# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

# NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

# MARINE FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

## PROTECTED RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

# Wednesday,

# February 24, 2010

The Protected Resources Subcommittee convened in the Honolulu Ballroom in the Sheraton Waikiki, 2255 Kalakaua Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii at 1:00 p.m. Hawaii-Aleutian Standard Time, Catherine Foy, Subcommittee Chair, presiding.

# PRESENT:

CATHERINE FOY, SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR
KEITH RIZZARDI
ANTHONY CHATWIN
TERRY ALEXANDER
PAUL CLAMPITT
RANDY CATES

# STAFF PRESENT:

HEIDI LOVETT

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

# P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:23 p.m.)

(Due to an unplanned and unannounced relocation of the session, and insufficient time allowed for court reporter to relocate recording equipment, the first two or three minutes were not recorded)

MR. RIZZARDI: One of the things, for example, that drove our concern was petition to list 82 species of coral. How is NOAA going to respond to 82 species?

MS. FOY: When you did your --

MR. RIZZARDI: I did. The initial thing you said was --

MS. FOY: I said there were 83 species, and we are going to respond to --

MR. RIZZARDI: Was you said you were going to respond 82.

MS. FOY: Yes.

MR. RIZZARDI: But now what you've also done is you've triggered the -- you did the 90-day time frame. So now you have the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	one-year time frame, right?
2	MS. FOY: That seems to be issue
3	number two on my thing, potential misuse of
4	ESAs you gave an example of the coral
5	research.
6	MR. RIZZARDI: Oh, you're right.
7	Right. So what was issue number one?
8	MS. FOY: Okay. So issue number
9	one, go back, ESA and you can see this
10	time. The ESA implementation priorities
11	outline, this was your issue, in the
12	endangered and threatened species listing and
13	recovery priority guidelines that were put out
14	back in 1990 are currently allowing litigation
15	to drive agency priorities and funding
16	allocation.
17	MR. RIZZARDI: Okay.
18	MS. FOY: And you said as a
19	Committee
20	MR. RIZZARDI: I understand. They
21	tie in.

MS. FOY: Okay.

MR. RIZZARDI: The reason for this was the concern about the latter. MS. FOY: Okay. MR. RIZZARDI: So was there prioritization process. And what NOAA seems to be doing is getting things done so quickly that you basically don't need to do a priority because you're responding. So there is no backlog of species-listing decisions 10 made because you're making a decision on 82 species. I don't know that we're really going 11 to be able to do fair reviews of 82 coral 12 species as to which ones should and shouldn't 13 in the next 12 months, but --14 MS. FOY: That was my concern. 15 far as the 82 species, was that. 16 17 MR. RIZZARDI: And that was just one example. 18 19 MS. FOY: Well, any example. afraid that people are going to have what I 20 call pat species right off. 21

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes.

22

Exactly.

1	MS. FOY: You know, the warm
2	fuzzies, the most beautiful; whatever. It
3	doesn't matter based on magnitude of threat,
4	how well they can be recovered or any
5	conflicts. That's not the three things that
6	are driving funding prioritization. We're
7	allowing litigation to provide people that
8	have pet species, their charismatic fauna, to
9	drive where our agency has to put the money.
10	MS. LOVETT: Got you. So it sounds
11	to me like you're asking, do we have and
12	maintain some kind of priority list.
13	MR. RIZZARDI: Priority list.
14	MS. LOVETT: And how is that
15	MS. FOY: And if not, can we get it
16	in place before litigation becomes a problem
17	that's or that
18	MS. LOVETT: Okay. So that's a
19	little bit clearer request. Maybe we just
20	maybe misunderstood.
21	MS. FOY: That's okay.

LOVETT: So that's your

MS.

request.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. FOY: I mean maybe reword the recommendation if that would help.

MS. LOVETT: Or just say this is a clarifying explanation for it.

MS. FOY: Yes. Yes.

DR. CHATWIN: Just for my benefit, let me understand. So if we are successful here and NOAA creates this prioritized list, what do we expect the agency to do in relationship of litigation? Because one of the reasons litigation drives prioritization is because they don't have an option on whether or not to respond to a lawsuit.

MS. LOVETT: We have to respond in some fashion.

MS. FOY: You have to respond, but should more of the scientific research in dollars and more of the staff time and more of the recovery money be spent on a species that is somebody's pet or should it be spent regarding the criteria of magnitude of threat,

recovery potential and the conflict? That's what we're saying: that the agency's money, the agency's time should be spent based on those three criteria and not on letting litigation drive which species.

Am I right, Keith, or am I -- I mean --

DR. CHATWIN: So, I guess in an ideal world you would have separate pots of money. The one to respond to litigation and one to attend to your priorities?

MS. FOY: Right, right, right.

DR. CHATWIN: And that's this one doesn't get --

MS. FOY: Well, our hope was that by saying at the beginning, this species as such-and-such of a quantity a quantifiable magnitude of threat, this is the recovery potential and these are the conflicts that arise. Therefore, this much funding will be spent there, that NOAA's lawyers could then say in response to a litigation, this is why

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we have spent the money this way and this is why we believe that this is the way it should be because ever litigation is -- it's not bringing money in from outside. It's shifting focus within the agency from one species to another. Not necessarily where it does it most benefit biologically.

MS. LOVETT: But it's mу understanding, when there's petition, а there's a path of response we have to take and it's one or two. And it's not we're spending our money and we're doing research on these five species and we're not going to deal with your species until next year or the year after.

It's -- we have to determine whether the petition is valid.

MS. FOY: Right.

MS. LOVETT: And if it is valid, whether or not we're going to -- but that, we have I think a certain period of time to determine whether or not we are going to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	investigate. If it's a valid enough issue
2	MS. FOY: Yes.
3	MS. LOVETT: we make a
4	determination that, yes, we're going to
5	conduct research to understand whether or not
6	it should be listed.
7	MS. FOY: Right. Right.
8	MS. LOVETT: And we can't not do
9	that. We have to say yes or no to the
10	petition.
11	MS. FOY: Are we talking about
12	MS. LOVETT: Did I say that
13	correctly?
14	MS. FOY: Are we talking about
15	whether or not it's being listed, Keith, or
16	are we talking about how funding is allocated
17	after the listing?
18	MR. RIZZARDI: Exactly. Look,
19	there are three ways that the funding battle
20	plays out.
- 1	
21	The first way is mandatory duties.

something that you were absolutely statutory required to do. You had to do it within 90 days, you had to do it within a year. You didn't do it. Go into court, defend, can't really defend, court says, damn it, go do it. Right? Pot of money has to get moved. Your point's right. They have to do it. Okay.

Then there's another category of actions that are discretionary: recovery planning, and five-year status reviews and when these things happen. Those cases are failure-to-act cases.

MS. FOY: Right.

RIZZARDI: MR. Those get into discretionary cases. And then you get into what's called the track defense and the track And one of them, you know, was it factors. reasonable or unreasonable for the agency to have delayed. Did they have good justification for their delay? On those kinds of cases, having a list of priorities and explaining which species you're putting first

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and which species you're putting last would
2	make a whole lot of sense.
3	MS. FOY: Yes.
4	MR. RIZZARDI: Then there's the
5	third category which is contempt. The court's
6	pissed at you because you didn't do what it
7	told you to do.
8	MS. LOVETT: We try not to get
9	there. It freezes all
10	MR. RIZZARDI: Then you at least
11	have yes. And NOAA's really much better
12	than the Fish and Wildlife Service about not
13	getting into those.
14	MS. LOVETT: We're really good
15	about following our deadlines when it comes to
16	90 days
17	MR. RIZZARDI: Sure.
18	MS. LOVETT: 120 days, whatever.
19	MR. RIZZARDI: But you're dealing
20	with the new layer, the new types of petitions
21	that are coming in
	1

MS. LOVETT: Sure.

MR. RIZZARDI: -- I think the point we made last meeting was, while NOAA has been good at that in the past, the dynamics are starting to change. And when CBD is filing a petition to list 82 species of coral and then there's another petition to address 400 different pesticides that are flowing estuaries, and to have consultations on them. I mean, pretty soon you're going to start seeing that dynamic shift and the same burdens that are on the Fish and Wildlife Service will start being experienced by NOAA. So having a prioritization of species is at least helpful for the agency to defend itself in how it sets its priorities.

MS. LOVETT: And I'm obviously not in the PR office so I can't really answer these questions as successfully as you might have hoped.

MR. RIZZARDI: Right.

MS. LOVETT: But what I can say is that Jim Lecky, the Director of the office, is

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

committed to come to the next meeting or have a staff person.

MS. FOY: Oh, good. Good.

MS. LOVETT: And we told him this early in November. I didn't get to meet with him about all these until more recently. And he's very happy to do that.

And so I would recommend that this be worded in such a way that you provide him with a clear picture of what you would like to understand better. So if it's the prioritization -- so my point is this is how I'm interpreting what your needs are. And, again, I'm not --

MS. FOY: Let me put a little note in here. We did not expect Jim Lecky to be able to make this meeting. This meeting, to my way of thinking, especially, is set up to deal with the catch shares.

MS. LOVETT: Right, exactly. And I explained that to them. And it was kind of too short to --

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. FOY: Yes. So I'm not expecting you to have all of these issues and have a pat answer for me. Right. MS. LOVETT: No. But it sounds that you're wanting to me to understand: does the agency have an internal sort of prioritization list? MS. FOY: Yes. MS. LOVETT: And if it does, how is 10 that developed. And what kind of activities 11 and resources goes towards moving forward the far priorities agency's aqenda as as 12 13 endangered and threatened species. MS. FOY: Well, wait, wait, wait. 14 MS. LOVETT: Okay. 15 MS. FOY: I want you to go one step 16 further. 17 MS. LOVETT: Okay. 18 MS. FOY: I want the agency to make 19 this as clear cut and transparent as possible 20 to protect itself from letting litigation 21 drive its programs. I think if you go into 22

court and say --

MS. LOVETT: So, that's a MAFAC recommendation that, I guess is what am I trying to say? I'm not sure how -- I can't answer the transparency question.

MS. FOY: Right, right.

MS. LOVETT: It sounds like that's already a desire, and my point is what would you like Jim to be able to discuss with you and present that you understand the process from which to make your recommendations? Does that make sense?

MS. FOY: It does. And remember, Keith, we had the Fish and Wildlife example we were bringing up. And that's where we got the three criteria just to nail them kind of.

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes. I'm not sure where the Federal Register citation came from. So I was just looking that one up. And I'm thinking that might be what you're working with there.

MS. FOY: Right.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	DR. CHATWIN: So are you saying the
2	Fish and Wildlife Service has a prioritized
3	list?
4	MS. FOY: It does. It has those
5	three criteria
6	MR. RIZZARDI: It has a set of
7	criteria.
8	MS. FOY: that it uses
9	MR. RIZZARDI: Right.
10	MS. FOY: to prioritize its
11	funding.
12	DR. CHATWIN: Really?
13	MS. LOVETT: You're talking about
14	its candidate lists and things like that, or
15	before you even get to
16	DR. CHATWIN: It has spotlight
17	species.
18	MS. FOY: Mitigation measures and
19	research and that kind of thing.
20	MS. LOVETT: Yes. Yes. Okay.
21	MS. FOY: I mean, we have limited
22	funding.

1	MR. CATES: Well, can anybody
2	propose the list at any time? How does that
3	happen?
4	MR. RIZZARDI: Yes.
5	MS. LOVETT: A petition can come
6	forward from a group at any time.
7	MS. FOY: Right.
8	MS. LOVETT: And it has to have
9	sufficient evidence for why it's making its
10	petition, why it feels that the particular
11	species is endangered or threatened or should
12	warrant consideration as being threatened or
13	endangered.
14	MS. FOY: Not every petition will
15	be considered for the listing. You have to
16	make the petition and provide support.
17	MS. LOVETT: Support evidence. And
18	the agency can determine it warrants review or
19	it's a no determination, meaning it doesn't
20	warrant the agency's review at the time.
21	MR. CATES: Did that coral one
22	catch everybody by surprise?

1	MS. LOVETT: Not really.
2	MS. FOY: I can't answer that.
3	MR. RIZZARDI: I'd say, not in the
4	existence of a petition, but yes in the
5	magnitude. The fact that they came up with a
6	petition with 83 species as opposed to a
7	dozen. I mean, you know
8	MS. FOY: Well, and I was shocked
9	that 82 of those species
10	MS. LOVETT: Were determined to
11	warrant consideration.
12	MS. FOY: were determined to
13	warrant consideration.
14	MR. RIZZARDI: Well, remember, the
15	standard is not whether the species should be
16	listed. The standard is whether the petition
17	has included enough information to justify
18	further review.
19	MS. LOVETT: To justify, exactly.
20	Thank you.
21	MS. FOY: Okay. There we go.
22	MR. RIZZARDI: Right? So NOAA has

not said we think we're going to list 82 species.

MS. LOVETT: These should be looked at, right. Exactly.

MR. RIZZARDI: NOAA has said we think that this petition has raised significant enough issues that we need to look further with respect to these 82 species. And ultimately they may say, well, these 30 we are, and these 52 we're not, you know and that process will play out however it does.

The concern we were all raising last meeting was how many more of these petitions are going to come for how many more different varieties of species that are out there. And how is that going to drive NOAA's priorities. And we're trying to get NOAA ahead of the curve --

MR. CATES: Absolutely.

MR. RIZZARDI: -- to have some sort of defensive strategy for when those petitions come.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. LOVETT: And I can't say	yes or
no to that because I'm not an expert.	So I'm
saying that I think what you were aski	ng for
to understand better is the process.	
MS. FOY: Yes. Yes. And	if we
can, somehow help NOAA to get ahead o	of the
curve so that we're not behind the eigh	t ball
like we've been numerous times.	
MS. LOVETT: So, I don't ki	now if
you want to draft. Someone else is goin	g to -
- I mean he's taking notes.	
MS. FOY: He's taking notes.	
MS. LOVETT: You'll draft som	nething
as a recommendation.	
MS. FOY: I'll draft somethi	ng and
run it by Committee members before we	e make
another recommendation.	
MS. LOVETT: Absolutely.	
MS. FOY: Let's keep the	ball
rolling.	
MS. LOVETT: Yes.	
MS. FOY: Paul and Terry,	please

don't feel like I'm ignoring you. It's not on
purpose; I'm trying to face Heidi. If you
need my attention, just get me.
MR. CLAMPITT: It's fine. No, it's
review so far.
MS. FOY: Okay. Issue two, Heidi.
Why don't I let you get up to speed while I
review what we're doing.
MS. LOVETT: Well, no. I'm right
there. The office at this point in time
filed, in particular, that CEQ, the letter
from CEQ climate change
MS. FOY: Yes.
MS. LOVETT: in NEPA would be of
interest and provide some background.
MS. FOY: And that's in the
background briefing for the
MR. CLAMPITT: What CEQ?
MS. LOVETT: I'm sorry. The
MR. RIZZARDI: Council for
Environmental Quality.
MS. LOVETT: Council for

Environmental Quality, which is in the President's office.

CEO helps -- well, they essentially oversee and make sure all the federal agencies abide by the NEPA regulations. And if there's any issues that might have any internal conflicts between an agency. I mean, if decision that different there's some two agencies come to different results, it gets elevated to CEO to help figure out resolution and what's the government's policy or decision.

So your recommendation was request discussion between appropriate D.C. staff and MAFAC Committee. And then report on the status of a new rule following up on the rescission of the Bush ESA regulation.

And my understanding is that there's not much that we can say yet about any new rule.

MR. RIZZARDI: Is that the rescission of the consultation?

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. LOVETT: Yes.
2	MR. RIZZARDI: All right. That's
3	done.
4	MS. LOVETT: No. That was done,
5	but you asked what's the follow-up on the
6	rescission of the Bush ESA regulation.
7	MR. RIZZARDI: Right. Right.
8	MS. LOVETT: There were a number of
9	changes put in the ESA, and it was rescinded.
10	MR. RIZZARDI: Right.
11	MS. LOVETT: And there's nothing to
12	report as yet as to what direction the new
12	report as yet as to what direction the new agency is going to take.
13	agency is going to take.
13 14	agency is going to take.  MS. FOY: Right.
13 14 15	agency is going to take.  MS. FOY: Right.  MR. RIZZARDI: Is that issue three
13 14 15 16	agency is going to take.  MS. FOY: Right.  MR. RIZZARDI: Is that issue three or is it two?
13 14 15 16	agency is going to take.  MS. FOY: Right.  MR. RIZZARDI: Is that issue three or is it two?  MS. LOVETT: That's two.
13 14 15 16 17	agency is going to take.  MS. FOY: Right.  MR. RIZZARDI: Is that issue three or is it two?  MS. LOVETT: That's two.  MS. FOY: I wonder
13 14 15 16 17 18	agency is going to take.  MS. FOY: Right.  MR. RIZZARDI: Is that issue three or is it two?  MS. LOVETT: That's two.  MS. FOY: I wonder  MR. RIZZARDI: That's still two,

tool for regulating climate change and greenhouse gases.

MS. FOY: Right. Right. Now you'll let me take it for a minute.

MS. LOVETT: Sure.

MS. FOY: There's a letter on the Protected Resources Subcommittee thing that Heidi provided between the CEQ and, help me Anyway, they're discussing whether or not NEPA allows regulation of indirect effects regarding release of greenhouse gases, not the ESA. Is that but that may be indication, to my way of thinking, of how the Administration deals with things as far as the You can speak to that if you, I mean, I ESA. see that as a hot --

MR. RIZZARDI: No. I mean, I think that's 100 percent correct. The letter went from CEQ to the Senate members saying this is how CEQ thinks we're going to address some climate change concerns.

MS. FOY: Right.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RIZZARDI: We're looking at in NEPA context.

MS. FOY: Right.

The issue we were MR. RIZZARDI: raising still exists: 82 species of coral are potentially going to be listed. Those 82 species will now be a mechanism for raising issues and concerns as to climate change, just the same way the polar bear was being used as a proxy for climate change issues. And as a result, when the polar bear was listed, the Fish and Wildlife Service came up with special regs that said, we will not use the polar bear for purposes of evaluating global climate change and emissions from a power plant in Florida to see what the impacts are on polar bears in the Arctic.

Right. So now what you're looking at is the same exact dynamic for 82 species for coral --

MS. FOY: Right.

MR. RIZZARDI: -- and for any other

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

future species that's coming up on a list.

And just as we were looking for NOAA to have some priorities as defensive forward-thinking strategy, so too are we asking what's NOAA thinking about how the ESA is going to be implemented as climate change is more and more one of the key reasons for the listing of the species.

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

MR. RIZZARDI: When you go through the Federal Register publications, over and

MR. CLAMPITT: No, no, no.

MR. RIZZARDI: -- the species designation is based on it.

MR. CLAMPITT: And one of the big ones was climate change.

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes. Everytime there's a species, a big piece of the analysis is impact to habitat, impact to species populations derived from --

MR. CLAMPITT: Right. Right.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

over and over --

Ocean acidification. MR. RIZZARDI: -- changes to ocean acidification. Bingo. Exactly. MR. RIZZARDI: Now recognizing that's a problem, the potential exists for every issue to turn into something that requires consultation as to how acidification is going to be effected and what consequence it has for 82 species of coral. 9 10 MR. CLAMPITT: Right. MS. LOVETT: Right. 11 MR. RIZZARDI: Or whatever other 12 13 insert-species-here you want to pick. MR. CATES: Can I ask a question on 14 I know I'm walking in and out. that? 15 think MAFAC should hear about 16 climate change. I mean, everybody assumes 17 that's based on science's foregone conclusion 18 19 that there's something we can do about it, and there's a lot of doubt in the air, I would 20 say. And so much money and so much resources 21

being thrown at it. I'm not convinced it's a

1	real issue that
2	MS. FOY: Do we need to have Dr.
3	Feely back again? No, it wasn't Dr. Feely
4	that came.
5	MS. LOVETT: It wasn't Dr. Feely
6	that came. I happened to hear him give a
7	talk.
8	MS. FOY: But it was from his lab.
9	MS. LOVETT: But, yes, it was
10	somebody from his lab that came. That or, I
11	guess it's somewhat relevant, it's up to you
12	all. Obviously, the agency has a new climate
13	science services line office. And maybe it's
14	an understanding of the work that they intend
15	to do and how it integrates with the other
16	responsibilities of NOAA as an idea as far as
17	a guest speaker topic.
18	MS. FOY: Depending on where the
19	MS. LOVETT: The meeting is.
20	MS. FOY: meeting is I have a
21	resident expert that

MS. LOVETT: I think that Jim can

talk to this a little bit. I mean, he's --MS. FOY: Jim Lecky? MS. LOVETT: Yes. He explained to me that there was -- the rescission, there's something related to climate impacts that is something that is a responsibility of the agency to look at with respect to potential listings. But I'm not clear exactly on what I forgot if it was mitigation or, that was. indirect 10 you know, direct or impacts, or looking at mitigation. So I really would need 11 to get back with you on what that is. And my 12 13 notes don't show it right now. MR. RIZZARDI: Timing is important 14 here. 15 MS. LOVETT: Right. 16 MR. RIZZARDI: The next meeting for 17 MAFAC is June. 18 19 MS. LOVETT: Right. MR. 20 RIZZARDI: And not too long thereafter, there's going to need to be a 21 decision on 82 species of coral which may 22

require special regs to be published, just as special regs were published for the polar bear that distinguished how climate change going to be dealt with for polar bears. think NOAA is going to be looking at needing to carve out those same distinctions, otherwise construction of a power plant in Miami is going to require consideration of climate change for the various concerns species of coral in the Florida Keys. the you don't even have same attenuation arguments that you have with the polar bear.

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

MR. RIZZARDI: It's much more close in proximity even though it doesn't really make any sense. You know, whatever FPL does with the power plant in Miami is going into the atmosphere, it's so marginal in terms of its impact atmospherically. But does it require you to look because, well, you have geographic proximity? Those are the kinds of issues that are bubbling and that are going to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

be facing NOAA in the very near future.

DR. CHATWIN: So I'm not following exactly what the agenda is here, what it is that we are trying to advise the agency about.

Because I'm thinking, okay, I mean coral is definitely experiencing a lot more bleaching than it ever experience.

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes. Absolutely.

DR. CHATWIN: And I understand that that isn't because of one power plant in a certain place. But what I'm thinking is okay so we say that the agency -- it sounded like the suggestion was that we say the agency should exclude climate change from the things it should consider if these 82 species get listed, is that what you're saying?

MR. RIZZARDI: No, no, no.

DR. CHATWIN: Because I'm thinking well what's left then for the agency to work on is fishing. Is that what we want to do, is like --

MR. RIZZARDI: We were beyond

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fishing. The issue is bigger than fishing. DR. CHATWIN: I know it is, yes. But what I'm hearing is there's one threat that we want to exclude from being considered in the listing. MS. FOY: What we're trying to avoid is doing repeated -- having a large portion of our National Marine Fisheries staff's time, energy and money being focused 10 on reviewing power plants in Iowa regarding its impact on coral in Florida and Hawaii 11 because they emit greenhouse gases. 12 13 to get ahead of the curve because it's headed that way and people are going to be able to 14 start suing NMFS and NOAA because they are not 15 doing that unless we get ahead of it now. 16 you understand what I'm saying here? 17 DR. CHATWIN: Yes. But I'm still 18 19 trying to think -- so what are you preserving those people for? 20

NEAL R. GROSS

issues as opposed to consultations as to how

MR. RIZZARDI: To work on fisheries

21

an Iowa manufacturing plant is going to affect Florida Keys' corals. I don't think that that's where we want NOAA spending its time.

MS. FOY: My point is that the Endangered Species Act was not designed for a global impact to species.

MR. RIZZARDI: Right.

MS. FOY: But we may be approaching where professional interest the point now groups or NGOs or whatever you want, litigate under the Endangered Species based on climate change and NMFS and NOAA has to respond to that, even though they don't regulatory authority have any over it. They're going to have a large amount of their resources suddenly shifted into just reviewing NEPA documents.

MS. LOVETT: Well, there are two of our offices that do that.

MS. FOY: Right.

MS. LOVETT: The Habitat office.

MS. FOY: Right.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. LOVETT: And the Protected
2	Resources office. And obviously I mean the
3	agency
4	MS. FOY: But it's based right now
5	localized effects, Heidi, not on
6	MS. LOVETT: Oh, I understand.
7	MR. RIZZARDI: Right. Right.
8	Those consultations are on fisheries.
9	MS. FOY: Right.
10	MS. LOVETT: No, they're not
11	fisheries. That's my point. They're not
12	strictly fisheries. When it comes to salmon,
13	it's water.
14	MR. RIZZARDI: Well, that's true.
15	That's right.
16	MS. LOVETT: But when it comes to
17	marine mammals, it's
18	MR. RIZZARDI: And you know what?
19	Salmon is a perfect example of the big
20	problem. Because, how much of NOAA's
21	resources are being spent on consultations
22	relating to BOR and the water management in

Sacramento to deal with some salmon issues? MS. FOY: And the climate, and whatever else. MR. RIZZARDI: Right. And if you start taking that kind of approach to things and think about what would happen if that same approach was magnified all over the country and you're consulting all over the country on climate change issues for things that are even more removed from fisheries --10 MS. LOVETT: Well, I just wanted to 11 clarify that a major responsibility of 12 13 agency --MR. RIZZARDI: Absolutely. 14 MS. LOVETT: -- for two of our 15 major offices consultations and 16 are particularly for Habitat, you know, we don't 17 have regulatory authority. Agencies just have 18 19 to respond in writing whether or not they disagree with the consultation 20 agree or

MS. FOY: Yes.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

21

22

recommendations.

MS. LOVETT: But the Habitat office
would argue, too, that we've gained quite a
significant amount of protection based on the
consultation process.
MS. FOY: Maybe our new
recommendation should be that we have a member
of the Habitat office come as well and discuss
that viewpoint with us at the next meeting
with Jim Lecky.
MS. LOVETT: Yes.
MS. FOY: I mean, that would be my
request.
I don't disagree with you, Tony,
that we do need to have climate change
controlled. I just think that the ESA is the
inappropriate law to do that and we need a
separate climate-change law. But in the
absence of that, ESA is going to be
MR. RIZZARDI: And, Tony, from my
perspective, I think I'm hearing you having
concerns about whether we are saying list the

coral or not?

DR. CHATWIN: No, not at all?

MR. RIZZARDI: No?

DR. CHATWIN: What I'm seeing is, this is how I'm interpreting this, we want to protect the agency resources to its current obligations and so we don't want it consulting on things like power plants in Iowa. That's it, period.

My concern is, I go to the next step, if you don't have NOAA thinking about the marine resources and the impacts of other entities, you're left with no one thinking about marine resources and the impact. So that's my concern is have we thought this through?

The immediate problem of not wanting the resources to be allocated according to lawsuits; I totally understand that. But I'm just wondering what are we giving up by saying, you know --

MR. RIZZARDI: I would say that's what the Climate Service should do.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. CHATWIN: There's no one.

MR. RIZZARDI: Right. But it's not what the National Marine Fisheries staff and Protected Resources or Habitat should be doing. If Climate needs to do it and if we can get legislation passed to deal with that, great. That's where it should happen. But to spend the time and effort of the handful of biologists who do consultations on fisheries and have them be now charged with solving the problem of global climate change, I don't think that's realistic.

So you're right; NOAA needs to think about it. I'm just saying let's put it in the right box. Let's put it in the Climate Services box as opposed to the NMFS box. Right?

And then on the climate change, just so I can be on record, I think we should all be careful about how we talk about climate change. I think it's one thing to say that there's great variability over the degree of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	climate change. I 100-percent agree. I think
2	it's not correct to say there's no such thing.
3	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I don't think
4	it's part of the discussion. In other words,
5	so what?
6	MR. RIZZARDI: I agree.
7	MR. CLAMPITT: Whatever way you
8	agree on that, but that has nothing to do with
9	what this discussion is about.
10	MR. RIZZARDI: Right. But I don't
11	want MAFAC being on record as to one way or
12	the other on
13	MR. CLAMPITT: I agree. I agree 100
14	percent on that.
15	MR. RIZZARDI: climate change.
16	MR. CLAMPITT: It's not the venue
17	for that.
18	MR. RIZZARDI: And when the science
19	really
20	MR. CATES: We've had several
21	meetings where people have stood up and made
22	their presentations and said

1	MR. CLAMPITT: That's a good point.
2	MR. CATES: in our last meeting.
3	And we all agree that climate change is man-
4	made.
5	MR. CLAMPITT: We don't.
6	MR. CATES: We don't all agree on
7	that.
8	MR. RIZZARDI: No.
9	MR. CATES: I haven't seen
10	MS. FOY: Now wait a second here,
11	Randy. That's beside the point. It doesn't
12	really matter if it's man-made.
13	MR. CATES: I agree.
14	MS. FOY: What matters is that our
15	ocean pH is changing and that whatever else,
16	and so the impacts are changing.
17	MR. CATES: I agree. Whether we're
18	on record as saying that climate change isn't
19	happening
20	MS. FOY: Right.
21	MR. CATES: I want to make the
22	point that far too often it's insinuated that

we all agree that this is a man-made thing. And that while this money should be spent on climate change, I don't agree with that. I think that we should have a discussion on that, actually.

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes.

MR. CATES: It's a separate issue.

DR. CHATWIN: Exactly. I mean I'm in your camp on that. But what we're talking about here really has nothing to do with that.

MR. CATES: I totally agree with you, but I'm commenting because --

DR. CHATWIN: I got it.

MR. CLAMPITT: I mean, I think you don't have to use the coral example, but you can use what they just did recently with the leatherback turtle off the coast of Oregon, California and Washington. The National Marine Fisheries Service just said that's critical habitat for the leatherback turtle and what are the consequences of that and why was that brought up? I mean, they saw a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

leatherback turtle off of Cape Flattery once, and so now that's somehow critical habitat for leatherback turtle. Well, what are the consequences for that? This is exactly what we're talking about.

They're going to take that new designation and use it for a lawsuit to maybe stop whatever they think might interfere with leatherback turtles. I mean, I don't think that's what the Endangered Species Act was set up to, you know, somehow get around these resources issues to put a stop to resource use.

I don't if that's what this --

MR. RIZZARDI: I think the Endangered Species Act was set up as the final backstop to avoid the extinction of a species, period.

MR. CLAMPITT: Yes. Right.

MR. RIZZARDI: And it is an absolutely blunt instrument. It is a sledgehammer. There's nothing surgical about

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CLAMPITT: Yes. Right.

MR. RIZZARDI: Ιt is you shall stop. You shall not. And if it means that the means that fishery closes, it the fishery closes. And I don't think it was ever a predetermined agenda that we're going to use this as a tool to achieve stopping these other things. I think it was more the other way. was protect the species at all costs. why it was passed.

MR. CLAMPITT: Exactly.

MR. RIZZARDI: Now the reality is, yes, it gets used and manipulated now by some groups that do have agendas that do want to achieve certain other outcomes and they grab a species that is representative of whatever outcome they want to achieve and they push. And they the court system and use Endangered Species Act to try to get to that goal.

And what I think all of us have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

been trying to get at here is let's be defense minded and let's get ahead of that and have a strategy that avoids having our resources spent in the ways we never intended, and having to use our resources in ways that were never intended so that NOAA can keep doing its core mission with respect to fisheries management.

MS. FOY: I personally would be open to some legislation about climate change and having the Climate Service respond, as Keith was saying. But I agree with him that I don't think it is properly in the National Fishery Service or NOAA.

MS. LOVETT: Well, just as a point of clarification, I believe the official new title is the Climate Science Service, Climate Science and/or Research Service.

So I'm not sure it's been designed or intended to be a regulatory type of entity such as the existing NMFS. And, obviously, NOS has some regulatory authority related to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	sanctuaries.
2	I think it's more of a
3	consolidation of the research efforts that are
4	at the moment in a few other boxes, so to
5	speak, within NOAA. We've always had a
6	Climate Service within OAR. I think it's just
7	elevating it a little bit and tying in other
8	entities.
9	MS. FOY: To those of you from D.C.
10	and who have different contacts than I do, is
11	there any movement towards any climate
12	legislation?
13	DR. CHATWIN: That's a high
14	priority for CEQ and high property for the
15	new Administration.
16	MS. FOY: Okay.
17	DR. CHATWIN: I mean are they ready
18	this year? Not this year.
19	MS. FOY: Was there any action from
20	
21	DR. CHATWIN: Last year that of
22	no climate, we're not going to move or

climate. But then this year -- with folks from CEQ and saying this is a high priority for the Administration.

MS. LOVETT: Let me just do a time check for you all. It's now 2:00, or close to. You have a few things I can give you a

MS. FOY: Okay.

little bit of feedback on.

MS. LOVETT: It sounds like linking this and the other first issue, that again you're trying to understand the prioritization within NMFS how it both spends under Protective Resources, how it strategizes to get the work done that's on the table in front of it.

MS. FOY: Right.

MS. LOVETT: Which is consultations, permits, research, your other issues, the recovery plans. Those are all priorities and how does the agency --

MS. FOY: Allocate things.

MS. LOVETT: -- allocate things is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

kind of what I was hearing from the various discussions. And is it being proactive in identifying potentially how new species or species -- I don't know if that's the right word -- but is it being proactive with respect to candidate species? Am I right? Is that what you were saying? You're shaking your head yes, Keith. You know, rather than waiting for a petition to bring forward the name of a particular species, is the agency being proactive in identifying what kind of species need to be looked at for potential listings. That's what I thought I heard earlier.

MS. FOY: Potential listings and what's been for funding allocation based on those quantifiable three criteria.

MS. LOVETT: Again, though, it sounds like a clear understanding --

MS. FOY: Yes.

MS. LOVETT: -- so that you can develop recommendations based on your

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

subsequent discussions --

MS. FOY: Right. Yes.

MS. LOVETT: -- after you really hear from the horse's mouth how things are done.

MS. FOY: Yes.

MS. LOVETT: I think is what you're asking for. And so I'm going to help you all and maybe move on to the next one, and then you can come back maybe to this just so you don't run out of time.

MS. FOY: Good. Please.

MS. LOVETT: Okay. So the next issue was, the issue as stated was scientific efforts of near zero impact and in parenthesis level В harassment, require extensive documentation and effort by both agency and applicant, more than required of general public for same incidental harassment. And you thought creates disincentives it to beneficial research efforts. So the recommendation was to request a discussion

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with staff regarding feasibility of further streamlining noninvasive scientific research permitting by developing a standardized permit application for the issuance of incidental take permits or general authorizations. So what I learned related to that is the general authorization is an MMPA permit for level B only. Nothing similar exists for Oh, you knew that? Okay. And then, of course, they provided link clear for you all could the see description of the various permits and then you can drill down from the website and get more information about various permits. MS. FOY: So what I heard back from you, Heidi, is that it is not illegal for them Level B harassment MS. LOVETT: permits are not available for ESA species. Right. MS. FOY:

NEAL R. GROSS

question in that one?

MS. LOVETT: Does that answer your

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. FOY: I think it does, yes.
2	MS. LOVETT: Okay. So I don't
3	think there's anything more streamlining
4	related they can account
5	MR. RIZZARDI: Why not?
6	MS. LOVETT: Pardon?
7	MR. RIZZARDI: Why couldn't we come
8	up with a streamlined permit application for
9	it.
10	MS. FOY: My understanding was that
11	it was not legal to do that. That there are
12	certain requirements under was that not
13	true, Heidi?
14	MS. LOVETT: Okay. Maybe our
15	lawyer in the midst can explain it better than
16	I can.
17	MR. RIZZARDI: There are very clear
18	criteria for getting an instant on the take
19	permit.
20	MS. LOVETT: Right.
21	MR. RIZZARDI: But what also exists
22	in many instances are pre-prepared habitat
	NEW D 0000

conservation plans for a given species to make it very easy for somebody to get that permit. So if you're a single family homeowner and you are going to develop a little parcel land and you are going to impact a scrub jay, you take the prefilled- out HCP, you put in your name and address and a few other pieces of information and you submit that to the Fish Wildlife Service and and you get your incidental take permit for that very impact as long as you did all the things in that permit application.

What came to me was why can't there be a similar process for some species for scientific research through NOAA. And the one that I hear a bunch is sea turtles and manatees.

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

MR. RIZZARDI: The public can jump in the water and go swim with a manatee and don't need no stinking permit.

MS. LOVETT: Right.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RIZZARDI: But the researcher who is trying to do some good work on manatees needs to go through this online MS Word document with 50 different criteria that they fill out.

So if we know what's good and we know what's bad, why can't NOAA again get ahead of the curve. Give a pre-prepared document that says do these things, fill out this lesser amount of information, we're going to make this process a little easier for you. If you're doing sea turtle research, you're doing manatee research, your doing sea otter research, you know we want to encourage it. Do these things, here's the pre-prepared application.

MS. FOY: Right. I mean even to the point where just background for you guys, it's I'm not allowed to approach in a boat to the same distance as a wildlife viewing operation and watch the sea lions through binoculars to get brand resite information.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Without a scientific permit it requires 25 to 30 pages of text.

MR. RIZZARDI: And then the Disney scientists complains about the exact same thing for sea turtles.

MS. FOY: Yes. Right. You know, the charter boat operators are not required without any permitting at all, it's considered general public. And you know, I would argue that that's a major glitch.

MR. CLAMPITT: It's a major glitch.

There's a lot of major glitches. That's a good one.

MS. FOY: It's done. Permitting requires a vast amount of effort on the part of biologists and it is something that is familiar with the permitting process. That's one of my main marketing skills which are demanded of the job. I'd much rather be out looking there at the sea lions through binoculars than sitting there filling out 30 pages worth of permitting and then annual

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

reports back on exactly how many sea lions I looked at and exactly what their response was to me looking at them. What the GPS locations of each site were. the reporting Τ mean, back afterwards sometimes just onerous once you have he permit. MS. LOVETT: Well maybe we didn't understand this issue as clearly the way it was written up. Well, this would be MS. FOY: another issue that we could talk about with Jim Lecky. MS. LOVETT: Yes. MR. RIZZARDI: You know, you have very reputable scientists doing the same sea turtle research they've been doing for years. And they've got to fill out a 30 page application. MS. FOY: Yes. MR. RIZZARDI: We want the data.

We want them to be doing this research.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

helps with the Fisheries helpful. It management decision. And why are we making it folks hard for these and creating this additional cost for them when there are ways that we can make this easier? MS. FOY: Okay. So should we move on to the next item before we run out of time

So number four MS. LOVETT: was there are inconsistent approaches sea turtle protection in regional fishery regulations. example the 2009 And was loggerhead status report indicates increasing risks of extinction. And the recommendation that was officially passed, and I have to make a comment. Because there were like three bullets and one of them was not approved. I wasn't sure if all three were not approved and it was just a brand new effort --

MR. RIZZARDI: No. It was just me going to St. Pete that was not approved.

MS. LOVETT: That was the only

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

here?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thing not approved? Okay.

So the recommendation was: To appoint an ah hoc effort to synthesize an understanding of theories explaining declines and threats; statutes seek to ensure consistency in management approaches for all regions, and there's a recommendation for Subcommittee members to work through Policy office for factfinding on sea turtle protection issues and report back.

So the one thing I did know about is the NRC was contracted by NOAA to do a report about sea turtles to assess -- I'm going to be wrong about what they're doing exactly probably. But I think it's to assess both how we make determinations to assess what we're doing in our different regions. In particular, the best methodologies -- I think they're looking for recommendations regarding best methodologies to use for doing turtles, which assessment on sea Ι understand it are quite different from marine

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mammals and definitely different from fisheries. And to provide recommendations back to the agency.

And I thought that effort was going to be done by this point in time so a draft might be able to be shared with you. But my understanding now is that they're supposed to be finalizing their work by April or May. So the June/July meeting would be appropriate to -- you know, once we have their report and it's been finalized and approved and whatnot, it will be shared with you. And I'm sure it will actually get at some of these particular issues that you raised in this particular point.

MS. FOY: That's good.

MS. LOVETT: And then, obviously, the agency will be developing a response as to how it's going to incorporate or adjust or move forward based on the NRC recommendation.

MS. FOY: Okay.

MS. LOVETT: So that's been a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

priority within the agency to such a degree that they've asked for some outside external review to assist in helping lead the way forward.

MS. FOY: And that's something that we should expect more on next meeting, too. So let's just, if we can, keep in mind, Keith, since I know this is your baby. Do you mind if we table this one for now since we're running out of time and go quickly--

MS. LOVETT: We have a little bit more time.

MR. RIZZARDI: Which was five?

MS. LOVETT: Five is --

DR. CHATWIN: One of the key problems identified in recovery plan of sea turtles is bycatch. And it's a problem not only for the turtles, it's a problem for the industry because there is inadequate information on bycatch rates and stuff like that.

And I meant to bring it up on the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

discussion of the budget, but I think a question that should be asked is why is there so little money allocated to the national bycatch strategy? Because we hear a lot from industry saying, you know, we need money to do the research to show that we're not actually having impact that we're perceived to have. But there is very limited amount of money available to be able to do that.

And the national bycatching budget, the way it works, it's around three million, I think. I mean it's really -- it's divided up into tiny pieces this is for the bycatch strategy for research, there's turtle research that goes straight to the regions. But as far minimizing bycatch, the amount of money available for that work is kind of very low. So that's also something I want to get and have it reported back.

MS. FOY: For the next meeting.

MS. LOVETT: Okay.

MS. FOY: It sounds like we're

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to have a have a turtle expert there.

MR. RIZZARDI: Yes, please.

MS. FOY: On that same note is the next issue which we felt that there was a lack of overarching guidance for the recovery plans to standardize the downlisting or delisting of species. I was just talking to Kitty a few minutes ago and they're having trouble with that, the green sea turtle here in Hawaii. And it appears to be a distinct population segment, meaning it does not travel outside -this population does no travel outside of the Hawaiian Islands. And is at a point where it should be delisted, but it seems to be there's something holding up the process. So she's concerned about that.

And we include with that the recommendation that Paul had that we have an update on the humpback and sperm whale population delisting status.

MR. CATES: What we are having seems that there's an agenda not to do the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	work.
2	MS. FOY: Yes.
3	MR. CATES: That's it.
4	MS. FOY: Yes. But there should be
5	a standard timeline based on after a staff
6	assessment if the population reaches this
7	standard, then it should follow a logical
8	timeline just like listing is required to
9	follow on a logical timeline.
10	MS. LOVETT: Just like listings are
11	required?
12	MS. FOY: Well, when you have a
13	listing, you have
14	MS. LOVETT: Yes.
15	MS. FOY: And it's not that way for
16	recovery.
17	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, they're
18	spending all that money on listing and they're
19	not spending any money delisting.
20	MR. CATES: Well, on this I'd like
21	to put something out to the Subcommittee.
22	Because in their response that they gave us on

this issue they included this link to all the recovery plans and it was very revealing to me. Because there were two recovery plans that have been sitting in draft status since 2006.

MS. FOY: Right.

MR. RIZZARDI: So one of them is spin whale, one of them is sperm whale. Public comment's closed. Document was done. I think

spin whale, one of them is sperm whale. Public comment's closed. Document was done. I think MAFAC should encourage NOAA to go finish the recovery plans. I mean, there are these two documents and they're done.

MS. FOY: Right. Right.

MR. RIZZARDI: Please go finish.

MS. FOY: Well, that's the problem:

There's a lack of overarching guidelines --

MR. RIZZARDI: Exactly.

MS. FOY: -- to standardize this. There needs to be a standard for downlisting or delisting, and that's lacking. It's lacking.

MS. LOVETT: So the one little bit

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I recall learning about this was recovery plans do take a long time to get them. MS. FOY: Yes, they do. MS. LOVETT: There are no deadlines how fast the recovery plan must be completed. So I'm assuming that means there's no statutory deadlines such as there are with listings. MS. FOY: Right. Right. MS. LOVETT: So it is the reverse. There's acknowledgement that a lot of the plan are stale. MS. FOY: Right. MS. LOVETT: And there likely does need to be a better process to keep them up to date. Right. MS. FOY: MS. LOVETT: But as you've all noted yourselves, there's a lot of priorities that this particular office has.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. FOY:

Yes.

Right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. LOVETT: So when things are not on a tight schedule such as when you have a petition and you have a deadline that you have to meet to make sure a court doesn't step in and say you've not met your obligation, this is the type of activity that then gets downgraded depending on whether or not there's enough resources, which doesn't mean just money but people as well to do the work.

MS. FOY: Right.

MS. LOVETT: So that's the reality.

MR. CLAMPITT: I know the answer to this, I think. Let's say an industry is going to be shutdown mainly because the process hasn't been completed. It hasn't been completed because they don't have any money. What if the industry wants to put up the money to have NOAA finish the work? I mean is there any --

MS. LOVETT: I wish I knew. I mean, there are --

MS. FOY: For NOAA that's illegal.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. RIZZARDI: Yes, there are
2	restrictions on that.
3	MS. LOVETT: Yes. I don't know if
4	ethically that's legal. But that's a good
5	question to ask.
6	MS. FOY: But then it would be
7	almost like you were coming up for bid, like
8	who wants theirs first.
9	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, you know, I
10	mean you got a \$350 million industry and NOAA
11	won't spent \$2 million to go out and find out
12	how many animals are in the water.
13	MS. FOY: Right. Right.
14	MS. LOVETT: I would suspect that
15	there is creative ways. I mean, obviously
16	that's the whole reason for cooperative
17	research and other things is that that's able
18	to get money. And that's a way for the agency
19	to get more bang for the buck by
20	MR. CLAMPITT: I would like to know
21	how that money could possibly be
22	MS. FOY: You need to talk to Randy

1	Fisher, also known as the North Pacific Tooth
2	Fairy.
3	MS. LOVETT: I've even had projects
4	go through his office before I came to NOAA.
5	MS. FOY: There's one thing that I
6	do know that has been done, Paul, is that you
7	can hire retired stock assessment people.
8	MR. CLAMPITT: We've done that.
9	But, you know
10	MS. LOVETT: No, I understand.
11	MR. CLAMPITT: fisheries are
12	taking a three percent as a
13	MS. FOY: Catch of recovery costs.
14	MR. CLAMPITT: Of recovery costs,
15	right? Well, how's that what if an
16	industry depends on a couple of million more
17	dollars? I mean, can't they take it out of
18	that or pump it up?
19	MS. LOVETT: Yes, I don't
20	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, just
21	MS. LOVETT: Anne might be able to
22	answer that one for you.

1	MR. CLAMPITT: One or the other is,
2	I don't get
3	MS. LOVETT: I think I saw Alan
4	sitting here before and he's stepped away. I
5	think that when monies are recouped via those
6	cost recoveries because of a specific IFQ,
7	those monies have to stay and be used for
8	research and management
9	MR. CLAMPITT: That's right.
10	MS. LOVETT: within that
11	particular fishery.
12	MR. CLAMPITT: And that's what I'm
13	talking about.
14	MS. LOVETT: Okay. So you're
15	saying why couldn't those dollars be used for
16	other research?
17	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, I'll just get
18	to the point. You know we have the sperm
19	whale problem, and really the only problem is
20	how many are there. And nobody can tell you.
21	MS. LOVETT: Right.
22	MR. CLAMPITT: And it's very

efficient to find out. Well, take the three
percent out of the halibut and black cod
fishery and spend some of it on finding out
how many sperm whales there are.
MS. LOVETT: Is that a decision in
the Council how to use those monies?
MR. RIZZARDI: That's a good
question.
MR. CLAMPITT: Well, no, it's not.
MS. FOY: I think that's the
decision of the Council, but it can be
MS. LOVETT: No. I think the
Council
DR. CHATWIN: The first question is
is that money being recovered?
MR. CLAMPITT: Oh, yes. Yes, it is.
MS. LOVETT: In IFQs it is.
DR. CHATWIN: It is being charged?
Because I know that the Act creates the
ability to do that.
MR. CLAMPITT: Oh, no, they're
taking it.

1	DR. CHATWIN: They're taking it?
2	MR. CLAMPITT: Yes. I mean,
3	although they haven't taken the three percent,
4	they're figure out, for instance, how much
5	sablefish they figure, 1.8 percent this year.
6	MS. LOVETT: Right.
7	MR. CLAMPITT: Because they didn't
8	use it. They didn't need. They could take up
9	to three percent.
10	MS. LOVETT: Yes. But I think
11	MR. CLAMPITT: So they took 1.8.
12	MS. LOVETT: But I get back to the
13	point, I think that's a council decision. And
14	we can check on that how much because you
15	just said they took how much, the 1.8.
16	MR. CLAMPITT: 1.8.
17	MS. LOVETT: Who made that
18	decision?
19	MR. CLAMPITT: Oh, that's made by
20	National Fishery Service. This is how much
21	MS. LOVETT: Oh, okay. So it's our
22	agency. Okay. I take it back then. I'm not
	NEAL P. CPOSS

1	on that track.
2	DR. CHATWIN: You should be able to
3	
4	MR. CLAMPITT: Yes, take another
5	1.2 and go out there and find out what our
6	impact is on this whale and get us off the
7	hook.
8	MS. LOVETT: I believe that the
9	money can be used for that.
10	MR. CLAMPITT: Yes. You know,
11	we're not the only I mean, everyone of
12	these catch share programs are going to have
13	these problems.
14	MS. LOVETT: Yes. But everyone
15	does have cost recovery. It has to be an IFQ
16	and a LAP for having cost recovery.
17	Okay. I'm sorry, I think I read
18	the last bit. So that, for sure, is something
19	that you want to understand better.
20	MS. FOY: Right.
21	MS. LOVETT: And he for sure is
22	able already knows that this one is on your

radar screen. Because that was transparent. MS. FOY: One of the issues that was my particular concern, Heidi, that I don't hear being addressed or I'd like somebody to talk to me about is that there is a lack of criteria for saying when a species is eligible for de-listing based what level does population need to recovery to. Is what 10 historic level --MS. LOVETT: And you don't see that 11 in the existing recovery plans? 12 I don't see a lack of --13 MS. FOY: of standards. 14 MR. CLAMPITT: It depends on the 15 animal. You know like if you read the sperm 16 whale one, you know they say it's going to be 17 80 years because they've got see a one percent 18

MS. FOY: Right. But what point do

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

improvement in population over a period of 80

years before they're going to say that it's no

longer is danger.

19

20

21

you go back? Do we go back to pre-rating days, or do we go back to when the population is a viable sustaining population, or do we go back to the point where the environment is -- what the carrying capacity is, or how do we define?

MR. RIZZARDI: The standard under the ESA is recovery is the point of which the measures required by the Endangered Species Act are no longer necessary.

MS. FOY: Okay.

MR. RIZZARDI: Right. There's a five part analysis that justifies whether or not a species is listed in the first place.

MS. FOY: Right.

MR. RIZZARDI: Like habitat and inadequate regulatory measures and disease and predation are the big three that pop up over and over again.

If you've eliminated the threats, if you've got an increasing population, you've got a good argument as to whether or not the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	measures in the Act are necessary any longer.
2	And at that point even though the population
3	may be smaller, you may have reason to say a
4	delisting is reasonable.
5	MS. FOY: The problem is that they
6	can have, such as in the Steller sea lion
7	issue, well that and you have experts around
8	the table that are violently disagreeing with
9	each other.
10	MR. RIZZARDI: Right. Right. And
11	that's what the whole point of the recovery
12	plan is.
13	MS. FOY: So what standard do we
14	have to hold them to. Well, they're violently
15	disagreeing over recovery.
16	MR. RIZZARDI: What should do that?
17	Right.
18	MS. FOY: And what should be in
19	there.
20	MR. RIZZARDI: But, you know, when
21	it works you get at least some consensus on
22	where's a reasonable population threshold, at

which point you're seeing growth of X and total numbers of Y where you're willing to say okay the measures in this Act are no longer necessary.

MR. CLAMPITT: But the important thing -- I mean, well, if you're a natural resource exploiter is -- yes, isn't that a horrible thing. You know, if you can bring this animal from endangered to threatened, you get out of all kinds of problems. I mean, as far as being able to operate. And that threshold, moving from endangered to threatened, is much easier than taking them off, delisting altogether.

So if you read the sperm whale report -- I won't belabor that anymore.

MS. FOY: Well, my perspective on this is that all of this has a very negative connotation, and that leads back to the next recommendation --

MS. LOVETT: Right.

MS. FOY: -- is that we won't know

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to develop a plan to celebrate their ESA
successes. Because the point is we don't do
that now. And, you know, it's really the
Endangered Species Act and FDA have such a
negative connotation. They shouldn't. I mean
I feel like if we were more on the ball with
the delisting and say, look it worked and now
we're going to remove a lot of the negative
measures, then fishermen and a lot of the
public would be more supportive of the fact
that it worked.
MR. CLAMPITT: Well, there's a lot

MR. CLAMPITT: Well, there's a lot of success stories out there too if you read through the stuff. But they never quite finish the job.

 $\label{eq:mr.make} \mbox{MR. RIZZARDI:} \qquad \mbox{Well, good news} \\ \mbox{doesn't make the news.}$ 

MS. LOVETT: Right. It doesn't make the news.

MR. CATES: Humpback whales are fully recovered. They don't want to get them off the list. It potentially interrupts

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

revenue stream for national humpback whale sanctuary, for example. And they got gobs of money to do research. And if you take it off the delisting, then there goes your funding.

MR. RIZZARDI: But even if it's downgraded to threatened and you're able to repeal some of the take rules, then you're still in a better place and there's still something to celebrate and you can still be celebrating the fact that you're achieving recovery targets.

You know, one of the things that's amazed me in the last few months is the beating that the Obama Administration is taking for not listing more species. The press releases from the environmental groups are about how the Obama Administration is worse than the Bush Administration in the number of species it has listed for protection under the Endangered Species Act.

MR. CATES: It's just a measure of success for the environmentalists.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RIZZARDI: For them the measure of success is more species are in peril of extinction. I mean, the world is upside down.

And that's where we need to make sure that some of the good thing about the Endangered Species Act are getting out there and the protections it's offering.

MS. LOVETT: So along the line, really quickly, my understanding from the Deputy in the office is that they are right now actually in the beginning process to develop both a strategic plan and a media plan and or communications plan. And, yes, they would definitely welcome input from MAFAC.

I think, I asked them, you know, is there something in the area that you can actually -- do you want to have some positive input from as far as you all might probably have a better experience about communicating successes maybe. So anyway, they said yes.

And I know from Mark's perspective I think, I mean it's all these things that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you're talking about relate to a strategic plan for the office. So I know that they're going to be ready to discuss where they're at in that process. I mean, they said -- they reported that they're at the beginning part of that process now.

So I think we'll need to make a clear list so I haven't lost track of things, unless it's all in our notes, or it will be in your report tomorrow as to what specifically you would like PR to be discussing. Because it seems to me there's a pretty long list of items and just issue points. And it might be the kind of thing that you want as much attention to like catch shares, like a day of looking at these various things, or at least half a day of looking at PR related topics. I'm getting that sense from you all because there's a long list from what I can see.

MS. FOY: Yes, I think a day. Yes. Half a day I think would be glossing over a lot of the topics.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. LOVETT: So my point is you all need to make that recommendation and make that. This MR. CLAMPITT: Protected Resources is driving the industry. So if we don't get this solved, then we're going to be shutting people out of work. MR. CATES: I agree. We have a huge conflict of interest. We say we manage our fisheries science base when we choose to do the science. But now we have problem when we're choosing not to do the science. MS. LOVETT: Yes. MR. CATES: Because it's a revenue stream for the very agency that you're asking to do the science that would clearly show we should delist it. They don't want to do it because then they lose funding. whole national monument I mean, they're now in meetings upside down.

in meetings that we

expand into other species because

I've

probably

sat

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

clearly we're going to lose our revenue. And the numbers are growing. We got to get other species out there. Otherwise we don't -- because it brings in other revenue. We want to turtles, we want to add all these other species in the sanctuary because it's more revenue.

MS. LOVETT: Well, that's National Ocean Service. So I won't comment. No, I understand. No, I understand. No, no, no, I I'm just saying that NMFS understand that. doesn't direct the request that NOS makes, and NOS doesn't direct their requests that NMFS makes and internally each one develops their priorities and budgets. It moves up to NOAA. And NOAA has to across the board formulate an overall plan. And NOAA has to sell its budget to DOC. We just don't get the budgets we request. Just so you know.

In the big scheme of things we also complete against those other agencies within DOC for the budgets that we do try to request.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MR. CATES: And we're advisers to
2	the Secretary of Commerce.
3	MS. LOVETT: Absolutely. No, no,
4	no. I'm not saying you shouldn't that. Yes.
5	I'm just saying
6	MR. CLAMPITT: I've got a question
7	I'd like to ask.
8	MS. LOVETT: Yes.
9	MR. CLAMPITT: And the one is with
10	the whales.
11	MS. LOVETT: Yes.
12	MR. CLAMPITT: And maybe I'm not
13	being current, I'm trying to read between the
14	lines that one of the reasons why they don't
15	move forward on delisting some of these
16	species is because of the fear that once
17	they'll do then you'll have to go Norway and
18	these other countries when they start hunting
19	them. It gives them a reason to do it.
20	MS. FOY: Now wait, wait, wait.
21	Now U.S. endangered species listing does not
22	really impact

1	MS. LOVETT: Right.
2	MR. RIZZARDI: IUCN is still going
3	to have the species listed. There's still
4	going to be CITES issues. You know, just
5	because you take it off the Endangered Species
6	Act, which limits what the feds can do,
7	doesn't necessarily trigger consequences for
8	Japan and its whaling.
9	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, it does in a
10	way because, I mean just in public relations.
11	They say "See, look they're back."
12	MR. RIZZARDI: True. I mean,
13	there's definitely a PR side. But that can
14	still be managed. You know, that's why
15	there's an International Whaling Commission
16	and that's why there's
17	MR. CLAMPITT: Well, they're still
18	within 300 miles of the United States coast,
19	so that protects them there.
20	MR. RIZZARDI: Right. And they're
21	still an MMPA.
	1

DR. CHATWIN: Is there a standard

in the ESA that assures that delisted species
won't trigger a listing in a year or two,
something along those lines?
MR. RIZZARDI: There's even a
requirement that for a certain period of time
after delisting you have special monitoring
measures in place to make sure that the
species doesn't crash, in which case you can
go back and quickly relist.
DR. CHATWIN: Because I think
that's the standard that drives the decisions
is everything in place to assure that you're
not going to be right back where you are now?
MS. FOY: Right.
DR. CHATWIN: Once you go ahead
with the listing.
MS. FOY: Right. Well, is it just
the delisting or is delisting and removal of
the mitigation measures? Because my
understanding is that those may be separate

MS. LOVETT: Yes, I'm not familiar

issues.

enough to know. I would assume that -- I mean MS. FOY: I see facial expressions that --MR. RIZZARDI: That's good question. I don't know the answer. Marine mammals don't -MS. LOVETT: - I mean, I'm not as familiar as MMPA, but it's my understanding obviously there's a lot 9 10 of marine mammals that are not ESA species. So things that 11 there's other hold those we slightly different pedestal. species 12 on а Because there's a law and whether or not is on 13 the ESA is a little bit different than the 14 requirements of the MMPA. 15 MS. FOY: Right. 16 MS. LOVETT: But I don't know the 17 specificities of those requirement. I'm not 18 19 that expert. So I don't think that that by removing them from -- it doesn't remove them 20 still from MMPA related obligations 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

they're not an endangered species. Does that

make sense?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. FOY: It does. And the case I'm thinking of Steller seal lions, I don't know if you guys have seen the maps. But when the listing came about, there were almost just instantaneous circles on the map, ten mile no approach you know, fishing zones, 20 miles circle zones. And I don't know whether those are tied to ESA and if delisting would mean that those would automatically go away, or whether or not it's something that could be said, okay, we're downlisting them down to threatened to keep the mitigation measures in place, or maybe reevaluate which mitigation measures are working, whether or not it may be possibly -- or haul outs, or maybe it works for some haul outs and not for others.

MS. LOVETT: Right.

MS. FOY: And so then you reevaluate. But you don't necessarily remove all the mitigation measures because that's, hopefully, what that got you to the point of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

having the species recovered.

MS. LOVETT: Right. It's a balancing act, I'm sure.

MS. FOY: I don't know.

MS. LOVETT: That would be a question you could ask.

The one thing I will say is this NIC actions before they're public, because I sit in on a priorities meeting each week.

MS. FOY: Right.

MS. LOVETT: And I'm not going to talk about anything specifically because it's confidential. But as a rule as a whole there's things that come up related to the DPS that distinction population segment. seems to me that as a whole science has moved forward enough that rather than just saying the species is endangered or threatened, they're getting much more specific about the science information because and providing more detail when there are distinct populations. And they are trying to be much

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more deliberate in their my agencies trying to be much more deliberate in the designations of threatened versus endangered by understanding these distinction population segments better for a variety of species.

So I think that as a whole the agency doesn't rush to say this has to get listed. It really does try to base its decision on science and on the best information that is available. And tries to ensure that the boundaries aren't exceeding what's really required for the species.

MS. FOY: Well, we really when you do the Steller sea lions --

MS. LOVETT: When the information is there to answer that question.

MS. FOY: And a lot of times the information that we gain biologically comes about a result of the -- as Randy was saying, that's where the money goes. So we know a lot more about Steller sea lion foraging, all kinds of things now than we did before the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

listing simply because of --MS. LOVETT: We're almost done. It seems like on each one of these major issues there was an interest in more information. MR. RIZZARDI: Absolutely. We have to clarify. MS. LOVETT: Maybe as a Committee if you take your first crack at, you know, what exactly you want to 10 have and I can help within the next day. But after this meeting, you know, scope out a much 11 clearer path so you all get the information 12 13 you want to hear from Jim Lecky and whoever else. 14 MR. RIZZARDI: Turtles. 15 MS. LOVETT: And turtles. Right. 16 RIZZARDI: 17 MR. I want a turtle person. 18 19 MS. LOVETT: So that's my point is to make a clear recommendation of what kinds 20 of information you want provided. Obviously 21 recommendations don't

these

22

go

away

1	you've had. But I think and I can see if
2	there are things that can be provided before
3	the meeting, all the reports and whatnot.
4	MS. FOY: Right. My suggestion
5	that maybe we open an email dialogue and we
6	just put interested parties on there and then
7	clarify agenda
8	MS. LOVETT: Right.
9	MS. FOY: before the meeting
10	this is what we would like them to address
11	special, any new concerns that come up. That
12	way they've got it.
13	MR. RIZZARDI: If we are going to
14	do turtles
15	MS. LOVETT: I'm sure we can find a
16	turtle person to come to the meeting.
17	MR. RIZZARDI: But I'm not sure the
18	next meeting is the place to do it since we're
19	talking about Alaska.
20	MS. FOY: Well, they could come to
21	Alaska.

MS. LOVETT: Yes.

	MR. RIZZARDI: I III Sule they could.
2	MS. LOVETT: Is there anybody in
3	particular you would
4	MR. RIZZARDI: I just have a
5	feeling you're going to be telling me you're
6	going to be looking for people for Miami
7	Service, or Miami Office or the St. Pete
8	office, or
9	MS. LOVETT: Headquarters, I
10	presume, actually. Somebody from one
11	particular region is probably not the best
12	person because they may not know enough about
13	other regions specific or the North Atlantic.
14	So I would recommend somebody from the
15	headquarters office who sees everything when
16	it comes up related to these kinds I mean,
17	of course, all permits and things I think
18	well, I shouldn't say that. A bunch of them
19	come through the head office versus the
20	regional office. But I may be wrong on that.
21	MR. RIZZARDI: But I would be happy
22	to have a conversation with the person ahead

of time to hear some issues that we'd love to hear about.

MS. FOY: Well, let's do that on email, its agreed to do that.

MS. LOVETT: Once there is a date and location, then -- obviously because it's just a balancing act with other people's calendars.

MR. RIZZARDI: Okay.

MS. LOVETT: I hope I was helpful.

(Whereupon, at 2:36 p.m. the Subcommittee meeting was adjourned.)

10

11