



Marine Conservation Alliance

promoting sustainable fisheries to feed the world

431 N. Franklin St. Ste 305
Juneau, AK 99801
(907) 523-0731
(206) 260-3639 fax

- Adak Fisheries, LLC
- Alyeska Seafoods
- Alaska Crab Coalition
- Alaska Druggers Association
- Alaska Groundfish Data Bank
- Alaska Pacific Seafoods
- Alaska Scallop Association
- Aleutian Pribilof Island
Community Development
Association
Akutun, Alka, False Pass, Nelson Lagoon, Nikolski, St.
George
- At-Sea Processors Association
- Bristol Bay Economic
Development Corp.
Aleknagik, Clark's Point, Dillingham, Egegik, Ekuk,
Ekwok, King Salmon, Levelock, Marikotak, Naknek,
Pilot Point, Port Heiden, Portage Creek, South Naknek,
Togiak, Twin Hills, Ugashik
- Central Bering Sea Fishermen's
Association
St. Paul
- City of Unalaska
- Coastal Villages Region Fund
Cheforak, Chevak, Ekuk, Goodnews Bay, Hooper Bay,
Kipnuk, Kongiganak, Kwigillingok, Mekoryuk, Napakiak,
Napaskiak, Newtok, Nightmute, Oscarville, Platinum,
Quinhagak, Scammon Bay, Toksook Bay, Tuntutuliak,
Tununak
- Groundfish Forum
- High Seas Catchers
Cooperative
- Icicle Seafoods
- Mothership Group
PV Excellence
PV Ocean Phoenix
PV Golden Alaska
- Norton Sound Economic
Development Corporation
Brevig Mission, Domesvik, Eim, Gambell, Golovin,
Kayuk, Nome, Saint Michael, Savoonga, Shaktoolik,
Stebbins, Teller, Unalakleet, Wales, White Mountain
- Pacific Seafood Processors
Association
Alaska General Seafoods
Alyeska Seafoods, Inc.
Golden Alaska Seafoods, Inc.
Peter Pan Seafoods, Inc.
Premier Pacific Seafoods, Inc.
Supreme Alaska Seafoods, Inc.
UniSea Inc.
Wards Cove Packing Company
Western Alaska Fisheries, Inc.
Westward Seafoods, Inc.
- Prowler Fisheries
- Trident Seafoods Corp.
- United Catcher Boats
Aleutian Catcher Vessel Assoc.
Arctic Enterprise Assoc.
Mothership Fleet Cooperative
Northern Victor Fleet
Peter Pan Fleet Cooperative
Unalaska Coop
Unisea Fleet Cooperative
Westward Fleet Cooperative
- U.S. Seafoods
- Waterfront Associates
- Western Alaska Fisheries, Inc.
- Yukon Delta Fisheries
Development Association
Atakanuk, Emmonak, Grayling, Kotlik, Mountain Village,
Nunam Iqaa

June 16, 2009

The Honorable Madeleine Bordallo, Chair
Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife
Room 1324 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: MCA Comments on HR 21, January 2009 Draft

Dear Madam Chair:

The Marine Conservation Alliance (MCA) appreciates this opportunity to comment for the record on the January 6, 2009 draft of HR 21, the Ocean Conservation, Education, and National Strategy for the 21st Century Act. MCA does not support adoption of Title I or Title III of HR 21 for a variety of reasons set forth below. MCA does support Title II, the NOAA Organic Act, but we strongly recommend that it be strictly confined to administrative issues and not seek to impose additional policy or management direction over and above existing statutes. Title IV, and especially the Oceans and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund, should be carefully evaluated as to the purpose, distribution criteria, and source of funding before its adoption as well.

MCA is based in Juneau Alaska, and represents harvesters, processors, coastal communities, Community Development Quota organizations, and support services businesses involved in the groundfish and shellfish fisheries of Alaska. MCA was formed to promote the sustainable use of North Pacific marine resources by present and future generations. MCA is a strong voice for the application of sound science, prudent management, and a transparent open public process. MCA supports research and public education regarding the fishery resources of the North Pacific, and seeks practical solutions to resource conservation issues to protect the marine environment and ensure sustainable fisheries.

MCA members collectively represent roughly 80% of the production of North Pacific fisheries, which in turn represents over half the nation's total seafood landings. For Alaska, these fisheries account for approximately \$ 5.8 billion in direct and induced economic value and roughly 78,000 direct and indirect jobs (2007).

Most importantly, the majority of Alaska's coastal communities are built around a fisheries based economy, and without a stable fishery resource base many of these

communities would not exist. It is because of this dependence upon the sea and its renewable resources that MCA works hard on behalf of our members to ensure that conservation comes first, and that fishery resources are managed for their long term sustainability.

The record speaks for itself. There are no overfished stocks of groundfish in Alaska. Fisheries are managed under hard caps and close when harvest limits are reached. Federal observers, Coast Guard, NOAA Enforcement, and Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) monitor the fisheries to ensure compliance with regulations and closures. Over 600,000 square nautical miles are closed to bottom trawling, all trawling, or all fishing to protect marine habitat or important species. Ecosystem considerations are taken into account in fishery management plans. For example, fishing on forage fish species is prohibited, and measures are taken to protect endangered species, marine mammals, and seabirds. For depressed crab stocks, aggressive rebuilding plans have been in place for many years. Most scientists believe that these stocks are depressed because of oceanographic changes that happened in the late 1970's, and that these stocks will not rebound until oceanographic conditions become more favorable for these species.

In this context, and with this perspective in mind, we have provided comments and testimony on several occasions on different versions of HR 21. Our concerns regarding the bill have been consistent over time, and we appreciate that some of the deficiencies and problems with earlier versions of the bill have been addressed. However MCA remains concerned that many of the major problems we identified with the original bill remain, and in some instances have been amplified, not resolved.

MCA continues to look for practical solutions to ocean conservation and governance issues. We still believe that Title I and Title III should be dropped from the bill until several issues can be resolved. Title II, the NOAA Organic Act, should be adopted, but again we want to emphasize that it be strictly confined to administrative issues and not seek to impose additional policy or management direction over and above existing statutes. The Oceans and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund set out in Title IV also needs further work as to its purpose, distribution criteria, and source of funding before adoption.

While the bill has been improved somewhat, many our previous comments on HR 21 are still germane for this version. Our concerns center on three basic aspects of the bill:

- Establishing a broad national policy based on poorly defined key terms, with vague and open ended national principles subject to wide interpretation, increasing the potential for unnecessary litigation;
- Setting up far reaching mandates for protecting “marine ecosystem health” and applying “ecosystem based management” with little or no recognition of the realities of the status of the science involved, the role of natural fluctuations in the dynamic world of the marine environment, or the need to balance among competing uses;
- Building an expensive, top heavy bureaucratic structure that will amplify the conflicts between new policies and current conservation and management programs, and undercut the funding and personnel engaged in ongoing conservation efforts.

Title I sets out a national policy that fails to acknowledge the importance of sustainable uses of marine resources including food and energy production, transportation, or national security. The overall policy and associated definitions (e.g.: ecosystem-based management, marine ecosystem health, etc.) are extraordinarily broad, do not take into account natural fluctuations within and between ecosystem components and ecosystems, and do not acknowledge or take into account the effects of external factors such as climate induced impacts. The bill still sets goals and standards that are virtually impossible to meet under present circumstances, and fails to specifically require, as part of the national policy, explicit and transparent mechanisms to balance between competing uses.

Implementation of this policy would be placed in the hands of a National Oceans Advisor, a sort of Oceans Czar, including the development of federal agency regulations implementing the policy and other provisions of the bill. The Advisor appears limited to assessing and analyzing marine ecosystem trends, apprising programs and activities of the federal government in light of this national policy, and recommending actions to promote marine ecosystem health. The bill apparently does not see a role for the Advisor in promoting sustainable use of marine resources. Given the directive in the bill, we fail to see how the Advisor is going to be in a position to strike the needed balance between different ocean uses, or a fair arbiter between competing or conflicting federal statutes and programs.

Under Title III the bill continues to require the establishment of a new regional ocean governance structure. This structure is an elaborate, and potentially very expensive, ocean planning process. The potential geographic scope of the proposed new system, in conjunction with the new national policy directives, further complicates resource management programs of states and local governments through the application of new federal mandates. As such, it has a high likelihood of creating added confusion, delays, and new conflicts, not resolving existing problems. Regardless, this will be an expensive endeavor, with the potential for drawing funds away from ongoing conservation or science programs to fund the new bureaucracy. For example, funding for on-going critical programs such as stock assessments and other fisheries and ocean science programs remains woefully inadequate, a situation which will deteriorate with the creation of another competing bureaucracy.

The Oceans and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund is intended to help address the issue of funding for the programs initiated under HR 21. However, as stated previously, the funding mechanism for the Trust Fund is weak, and the purposes and criteria for using the Fund do not address basic science and management needs. MCA believes that the overall concept requires further development if it is to address the nation's widely differing funding needs for ocean science, conservation, and management.

In conclusion, MCA remains concerned that the scope of the bill is well beyond the current state of research and government resources. We recommend approval of a NOAA Organic Act to institutionalize an important federal agency, but urge the Congress to withhold action on Title I, Title III, and Title IV until the issues identified above are addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Benton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

David Benton
Executive Director

Encl: (1) MCA Letter of October 26, 2007
(2) Testimony of David Benton, Before the House Subcommittee on Fisheries,
Wildlife and Oceans, Regarding HR 21, April 26, 2007



Marine Conservation Alliance

promoting sustainable fisheries to feed the world

P O Box 20676
Juneau, AK 99802
(907) 523-0731
(206) 260-3639 fax

Adak Fisheries, LLC
Alyeska Seafoods
Alaska Crab Coalition
Alaska Druggers Association
Alaska Groundfish Data Bank
Alaskan Leader Fisheries
Alaska Pacific Seafoods
Aleutian Islands Brown Crab Coalition
Aleutian Pribilof Island Community Development Association
Akutun, Adia, False Pass, Nelson Lagoon, Nikolski, St. George
At-Sea Processors Association
Bristol Bay Economic Development Corp.
Aleknagik, Clark's Point, Dillingham, Egegik, Ekuk, Ekwok, King Salmon, Levelock, Manokotak, Naknek, Pilot Point, Port Heiden, Portage Creek, South Naknek, Topak, Twin Hills, Ugashik
Central Bering Sea Fishermen's Association
St. Paul
City of Unalaska
Coastal Villages Region Fund
Cheforak, Chevak, Eek, Goodnews Bay, Hooper Bay, Kipruk, Korogalnak, Kwigillingok, Mekooyak, Napakiak, Napaskiak, Nevtok, Nightmute, Oscarville, Platinum, Quinhagak, Scammon Bay, Toksook Bay, Tunutulalik, Tununak
Groundfish Forum
High Seas Catchers Cooperative
Icicle Seafoods
McCarty and Associates
Mid-Water Trawlers Cooperative
Mothership Group
PV Excellence
PV Ocean Phoenix
PV Golden Alaska
North Pacific Longline Association
Norton Sound Economic Development Corporation
Brevig Mission, Diomede, Elm, Gambell, Golovin, Koyuk, Nome, Saint Michael, Savoonga, Shaktolik, Stebbins, Teller, Unalakleet, Wales, White Mountain
Pacific Seafood Processors Association
Alaska General Seafoods
Alyeska Seafoods, Inc.
Golden Alaska Seafoods, Inc.
Peter Pan Seafoods, Inc.
Premier Pacific Seafoods, Inc.
Supreme Alaska Seafoods, Inc.
UniSea Inc.
Wardis Cove Packing Company
Western Alaska Fisheries, Inc.
Westward Seafoods, Inc.
Prowler Fisheries
Trident Seafoods Corp.
United Catcher Boats
Akutun Catcher Vessel Assoc.
Arctic Enterprise Assoc.
Mothership Fleet Cooperative
Northern Victor Fleet
Peter Pan Fleet Cooperative
Unalaska Co-op
Unisea Fleet Cooperative
Westward Fleet Cooperative
U.S. Seafoods
Waterfront Associates
Western Alaska Fisheries, Inc.
Yukon Delta Fisheries Development Association
Alakanuk, Emmonak, Grayling, Kotik, Mountain Village, Nunam Iqua

Friday, October 26, 2007

Chairman Nick Rahall
Committee on Natural Resources
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Ranking Member Don Young
Committee on Natural Resources
1329 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Re: MCA Comments on HR 21, October 18, 2007 Discussion Draft

Dear Representative Rahall and Representative Young,

MCA appreciates this opportunity to comment on the October 18, 2007 Discussion Draft of HR 21. We also appreciate that some of the deficiencies and problems with the earlier version of the bill have been addressed. However MCA remains concerned that many of the major problems we identified with the original bill remain, and in some instances have been amplified, not resolved. MCA believes that Title I and Title III should be dropped from the bill. Title II, the NOAA Organic Act, should be strictly administrative and not seek to impose additional policy or management direction over and above existing statutes. Title IV should be carefully evaluated as to the purpose, distribution criteria, and source of funding before proceeding.

Because of this, our previous comments on HR 21 are still germane on many of the provisions in this version of the bill. Our concerns center on three basic aspects of the bill:

- Establishing a broad national policy with a vague and poorly articulated national policy that is open ended and subject to wide interpretation;
- Setting up far reaching mandates for ecosystem based management with little or no recognition of the realities of the status of the science involved or the role of natural fluctuations in the dynamic world of the marine environment;
- Building a structure that will amplify the conflicts between new policies and current conservation and management programs, increase the potential

for unnecessary litigation, and undercut the funding and personnel engaged in ongoing conservation efforts.

Title I continues to require that all federal agencies “to the fullest extent possible” meet the stated policy irrespective of the need to balance among uses and other statutory and regulatory goals and requirements. Implementation of this policy would be placed in the hands of a National Oceans Advisor, a sort of Oceans Czar, including the development of federal agency regulations implementing the policy and other provisions of the bill.

The bill continues the establishment of an elaborate, and potentially very expensive, oceans planning process. Some of these provisions mirror recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Oceans Policy, some of which have already been adopted by the President. Some of these new provisions simply create a new and somewhat redundant bureaucracy. This will be an expensive endeavor, with the potential for drawing funds away from ongoing conservation or science programs to fund the new bureaucracy. Funding for current fisheries and oceans science programs remains woefully inadequate, a situation which will deteriorate with the creation of another competing bureaucracy.

The overall policy and the definitions of ecosystem-based management and marine ecosystem health, are extraordinarily broad, do not take into account natural fluctuations within and between ecosystem components and ecosystems, do not allow for consideration of the effects of external factors such as climate induced impacts, and do not specifically identify the need to balance many competing uses of the marine environment.

Finally, the potential geographic scope of the proposed new policy and system reaches far inland, complicating resource management programs of states and local governments through implementation of new federal mandates.

Overall, the scope of the bill is well beyond the current state of research and government resources. We recommend approval of a NOAA Organic Act to institutionalize an important federal agency, but urge the Congress to pause for a significant period before moving forward the other titles of the Bill.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Benton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

David Benton
Executive Director

Cc Representative Sam Farr

**TESTIMONY OF DAVID BENTON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
MARINE CONSERVATION ALLIANCE
BEFORE
THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WILDLIFE AND OCEANS
REGARDING
HR 21
THE OCEANS CONSERVATION, EDUCATION AND NATIONAL STRATEGY
FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT
April 26, 2007**

Thank you Mr. Chairman. For the record, my name is David Benton, and I am the Executive Director of the Marine Conservation Alliance (MCA). MCA is based in Juneau Alaska, and represents harvesters, processors, coastal communities, Community Development Quota organizations, and support services businesses involved in the groundfish and shellfish fisheries of Alaska. MCA was formed to promote the sustainable use of North Pacific marine resources by present and future generations through the application of sound science, prudent management, and a transparent open public process. MCA supports research and public education regarding the fishery resources of the North Pacific, and seeks practical solutions to resource conservation issues to protect the marine environment and ensure sustainable fisheries. Our members collectively represent roughly 80% of the production of North Pacific fisheries.

I want to thank you and the committee for this opportunity to testify before you today regarding HR 21, the Oceans Conservation, Education, and National Strategy for the 21st Century Act.

Although the bill has much broader implications for oceans conservation and management, I want to speak to HR 21 mostly from a fisheries perspective. While MCA supports efforts to move towards an ecosystem based approach to fisheries management, we are concerned that several provisions in HR 21 will actually impede efforts to improve conservation of our nation's marine resources.

To put our concerns into perspective, let's first examine Alaska's record for fisheries management.

Alaska produces roughly half of the nation's commercial fisheries landings by volume. Fisheries account for about 35,000 jobs in Alaska, and are valued at over \$1.3 billion dollars in ex-vessel value. In 2005, the ex-vessel value of groundfish alone was \$740M with \$138.4M from the Gulf of Alaska and \$601.8M from the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. The gross value of the 2004 groundfish catch, after primary processing, was approximately \$2.0B (F.O.B. Alaska). In addition to groundfish, halibut and shellfish generated \$170.1M and \$159.2M ex-vessel values respectively.

Most importantly, the majority of Alaska's coastal communities are built around a fisheries based economy, and without a stable fishery resource base many of these

communities would not exist. It is because of this dependence upon the sea and its renewable resources that Alaskans work hard to ensure that conservation comes first, and that fishery resources are managed for their long term sustainability.

The record speaks for itself. There are no overfished stocks of groundfish in Alaska. Fisheries are managed under hard caps and close when harvest limits are reached. Federal observers, Coast Guard, NOAA Enforcement, and Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) monitor the fisheries to ensure compliance with closures. Over 380,000 square nautical miles are closed to bottom trawling to protect marine habitat. Ecosystem considerations are taken into account in fishery management plans. For example, fishing on forage fish species is prohibited, and measures are taken to protect endangered species, marine mammals, and seabirds. For depressed crab stocks, aggressive rebuilding plans have been in place for many years. Most scientists believe that these stocks are depressed because of oceanographic changes that happened in the late 1970's, and that these stocks will not rebound until oceanographic conditions become more favorable for these species.

We have also worked hard to address oceans conservation on the international level. Because of the combined efforts of the seafood industry, the States of Alaska and Washington, and the federal government, several new treaties were put in place that established one of the world's most effective multi-lateral surveillance and enforcement regimes, a comprehensive multi-national science program, and institutional arrangements that have the management tools to protect the region's marine resources from illegal and unregulated high seas fishing. As a result, high seas salmon interception has all but been eliminated, incidental mortalities of marine mammals and seabirds dramatically reduced, and vulnerable fish stocks in large areas of the North Pacific outside the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone are no longer subject to unregulated fishing pressure.

Because of this record, Alaska has been cited by the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and other groups as a potential model for the rest of the nation. Recent articles in National Geographic identify Alaska as one of three areas in the world where management is being done right.

But, we also know that nothing is perfect, and in the ever changing world of oceans conservation and fisheries management you can not rest on your laurels. We are constantly working to improve our understanding of the marine environment, and the factors affecting it. For example, in Alaska the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) is developing a Fisheries Ecosystem Plan for the Aleutian Islands. This is the first such plan for Alaska waters. In addition, the North Pacific Research Board, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation is funding a multi-disciplinary multi-year ecosystem research program for the Bering Sea. A second, similar program is planned for the Gulf of Alaska. On a broader scale, the NPFMC spark plugged an effort to bring together all the relevant state and federal agencies to discuss and address activities such as shipping safety, marine pollution, offshore oil development, land use in the coastal zone, fisheries, and other factors that are or might have an effect on Alaska's marine environment.

In a similar vein, Alaska's seafood industry has instituted several major cooperative research programs to partner with federal, state, and university scientists in numerous scientific projects to reduce bycatch, improve fishery monitoring and accountability, and mitigate the effects of fishing on seafloor habitat. We are also operating one of the nation's largest marine debris clean-up programs in partnership with NOAA and local communities and citizens groups.

All of these efforts are improving our management and conservation of fisheries and related marine resources. Most importantly, while quite similar to some of the concepts in HR 21, these efforts are being carried out under existing authorities within the context of well understood legal mandates and public participation processes. The results are practical and timely measures to improve resource conservation.

This record also provides the context from which we look at the provisions of HR 21. And it is because of our practical experiences in the North Pacific that we believe that some of the major provisions of HR 21 will actually impede efforts to improve conservation of our coastal and oceans resources.

Our concerns center on three basic aspects of the bill:

- Establishing a broad national policy with poorly conceived national standards;
- Far reaching mandates for ecosystem based management with little or no recognition of the realities of the status of the science involved, the conflicts that will arise between the new policies and current and ongoing conservation and management programs, the impacts of the policies on existing ocean related uses, the increased potential for unnecessary litigation, and the gridlock that will ensue;
- The expense of the new bureaucracy called for by the bill, and the attendant weakening of ongoing conservation efforts due to scarcity of funding and personnel resources.

Title I of HR 21 purports to establish a national oceans policy. However, instead of enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of our nation's oceans management regimes through a comprehensive approach to oceans policy, HR 21 further complicates an already daunting array of laws, regulations and policies that currently govern ocean uses. It does so by focusing on only one aspect of the nation's ocean interests, and by adding yet another layer of broad, far reaching, but poorly defined policies and standards. The bill establishes U.S. policy to "protect, maintain, and restore the health of marine ecosystems" and then a national standard that, "to the fullest extent possible, the policies, regulations, and Public Laws of the United States" shall be interpreted to meet this policy.

Actions covered by the bill are defined as "any activity affecting United States ocean or coastal waters or resources that are authorized (including a federal license or permit),

carried out, or funded by a federal agency”. The bill then mandates that such actions “may proceed only if the covered action is not likely to harm the health of any marine ecosystem and is not likely to impede the restoration of the health of any marine ecosystem”.

Taken together, this broad policy subverts all national interests in ocean affairs to one single policy, and circumscribes all other federal laws with a broad and poorly defined mandate. Any federal agency conducting any activity that might affect ocean or coastal waters is to judge any and all covered actions against this inflexible standard, a standard that is virtually impossible to verify, and certify compliance prior to allowing the action to proceed. If there ever was a formula for gridlock, this is it.

Title II of HR 21 is an organic act for NOAA. Section 204 requires NOAA to “take an ecosystem-based management approach” to all of the agency’s resource management obligations. While on the face of it, this sounds like a positive step in resource conservation; in reality it ignores some very fundamental and basic issues.

First and foremost is the question of whether or not the science is there to do the job right. The bill addresses this question by stating that lack of science requires managers to invoke the “precautionary principle” and take action. In other words, lack of information is no excuse, regardless of the consequences. The annals of resource management are replete with examples of well intentioned actions resulting in disastrous unintended consequences. Blind adherence, or in this case a legal requirement, to act on poor information is not, in our opinion, good resource management.

Instead, relying on the expertise of managers and their science advisors to take prudent steps seems more in order. But, by setting up rigid legal requirements, coupled with judicial review and litigation, this bill is heading in the other direction.

Secondly, the mandate for an ecosystem-based approach to management is exacerbating the problems managers already face. Namely, how to balance different resources and uses. For example, when endangered salmon come into conflict with protected marine mammals that feed on them, how do the managers meet the requirement for ecosystem based management? Or, when confronted with decimation of protected sea otter populations by protected Orcas, how do managers respond? Should they “take sides” in the ecosystem by reducing Orca mortality on sea otters? Should they engage in “control measures” to protect endangered salmon from predation? What if the only viable alternative is lethal control of the predator? Under the provisions of HR 21, would managers be vulnerable to litigation if they did not take such actions?

Admittedly these are extreme cases, yet each is actually playing out in the world today. They serve to underscore a more fundamental question. What do we mean by “ecologically sustainable”; and how do managers respond in a real world sense to a mandate for “maintaining biological diversity and ecosystem functioning and structure from one human generation to the next”. Given the statutory mandate of HR 21, does this mean that fishery managers base their management programs on the potential

consequences of coastal development that might happen sometime in the future? Does that mean that repairs to harbors or shoreline protections should be halted because it can not be shown that they are “not likely to significantly harm the health of any marine ecosystem”?

From the perspective of a region that is interested in making real, “on the water” progress in oceans governance and conservation, each of the definitions of “marine ecosystem health”, “healthy marine ecosystem”, “precautionary approach”, and most importantly the definition of “ecosystem-based management” all suffer from the same basic flaw. They sound good, and are full of ambiguities that will make the practical and real world work of managers virtually impossible.

These problems are even more daunting when considering the scope of the area and functions covered under the provisions of HR 21. The definitions of oceans waters include all federal waters, and the definition of coastal waters includes those waters covered by Sec. 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act, which includes bays and estuaries. By extension, this may also include activities taking place anywhere in the coastal zone, which in many states reaches far inland. This means that road repairs, sewers, harbor improvements, shoreline restoration, fisheries both commercial and recreational, housing, shipping and transportation, and all the myriad of activities that take place on or near the ocean will fall under the new mandate, and managers will have to juggle all of these considerations when making decisions.

As a final point, in addition to the provisions of Title II that establish NOAA, Titles III and IV establish an elaborate, and potentially very expensive, oceans planning process. Some of these provisions mirror recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Oceans Policy, some of which have already been adopted by the President. Some of these new provisions simply create a new and somewhat redundant bureaucracy. This will be an expensive endeavor, with the potential for drawing funds away from ongoing conservation or science programs to fund the new bureaucracy.

To address this concern, HR 21 would establish the Oceans and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund. Aside from the sale of a “Healthy Oceans Stamp” and some interest gathered on the Fund over time, deposits to the fund will apparently come from the general Treasury. Current fiscal realities will dictate that these funds will be counted against other oceans programs. The result is classic, once again the ocean community will be faced with broad and contradictory policies, and new mandates, with insufficient funding.

So what is the way forward? How do we make progress in a practical and timely fashion?

We propose the following:

1. Implement the Magnuson Stevens Act (MSA). Reauthorization of the MSA has already done much of what is needed. Now Congress needs to fund the research and conservation programs it just passed. The revised MSA was a significant achievement

that included provisions to move the nation towards ecosystem based fisheries management, prevent overfishing, strengthen the role of science in fisheries management, and improve monitoring and enforcement. The renewed MSA passed with broad bipartisan support, and was hailed by conservationists, recreational and commercial fishermen, scientists, and fishery managers; all of whom praised the bill as a much welcomed improvement for conserving our nation's marine resources. With regard to ecosystem based management, the MSA takes a step wise approach by providing the tools to move in that direction, and by strengthening existing scientific programs to get the data to support such efforts. This is a formula for success.

2. Provide a source of stable and long term funding for oceans research and observation. The MSA began this process, and HR 21 may have some elements to add through the creation of the Oceans and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund. However, none of these efforts will succeed unless new sources of dedicated funds are identified that do not detract from funding for existing programs.

3. Be selective in setting new policies and cautions when establishing new mandates. Fix only what is broken. Strengthen federal/state partnerships and promote regionally based solutions. Several reports and studies emphasize building on existing programs in an evolutionary manner. Make it the first priority to provide the resource management agencies the personnel and basic funding they need to do their job, and do it well.