

THE STATE'S INVOLVEMENT IN MARITIME AND OCEAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

COL. T. R. GILLENWATERS
Oceanic Advisor to the Governor
Sacramento, California

I consider it a privilege to be here and address this group. Phil Roedel once commented on how difficult it is to get the broad perspective properly communicated to the oceanographic community. I had to agree, because quite frankly in my own instance, having been exposed to this broad perspective for many years, I still had no idea what CalCOFI (California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations) was. However, it didn't take me very long since I was placed in the position of having to accomplish an overview of what was going on in California. I attended a Marine Research Committee (MRC) meeting and a CalCOFI meeting, and soon found that I wasn't the only one who had problems. Thanks again to the efforts of Phil Roedel, and others, I then made it my business to become more intimately informed on what CalCOFI was really accomplishing and what it was designed for.

It has been my good fortune through the years to have made the acquaintance of most of you, either in the course of my survey in depth of the national oceanographic structure in 1963, under the sponsorship of the Honorable Bob Wilson, Congressman from San Diego, or in connection with my association with the Ocean Research Institute of La Jolla.

In my current assignment as the Oceanic Advisor to the Governor, I am getting an overview of our total marine activity not only in this state but in the western coastal states, Mexico and Canada too since they contribute to the total Pacific basin marine community programs.

In this connection, my assignment to the Governor's staff wasn't by any particular design. I had never met the Governor when he was campaigning, but one of the members of his staff called me one day and asked if I would help with a program. Anyway it is interesting for me to go back and look over my original discussions with that staff in 1966, and very frankly I pointed out three very important things that you're dealing with: i) The confrontation between sport and commercial fishermen, ii) The confrontation between this country and foreign fisheries, and iii) That search as I might I could find no programs wherein the scientific community and economic evaluators had gotten together to establish some economic formulas by which you might sensibly approach these things.

I was then and I am now continually confronted by this cost effectiveness approach to fisheries. I might add that had we used the cost effectiveness system (I am not entirely against it I want to point out) but

had we used it in the agricultural areas historically, we would not have what we term in California now, agri-business instead of agriculture.

I am not an oceanographer, nor am I an expert on fisheries, my function as the liaison between the Governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources (GACOR) and the recently created Interagency Council on Ocean Resources (ICOR) requires that I be fairly well informed of all on-going programs not only in the State but in the areas referred to above and the Federal Government as well. Fortunately, I do have access to virtually all of the world's published literature as it is received by the Oceanic Library and Information Center from over 50 countries. This involves the review of well over 1,600 journals, magazines, special reports and individual studies with a gross number of ocean-oriented articles numbering approximately 70,000 annually. There are nearly 7,000 authors who have been identified as producing worthwhile articles, of this number a major portion are either residing in California or have had their training in this State.

Therefore, we must assume that one of our most valuable export items is that of oceanic know-how, an export that is impossible to be reflected in an economic formula upon which our gross national product is reported. In spite of the general impression, the news media to the contrary, Governor Reagan is deeply concerned about the necessity of supporting our discipline-oriented educational facilities related to the future requirements for the dynamic development of our ocean resources. We have under study right now the requirements not only for graduate students but also the need for marine technicians. Every agency of the State government that has ocean-oriented activities within it, is being directed to participate in the production of a comprehensive ocean area plan. The 1967 Legislature with concurrence of this Administration enacted the Marine Resources Conservation and Development Act of 1967 and this carries a mandate to the Governor to prepare such a plan and submit it to the 1969 Legislature.

In the meantime we are engaged in making an inventory of every on-going ocean-oriented project within the State. This will be accomplished by creating a unique planning, programming and budgeting system for the purpose of identification and analysis. Once the initial stage of this system is accomplished then recommendations from qualified persons will be sought for establishing priorities for legislative emphasis, funding, and allocation of our resources; nat-

ural, equipment, funds, and manpower. I have never been able to become enthused about planning until I had a fair idea of what we were talking about, hopefully our system will provide a working inventory.

I do not go along with the theory that once you have a planning, programming, and budgeting system that you immediately begin to apply cost effectiveness to everything that you do. In my opinion, the status of our fisheries in this country is one that you can relate to our agriculture as it was some 30-40 years ago. It is almost incredible the number of Congressional resolutions that are dealing now with studies of estuaries, studies of fisheries, things that will hopefully assist in developing some new or better approach to our maritime knowledge and to our posture in the International community.

We could make a lot of facetious remarks about the ineptness of some of our legislative bodies, but quite seriously, I become more impressed every year as I deal with this subject, with the know-how of a number of our Congressmen and Senators, with the desire on the part of our legislators to become better informed, but I am also almost startled by the lack of communication between people who have the need to communicate and the need to have a better understanding of their problems.

About a month ago I made a trip to Eureka, Fort Bragg and Crescent City, with Congressman Dan Clauson and I spent most of my time in individual discussions with fishermen in sport and commercial areas, boat riggers and with people who are really out there working with their hands. I was quite surprised to have them invariably say, "you are the first person who has ever taken the time to sit down and go through our shop and really see what we're confronted with." Well, that isn't entirely true, because I happen to know that a good many people from our Fish and Game Department call there. But I do admit that I am in a little different position and I can perhaps make a little different type of inquiry than has been done before. Last Friday I flew to Crescent City with Lt. Gov. Finch who is Chairman of ICOR, and I can assure you that he takes the opportunity every time he is in one of these coastal communities, to meet with ocean industry people, and listen to their discussions and I think this will all pay dividends.

In Eureka about six local fishermen and a couple of people from nearby Humboldt State College met for the first time. The fishermen were complaining about the lack of information. One man made this statement, "I'm 30 years of age and starting in the fisheries business. I am going to make it my career." I remember he mentioned black cod and saying, "I don't know why I got into that, I don't know very much about it. Where would I find something about it?" Sitting in the meeting was a young fisheries professor from Humboldt State, how qualified I don't know, but I am sure there will be benefits from those two getting together.

Now, changing quickly to a subject which I think is vitally important. I can say for the first time that

there is an economic study going on and going on in depth. It is being conducted by Prof. S. V. Wantrup, College of Agricultural Sciences, University of California who is a member of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources.

We have had many letters from fisheries experts who are encouraging us to go at this program in depth, and I have noted from Phil Roedel's initial address to you that the CalCOFI Committee has recognized that you must take further steps toward communicating the results of your scientific studies, get them into the hands of the public, get them into the hands of the legislators, get them into the hands of the sociologists, and the economists, and, by the way, to the banking institutions.

I am sure that most of you know that approximately one-third of our international monetary deficit, which is in the billions, is related to the imports of fisheries products. Now, I don't know the cure, but I can assure you that the same kind of approach has to be taken in the fisheries business as has historically been taken in the agricultural business. You cannot take the kinds of actions that are taken now on a piecemeal basis and hope to improve our international deficit situation. I do believe that if we can enhance the economic development of the fishing industry these deficits can be overcome. It is a great industry, and not one in which people should hesitate to participate. I do not agree with the people who say young men will not go into fisheries. I have already seen and I have already met and I have already had discussions with young men who would like to make fisheries their career and have already made that decision.

I think we have to improve our inter-communication in these various areas and this is one of my functions in this administration. We are not trying to give you people the idea that we are going to solve all your problems. I would say that one of our projects was to get some incentive programs going, and if you recall the only tax relief bill that passed the 1967 Legislature, and was approved by the Governor, was the one related to commercial fishing and research vessels. Even though there was a pretty serious battle over that and the county assessors fought us right down the line, it has been done. That may be an indication of our interest.

I do believe there are other tax incentive ideas that can be developed that can help the fishing industry. But this is out of the pure research area and into the socio-economic area.

It is my opinion that CalCOFI can be an organization that can carry on and perhaps expand its influence, into legislative areas and into economic and financial areas without diluting the fine scientific approaches that have already been so ably followed.

In closing, I would like to compliment those responsible for the way in which you have developed this particular CalCOFI program. I have contended for the past several years that those of us interested in the ocean, most of us with very special interests, have failed to get the working level segment of the public sufficiently involved. Your program will very

definitely contribute to a better understanding among all concerned with the future planning for a more intelligent and practical approach to our complex ocean problems. It is truly a privilege to be here.

DISCUSSION

ISAACS: One extremely important aspect of these fisheries, particularly the confrontation you speak of, sports versus commercial, is perhaps getting somebody like Wantrup to work on the problems of real comparison of these two uses in some rational way. To date, economics has always been brought in by the coat tails . . . but there is more to life than just the economics and it seems to me there are more fundamental ways perhaps of making these comparisons.

Wantrup is working on commercial fisheries right now; the recent project you mentioned. Wouldn't it be wise to set up a more rational defensible sort of comparison between these uses so they can at least be reduced to numbers?

GILLENWATERS: You are entirely correct. This is a kind of a break-through with Wantrup. I told the National Commission I was getting pretty badly put out with the Federal system because they continue to grant funds for research projects on specific species or specific piece of shoreline, or specific dredging program, but I have yet to see a grant which has written down the results of that research into some economic study, other than this catch phrase "cost effectiveness". I would like to point out that the nearshore waters have a total value, less shipping, of \$1,286,413,000 to California. Of that, \$450 million is tourist expenditure, \$316 million boating expenditures, \$107 million sports fishing, \$10 million SCUBA diving, \$3.8 million surfing, \$313 thousand boat fares and \$23 million fishing industry.

That \$23 million, if you multiply it out, means more to our gross national product in terms of benefits to California, than \$23 million.

It is my observation, and I haven't had a chance to evaluate it, but I hope that our own California Fish and Game Commission will drop this business of how

much the sports fishermen pay in, so much for lines and so much for this. I know they are confronted with this when they go to the Legislature, but I think that with a better understanding of the contribution to the GNP that perhaps we can make a better case for a better understanding of the scientific results.

I also think that with the economic formulas being developed we will get a better understanding of conservation. Now again, I have to admit I am placed in a very unusual situation. I am getting, for the first time, an overview, and if I were to plot a course of my opinion it would look like the mountain road coming up here from the valley. Two or three years ago I had a very definite fixation that there should be a wet NASA. I helped draft the bill. I admit Congressman Wilson and myself weren't too enthusiastic that that was the proper way to do it, but we did feel we'd stir up the natives, and we did. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Navy and the Department of Commerce, got busy showing everybody how good they were, and everybody got a little bit better.

I proposed to the National Commission that we forget about maintaining these commissions a long time, but put a death sentence on them and they must expire at a certain time and that in lieu thereof we create a Federal planning authority with some muscle on it so that 3-4 years from now you could have a separate marine department when you learn more.

Within the State, I presume I am going to end up recommending a somewhat similar thing, but my path of opinion changes constantly. You talk about a woman changing her mind! I have changed my mind so many times, as I become exposed to these problems, that I almost dislike to make a public speech because I am going to have to eat some of it a couple of years from now and I know it. But at least, we are now getting the sore spots exposed.

I will definitely take your suggestion and will put more pressure on some type of economic formula that will take it into consideration.