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PROCEEDINGS

(8:56 a.m.)

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Good morning everyone. So, today we're having the subcommittee reports. We were going to begin with a update from Peter on a recent meeting of the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force.

Paul is on a conference call from 9:00 to 9:30. He'll be joining us then. Then, we'll have our Ecosystems Approach subcommittee report and the Commerce subcommittee report. And then, Terri and Ted will lead us through some sort of status report on the Resilience Working Group.

We're going to add to the agenda after that, a discussion and potential approval of I guess a letter to Secretary Ross about the President's budget and hiring freeze, and our concerns about that. And then we'll have the close out, next steps, action items.

So, the things that were actually scheduled to sort of vote, consider voting approval this morning, are on the Framework and
Emergency Actions report and also, this letter to Secretary Ross. I'm not sure if there's any action items coming out of the Commerce and the Systems committee, that require a vote.

So, let's begin. Peter.

MR. SHELLY: Thank you, Julie. And so, I'm just going to repeat for those of you who were in the committee meeting about the same material. But I do want report on the first meeting of the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force.

I'm serving as the liaison between them and MAFAC and the ecosystem committee on the task force. Liz is a member of the task force in her private capacity. And for us recognizing her work there.

And just so people recall, this task force is being formed to allow this really important activity to go forward in the Pacific North West under the umbrella of the federal advisory committee structure.

There has been some discussion, that I think was reported when we undertook this task,
that they might have formed their own federal advisory committee. But the sense was that there was enough interest in this group, particularly, from the ecosystem-based management approach of what they were doing, that we would be willing to have them operate as a task force for this group. And what they will be doing, will be making recommendations to us at the end of this process if all goes well, on common goals and helping to define a shared path to a long-term salmon and steelhead recovery in the basin.

I think as many of us observed when this task force was being set up, this is a very ambitious project. A number of the parties have been in significant adversarial positions for a long period of time on many of these tops. And some of that adversarial posture continues. So, this set of conversations is going to be laying over the dynamic of that adversarial process. And I think a number of us were concerned about how they would work together or whether they could work together.
And just in summary, I would report that the first meeting went very well. And it looks like a very promising effort.

I'd particularly like to call out Barry Thom and the regional fisheries office out there, both for their willingness to do this, number one. And it is to sort of open your programs up to a scrutiny like this and be willing to be influenced by a group decision, is something new, at least in my experience with NOAA fisheries. And so, Barry, I think, this is probably a lot of Barry's brainchild, I think. And he and his team deserve a lot of risks their taking in this process.

We reviewed, I think at the last MAFAC meeting, the representatives to the task force and their where they came from, their interests, the stakes that they were bringing into the process. It seems like we did a really good job. I mean that sort of the group tested itself for like who was missing, who was absent. And there were some peripheral conversations about people who might be useful there. But the overwhelming consensus was
that the task force had the right group of people
to work on developing this shared vision.

There was, as I mentioned in the
committee meeting, a lot of these folks are fairly
process weary. They've been through a lot of
different procedures. And one of the task force
objectives, actually, is to come up with one
common set of metrics that can be used to think
about what the long-term objective is for salmon
and steelhead recovery. For the community, so
that there's agreement around that. And then some
metrics to measure progress.

And so, instead of having eight
different notions of what success is going to look
like, hopefully, this group will come up with one
set of metrics that the other subsidiary
activities could nest within, so that everyone is
sort of working in the same direction. And so,
it's a very ambitious and promising objective.

They were, I think, I don't know what
the right word -- cautious, about what MAFAC's
role was. They didn't really understand. We're
definitely the new kid on the block. And so, 
Heidi did a really good job of providing material 
and an overview of what a federal advisory 
committee is. We were very explicit in telling 
the task force that they were reporting to this 
group. That they were not reporting directly to 

senior management in Commerce. 

And so, there's a pretty healthy 
discussion about the degree to which MAFAC would 
feel at liberty to modify or adjust or add 
recommendations to their report of the task force. 

And Heidi and I, I think, reported back 
about other task forces we've had and said, you 
know, we intend to honor your work. And, you 
know, we'll stay liaised with the group and make 
sure we're all happy with it and that we're 
staying within the bounds of the federal advisory 
committee requirements. And that we might likely, 
given that some of the people here have comments 
back or questions back to the task force or 
thoughts about maybe preliminary work products 
that might come out of the task force.
But they were in the spirit of making sure that the task force came to us with the most comprehensive and representative set of recommendations they could, and that we would respect their work and would, you know, one of the important roles that we would play would be to make sure that the recommendations got before senior agency leadership under the umbrella of MAFAC. Which I think they all understood added enough weight to the process that they seemed enthusiastic to join it and once again, sort of roll up their sleeves and go back to the task of doing this.

The first meeting, was an organizational meeting. A facilitating group who seemed very good was hired and ran the meeting. There was material presented on sort of where we are in terms of the science around recovery. And I should mention that although some of the species, or maybe a lot of the species, that are within the scope of this task force, are ESA listed species. The task force actually is broader than that and
is looking at all steelhead and salmon populations, whether they're listed or not in the basin.

So, there was a very interesting science presentation on the basin. And it is an impressive piece of geography, going all the way up into Canada, which I didn't realize, Canada and then back down to Idaho.

And, you know, when you actually have representatives from all the stakeholders who have powerful interests in the outcome of this, sitting around the table, it was very impressive. There were representatives of tribes. There were representatives of the power utilities, which of course, you know, have their own mission to accomplish. There were states, state representatives and state governments who have a different prospective than the Federal Government does sometimes or they have. And then there were conservation interests. I mean it was really a very impressive group. And they, you know, I think made a commitment to each other to try to
make this happen.

They set up, I think they're going to be three groups to move work along between meetings, including a sovereign group, of tribes who respect, you know, coming from New England, I don't have a lot of experience with sovereignty issues. But they're very important in the Pacific Northwest. And the treaties and other legal arrangements under which some of these recovery plans operate. The treaties with some of these tribes are very important, both to the U.S. and the tribes. And so, I think there's a sense that having a separate sovereigns group be recognized within that task force was valuable. And then there were a couple of working groups. One that would be working on the agenda for the next meeting, and one that would be working on stuff, you know, the substance of the task force so that all the meetings would be productive.

I think they're four meetings schedule through the end of 2017 at this point. And, you know, it's kind of fasten your seatbelts, and
let's see where this goes because it could be very, very exciting.

So, I guess I'll stop there. I didn't go into a lot of the specific goals and objectives. There are materials available, both the minutes from the task force meeting, as well as materials that Barry and his team prepared, that are available. There's a website on the Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force, I guess it is. I don't know what the exact title of the webpage is, but if you look up Columbia Basin Partnership, if you search that, you'll come up with the materials.

And Heidi and her team are, you know, and Barry's group, are making sure that everything gets posted. That that is again, that's a fact of requirement, that the public is included.

There were opportunities for members of the public to attend. It was actually very well attended. The sort of seats in the back of the room were filled with other folks who participated at different times during the meeting. And I was
really impressed by the sort of effort that was
being brought forward. And I don't know, Liz, who
was also at the same meeting, maybe she saw a
different meeting. But I'd love to have you add
any of your thoughts as a participant.

MS. HAMILTON: I think you covered it
pretty well. I think a lot of us sitting at the
table, we don't know whether we're there to get
something done or make sure something isn't done.
You know how bad it is with interest that are so
varied at the table. But we got to give it a try.
I mean those who finish are optimists, right?
Today's our day. So, I'm sort of a little neutral
about it but committed. And I've got other staff
that will be attending the meetings with me as
well from the science centers.

MS. LUKENS: Okay, Peter, I wanted to
add that if you go to the MAFAC main page, there's
a link to the task force and all the materials in
the website there.

MR. SHELLEY: Great.

MS. LUKENS: So, if you all are
interested in that, you don't have to go
searching, just go to the MAFAC website.

MR. SHELLEY: Thank you.

MS. MORRIS: Are there questions and
comments?

MS. LUKENS: Yes.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Were there any
congressional staff there?

MR. SHELLEY: I believe there were. I
was going to mention that, but I couldn't recall
off hand. I think there were a couple offices.

MS. HAMILTON: It might have been
Blumenauer or Schrader, but I could be wrong.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Schrader.

MS. HAMILTON: It could have been.

Maybe Blumenauer. I'm trying to think now. As
you mentioned, there were a lot of interested
parties in the room that weren't --

MR. SHELLEY: But that's an important
comment. And I'm sure Barry, who was incredibly
thorough in setting this up, recognized the
importance of having those offices stay involved
or at least informed about the process. But I'll
double check and make sure that he is inviting all
those offices.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: (inaudible) is on
Schrader. But I'm just curious to if -- I mean
it's a pretty thorny issue at times. There's just
so many diversities there that go away in the
different routes of --

MR. SHELLEY: Right.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- ensuring business
and culture and everything.

MR. SHELLEY: Right. Yeah, this was
definitely the honeymoon meeting. And it'll
quickly into the, you know, the real nuts and
bolts of marriage soon enough.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Should be out looking
for divorce lawyers.

MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, we're not looking
for any divorce lawyers at this point.

MS. LUKENS: Liz.

MS. HAMILTON: I'm just going to add one
thing. and I don't know whether MAFAC has the
money to do this or not. But every year, there is
an annual update of juvenile passage data in the
basin, which is, for most of us, you follow it
closely, we know that's the limiting factor. You
know, it's not an adult issue, it's the babies
getting downstream through eight federal dams.
And so, every year, the scientists in the region;
if they're state, federal, tribal, scientists,
monitor the small-passage data. Think of an
annual report.

And it's fascinating. And it's done in
something that even I can understand as far as how
they translate the science. And it's what makes
us fight for river conditions that are good for
small (inaudible) downriver. And so, it's very,
very informative for people who are trying to get
their arms around what the underlying science
issues are.

And I know you talked about (inaudible)
factors. This is really the biggest one in the
whole basin, is downstream passages.

So, I'll look up the data and find the
date for it, but it's in April. It's a half-a-day meeting. And I don't think there's a phone-in because it's a public water resources building. But I leave inspired every year that I've been able to work with (inaudible) because it's pretty simple.

MR. SHELLEY: I just wanted to ask Heidi if she wanted to add anything.

MS. LOVETT: No, I think you covered (inaudible) except for what Jennifer added, that they will always be -- the West Coast region is sort of maintaining their website because there's so much information. And it's great to have your staff helping with that. But there's a link from our webpage right to it.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, I just wanted to say that, you know, we wondered whether this would be a good thing to add to the MAFAC scope of activities. I think it actually strengthens MAFAC to have this work in the Columbia Basin be under our umbrella. That I hope we'll learn things from this model of a facilitated process, to set goals
in a very intractable and complicated, challenging management area. And hopefully, we can learn from the model and use it in other parts of our nation that face difficult problems.

So, I'm very glad that it's off to a good start, and I am grateful to those of you that (inaudible) participated.

Yes, Julie.

MS. HAMILTON: So, based on that, I mean people tend to be focused on materials and interaction of the participants. But it sounds like for us, we need more of a documentational process.

MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

MS. HAMILTON: And so, that it can be applied somewhere else. And so, I don't know if that's something that's being kind of reported in terms of how the process is functioning and molding.

MR. SHELLEY: Heidi is in charge of that.

(Laughter) As far as I'm
concerned. I'm not a process guy.

MS. LOVETT: I can add that there was a lot of process since the kernel of thought started here, and the first meeting happened there. And it involved a lot of players. And there's some really key staff up in the Westcoast region that fought it through, including, starting with Barry. Actually, because he came to us and met with lawyers form general counsel, that understand the various options.

But as you said, I think he (inaudible) and brainchild. So, I think he tried to figure out what is the (inaudible) and make it happen and make it happen as soon as he could.

MR. SHELLEY: I think it's good, Julie, that Heidi participates because she really has a tremendous amount of expertise around the FACA process and what's acceptable under what the requirements are for it and has already identified herself to the group as helping to play that function, to make sure to ask for states within
bounds.

MS. MORRIS: So. that is mentioned.

MS. HAMILTON: Yeah, I'm thinking you were asking about how the process may lead to something or were you asking how this relates to other task forces we had in MAFAC?

MS. MORRIS: That's basically, how we had functioned (inaudible) task force, yeah. Especially, when it's as complicated as this one sounds.

MS. LUKENS: I just wanted to clarify, that I'm glad that it actually is a requirement under FACA, that the DFO or alternate DFO, be at those task force meetings and be a part of that. So, I just want to make sure for fact purposes you understand that we have to be there, so.

MR. SHELLEY: Good. Julie, I couldn't hear your conversation with Liz.

MS. MORRIS: Oh, I was saying that I'm thinking it's not so much about how this particular process is going to unfold in terms of
decision making, it's more about how the process could be applied in other task force agreements.

MR. SHELLEY: Right. Okay.

MS. LUKENS: Mike.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm sorry, you said DFO.

MS. LUKENS: Yes. Oh, not in Canada.

(Laughter) Designated federal official, sorry. (inaudible) has something under FACA, for each committee, there's a designated federal official. Okay, sorry, I began to table, but we said so. But Canada is not (inaudible).

MS. HAMILTON: You're awake, right?

MS. LUKENS: You are.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: We call that a DFO win on Alaska.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, any other comments or questions? Thank you. Thank you. We'll move into the Ecosystems Approach subcommittee report panel.

MS. YOCHEM: Okay. Thank you. we had a similar briefing that you folks just did, from Peter Shelley. Thank you very much, on the
Columbia Basin Partnership Task Force. We also, Susan Marie Stedman, stayed around to meet with us and talk a little bit more about the mitigation policy that NOAA's, and we appreciated that very much. And I thought what I would do is give you an idea of a general comment that we made to her and then some of the other issues that she brought to us, that you may remember she mentioned. There were 19, and she only talked about eight of them in her presentation. So, we asked her what those other ones were. And then a little bit of discussion we had at the end about process and what the next steps would be with regard to MAFAC.

So, one of the first comments that we made was that you may remember that she mentioned that the mitigation policy is envisioned as an overarching policy, a very general policy, and that they would follow with some more general guidance as needed. And one of the things that we mentioned was that a lot of the questions that MAFAC members had, fall into the category of the devil's in the details, sort of things.
And so, we hoped that the document, even if it is general, would have enough examples, maybe some case studies, something like that. So, that people will get a feel for how it would, not only how the policy is stated, but maybe some examples of how it would be implemented.

Of the other issues that have already been considered and that she didn't mention in her presentation, she talked about six of them that will be in the final summary document. And then she mentioned three that they talked about but are not going to include in the summary document. So, I'll just sort of run through those quickly.

The first one, was assessment tools, whether NOAA has the right tools in place to be able to evaluate mitigation and projects.

The second one, was climate change, how that should be factored in. And she gave the example of a person or developer who was looking to fill in a wetlands and then said that there was really no need to mitigate this because the whole area would be under water in 20 years anyway. So,
how this whole issue of climate change.

Monitoring came up, in that sites need
to be monitored long enough to actually
demonstrate that they are providing the ecosystem
services that they are supposed to be. And there
was a fair amount of discussion about this for
projects big and small. Really big projects, for
example, use performance bonds.

Another issue they talked about was this
concept about research project or a study as a
mitigation or as compensation. And in the case of
some endangered species, for example, data-poor
situations, actually, the best thing for
mitigation might be for the developer or other
entity to provide funding for a research project.

Mitigation for restoration projects was
also something that they talked about. And that's
a complicated issue. So, for example, if you
remove a dam, you may restore a stream, but then
you may drain a wetlands. And so, then how do you
mitigate for your mitigation project? Very
complicated.
Another issue that they discussed that will be included in the document is the concept of combination banks or combination mitigation banks or stacked credits. And the idea there is that you can't be allowed to sell the same credit twice. So, the same project can't be used to mitigate for more than one issue. And how do you make sure that that doesn't happen.

They also talked about at least three things that they decided were issues but were either beyond the scope of the document or for other reasons, they wouldn't include them.

One of them was the what possible mechanisms for elevating NOAA's recommendations, because their role is advisory. How can they do a better job of getting peoples' attention about their recommendations that they're making.

The other issue or another issue was that activities with minimal impact, for example, something that is affecting less than half an acre. Those sorts of projects or activities are handled differently in different regions. So, is
that okay or do we need to have a more standard approach? But it was felt that that wasn't necessary to be included in the mitigation policy.

And then, another issue they talked about was this concept of fines in lieu of. The concern was that these monies may sit in a fund at the Army Corps for years. And the question was whether somehow these could be used, if NOAA fisheries could get access to these funds for beneficial uses. And it was thought that, as you can imagine, there's a lot of legal issues and financial issues that was too complex and really not appropriate for the mitigation policy.

So, moving forward, you may remember the timeline that she talked about when she gave the presentation to all of us. Within the next couple of months, NOAA expects to have a revised or condensed version of the issues document. It's going to include some of the feedback that we provided. And then it's going to go back to, my understanding is that it'll go back to the stakeholders that have been a part of the process
so far, which would include MAFAC. And we'd be
given another opportunity to comment.

And I took notes on what we said during
the meeting, and then I also took notes about the
subcommittee member comments on some of these
other issues. So, I can either share those with
everyone now, or we can just wait until the issues
document comes out and make any comments then.

So, hold that thought, we'll think about that in a
moment.

And then, the full-draft mitigation plan
is expected by December. And so, then we would
have an opportunity to comment, our comments would
be valued on that plan as well.

MS. MORRIS: Randy?

MR. FISHER: You know, this thing
worries me because the more I think about it, and
the more I listen to it, the more worried I seem
to get. Because I don't know how we're going to
do all this stuff. My recommendation to Paul was,
you know, probably what you should do is instead
of calling it a policy, you should call it
principles. So, you'd have some general principle. Because I think what they're trying to do is tell other agencies, which have the rule of permitting authority, what they think is important.

It seems to me, that I would be more interested in the higher-level principles first, and then start drilling down. Because it just seems to me that there's a lot of workload here, and they don't have anybody to do it.

MS. YOCHEM: I would just say, in your mind, what is the distinction between principle and policy?

MR. FISHER: I think principles give you more latitude, policy may not. Because policy is usually, you know, when you have a policy, then you've got to have some sort way of dealing with that policy.

It seems to me that there is a lot of opportunity here for people with the regional to interpret a lot of the stuff the way they want to. And it seems to me that they maybe have already
done this is to go around to the different regions
and say, okay, what's the biggest problem we have
here. What now am I supposed to do? They
probably don't have enough people to do such and
such and consultations, you know, to resolve that.
There's a lot of other agencies that are getting
very upset. So, I just think it gives you more
latitude.

MS. MORRIS: Jennifer?

MS. LUKENS: So, I think that's a good
point when you say policy. There's a lot of
different -- it means a lot of different things to
a lot of different people. And the way the policy
directives system is set up within NOAA fisheries,
policy is a more overall high level over our
(inaudible) statement of what our beliefs are or
what our goals are.

Then, we have a next step down, which is
our procedural documents, which gets more into how
we do something with the directions on how you do
things or how you apply that to get to reach those
principles and with those goals that are outlined
in a policy itself.

When Susan Marie put out that schematic there that had the policy with the stepdown guidance, you're right, it's a lot if you include all of that stepdown guidance there. And that's a conversation that they are having, and they realize that it is a huge undertaking. It could be a huge undertaking.

So, they have involved folks from every single one of the regional offices, the habitat offices. And it is a very inclusive conversation. And I'm not sure how big it's going to be or how small it's going to be. But I think it is a worthwhile undertaking to look at from that high level and then make those decisions as to how far down and how much effort is being put into that and what it looks like.

So, I don't think the level of complexity that you're thinking about right now is the ultimate goal of the discussion. It's good, they're just starting to have the discussion.

So, I as the policy office director, is
going to be trying to help navigate them through
and advise them through that process.

MS. MORRIS: Liz?

MS. HAMILTON: I'm troubled from a
completely different prospective. Because I've
heard and I've seen that there are authorities
under which this needs to be done. And if it's
not done, that latitude could cause -- I'm just
making this up now, you know, someone in the
Southwest, to ask for different (inaudible) of
different litigation for damage than someone in
the Northeast. And so, the word programmatic was
popping into my head when she was talking.

But I'm sort of troubled with not
getting something on paper before we start having
banks, and I mean real banks, money; big, real
money as this grows as an industry, and it is on
the West Coast. I think some good guidance, so
people know how NOAA's going to approach this and
the consultations that are ESA or EFH or even from
permitting where they're

(inaudible). Anyway, I'm more
troubled on where how the money plays into all this. And I mean
workload's always an issue, but still, this is your authorities that have to do it.

MS. LUKENS: I've got Bob (inaudible).

MR. RHEAULT: Yes, I'm sort of wondering, so who is this for? Who's the target audience? Is this internal guidance? Is this external guidance (inaudible) agencies and NGOs? Are we telling the Army Corps how to do this, and do we have the authority to do that? (inaudible). Are we writing a BFD or are we writing rules? And I'm just, you know, who's the target audience and under what authority I guess, if we are telling other people other than NOAA how to do this, where?

MS. LUKENS: I would say, it is a NOAA fisheries policy. It is for NOAA fisheries employees and direction to them on how to implement under a legal (inaudible) system authorities. And is a publicly available document that will be listed on your external website, so
people can understand what our position is and how we're going to implement that. We cannot tell other people.

MR. RHEAULT: That's what I thought.

MS. LUKENS: But there's advisement on how we're going to do things and letting others know what our guidance is, and we're trying to get to the objective of predictability and consistency to a certain (inaudible), certain, you know, there's always going to need to be built-in regional flexibility based on geography and (inaudible) and whatnot. The purpose of our policy, we've been trying to tell other people to do.

MR. RHEAULT: And what goals and guidance and rules and regulations?

MS. LUKENS: Yeah, policy is not a regulation in my definition. In my policy directives world that we limit in fisheries, policy is not a rule or regulation or statute, it is kind of the next layer down of interpreting of what that means internally to our folks for
consistency, efficiency and help me execute our
programs and our mandates.

MS. MORRIS: In my sense to Pam's
concerns, that having policy guidance will help
the limited staff to feel like they can't deal
with the workload and consultations, this should
help them be more efficient and more productive in
terms of getting consultations. Pam?

MS. YOCHEN: I think this discussion
here is one of the reasons that we, I mean that
was the sense I got when people were asking
questions when she was getting her original
presentation, is that people are nervous about --
give us some examples about exactly how you intend
to use this or how you plan to, you know, so that
we do have some predictability and some
understanding of what this policy is going to mean
for, you know, for us or for others. Ray?

MR. ESPINOZA: Thank you. So, I found a
couple things really interesting. And one of the
things you mentioned was when using mitigation in
the face of climate change and habitat migrations,
I think we need to be really careful because depending on what the policy or principles go with that, you're implying that when you're modeling those changes, certain data is going to be accepted as the norm.

So, for example, if you're saying why am I going to mitigate this area because it's going to disappear anyway and seeing how you worked it out. depending on the language you use to put that in to the policy, it could set precedence onto, again, the science part. Onto what data is used for -- not specifically for the mitigation, but what modeling is used to see where errors are going to shift and not shift.

And so, that just makes me a bit nervous because what data are you going to use? Are you going to use the lower side or the higher side? And I know that it's risky as well as interesting. I mean that conversation really interests me as part of the science as well just because of what implications it could have on other things.

And, you know, to begin with, I think
it's not really mentioning about, we were talking about the ERP and that conversation with the rural versus urban if mitigation goes here and where it goes. I think it could play a role to identifying the best areas. And that's, I think where modeling as well could have a role seeing (inaudible) that doesn't mean you just don't have to mitigate it because you have to mitigate where it does migrate to.

I think, again, I think it's really interesting. It's a really big task, not just on the policy side but then on the implications that it has on what science is implicitly accepted as the norm. And so, that's what I just wanted.

MS. YOCHEM: Thank you. And again, I think that's what she was trying to convey a little bit is the dilemma. Is that we want to acknowledge that climate is an issue. We want to acknowledge that this off-site compensation is an issue, without getting down too much in the weeds about exactly how we're going to solve that problem or we would address an individual project.
But as you saw, with all the questions that came out, people want at least a sense of: Can you give us a case study? Can you give us an example of how that might be approached?

MS. LUKEINS: So, I think this discussion that you all are having here and your comments here is exactly what Susan Marie is looking to hear from and what NOAA is looking to hear from MAFAC. And looking at the issues paper coming out, what your concerns may be. And when they get to that actual draft, hearing from you all, it's too big, it's too small, it forgot something, it included something it didn't need to include.

So, the idea of what it's going to look like on the end, isn't there right now, it's in the scoping phase. And I think that will be very valuable, and I'm glad she had the opportunity to come up here and tee up the issue for you all. And as it moves along, you all have those concerns from a variety of different prospectives across the spectrum, for you all to weigh in on that. that's what we're looking for.
MS. MORRIS: Mike.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think Randy kind of nailed it once (inaudible). It seems to me, the principles and objectives and goals that are foundational to your policy. And I go on the website, and I see reference under ADFM, two principles, but I can't find them, of course. There's a roadmap, and there's kind of an outline of what it is all about. Maybe some of those could be principles, but it doesn't explicitly say they are principles. And I would think that that was somewhat elementary to developing policy.

MS. LUKENS: There's a policy and then the roadmap is the procedural directives. So, there's two documents --

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right.

MS. LUKENS: -- on it.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, that's what a roadmap would be, but --

MS. LUKENS: No, sorry. The terminology in our policy directive system. We have a policy. We have an EBFM policy. Our procedural directive
is called a roadmap. So, it fits underneath that
in how our system is set up, so.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I think it would be a
way to get policy implemented.

MS. LUKENS: It is.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: But the step before
that, it seems to be, is the lay and the
principles of what it is you're trying to achieve
and why you -- those are the basis for why you're
doing -- in my --

MS. LUKENS: And that's what's in the
policy. I can follow up if you need help with
that.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Again, missing
something.

MS. LUKENS: Pam.

MS. YOCHEM: So, as Jennifer says, what
I'm hearing is it's going to be up to use to
feedback. This is too specific. It's not
specific enough. It includes something it
shouldn't include, that general comment as well as
commenting on some of the specific topics.
So, yours about, you know, we should be talking about principles not policy, that could be something that when we see the issues document come back. Because I did hear, you know, from Susan Marie that she heard us and heard others who have commented on it so far. And so, we don't know how much our input is going to incorporated in the document that's going to come out in a couple of months. And if we don't feel like we got our point across, then we're going have another opportunity to try to get that point across.

MS. BONNEY: So, then in the timeline, wouldn't you suggest that we be doing a teleconference review?

MS. MORRIS: Heidi, do you want to comment on that? You had talked about that there might be several subcommittees that would be doing things or needing to talk in late summer or early summer.

MS. LOVETT: Yeah, I'm not sure of Susan Marie's timeline exactly, but there's opportunity
to do webinars and bring information back here.

I'm forgetting specifically when she said that issues paper was due, but when it came out, we thought we would do a webinar. It would be for the whole committee but targeting, obviously, the subcommittees, so that they can help monitor the progress of the work. Does that answer it?

MS. YOCHEN: Yes.

MS. BONNEY: So, it's a two-step process. So, the summer review and then probably another final review at

(inaudible). (inaudible) maybe?

MS. MORRIS: Well, it won't be final because the actual policy is not expected out until December.

MS. BONNEY: Okay. So, it might go to (inaudible) in the next few (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: So, what seems still a little bit unclear is whether the review of the draft issues paper in the summer is a subcommittee review or a MAFAC review.
MS. YOCHEM: Yes, and that's what I would like guidance from the committee, on whether you want the webinar to be just to the subcommittee, and we will, as I said, I've taken some notes, or if you think that this is something that the full committee would want to hear and have a chance to weigh in on.

MS. BONNEY: What do you think? The subcommittee has fluid boundaries, right?

MS. YOCHEM: Yes.

MS. BONNEY: Sort of it's not, there's a lay of a defined group of people empowered to participate in the subcommittee activity. Is that what you were going to say for your (inaudible) Peter?

MR. SHELLEY: No, I was just going to say (inaudible). But boundaries. I'm interested in hearing, but I realize I'm on this subcommittee, so I'm coming either way.

MS. MORRIS: That kind of fixes that.
MR. SHELLEY: Right.

MS. MORRIS: Do you have a strong feeling about whether there should be a full MAFAC review of the kinds of comments that the subcommittee will be developing in response to the draft issues paper? Am I using the right language here, Peter?

MR. SHELLEY: Well, maybe there could be a quick report out from the committee electronically to the full MAFAC with a reply, you know, it's a rather quick turnaround reply date for any concerns.

MS. MORRIS: Ray?

MR. ESPINOZA: Yeah. So, I'm not on the subcommittee, and so, I would either appreciate to be on the subcommittee or be part of -- allow MAFAC so that I could comment on that as well.

MS. MORRIS: Liz?

MS. HAMILTON: When she was describing the schedules, it seemed to me like they weren't date. That it is a work in progress. And I was thinking while she was talking that it is really
likely that our fall meeting will be close to the point of when they have a policy. And if they want advice, if, you know, if NOAA wants advice from us, we could mesh that with our next meeting. And so, that didn't seem that far off, but it could (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: Heidi.

MS. LOVETT: So, I think the question that you're trying to figure out is whether you all feel we need to have some kind of consensus advice or if you're comfortable with your individual advice coming through MAFAC to Susan Marie. Does that make sense?

If you want to be able to air and share all your concerns regardless of, you know, your stakeholder vow that you work in and who you represent so to speak and you're experience, all of that advice is helpful to Susan Marie. But if you feel it important for you to have some consensus advice, then, you know, we can monitor the process and organize the meetings as necessary of the full committee. Does that make sense?
MS. YOCHEM: Yes, so could either -- in other words, given all this timing, we could ask Susan to come back to the fall meeting and give another presentation of the revised document. And then we could comment individually there. Is that what you're saying, rather than having something interim?

MS. LOVETT: No, no, we could do something interim and provide comments. It's that individual comments versus a consensus advice. It's up to you all what you think you might need to do. Does that make sense?

When the draft policy comes out and it's out for public review, that might be a time where you might want to make some adjustments. Because she's getting input from a variety of people ahead of that. And otherwise, your individual input is very helpful to her at this point, I think.

MS. MORRIS: It seems like because MAFAC's engaged through this meeting, through a presentation to the whole committee, we kind of have a path to, as a group, make comments.
And so, we definitely want to comment once there's a draft policy at the end of the year. But it also seems like we have an opportunity, as MAFAC, to comment as the draft policy is being -- and I think that's what we should do, not just depend on this as the information and we respond individually until the official comment period. So, I'm moving in a different direction.

MS. LOVETT: Okay, that's fine. I just wanted to explain the difference.

MS. MORRIS: I think I'm new leader. (Laughter) I don't want to do something else.

MS. BONNEY: I agree with you.

MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

MS. BONNEY: And I think that doing it through the subcommittee makes sense.

MS. MORRIS: Okay.

MS. BONNEY: And then it's just everybody's noticed, so you're welcomed to join if you're a MAFAC member.

MR. ESPINOZA: Right. Julie, I agree
with that just because I was, for example, I wasn't approached as an individual or as (inaudible) NGO to comment on that. I was approached as a MAFAC member. So, that's my access to it. Because there's a lot of things I'm commenting to NOAA on my own, and I don't do it as a MAFAC member. And so, since it was done here, I think that's the appropriate avenue to do so.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, yes, Peter.

MR. SHELLEY: I just have a procedure question. Under the (inaudible) such a good federal advisory committee member --

MS. LOVETT: Yeah, in the notes.

MR. SHELLEY: -- decisions, if this group is making decisions, does that have to happen publicly?

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

MR. SHELLEY: Or it's with some public capacity to chime in.

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

MR. SHELLEY: Good. I mean, so we've got to take that in to account, whatever approach
we agree on.

    MS. MORRIS: So, if we have a summer
webinar or comments called, to develop some
comments on the draft, that would be a publicly
noticed, available for public comment.

    MS. LOVETT: Yes.

    MS. MORRIS: Thanks, Peter. Okay, so
whatever happens in the summer, is going to
be based at the subcommittee.

    MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

    MS. MORRIS: It will be publicly
noticed. We may invite Susan to come back to the
fall MAFAC meeting in order to brief all of MAFAC
on how our (inaudible) evolving. And then, after
the draft policy is posted for official public
comment, that'll be the third time we swing at it.

    Okay, great. Thank you for that. Ready
for the Commerce subcommittee report?

    MS. BONNEY: I don't feel that I can do
as good a job as Pam did. And I didn't have a
full cup of a coffee when you asked me if there
was an action to vote on.
MS. MORRIS: Okay, it is an action to vote on.

MR. SHELLEY: Yes. (Laughter)

MS. BONNEY: So, I think the background for the recommendation is, we had quite a bit of discussion at the beginning of the meeting before we actually figured out what direction we were going to go, about the excitement in terms of making progress on the aquaculture under the current Administration. And so, there's a lot of things happening on a policy level and also on the industry level, where people think that they're finally going to be able to break through the ceiling and make some progress. So, it was really felt that MAFAC should be a partner in that, in terms of continuing to make progress.

And if you look at the National Aquaculture Association letter, they basically are saying that they want us to be engaged with the implementation of the strategic plan. And also, are looking at certain elements in the letter to continue to make progress in aquaculture.
So, instead of having us be the, kind of the group that's tasked with monitoring the Agency's progress, we thought that the better approach would be actually to task the Aqua Culture subcommittee to do that.

And so --

MR. SHELLEY: Task for.

MS. BONNEY: -- the recommendation is for --

MS. MORRIS: The aquaculture?

MR. SHELLEY: Task Force.

MS. BONNEY: What did I say?

MS. MORRIS: Subcommittee.

MS. BONNEY: Okay, task force. And so, what we are recommending is to, you know, basically reconstitute the task force for a two-year period. And that we are suggesting a certain clear charge, which includes four points:

Review the strategic plan and progress on the points that they raised in their letter, annually.

Recommendations to the Office of Aqua
Culture of additional, and I guess it would be us, of additional actions and allocation of resources. These become apparent as a result of the review in progress with me. So, that's right of the letter.

Creation of a standardized permit process for short-term aquaculture research to allow the testing.

Demonstration of technologies in the EEZ and other recommendations that they deem important or recommend to MAFAC to help move aquaculture policy forward.

MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry, it's really hard to

(inaudible).

MS. LOVETT: So, ladies, we'll hang it on the screen for us all to see.

MS. MORRIS: Thank you.

MS. BONNEY: So, the only point I would raise, Heidi, is we need to take recommendations to MAFAC for the Office of Aquaculture. Because their making recommendations to us is not directly to the Office of Aquaculture.
MS. MORRIS: Is there any more explanation you want to provide while we're --

MS. BONNEY: So, I think the best thing to do would be to look directly at the letter. So, we're pulling a lot of tasks directly out of the letter that they submitted to us.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, and this was posted on the rating --

MS. BONNEY: Right.

MS. MORRIS: -- website where the presentations were posted, right?

MS. BONNEY: Exactly. And we did kind of put that one catchall in there. I don't know if people are nervous about that. But knowing that that group is really the expert, they may have better ideas than we do.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, is this a proposed motion from the Commerce subcommittee to the full committee? I guess it is.

Okay, so we're discussing the motion then.

MS. BONNEY: So, the only comment that I
would make is recommendations to MAFAC for the Office of Aquaculture because of the (inaudible). So, the second bullet, I think, needs to be modified.

MS. LOVETT: Is that what you're asking?

MS. BONNEY: Yeah.

MS. MORRIS: Peter?

MR. SHELLEY: I recommend we take out on the points that the NAAA raised in their letter from the first bullet.

MS. MORRIS: Do you have a rational?

MR. SHELLEY: Yeah, I mean I think we either do this or we don't do this. NOAA has alerted us to some concerns they have, but we're not doing this, you know, because they asked us to, I guess is the simplest way to put it. I mean I think it's, you know, if we reviewed the strategy annually and NOAA will certainly continue to keep giving those inputs, I think the same objective is made without sort of highlighting one group.

MS. MORRIS: Pam?
MS. YOCHEM: I would agree with that, because I think the, well the NOAA letter raised a number of issues, there might be others that the task force would want to -- other aspects of the strategic plan that they would want to review. So, we don't want to just --

MR. SHELLEY: Limit.

MS. YOCHEM: -- indicate that we're limiting to those points.

MS. MORRIS: And is annually the right time period for that review by the task force?

MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

MS. YOCHEM: Yes, it is.

MS. MORRIS: And the mover and seconder are okay with that adjustment?

MR. RHEAULT: Do we need to clarify that it's the

    (inaudible) agriculture strategic plan --

MS. MORRIS: Sure.

MR. RHEAULT: -- with what we're doing?

MS. MORRIS: Yeah. Any other suggestions
about the dots, the four bullets?

   MS. BONNEY: So, I guess my only
question on that is the strategic plan
implementation in progress? Are we implementing
the plan versus just --?

   MS. MORRIS: Sure. That makes sense.
Does that make sense? The implementation of
NOAA's --

   MS. BONNEY: Progress on the
implementation of. There you go, right there.
Get rid of the word progress.

   MS. MORRIS: That's good.

   MR. RHEAULT: And I guess I just have a
process question. How is the makeup of the task
force created and updated and indicating who's on
it and who gets on it and who stays on it and who
decides?

   MS. LUKENS: So, when the task force was
set up, we had a charter established for it. And
I think we need to go back to that maybe and look
at if we need to just reup with the new tasks that
we're asking it undertake or if we need to create
that. So, I'll defer to Heidi now.

MS. LOVETT: So, there was a terms of reference assigned to the task force. And it seems to me that what you're doing here is creating a new terms of reference, and you've made the request that the task force be maintained for two additional years.

So, I would propose that we would send letters of invite to the current members, asking if they wish to continue for the next two years with this terms of reference. And then if there are gaps, meaning people are stepping down or for whatever reason, if there's vacancies, then we can put a call out to solicit additional members for it.

MS. MORRIS: Yes, Julie?

MS. BONNEY: So, in the past, I think, John Corbin was kind of the liaison between MAFAC and the task force. And so, I don't know if there's that bridge that exists between the current members and MAFAC right now.

MS. LOVETT: Bob's been doing both.
MR. RHEAULT:  I mean I can do it until like I'm termed out in February.

MR. PARSONS:  I'm fine with doing it too, so.

MS. MORRIS:   So, Jim and Bob will help with that.  Julie, can you help us get the right words for the first part, which is just kind of suggested here that MAFAC is recommending reconstituting or breathing new life -- I don't know what the (inaudible), bringing new life into -- giving a second life to the Aquaculture Task Force for a two-year period with terms of reference as follows.

MR. PARSONS:  We approved their continuation last year for one year.

MS. MORRIS:  Okay.

MR. PARSONS:  But we haven't had any tasks for it.

MS. MORRIS:  Oh, so it's still -- when does that one year up?

MR. PARSONS:  A year from Portland.  So, whenever that is.
MS. BONNEY: Coming up. Yeah.

MS. LOVETT: And there was a task force for it because they provided input on the strategic plan. So, that was their work --

MR. PARSONS: Right.

MS. LOVETT: -- over last year.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Julie, can you help us give the words so that this is an actual motion about --

MS. BONNEY: So, you need -- basically, you're talking about up above.

MS. MORRIS: Right, just kind of says may wish to, could be. So, what are the words that represent what we're doing there?

MS. BONNEY: Well, she's typing right now. I think it's reconstitute, would be the right word, don't you think?

MS. YOCHEM: Or continue. Maintain.

MS. MORRIS: Maintain or continue (inaudible).

MS. BONNEY: Okay, it's continue.

MS. YOCHEM: Maintain.
MS. BONNEY: Maintain for an additional two years. That works.

MS. LOVETT: Does that work for you?

MAFAC request that the Aquaculture Task Force be maintained for two years to conduct this work.

MS. BONNEY: I would say to conduct the following, versus.

MS. LOVETT: Okay.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, is this acceptable to the mover and the second? Mike.

MR. RUBINO: Just a question that I've been asked to

(inaudible). I guess number one for a bullet point, highest bullet point. Has there been an attempt to like capture how many permits or how many applications have been submitted, you know, for how long they're going and when their progress is -- individual projects is or how many of them are prototypes or what? I mean what
stage of development or how much
progress are they actually making
in this implementation?

MR. PARSONS: Zero.

MR. RUBINO: So, that's a pretty easy
measurement. It's also an F grade in school. So,
I guess maybe it's nothing to do with language,
but going forward, I think that's something we
want to get measured (inaudible) or at least
comment on.

MR. PARSONS: Well, there's a lawsuit
that has to disappear first for Gulf anyway, so.

MR. RUBINO: I always mention that too.

MS. MORRIS: So, I take your comments to
be supportive. Anybody else? Heidi?

MS. LOVETT: I just want to point out.

I think as we were capturing this during
yesterday's meeting, the third bullet was
something which you all were requesting of the
Agency. I guess I'm not reading it right. So,
you might want to pull that bullet out and have it
separate from what you have, you know, proposed to
the task force.

MS. MORRIS: Pam.

MS. YOCHEM: Oh, Paul had something to say.

MR. DOREMUS: My question was about that bullet too.

MS. MORRIS: Yeah, it's because this was notes on the generation of the subcommittee work, so.

MR. DOREMUS: Yeah, it's probably where that gets directed. But also, it implies the limitation in a sense on technology development for using EEZ and (inaudible) economic zone was (inaudible) on, and (inaudible) and see where the value changes (inaudible) attributes (inaudible).

I think intent is to try to develop technology that can be used to forebode production, that could evolve a complex system to have land-based components (inaudible).

MR. PARSONS: I think the intent of the association and the directors that pushed this forward was to make the process standardized for
those that wanted to try to get a research project going. Because they're not yet at this point --

MR. DOREMUS: I wasn't getting that meeting from that bullet. I was just testing for --

MR. PARSONS: But it's not yet.

MR. DOREMUS: You can't get a streamlined permit for research projects.

MR. PARSONS: Yeah.

MR. DOREMUS: So, you wouldn't necessarily have the same rigorous and --

MR. PARSONS: That's production.

MR. DOREMUS: -- time-consuming nature as a full commercial permit.

SPEAKER: How are we getting that from them

(inaudible)?

MR. DOREMUS: Clarification helps a lot.

MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry, Pam had her hand up.

MS. YOCHEN: Actually, I remember this discussion too, and I thought one of the things
that came out of that discussion was that maybe
this was too specific for a charge -- that this
was a specific recommendation that the task force
might make after reviewing progress on the
strategic plan and finding that it wasn't moving
forward fast enough, that a suggestion might be a
standardized, you know, process for doing
demonstration projections. That recommendation
seems at a different level than the other ones.

MR. MORRIS: Julie's next then Bob.

MS. BONNEY: Let Bob go first.

MR. RHEAULT: Well, I'm just suggesting
that that would be something that would be more
appropriate for the full MAFAC to recommend to the
intergovernmental working group on agriculture.
That that's really where, you know, this is
something that should eventually come from MAFAC
as a recommendation to the intergovernmental
working group, provided we can all agree that
that's something we want to do.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, so are you saying it
doesn't belong in the motion or --
MR. RHEAULT: Correct.

MS. MORRIS: -- it doesn't belong in the motion? You would recommend removing it from the motion.

MR. RHEAULT: Yes, that would be something that MAFAC should decide to do, not necessarily a task for the --

MS. MORRIS: So, is that --

MR. RHEAULT: -- task force.

MS. MORRIS: -- is that a second motion that we'll take up after this motion or something that will be

(inaudible)? I don't understand.

MR. RHEAULT: The question is whether it belongs here as a direction to the task force.

MS. MORRIS: Okay.

MR. RHEAULT: I do believe that as a recommendation from NOAA from other bodies and various formats, it's already been recommended in a letter to the intergovernmental working group, that I just received this morning. So, I mean other people are advocating for this. We could
emphasize that and carry that message forward from MAFAC or choose not to. That's something that's sort of different from what we're discussing right now, it's just the judgement of the task force.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Harlon?

MR. PEARCE: I just don't want us to get confused because really, my vote today, was to get something done and

(inaudible), so you could get some sort of prototype or whatever, so that we can process this policy (inaudible)). It just not as simple with the (inaudible) as opposed to when you intend to make it work.

And so, whatever it takes to get that to work, is what I'm in favor of. If you've got to move it to another spot or whatever. All I want to do is get 'er done. Get it over with.

(inaudible). I understand what Bob's saying. I just don't want to lose it or however you put it.

So, get it out of this (inaudible) and put it in
something maybe let's say we're stronger than this spot here.

MS. MORRIS: Jennifer?

MS. LUKENS: I thought I raised my hand.

But in looking at this, I think the top three bullets are what the motion should be, and that the bottom one that is no longer a bullet, is something that our MAFAC or representatives, Jim and Bob, could bring to include as part of the discussion of the task force, as part of reflection of their conversation here and bring it back there, so it doesn't have to part of the motion itself.

MS. MORRIS: Julie?

MS. BONNEY: Well, I guess my only question is, is that something you need the aquaculture experts to have input in? So, in other words, is it something that you could just direct NOAA up to begin the process of developing these kinds of permits or do you need a stakeholder group to help advise how to make that function?

MR. PARSONS: I don't think we need to
micro-manipulate the intergovernmental workings with agriculture. If we tell them that we think this is imperative, that this is helpful, please do this. And there's a lot of agencies that are still going to have to work on it. It's not just NOAA. They all need to get their finger in the pot.

MS. MORRIS: Harlon.

MR. PEARCE: Keep it simple, stupid. What you did is risky is done (inaudible). So, the less bureaucracy you add to this process, I think the better. (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: Okay, so on I need sort of a clear direction from the mover and the seconder about -- I think you're clear that you want us to go ahead on the motion with the three bullets.

SPEAKER: Correct.

SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: So, at this point, is there any more discussion on motion with the three bullets? Hearing done. All those in favor, say aye.
COLLECTIVE: Aye.

MS. MORRIS: All those opposed, (inaudible). Any abstentions? Okay, that motion passes. Is there another motion that the Commerce subcommittee wants to take at this point? Question at the (inaudible)?

Harlon's walking out of the meeting. (inaudible) but not because he's upset (inaudible). (Laughter)

MR. PARSONS: I think that, you know, this would almost be like when one of those circular references in Excel. Because that recommendation initially came from the aquaculture task force.

MS. MORRIS: Okay.

MR. PARSONS: So, we can't really send it back to them.

MS. MORRIS: Well, we could (inaudible).

SPEAKER: Or we could embrace it and move it to NOAA.

MR. PARSONS: Yeah.

SPEAKER: With the motion that it's a
recommendation.

MS. MORRIS: Mike.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just had a clarification question, maybe for Bob or Jim. When they use this intergovernmental working group, do they kind of keep the same people and the same agencies involved at every point or does it change every time you go (inaudible)?)

MR. PARSONS: You know, it's sort of (inaudible) a recent development is that they all (inaudible) the meetings. We don't even get the minutes. We don't get to attend. And we don't know who is attending or not.

So, (inaudible) we're not happy about that. We've registered our (inaudible) with (inaudible) now secret meetings without minutes. And the lack of transparency is something that we regret. And we'll registered our displeasure. And that's where it stands.

Now, with whether the intergovernmental working group, you know, actually does anything, I hope they do and continue to do work. And we have
to some faith in that. But I don't know who attends. And we don't really talk about it, so.

SPEAKER: (inaudible).

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, they meet twice a year I believe. And there's a representative from each of the major agencies that usually attends, but there's spotty attendance of certain agencies according to my sources.

MS. MORRIS: Listening devices. We've got listening devices.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: They have done some good work.

MS. MORRIS: What did (inaudible what did Shawn?) say?

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I was going to say there's a meeting report out and there's --

MR. RHEAULT: There are some good work products, but the last couple, I guess it was two meetings or so,

(inaudible).

MR. DOREMUS: I'm just kidding.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Just a quick follow up.
This is pretty important to many people. There's billions of dollars that are invested (inaudible). And it looks like to me like this task force (inaudible), it's going to be a long haul, more than two years. And if you've gone this far (inaudible), not the task force but just in general, it speaks volumes about how much (inaudible) you're going to have to start building momentum. Because unless you get something done somewhere, (inaudible) so to speak, I believe it's going to keep (inaudible) aquaculture.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, any other business for the Commerce committee. Terri wants to say something.

MS. LEI: I have a question. So, what would be the vehicle to provide comments to the interagency such as that particular recommendation or others, that what is our vehicle to provide input them or how does MAFAC?

MS. MORRIS: It seems like we provide input to the assistant administration (inaudible) for fisheries.
MS. LEI: Okay.

MS. MORRIS: And through that, to the development people in the Department of Commerce.

MS. LEI: So, if MAFAC wanted to compose a letter emphasizing this issue and its importance to have it, you know, that the permitting is, you know, we all know permitting is the big problem, but how do we go about having, you know, small pilot projects be able to begin by having something streamlined liked that? So, would the Commerce committee want to think about pulling together a letter that we could send from MAFAC, transmitted, that would go through the Agency to the right people --

MS. MORRIS: Bob?

MS. LEI: -- to promote that?

MR. RHEAULT: Yeah, so (inaudible) at the National Agriculture Association held a town hall with all federal agencies, (inaudible) and agriculture (inaudible) about a month ago. And it was a big cry fest for all the industry. And they came out with two pages of (inaudible)
recommendations. And it was just moments ago sent to the intergovernmental working group on agriculture, with two pages of recommendations.

MS. LEI: Including that?

MR. RHEAULT: Including that.

MS. LEI: Okay. All right.

MR. RHEAULT: Now, we can choose to reinforce these if we think it's important that it comes from here as well as the NAAA. I don't know how much more impact that would have.

MS. LEI: Just inquiring (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: Ted.

MR. AMES: Yeah, I wonder if defining a specific length of time that this task force should function, is more detrimental than it would be simply to say that we are going to continue it or push to continue.

MS. MORRIS: So, Ted, what I would say for that, is if you're trying to recruit people to serve on the task force, and I mean a defined period of time for their next global commitment, is probably a good thing. And we could come back
and extend it to future MAFAC members and extend it for (inaudible) periods of time. Let's see, Rai.

MR. ESPINOZA: So, on Bob's. I'm not part of the NAAA. I have no idea of that meeting.

MR. RHEAULT: We can change that.

MR. ESPINOZA: But I do understand that MAFAC is something entirely separate. And so, if that intergovernmental panel for agriculture is deciding something that it's just receiving information from the sector that wants to do agriculture, I think it would have a different type of weight if it came from a different type of organization, such like MAFAC. And I think, again, here, I for example, support us sending a letter if that's something that's appropriate, from this committee to that.

MS. MORRIS: Jennifer? You had your hand up. No?

MS. LUKENS: No.

MS. MORRIS: Bob?
MR. RHEAULT: So, I'm just going to suggest that we pass this motion and ask the task force to look at the issue; they are away of this list of issues, decide a priority ranking of things, and bring it back to the MAFAC. If the task force thinks it's important enough to have MAFAC make this recommendation to reinforce what the NAAA has said, we will ask that MAFAC pile on. And so, once we reformulate the task force and ask them to do this, I expect the task force will come back rather quickly with the request to reinforce some of our recommendations because it's all (inaudible) been done. And now we just need to decide what to do with MAFAC. And rather than try and do it in a hurry today, let's get the task force to prioritize, rethink it, and (inaudible) to make a recommendation and we can do it on an interim basis electronically in the next couple months perhaps.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, when you said pass this motion, we have already passed the motion.

MR. RHEAULT: Oh, good. (Laughter) But
we operate under Congress, correct?

MS. MORRIS: Right.

MR. RHEAULT: So, we have friends in the Congress Department, which preferably I mean the whole Congress Department. That would be our one champion agency that we would love to get some support from. We can't even break through that, we're, you know, nowhere.

But if they could kind of agency-to-agency, become the champion I guess. I don't even know if it (inaudible). But having a champion that believes in this stuff would be, I think, at that level, would be important.

So, I mean for putting the recommendation out there, I think we somewhat want to line up the department before we do anything and see if they can maybe (inaudible) the other agencies I guess. Maybe that's just naïve of me, but I don't know.

MS. MORRIS: Okay, so we continue to have this like push and pull. So, people push and let's pass a motion.
(inaudible) we went to is kind of the subject of a (inaudible) expert on this and say let's wait. Let's let it come to us through the aquaculture task force. There's enough time.

MR. RHEAULT: Well, I don't want to just pass that one piece because I don't think that's the best recommendation (inaudible)

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Do you want to --

MR. RHEAULT: I think that (inaudible)

--

TERRI LEI: More inclusive.

MR. RHEAULT: -- about the field of recommendations, that I think the task force is ready to bring forward.

MS. MORRIS: Julie?

MS. BONNEY: So, I agree with that. I think it makes more sense to do a more holistic ask at the end of the day once we get feedback from the task force.
The only other thing I would note under this item, is we need to send a loop back to the National Aquaculture Association and tell them what we did as a group in terms of reacting for their letter. So, I'm assuming that there would be a letter. So, in terms of function: We're reconstituting the task force. We need to reach out to the members, send them a letter, ask them if they're willing to serve for two more years. Figure out whether we have all the box filled. Have Bob and Jim serve as the MAFAC representatives to the task force. And then loop back to the Aquaculture Association and tell them what our action was based on the letter. And then I think we're done with this issue. That's my recommendation.

MS. MORRIS: Thank you, Julie. Any other discussion?

Okay, we've arrived at our morning break time a little early. So, it's 10:20. Please be back here -- you can leave the check out at this moment, you know, for the longer break. Please be
back at 10:40.

(Recess)

MS. MORRIS: Okay. We are going to jump back in.

SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: Terri is going to lead the discussion about the status of the reports on the Resilience Working Groups.

MS. BEIDMAN: Right. And I'm going to say that I want to thank all the people that participated on all these working groups, and that, you know, I've learned a lot in trying to coordinate them. And it's not always as easy as it looks sometimes, it's very, very much different than that.

So, anyway, thanks again, for everyone's work. So far it's great, and I was working on trying to figure out how to framework these into an executive summary, and being kind of new at these charges I took a look at our initial discussions, and I went: oh, well, we didn't address that, and we didn't address that. But we
did address a lot of it, and our conversation included into these tasks.

So, many of the tasks -- some of the tasks got completed rather quickly. I've asked task leads to, please, provide me with some -- like a one-pager type of summary. What's in their document which will be attached in full but they are lengthy, and so it precludes kind of inserting them into one document. I think it would be better used as, perhaps, standalones that could be useful in lots of ways.

So I've asked the leads to come up with sort of a summary and, you know, three to five more pressing recommendations that they would like to highlight that could assist in making it, you know, perhaps more easily digested. So, we had our Resilience Group, Task 3 was completed and approved November, and I always thought to do that, and am happily going to do it.

Tasks 4, 5 and 6 are still in process, but we have made some great progress here at this meeting on all of them, and the groups are
working. So, I'm going to ask, first of all, because our initial timeline, we have exceeded, in some cases, for good reason, you know, we are trying to be thorough, but I'm going to ask the indulgence of the Committee that we have a little bit of an extended timeframe, and try to get this work wrapped up completely during the summer the groups are working to finalize reports.

In some cases they have some tasks to do. So, I'm going to first, turn it over to Task 4, update from Julie Bonney concerning the Social and Economic Community Impacts.

MS. BONNEY: Okay. Second cup of coffee? (Laughter) So, we finally kind of settled on a direction, and moving down the path, so what we've been involved with it, and as we are in it, and we went through and found six different case studies, where there's been adaptive planning for climate change, in terms of fisheries, and through six different communities. It was interesting that there really was not that many cases where it's dealt with fisheries, it's usually community
infrastructure, sea-level rise.

So, the next step was, okay, so how did the process work? We developed and interview, the questionnaire, and I've been contacting the practitioners of these six different case studies, to understand how the processes work. We completed four out of the six interviews, and it's interesting that when you go -- even though they are all over from Alaska, the West Coast, Rhode Island, (inaudible), and more Sea Grant oriented with the common threads, the class before that we've already done.

And so we have two more interviews to complete, and then we are going to start drafting kind of our reports, and some of the recommendations. And also planning to do additional interviews with two different universities that are talking about climate change, and how to talk about climate change; one is Yale, and then there's also a gentleman, and I forget the name of the book, that there's been a lot of community planning in terms of climate
change, and so that was coming.

So, process-wise, the way I see this, is we will complete the interviews, it has been -- and I want to thank Heidi and Kate quickly, that's not here, on the phone, but they've been a huge help in terms of staffing this task force. So, we hope to complete the interviews sometime the first part of April, and then we'll start drafting our report, and then have some kind of an interim teleconference to review what we found so far, figure out if we are going to interview website folks, and then (inaudible) with the book, and then I think we'll be in a good place to be completed.

So, I think that Terri's timeline of the first part of August to, you know, make that our final recommendation to our task should work, barring no disasters.

MS. MORRIS: Julie, you said the final recommendation or the final report?

MS. BONNEY: Final report.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. And can you give us
a little flavor of what the common threads are?

MS. BONNEY: So, the one that I think is interesting is that the conversation starts with, what are your problems. So, in other words, it's a bottom-up approach versus a top-down approach. So, there's a conversation with the stakeholders to understand what they are seeing in their Fisheries. Versus talking to them and saying that climate change is affecting your livelihood, and this is how to, so it's more organic, and so once they kind of identified what the issues that they are seeing within their fisheries then you bring in the experts to kind of say, what is causing those effects. So that was one of the key ones.

Help me out, Ted. There was another one too; there was a big one and Heidi -- Oh. The other one was then that the best way to entice people to come, is to have a fun place to go. So in one case it was -- they had coffee and bagels and stuff in the morning, at a set time, like on Sunday mornings. And in the other one they were meeting in a bar in the (Inaudible) area, happy
hour; so, trying to get people engaged too.

Shoot! I'm drawing a blank. There was another --

MS. LOVETT: That one was to sort of meet them where they are, in fact that Sunday morning, we planned to meet at 7:30 in the morning, which was a surprise, you know, for most of us. The other thing was, Julie, I think to talk about using local experts, people that we trusted, and I just want to (crosstalk) that one.

MS. MORRIS: Any other comments or questions about the task force? Any other comments or questions about -- Did you want to comment, Ted, about the work?

MR. AMES: It's really fascinating, those groups that started, as Julie suggested, came up with a set pattern, where they developed a concept of how to address the local problems, gather the group of experts, or individuals, or organizations that could support -- answer the questions that they were raising. And it really became a bottoms-up effort in the interviews that I did. It was incredibly successful. I think it
was true for all of them I think that we've
scheduled so far. Good job.

MS. BONNEY: It's just fascinating, I
would just think it was the Agency would go to the
community and say that's a problem, let's figure
out what we are going to do, but the reality of
just having a conversation, identifying the
problem, and then figuring it out, so far.

MS. BEIDEMAN: So, the next task, you've
heard the report from Erika yesterday, and she is
in the process of pulling together also her
report, so she appreciates having a little extra
time to try to make sense of the issue. But you
did get her report out yesterday, so I don't have
a lot more to add, other than she is estimating
that she'll be able to have the report ready,
hopefully, in June, to co come back to the Task
Group.

And then be able to have that ready,
whether or not we would do a separate call, I
think maybe it depends. But it would all be
circulated out for MAFAC to review, and suggest
comments, so then we could hopefully finalize that in there, rather than have to have three separate calls for this (inaudible). So, that's my hope, and everyone here seems to be buzzing along, so I'm happy to say that I'm sure that she'll pull it together. So, you'll all be alerted once (inaudible). So, the next issue is task 6, which turned out to be a lot more complicated than we thought it would be, however, I think the product is -- it was worth the effort of going through the exercise to try to get to where we needed to be. But it's easy when you talk about data, particularly to get very wide, and then try to hone it back into what we actually need.

So, I think we made huge progress especially in our call yesterday with Gail on the phone who, you know, I appreciate the little data task group has put a lot on her back to do. So,
huge kudos to Gail Beck for offering to do
drafting on this, because you know I was trying to
do some of it, and Peter Moore was also in the
group. So, he's not here, so it kind of fell on
her, a lot of it. And we did make great progress
yesterday. I believe -- I don't know where --

SPEAKER: Where is Harlon?

MS. BEIDEMAN: Harlon is, so we'll take
-- Oh, Harlon is not here, but the data issue
turned to be a bigger deal, or more difficult to
get refined. So, that paper, the next draft of
that is scheduled to be prepared by April 11th, is
what she hopes, and then that will be distributed
out to the Task Group. We'll be doing some, you
know, whatever revisions within the group, and
then we'll be circulating that out, and hopefully
we can get to a final before this August point.
And I'm hoping that we can get by the end of July,
or beginning of August. So, that is that, in
terms of the data issues, paper for task 6. And
I'm going to see if Harlon has anything to add,
because --
SPEAKER: We are at home.

MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. PEARCE: I'm sorry, that I was walking around with something that --

MS. BEIDEMAN: No problem. I just went over the data issue, and that we are having a draft paper ready by April, and the goal of course is to have it all completed, by the end of the summer we should have a teleconference with MAFAC to approve the entire document, and that deletes --

MR. PEARCE: If you are going to bet it down, I can go to (crosstalk) --

MS. BEIDEMAN: I doubt it. However, so I wanted you to add whatever you might want to, concerning Task 6, and the progress that we made.

MR. PEARCE: On what would you have it here?

MS. BEIDEMAN: On Task 6 on your task.

MR. PEARCE: Okay. Have you gone over the framework, and have we done that yet?

MS. BEIDEMAN: No. We haven't done that
yet, I kind of thought we'd save that till last, just to get through the other two little sub-reports.

MR. PEARCE: Okay. Got you.

MS. BEIDEMAN: So, here we are, it seems

--

MR. PEARCE: Sorry. I'm sorry I was outside. I will try to catch that quick -- Well, I think one of the problems that we had with Task 6, was we kind of got far afield without thinking that it's easy to get way out there when we start talking about data, because we all love data. And so we kind of got a little away from our charge, and I think we did a great job yes bringing it back down to earth.

So, we really approached our charge, and pay for the charge to make sure we have the data that the councils need to develop framework actions within plan amendments that have triggers and then drove to the future. So, I think we get a lot of work there, I think. Like Terri said, we are going to be finishing this up soon, and I
think we are ready to go. I mean, we won't be long now to get it done. Gail will have a final draft in June, is what I think she told us. Right, Terri?

MS. BEIDEMAN: April 11, for the next little run out for our Subcommittee for the Task Working Group.

MR. PEARCE: Okay. So, all right, that will be fine. So, we'll get that done. And by our next meeting in Silver Spring, we'll be able to wrap this thing up.

MS. BEIDEMAN: We'll hopefully be able to wrap it all up before then, and that's my goal.

MR. PEARCE: Right, yeah. But to become final, I mean.

MS. BEIDEMAN: It could be final, by teleconference likely during the summer, late summer, I think, by the way it looks.

MR. PEARCE: That's good. And then --

MS. BEIDEMAN: And then we'll send it to the --

MR. PEARCE: So, that's pretty much it.
You know, we'll get into the details more when we get finished with the paper, we'll do another draft with them. And so we did a good job yesterday and we all focused a little bit better. I feel very good about it. And so then I'm fine with that, I mean, at the end, I don't know what she'll want to do with that particular segment I think we are good. We can go into the framework, if you are ready.

   MS. BEIDEMAN: I'm ready.

   MR. PEARCE: Okay. We, thanks to Julie and Columbus, we have an excellent framework paperwork that we discussed yesterday. There were some moderate changes made. I understand, Peter, you made some changes this morning.

   MR. SHELLEY: Some suggestions.

   MR. PEARCE: Suggestions, is that in this documentation that we are looking at? I can't see that.

   MR. SHELLEY: I think so.

   MR. PEARCE: Pete, do you want to tell us what the changes -- suggestions are?
MR. SHELLEY: Well, a couple. And I apologize to Columbus and Julie for the (inaudible) -- yeah, the goal lines, stand here. Let me just start that over. Some of the changes are just clarifying, from my perspective, of how frameworks are actually are used in the fishery and management process, and why they are a good tool for managing with dynamic information without sacrificing public participation, or all the other more extended processes that are associated with the underlying fishery and management plan.

So, I had some language that sort of nested the framework a little bit more than these other public processes, so it didn't seem quite so free-standing. There was one section that I just didn't understand exactly having to do with policy directive that NOAA Fisheries develop for framework actions and with the focus on NIPA compliance.

And it seemed like the first -- I don't know which paragraph it is, but it seems like the first couple of sentences of the policy directive
was, you know, fully cooked. And then there are a couple of sentences, I would say, were highly controversial and people were concerned about all sorts of things. And I don't know if those were comments that came in during the development of the policy directive, or whether the policy directive was being challenged by people with those sorts of concerns.

So, it just didn't -- it just didn't make sense to me, in terms of how it's stated. You know, I don't know -- So, it's very simple, I just flagged it because, reading it through, I didn't see a --

SPEAKER: Peter is referring to the sort of dark teal color shading on the screen.

MR. SHELLEY: So, maybe that was what, maybe that's saying that the tiering, beneath the tiering was considered by NOAA in the policy directive, but was not adoptive, but I don't think that's true. So, I figure you would understand.

MS. MORRIS: Columbus?

MR. COLUMBUS: Okay. I believe you are
talking to the reference, if that will help you.

MR. SHELLEY: Okay. Yeah.

MR. COLUMBUS: And if anybody who knows this, and would like help me out, please do.

(Crosstalk)

MR. SHELLEY: I have no question that those issues were raised during the development of the directive. I just thing they were --

MR. COLUMBUS: After the Magnuson Act is (inaudible), NOAA's requires to --
take a look at it, and at the procedures that had all kinds of meetings across the country, within the councils sorting through, and so forth, and it was a very --

there was a lot of hostility in the room, at a level that the Council meetings of -- Where are we going to go? How we are going to get there?

And I added that part in there just to sort of add -- lend some credibility to the
process because, you know, NOAA did go through a
very rigorous process, and I didn't bother -- you
know, and I went back into it, and had a look into
their documents so I could understand the
complexity of what they were dealing with. You
know, perhaps we could (crosstalk) --

MR. SHELLEY: Well, then I think it's
just editorial, I think it should be --

MR. COLUMBUS: Okay. Perhaps we could
-- You know, perhaps we could smooth that out
somehow, and I would say maybe with help from NOAA
to make sure that --

MS. LUKENS: I think I need to look at
this a little bit more, and read the actual
directive itself to understand that. That the
folks are in my office who wrote the policy
directives so I can -- they can --

MR. COLUMBUS: Right, right. But from
the documents that go online that --

MS. LUKENS: That's actually (crosstalk).

MR. SHELLEY: This makes it seem like
it's still an open fight, and I don't think it is.
I think it was resolved, and those concerns were
heard, and dealt with.

MR. COLUMBUS: Well, what happened was,
there were some areas where, well NOAA had a --
they wanted to move in this direction, and those
were some confusion, and some people felt like,
you know, this is a good idea and go ahead. Some
people felt like, I'm not feeling it, so I think
if we go in this direction, public input might be
lessened, and --

MR. SHELLEY: I think that was
absolutely the

(inaudible). So, I mean I think --
I do know that it was all --

MR. COLUMBUS: But process-wise under
NIPA, they would not be knocked out of being able
to provide input.

MS. MORRIS: So, Columbus, is it okay to
delete from the document that will we be doing
that today, the language that's highlighted in
teal here?
MR. SHELLEY: Julie, this is mine. I wouldn't delete it because it does add color to the development of the policy directive. I just think it needs to be reworded slightly so that it doesn't seem like there's pieces still floating around there on the directive.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Well, some we are --

MR. SHELLEY: So, it's kind of editorial, I believe.

MS. MORRIS: Where we are today, is either going to approval of this, or delaying. Or going approval with direction for somebody to be empowered to edit this particular section in a way that we trust to be done, so I'm trying to get an indication about where people would want to go on this.

SPEAKER: Jen, do you understand what needs to be done?

MS. LUKENS: Yeah. I'm trying to get a hold of the -- if that's necessary to have the context for the document that you all are going to put together here. I think it's citing the policy
directive, in your policy, I'm looking at it right now, it goes through the process stage and went through to develop this, a couple of comments that they put on it, and how they are addressing it. So, I think that can be found in the policy directive.

SPEAKER: Right.

MS. LUKENS: And I don't know if it needs to be stated here additionally, but that's for the Committee to consider and act on that.

MS. MORRIS: Could we just say something like, see -- And is this the link that's already embedded there?

MS. LUKENS: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: The comments in the process?

SPEAKER: Yeah.

MS. MORRIS: So, maybe just a note saying: see the Final Policy Directive document for insight into the questions that were raised and how they were addressed by the Agency?

MR. SHELLEY: I think that's fine. I
would just add, that maybe just in the place with
the public process.

MS. MORRIS: But the public process was
enough --

MR. SHELLEY: As addressed through a
public process framework with the actions in
policy directive. That would be fine too.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Heidi is ready to
type the words if you could get them through.

MR. SHELLEY: No. If there's a reason I
suggest then the actions through a public process
resulting in policy directive where you need -- to
follow. And then get rid of the last two
sentences, I think.

SPEAKER: The tiering?

MR. SHELLEY: Under the tiering
mechanism. That would be my recommendation. Yes.

MS. MORRIS: Are there any comments on
that change; any objection to that change?

SPEAKER: I'm okay with that.

MR. COLUMBUS: I'm good.

MS. MORRIS: Columbus is good. Any
other objections? Okay, so we'll take that (inaudible), even though we haven't placed this in a motion yet. And then, Peter, it seems like the --

MR. SHELLEY: The only other sort of thing I'd put in here, dealing with the policies, is that I think it's really important to stress, since we are not going to be doing the data piece, contemporary mostly with this, but the successful use of frameworks is premised on good, near real-time data to avoid false positives, false negatives, you know, sort of reacting quickly, and mistakenly so, I added a sentence that eventually we can link a reference back between the two papers, saying that these framework is only as good as the data that supports this, that's said in many more words, but that's the thought.

SPEAKER: Yeah, for setting the process.

MS. MORRIS: Yes. That's highlighted in yellow that's on the screen there. Any objection to that?

SPEAKER: Columbus, are you okay?
MR. COLUMBUS: I would say: management actions that result in unintended consequences.

MR. SHELLEY: Yeah. Sure. That's better.

SPEAKER: Heidi, did you catch that?

SPEAKER: Say, that last piece.

MS. MORRIS: Terri?

MS. BEIDEMAN: I would say in the second line down there "the ability of councils" I would rephrase that to remove councils and say: fishery managers, in general. We don't have to say "in general" just "fishery managers".

SPEAKER: So that we can capture the HMS.

MS. BEIDEMAN: And others -- state, commission, and we will try whatever.

SPEAKER: And we could have the last part deleted as I did.

SPEAKER: I think everything else, and just kind of editorial comments that would deal with that.

MS. MORRIS: Yes. That's right.
SPEAKER: And we reject it or accept it, whatever.

MS. MORRIS: So, Harlon, can you move this as -- can you make a motion to -- to make that to approved this?

MR. PEARCE: So moved.

MS. MORRIS: Likely for trademark actions?

MR. PEARCE: So moved.

MS. MORRIS: Is there a second?

SPEAKER: Second.

MS. MORRIS: It's, clear; is there any additional discussions?

MS. BONNEY: I have a question?

MS. MORRIS: Yes, Julie.

MS. BONNEY: So how did you end up picking these particular cases?

MS. MORRIS: She asked how we ended up picking the particular case studies. We asked MAFAC Members to suggest things. We asked Wendy Morrison, NOAA Staff, to suggest things, and then we tried to find excerpt and plans that followed
up on our suggestions. And some of those were inappropriate, and some of them got included in the document. And just recently, over the weekend, Sylvia from the Western Pacific, Fishery Management Council staff, suggested some adjustments based on their direct experience.

But Peter and I have concerns that, you know, if we sent this document out to all of the regions they would find errors and updates. So that is a concern, because Wendy Morrison, and all of you, to review it, I'm not sure that you have. So, there's a little bit of risk that this should go through greater review, so we are not embarrassing ourselves. But we have a motion right now. So, what do you want to do?

MS. BONNEY: I guess for this event, I didn't think in this report, and then some of the ones that's in there

(inaudible), and the North Pacific had questions that -- Okay, well I made that as (inaudible) --

SPEAKER: I can't hear Julie.
MS. MORRIS: You can't hear Julie.

MS. BONNEY: I said some of the ones on the North Pacific I question.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, maybe this is a cautionary note, and we should table this until they've had more opportunity to have Council's review whether the examples are (inaudible). And if you feel that way, somebody should move to table. And I will not take it -- We will not personally -- will not take it personally.

MS. BONNEY: I hate to be the (inaudible) on, and so if people are -- it's conceptual, and if people don't get all that, without the details, and I'm fine with letting it move ahead, just as far in advisory than it tells the specific in my mind. If you feel that it erodes the credibility of the document, and it should be moved back and in terms of the case studies, then I would suggest that you table it. So I could go either way with that. Those are my
MS. MORRIS: Peter?

MR. SHELLEY: My concern is that there's a lot of detail, these plans are all very complicated. I don't know anything about them, and I don't know if they are successful, and they are being promoted as successful examples, I think. So, I think it is important to document the case studies and ground rules, at some level. And I'm just not capable of doing that. I don't know if maybe some of the members here can let you -- or in some of the fisheries that are involved, but I'm not sure if it's to involve them.

MS. BONNEY: I mean, I can't think. Increasing the VSC limits may be appropriate of such -- for mortality and it's going to -- In other words, I don't know of any case in the North Pacific where you had a hard cap on a VSC that they decided to make it higher to prevent a Fishery from being, economically and basically impact. So, with that example, I don't know if that's ever happened.
MS. MORRIS: So, it's something that's in the document but it hasn't been employed, it hasn't been --

MS. BONNEY: Well, I don't know if it's even possible. I mean you could do an emergency rule to change if it's a new amendment packet, but I've never known of them -- I guess I should try it. (Laughter)

MS. BEIDEMAN: I recall our conversation was to try to find things that would help -- that we could point to that were potential examples. Perhaps they weren't employed yet, or perhaps they were not completely even thought about, but that raise for management to be more nimble. And the use of framework actions is a way to speed up the amendment process which is lengthy, and be more responsive to conditions.

And of course the (inaudible) on having good data to base it on, but the purpose, I thought, in trying to find these examples, not all of which have been actually utilized, but some of them are in place, or could be in place. Instead
of using an amendment process it would be potentially, something that Councils could think about.

SPEAKER: Correct.

MS. BEIDEMAN: Or managers could think about to make management more responsive and flexible and nimble. And that I thought was the purpose of the final --

MS. BONNEY: And just a follow up, I agree that that is the purpose of the whitepaper, and there are several examples in here for the North Pacific that gets us exactly to that point. I guess my question is: Of all of the examples, are they true or not? If they are true, should the fish be included? Or maybe the better example would be to make us do just a few examples, versus the large (inaudible) ones that are in here. I don't know.

But the one for yellow fin in here, is a great example which basically involve the ability, this is a North Pacific example, but it's pollock -- FA (phonetics) pollock allocations are, you
know, very complicated, and so it's really a trade
off, whether you get a lot of pollock you've been
to the Pollock Fishery.

This is the trigger that basically says, when pollock is low we are going to make flatfish
-- yellow fin available to a larger group of stakeholders so they are not economically damaged. And the science suggests that yellow fin -- or flatfishes will be higher, and with climate change that pollock will be lower. So that's a great case study of the framework to action that really addresses climate change.

Other ones in here, I think they are maybe on the books that they've all been discarded, so I guess I don't, like I said, yeah, the purpose of the backing if it's great, it's just whether if it's perfect. If you don't care if it's perfect, let's pass it on because I think it meets the objective of what you are planning to do.

If you are worried about perfection, and people coming back on that saying, you could vote
this back, and this isn't right based on my
Council, then you know it's -- table it and maybe
have the different councils to review it, and
maybe they even have better examples of framework
to actions that might come out the other end.

MS. MORRIS: Right. And you have reason
to do it, now it's to be done with something,
right? And maybe that's not the overriding goal,
it would be better to really investigate whether
these examples are [inaudible] -- are positive
examples, rather than, you know -- So, again, I'm
waiting for further discussion on a decision about
whether to table for further ground-truthing or
crew. Go ahead Mike.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Well, I've learned a
lot from Julie over the years, and she has yet
agility; so it sounds like you kind of had two
directions you might choose from, perfection, or
close to, or somewhere in the vicinity, which one
would you recommend?

MS. BONNEY: I guess it depends on how
well, you know, you put the qualifier at the
beginning that says that these are examples that
have been pulled from the regulations, that hasn't
been (inaudible) of the region. If we did that
then I think it would be less likely to have
people say something negative about the document.
So, if you did that, then I think you could just
go ahead and then approve it as is.

Otherwise, if you don't put the
qualifier in there, I think that you need to
re-task what's in here and make sure that it's
factual, and is actually on the books for a true
framework that's in use within the Council.

MS. MORRIS: Are the mover and seconders
for the qualifier of the type that Julie is
suggesting?

SPEAKER: I'll put it in the discussion,
yes.

MS. MORRIS: Tegan?

SPEAKER: I'm okay with that.

MS. MORRIS: Peter, you were the
seconder?

MR. SHELLEY: From my agreement, you can
table it or to do the qualifier?

SPEAKER: I'll table the qualifier.

MR. SHELLEY: I don't think there's any
time for the department driving this, and so I was
rather pretty comfortable that it's good enough.
I don't need it to be perfect, but I do think it
would affect, you know, our readers' confidence in
recommendations if they looked at a particular
example and they note that, that doesn't exist, or
that's not how it works, or that slows things
down. I mean, it's -- I think it's important to
be good enough, and I can't tell right now whether
these are good enough. I like that Mike
(inaudible), and we have wonderful examples
outside Fisheries, but it's the particular
Fisheries ones that are going to great detail in
the document.

MR. COLUMBUS: Yeah. I think the key
point that was made in the last discussion was, we
need to move towards a blueprint of what it should
really look like, with involvement from the
councils, and so forth.
MR. SHELLEY: And if it's the will --

You know, if the consensus I'll go along with the ballpark, but I just think a little bit more work on it would make it potentially that it's a better product.

MS. MORRIS: Good. Jennifer?

MS. LUKENS: Just something to think about. If you don't have a time constraint on this, and I've heard the comment earlier when we were talking about the data, why people, or whatever were calling it, the next (inaudible) date it would be nice to have that come out complementary with this. It's up to the Full Committee, but it sounds like if you put them all out together at the same time as one complete package, as Terri was talking about delivering it as one complete executive summary, and all the tasks that following the resiliency tasks that we developed last fall.

If there isn't any time constraint then that will give you some time to make it more of everybody seeing it at the same time as a complete
package instead of step-wise. So, I offer that out just for (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Ted?

MR. AMES: Well, I agree with Julie. I think putting in that -- or announcing that this may not be directly on point for all of the groups -- or all of the studies. I looked at yours and Mike's question and your response, and I think that a simple way to address what the (inaudible) needs, what are these, it's going to take incredible amount of time. Regardless, it seems like putting in note saying -- qualifying the management approaches listed there is a good idea.

MS. MORRIS: Harlon, I think I'm coming across the suggestion. Go ahead?

MR. PEARCE: I have a question, and I guess a suggestion, too. If we put this off until we bring the whole paper together with the data, is that enough time, to get what you want done, done? I mean, are you going to be able to get all these councils to come back and tell us what they (crosstalk) which I doubt that you
can. So, with that goal in mind, I think we go with the qualifier, and get this thing moving now. Other than that, you know -- and Jennifer, I understand what you said, but I'm just concerned about --

MS. LUKENS: I don't have a position, I'm just

(crosstalk) --

MR. PEARCE: No, no. I know you don't, but I'm -- but I almost agreed with you, but then I say, like Ted said, are we really going to be able to get the answer we need in our timeframe from the Council system? If that would go to looking and ask for comments, and I doubt we do. So, I would say let's put the qualifier in and move it out.

MS. MORRIS: Peter?

MR. SHELLEY: So, an alternative right here. You know, looking at the table, the table looks about right, you know, it feels right to me,
all the sort the bullets seem like good

descriptions of the purpose of the framework

actions that are referred to. So I think that I'm
certainly comfortable at that level saying this is
good to go. I think it will be good to flip, and
the details, kind of an appendix on those, so it's
like a --

And that's where I think the qualifier

would be useful. Saying, you know, we are putting
these out here with the qualification, and that
whatever it is, we haven't been able to
exhaustively research each framework and determine
how successful those have been in an operation, or
something like that.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, we have a very

specific suggestion that we might be able to get
majority to agree to, which would be to move the
details from an appendix with a qualifier
introducing them for the framework part. Harlon,
is that supportive?

MR. PEARCE: (Crosstalk).

MS. MORRIS: Would you view that as
friendly, to reorganize the report with the table,
the details going in the appendix with the
qualifier saying, these haven't been ground-
truthed yet?

MR. PEARCE: Do you want a yes or -- I believe, yeah.

MS. MORRIS: I'm asking as the mover, whether you would be supportive of the use of that --

MR. PEARCE: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, we are viewing that as friendly. And is there any more discussion on the main motion then with those changes that we have just (inaudible). If not, are you ready to vote? All those in favor say, aye.

GROUP: Aye.

MS. MORRIS: Those opposed, like sign? Any abstentions?

SPEAKER: Me.

MS. MORRIS: One abstention. The motion passes. Terri?
MS. BEIDEMAN: So, I would assume that
the writers would have the ability to reorganize
that. I think that that's a good idea to, you
know, put some sort of a disclaimer, and that we
haven't, because rules -- framework actions even
change in the process of writing it so, you know,
there may be examples that are obsolete, or what
they are provided for example. So I think that's
a good way, and I do, you know, prefer that we
have -- you know, it be as accurate as we can make
it, but I don't really know that we would have
time, and I believe people on all sides of the
issue might have some debate as to whether or not
framework actions worked well or not, depending on
what your viewpoint is.

So, I think that's a good way to try to
compromise and get the document rolling. I also
believe that that will provide time to have the
data section pulled closer to it; and given the
fact that it's all going to task that that will be
helpful.

MS. MORRIS: Great. Thank you. And
thanks for leading us into a difficult discussion, and rescuing us from this (inaudible) (laughter).

MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you.

MS. MORRIS: So, next is the added agenda item today which is the review of the brief letter that we would like to convey to Secretary Ross. And that was emailed to everybody this morning. And so, please look through your email. And I think, Heidi, you can get it projected up on the screen. Right?

SPEAKER: So, are we working from Peter's revision, or an original one?

MS. MORRIS: Yeah. Let's work from Peter's revision, which was also emailed to everybody subsequent to the initial (inaudible), right.

SPEAKER: Heidi, could you pull it up just a little bit, please? Thank you.

MS. BONNEY: So, I have to ask the question. When you bold it in yellow, versus underlying in red; what's the difference in terms of the context that you are trying to make?
MR. SHELLEY: Sloppy, me editing. I mean they are all -- At least I know the blue underline is mine, (inaudible) in yellow.

SPEAKER: I think it means that (inaudible)?

MR. SHELLEY: Yes.

SPEAKER: So the yellow means you are questioning whether that's --

MR. SHELLEY: No. That's, I'm adding that. Those yellows are all adds, and I think the blue underlines are probably full edits from (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: So the evolution of this document was, we talked about it, Jennifer and Bob.

SPEAKER: Bob wrote it.

MS. MORRIS: Bob wrote it -- Sent it to Erika as the Chair of the Subcommittee on Strategic Planning, and Budget, and me to review.

Erika made it better prose and (inaudible) (laughter) and --

SPEAKER: That's a short (inaudible).
MS. MORRIS: And then she sent it to me before she left for the airport, at 4:30 a.m. And then I edited her better prose to get it more concise, and then Peter has made some suggestions too. So, I think we are pretty close to the work of those people who have edited it, generated it and edited it to some things for us to consider adopting, and so now is the point in time in which we would discuss it. Yes, Heather?

[HEATHER]: XXXNo surname noticed in notesXXX Well, when I vetted it -- to me it read like a cover letter to the editor, and comments to the transition team? Which I think was the point of this, and I wonder, there were three points that the group wanted to emphasize yesterday, and I just think they should be called out in a more visually, striking manner, so maybe three bullet points. Like, these are the three things we really want to highlight in this one-pager.

MS. MORRIS: And what were those three things?  [HEATHER]: The staffing issue, other people were --
they were -- they were the three things.

SPEAKER: Budget; impact of the budget?

[HEATHER]: Well, the impact of the budget and the
staffing issue were --

SPEAKER: Were they met? [HEATHER]: --

were one, weren't they?

MS. YOCHEM: It says: elimination of key
programs, hiring freeze, and then permanent
reduction of Federal workforce. Were those the
three?

SPEAKER: I suppose.

MS. YOCHEM: Or is the hiring freeze and
permanent reduction, one?

[HEATHER]: And I guess reducing the
trade deficit was -- I thought like that was one
of the points, too. But maybe that was something
that couldn't be done without if the budget and
the workforce weren't in place.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So all of those
things are addressed here, but they are not
influenced -- they are not put out as (crosstalk)

--
[HEATHER]: Right. So what I'm saying, that something visual will strike this. If this person doesn't really have to read this document, right, so, if the person can just glance at the page, and take away these are our three top problems, the three things we want you to know about, and how that reads less like a cover letter, but of course you can refer them to the longer document, so that was written for the Transition Team, that's just fine, you have that. But yeah, so have the point be more visually, visually (inaudible) is my suggestion.

MR. RHEAULT: And just so everyone, as we are cautioned to keep it brief, that's what we've been told the person -- with limited appetite for lots of words. And we wanted to reemphasize his own priorities, state the priorities of trade, jobs, fish, deficit, and say we recommend those, and we fear that these -- you know, reductions and so forth, and our ability to get there, and it's all, how you get there, and we tried to make it.
We realize that we weren't going to be able to get everything we wanted in there, and then we had this nice transition document, and if we can get, you know, draw his attention to that, then that's great; or, someone on his staff, more likely. But, you know, I made a lot of effort to keep it as brief as possible without making it just three big bullet points, and I think it so matters, striking a balance between that in the English language and the bullets.

MS. MORRIS: Great. So, I think that Heather's main point is not that the -- she wants some bullets so that it jumps out, where (inaudible). It's not of content -- she's kind of reorganizing and reformatting the points that are there. Right?

[HEATHER]: Yeah. I mean the way it reads to me, the first paragraph, it's like, well, we are patting you on the back. Like, we agree, even, you know, and then the second paragraph was: however, you know, we have these problems, and then finally, referred to a longer document, where
you could go for information. It just doesn't --
it doesn't, to me, seem like really striking, so I
just feel, like, maybe the points could be more --
Well, just think of yourself, if you are reading
document and you don't have very much time, you
skip to what's bolded -- or what's bolded or,
well, I just need what are the main points.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Liz?

MS. HAMILTON: I'm not a writer I'm
quite sure by a long shot, but I'm a little bit
concerned that there's nothing in here about
NOAA's responsibilities, and their consultation,
and various issues that -- things that I care
depth about, and I know that, you know, they are
not of the aquaculture and trade deficit
reduction, but if we could get just a tiny, little
--

SPEAKER: Mention?

MS. HAMILTON: -- mention of things that
I think
(crosstalk), because I feel cutting
would get NOAA's ability to do
that, is it's actually going to stop all sorts of projects from moving forward.

MR. RHEAULT: I'll accept that --

MS. HAMILTON: That's a disaster --

MR. RHEAULT: -- as absolutely true, but my personal opinion writing it was that he probably doesn't care about that, and it hasn't been more at this stage, cause or objectives. And I was just trying to pat him on the back of the things that he has come out and said, that we can agree with, and said, you know, hopefully that would spark his attention. And then point out now, some of these cuts will damage, not only those priorities, but certainly other priorities as well. And, you know, mentions of NOAA, we could bring those (inaudible) in and the whole panoply of NOAA's kind of facilities, but it's going to become a longer document. I was trying to trim all of that ancillary stuff out and keep this as brief as possible.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Bob, you don't
feel like you -- you don't need to feel you need
to defend in response to every comment.

MR. RHEAULT: Okay. You are absolutely
correct.

MS. MORRIS: Liz, you wanted to follow
up? But not when it's going to cause another --

MS. HAMILTON: You know, I guess that
I'm hopeful, that our emphasis on what he what
said, doesn't mean we want you to prioritize
everything else that would be funding

(inaudible), so as long as -- Oh,

yes, we can't control it -- just to
advise, so.

MS. MORRIS: Julie?

MS. BONNEY: It seems to me the examples
are a little -- I'm fine with the way that the
letter -- I'll say that, in terms of, (inaudible),
what our concern is, and we are willing to work
with you, and by the way, there's an attachment.

So, really, I think, what you are saying is, is
that we need to call out what our main point is,
so can't we just underline and bold, really the
points --

SPEAKER: Certainly (crosstalk) --

MS. BONNEY: Oh, actually, I think when the President proposed fiscal year 2018, that line and the following line, and leave it at that.

SPEAKER: That was my suggestion too.

Pull those two sentences, or underline those two sentences.

MS. MORRIS: Did you want to say anything else, Pam? No?

MS. YOCHEM: No. Besides the entry (crosstalk) that pitch seems to be --

SPEAKER: The whole difference.

MS. MORRIS: Mike?

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I have a sense that the only way of saying that it does reference the (crosstalk) reference the group, the idea, you know, which I think Bob captured very well, is that the (inaudible) over us, stating certain goals of the idea about trading deficit, if we weren't, as Bob said, we were all about climate change, I don't think we are addressing
But, you know, if you hit on the scene when it's already developed, then at least you get his attention, maybe we can (inaudible) that away from him, and I think Bob did exactly that, or with that, well, with some additional if getting to that process from his part and other people's. I am sensitive to what you are saying but, I mean, I can identify with probably with (inaudible) the target, and I don't want to get it, you know, right in front of it. Probably thinking industry in general; and stakeholders in particular would probably all come up with something. We do reference a transition document in there. The bullet points I think it's probably a good idea, but the content, as is, I think needs to be (inaudible).

MS. MORRIS: Okay. So, Pam, you are following up?

MS. YOCHEM: I'm trying to read his mind. I also think that it could be that recommendations that are in the President's
budget, he doesn't think will impact the ability
to address the trade deficit, things like that.
And so if nothing else, we are saying, we think
that your attempt to streamline the department and
eliminate things you don't think are important or
whatever, we do think that it's going to affect
the Secretary's stated objective to focus on these
things.

MS. MORRIS: Ray?

MR. ESPINOZA: I just have with just the
word at the beginning "however" where, you know,
the patting on the back can get that. And then
just diversity is the, however, we are trying to
-- we are not presenting something different, we
are presenting this letter in support of his
concerns and our concerns. So I think it's not an
however, it's a --

SPEAKER: Just strike "however" --

MR. ESPINOZA: Yeah. I just would -- I
think we can we say: we are bringing this to your
concern. But I think it's just -- it's less
tension and the less, I think more support.
MS. MORRIS: Good idea.

SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: Back to Heather.

[HEATHER]: And then just right after that, can we just say: our concern; instead of having all that other language? Just to make that concise? However, we are -- no however -- we are concerned.

SPEAKER: Mm-hmm. Just a simple fact?

MR. AMES: Since we are in the process of edits, I've been looking at it and saying, the sentence we had prepared a set of concise -- a concise set of recommendations, I would be tempted to switch the sequence with the last paragraph that says: As your stakeholders and advisors, etcetera. And then follow it with a set of -- a concise set of recommendations. That way the person is recognizing, we are advising, you know, helping with what we can, and here is our first offer.

(Discussion off the record)

SPEAKER: And this is affected by --
MS. MORRIS: Okay, so this is now -- I'm sorry. The sequence we have now talks about the transition document, and then says, welcome, and thanks. It's that, you are suggesting reversing the two?

MR. AMES: Yeah. Just switch the sequence; I think you've done it there.

SPEAKER: Right, that's the blue underline that I proposed to switch that sequence.

MS. MORRIS: We've done exactly what you've -- Now, I know that people are rolling their eyes. Group editing is very difficult, (laughter) it's better to have a clean document that everybody can look at, and so, you know -- but I think so far we are moving towards something that we can all support, and so we'll mumble through with this a little bit longer. Liz?

MS. HAMILTON: Just, I also would ask if you

(inaudible) listening but also shares her concern. I like the idea of bolding those two sentences
-- in the (inaudible) down there
and looking at (crosstalk).

SPEAKER: Yes, yes, yes.

MS. HAMILTON: And then maybe the set of
recommendations. So there are two things: we
address our concerns and then we refer to our
document, and those two would jump out.

SPEAKER: So bold the reference to the
recommendation?

SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

SPEAKER: I don't know if that's too
much in bold, because that's three bold sentences
that we'll engage, but --

MS. LOVETT: So, I'll just cross this
out, because there are two more lines that
(inaudible).

SPEAKER: Right. Thank you.

SPEAKER: Okay. So, it's all the bold
sort of the -- is that sort of like, sending an
email message in all caps?

(Laughter)

MS. HAMILTON: Well, it's either that or
we bold it, I think that's (crosstalk).

SPEAKER: It's likely to do two tweets.

SPEAKER: I think so. I think that
(crosstalk) my reaction to writing the letter.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Any other suggested
changes to the draft letter to Secretary Ross?

Yes, Columbus?

MR. COLUMBUS: Go back to the first
paragraph. Are we suggesting adding conservation
interests to marine resources professionals?

GROUP: Yes.

MR. COLUMBUS: You know, I think we need
to be consistent in our dialogue and make sure
that we don't throw out the baby with the wash,
because, you know, we spend a lot of time on the
charter and what it says in a previous document.
So, if you recreate this language over time, you
sort of lose the breadth of the organization in
the process, and I would recommend that we go back
to the same language that we used in the second
paragraph of the letter, about where the people
are coming from who are members of MAFAC.
1  MS. LOVETT: Where is it different?
2  MR. COLUMBUS: Is that what we are
3  talking about. But we said MAFAC used -- members
4  are supposed to possess a wide range of expertise
5  on commercial records of fishing, aquaculture,
6  seafood processing, seafood marketing sales.
7  Consumer interest is not mentioned here. That's
8  another component --
9  MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry. We don't know
10  where you are, Columbus.
11  SPEAKER: Where are you reading from?
12  MR. COLUMBUS: I'm reading from the
13  Abundance Seas, making the (crosstalk).
14  SPEAKER: Transition?
15  MR. COLUMBUS: Marine Resources
16  Transition document.
17  SPEAKER: The transition document.
18  MR. RHEAULT: My intent was to try and
19  be brief.
20  SPEAKER: Yes.
21  MR. RHEAULT: So, I cut lot of language
22  out there, I'd love to put there, in the goals,
but we were told to keep this brief.

SPEAKER: Well, I mean, I think you can

-- If he is going to need us for different things,

then I think we need to make sure it's clear to

him other areas where our expertise comes into

play.

SPEAKER: And all of that language is

going to be in the attached document.

SPEAKER: Right. The transition
document, yeah.

SPEAKER: Yeah. But he's not going to

read that.

SPEAKER: (Crosstalk) for certain.

[PHIL]: XXXLast name not in notesXXX Excuse me?

MS. MORRIS: Yes, Phil. [PHIL]: It's

perfectly acceptable for the Chairman

or the Incoming Chairman, when they've

got the gavel in front of you, to eliminate this

endless wordsmithing, and simply say: we will do

it for X-amount of time, only will allow staff to

do the final wordsmith thing, so you don't end up

wasting endless time on something that doesn't
MS. MORRIS: So, Phil at last moments, his last meeting is expressing frustration about (crosstalk) (Laughter)

[PHIL]: Other government, you know, advisory committees I sit on do that, but they won't allow this to happen because it takes away from the purpose of what you are here for.

MS. MORRIS: So, based on that, would somebody like to put the current language into a motion?

SPEAKER: So moved.

MS. MORRIS: Would somebody like to second that motion.

SPEAKER: Second.

MS. MORRIS: Do you want the motion to include final editorial delegation to the --

SPEAKER: Heidi, to Heidi Lovett.

SPEAKER: For her editorial?

MS. MORRIS: -- Heidi Lovett. So, that's included in the motion; any further discussion on the motion? All those in favor say,
aye?

GROUP: Aye.

MS. MORRIS: All those opposed, like

sign?

(No response.) XXXnot sure I should

type?XXX

MS. MORRIS: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

MS. MORRIS: The motion carries.

SPEAKER: Can we have (inaudible)?

MS. MORRIS: Oh, yeah. Okay. So, for

the first time in our agenda we are all

(inaudible). What we are supposed to do now is

close out. We have decisions, action items, next

steps and next meeting. What do we know about the

next meeting? Heidi?

MS. LOVETT: We have been looking at a

few different things, trying to avoid the kind of

CB partnership -- that the Columbia Basin

Partnership is needed when we have our Leadership

Council Meeting we always tell which Council and

Commission meetings. I think last night, Dave
Carlson mentioned that one of the proposed dates might be his meeting, his Fall Meeting. So right now, some dates are: October 24 to 26; or November 7 to 9.

The location is -- the group is looking at the general Silver Spring, Washington, D.C., area. It seems like at this point that you would have finished a lot of your work coming to the summer on the Resilience task. So, there is the one topic that I heard for sure that you would like to come back is the Litigation Policy.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. We are moving into what the next steps are.

MS. LOVETT: Oh, sorry. I can leave it.

MS. MORRIS: So, I just wanted to talk about the planning of the meeting. So, it will be testing those two possible dates with the MAFAC Members, via a Doodle Poll, or something like that?

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. Terri, you wanted to say something about the dates?
MS. BEIDEMAN: Yeah. I'm on other
government panels that meet in the fall as well,
so if you could try to coordinate with the AP
folks, or HMS, and the other -- the Advisory
Committee that overlap this one, and I know Rachel
is going to try to avoid that in John's office.
But, so expect a call, or call her.

MS. LOVETT: I will work with the New
Chair on the date.

MS. BEIDEMAN: Thank you. (Laughter)

MS. MORRIS: Okay. (Crosstalk) chairs
here.

SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Could you remind
me?

MS. MORRIS: The 9th -- I'm going to go
over the notes that I have about the next steps,
and where we are on things, and as we go please
verify, and all that. So, the Columbia Basin Task
Force has four meetings scheduled for 2017, and I
don't think there's -- MAFAC has done a reporting
and filing rules on that.

The Litigation Policy, there's going to
be an effort for the Subcommittee to do summer
comments during summer on the next Issue Paper
Draft.

And then possibly invite Susan to come
join the Subcommittee again in the Fall Meeting,
with official comments from the full MAFAC after
the total comment period begins after the summer.
Is that correct? Okay.

We are going to ask that the Aquaculture
Task Force be reconstituted for a two-year period,
and we have certain -- a new list of tasks for
them, and we probably hope to hear back from them
in some regard (inaudible). And we also need to
draft a letter replying to their letter that came
to us on January that describes this action --
this motion of the
(crosstalk). We need to, for the
Fall Agenda, talk about
transition of Subcommittee Chairs,
because several of the current subcommittee Chairs
will be rotating off in February of 2018. So, it
might be, you might want be, you might want to
think about putting your Subcommittee Chairs would be for the Fall Meeting, and so there's some kind of overlap, and we'll end up there.

On Resilience, Terri has asked each of the Resilience to identify some areas of focus. Is that right?

MS. BEIDEMAN: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: And all of the Resilience tasks are supposed to wrap up with some kind of product, by the end of summer. And I think it's a little unclear about what we do about that for the Fall Meeting, and if everything is all wrapped up, what's the main factor next? So, I feel a little muddy about that. Go ahead.

MS. LUCENS: Well, so I think we will be joining a call -- a follow-up meeting in the summer, and it's not going to be a teleconference call, and that's one of the topics we could add to that. And I think other things will certainly pop up, and we can refer back that to the transition document that you all put together, and see if there's anything to refine there, and working with
the other (inaudible) leadership, the few topics that they may be interested. So, I think we could have done (inaudible) at the conference.

MS. MORRIS: Okay. And then, it's set -- Yes, Liz?

MS. HAMILTON: Are you going over agendas for the next meetings, still, because I'm (crosstalk)?

MS. MORRIS: Yes. And then according to Paul, there will be more detailed Presidential Budget out in May.

MR. DOREMUS: Yes. That's what we are expecting. Yes.

MS. MORRIS: And Paul was thinking MAFAC might want to put out additional comments once we have more detailed budget direction.

MR. DOREMUS: That would be the time to understand what the specific implications of the budget might be.

MS. BONNEY: I have a clarification?

MS. MORRIS: Yes?

MS. BONNEY: So you'd like that in
October, and the (inaudible) teleconference?

MS. MORRIS: I'm putting this out to the Committee and the new leadership about whether they think there will be a need for MAFAC to communicate over the summer, to respond to the more detailed budget direction coming sometime in May.

MS. BEIDEMAN: So that would be out in May.

MS. MORRIS: Mm-hmm.

MS. BEIDEMAN: And timing of course I know the sooner the better, et cetera. If we have a teleconference in August is that too late for a response?

MR. DOREMUS: It all depends on -- frankly with FY '18, the administration has, well, I think it's always helpful for the Committee to be on record with their views with the Secretary. But the President Budget, we can submit it -- congressional considerations will be taking place pretty much immediately. I don't know what their
calendar is going to be for FY '18
decision-making. That is, of course, your
individual opportunities to -- especially if you
are using your individual capacities, so that's
where the more urgent timing would be, I think.

MS. MORRIS: Okay.

MR. DOREMUS: As far as the Committee
action, it's up to the Chair at the time but, you
know, at any time is always -- any time that the
Committee can actually, you know, reasonably pull
together a statement of views, it would always be
welcome.

MS. MORRIS: So, Paul, do you imagine
having an analysis similar to what you shared with
us today, after you'll be redoing that kind of an
analysis, so definitely making that available to
maybe some -- maybe a webinar, or something like
that?

MR. DOREMUS: Yes. We could probably
figure out something virtually, I don't see why we
couldn't do that.

MS. MORRIS: Yes. I think that would be
very helpful as the next step. Mike?

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yeah. Two things

actually: the letter, the one-pager we are doing, once finalized it will go out immediately, or soon, or --

MS. MORRIS: Yeah.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: And then from that point, it's a public document, or not?

MS. MORRIS: Correct.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: So, if we wanted to use it --

MS. MORRIS: We will share it in the field.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: -- to some (crosstalk)?

MS. MORRIS: Yes.

MS. BEIDEMAN: And we'll post it on our Web page, so that --

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right. And it's all different if it comes from a constituent and a district, too.

MS. LUKENS: Yeah. But you can use it as you probably wish.
MR. OKONIEWSKI: Right. Okay. So, that was my question.

MS. LUKENS: As an individual.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I'm sorry?

MS. LUKENS: As an individual you can use it.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: Yes; or representing an entity.

MS. LUKENS: Yes.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: But the second one is -- it would seem that this -- When does Congress adjourn for the summer?

MR. DOREUS: I don't have the schedule for May, but that's probably available.

MR. OKONIEWSKI: In May?

MR. DOREUS: I don't know when they -- it's always (inaudible).

MR. OKONIEWSKI: I guess in some sense if they (inaudible) it anyway, maybe it doesn't matter if it's submitted --
of the comments that we might make from MAFAC about the (inaudible), I think that would be something that might be available till maybe August, I would think is too late. And of course, I don't know this process at all, but it would seem like you'd want to get in front of it as soon as possible.

MS. MORRIS: It seems like the first thing would be get sort of an analysis that probably will lead to broader audiences. And provided to MAFAC, and then you can figure out what to do next. Peter?

MR. SHELLEY: I'm would be interested in knowing whether a charter, whether it was appropriate for this Committee to actually -- as a Committee put comments to Congress.

SPEAKER: (Crosstalk) --

MR. DOREMUS: Well, it is not possible for you to do that with Congress, that's why I made the distinction.
SPEAKER: That would be the individual letter.

MR. DOREUS: The Secretary is formerly your charter, but then each of you in your individual capacity, are at liberty at any time to engage the members.

SPEAKER: And then you could attach the comments.

MR. DOREUS: Yeah -- Well, you can't represent the Committee, you can only represent yourself.

SPEAKER: Sure. Right, right.

SPEAKER: I think that's the key.

SPEAKER: But you can reference the document.

SPEAKER: And to be clear. That's what I was suggesting, it's not as a MAFAC representative.

MS. MORRIS: Then, moving on it seems like for the Recreation Subcommittee we talked about maybe some briefing on this issue paper that came up regarding --
SPEAKER: (Crosstalk)?

MS. MORRIS: Say again?

SPEAKER: Can the (inaudible) issue paper, and Dick shared with me, so I don't know if that's a next step for Recreation Sub or not.

SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. MORRIS: It would be a next step then. Okay, other next steps that we might have missed? That I would have missed in my list?

SPEAKER: Were you speaking of something?

SPEAKER: No. That was it.

SPEAKER: Okay then.

MS. MORRIS: Oh. Okay. All right, so we've covered review of decisions, not really. Have we covered review of decisions? They are recent that I'm not going to remember --

SPEAKER: Yes. You just did them this morning.

MS. MORRIS: Action is next meeting.

Final comments? We'll go to the order, before we recess our successful meeting. Everybody just
wants to leave. Columbus?

MR. COLUMBUS: I think we just need to
give our Chair a round of applause.

SPEAKER: Yeah. (Applause)

MS. MORRIS: Thank you. It's been a
privilege and a pleasure to work with such great
team of people, with such impressive leadership
skills, such deep knowledge, and such broad
experience and major (inaudible) of perspectives,
and at the same time when everybody is really open
and wants the best outcomes for the Agency, and
for Fisheries, and for

(inaudible) marine service. So,
it's been quite a ride. I've grown
a lot, and grateful for the
experience, and hope to
(inaudible). Okay. The meeting is
adjourned.

MS. LUKENS: Can I say one last thing?

MS. MORRIS: Certainly.

MS. LUKENS: Thank you to Heidi for
arranging this wonderful place and hanging it
together so quickly. She does so much work, that
she does behind the scenes. I think a lot of you
know that, but I just wanted to publicly
acknowledge that. And to Adele for helping us
with the (inaudible) and support for this meeting
also. So, thank you, guys.

SPEAKER: Thank you. (Applause)

(Discussion off the record)

(Whereupon, at 12:00 p.m., the
PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)
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