5:45. They'll
21 come back. So, drop a bunch of people off. Come
22 back, pick people up again. Meet again around

1 6:05, 6:10. So, take the shuttle. It is a
2 catered dinner, featuring fresh seafood courtesy
3 of Wes. He got some Black Sea bass the other day.

4 Again, if you're sitting in the audience
5 and you really want to eat some sea bass then see
6 Shelly and she'll get you set up for us for the
7 reception tonight. Any questions? Is at the
8 Annapolis Maritime Museum. If you decide to
9 drive, parking is limited. There is some parking,
10 but it's very limited. So, again, if I were you,
11 I'd take the shuttle. Any questions?

12 CHAIRMAN LUISI: I'll just add that I
13 was going to make the comment that parking is very
14 limited. You can try to find parking on the
15 street of Eastport, but it does. At this time of
16 day, it's going to start filling up fast with
17 people coming home -- everyone coming home from
18 work. It is an indoor facility, but there are
19 outdoor areas where you can you know, go out on
20 the dock and hang out. So, dress accordingly.
21 And we look forward to seeing many of you there
22 tonight.

1 That concludes our business today.
2 We're on recess until 9:00 tomorrow morning.
3 Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the
5 PROCEEDINGS were continued.)

6 * * * * *

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

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

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF MARYLAND

I, Mark Mahoney, notary public in and for the State of Maryland, do hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell the truth under penalty of perjury; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was called; and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public, in and for the State of Maryland

My Commission Expires: June 7, 2022