UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

AND

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

+ + + + +

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS (MPA) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

INAUGURAL MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 25, 2003

The Advisory Committee met in the Auditorium of the Department of Commerce, $14^{\rm th}$ Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 8:30 a.m., with Eldon Hout, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

ELDON HOUT, Director, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, NOAA

MARJORIE ERNST, Designated Federal Official, DFO
National MPA Center

JIM KENDALL, Department of the Interior

JOE URAVITCH, Director, National MPA Center

DR. TUNDI AGARDY

DR. DANIEL BROMLEY

DR. MICHAEL CRUICKSHANK

ROBERT DENDICK, JR.

DR. DOLORES (DOLLY) GARZA

DR. RODNEY FUJITA

DR. MARK HIXON

MELVIN MOON, JR.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (cont.)

DR. STEVEN MURRAY

MICHAEL NUSSMAN

DR. JOHN OGDEN

TERRY O'HALLORAN

LELEI PEAU

DR. WALTER PEREYRA

GILBERT RADONSKI

JAMES RAY

DR. DANIEL SUMAN

H. KAY WILLIAMS

ROBERT ZALES, II

MARY GLACKIN, NOAA, Ex Officio

REAR ADMIRAL JEFFREY HATHAWAY, U.S. Coast Guard, Ex Officio

MARGARET HAYES, ESQ., State Department, Ex Officio COMMANDER KAREN KOHANOWICH, U.S. Navy, Ex Officio Representative

DR. JOSEPH PAWLIK, National Science Foundation, Ex Officio

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN FARROW, MMA Inventory Coordinator, Chief of Special Projects, NOAA Ocean Service

CHARLES WAHLE, Ph.D., Director, MPA Science
Institute

DR. ANTHONY CHATWIN, The Nature Conservancy CAROL DINKINS, ESQ.

MICHAEL DOEBLEY, Recreational Fishing Alliance HANNAH GILLELAN, MCBI

ERIC GILMAN, National Audubon Society

JAY JOHNSON, Commercial & Recreational Fisheries and Support Industries

RYCK LYDECKER, Boat U.S.

ROBERT MORAN

CHERI REDCCHIA, The Ocean Conservancy

KITTY SIMMONDS, Western Pacific Fishery Management Council

DORINDA (BUNNY) SPARKS, Program Assistant, National MPA Center

BARBARA STEVENSON

ALEXANDER STONE, ReefKeeper International

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

AGENDA ITEM PAGE
Call to Order 4
Additional Background on Areas of Initial Focus MPA Definitions - Dr. Charles Wahle 26
The Nation's MPAs - Don Farrow 60
Public Comments
<pre>Improving MPA Stewardship; Identifying And Addressing Program Implementation Needs - Ginger Hinchcliff</pre>
Committee Discussion on Organizational and Functional Matters
Travel and Miscellaneous Administrative Issues - Dorinda (Bunny) Sparks

NEAL R. GROSS

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

MR. HOUT: Good morning and welcome or welcome back as the case may be. We're here to conclude the first meeting of this Advisory Committee but with quite a bit of work to do here in the second day. And I'd like to have Joe Uravitch give us a brief description of how we're going to proceed for this period, a few changes to the agenda but not dramatic. Joe?

MR. URAVITCH: Thank you, Eldon. I think we'll get the lights on shortly. Just so the members are aware of what's at their desks, we have a copy of the Marine Protected Areas Needs Assessment that was put together by the Training and Technical Assistance Group in Charleston and that will be part of the discussions around one of the charge discussions on MPA Stewardship Improvements later this morning. Also the Ocean Conservancy has provided copies of a study they did of marine and coastal protected areas up on the Gulf of Maine. They thought that that would be sort of a useful document for you all to see on an analysis of different kinds of MPAs in the Gulf of

NEAL R. GROSS

Maine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In terms of today, we'll give you a report on membership changes as soon as possible. We are joined today by Kay Williams, so we do have a new member up from the gang of six sitting up here at the front table I'm pleased to say and as soon as we hear more about other people, we will let you know, though I have a feeling it's not all going to be finished today, unfortunately.

are number of issues be addressed today. One of the major issues from the substance perspective of the committee will be to go the three specific charges to the Advisory Committee from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce and we'll have presentations by Dr. Charles Wahle, Dan Farrow and Ginger Hinchcliff relating those specific charges the to from departments as well as time to discuss those and I think that may start getting towards the specificity you all have been asking us about in terms of what is it that the committee will be actually taking on.

I think we need to have a discussion

NEAL R. GROSS

related to the question of electing a chair or not at this point given the fact that all the nominees have not yet been approved. That's obviously a committee decision but I think it needs to be discussed among yourselves and I don't know, Eldon, if you want to start off with that this morning.

MR. HOUT: I thought we would.

MR. URAVITCH: And looking down my list, there are sort of administrative things we need to deal with later in the day that are particularly crucial. Please don't skip out on the discussions of travel and miscellaneous issues, because that relates to how money gets spent and in terms of getting things in on time so that we can actually invite you back because it effects the budget pool that's available. So those things are crucial in terms of getting things in to us.

Other issues relate to the charter and potential changes to that. We've obviously heard about some issues related to the charter that need some amendment relating to things like election of a vice chair as well as chairing of other groups,

working groups, et cetera. And so we'll need to go through those so that we can identify those areas of the charter that may need some amendment so that we can move forward on that process.

And I think that's the list for now. Maggie?

PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible)

Right, thank you, Maggie. MR. URAVITCH: And last is establishing a communication mechanism so that we all can use. We actually have a new webmaster starting on Monday at the MPA center and one thing that we'll try and do as quickly as possible is get up a member accessible web page that will be available to membership electronic the so we can start communication as well as setting up a list serve so we can do some root communication and we'll also have to discuss any other mechanisms that we might want to to help communicate across the organization. use, Thank you.

MR. HOUT: Questions of Joe on the process? Well, let's move then -- well, you know, it's only fair that Kay Williams give a little brief

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

description of her interest in this committee and why she's here and why she wanted to be here. So I think we should do that.

MS. WILLIAMS: I had prepared a statement before I came. I've been waiting patiently to let all of you know who I am since I've already had the pleasure of hearing your introductions. My name is Kay Williams. I live in the State of Mississippi. I am President of the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation, which is a non-profit educational and scientific research development organization serving the commercial fishing industry since 1976.

Its purpose is to enhance the long-term viability and productivity of the Southeastern U.S. commercial fishing industry through the wise use of marine resources and application of environmentally sound business practices. The Foundation serves as a liaison between the Federal Government and the commercial industry from Texas through Virginia. also a member of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Council prepares fishery plans which are designed to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

manage fishery resources from where state water ends out to the 200-mile limit of the Gulf of Mexico. The council the services of knowledgeable draws upon people from other state and federal agencies, universities and the public who serve on our advisory I've served on panels and committees. the Gulf Council since 1997 and previously served on three advisory panels to the council and participated as an industry spokesperson.

council member, I have served chairman, as vice chairman of the council, chairman of Marine Reserves Management Committee and as the council appointees to the Tortugas 2000 working group which was charged with developing marine reserves in the Florida Keys area. During this period the council conducted scoping workshops on marine reserves and created three marine reserves in the Gulf of EEZ that totaled 279 square nautical miles. The council in cooperation with NOAA, the State of Florida and the National Park Service created another marine reserve.

The Gulf Council has had a long history of established marine protected areas to regulate deer

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and/or to protect critical life stages of the fish we manage as well as habitat of particular concern. The council had established 134,671 square nautical miles of marine protected areas prior to the completion of Amendment 19 which is also known as the generic amendment addressing the establishment of the Totugas Marine Reserves.

At present the council is reviewing a proposed amendment to the Marine Fishery Management Plan to extend the time period for the Madison Swanson and Steamboat Swamps Marine Reserves beyond the June 16th, 2004 expiration date. My interest as a member of this advisory panel is to work with our partners in improving management and conservation of our nation's MPAs. Thank you.

MR. HOUT: Thank you very much. Move then into the agenda and the first order of business on the agenda is the question of the chair of this advisory committee. It seems to me that there's some choices that you have to make and I would guess that they would include choosing a chair today, deferring or selecting a chairperson protem to manage the remainder

of the agenda. Those are the options as I see them, but let's open this up for discussion and what it is that the Advisory Committee has in mind. We actually have a gavel which we can pass to somebody and being deposed would not ruin my day. Observations or suggestions.

MR. ZALES: Yeah, I would suggest that we defer until we get everybody on this panel and that you all can do what you did yesterday, is continue to run the meeting, because I don't think that it's fair to those of them that are sitting in the audience that are not up here. They can't participate and so I think it would be reasonable to just defer until the next meeting or some electronic thing, however the panel feels that they do, but I don't think it's prudent to do it today.

MR. HOUT: Other views, observations?
Bob?

MR. DENDICK: I agree with that. I think though it would be helpful if you guys could set up some sort of process for this to happen between now and whenever, including circulation of statements or

summaries. I think we've had one, but I think it would be better not to -- better to have some background and some order to this process than just to do it at the last minute.

MR. HOUT: Other views? Joe, any comments that you want to make on the process that we might want to follow in the interim if, indeed, it is a deferral?

What I plan to do is to keep all of you informed as the weeks go on and let you know who has been cumulatively nominated for the chair position and I think you have another decision to make as well, because you can either wait till the very last person is formally appointed or you can wait until the 27th or the 28th person is appointed and possibly that last individual might defer and allow the rest of you to vote. In the meantime, we'll be exploring possible to conduct the vote ways electronically well before you get to the next meeting and there will have to be kind of some component to that vote, but we will be working on that and I hope that if some of you had any suggestions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

based on experiences you've had in voting in that manner, you might give those to us now.

DR. HIXON: On thing I think would be useful here is to actually hear from those who have put their name up for nomination. Bob sent around some information via e-mail before the meeting, but it would be nice -- I don't even know exactly whose names are up. It would be nice, maybe, to hear from each person if they're willing to speak.

MS. ERNST: Thus far, we all were informed Zales interested Bob that he in being was considered for the chair. We also heard -- or I was informed that Dr. John Ogden in being a candidate and I now also have been informed the Dr. Dan Bromley and Dr. Bonnie McCay are also interested in that post. So we have four individuals but there could be more given that I think the window will be open.

DR. PEREYRA: It seems to me that we probably don't have to go through the pain of some sort of electronic selection of a chairman, that if we deferred until the beginning of the next meeting and had that be the first order of business, I would think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that we would be well-served at that point in time. In the meantime, we can go through whatever process we need to be as informed as we should be as to the various candidates and capabilities and so forth. That would be my preference.

DR. GARZA: I guess my only concern there is that often a chairman does put a fair amount of time into setting up the agenda and so if we don't have a chair to help set up the next agenda, it would be a government agenda.

MR. HOUT: A couple of options there, perhaps. Volunteers to serve on an agenda committee in the interim and Joe could work with that maybe smaller group and if you don't volunteer, he'd probably ask somebody.

MR. NUSSMAN: I would certainly agree and understand the concern there and I think we need to have -- I was going to suggest a working group but that's actually what you've done just some folks or anyone that is particularly interested in agenda item or specific issues that need to be covered by an agenda. I would hope we'd all have the ability to at

least comment on what the next meeting will involve
but I think that would help move it towards involving
the committee in that agenda setting process. And one
of the concerns I'd have about I'll throw this out.
One thing we could do is to have rather than an oral
statement here at this point, ask each of those
interested to put a statement forward electronically
so we all could review that and if we had questions,
we could follow up with them individually or in some
sort of group e-mail process to try and address
specific issues.

MR. HOUT: I'd like Joe to make a quick comment on some of the procedural electronics that they're considering.

MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, I think that will give us an incentive to get this in a password protected website set up for the committee as quickly as possible, so that will be our first order of business in terms of our website update is to make sure we have a secure mechanism that you all can use to vote or to discuss and share information.

DR. BROMLEY: As I look at our schedule,

we have basically from the period after lunch until whenever we break, 4:00 o'clock, 5:00 o'clock. don't understand why we couldn't use the time this afternoon profitably to collectively discuss the agenda for the next meeting. I guess I'm not a fan of sort of e-mail kinds of conversations of this nature because there's lot of give and take and а reconsideration of positions and e-mail is overrated in terms of a medium by which this can be carried out expeditiously, I believe. So I'm not in favor having us go away and then start e-mailing around to get our agenda ready for next time. I would much prefer a creative use of the afternoon so most of us who are here can get at least the agenda for the next meeting under control. That would be my proposal.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I too, would also like to know and have a copy of the Department of Commerce committee management handbook, because before I can vote for a chairman, I'd like to know what the chairman's duties are depending on if you work under Roberts Rules or if you do not, I know that they can vary. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. AGARDY: This may be a futile question but is there any indication of knowledge about how long the clearance process will take and what you're aiming for in terms of the next meeting? Is it September, October, November and will you have the meeting even if the clearances haven't gone through by then?

MS. ERNST: I think we're -- my guess would be that we would be holding the next meeting roughly in November time frame and by then, one would assume that at least 29 -- I cannot say for sure about the 30th position for Ernesto, but certainly by then they should be fully approved. We wouldn't want to try and hold one earlier and recreate the situation we went through for this meeting.

MR. HOUT: Mike?

MR. NUSSMAN: To follow one rather futile question with another futile question, we discussed the vice chair position and an issue there. I think it struck me as a consensus there that having a chair in a group like this where you may have multiple meetings would -- whoever it is, would love to have

someone to tag team with and say, "No, you take it for while". Is there any -- as we think about a chair, should we also think about a vice chair?

MS. ERNST: Yeah. I hope that over the course of today we'll get input on other suggested changes to the charter and what we can do this summer is amend the charter and add the provision for a vice chair and any other kinds of changes -- we have to change it to reflect that the Coast Guard has now been moved to the Department of Homeland Security but there will be others that I hope are engendered in the discussion today and we will amend the charter this summer so that by the time the vote occurs, you will be able to have a vice chair in place.

I thought the discussions MR. RADONSKI: although not a consensus, were leaning yesterday, towards a meeting much earlier than six months hence. And I think the November time frame is going to be I think there's several council pretty packed. meetings and a -- Kay was mentioning the constituency meeting in November, a lot of conflicts in November. for around would hope we'd shoot something

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

September.

MR. URAVITCH: Observations on future meeting. Bob?

MR. ZALES: Yeah, I would agree with that. It's like I said yesterday, I mean, we're in the beginning stages of forming up this committee and other panels that I've served on that HMS and Bill Fish are two that I would point out that I was on the initial stages and it takes time to get your logistics set up so that you can really get into the meat and start working on what you're assigned to do.

So I would agree with that. I also would agree with Dr. Bromley that this afternoon would be a good time to discuss not only agenda items but also maybe the charter thing and if we've got time to play with that for suggestions in there, and the issue about the vice chair to the following meeting and, hopefully, all clearances would be done and at the time that the election of the chair, we could just handle all of it and get it over and done with at that time.

MR. HOUT: Terry?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. O'HALLORAN: The discussions about the elections and our next meeting it seems has to wait until we know when our other members are going to be approved and lacking that information, it might be difficult to set a meeting time. I agree with an earlier meeting rather than a later meeting, but we do need to have all of our members approved. like we also might need to make a decision if Ernesto is way behind the curve on getting his paperwork submitted and actually being approved. make a decision, do we have a meeting with, would that make 29 then, not counting Ernesto? Do we have a meeting then and do we vote for a chair and vice chair and some of these other issues?

So I think that we need to -- rather than just talk about generic meetings, we need to nail down some of these specifics and then we can move forward with a meeting date.

MR. RAY: I think a possible option is to select a couple of tentative dates pending one thing is, of course, getting our new members on the committee but secondly, taking the opportunity to poll

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for the tentative dates how many of the committee members are available because everybody is Everybody has commitments. Let's be sure we don't arbitrarily pick a date when nobody's checked their schedules and you miss half the committee. know, I think we need to be a little bit careful about setting a date in stone right now and maybe pick a alternates, let everybody couple of check schedules and then let's see where we go with the clearance on our other committee members. I would recommend following a course like that.

MR. HOUT: Yes.

MR. RADONSKI: Just clarification on a point; one of the members has -- one of the appointees has not submitted the proper forms, I believe it was stated yesterday, indicating, perhaps, I don't know, a lack of interest in serving on the committee. I don't know what the facts are, but if that person were not appointed, would the process go forward and another name submitted?

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, that would go back to the two departments to select a 30th member.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. RADONSKI: Well, if that does happen, I would suggest that a recommendation go forward that filling some of the holes on this committee, one of the areas that is not represented adequately is the area of antiquities and cultural things that I think we would need to have some representation on this committee.

DR. BROMLEY: Yeah, I have a procedural issue and then a question. Mr. Zales I appreciate the Dr. Bromley stuff, but maybe you should just call me Dan from now on. Would that be all right? You know, I don't need that other stuff and it's very awkward. Let's just -- we're on a first name basis here. Is that okay? Thank you but the procedural question is, do I understand that we cannot do any business until 30 people have been approved? No. So we can do business with 24 approved, with 27 approved, with 29 approved or with 30 approved; is that right, Joe?

MR. URAVITCH: That's correct. I think the question really relates to the big issue of the chairmanship of the committee itself and where you all are comfortable in terms of saying, "Okay, if there's

27 of us next time, we're going to vote regardless". You know, what's the number that you're comfortable with to set so that we have an opportunity to bring in the rest of the membership, but I think if we waited for 30 that might never happen just at the pace of life. So that's really a decision for the committee.

DR. PEREYRA: I've had the opportunity to meet Ernesto on several occasions and he's a very reasonable man, and I'm sure that if for some reason, his appointment is delayed because of clearance and so forth, that he would, you know, would tell us to carry on, you know, "The will of the majority is certainly the will of the majority and I'm certainly going to follow along", so I don't think that's going to be a particular hang-up for us. So I'd certainly be in favor of us moving forward on the meeting and if we have 29, I don't think that's going to be a particular hang-up for us.

MR. RADONSKI: I support the position stated earlier of waiting till we have more people on the committee for the candidacy of the chairman, but once we do vote for chairman, I think we're going to

have to establish a procedure for voting and I would recommend that the candidate must have a clear majority to be elected chairman. That would require, if there's more than one -- more than two candidates, and one candidate does not receive a clear majority, you'd have to have a run-off but I think if we're going to be chaired, we should have -- the chairman should have the majority of the votes.

MS. ERNST: That's what the charter calls for right now.

ZALES: This is MR. just bit of information on the Gulf Council on advisory panels up until two years ago, the council members themselves decided who was chair and vice chair of those panels, but Kay can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think two years ago they decided to let the panels choose their chair and vice chair on their own and the way that that went was that if there were more than two people who were nominated, the person chosen had to have better than 50 percent of the vote. If not, then it got to the two top people and then the vote was held again between the two top people so that may be some

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

procedure you want to consider.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. HOUT: Additional comments? I have -- Kay?

MS. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. The process that I'm familiar with as far as electing a chairman the the full committee is chair is usually nominated by one of the members and at that time, they do a paper ballot, secret type ballot and then they are totaled up and whether it's one vote or, you know, someone wins by one additional vote, that's the person that gets the chair. So that's just how we do it at the council level. Thank you.

Well, we are obviously bound by MR. HOUT: whatever the charter provisions are, unless they are modified, but it looks like, and Maggie has indicated, that it is a majority vote of the committee. about three things, I think, that have come down here. One, defer the chair selection but permit statements circulated by e-mail from those are interested in serving as chair. Secondly, the discussion of the agenda and the charter should proceed after lunch in the time that is available this

afternoon and three, that tentative dates for the next meeting should be proposed and members polled as to the appropriateness of those dates. Now that's the consensus I have detected here this morning. If there are other points, then maybe we could go further. Otherwise, maybe that's as much as we need to do on this subject now. Any final comments or observations?

Seeing none, we'll proceed then to the next part of the program which is we'll require you to make the move into the seats to view the screen. The first presentation is discussion of MPA definitions and types and the problem of the common language beginning with Charlie Wahle and then to be followed by Dan Farrow and then with a break moving into the implementation needs. Ginger Hinchcliff will be making a presentation.

Is everybody all WAHLE: settled? Okay, well, good morning. For those of you weren't here yesterday, my name is Charlie Wahle. the Director of the MPA Science Institute which is part of that National MPA Center. We're based in Santa Cruz, California at the National Marine

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

This morning, I'm going to talk about Fisheries Lab. something that is really fundamental to why we're all It's something that's been bothering all of us for years, I think, which is this question of, what is it we're talking about. If you go to any MPA meeting anywhere with any group of constituents, the very first thing people will say is, "We need We don't know what this means, we don't definitions. know what that means, and it isn't fair to proceed until we understand it".

It's a serious problem so we spent some time on it and we are going to show you what we've done so far and ask for your expert opinion on whether this might solve some of the problems. Now, what I will do today briefly is give you a little overview of all the different ways that we currently talk about MPAs and then to discuss a proposed classification system for how one might categorize or describe MPAs in terms that work and make sense and have meaning on the ground. And then finally, to use that which is more of an analytical tool, to develop a more simple and even more straightforward language that we can all

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

use and the public can use and your mother can use and everything else to talk about MPAs and what they really mean.

So this is a review from yesterday for those of you who weren't here but we're building, of course, on the federal definition of an MPA which is in Executive Order 13158 which says, it's very broad, "Any area of marine environment that's been reserved by federal, state, territorial, tribal or local laws or regulations to provide lasting protection to part or all of the natural or cultural resources therein".

So if somebody -- you're at a meeting and an angry constituent stands up and says, "What do you mean by MPA", you tell him that, they're even more So you know, we're kind of agitated ourselves about this, so we're trying to get beyond it. are just some examples of MPAs around the country that we covered yesterday, but basically, there are a lot of them, of different kinds; national parks, fisheries, closed areas, protected species cultural resource areas, you name it, and they all These are some of the names; sanctuaries, have names.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

critical habitat, reserve, conservation area. Ιf there is a phrase that can be strung together to describe a place, it's probably used to describe MPAs. And the difficulty here is that it's very -- it's almost impossible actually, to look at any of these terms and to really know what that thing is going to do in the water and to you. So there's a lot of confusion out there about terms of MPAs and some of the consequences of that confusion are that -- or the sources of it actually, are that the program names, call marine things that we sanctuaries, national parks, estuarine research reserves, et cetera, don't always really reflect the actual purpose of the MPA or its management approach or probably more importantly, its impacts both on the environment and on the users that live and work in the environment.

So right away you have a problem that the name that we use to describe these things that we're proposing or evaluating doesn't really tell people what it's about. And sometimes it's really very different. And related to that, of course, are the --sometimes you have similar sounding names of MPAs that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have very, very different impacts in the water. So one person's marine reserve is a no-take, no-go, no nothing area and yet the Estuarine Research Reserve System is a multiple use area where there are frequently allowed hunting and fishing and all kinds of other activities. Both are calls reserves and both elicit the same response in a public meeting. So we need to somehow get beyond that problem.

And then growing from that is the growing confusion of equating no-take which is the way the most restrictive and the most rare type of MPA in this country, with the general term MPA. So that frequently people when they hear discussion of MPAs as we've been talking about yesterday and today, their reaction is often based on the assumption that means So if we're ever going to get to the part no-take. where we can have a rational discussion about both the broader MPA realm as well as no-take, we have to be a little clearer about what those mean.

So all of this has led to really for several years now increasingly strident calls for a set of terms that we can all use that are simple and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

consistent and intuitive so that they actually mean something to people who may be aren't enmeshed in all this stuff. And that accurately reflect what the program's goals and approaches are and then allow an objective assessment of the impacts of an MPA on both the environment that it's intended to protect and the human uses that interact with that environment.

And that's really critical is you have to be able to convey or if you're on the other end of the discussion to understand what this thing is going to mean to you if you're a fisherman or a boater or a scientist. And then also these terms ideally shouldn't overlap too much at least with programmatic names, so that we don't get into the problem of, "Well, when we say park, we don't really mean national park, we mean some other thing". And ideally we'd like to use terms that don't have a lot of baggage in the MPA debate, because some terms tend to elicit stronger responses than others.

This shouldn't be that hard to do. We do it all the time in every aspect of our lives. Just as an example of what might happen if you called all of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

these things boats and, you know, when I say, as I do once in awhile, "Gee, I'm really -- I'd like to buy a boat", and so my wife assumes it's the sailboat and then she says, "No way". Now, somebody else might think it's a fishing boat or a commercial fishing boat or a recreational one. Or it might be a jet ski or it might be something, a foreign policy instrument in the But what -- usually we're pretty careful about what we mean by, "Well, can I tie my boat up to your dock", you don't come up there with a cruise ship and say, "Well, here I am". You've very explicit about, " I have this vessel that has these characteristics and this is how I'm going to use it, now let's talk".

We don't do that with MPAs because we don't have the language to do it. So what we did was, after looking at what's out there and there are a lot of different ways of describing classifying MPAs, the ICUN system is sort of the generally accepted but not often used approach as well as a bunch that are developed typically by statutory programs at the state or federal level or by some of the NGOs. So what we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

tried to do is figure out a way to describe these things we call MPAs in functional terms that really the issues that we're all most address about, which is basically what's it for and what does And if you keep tearing at that long enough and it's taken us quite awhile to strip away all this other baggage, what you with are come up fundamental aspects of the design and the impact of an MPA that, taken together, pretty well describe it.

And their objective in the sense that they the statute or be deduced from reading management plan, SO they're not just, you know, somebody standing there and saying, "Well, our mission is". relatively today And they're also straightforward, and these are the primary conservation goal of the site which is its essential purpose and reason for being established, the level of protection that it provides to the resources that it encompasses and that generally equates to, you know, the other side of the coin is, what activity, what nature of activities are restricted, the permanence of protection which is becoming an increasingly important

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aspect of understanding MPAs because they're not all out there forever. In fact, many are of finite short duration, some are very term. Many and increasingly so are on what we call the Sunset Clauses which is a mechanism by which at the end of some fixed the site's period, performance and impacts are evaluated and based on that evaluation, a decision is made whether or not to go forward or change the plan or just get rid of it all together.

So permanence is a key feature of the design of an MPA and of understanding any given proposal or understanding the whole suite of MPAs that we have in this country. Similar to that is this thing we're calling constancy of protection which has to do with whether it's operational year-round or whether it's seasonal. And then finally, the scale has to do with the degree to which the protections -- it's the target basically, if it's an eco-system wide MPA or whether it's focused on focal resources.

What I'm going to do here and I'll try to do this quickly, because there's really too much material to really assimilate. It's in your books.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But I'm going to go through each of these five characteristics and just highlight the different options that we've developed. So in the end what you do for any given MPA is you have this menu of five characteristics and under it, you have a series of options. You pick one option and only one for each, so you end up with five and that describes the site.

The first two, which are highlighted in red, are the key ones, primary conservation goal. we discussed yesterday, there are essentially three fundamental purposes for MPAs in this country. Those are very broad and we recognize that many sites are established to serve multiple objectives but most, if sort not all, have а primary of over-arching The first is natural heritage, conservation goal. established essentially to which is protect biological communities and their habitats, eco-systems and processes and ecological services, uses and values that they generate. That would be -- an example of that might be a marine sanctuary or a national park.

Cultural heritage sites are established primary to protect, understand and interpret the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

submerged cultural resources, the artifacts, the actually tangible evidence of our history with the sea and through that to maintain our connection to our traditional uses with the ocean. And finally, the sustainable production MPAs which include both fishery sites as well as MPAs that might be used for the sustainable harvest of other species and resources. They're established principally managed actively to support continued sustainable extraction of renewable living resources through the protection of areas that are important to that ongoing effort.

Under level of protection, this is probably the most important element of the national dialogue on MPAs, there are five relatively discrete levels of protection within the suite of MPAs we have. Starting with the most restrictive and also the rarest and going down toward least restrictive and most common in general, we have no access MPAs which are essentially you can't go there and therefore, you can't do anything to it or in it.

By limiting access, they limit the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

potential for adverse impacts unless specifically permitted for scientific reasons or others. There are very, very few of these in this country and those that exist are small and typically embedded within a larger MPA and used mainly for scientific research.

No impact MPAs are those that allow access but prohibit or otherwise restrict activities that could both remove resources, extractive activities or harm the ecological processes and services that the site provides. There are very few of these as well. No take areas which tend to be probably the focus of most of the discussion on MPAs, are those that allow access generally but -- and often allow potentially harmful activities other than the extraction of natural and cultural resources from the site.

Zoned multiple which use areas are relatively common and getting more so over time, are MPAs that use marine zoning to allocate different uses in space and time and thereby to minimize both user conflicts their and to reduce impacts the environment but they allow generally both extractive and other kinds of uses different ways. And finally,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

non-zoned multiple use which is kind of a mouthful for a system that's supposed to be simple, are those sites where multiple uses are allowed but there is no zoning. It's basically uniform allowable uses throughout the site which tends to be found in older sanctuaries, older parks, things like that.

So we have these five relatively distinct levels of protection for all of the MPAs in this country. Now the other three categories are equal --well, they're important but it's the first two that really drive a lot of what we're all concerned about, I think. Under permanence, you have, of course, permanent sites which are established in perpetuity forever, to protect the resources for this and future generations. Examples of that include I believe all the national parks, some marine sanctuaries and some state MPAs.

Conditional protection is the one that I think is worth paying some attention to because it's a growing phenomenon and it is partly responsive to concerns by stakeholders and others about effectiveness and the response to that is, okay, let's

try it out. We'll have some fixed period at which we go back and look and see whether it's working and based on that scientific assessment, we'll adjust or eliminate or expand. So those sites have this potential and usually an expectation for renewal but there is at some point a finite decision point based on a science based evaluation. And then finally, there are sites that are temporarily protected which have no expectation or mechanism for renewal but are set up for some discrete purpose, for a finite amount fair number time and there are a of those. Typically they are either for fishery management purposes or say emergency restoration or something like that.

Constancy has to deal with -- deals with the idea of is it there all year round and if not, what's the basis for it. So there's year round protection which is typically most sanctuaries, most national parks, a lot of fishery sites. Season protection are sites that are established to protect an area that's critical for some ecological or economic purpose but the risk that is of concern is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's only seasonal because for example there's a seasonal mating or spawning, what have you, feeding area where it's only important to limit activities at that particular time. Those are found primarily in the fisheries management realm and there are a growing number of them in this country.

And then rotating MPAs are ones which are still relatively uncommon but may be increasingly so over time that are moved basically. They're established for a purpose. They fulfill that purpose and they're moved to another area for the same purpose. And finally there's scale of protection. And the scale falls into basically two categories. Looking at the whole eco-system and its resources and the processes that drive it or looking at focal resources either one or more species or resources of any kind that are of particular interest and are protected by the legal authorities.

So we have these five ways of describing an MPA. So when you take this to the real world, it actually -- it's kind of interesting how it plays out.

What we've done here is those first two categories,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

primary conservation goal and level of protection are in the first bullet. Can you all read that all right? and that's the first bullet because that's really the principal thing that most people are And then the second bullet has to do with focused on. the permanence, the constancy and the scale protection. So what you end up with is something like the Channel Islands National Park is, it's a zoned, multiple use natural heritage MPA. That's basically the story most people need to know but it also has permanent year-round ecosystem protection.

A marine mammal, critical habitat might — a generic one, might be a knowing pact area where you can go but you're not to disturb the processes or the species, the natural heritage MPA with permanent but seasonal focal protection. So you can begin to see how this sort of plays out and then I'd use the monetary cultural resource example. It's a no impact cultural resource MPA with permanent year round focal protection. Now what you get by using this is a way — once you sort of get used to the phraseology and it doesn't take long, it's a way to easily categorize an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MPA in functional terms that we can all understand, we can all use and it allows you to both describe it in the debate, so to speak, and to evaluate and understand any proposed MPA or what we've already got out there.

Now, why would we want to do this? The first thing, of course, is to bring some objectivity and reason to the debate on MPAs and through educating the stakeholder communities, and that's broadly defined, including the managers, we will hopefully be able to clarify and inform this discussion so we're all using the same common language. It also provides a mechanism for us to easily illustrate and understand what we've got in the water right now and Dan Farrow from the NOAA Special Projects Office will be talking right after me about the inventory which is what we have in the water right now.

It also will allow in time when it's overlaying in top of the inventory, it will allow us to take at least a first cut at looking at the goals, the stated goals of the MPAs that we have and of getting some assessment of their ability to both meet

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

those goals and to cover the important resource needs that we have and therefore, it may help us identify gaps in protection and it will be very useful in the design of both MPAs individually and networks largely in the discussion phase of that process and then finally, it gives us the building blocks, if you will, for our work on developing this framework for a national system, because it will give us a way to describe what it is we're trying to do.

Here's an example, this is a power point version of what might be GIS someday. This is what a lot of MPA maps look like right now. And the first response it, God, there's a lot of them out there and this is sort of a compressed version. And even though it may look like California, it really isn't. It's just generic land somewhere with water off of it. there are a lot of these protected areas. Sometimes they have names on them, that' makes it worse. names are confusing. They're not going to tell you if you apply this you need to know. So classification system to it, in this case coding the sites by their primary conservation goal, you begin to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

see, okay, well, now I see what's out there and why it's out there, what are these areas purported to be achieving. The green are the natural heritage sites. The yellow are the cultural heritage sites where you might have some scattered shipwrecks around and then the blue are the sustainable production sites which in this example are primarily fisheries areas.

And you can begin to see that not only is distribution of them, but there's interesting overlaps where there might be sustainable production MPAs embedded within a broader natural heritage one. So it gives us a tool to look at and understand what we've got. If you do the same cut but by level of protection, you can begin to see just how protective or restrictive this system really is and this, of course, is a made up example, but it's for of the probably -most areas country it overstates that relative proportion of no take areas. Mostly in the country there are very few of them and they'd be so small that you wouldn't be able to see them on this map, but this is a way we can get at that question because a lot of people are concerned about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

areas that will restrict their activities and a lot of people believe there are a lot more of them out there than there really are. So we need to have a way to show what's out there and what we may need to do about it.

Okay, so this is an analytical tool. It simplifies things in the sense that it strips away all this confusion and duplicative language, but it's still kind of a complicated thing. I wouldn't want to stand up in a public meeting and say, "Okay, calm down, here's the answer", because it's too much, but it will be very useful for us, we hope, if you all agree, as an analytical tool.

So we wanted to take it one step further and solve this problem of we need some simple definitions and so what we've done is taken those first characteristics, the two key primary conservation goal and the level of protection and combined those as the definition. Now, we've also compressed within the level of protection, the five that I had laid out into two. And so the one is no take, which encompasses the three types of no take

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

areas, the no access, no impact and no take into just one generic you can't extract anything from here, which is what most people are most interested in and then it compresses all the multiple use sites into a single category.

Now, you lose a lot of information there. I mean, there's no doubt about it, but my guess is that 85 percent of the dialogue is at this level and if you need to go further, you have that information available. So if you use that approach, then it gets a little cleaner. I mean, I could do this with my mother probably. The Channel Islands National Park is a multiple use natural heritage MPA. The Marine Mammal is a no take natural heritage MPA. The Monitor is a no take cultural heritage MPA. So you begin to it falls into place and it basically see that addresses the key question which is what's this thing for and what's it going to do to me and to the resources it protects?

Now, one of the things that we want to do with this is get it into the public dialogue, essentially. You know, once we get feedback from you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

all and others about the adequacy and applicability,
we want to actually use this. And the way that we
envision doing that is through members of the
committee as conduits to your sectors, if you will,
and your regions, to get some feedback on will this
work for you and if not, how might it need to be
changed. And then once we've gone beyond that stage
and we've gotten something we're all comfortable with,
we really need some help in getting it plugged into
the national discussion on MPAs, which means going to
your for example, you know, if you're in the
commercial fishing sector, going to your colleagues
and working with them to understand it and then
getting them to incorporate this into their
discussions and their thinking. This doesn't take
over or replace the existing names that we use for
MPAs. We'll always call a sanctuary a sanctuary and a
park a park, but then we can also say, "But what that
means in functional terms is this or something like
it".

And that will be a very powerful place to start from with our discussion about how we might want

to use this tool in the future. So we're seeking your help in making this work. I think that's it for me, thank you. Questions. John?

Thanks, Charlie. DR. OGDEN: That was Andy Rosenberg, who is on very interesting. Commission on Ocean Policy when we were talking once about confusion of terms and I brought up the idea of zoning the ocean just in certain aspects, said, "My God, anybody who talks about zoning ought to go to the local planning council meeting some time". thought about that and the fact of the matter is that on land, we deal with terms and confusion about the definitions of land areas and redefining them and so on all the time and, you know, I think this confusion that we perceive in the ocean is brought about by two things.

One is the unfamiliarity of applying a concept which has worked so well for us on land in an environment which has been traditionally open to open access environment, the so-called commons. And then, frankly, I think one has to say and it certainly is true in my experience, that the confusion arised not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

so much from an inability to take the land experience into the ocean but serious dis-information campaigns whereby every time the term comes up, somebody says, "Well, we have", -- you know, essentially puts out the usual kinds of confusion and that does happen, I think you have to acknowledge that. But anyway, I think this is an interesting presentation. Thank you.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Yeah, thanks. MR. WAHLE: It definitely does happen and it's -- who knows what the motivations are but it's -- the confusion is being generated on I mean, when I worked in sanctuaries all sides. before doing this, there were times when I thought, "Well, it sounds really good but is this really, you know, what we're doing". And of course, the answer was don't worry about it. But the conclusion that you begin to draw is, you know, we need to somewhere in our collective discussion have the ability when we want to, to say, "Okay, well, what it really is, is this, this and this". And then we can go back to calling it what we want and taking our positions, but at least we all know what we're talking about. Yeah.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. RADONSKI: I thought it was an excellent presentation and I think it's very important for us to start off with a systematic classification and what you presented is almost intuitive. There are sanctuaries and MPAs of different colors of everything out there and this is just so we're all on the same page we can talk about them and I like it very much. I don't even -- there may be some tweaking necessary but I think it's a good starting point and I think the group should come to some agreement in accepting this type of classification.

MR. WAHLE: Great. Thank you. A lot of us have worked hard on exactly that intuitive thing because, you know, you first start with all the stuff that later you realize isn't very intuitive but one of the things we're hoping to get from you all is think about all the many different venues that you're talking about this stuff with and will that work? Like yesterday, when we were in this orchestra pit, if you could identify yourself for the Court Reporter. That was Bob Zales who just spoke. Oh, sorry, for me, too. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. FUJITA: Ron Fujita. Thanks, Charlie, that was great. And I like the classifications but I see at least two different venues which could benefit from two different kinds of classification systems. know you don't want to complicate things but it seems to me that the one you've laid out which is about function lends itself to analysis. You can categorize It's very logical and you can do these things. inventories to determine the number and area of marine reserves that have different levels of protection and serve different functions.

But in a lot of the venues I work in the key criteria are use and access. You know, what kind of access, is it restricted, is it open to everybody and what kind of uses are allowed? Can you fish in there? If so, is it recreational only or commercial or is it research? So I think that those two things have a lot of salience on the ground and would easily overcome some of the fears and concerns when you just talk about generic MPAs and nobody knows what the use of the access regimes are. That's I think what people really care about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Uh-huh. MR. WAHLE: Yeah, it's a very good point and I think that when you're using that five-category system, it gets to the access piece pretty well, but the use distinctions of recreational but not commercial or vice versa, that -- this doesn't work for that and we actually -- there are, you know, as you can imagine 10,000 earlier versions where we tried to deal with that and it just didn't work very well. So I would be very grateful if you guys could help us figure out a way to easily package different kinds of use, you know regimes in a way that people can understand. But what we ran into is there are 10,000 permeations, which is what we're trying to avoid here, but yeah, you're right, it's a big hole and it's one that many of you are particularly interested in.

MR. FUJITA: Yeah, I just think a very simple classification, maybe, you know, open access, restricted access and recreational use, commercial use, and natural heritage and then those would serve as gateways to people who want to find out in more detail exactly what kinds of fishing are allowed,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	exactly what kinds of access are we talking about. So
2	maybe just two or three categories of each use and
3	access.
4	MR. WAHLE: I think that makes a lot of
5	sense. Tundi.
6	DR. AGARDY: Tundi Agardy. As a
7	beleaguered advocate for multiple use marine protected
8	areas, I am very sensitive to the misconception or the
9	perception that multiple use marine protected areas do
10	not contain no take zones and that they are,
11	therefore, toothless often paper parks, and I wonder
12	if it wouldn't help to have a sub-category of the
13	multiple use marine protected area category that would
14	indicate whether not it contains no take areas.
15	MR. WAHLE: Yeah, I see what you mean.
16	Well, it's embedded and sort of implied in the zoned
17	multiple use level and often that is what the zoning
18	is about but you're right, we need to have a way to
19	highlight that explicitly. Mel, did you have a
20	question?
21	MR. MOON: Mel Moon. I was thinking that
22	not to complicate this thing further, but the other

element that I would take interest in would be how these MPAs have been created and their origins and the processes that were used in order to get to some kind of identification. Ι think that's an important It sounded like there was a good deal of discussion about social sciences and people connected into these creation of these areas. So I think as a suggestion, perhaps, another area of trying identify what is would be to define the origin and how it was created.

MR. WAHLE: That's a very good idea. I should mention that in the inventory which Dan will speak about in a minute, we have a zillion data fields on sites and some of that kind of information is in there but it might be worth pulling it out as a piece of this too. Yes.

MR. CRUICKSHANK: I'm Michael Cruickshank.

On the sustainable production, I like the effort very much, it's very good. That's one, to me a large thing and to many people an important thing is that the sustainable production refers largely to living resources and we have to consider the non-living sands

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and the coral reefs, the coral reefs are living too, the production from other natural materials because the coastline particularly in island areas are very sensitive to taking indiscriminately. very, You've serious beach erosion, beach got very excretion, alteration of wave forms coming into the areas and it's something that could be plugged into that, I believe, without much problem.

MR. WAHLE: Yeah, I think that's a good point. It's something we talked about yesterday, too, we sort of struggled with whether we're really focusing on renewable living resources or all natural resources and I think we need to reflect that in here. Yes.

DR. GARZA: Dolly Garza. If we could stick on this one here, under cultural heritage, I think since yesterday hearing it and then seeing it here, my concern is that it seems to focus on submerged things. And in terms of cultural heritage, you also have at least native uses of areas that are quite important, and so I would hate to have that go forward that it only refers to submerged areas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. WAHLE: Uh-huh. Yeah, that's a very good issue and one that we worked on or tried to figure out. The problem we're dealing with is, if I get this right, now the Executive Order is focused on the artifacts, the resources. But we all recognize that there are these other dimensions that are equally important and there are MPAs either now or in the future that would be established for the more sort of traditional use and cultural aspects.

We have to find a way to capture that and I don't think this does it quite yet, so I'd appreciate some help on that. But we do need to --somehow our work under the Executive Order is focused primarily on the resource piece but we -- any system needs to acknowledge these other dimensions, too. Questions? Yes.

MR. SUMAN: Daniel Suman. I was curious, perhaps I misunderstood when you were talking about conditional protection, you -- I understood that you mentioned some national marine sanctuaries are only conditionally protected. Could you explain what you meant by that or if I understood you correctly?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. WAHLE: Well, the Florida Keys is the example that came to mind. When that was -- when the management regime was finally approved, there was an agreement with the state which co-manages the state waters of the sanctuary, to evaluate the effectiveness, if you will, in five years and then based on that evaluation, the state part of sanctuary could be modified or eliminated or what have you. That just took place, as I understand it and it was successful in the sense that they thought is was working and kept doing it.

But there are -- that same provision is in the Hawaiian Islands hump back whales sanctuary. think maybe in Thunder Bay. It's a growing trend and I think it's actually something we'll see a lot more of, also on the sustainable production side and it makes sense. It makes -- it's fair to the users and it also in an indirect way, forces MPA programs to be more explicit about their purposes and their measurable objectives and then to evaluate them in order to meet that day when they have to So I think we'll be seeing a lot of this themselves.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

which is why we tried to find a way to put it in there. Mark.

DR. HIXON: Mark Hixon. This is certainly a logical framework especially once no access, no impact and no take are sort of combined, because I was having difficulty in my mind separating those three. Unfortunately or not there's a historical context here and that is especially within the peer review scientific literature. Fully protected areas have come to be labeled marine reserves. It's a very common term and actually it's sort of the focus of much of the debates surrounding marine protected areas and this scheme does not include that term that's already very much embedded in the literature and in much of the public debate. So somehow I believe that needs to be incorporated.

We can call these things anything we want as this committee but marine reserve fully protected areas, marine reserves are certainly embedded in the ongoing national discussions and internationally as well.

MR. WAHLE: Yeah, you're right. Well,

NEAL R. GROSS

we've gone round and round about that and the only reason we thought we might not use the term was because it is actually used programmatically but on the other hand, it is the term of art for these top three. So one thing that maybe you all could help us think through is whether we maybe keep these top three in the classification scheme which is really sort of you know, priesthood will be using that and then we get down to the one that's more for the public use. What did I do with it?

Okay, so in here are you suggesting that this become marine reserves and -- it makes sense to me. We should talk about it some more and we need to get the real issue here is the programs that call themselves reserves, but I think we can probably work this out.

MR. WAHLE: And certainly, just to follow up on that, I agree with Tundi that there are multiple use areas that include fully protected areas and those that do not. So, for example, I think it was your last slide mentioned the Channel Islands as being multiple use. There are not fully protected areas

within that.

DR. HIXON: Right.

MR. WAHLE: And there are certainly multiple use areas that do not have fully protected areas. So there's that dichotomy as well.

DR. HIXON: Yeah, that's a good point and I had forgotten to mention that this system, the five-level system works for zones as well, so you can have the big site and in each zone it's described that way, too.

We're a little behind schedule. If you're willing, maybe we should defer more discussion to later and move onto Dan Farrow, who will talk about the heroic efforts we've done in the inventory work. Thank you very much.

MR. FARROW: Good morning, my name is Dan Farrow. I'm the MMA Inventory Coordinator and I'm also the Chief of the Special Projects -- it's not even an office. We're just called Special Projects in the National Ocean Service. This is taking a long time to load up. Julia Brownley has handed out a packet of information. I just want to make sure that

everyone has it and what's contained in there are four things, you should have four things. The first is an example and I'll talk about this a little bit in my talk, but an example of one of the initial assessment activities that has been undertaken with the inventory by the National Marine and Fishery Service. This is preliminary.

And then the second thing, the second item is really probably one of the most important and that's actual hard сору of the inventory questionnaire, the survey form. The third is an did for excerpt from a report that we the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. It's the title page and the table of contents and executive summary and then lastly there is a list, a master list of all the sites that are in the inventory right now. We don't have copies for everyone else. I apologize for audience, although I think there are enough copies of So if anyone wants a copy of the inventory form. this, Julia, you could maybe hand out the copies of the inventory form, people may want to look at that.

Okay, well, I know time is short so I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to go quickly and then if there's any questions, I guess we can either handle them or handle them after the break. What I want to talk about -- I don't know if this is the right power point. I don't know where Erin is but I'll go through this. There's not many changes. I'll make the changes on the fly. I'm going to talk a little bit about the inventory basics, where our data collection stands right now; some initial analyses, what we're doing with international efforts and then this next slide, the next bullet should really say "Next Steps", and not "Take Home Messages".

Before I start though, I actually would like to acknowledge the inventory team. Charlie talked about a heroic effort. This is -- I was just looking back at one of our meeting summaries. We have had 26 meetings of the inventory team since we started keeping track of this in January of 2001. There have been 62 participants that have filtered through our team and this really has been a tremendous -- it's probably the highlight of what I'm working on right now. It's really been a personally great opportunity and something I've really enjoyed getting to know

everybody but as an example of collaboration and inter-agency cooperation, I think it really stands out as an exceptional effort and just the longevity of people coming to this and committing to working hard on it. So I'd like to acknowledge -- a lot of the team members are here in the audience and past team members are floating through as well. So I just want to acknowledge all the hard work that everyone has done.

The inventory process that we have set out upon really is a three-step process as we see it. first step is building this inventory of marine managed areas and the idea there after an initial start and a lot of discussion was that we -- and input from constituents at stakeholder meetings, is that we needed to have a very broad casting of the possible the possible remanaged areas, for the U.S. areas, before went the next of doing we to steps assessments and then the further step of actually identifying the list of MPAs which is required by the Executive Order.

Charlie, already mentioned to some degree

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the development of criteria and I'll talk about that in a little more detail. There is a Federal Register Notice that is going to be going out this week, in fact, which is going to propose some working definitions to move into -- or to qualify sites to be put on the inventory and that's something that I think the committee may want to look at very closely and certainly help us get the word out and get a good response to that.

idea The then is after we had is to populate this with a wealth of definitions information as you can see if you look at the form, and then to work a lot with partners to make sure that this is very useful information. We've talked about this internally as being the year of the inventory. Our goal is to -- our target is to complete the inventory, the first round of the inventory by the end of this calendar year. That is pretty -- I will tell you now, that's pretty ambitious, but I think we can make good progress on that. We're going to try our best to reach that goal. If this is the year of the inventory next year and our internal discussions is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the year of assessment and analysis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The hard work is building the inventory. The fun part is being part of the team that helps do some of these analyses. After that, and I think to be continual refinement there's going of this inventory, then we move onto this difficult process of determining the list and that's something that the committee is probably going to have a lot of advice and quidance on. Talking about the definitions, Charlie's already mentioned this is the section of 13.158 where we drew our guidance from and we picked out the six key terms; area, marine environment, lasting protection and cultural resources, and that's really what this Federal Register notice addresses in a lot more detail.

This is our attempt at GIS. This is what we've called MMA Bay and this just shows -- we use this when we go out and talk to states as a way to graphically show how the criteria apply. The first criteria area, fairly simple. It just says there have to be a defined boundary in order to have a site be put on the MMA inventory. A key point here is that a

lot of these sites have both a land and a water component and although we are only in the inventory focusing on the water component, often the GIS boundaries also include the land, so if you look at Big Bird Wildlife Refuge, on the right-hand side of MMA Bay, you'll see that in our GIS that might be represented as the entire water and land area.

We don't collect information or deal with the Upland area. Reserved simply means that it has to be established through legislation or regulations or laws. The duration, this actually had changed from the initial -- our initial working criteria and so the duration of site has to have a minimum of two years of -- protection for a minimum of two years with -- and then within a year it has to have a minimum of three months of protections. That is a more liberal definition than we initially started with.

The protections, simply, they have to be greater within the boundaries and outside the boundaries. And marine, this was one that we debated long and hard about in the initial phases back in the summer of 2000, summer and fall, and we said that an

area has to be ocean or coastal waters and we're defining that to include the inner tidal and we define inner tidal as from mean low to mean high water or in t.he Great Lakes, in the Great Lakes areas are and the definition that's being connecting waters proposed in the Federal Register notice is areas that are within the eight-digit USGS cataloging unit that's the Great Lakes adjacent to or their connecting waters.

Also it has to be a submerged cultural resource, so the example in the little cartoon, Harbor Light State Park, although it has a historic lighthouse, would not be a site that we would include in the inventory because it really doesn't have any component that is in the water in our definition of marine waters, where as Shipwreck Shoals Historic Site would be a site that would be in the inventory.

On the data collection tool, this is a simple tool to fill out. I don't know why people get so upset about this. It actually has 42 questions, if you count the questions. It has five parts and I think one of the parts that would be of most interest

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to the committee is the last part, the zones, where there's a number of questions that deal with purposes, methods for delineating boundaries, the types that protected. There's resources also are the question about historical -information, origins each of of these sites, there's information and I believe it's in the site description area that talks about what the basis -- what the historical origins of each of these sites are.

What we have done when we ask people to collect -- or to fill this -- fill out this survey form is we provide them an electronic application. It's in the filemaker, it's on a CD and then can fill this out. Typically, they'll use in the states we now have a state data collection interim program and the state data collection interim program and the state data collection interns typically are the ones that fill this information out. They can batch load it or most commonly they have to fill it in site by site. I've been told that this estimate of one and a half to four hours is slightly optimistic. I think this does take a little longer.

If you have all the information in front

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of you, it really doesn't take very long to fill this out at all. If you have to collect the information, it can be time consuming. Here's where we are in terms of our federal data collection. And there's an error in this slide. It actually -- we now have 276 federal sites. The error is in the -- for one, we didn't add up the numbers right. That should add up to -- that ads up to more than -- if you add up all the different programs, it adds up to more than 251. that should be 276 and the number of Marine Fishery Service sites is 36. Those are the sites that are publicly available if you would go onto the MPA.gov website.

We actually have other sites in the data base but we have not gotten the agreement from the agencies to make them public and so if there is discrepancies in some of the numbers that's where that comes from. You can see that the greatest number of sites -- that the National Wildlife Refuge is the greatest number of sites, 162, but in terms of area, the actual largest area is by far the National Marine Fishery Service sites and then followed by the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

National Marine Sanctuary sites and some of those numbers are in one of the handouts. There's federal sites in marine managed areas. There's a little table in there that lists the numbers and areas. The federal site is the component to be worked on first and then we moved into the state inventory and the state component and that has really been a challenge. There's 35 states, commonwealths and territories. One of the first things we did was set up an informal state advisory group. That has been a very useful Bob Bailey from Oregon is the chair. group to us. Athline Clark is the vice chair. You probably know some of these other folks.

We talk with them about three or four at the Coastal times a year, either at the state -annual Manger's meeting we have meeting sometimes we'll have telephone conversations, conference calls with these folks but they both give us feedback on how to approach states and they resolve some technical issues that we have when there are concerns, so this has been a very valuable group for us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In terms of the MPA states status, we have held initial discussions with all the -- actually with all 35 states, territories and commonwealths and we have active data collection going on in 10 of them and I think we have one site or one jurisdiction, the Northern Mariana Islands that was the first to cross the finish line. They have 11 sites and those are up And these are the number of on the website now. sites. When we had talked with states and they had told us the number of sites that they are planning to submit to the inventory, these are the numbers. adds up to I think it's about 461 sites, if you add up all those and as Joe and Charlie have said, we're estimating somewhere between total from the state and the federal data collection that by the end of that we will have somewhere between 1,000 and 2,000, probably more like 1,000 to 1500.

The other thing I wanted to point out is that California -- let me go back here, California, Oregon and Washington are all very close to being -- finishing their final review, so that will be the first region where we have a whole coastal region

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the state data and I'11 where we have mention something about that in a little bit. This is the analysis portion. These are some of the questions that we get asked a lot and in some cases we can begin to start answering. How many sites in the inventory right now? As I said, there's 276 federal sites total, publicly available are 328 sites, I believe but as the states come in, finish their reviews and give us permission to publish their sites, that number will change very significantly over the next four or five months.

The total area of U.S. waters, this is a tough one because of the difficulty in estimating the water portion of these land and water sites. We are working on that. We have an initial estimate. We don't feel comfortable yet releasing that but I know that's a number that people are very interested in. One of the other analyses that we did for the Ocean Commission was look at overlaps of sites for the federal sites and that information is in — this binder is the whole report we gave to the Ocean Commission and we would like to leave three of these

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

binders with you today to look at. We would like to get them back but we can send any one of you that are interested a CD with a PDF on it. It's just too big to e-mail but you're welcome to take a look at this. There's some great maps, a lot of great information in this report.

We have not pulled out the information on the top four reasons sites are established, effectiveness although that information is in the One of the things we really want to work survey form. on over these next six months is getting -- although the sites are in the inventory, in not all cases are they completely -is the information completely available for the sites are completely filled out, even for some federal sites, so that's an area that we really want to emphasize in these next couple months in order to meet our December deadline.

The other thing I'd like to mention is if you haven't had a chance to get onto the MPA.gov website, that is -- the inventory component of that site is where we have an awful lot of information that allows you to look at individual profiles for each of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the sites in the inventory that are available. There are reference maps and individual -- and regional maps and monthly updates. We update that monthly as we get information in. beyond that, there And is а tremendous amount of information on that site as well, but I would encourage you to take 10, 15 minutes to look at the inventory section. I think this just shows -- this is an example of the regional maps.

also have been working with some international efforts. As Charlie mentioned, in some cases there's -- you know, there's a lot of activity in this area in the international arena. Most closely we're working with the Commission on Environmental Cooperation, CEC, not of. But we -- I actually am one of the marine -- attend some of their meetings as one of the marine advisors for NOAA and we are making sure -- we shared with them our inventory survey form with the Mexican government officials and with the Canadians and so we're making sure that we identified a key set of fields, common fields, that will allow us eventually to pull together a North American inventory and then we were also working with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some other organizations, World Commission on -- World Commission Monitoring Center and the World Congress on Protected Areas on -- it's the World Conservation Monitoring Center, I'm sorry, on -- but they're coming to us for advice on how to develop inventories and we're sharing -- planning on sharing some of our information with them as well.

These are our next steps. As I said, our target is to finish by January of `04 the actual data base. The associated GIS is much tougher to pull together. Our goal there is June 2004. We have a -- our data collection interns are working very hard. That's a great program, it's a great outreach program for the whole center. They're working on that.

This next piece, I think if you look over the next three or four months you will see some significant improvements to the inventory. Website, you will hopefully see an interactive website, interactive mapping where you'll be able to pull up MPAs by different programs and zoom in to areas and then connect to the profiles. We are developing an editing capability which will allow sources of data to

get on and modify -- add or modify their data. That's important right now. That's kind of a cumbersome process. Important for users is they will be able to download the inventory and also download the GIS layers, the maps for their own use. I think those are the three major areas that will make the website significantly more useful for users.

And finally, and Charlie eluded to this, we're hoping to undertake a pilot, a regional pilot study on the West Coast because with having the three West Coast states, including their state inventory having the federal sites completed, we now have the pieces and there's a lot of other work going on, on the West Coast in terms of characterizing habitat and physical characteristics and even human activities, pressures and stresses from the land side that we would want to look and use that as our first pilot of conducting an analysis.

So that's an overview of the inventory.

I'll be happy to answer any questions or happy to show
you more details at any time. Mark.

DR. HIXON: Thanks for that, Dan. Mark

NEAL R. GROSS

Hixon. I'm very much impressed by what you and your colleagues have accomplished so far. I look forward to --

MR. FARROW: Big team effort.

DR. HIXON: -- continued -- yes, I can see that. It was gratifying to see that the West Coast is almost on line and I just want to repeat for the record the discussion you and I had last night, that there's now a quite detailed map of the sea floor of the Continental Shelf or the Western States. been completed along with a GIS on socio-economic data particularly related to the commercial fishing. So there's been some discussion among this group so far about having at least some region in the United States with sort of a demonstratory GIS and it looks like the West Coast will be on line perhaps sooner than people may have believed otherwise. And I'm looking forward seeing this tool because it's going be absolutely essential to have a user friendly system where all stakeholders can have access examine different scenarios. Thanks.

MR. RADONSKI: Gill Radonski. I was out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	of the room when you began your presentation but
2	you're using MMA and MPA. Are they synonymous in this
3	context?
4	MR. FARROW: No, if I've misspoken and
5	I've slipped back into MPA, the term we're using is
6	MMA, Marine Managed Area which we define as a broader
7	collection of sites and the MPA being the official
8	designated the sites that would be on this list
9	eventually once the process is defined. So if I
10	misspoke, I apologize.
11	MR. RADONSKI: Okay, so going back to
12	Charlie's presentation, we can just plug MMA into
13	that?
14	MR. FARROW: I"m sorry?
15	MR. RADONSKI: Going back to Charlie's
16	presentation on terminology and definitions, do we
17	just plug MMA into that and why are we having this
18	confusion?
19	MR. FARROW: Joe, do you want to
20	MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, it sort of points out
21	the reason why it is confusing and if you go into the
22	Executive Order, there's a requirement under Section

5 that requires federal agencies to avoid harm in MPAs that are on this list of Marine Protected Areas. And so, you know, I know it's spreading confusion in a way but to avoid a confusion between the inventory that we're collecting right now and those sites which will end up on this official list of marine protected areas, which is going to require us to go through another Federal Register Notice process, we've had to differentiate, because we've already had cases in which permit applicants, for example, or people not wanting people to get permits have started saying, "Well, if you're on this inventory, you're an MPA and therefore, something needs to be done about that".

So specifically for this inventory purpose and for the purposes of Section 5 of the Executive Order, we're just making this distinction and that's why.

MR. RADONSKI: A follow-up, please. I don't think that answers my question. Going back to Charlie's presentation, we're talking about definitions and everything else.

MR. URAVITCH: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. RADONSKI: At some point, these two have to mesh.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, and right now, you know, we're as close as we can. What you're seeing on this Marine Managed Area Inventory will track with the definitions that Charlie proposed. But for the specific legal purposes related to Section 5, we are required to prepare a list of marine protected areas which will be set up by a very -- a more refined set of definitions and criteria and in order to meet those legal requirements, there's a process we have to go through.

But generally speaking, I would apply what Charlie has put together as terms and definitions to the sites on the MMA inventory. So, I mean, I wish we could invent another term if we had to, but that's -- we're stuck with working within the confines of the Executive Order and that's what we're trying to do. Rod.

DR. FUJITA: Thanks, Joe. Ron Fujita.

Dan, I also was very impressed with how far you and your team have gotten on this inventory. I think it's

1	going to really useful. Looking through this survey
2	form, I notice that you asked for information on what
3	kinds of indicators are used to assess the
4	effectiveness of the Marine Managed Area. Is there
5	also a data set related to the actual performance
6	according to those indicators?
7	MR. FARROW: No, we're not actually
8	collecting the data for individual sites. We're just
9	wanting to find out at a very high level what they're
10	doing to measure effectiveness.
11	MR. SUMAN: Dan Suman. About Marine
12	Managed Areas, why not include sites designated in the
13	National Estuary Program of EPA?
14	MR. FARROW: My understanding is that the
15	National Estuary Program has no regulatory authority
16	associated with it, so it would not make the criteria
17	on regulation. It was primarily a planning program.
18	I believe well, it doesn't matter. Go ahead.
19	MR. PEAU: Lelei Peau. I just want to
20	follow up on that question of the process. One side
21	of the American Samoa is under local jurisdiction and
22	I didn't see that on your inventory. I was just

curious as to how that was determined and what was the process to -- what was the process to get the local authority to be part of the determination process.

MR. FARROW: There is -- we have plans to conduct -- to have a local component as well. had to prioritize our data collection efforts and so we haven't -- in most states it's a different issue than say in American Samoa, so we have not initiated a local data collection process until we finish the state data collection process. If there was a site, given the size of American Samoa, if there's one or two sites -- we never turn down data, so if there are one or two sites that are submitted -- I don't believe American Samoa has -- I don't know where the status, whether they've submitted their list back to our team, so we may not be aware of that yet. Once that's there and if there would be a site under local jurisdiction in that mix, it would be the first local site that would be in the inventory. We would probably just go ahead and put it up. Yes.

MR. MOON: Yes, Mel Moon. I notice that there was a lack of information in your inventory, at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

least in the West Coast, and perhaps on a national level to indigenous peoples and there -- obviously in their history they had ceded vast amounts of land in exchange for some treaty rights and rights to various resources. In particular on the West Coast you have 26 tribes in three states that have defined treaty rights through a course of years of litigation and definition, and when an activity takes place, a NEPA or some change to regulation or legislation in the ocean, there are some 72 tribes that are contacted in terms of the impacts that that may have on them.

So they're very much a part of the -- I guess the group or a political or a group of people with rights that need to be included. My question is, are they going to be included and to what extent are they going to be involved in a consultation or provide you with information?

MR. FARROW: The answer is, yes, the Executive Order also mentions tribal -- sites under tribal jurisdiction and we actually have an individual who has been working to compile those sites. The -- yeah, the schedule on this is a little delayed because

of the number of tribes that we've been working with.

Kate -- I think Kate Smuckler may be in the audience.

She's been the person working on this. So they will definitely be included, probably they'll start showing up a little bit later than federal and the state sites, but there's a very active effort to discuss and get their input.

MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, Mel, we've been working with folks at Bureau of Indian Affairs to make sure that we have at least a working list of tribes with coastal resource responsibilities around the U.S. and Kate Smuckler has been our primary worker on this. We're about ready to go forward with a list or a letter from me to the various tribes letting them know what we're doing and asking for -- letting them know we'd like to contact them and take this further and start working on this process tribe by tribe.

MR. MOON: There's an issue with I guess a timing element that if you're going to have a pilot study take place without the tribes being present, I think the timing is not right. You also have a cultural and traditional level of information that

needs to be incorporated as a layer into your studies as well.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay. Yes, Tundi.

DR. AGARDY: Tundi Agardy. I think you've done a great job. Really, it's superb to have all this information compiled and both the definition of the Marine Protected Areas and using the different Marine Management Areas, it doesn't bother me at all and I think, you know, we're progressing to the point where we can start to understand what we have in this country and what is missing.

To that point of what is missing, it would be useful now that you have the elements of the -- at least the basis for or a foundation for understanding where the Marine Protected Areas are and you have the contact information, and you can start to work down to even the local tribe level, it would be useful to go back and ask the question of the appropriate managers or entities that manage those protected areas, are there specific objectives that have been articulated for these protected areas of various types? Are there indicators, which is a question you've already asked

and bench marks and in your estimation, is the Marine Protected Areas working or not? It's a little bit alarming to see all these sites mapped and be faced with the fact that there are a lot -- even just the tally, you know, there are an awful lot of Marine Protected Areas out there and it might lead to the, I think, mistaken conclusion that the United States has an effective Marine Protected Areas system already.

MR. FARROW: In the data collection form, there is -- some of the questions begin to get at the purposes which may address your first question, the issue of asking about whether they are working or not, we discussed, it's very hard to capture that in this And there was a lot of debate. form. It's a large form, a large survey as it is and we've gotten a lot of push-back from states that said it's just too much. That's why we developed the state data collection So we're trying to find a balance intern program. between compiling this inventory so people know what's compiling it with a richness out there and of information that would answer a lot of questions but also may make it impossible to ever complete.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And the one thing I would say is by
getting well, two things. We in order to do
this, we have to do a Paperwork Reduction Act request
and so if we modify this, we will have to probably
modify that request. That's time consuming but by
eventually having a data base tool on the web that
would allow for editing and adding new sites, I think
in the future we may want to look at a second round
after you all look at this and say, "Well, what other
information we want".
It's certainly something to discuss and we
could make that request. It's much easier to go back

It's certainly something to discuss and we could make that request. It's much easier to go back and add one or two questions than to face this daunting task of filling this out for the first time.

I guess for time sake, can we just have one more question?

MR. BENDICK: Bob Bendick. I probably missed this, but is the data base that's been gathered by the survey actually associated in like an arc info format with the polygon boundaries of the protected areas?

MR. FARROW: There is a GIS that is in a

NEAL R. GROSS

software application. That only has a few attributes associated with each of those polygons. But we could associate the data base if we wanted to, if we wanted to provide that to people with the GIS system, and that's what we're hoping to design in the next couple of months and probably not the whole inventory, that would be pretty cumbersome, but a subset of important data fields so when you've clicked on a site, you could see information.

Also, if you go on the website, there's what we call a MPA profile or MMA profile and that provides everything about that site that's in the data base in a kind of user friendly report form.

MR. DENDICK: I think it would be useful to go on with that step that you just described for our purposes so that we could ask questions of the system and have them return in visual, you know, in map form rather than in long tables or charts.

MR. FARROW: Yeah, I think that's certainly something that we could work on and produce and we'd like to get guidance on what capabilities would be useful, not so much a public tool. It

doesn't work very well on the web but an internal tool for decision makers.

MR. DENDICK: The other thing is probably maybe we can talk about this afternoon but in the first presentation there was one bullet that talked about goals and gaps and heading toward an analysis to look at goals and gaps and I'd be interested in a more detailed description of sort of how we go from the inventory stage to that and what you envision by that and we can talk about that later, because it seems fairly important to what we're trying to do here.

MR. NUSSMAN: Mike Nussman, this is more of a statement than it is a question, perhaps, so it will be shorter. I understand the tremendous amount of work that it takes to put all this together and I can certainly appreciate that but I have to say, I'm somewhat disappointed that the couple questions we've had about evaluation we're not going to be able to have that component added, because obviously, there's a debate going on about how large a system do we need and what does it need to look like. And of course, evaluation and results are an important, maybe the

most important component of all that. So I would like to understand that and talk more about it, the evaluation piece, but I'd have to say, I wouldn't be satisfied by asking someone who runs that site are they doing a good job. That wouldn't be my evaluation. Thank you.

MR. FARROW: Well, when we debated putting that question in, we thought we could fill it in ahead of time. Okay.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay, thank you, Sorry to cut this short, but we are a bit behind schedule and we do have a public comment period that starts promptly at 11:00 o'clock. What we're going to third presentation from do is defer the Ginger Hinchcliff on the stewardship piece until after lunch so that we can keep the public comment period as scheduled.

So what we're going to do is take a short break. I would note on this inventory process, remember, this is a Federal Executive Order which directs federal agencies to do things. Participation by the states, the territories, the commonwealths, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

tribes is all voluntary. And so a lot of our process is working with them to get them to decide it's even worth working with us on this process, which is one of the reasons why it's taken quite awhile to get this information together.

That said, let's get back together promptly, please, at 11;00 o'clock and let's meet up on the stage at that point because we'll be hearing from the public. Thank you very much.

(A brief recess was taken.)

MR. HOUT: This is the time to give full time to the oral communication period. Consider this a one-minute warning. The periodic coming on and off of the lights is a technical problem. It's not somebody leaning on the light switch somewhere. We're trying to get it fixed.

This is the time set on the agenda and in the Federal Register Notice for oral communications from the public. We have indication from some 10 people who want to testify and that -- those are the people we will take first. Maggie will read the names. There's a five-minute -- there's a five-minute

duration time for speakers. We have, I think, the full hour and more. If we need it, we can run into the noon hour. So I'd ask Maggie if she can read it, to read the first name. I'd also like to mention that MS. ERNST: we've asked people to limit their comments to five minutes and at four and a half minutes Joe Uravitch will raise this red flag to let you know that your time is closing in on you. If your statement contains questions, we ask that they be in the form clarifying questions for the committee and finally, I'd like to remind all of the speakers, if you haven't done so already, to provide a written statement after the fact to me. And so we'll start with the first of the 10 speakers and we'd like to hear from Cheri Recchia and she's representing the Ocean Conservancy. MS. RECCHIA: Good morning, maybe I'll try this microphone. Is this any better? No? Perhaps you could come down MR. HOUT:

front and use one of the microphones in front or at

the podium.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS.	RECCHIA:	This is	like m	y personal
microphone advent	ture. Oka	y, is	that bet	ter. All
right, thank you	and good r	morning.	My nam	ne is Cheri
Recchia and I'm	Director o	f the Ed	cosystem	Protection
Program for the O	cean Conser	vancy.		

MR. HOUT: We're not getting any sound on the stage that we can hear.

MS. RECCHIA: I don't think that I can help with this. Is that any better? Okay. don't know, wave if it gets too loud or gross or something. Okay, starting over, good morning, my name is Cheri Recchia and I'm Director of the Ecosystem Protection Program for the Ocean Conservancy. Ocean Conservancy formerly the Center for Marine Conservation, is the country's largest organization dedicated exclusively to marine conservation. 10 offices around the country and we've been business for a little over 30 years and we have about 150,000 members nationwide.

I think as the debate here today and yesterday has reflected, the challenges facing this committee are substantial. The goal posed by the MPA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Executive Order to implement a comprehensive national system of Marine Protected Areas, that's an enormous goal and the challenges facing that are incredible. The committee is specifically charged with advising on the implementation of Section 4 of the MPA Executive Order and a casual reading of that reveals that it is also enormous. It includes questions such as where should MPAs be, how big should they be, how many should there be, what should they do, how much will they cost, how do you know if they're working and how do we start.

Each and every one of those areas clearly is huge, controversial and challenging. Clearly, you can't do it all. So the question is what can the committee do to help figure out how to advise this debate constructively and efficiently in the time available? I would suggest that the single biggest obstacle now facing all of us working on MPAs is the increasingly acrimonious debate. I would suggest that at this point it is difficult to have any sort of constructive dialogue about MPAs with anyone who does not share ones own views, whatever those views may be.

NEAL R. GROSS

For example, my organization, the Ocean Conservancy, has four different programs. We work on fisheries threatened management, species, water pollution and various aspects of ecosystem protection including coral reef conservation and marine protected areas. Only a fraction of our work is on MPAs and only a fraction of that is on no take reserves which are clearly the most controversial of the vast swath of areas that are called MPAs. Yet increasingly the organization is painted as one that seeks to close fishing vast areas of the ocean to organization that is simply anti-fishing.

This is patently untrue. Indeed many of our staff members are fishermen. But what's more important, I think, is that this kind of mischaracterization and misinformation typifies debate. And an asides, the MPA debate is increasingly us versus them. It's enviros versus fishing, oil and It's rec fishers versus commercial fishers. gas. feds, States versus scientists versus managers, it is, the point is the debate has become rancorous, acrimonious and counter-productive,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

particularly in the three years since the MPA Executive Order was issued. What do we do about this?

I suggest that the first step is for this committee to have frank and constructive dialogue about the subject. Yesterday I heard several people, I believe from the committee elude to the fact that the committee members are all on the same page, that they all are here because we agree the oceans are in trouble and we need to make better use of MPAs. I would suggest this is an optimistic view. I am fairly certain that the views held by the committee members are strongly divergent and strongly held.

Given the state of debate today, I think that's a good and necessary thing, although difficult for committee members. I am hoping and I think many of us in this room are hoping, that this will be a place where the strongly held divergent views can be expressed in a constructive, frank and productive way and that this committee can be one place where we start to make the debate more constructive. This committee may even be able to come up with specific suggestions, mechanisms for outreach tools, public

education devices, inter-governmental communication
structures, whatever, to help. To further that, the
committee may issue briefings on a variety of MPA
subjects, such as various governmental initiatives.
To answer another question from yesterday, the MPA
missions are not coherent. There are scientific
reviews, socio-economic analysis. There's the
committee who wish to work with people to develop an
agenda perhaps for the next meeting. This report
which you have been provided with this morning is one
example of an analysis of MPAs in the Gulf of Maine.
It shows a little bit of diversity of approaches and
the challenge ahead.

I will conclude by thanking the committee members for the time they will spend on this important debate and by wishing you good luck and productive discourse in your deliberations. Thank you.

MR. HOUT: Thank you.

MS. ERNST: Our next speaker is Jay Johnson from Ball Janic (ph) LLP and he's representing the commercial and recreational fishermen and support industries.

MR. JOHNSON: Is this okay? Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jay Johnson. served as the NOAA General Counsel for Fisheries from 1979 to 1988 and as NOAA's Deputy General Counsel 2000 retired from until January when Ι federal service. For more than two decades, I was principal legal advisor for all of NOAA's conservation and enforcement programs, working almost exclusively on issues arising under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, National Marine Sanctuaries Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

Let me explain to you briefly that all of those statutes have different purposes and are often conflicting. My current clients include 80,000 recreational fishermen, a commercial fleet of four high seas tetra processors (ph), a major international fish processing company that's United States owned, and a start-up marine aquaculture entrepreneur in Hawaii. What all of my clients have in common is a deep and abiding fear that the Federal Government will close their favorite fishing grounds, force them to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

relocate, increase their operating costs without their consent and without any showing that sustainable yields will increase. Their fears are well-taken because on the next to the last day of the Clinton Administration, that is precisely what happened to the small fleet of family owned boats that had fished for bottom fish in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands on a sustainable basis for decades.

My clients are not opposed to all Marine Indeed, they have actively supported Protected Areas. conservation benefits MPAs when the many were demonstrable scientifically. Rather they are opposed almost to a man and woman to a single type of MPA, the type that Rod Fujita has referred to as a fully protected no take marine reserve and others such as the Ocean Conservancy refer to as ocean wilderness but which I will refer to as permanent no fishing zones because that is what my clients legitimately perceive them to be.

As many of you already know the engine behind the no fishing zones bandwagon consists of scores of millions of dollars given annually in grants

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

from the Pew Charitable Trusts, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation and other philanthropic groups. support Those grants the Ocean Conservancy, Natural Resources Defense Council, Oceania, Environmental Defense, Sea Web, COMPASS, and other environmental advocacy groups as well as a few oceans commission. Thus far, in my opinion, all of these efforts have failed to make the case that permanent no fishing zones are superior do conventional fishery management in achieving the highest sustainable yields, that's whether you measure that sustainable yield in biological terms in recreational success rates, or economic terms.

from a following excerpts special issue entitled "Economic Models of Marine Protected Areas" printed by Arizona State University's Journal Resource Modeling, this winter, tend Natural skepticism. These are direct confirm my quotes. "With marine reserves the sustainable yield for any total stock size will always be less than or equal to the status quo sustainable yield for that total stock The lower the migration rate, the lower will be size.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the sustainable yield. Seen from the other side, the cost of producing any sustainable level of catch will be higher with marine reserves". That's Lee Anderson, College of Marine Studies, University of Delaware, 2002.

quote, "A given MPA may provide protection to fish stocks or sub-stocks in habitat inside its boundaries but can also be expected increase pressure on fish stocks or sub-stocks outside the habitat MPA unless redeployment of effort is displaced somehow constrained. An incorrectly sized or located MPA may actually increase the risk of depletion or collapse of some species and can easily reduce the sustainable value of the system of fisheries it impacts. Even when an MPA increases the productivity of the fish stocks directly impacted by it, other biologically separate fisheries and incomes from fishermen dependent on them, may fall as a result of displaced effort those fisheries absorb. We should not assume that the impacts of large scale MPAs will be positive or benign. If large MPAs are implemented, we should not assume that the remaining

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

unclosed areas can still support the same level of harvest as the entire fishery did", David S. Holland, School for Marine Science and Technology, University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth, 2002.

In closing I would like to offer to you some principles to guide the exercise of federal discretion to establish areas within an eco-system where all fishing would be prohibited. should be scientific evidence that the standard biological yield of the fishery will be equal to or higher than the sustainable biological yield that could have been obtained from the same eco-system using conventional fishery management measures. those measures are temporary area closures and specific area closures.

Two; the sustainable economic yield from the fishery should be equal to or higher than the sustainable economic yield that could have been obtained with conventional fishery management. Three; a full environmental impact statement should be prepared that takes into account both positive and negative effects on the human environment. Clearly

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there will be positive environmental effects with any closed area, at least initially. Negative effects, however, could include displaced fishing effort outside the closed areas, increased enforcement costs, increased fuel consumption, decreased fish supplies, decreased sport fishing revenues and those fish supplies and sport fishing revenues support many of our coastal communities.

MR. HOUT: Your time has expired.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll take one minute more, Since scientific knowledge will improve and please. economic factors will change over time, there should sunset provision. Finally, and though recognize that there are economic gains from fish watching, whale watching, et cetera, you need to take that in context. One example, when the National Park Service excluded commercial fishermen from Glacier Bay National Park, they invited in approximately double the number of cruise ships. I don't necessarily think that the eco-system benefited. Thank you very much.

MR. HOUT: Thank you.

MS. ERNST: Our next speaker is Kitty

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Simmonds. She is representing the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council.

MS. SIMMONDS: Thank you very much. just wanted to say a couple of things. One is that our council and the Western Pacific Region, we've established a Marine Protected Area Working Group made different of individuals from all of the up disciplines; sociology, economics, fisheries biology, and the like and this group is developing a policy for the council to follow as we try to develop Marine Some of the things that they've Protected Areas. asked us to consider is that we need to establish a for scientific process for designation, a process criteria, socio-economic criteria, coordinated а monitoring program, to assess effectiveness of these areas and developing provisions for assessing long-term demonstrable benefits to the eco-system, the fisheries and society as a whole.

The other thing that I want to say was that over the last 25 years our council as well as other councils have developed what we've just called closures and we've had several different closures that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	we developed with the fishermen, with the community
2	and hopefully with this new emphasis on MPAs, the
3	scientists will assess the effectiveness of these
4	closures. Our closures in the Northwestern Hawaiian
5	Islands and elsewhere have never been assessed. So
6	hopefully this will happen. The other thing is that I
7	do want to congratulate the staff for quickly
8	developing this inventory because you need to know
9	what you have out there before you can really get into
10	working on what's necessary.
11	And the last thing that I might offer to
12	the lady from the Ocean Conservancy that would be
13	helpful to all of us is to stop suing the Federal
14	Government because that isn't useful. Thank you very
15	much.
16	MR. HOUT: Thank you, Kitty.
17	MS. ERNST: Our next speaker is Bonnie
18	Mckay, a candidate for the Federal Advisory Committee.
19	MR. HOUT: Is Bonnie with us? Evidently
20	not. We'll move on. The flashing lights are
21	evidently going to be with us until after lunch. So

bear with us.

1	MS. ERNST: We'll move to our fifth
2	speaker then and that's Dr. Anthony Chatwin and he is
3	also a candidate whose background check is pending.
4	He is representing the Nature Conservancy.
5	DR. CHATWIN: Well, good morning future
6	fellow committee members, hopefully. Thanks for the
7	opportunity to be able to share with you
8	MR. HOUT: Can you get as close as you can
9	to the microphone?
LO	DR. CHATWIN: Sure, is that better? Well,
L1	good morning, future fellow committee members and
L2	thanks for the opportunity to just share a few
L3	thoughts with you this morning. I think I
L4	understand the mission of this committee to be very
L5	clear from the Executive Order and that's to develop a
L6	national system of Marine Protected Areas to help
L7	protect the significant natural and cultural resources
L8	within the marine environment for the benefit of
L9	present and future generations.
20	I think that's very clear and as a marine
21	conservation planner, that sounds like a mandate to do

marine conservation planning. And what I would offer

to the committee is that there are several conservation planning approaches out there that I think we should look at and that I think can help us structure the work from here on in a way that we can then engage in discussing about the issues that we need to discuss.

aspect of conservation of one planning is to break down this mandate into achievable goals and I would suggest that as far as the natural heritage goals or the natural resources goals, I think the most important one for future generations insuring that this national system of Marine Protected Areas can act as a tool to protect marine biodiversity and I would offer that -- we can do that. There is no single agency that is responsible for protecting marine bio-diversity but there are numerous within the Department of agencies Commerce and Interior that have responsibilities for components of bio-diversity and we can help add value to their work by looking at bio-diversity, marine biodiversity and its protection through this network of marine protected areas and I look forward to doing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	chac with you all. mank you very much.
2	MR. HOUT: Thank you, look forward to
3	having you up here with us.
4	DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, and I'd just like
5	to thank the committee members who have gone out of
6	their way to insure that our voice was also heard. So
7	I really appreciate that. Thank you.
8	MS. ERNST: Our next speaker is Barbara
9	Stevenson, also part of the group of six waiting to be
10	formally appointed to the committee.
11	MS. STEVENSON: I always did like being an
12	outsider. Hopefully soon, I'll be sitting up there.
13	There are a couple of things that I wanted to share
14	with you and part of it is what I was going to say
15	were I up there yesterday because in a lot of ways
16	it's helpful for you to know where I come from. I'm
17	on the New England Fishery Management Council. I'm
18	ending my ninth year. Eight and a half years ago in
19	the very first action on my service on the New England
20	Council I voted to close the areas that I had
21	previously fished and they are still closed.

One of the problems is that we knew they

were the wrong -- they were partially the right areas and partially the wrong areas then but they were delineated and what can you do in an emergency action. You do things that are already delineated. Well, the very next action we were supposed to do was to make them the right areas. I'm leaving in August and they still aren't the right areas. They are effective but the example is that it's very difficult to change something once you've done it, so you'd better be sure it's right the first time.

Secondly, I was Chairman of the committee that developed the process for opening areas that were I was also chairman of the committee that closed. developed the process for allowing competing interests in when they would have some degree of impact but not a totally detrimental impact on the purpose of a So I've spent a lot of my recent years closed area. dealing with at least some aspects of the closures. will note that you do not have an entire list of the names of different kinds of closures. Three came instantly to mind to me because have we closures, and we have DAMs and we have SAMs. And they

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

weren't even on your list of kinds of closures. I would suggest that if you want to look at current MPA closures in the broader sense as to how industry has to deal with them, that you visit my website which is BDSSR.com. It is an industry site, but I have listed every month all the closures and types of closures that we have to deal with other than the DAMs and SAMs because they're too quick.

The other comment that I would like to make is that in the very last presentation that we had, I'm a little confused as to why their definition of MMAs is different than the MPA definitions but even given that, there are a number of New England closures that would meet that requirement that are not on the list. I would suggest that for the federal closures, federal areas that would meet the MPA list, that it be listed why they aren't on the MMA list because one of the -- there is one particular closure that bothers me as much as I think that closures are good, and if that's not on the list because it's not effected, boy, do I want to know that.

So I think it would be helpful to all of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	us to know why the ones that at least at first glance
2	should have been on the list, aren't. Thank you and I
3	hope I'm up there soon.
4	MR. HOUT: Thank you. Next time at the
5	table.
6	MS. ERNST: We'd like to now hear from
7	Alex Stone, who is the Executive Director of
8	ReefKeeper International.
9	MR. HOUT: And please get as close to the
10	microphone as you can.
11	MR. STONE: How's this, close enough?
12	MR. HOUT: Thank you.
13	MR. STONE: Good morning, committee
14	members and thank you very much for this opportunity
15	to address you. My name is Alexander Stone. I'm
16	Executive Director of ReefKeeper International.
17	ReefKeeper has been involved in Marine Protected Area
18	creation for 25 years. Starting in 1978 with the
19	state level creation in Florida of the Biscayne Bay
20	Lobster Sanctuary to most recently the federal efforts
21	to create a ecological reserve under the Florida Keys

National Marine Sanctuary and the currently ongoing

renewal efforts to extend the Aqualina (ph) Experimental Reserve in the South Atlantic and the Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps Reserves in the Gulf of Mexico. Based on all that experience and all of the different MPAs and MPA effort that we've been involved in, we have five points that we would like you to consider as you begin your work.

First of all, number one, have no doubt that your task is urgent because in our estimation the need for MPAs is urgent. I'm not going to recount for you all the different reports that are floating around, have been coming out for many years on the ongoing deterioration of the ocean environment. Fish stocks are declining. Marine water is being polluted. Ocean health is deteriorating. And I mention all of those because I want to make a point that MPAs are not just about fishing. They should not be just about fishing.

Point number two; please consider that MPAs are a necessary insurance policy, a necessary public insurance policy against management failure to correct these very serious ocean problems that we are

faced with. I recommend processes to create Marine Protected Areas where the Marine Protected Area is termed to be another tool in our management tool box.

I'm asking you to view MPAs differently. View them as an essential backstop. That's what they are supposed — that's what they are made as, as a reserve against possible ongoing worsening conditions if standard management doesn't work because there is no guarantee that standard management is going to work.

Number three; Ι would ask you approach MPA functions not just as a means to prevent the extraction of resources from a given area, but also as a means to prevent the infusion of degrading an area, such as pollutants, debris, inputs into sedimentation and so on because I repeat, it's not just about no taking. It's about ecological health and insurance policy for our public resources.

Number four; we would ask the committee to raise the bar of your expectations for MPAs. We don't believe -- ReefKeeper doesn't believe it is good enough just to aim to rebuild or maintain some minimum level of sustainability. We think we should look

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

further in your work. We think that we should look to reinstate and preserve the abundance and ecological health that once was and could be again particularly through a system of marine protected areas.

And finally, we ask that you resolve to act now or as quickly as you can based on scientific information already available on MPAs and their effectiveness. Please, don't reinvent the wheel calling for new studies that simply confirm what existing studies have already demonstrated. Make yourselves action group rather than an study committee, please. In the end, your effectiveness at least from the point of view of our constituents is going to be measured by how many MPAs you help create, not by how many reports you help generate.

And to that end, ReefKeeper International stands ready to help you and wishes you every success in your endeavor as you begin them. Thank you very much.

MR. HOUT: Thank you.

MS. ERNST: Our next speaker is Hanna Gillelan. She's representing MCBI.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. GILLELAN: Hi, can you hear me? Μy is Hannah Gillelan. I work with the Marine Conservation Biology Institute which was mentioned yesterday in regards to the cooperation with the Coastal Society in what led up to the Executive Order. I just wanted to make the point that in a lot of the comments we've heard so far and in a lot of the discussion we've had in the past two days, questions have come up with this committee should do and to me one of the most essential questions that should be addressed, one of the most critical questions is what the purpose of a nationwide system of MPAs is or That purpose will guide what an MPA should should be. defined what criteria should be used as, designate an MPA, and what the process should be to go through with such a designation.

Additionally, such a clear purpose, I think would help overcome or at least clear the waters of some of the acrimony that has gone on and lead to a better understanding of when an MPA is effective or when it's not. In relation to that last point, I just wanted to say in regards to effectiveness, I think the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

question is not just whether the MPA has met the purpose for which it was designated, but whether it could meet the purpose for which it was designated. In other words, some of the questions which came up most recently in Oculina and whether that area should be extended into future years, there was insufficient enforcement and insufficient funding and there was a question as to whether it was wise to continue having a reserve when there was insufficient funding and it wasn't necessarily an effective reserve according to some people.

So to me the lesson learned from that recent discussion is that the concern should not just be whether it has been effective but whether it could be with more enforcement, with more funding or with other resources which leads me to another point that I think the committee could be helpful with which is identifying areas that the two agencies, Commerce and Interior, could take to better increase effectiveness of MPAs, whether that's better funding or a targeted funding to particular areas, whether it's increased cooperation between the two agencies, between the two

agencies and other federal agencies as evidenced by the ex officio members, better cooperation with states, whether they have ideas has been mentioned a number of times on how to involve stakeholders or other groups. Thank you.

MR. HOUT: Thank you.

MS. ERNST: Our ninth speaker is Ryck Lydecker from BOATUS.

MR. LYDECKER: Yes, good morning. Ryck Lydecker and I'm Assistant Vice President for Government Affairs for BOATUS. That stands for Boat Owners Association of the United States. I'm also the Associate Editor of BOATUS magazine. As our name organization implies, we're а membership of We have 540,000 members across recreational boaters. the country, a very large percentage of whom use their boats in our oceans, coastal and Great Lakes waters, in other words, in very marine environments that this committee is charged with considering.

Recreational boating is a huge constituency in this debate and I must say I'm disappointed that no one from the boating industry or

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the boating advocacy community is represented on the committee today. As MPAs effect access to the water for recreational boating, this is very, important concern for us. Nonetheless, it has been said that the problem with marine protected areas is that the term means different things to different On the contrary, I think the term means people. precisely the same thing to different people, at least to the members of the two stakeholder groups that I hear from most frequently.

If you use the term Marine Protected Area around an environmentalist, for want of a better term, or a recreational angler, both of them will hear the same thing, no take/no fishing zone. You've heard some of that already. I was only able to attend the morning session yesterday where the committee was introduced, so I don't want to belabor the fishing/no fishing if that was discussed further. But if you accept the definition of the Executive Order that we saw on the screen earlier, we have by that definition, I gather over 1,000, perhaps 1500 MPAs in the U.S. We've had Marine Protected Areas for years, decades in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fact. But the other more restrictive meaning, the no fishing zone implied, is a more recent concept. I guess because I'm a journalist by trade, and I'm concerned with terminology and definitions and language, that bothers me. I think we need to use definitions that mean something. I think the one in the Executive Order is perfectly serviceable as a collective term and there are all sorts of regulatory permeatations under that.

I hope you, as a committee, and the will use that term such. In agency as deliberations, if you are talking about no fishing zones, then by all means, say so. All of us, and I this committee, mean bу this, that management authorities, Interior, NOAA, and the stakeholder organizations, do a disservice to the boating public, to the voting public if our language is ambiguous. And Ι from the slides earlier the as saw classifications, the language is going get disheartedly more complex.

There are too many statutory or regulatory designations out there now and when a new term or more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

likely a shorthand acronym pops up, the boating public groans, "What are they doing to us now"? As an example of that, about, I guess maybe six months ago there was a -- NOAA declared a new zone of protection around the Florida Keys meant to keep large vessels away from the coral reefs, but when it was announced I got all kinds of calls from our members in Florida concerned that there was yet another regulatory level laid on them, and I had to say, "No, this is for large vessels and of course, you have an obligation as a boater to avoid the coral reefs".

Well, I hope as this committee continues its work it will consider the existing MPAs. We just heard a call a minute ago for you to be measured by the number that you create. I don't know that that's the proper measure at this point. I think we should consider the existing MPAs, are they doing their job. They're created for various purposes. That's why this inventory we saw this morning is so important in my opinion. As you consider, are the individual areas meeting their missions.

Speaking of the Florida Keys, I want to

give you an example of something that's not working and perhaps the committee could help here. Scarring of sea grass beds by boats is a big problem. We work very hard to educate our members to avoid sea grass beds and if they do happen to go aground to minimize damage and don't try to, you know, power off and all of that. And apparently there are miles of what they call orphan scars down there where boats have gone through and there's no culprit was found, but there are also damaged beds for which fines have been levied and restoration costs already calculated but they've not been restored, sometimes not for years.

In fact, I was just told of one, of a damaged area that goes back 10 years and it was not restored and apparently the erosion continues, the habitat continues to deteriorate and I don't know why this should be, if it's lack of funds or bureaucratic red tape, but I would hope that this committee would examine these existing MPAs before they commit to working on creating any new ones.

To sum up my initial point, I would like to ask you to use the term "Marine Protected Area" in

1	its broadest sense and when you talk about management
2	measures, within a given category or at an individual
3	site, please be specific so that we know what you
4	mean. You have the opportunity to make boaters
5	advocates or adversaries and sometimes the difference
6	hangs on a word.
7	MR. HOUT: Thank you.
8	MS. ERNST: Our last speaker is Michael
9	Doneley from the Recreational Fishing Alliance.
10	MR. DONELEY: Thank you for the
11	opportunity today. Rather than simply repeat many of
12	the comments you heard, I'll say I think Mr. Lydecker
13	and Mr. Chatwin did an excellent job or representing
14	the views and concerns of the recreational fishing
15	community. I will simply submit our comments in
16	writing for you to review and consider another time.
17	Thank you.
18	MR. HOUT: That completes the list of
19	people who have signed up. If there are people who
20	have not spoken and wish to communicate with the
21	committee at this time, we would entertain that as

time permits, again with the five-minute rule in

certainly in place. Please step to the microphone, give us your name and affiliation, if any, for the Court Reporter.

I am Eric Gilman. MR. GILMAN: I am a candidate for the committee and I'm representing the National Audubon Society. I just want to briefly suggest a process for the committee to establish a national representative system of MPAs and I want to propose five over-arching components to the process just sort of as a starting point for discussion. first step would be defining committee purpose. Ιt would be useful to confirm the committee's mandate for the Executive Order. My interpretation is that the mandate might be broken into two components to create an ocean legacy by saving diverse and relatively undisturbed ocean eco-systems and cultural resources and to achieve ecological and economic sustainability.

We're all in the dark now. The second step would be to assess what constitutes a representative system, to assess and define what constitutes the representative system. For instance, what should be the components of the full range of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ocean eco-systems and what is the appropriate scale for each eco-system. A third step would be a gap analysis to review the MPA centers' inventory and other relevant information identify sources, to natural and cultural resources that aren't currently preserved. They aren't in protective status otherwise not ecologically or economically sustainably managed.

This analysis should also include an evaluation of the effectiveness of existing MPAs to determine to what degree for achieving their purpose and if they have the capacity to do so. And also it would assess how the MPA system can preserve critical habitat for migratory and trans-boundary wildlife. A fourth step would be to identify candidate sites and to identify both U.S. and multi-lateral trans-boundary areas to establish new protected areas or to improve the management of existing protected areas based on the results of the two previous steps.

And finally it would be -- the final step would be to identify priorities to network protected areas to create a system. For instance, the committee

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	can assess how to establish a standardized site based
2	and regional monitoring and evaluation methods.
3	That's just my suggestions. Thank you.
4	MR. HOUT: Thank you. Any additional
5	comments for the committee, anyone that wants to
6	address the committee that hasn't spoken. Seeing
7	none, I think we will proceed to adjourn for lunch and
8	return at 1:30 to take up the remaining items starting
9	off with Ginger Hinchcliff's presentation. And by
10	that time, I would hope that we will have the wiring
11	which seems to date from the Hoover Administration,
12	corrected.
13	(Whereupon at 11:49 a.m. a luncheon recess
14	was taken.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

(1:33 p.m.)

MR. HOUT: Well, the appointed hour has arrived. It's truly a pleasure to introduce Ginger Hinchcliff, who is my former colleague when I worked for the Coastal Services Center. She was based on Charleston and I was based in Honolulu. I had the better assignment, I think but we talked a lot. She, in her real life, is a program manager of the Coastal Learning Center down at Charleston but is also heading up the MPA Training and Technical Assistance Institute which is not a very large organization, as she'll probably tell you. Ginger?

MS. HINCHCLIFF: Thanks, Eldon. Well, welcome back from lunch. Glad to see some of you all have eaten and are ready to go again. I know this was supposed to be this morning, but since we ran late, I'm pleased to be able to present this afternoon. This actually comes at a good time in that it's after the public comment. Dan Farrow, when he was talking about inventories, set it up fairly well in that there is 1,000 to 1500 existing MPAs. In the public

NEAL R. GROSS

comments we also heard that we not only have to think about the national system, but what about the existing ones, what are their capabilities now and can we build them up so that they can be effective, and this is really what I'm going to address during this presentation.

During the presentation, first, I'm going to, of course, focus on goal one and this is the stewardship goal rather than the building the network We're going to talk a little bit about the goal and the methodology of a needs assessment of findings and then what I'd like you to do is we're going to walk through and I'm going to be asking from feedback feedback doesn't from you. The have t.o come necessarily today but this is one of the charges, if I'd really be interested in hearing back you will. and when I say "I", I'm referring to the entire center would be interested in hearing your opinions.

And some of the things specifically we'd like to hear about is that I'm going to -- or during the needs assessment, you all have received a copy of it. It's the little booklet that was handed out this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

morning. In this it talks about 23 different elements of needs that Coastal Management, current Coastal or MPA managers need and one of the things I'd like to hear back from you at some point is talking about what do you think are the most critical? What would be your priorities in terms of addressing their needs. Also, as they're defined now, I'd be very interested in hearing if you have any further articulation or definition of those needs. Maybe we've missed some. Identify some gaps.

And lastly, one of the key needs is really being able to get to the stakeholders and this is was articulated by a lot something that of managers and we would love to hear your input in how best to reach out to the stakeholders that you And some of this is covered in the needs represent. but we'd again, be very interested in hearing that piece as well.

As I mentioned, this focuses mostly on the stewardship role and in Section 4, it very clearly talks about this national system but it also talks about, you know, enhancing what's already there,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

building the capacity of the present MPA managers or management regimes, so that they're able to do their job effectively.

These are a series of objectives that fall under Goal 1, and Joe actually went through the goals during his presentations but I'd like to focus just on the first one, "Assess the needs of existing MPAs". That's one of our primary objectives, you know, under this goal. We also have things like effectiveness, looking at science, facilitate the development sharing and application, you know, all the -- down to public awareness, all of this is important but I want to just talk about the needs assessment right now and what we've done to date.

Many of you are probably familiar with needs assessments. It's basically a gap analysis; what's currently, what is the desired state and were is the gap and we do it for a couple of reasons. First of all, we recognize that there's lots of ongoing MPAs efforts. There's lots of groups that are already providing services to Marine Protected Areas and at the National Center we certainly don't want to

duplicate any ongoing efforts. That would just be, you know, not what we want to do.

The is that second we want be responsive to the needs of the community. We want to collect the information systematically. As Joe had mentioned before, we heard lots of needs and sometimes the folks with the loudest voices get heard but there is a majority of folks that are silent and so by doing a needs assessment, or conducting a needs assessment, it's a more methodical or systematic collection of So we're hearing from across the whole range needs. as opposed to just the people that have the ability to get their voices heard.

Another thing a needs assessment always does is it starts to build rapport with the MPA community and this is because we're asking them what are their needs, what are their priorities, those kinds of things. And lastly, but probably most importantly is that insures the effectiveness of our projects. Joe had mentioned that there was two drivers for the projects that he listed yesterday as sort of what we're doing already. The first one, were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

direct things out of the Executive Order. It says, "Build a website", we're going to do that. But we also completed this needs assessment to help us focus and say, "Let's address the needs that are there as well. And so starting with needs, we have a much better way of knowing whether or projects are effective or not.

Very briefly, the time frame. We started in May, ended in February of `02. The goal was to identify information skills, tools and processes. Now, a lot of times needs assessment only looks at information and we made a special point of looking at the skills, the tools, those kinds of things as well. The use, of course, was to design our services. And the target audience for this needs assessment was actually the MPA managers themselves.

And as MPA managers, I use that term fairly broadly in that I mean both state, national, regional but the folks that are more involved with the site based management and we recognize that the MPA communities certainly are much, much larger than that, but in order to do an effective needs assessment. You

have to focus that audience down and because of our stewardship goal, we felt like this was a priority; what's out there, how can we help them do a better job at what they're already doing?

The other thing that I want to mention is just because we focused on that audience, does not mean that we only ask them what their needs were. We actually did what we call triangulation which very much like the nautical, we're focused on coastal managers but we ask them questions, but we also ask lots of the different stakeholders what managers need to do a better job. So for instance, we asked fishermen, we asked enforcement, we asked, you know, lots and lots of different groups, cruise industry, we said you know, "What needs -- what do you coastal managers, MPA managers, need to do a better job", because you get different things from different people.

The classic example, if you will, is if you ask a mid-level manager what they need, they say, "Well, I need stress management". If you ask their boss what they need, they say, "Time management".

NEAL R. GROSS

Different needs but you need to sort of get the whole picture before we start addressing needs.

As I mentioned, there are actually a couple different objectives. First of all, what are their priorities as well as specific acts, knowledge and skills? We also wanted to talk about attitudes and motivations and dis-incentives that could impact manager's abilities to benefit from any kind of products or services we're going to be able to provide.

The who is the sub-group. As I mentioned before, we use this term fairly broadly and there's lots of different ways of slicing it. So for instance, we can look at the coastal or the MPA management community and say, "Okay, educators really need this level but the researchers have that down". Or we could say, "You know, sanctuary people really need this but Fish and Wildlife has that down", so we looked at the sub-samples as well.

And lastly, we talked about how we can best reach them, so we asked them, "How do you prefer to get information, what's your primary means"? In

the methodology, we covered a number terms of different things. We did look at the literature. Wе held focus groups. Those were held actually in four different locations around the country. We conducted phone interviews with another almost 30 people and to fill in the different gaps, whether was geographically or the kinds of input that we wanted to We also actually did some computer work looking at what LexusNexus information was saying about Marine Protected Areas. We also, of course, got information from different meetings, conferences and discussion lists that we were able to monitor during that time.

The needs assessment itself is broken into The first one is on policy and legal three sections. issues. Second on science and technology and the third one is on MPA program implementation. All these are in your book. Please, please, you know, look through those. However, today what we're going to primarily focus on in this presentation is on Section 3 because again, the stewardship piece. Very briefly, legal issues responsible authorities, the and everything from the defining terminology that we've

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

heard over and over again, to managing across jurisdictions and you can look down at the other kinds of ideas or needs that came up.

Under the science and technology, starting with the inventory and monitoring needs, which are great, went on to mapping and spacial analysis needs through the sciences. A lot of needs were articulated specifically about getting the science into the hands of management and finally, just a bit on climate This is a section I'd like to focus primarily and this was the program implementation. This was the largest section and again, you're going to be able to look through each of the sections, you know, as you want to but these particular sections have a lot of interest and hopefully could benefit from some focused attention from you all. We're going to look at the public education, the stakeholder, visitor impacts enforcement and then of course, evaluating MPA effectiveness.

What we heard with public education was very broadly. We need more of it. Now, one of the things that came across very clearly is not only do we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

need more information about MPAs specifically but we need more information, education, about marine resources in general. I don't think this surprises any of you here. Another thing that we heard very clearly is that they wanted non-biased information. And it was really interesting because almost every sector that talked has a bias by somebody, possibly academians exempted from that but everyone perceives biases.

So for instance, if the Federal Government is doing education, there's a perceived bias. Ιf there is а non-profit doing education, there's perceived biases and so one of the needs, of course, was not only this non-biased information but they wanted it at the local level. They felt that that was extremely important. And the last one that came out quite a bit is the idea that graphics and images to communicate and share ideas are really important, and I think we've talked about the values of GIS already and just being able to picture what you're talking about.

At this point, I also want to mention that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

there's lots and lots of details. In this report we literally have dozens and dozens of specific comments that we receive during this. This is just the summary.

Stakeholder and community involvement, the first one we heard is that it must be meaningful and not formula driven and I don't know exactly what people are referring to or if they are referring to the same process or the same formula all the time but they felt that sometimes you just get in this pattern and the people that know the pattern are able to jump in, but in order to be meaningful, it cannot be formula driven.

They felt like every case is different and that's an important thing because I know you all have been talking about let's think about big processes, so if that's where you want to go, you also need to think about the flexibility to make it relevant and meaningful at the individual sites or at least this is what they want.

Process knowledge skills are required. It was pretty clear that a lot of resource managers and

MPA managers come through either a natural science background or sometimes policy, but things like facilitation skills, not necessarily taught in the sciences, really important the people and the managers have the skills so that they can reach effectively. Local involvement balanced with a top down approach is something that they wanted, obviously, lots of local involvement but sometimes people felt that too much local involvement, they needed to have a perspective, a broader perspective as well.

Of course, they wanted multiple methods or means of disseminating the information and the equitable treatment of different stakeholders was a pretty hot one and as you read through this, you'll find that we weren't -- we were able to get some very truthful kinds of needs from people and one of the things that was most upsetting to people is if they felt they were being treated as a stakeholder group, if they felt they were being treated differently than the other stakeholders.

In terms of managing visitor impacts, this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

came up a number of times as well. And the first one in terms of actually balancing public access with protection and that's something that's longstanding. I think any natural resource manager deals with that. But that continues to be an important factor and maybe is even increasingly important because of the increasing use of the coastal areas and that kind of thing. And it's not just safety kinds of things but it's also visitor experience kinds of things. So are they having the quality of experience that they would like to have when they go scuba diving.

The non-consumptive recreational impacts, things like changing behaviors of animals, you know, it's non-consumptive but when you have 30,000 people in a two-square mile area, you know, maybe there's impacts. So whether it's consumptive or non, to recognize and actually plan and manage for those impacts. And of course, the other big one is this idea of multiple jurisdictions within an area. One of the things that we heard over and over again is because there's so many different layers, the public people trying to actually do the right thing are

confused by the multiple layers and so that can be very difficult for them.

Enforcement is something that's increasingly important. Lots and lots of needs around that. First officer training and resources basically there's not enough officers and they don't have enough training and they need additional resources in order to effectively enforce the existing Marine Protected Areas. One of the things that happens over and over again is the unclear boundaries and the regulations and so even if you have enforcement officers, can they get something all the way through court in order to enforce.

The role of education and outreach was closely linked with enforcement. Many times the role of enforcement is education first. There is a quote in the report that talks about the 80/20 rule or the 80/15/5 rule. Most people, 80 percent of the people are going to do what they're supposed to do all the time. Twenty percent divides out. If they're being watched, about 15 percent of the people will do the right thing, and five percent are going to do what

they want to anyway. But if they're not being watched, that 15 percent starts sliding over towards the five percent. The idea that some laws enforced and some are not also came out. Specifically the fishing rules, terms of some of commercial fishing but not recreational, those kinds of ideas came out and also just the management's -importance of management understanding different legal frameworks of adjacent or overlapping jurisdictions, all big needs within enforcement.

In terms of the effectiveness and I know that you all have talked about this some as well, evaluation and monitoring to see if they're actually meeting established goals. And they talked about that in a couple different ways. First of all, they're interested in doing that and they, a lot of times, don't have the resources to do that or the skills to do that. A second thing that they talked about is a little concern of this is the reason why they were established and they're meeting those goals. Is it fair to judge them on some other goal and that came across as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

evaluations should The look both at ecological and socio-economic impacts which almost implies that when we're looking at goals to include both the social and the natural science goals. Very clearly the evaluation process should be built into new efforts. I think most people are in agreement with that and also the idea that evaluation standards be designed and people were looking guidance for help in designing these standards.

I'd invite you to look through this at your leisure, but the way we're going to be using this information and the way we have been using this information is first of all, like I said, this is one of the drivers of the Marine Protected Areas' center projects and a lot of our projects that we've started this year or have been continuing relate directly back to some of the findings of the needs assessment.

A lot of us and particularly the training and technical assistants do, we provide direct services. We are providing training. We're providing technical assistance but we also recognize that we're not the only game in town, that we want to make sure

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that there's good resources elsewhere so one of the ways we're using this needs assessment is actually to help partner with other groups. For instance, we've taken these kinds of needs assessment, talked to different academic institutions. We've talked to a number of different groups saying, "Hey, these are the needs. Are there any of these that you're able to meet? Are there things you're doing now that could be slightly tweaked?"

For instance the National Training Center, Conservation Training Center the National in Shepherdstown, which is a fish and wildlife facility primarily, we're starting to work with them, saying, "Hey, can we fit marine stuff into your extremely well-established and well-thought of curriculum"? The other thing that we're doing with out needs assessment is that we don't plan to quit doing them. We feel like it's very important to continue to listen to people and as Joe mentioned before, this was our first and our primary needs assessment. We're actually taking some of these and getting more information on them. Specifically, we have a technology needs

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

assessment right now going on but we're planning on additional needs assessments in the future to get that specific information so when we work with groups, we can know their needs as opposed to trying to say, "Oh, we know what you need, let us help you". We want to make sure we hear it from them.

So again, what I'd love for you to help us with is first, as you look through this, to get back to us on which elements do you feel are most critical from your position, from your world, from the views of your stakeholders, which of these elements are most important for us to tackle as sort of a priority issue? We're starting on a number of them. We'd love your input on that.

The second is, just from your definitions, perhaps you can further define some of the needs that are out there and as you look through this, you know, go ahead, scratch them down. Say, "This wasn't covered, this wasn't captured", this is something that I've heard as well. The gaps, whether there's issue gaps or just maybe some articulation of needs that were gapped.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	And lastly, and this is an important one,
2	is to recommend the best mechanism for engaging the
3	stakeholders you represent into the ongoing management
4	processes. And this information can do two things.
5	One, it can help us, you know, collectively with the
6	Marine Protected Area Center and our partners to
7	better engage stakeholders but we also do lots of
8	training and skill building, capacity building for
9	managers and would love to have them have that same
10	ability to better engage the stakeholders as they're
11	planning, not just as you start an MPA but the entire
12	process which is certainly as important.
13	Does anyone have any questions for me?
14	Yes, sir.
15	MR. RADONSKI: Gil Radonski. Your the
16	questions up there, you're obviously asking people
17	questions about MPAs getting feedback. Who's
18	designing your questionnaires? Are the questions
19	asked so that they don't solicit a specific answer?
20	MS. HINCHCLIFF: Yes, we did not use a
21	questionnaire at all. What we used were focus groups
I	

and interviews and the way those were structured as

1	when the group, like a focus group would come in and
2	we would ask them to identify what their priority
3	issues were and say, "What you know, what are you
4	pulling your hair out on? What are you dealing with
5	most frequently"? And they would brainstorm and then
6	collectively as a group, they would actually go
7	through a priority process where they would put dots
8	or whatever, and basically come up with three to five
9	and then we would discuss those in-depth and saying,
10	"Okay, why is it a problem, what you know, why is
11	it a bottleneck", you know, those kinds of questions.
12	We do not have, sort of is this a problem?
13	One of the things we find in needs
14	assessment is if you say, "Is this an answer", people
15	go, "Oh, yeah, that's a good answer". You know, we
16	wanted to get at their needs rather than their wants
17	or their instant ideas of solutions.
18	MR. RADONSKI: One more question.
19	MS. HINCHCLIFF: Sure.
20	MR. RADONSKI: One of your statements up
21	there was local level involvement with
22	MS. HINCHCLIFF: National

1	MR. RADONSKI: with top down something.
2	MS. HINCHCLIFF: Right.
3	MR. RADONSKI: Where was that one?
4	MS. HINCHCLIFF: I think that was
5	MR. RADONSKI: Right there, "Local level
6	involvement balanced with top down approach", would
7	you explain that?
8	MS. HINCHCLIFF: It's it was an idea
9	that came out that they want lots of local involvement
10	in order to be meaningful. At the same time, they
11	wanted some national perspective brought into it. So
12	there are people that are saying, "Okay, we're working
13	at the national level, we're working at the national
14	level, but they also wanted that top down or national
15	perspective brought to bear on their issues as well.
16	It was, you know, perhaps not everyone but we heard it
17	a couple different times, so that's why it's up on the
18	slide, but you can probably read the quote, couple of
19	the quotes right in the book where we got that from.
20	Yes, ma'am.
21	DR. GARZA: Dolly Garza, thank you. So in
22	your presentation it sounded like you've had meetings

1	with various groups. Are you intending to continue
2	meetings throughout the states and if so, are you
3	asking us as advisory council members to give you
4	ideas of when and where and to whom you should meet
5	with?
6	MS. HINCHCLIFF: At this point, this
7	particular needs assessment is completed. And so for
8	this particular, no, we're not looking to do
9	additional. But the idea in the future that we will
10	continue to listen to needs is very much part of our
11	game plan. We have nothing specific planned in terms
12	of this national level again.
13	DR. GARZA: Okay, so then based upon
14	request, I mean, if the native tribes in Alaska get
15	together once a year and we generally have the biology
16	people there, then can a request go to you guys to
17	have you meet with them?
18	MS. HINCHCLIFF: Yeah, I think that would
19	be a fine idea. We would be very interested in
20	hearing that. Thank you. I'm going to go back to
21	any other questions? Thank you.
l	II

MR. HOUT: We will reassemble at the table

as soon as we get the screen out. Well, we've reassembled for committee discussion on organizational and functional matters. That must include just about everything. You've survived faulty wiring, funny funky public address system and I was shocked and amazed to find that they changed the entry to the Hoover Building when I went out for lunch, so it's good that we're all back.

Given the nature of the next part of the fact program, the it's basically going discussion among yourselves and with Joe and Maggie and Charlie, I'm going to excuse myself and thank you for your discipline and good wishes and hope to see you again soon, but sitting in the audience rather than here at the kind of temporary chair of your It's been a pleasure. organization. This is an impressive group of heavy hitters. Thanks. And Maggie has some housekeeping arrangements.

MS. ERNST: That I'll intersperse over the course of the afternoon. Eldon, you had gathered a number of agenda items from this morning that we were to cover this afternoon. Do you still have those?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. HOUT: I think you can handle it.

MS. ERNST: I recall a variety of issues that you wanted to try to cover this afternoon related to starting to draft the agenda for the next meeting and we wanted to solicit ideas from you on how you can best communicate after we leave this meeting. There are -- I think there was a suggestion yesterday to start developing priorities based on the short to medium term charges that you heard about yesterday and got more detail on today. So I think unless the subject of getting more specificity on how to go forward with the eventual nomination and voting of the chair for the committee.

There were a series of maybe four or five of those issues that we wanted to try to cover this afternoon. So I am by default, I guess, going to suggest that we just keep an eye on the clock to make sure we don't -- we apportion enough time for each of these, but if no one has any objections, we might start with suggestions for the agenda for the next meeting and then move on from there. Yes, Tundi?

DR. AGARDY: An idea I have, two really

small points that really don't fit with any of the things that you mentioned but I just want to throw them out there.

MS. ERNST: Please do.

DR. AGARDY: Questions, actually procedural questions. One is that I wondered if there's any way to access the Cvs of the committee I personally would like to know more about my colleagues and I know those of my colleagues who have published on the issue of Marine Protected Areas, I'd love to know about recent publications that I might not know about and request copies of them and so forth and so I wonder if that's a possibility. the second question I have is I am very concerned about the lack of Environmental Protection Agency representation as ex officio and I know there was a lot of enthusiasm on the part of EPA after the Executive Order was issued and I understand that there are reasons that EPA has kind of diminished in stature but I think that we ought to think very broadly about all of these marine issues and pollution is a very important issue and bу not having the federal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

representation of the agency that is most dealing with the pollution issue, I think we're missing something.

So I wondered if we could influence that in time for the next meeting.

Yeah, I'll answer that and MS. ERNST: then Joe can add on to that. I'll answer your second question first. We intend to have an ex officio representative from the EPA joining your committee. Regretfully, the letter going out from us went out in the middle of May and it didn't give all the agencies enough time to properly designate a representative and I would possibly quess that the fact that EPA will be looking for a new administrator may have something to do with that as well. And so we're very interested I reconstituting the inter-agency working group and existed a few years ago and when we break up from our meeting, we'll be moving forward to contact the other agencies that weren't represented here today.

And to answer your first question, I guess you're suggesting that you'd like more detail than we've provided on the short bibliographies that we've included in the handout, the books you received and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we'd like to get feedback we'd be on those biographies. I meant to say biographies, sorry about We'd like to get feedback on those. We got it from a few. We'd be happy to modify those and bring them up to date and we, in our files, have fuller CV's that we'd be happy to share but those are a bit dated, so if you so want to refresh the file, please send me a copy of a CV and I will collect as many as I can and then forward them to all of you, particularly in terms of preparing to vote for a chair. That should be very helpful for that, too.

DR. FUJITA: Yeah, Maggie, as you eluded to in your opening remarks, I think there's a number of things that we need to move forward with this afternoon. We have a limited amount of time, so I want to suggest a sequence of events for discussion and maybe we can apportion our time accordingly. To me, the most important thing we have to do first is to get clear on our charge and our purpose and specify the goals that are related to that charge and purpose. For me the priority is as I said before, to try to deliver a planning process that all the federal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

agencies that we're advising can use to scope marine research and Marine Protected Areas and Marine Managed Areas, whatever you want to call them, including an outreach component. A second thing that we need to do this afternoon, I think, is to decide on a process for electing our chair. We had a discussion this morning but I think because there's no mechanism that we've agreed on to make motions, second them and approve them, we just sort of had an open-ended debate and I'd like to see some kind of process to get closure on some of these elements this afternoon.

Thirdly, we need to discuss the agenda for meeting which the I think will flow next logically, more systematically after we're clear our charge and our specific goals. And then finally, I think it would be useful if we could agree on some tentative meeting dates both for a call-in, if we choose to go that way to elect our chair, and for a more substantive meeting because it's much easier to compare calendars. We're all here in person and I say tentative, because we don't want to make conclusion on that until we have all our members

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

seated, I think.

MS. ERNST: Robert? I also neglected to mention that there was some discussion about trying to look at your charter and suggesting short-term changes that we could make to it over the course of the summer.

MR. ZALES: In relation to what was just said and maybe step into the second thing, but I would suggest that if by consensus or whatever, that this committee adopt a procedure such as Roberts Rules as a guideline to go by, not that you have to strictly adhere to it but to give you a guideline if people are uncomfortable with that. But that would kind of set out the procedure for doing what has been suggested.

MS. ERNST: I confess I'm not an expert on parliamentary procedure and we will do our best here today and we assume that whoever becomes the chair of the committee will work with you to adopt possibly that approach or some other once you, you know, are fully formed and running. So you'll bear with us today if we don't adopt that.

MR. ZALES: Well, I wasn't suggesting for

1	today. I'm talking about for the next meeting, for
2	the procedure for the new chair and the agenda and the
3	whole bit at that point dealing with the order of
4	business of the committee with a guide rather than
5	just kind of haphazard.
6	MS. ERNST: Terry?
7	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes, I agree. I think
8	that if we could at least make motions, take some
9	votes and as Rod said, get some closure on some issues
10	rather than just discussion, that way we know we've
11	settled an issue and we can move on.
12	MS. ERNST: With the caveat that not
13	everybody is here and so we're walking that fine line
14	about the kind of business you can do given that
15	you're partially represented.
16	MR. O'HALLORAN: Right, I understand that
17	but some of the things that we're now, I have some
18	power. Go ahead.
19	DR. BROMLEY: Well, I thought I asked the
20	question this morning about are we able to conduct
21	business without 30 people here and I thought the
22	answer was yes, and now

1	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes.
2	DR. BROMLEY: sorry, Terry, but I read
3	from you that we can't do anything because those
4	people aren't here.
5	MR. O'HALLORAN: Oh, no, no, that's
6	not what I'm saying at all. I'm saying we need we
7	do need to get some closure. And like what Rodney
8	said, that we need to have some closure, which means
9	that we might have to say I have a motion and
10	discussion and vote or however we do that, but some
11	way to close on each issue so we can proceed.
12	MR. URAVITCH: You are a duly constituted
13	committee and they have the authority to vote. I
14	think the question related more to the selection of a
15	chair for the committee and I think that's maybe
16	that's one of the first issues that ought to be
17	addressed is your view on that particular part of the
18	process. But, yes, this is a duly constituted
19	committee and you do have the authority to vote.
20	MS. ERNST: I apologize for getting some
21	confusion into the mix.
22	DR. PEREYRA: To move things along, I'd

make a motion that we adopt Robert Rules of Order as the guiding principle for the conduct of business of our Advisory Committee.

MR. ZALES: I'll second that.

MR. URAVITCH: Is there, yes, discussion?

MS. WILLIAMS: Actually, two questions. Is everyone here familiar with what is in Roberts Rules and how you conduct the meetings accordingly? And what does the committee handbook say as to how we will conduct our meetings since no one has produced that document for us to look at? And those are just questions.

I believe that we have that MS. ERNST: handbook back in the office. We can't -- we don't have it available to distribute it to you now but we can mail it to you and I -- without having seen it, I gathered from Alice McKenna's that there presentation yesterday that you have an option procedural choices for -- but once you decide on one and if you choose to codify it in your charter, that's what you would be using, but we will share that with you. Yes? John?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. OGDEN: Could I make a suggestion that we don't get bogged down in this discussion now. should be taken up when we have a chair and we're discussing essentially conducting we're the committee's business. Right have the now we suggestion by Rod to have -- we have four things that I think we can achieve by simple consensus. need to have -- we're not going to be voting on these things at this point in time. We're simply discussing procedural matters. It strikes me all of these things can be achieved by consensus without worrying right now about that, although I take the point of both Wally and Bob that this is an important point for later on.

Could we just -- because we have to move ahead. We really do have to get going here. People will be leaving in an hour and 45 minutes.

MS. ERNST: So with that, I'd suggest we begin with what Rod had suggested should be the priority for the group to consider this afternoon and that was a discussion on your charge and purpose and the kind of planning process you might want to develop

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to go forward. Mark?

DR. HIXON: I agree that our charge and purpose is extremely important. I also see that as being a fairly protracted discussion at this point. So I'd like to see the sort of shorter term items taken care of first. Say, number one, how are we going to select a chair and then maybe go back to the charge of the committee or maybe even second, get the agenda set up for our next meeting. That's my opinion.

MS. ERNST: Dolly?

DR. GARZA: Thank you, I agree with Mark.

I think that that first one could take us until midnight or until we all fall over, so perhaps going to how will we elect a chair and the agenda for the next meeting as well as the location and possible dates, if we can narrow those down.

MS. ERNST: We have -- Bob?

MR. ZALES: Yeah, I would suggest in that context then that rather than try to play with chair and vice chair, what are we doing to do with that electronically, because I see this as a very simple,

NEAL R. GROSS

not very time consuming process. If we can just kind of agree by consensus to do that at the next meeting as the first order of business. Establish an agenda type here so that you know where you are and just put that at the top of that because I don't see that process drawing out very long, but I do see it electronically lasting more than 15 or 20 minutes. It may do that at the meeting, but I don't see it doing that.

That's what I would suggest we do and that way we can kind of get off that ball and get into the agenda and then to the rest of what Rod suggested.

MS. ERNST: Bob?

MR. DENDICK: Well, it's a little hard to establish the agenda without knowing what our purpose is and particularly given a limited number of meetings. I still am interested in the question I asked yesterday which is the staff has been working on this for several years and what their view of the most important three things we should be doing, but we don't have the consensus that we want to even get into this discussion, but at some point we need to frame

the issues and the focus of what we are supposed to be doing and what -- we cannot probably remake the entire world or the world beyond the land. We need to have some specific sense of where we're headed and we need to decide when and how we're going to -- if we don't decide what it is, we've got to decide when and how we're going to decide what it is.

I think Bob's question has DR. BROMLEY: triggered a thought in my mind which has been sort of bubbling around over the last day and a half and that is are we here to advise the MPA center or are we here to advise the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior and my answer is, it is the latter and we have had wonderful -- if I may put it in terms, staff work, having been done over the last several years by the MPA Center. They are a wonderful resource but I understand our charter to be to address the questions in the Order that direct us to advise the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior on what has been done, how well has it been done, what might be done in the future. I have no doubt that the MPA Center will benefit from that. I have no doubt that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they will be participants in that conversation. But I don't understand that we are here to respond to the request of the MPA Center, with all due respect. We are here to respond to the imperatives in the Executive Order which is to advise the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. So maybe we'd better get this clarified further.

MR. URAVITCH: If I may, I'm not here representing the MPA Center, nor were choices of what ought to be discussed. The function of this committee is to advise the two departments in terms of activities under Section 4 of the Executive Order and the three specific areas of initial focus for the committee presented this morning were those were agreed upon by both the Department Commerce and the Department of the Interior and we, as staff, were basically providing background information related to the whole question of terms and definitions and how you all could help us in the process of helping clarify that debate which continues to rage around the country.

So that is the first charge to this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

committee from the two departments is to help address that specific question. The second relates to the whole process of the national system and framework for the design of the national system, the beginning of which is the work that we're doing on this national inventory and the terms and definitions associated with that along with the soon published Joint Federal Register Notice by the two departments. And again, your ability to help us both reach out to the stakeholder communities that represent as well as gain from your expertise and knowledge on this and help us in this public process that we hope to start by the end of the week with the publication of this notice, which will start to define what sites go on the Marine Managed Area inventory, which are going to lead us to a lot of these valuative functions and other functions that we've been discussing for the past day and half.

And the third charge from the two departments was Ginger's at the last related to one of the primary goals of the Executive Order which is how we make existing MPAs more effective and efficient in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	doing what it is they were established for and what
2	you saw this morning was an initial presentation by
3	the Director of our Training and Technical Assistance
4	Institute on what we've heard from the public so far
5	and what we need your advice on now is where do we go
6	from there related to that. And we also did raise the
7	question of, yes, we want to hear about other things
8	that we ought to address.
9	DR. McLELLAN: This thing that you're
10	publishing in the Federal Register next week on the
11	issue of
12	MR. URAVITCH: The inventory, yes.
13	DR. McLELLAN: Did we get a full
14	understanding of that, what is being published from
15	the time today?
16	MR. URAVITCH: That may not have been
17	clear. It's a specific Federal Register Notice that
18	the two departments have been working on essentially
19	for a couple years to try and clarify how sites get
20	placed on this inventory of Marine Managed Areas.
21	It's part of a longer term process that was in Dan
22	Farrow's discussion which leads us to this list of

1	Marine Protected Areas called for under Section 5 of
2	the Executive Order so that inventory has a number of
3	different purposes.
4	One is to help us do a variety of analyses
5	that need to be done in terms of thinking about where
6	we go forward as a nation with the whole concept of
7	marine protected areas. The other relates to a very
8	focused use pertaining to Section 5 of the Executive
9	Order, that's a list of protected MPAs and the
10	requirements for federal agencies to avoid harm to
11	those sites on that specific list. So there are two
12	things happening with this Federal Register Notice.
13	DR. McLELLAN: So the notice is in draft
14	at the present time?
15	MR. URAVITCH: It was just signed on
16	Friday and it will be going out for public comment, we
17	hope, this coming Friday.
18	DR. McLELLAN: So it's timely for us to
19	wait on that or should we be looking at that before
20	MR. URAVITCH: It will be timely for you
21	to look at it as soon as it is published because it
22	will be out for public review for at least 60 days.

	DR.	McLELLAN:	Thank	you
--	-----	-----------	-------	-----

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. URAVITCH: Dr. Garza.

I guess I need to DR. GARZA: Thank you. get back to Wally's motion that we have at least Robert's Rules of Order for the remainder of today so we could stick on one particular subject and take some action, otherwise we're talking -- sometimes we may think we're agreeing with what someone is saying when, in fact, we're not and we're changing subjects and we're going to be here till midnight. So getting back the order that was suggested and perhaps chairmanship is the first one which we may be able to deal with. Although it can be quick, the concerns I have are with the four candidates, we have one who has not yet been cleared through security and so do we hold off elections until after she is cleared through security.

The second question that was brought up earlier was should it be a majority vote? I didn't hear anybody shaking their heads no, but we did not decide clearly or publicly yes.

MR. URAVITCH: Do I hear a motion?

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. HIXON: I have a suggestion and that
is we have basically four questions. And we can just
do it by raising our hands and be done with it without
getting bogged down in procedures. Bob has made a
suggestion that we postpone selection of the chair to
the beginning of the next meeting so that we can do it
face to face rather than trying to do it
electronically. That's a question.

Another question is, okay, well, but they're related to each other so maybe let's look to them first. Another one is the issue of whether we want to have a vice chair as well as a chair. Another issue is -- Dolly, would you repeat the two you just did so I don't misquote you?

DR. GARZA: Do we need a majority vote for one person and then the final one, which does -- which gets eliminated if we do wait for the next one, is the fact that we have one candidate who's not currently seated.

MR. RADONSKI: You said that the procedure for voting is in the charter. Didn't you tell me that this morning for the chairman, that it had to be a

NEAL R. GROSS

1	majority?
2	MS. ERNST: That's written into your
3	charter, a majority vote of the full committee.
4	MR. RADONSKI: Then we don't need to vote
5	on that.
6	DR. GARZA: Okay, so I would move that we
7	postpone the election of chair till the next meeting.
8	DR. HIXON: Second.
9	MR. URAVITCH: Discussion?
10	MR. ZALES: Move to call.
11	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, the question has been
12	called. All in favor?
13	DR. HIXON: Call the question.
14	MR. URAVITCH: Call the question.
15	MR. PEAU: What do we do when we come to
16	the next meeting and that one person that is unseated
17	is not clear? Do we postpone another vote or proceed
18	with the voting?
19	MR. URAVITCH: I think we should proceed.
20	MR. PEAU: I just want to be clear on
21	that.
22	MR. RAY: Before we go on, there's just

one caveat. I would recommend that prior to the next meeting that two things, people be allowed to send in any additional nomination recommendations in and secondly that I think what you should do is send back out a package to us of all the nominees and any other supporting information that a candidate might want to provide the whole committee in consideration of them being chosen.

And then just one other point, is you can simplify the process and the voting process if you let the vice chair be the person that comes in second place and you don't have a separate slate of candidates. That's a simple way to pick a vice chair. It's a thought, it's a suggestion.

MS. ERNST: Yeah, that's how we would go and change your charter and we would add that language. We would, of course, run it by all of you just to confirm that.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes.

MS. WILLIAMS: The problem that I have with the suggestion of whoever isn't chosen chair would be vice chair, someone may be willing to serve

NEAL R. GROSS

1	as vice chair and not necessarily want to serve as
2	chair, especially when once you looked at what your
3	duties are as chair person, you may be willing to
4	temporarily serve such as which is what the vice
5	chairman would do. So I don't think that we can just
6	go with whoever comes in second is going to be vice
7	chair. I would be in opposition to that.
8	MR. URAVITCH: Dr. Garza?
9	DR. GARZA: The motion on the table is to
10	postpone the election till next meeting, if we could
11	get passed that first step.
12	MR. URAVITCH: Right, we could settle that
13	and then we could discuss later the amendments to the
14	charter which we would build this into, whatever the
15	decision of the committee is.
16	DR. FUJITA: Clarification; does the
17	motion include the possibility at the next meeting as
18	a conference call or does it have to be a face to
19	face?
20	MR. ZALES: Face to face.
21	MR. URAVITCH: All right, any objection?
22	Are we ready for a vote on this? Okay, all in favor

1	of basically deferring the election with the
2	appropriate caveats we've heard related to sending out
3	information, please raise their hands.
4	(Hands raised)
5	MR. URAVITCH: All opposed? Seeing none,
6	the motion is carried and the election is deferred to
7	the next meeting?
8	(Applause)
9	MR. URAVITCH: First decision. Dr. Garza.
10	DR. GARZA: Okay, I'm on a roll here. I
11	know Roberts Rules of Order inside and out. I would
12	move that we request that the charter be amended to
13	allow for a vice chair and that that position be voted
14	on at the next meeting.
15	MR. ZALES: I second.
16	MR. URAVITCH: Discussion?
17	MR. RADONSKI: And this would go back to
18	the previous motion which I can't do anything about
19	but just a word, when people are submitting their
20	qualifications for chair, I would like them to include
21	some of their experience in running a meeting.

MS. ERNST: Did I hear you also say that

1	you'd like a nomination process for the vice chair as
2	well? Is that a consensus?
3	DR. BROMLEY: Bob was good enough is it
4	all right if I call you Bob, Bob? Bob was good enough
5	before we started to distribute his interest and bona
6	fides and so on but I would is it clear that now at
7	this stage, these things would come to Maggie and then
8	she would distribute them to everybody? Is that
9	right, and maybe as a package so that we wouldn't get
10	them one at a time? Is that understood is the way we
11	would proceed? Whatever material the interested
12	parties which to submit, the submit it to Maggie or is
13	it Margaret? Maggie?
14	MS. ERNST: It's actually Marjorie.
15	DR. BROMLEY: Marjorie, sorry. Ms. Ernst
16	and that you would then distribute that, is that
17	right? Is that okay?
18	MS. ERNST: Yeah, the electronic approach
19	goes to all of you at once as well.
20	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, let me read the list
21	of what I've heard in terms of the charter so far over
22	the past day and a half. There was the issue of the

vice chair. I've heard a question related to the section in the charter on working groups which says that they all have to be co-chaired by a scientist and some people have raised some objections to that, that maybe that doesn't have to be the case for all working groups but that's what the charter presently says.

a question about operations There was Right now that is capped at \$250,000.00 for the operation of the committee. There was the question raised yesterday about the need for a quorum and how one would define that. And we had some discussion about the issued related to quorums and how that might pose some difficulties for meetings depending on how many people show up. There was the technical correction for the Coast Guard which has been reorganized out of the Department of Transportation and into the Department of Homeland Security.

And there was the question related to the elections of the chair and I would assume vice chair needing a clear majority to be the chair or some variation on that theme as we've heard in terms of the vice chair being the runner up. And those are the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

issues I've heard so far as possible charter changes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

1

I would like to offer a DR. BROMLEY: motion that in paragraph 3 of our objectives and duties, the word, the third word, I'm sounding like a lawyer now, the third word in paragraph 3 that says "shall", that this word be changed to "may", so that "We may establish scientific working committees", not that we shall. And if we do that, then much of our think goes away because Ι if paragraph 2, it says "We may, with the concurrence of the secretaries establish subcommittees as need", and then the whole issue of who chairs and is it a scientist or not a scientist, I think we've finessed that and I would imagine that it might be easy to get the word "shall" changed to "may" and then I think we're home free.

18

Sorry, that's a long awkward motion but just change a word and I think we're out of difficulty for the most part.

21

22

DR. HIXON: I have a sense we're getting off track. The talk just now -- Dolly was talking

1	about changing the charter just as it had to do with
2	getting the vice chair elected. That was what was on
3	the table. So rather than trying to address every
4	single change in the charter that we've been bringing
5	up the last two days, I'd like to suggest that we just
6	get done with that one issue, are we the motion of
7	changing the charter to add a vice chair. We did? I
8	thought we only voted once. Had we voted once and
9	that was just to select a chair at the next meeting.
10	MR. URAVITCH: Yes, correct.
11	DR. HIXON: We never got through the
12	second vote, so I'd like to get that done first, if we
13	could.
14	MR. URAVITCH: Let me just point out,
15	though, it is not that simple a process to change the
16	charter and we would prefer to do this once because it
17	requires a major process going through the Department
18	of Commerce and legal counsel.
19	MR. RADONSKI: Yesterday, I heard that
20	some people are appointed to a two-year term and some
21	to a one-year term. Is that correct or not? I heard

that.

	MR. URAVITCH: No, sir, everyone is on a
2	two-year term.
3	MR. RADONSKI: Thank you.
4	MS. ERNST: There are criteria for what
5	constitutes a major amendment versus a minor
6	amendment, so we would have to based on what you
7	would want to see changed, we would have to bundle
8	them into major or minor amendments and go forward
9	separately with changes to the charter.
10	DR. PEREYRA: I call a motion on the vice
11	chair.
12	MS. ERNST: Dan Suman had a question.
13	DR. SUMAN: I'd like to make a suggestion,
14	in Section Number 3, that we perhaps change the word
15	"scientific" to or eliminate "scientific" in that
16	first line and then down again toward the end.
17	"Scientific working group", just eliminate
18	"scientific" or just add "scientific and social,
19	socio-economic" as well, in both.
20	MR. PEAU: Just a point of
21	DR. SUMAN: Just eliminate "scientific"
22	and just say "working groups".
	1

1	MR. PEAU: Just a point of clarification,
2	I think there's a suggestion on the table to limit our
3	discussion on charter just on the vice chair. If
4	that's not the consensus of the group, then I suggest
5	that we defer this discussion until next meeting.
6	MR. URAVITCH: Yes.
7	MS. WILLIAMS: The question has been
8	called. That means that you can't have any more
9	discussions under the Roberts Rules of Order. Then
10	you have to call and ask for a vote on whether or not
11	you can call the question. I thought the question was
12	called. I didn't hear someone say that?
13	MR. URAVITCH: It was not clear.
14	PARTICIPANT: On the previous motion.
15	MS. WILLIAMS: Which is on the vice chair,
16	but we're discussing something else. Right, we were
17	discussing the vice chair.
18	DR. GARZA: Let's if you strictly
19	follow Robert's Rules of Order, when you call for the
20	question, you're calling whether or not there are any
21	further questions on the subject at hand and then you
22	vote. So when she called for the question, there was

1	a further question, and so we called for the question
2	again and nobody brings anything else up and then we
3	vote. So I call for the question.
4	MR. URAVITCH: Okay. The question relates
5	to the selection of a vice chair and the process for
6	so doing.
7	PARTICIPANT: Put it in the charter.
8	MR. URAVITCH: Well, but to put it in the
9	charter that there will be a vice chair.
10	DR. GARZA: Correct. So the motion was to
11	create the vice chair position by amending the charter
12	and having the vote for the vice chair at the next
13	meeting as a separate vote from the chair position.
14	That was it.
15	DR. BROMLEY: I second the motion.
16	MR. URAVITCH: All right, discussion?
17	Lelei?
18	MR. PEAU: I don't want to be out of order
19	but I was going to introduce a second motion.
20	MR. URAVITCH: We still have
21	MR. PEAU: Yeah, but can I say point of
22	clarification? There was some discussion on whether

1	we want to do a complete review of the charter, minor
2	change versus a package of a complete review of the
3	charter. There wasn't any I guess what I'm seeking
4	for is a clarification, what are we doing here, are we
5	looking at a short-term fix or are we looking at a
6	long-term?
7	MR. URAVITCH: Kay?
8	MS. WILLIAMS: I was going to make a
9	substitute motion. The substitute motion would say
10	that the vice chair shall be selected from the
11	membership by a majority vote of the full committee.
12	The vice chair would serve a two-year term.
13	MR. URAVITCH: All right, a substitute
14	motion has been offered. Do I hear a second? No
15	second.
16	DR. BROMLEY: I'll second it.
17	MR. URAVITCH: We have a second.
18	MS. WILLIAMS: This is adding
19	clarification.
20	MR. URAVITCH: Ms. Williams.
21	MS. WILLIAMS: The clarification is
22	exactly what we were talking about earlier when

Marjorie brought it up and I heard no opposition. So I thought by there not being any opposition, that we had agreed to do just that. Since it was brought up that the reason we will have a separate election for the vice chair is so that the runner-up doesn't necessarily get vice chair, because that individual, while they may be willing to serve as chair, would not want to be vice chair, or vice-versa. That's the reason I made the motion for us to elect the vice chair just as we would the chair.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes?

DR. GARZA: That was the intent of my motion, and the only thing different is that it requires that the charter be changed, otherwise we're not supposed to do it. But I did say, "by separate election," so it wasn't the runner-up gets it.

So I was trying to incorporate yours into it and I was trying to bring it to a motion because, as I said earlier, we're talking about things and we're assuming, if no one disagrees with me, then everybody must agree with me, which isn't true. Although I think it should be true sometimes.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	(Laughter.)
2	MR. URAVITCH: Dr. Agardy?
3	DR. AGARDY: I think that there is some
4	confusion or derailment of the process because there
5	are actually two issues. One is whether we agree with
6	the idea of having a separate vote for a vice-chair,
7	and secondly, whether we agree to amend the charter.
8	I guess my question I don't want to complicate
9	matters " is, do we really need to amend the charter in
LO	order to have a vice-chair, or can we just agree to
1	have a vice-chair and not amend the charter?
L2	MR. URAVITCH: You must indeed amend the
L3	charter, because you are not allowed to have a vice-
L4	chair if the charter does not call for one.
L5	DR. AGARDY: So can I suggest we have two
L6	separate motions, one motion regarding the election of
L7	a vice chair, and the second motion be that we
L8	recommend the charter be amended to reflect that
L9	procedure?
20	MR. URAVITCH: Dr. Garza?
21	DR. GARZA: Yes, I think if we follow Kay's

substitute motion that that would be the first motion,

and the second would be to amend the charter to allow for that. We may, at that time, consider other charter options.

MR. URAVITCH: Let me introduce Jim Kendall from the Department of the Interior, who is substituting for Pete DeWitt. Jim?

MR. KENDALL: Maybe I can help a little bit. I am the Executive Secretary to the MMS Scientific Committee, which is very similar to this. Jim Ray has been on the Scientific Committee, and Steve Murray. Our chair and vice chair are elected separately. The reason we do that is because they sometimes are different disciplines. One could be a biologist, and one could be a social scientist.

Typically, the vice-chair, after working with the chair, if it works out, could be elected as the chair the next time elections come up. Then you have a different discipline as the chair, and then there's an election for the vice-chair, which is a different discipline. So you have a balance there. The chair and the vice-chair are different disciplines, working together.

NEAL R. GROSS

It works for us, and that's just an example, if that helps at all. Jim, Steve, you all have had experience with MMS' Scientific Committee.

MR. URAVITCH: Bob, you have a question?

MR. ZALES: A couple of points. That's one scenario I would suggest, though, that after two years is up then whatever happens with "because obviously, maybe they want to go and limit terms, or whatever "but the Committee, I think, would be free to choose the vice chair as chair, if they wanted, or not.

My main point is to the issue of the charter. To try to save time here, so you don; t have constant votes on well, if you pass this for vice chair, then let's put it in the charter. If we do something else for wording in the charter, then you pass it to put in the charter. Let's kind of go along with the "deal with it for chair, we go along for the vice-chair, whatever we come to as consensus that will affect the change of the charter, do them all.

Then, in one consensus vote say, okay, all these go into changing the charter. Then that's the way the charter gets amended.

DR. GARZA: I would call for question on the substitute motion, which requires that we vote on a vice-chair at the next meeting.

MR. URAVITCH: All in favor, please raise your hands.

MR. URAVITCH: Opposed? One in opposition.

I'll state my reasons for DR. PEREYRA: being in opposition, because it speaks to the full committee and I'm concerned on two points. point is we may not have a full committee, which is 30 individuals. There may be one that might be not And secondly, the full committee, the way this reads now, we'd have to have votes from those that were not present, so I think that it has to modified slightly which is what I was going to do as a friendly amendment, that it be modified slightly to be include only those committee members that approved and present at the meeting so we can get away from this problem of all of a sudden having do so some sort of an electronic selection process. The way the charter reads now, it's the full committee which is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	the way I read that it would mean, it would be the
2	full 30 members.
3	MR. URAVITCH: Dr. Garza?
4	DR. GARZA: I think if we let this motion
5	go we could make a separate motion that would refer to
6	both
7	DR. PEREYRA: That's fine. I change my
8	vote.
9	MR. URAVITCH: All right, the second
10	motion I heard was that the proposal that the charter
11	be amended to take that into consideration. Shall we
12	add Dr. Pereyra's proposal as well?
13	DR. PEREYRA: It's Wally.
14	MR. URAVITCH: Wally. Okay, the motion on
15	the floor pertains to amending the charter or
16	recommend amending of the charter to incorporate the
17	selection of a vice president as well was a friendly
18	amendment pertaining to the approval of those a
19	majority vote and approval by those present
20	substituting for the full committee so that we don't
21	need 30 members present in order to vote.
	1

DR. GARZA: We voted on the vice chair.

1	DR. PEREYRA: Right.
2	DR. GARZA: So then you would make the
3	motion now that we amend the charter to a majority of
4	those present at a public meeting.
5	DR. PEREYRA: Yes, both the committee
6	members that are present and standing which mean would
7	have to be approved.
8	DR. GARZA: If that's the motion, I'll
9	second it.
10	DR. PEREYRA: Thank you.
11	MR. URAVITCH: Discussion?
12	MR. RAY: Just as a side point, I think
13	it's very important we keep track of all of the
14	recommendations for changes to the charter so that we
15	can once we all end all these various discussions,
16	we can consolidate those and take a nice clear look at
17	what we're recommending be done so, as Joe said, we
18	only do it once.
19	MR. URAVITCH: Staff will definitely do
20	that. We'll have that ready for you. We also have to
21	run these by the two departments as well, because they
22	have to give their approval to any charter amendments.

DR. MURRAY: I think we need to appreciate
that we need to move along here and get this done,
because it's been pointed out that getting the charter
amended is not necessarily an easy quick process and
therefore, if we have other changes to make, we'd
better get those made. Also it seems to me that we
need to be thinking first and foremost about changing
the charter so components to our decision making that
go like, we're going to elect a vice chair at the next
meeting are really not necessarily what we need to do
to the charter. The charter says, we want a vice
chair, period. Then we agree by consensus or we're
going to elect it at the next meeting. We're going to
elect it by a process. But we'd better get on this
and get it really boiled down to what this charter is
going to look like and make these decisions because I
have the feeling that we're really engaged in a series
of entangled communications and we really are all
headed in the same direction.

DR. BROMLEY: Yeah, I would like to second what Steve said, not second in Robert's Rules of Order but reinforce it and I come back to my mistimed and

NEAL R. GROSS

misplaced motion about the language of paragraphs 2 and 3 and would like to try again to see if we can't -- since we're doing this, see if we can't change the "shall" "may", word to so that may appoint we scientific working groups and we may create subcommittees and is this important for us because now we are directed, "we shall scientific working group", and I wonder if we want to be constrained that way or do we wish to have it be that "we may appoint a scientific working group". it may seem trivial but I do think it's important. So I offer my motion again.

MR. URAVITCH: Mr. O'Halloran?

MR. O'HALLORAN: I like your suggestion about the change of word. I think that that does a lot for this. There was an earlier suggestion about removing the word "scientific" from "working groups", and it seems that if that were to take place, it would give us the flexibility to create scientific working groups and other working groups that might not be science based and I think we might need some of those in this process. So I would like to -- I'd like to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	add, if I may
2	DR. BROMLEY: Kind of a friendly
3	amendment.
4	MR. O'HALLORAN: Dan, may I call you Dan?
5	DR. BROMLEY: I think so.
6	MR. O'HALLORAN: Okay.
7	DR. BROMLEY: My friends do. They call me
8	other things, but that's a good start.
9	MR. O'HALLORAN: We'll start there, that
10	we remove the word change the word "shall" to
11	"may", and remove "scientific" from that paragraph.
12	DR. CRUICKSHANK: With regard to that,
13	there's another issue. "The working group shall be
14	co-chaired by a scientist from the MPA". So but in
15	other words, it shall be co-chaired. There is nothing
16	here that says it has to be chaired by a scientist, is
17	there?
18	MR. ZALES: I'm just going to suggest that
19	starting on paragraph 3 where we're talking about
20	changing "shall" to "may", and then where it's got
21	"scientific" leave that but "or other working" which
22	allows you to do either/or. You get down in there to

where it's got "any working group created shall", you change that to "may be co-chaired". I mean, we may decide that may be what we want to do and then, again, we may not. And then you get into number four and this committee "may deliberate on materials". It's not that we have to but we can if we want to or not if we want to.

And then you get further into some more on the -- under the members and chairperson, under number three, where "The chairperson of the committee shall be selected from the membership by a majority vote of the committee members present". And that's kind of the editorializing of the charter that I've worked through.

MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, there is one technical problem with that. The advisory group, under Section 4 is required to do that deliberation because the working groups have no legal standing other than as agents of this protected -- or the Marine Protected Area Federal Advisory Committee and it's this committee that's responsible for providing advice. So under Section 4, you can't take the "will"

1	and make it a "may".
2	MR. ZALES: Okay, that's fine.
3	MR. URAVITCH: Please.
4	DR. BROMLEY: In the spirit of what Bob
5	said, if he's going to have scientific how did you
6	put it, Bob, or other? Yeah, well, then that same
7	problem appears in paragraph four, right the first
8	line, "Materials submitted by scientific or other
9	working groups".
LO	MR. ZALES: Add "or other" to it,
L1	"scientific or other".
L2	MR. URAVITCH: Yes.
L3	MR. ZALES: This would give editorial
L4	license for the staff to go through and wording like
L5	that, if the committee is happy with them, give them
L6	editorial license to go through and where they see
L7	those kind of problems, fix them.
L8	MR. URAVITCH: All right, thank you. Dr.
L9	yes, John.
20	DR. OGDEN: We've got to hurry this
21	process along. As I understand it, Joe, this is not
22	our document. We have no business word smithing this

1	document.
2	MR. URAVITCH: This is our this is the
3	department's charter.
4	DR. OGDEN: Well, it's not written by us.
5	It's written by the departments for us.
6	MR. URAVITCH: That's correct.
7	DR. OGDEN: So can we go back to your
8	summary and say are there other general changes and
9	then simply say, we're going to have a read-through, a
10	chance to read through this as a group and just sort
11	of say that and other changes that who knows what
12	other changes?
13	MR. URAVITCH: Yes, this, like the charge,
14	is the department's charter on how this group will
15	operate.
16	DR. OGDEN: So we have no business adding
17	commas and things.
18	MR. URAVITCH: But we've obviously seen
19	some functional problems with this which we want to
20	correct.
21	DR. OGDEN: Absolutely, and that was a
22	simple list and it seems to me that we can just send

you off with that list and anything else of major concern.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, that would be fine and we will put a draft together which will be run by you all as well as by the departments for their review and approval. And that will relate to how this advisory committee will function. Okay, I see a couple of other things on the agenda that we really do need to get to. Time is starting to run out on us and I think the next thing is when this committee will meet again. I think we need to look at some alternative dates for the committee and the original proposal that we had put forward was some time in the November/December Others have said there's some problems time frame. with November but I think we need to see when there is a window available for the membership. So I would suggest that we look in the October/November time frame.

MR. ZALES: If I could, November has been mentioned several times by several people that it's a real difficult time. There are several meetings going on. You've got the constituent thing here from the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Fishery Service that's going to be going on here, plus there's several council meetings in different areas. So November may be a very difficult time to do. October, maybe September/October, something along that line may be better. October kind of seems like a decent month at the moment. That depends on other people.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes.

MS. ERNST: You probably have some different opinions on that.

DR. GARZA: Yeah, looking at months October in Alaska is like one of the worse months to meet. If it were October, October 6th is clear unless the council's meeting then. Going into November, I don't know if we should just like take a break and, you know, write up all the months and weeks and everybody can scratch out what doesn't work for them and see what's left, if anything is left or if everybody just wants to say what month is -- or what week is best for them.

MR. URAVITCH: Would it make sense for us to have you all send us your available dates in the

1	October/November time frame and send those
2	electronically to Maggie Ernst and we will pull this
3	information together, do an analysis and see who's
4	available when and see if we can come up with a list
5	of dates where the vast majority of you are available?
6	DR. HIXON: Can you give us a range of
7	months?
8	MR. URAVITCH: We were suggesting October
9	and November of 2003. Joe.
10	DR. PEREYRA: Could September be put in
11	there also, because November and October, we may find
12	some real jam-ups here?
13	MR. URAVITCH: All right, we'll put
14	September in the mix, too, so September, October and
15	November. Send us your available dates. We will do
16	an analysis, provide that information and hopefully
17	come up with some options for the majority of the
18	members of the committee.
19	MR. RADONSKI: Since you so ably solved
20	that problem, place is next and I recommend that we go
21	to Santa Cruz at the lab and have the next meeting
22	there.

1	DR. HIXON: Second.
2	MR. URAVITCH: Discussion? Kay?
3	MS. WILLIAMS: I'd like to make a
4	substitute motion that we do a cost analysis before we
5	choose our next place, since funding is limited.
6	MR. URAVITCH: Do we hear a second on the
7	substitute amendment?
8	DR. HIXON: I second that.
9	MR. URAVITCH: We hear a second. Any
10	discussion? All if favor of the MPA staff looking
11	into the cost of holding meetings in a variety of
12	locations. Lelei?
13	MR. PEAU: I was hoping that we do it on a
14	rotation basis. I know cost is important attributes
15	to our decisions, but also we have to consider, it
16	might be cheaper for some, but it also may be
17	expensive for a minority but considering other
18	attributes to travel arrangement, it could be very
19	costly, so I'd like to suggest maybe on a rotation
20	basis. I know that the doing it out in the Islands
21	might double, triple our budget, but I'm more willing

to do it East Coast/West Coast as an alternative.

Thank you.

2 MR. URAVITCH: Bob?

MR. ZALES: And the cost analysis, I just would suggest -- and I'm just making an assumption here, it may be wrong, that the Santa Cruz thing was done because of the convenience of the MPA lab there and whatnot. So maybe in whatever meeting location that it be in conjunction with some area that's heavy in sanctuaries or some kind of marine area that we're dealing with, just kind of for maybe part of the thing to be done as an educational, informational thing for us to tour whatever facility is there maybe.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay.

DR. BROMLEY: In that regard, I have spoken earlier about what I think is the importance of having people from the agencies who have been involved in identifying MPA areas, that whole process, come before us and as I put it, sort of explain what they've been doing and why they've been doing it. So if that's an important issue to address early on, then as unpopular as this may be, maybe our next meeting ought to be here as well, so that the agency

people would be able to come to us and in a sense, tell us what they've been doing. So I think if we're going to throw those considerations in, I would like to get that on the table as well.

MR. URAVITCH: May I make a suggestion which is that this group very quickly decide on maybe a list of places they think might be appropriate for the next meeting. We will cost that out, see what's available in terms of our budget to pay for that in this current fiscal year or in the start of the next fiscal year because this may well slip into our next budget year and we will get back to you with that information in terms of what it is that we can afford based on locations and dates at this point. Mel?

MR. MOON: Well, I would be in support of the rotation discussion. I think it's important that we have interactions with the places where these types of activities are taking place. And often we get pulled away into sort of an administrative empire and that's where we end up and we never get to see what it is we're talking about. So I think it's important that we do rotation and we try to -- as we become

familiar with each other, we may want to visit each other's places and build our relationships around this table.

MR. URAVITCH: Wally?

DR. PEREYRA: Yes, thank you, Joe. I also think the rotational idea is good for the reasons that have been stated, but also I think we're forgetting that we also have a public and that public has an interest in our deliberations and by moving meeting around, we provide an opportunity interested public organizations and so forth that maybe can't travel to Washington, DC or whatever, to give us their thoughts and suggestions and so forth as So I think that that's we develop our responses. another strong reason for us doing that.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Kay.

MS. WILLIAMS: I would support doing the rotation but I would still like to see a cost analysis because anyone that is a travel coordinator, you can't just always get a meeting place large enough. So for me to sit here and tell you well, I want to hold one in Texas or I want to hold one in Virginia, I can't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

tell you that because I'm not the person that's got to go out and find a meeting location that will be set up large enough for all of the members, getting the hotels, providing the transportation to and from, how easy it is to get in there and also a large enough place to accommodate the public. So there's a lot of things that has to go into the planning.

MR. URAVITCH: May I recommend that we try and cost out what it would take to go to a site on the Pacific Coast, the Gulf of Mexico, the South Atlantic, the New England Northeast Area and the Great Lakes? We'll cost that out and that can be a basis for budgetary discussions in the next meeting and for your sort of long-term planning and then the Pacific Islands, of course.

MR. PEAU: What about Hawaii?

MR. URAVITCH: All right, well, and we can cost out the Caribbean as well. We will cost out the various regions of the country and what it will take in order to go there so that we have some basis for making a rational decision in the next meeting about where we're going and how we budget in the future for

operations, because we are functioning under a ceiling in the charter in terms of the budget, so that's something we need to take into consideration. Dr. Garza?

I appreciate the need for a DR. GARZA: budgets, but like the hand is waving over there, does that mean you'll never meet in Alaska, which I would hate to see, so I would hope that as a starting point, we would agree to meet on the West Coast next meeting so those of us who came all the way over here can not travel so far next time and at that meeting we can look at some of the costs and say, "Okay, where should we go next and what does that mean", not intentionally leaving the most expensive places out but understanding that that may reduce money for other activities?

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Tundi.

DR. AGARDY: Joe, you mentioned that the next meeting might cut into the next year's budget. Do you have a carryover for the -- in other words, do you have \$250,000.00 to support this annually? We've only had one meeting. I presume there's money left

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

over. If we get into the next fiscal year, do you
carry over the remainder?
MR. URAVITCH: No, we do not.
DR. GARZA: You lose it
MR. URAVITCH: Right. So that money right
now is going to other projects at this point because
we're heading towards the end of our fiscal year. We
would have had to scrounge to do something in
September.
DR. PEREYRA: Is the \$250,000.00
established by statute or is that a number which was
developed internally?
MR. URAVITCH: It was a number developed
internally when the charter was first put together
about two and a half years ago.
DR. PEREYRA: If in fact I hear a
number of \$4 million a total budget for the MPA
Center.
MR. URAVITCH: That is correct. This
year's appropriations for
DR. PEREYRA: Then our portion of that
budget is something like six and a quarter percent or

something like that and it would seem to me that if we're, you know, 10 or \$15,000.00 beyond the 250, that there might be the possibility of some reprogramming or at least looking into that possibility to enable us to have the meeting on the West Coast which I think is an important point.

MS. ERNST: I have a question for Joe. Is it possible that we could ask for a special exemption to carry over money that's devoted to the committee?

MR. URAVITCH: I'll see what I can do. Yes.

MR. ZALES: And then this is just -- when Santa Cruz was mentioned and I mean, because I know logistics for the number of people and whatnot, meeting facilities and whatnot, and I'm not familiar with that lab but does that lab, does it have facilities to hold a meeting similar to this for this amount of people and that type thing and have all the audio/video, all the technical stuff that we would need so that basically what you'd be looking for out this point in my mind would be hotels. Because I'm assuming Santa Cruz, you fly into San

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Diego, I guess. I don't know, I'm not that familiar.
2	No?
3	PARTICIPANT: San Francisco.
4	MR. ZALES: Oh, San Francisco, okay, all
5	right. So basically you're looking at just hotel and
6	travel if the lab could accommodate us.
7	MR. URAVITCH: Charlie, you look like you
8	wish to make a statement.
9	DR. WAHLE: First of all, the lab, when
10	you turn the lights on, they stay on, until there's an
11	energy crisis or something, but there is a room that
12	is big enough for this group and probably 20
13	observers, but if you're anticipating a large public
14	contingent you may have to work in a hotel. You'd
15	want to think about that. And logistically, you'd fly
16	into San Jose or Monterey and they're both roughly
17	equal distance from the Santa Cruz Lab.
18	MR. URAVITCH: Jim?
19	MR. RAY: Just a minor consideration when
20	we're planning meeting places and travel. The meeting
21	should be within a reasonable driving distance of the
22	major airport so that people don't have to take

secondary flights. Secondary flights are very expensive and it also adds to the travel time, so the next thing you know, you add another day of travel to people's time. So we have to keep in mind, you know, for cost sake, you know, where the non-stop flights come in and again, taking in, you know, long distance flights and whatnot. So that's just a consideration but it's an important one.

MR. URAVITCH: Let's see, Terry and --

MR. O'HALLORAN: This is just a question about the possibility of stretching our budget. I do know that if -- should we consider meeting in Hawaii, that there would be a good possibility that we could get a donation of hotel rooms from Hawaii Hotel Association. We might be able to get other support from other organizations in the state who support the effort, and so my question is, is as a federal advisory committee, can we accept those kinds of in kind support?

MR. URAVITCH: We'd have to look into that. There are federal gift forms that have to be filled out. There might be a way to do it. We can

1	inquire and see what the mechanisms might be and see
2	if that's indeed possible.
3	MR. O'HALLORAN: Because I would think
4	that that could stretch our budget considerably. I
5	mean, I'm sure we all have connections in our areas
6	that it's I mean, if this was a business, we would
7	be leveraging our marketing that way and it would be -
8	- so anyway, if you could answer that question, I
9	think we might be able to have more face-to-face
10	meetings.
11	MR. URAVITCH: We'll check with
12	departmental counsel and see what the rules are on
13	that. I have a feeling it might not be possible, but
14	we'll check.
15	MR. O'HALLORAN: Okay.
16	MS. WILLIAMS: When he was talking about
17	Hawaii, I was there at a national forum and it was in
18	November and I think our rooms were like \$112.00, very
19	reasonable government rates. So you might not need
20	donations because of the government rate.
21	MR. URAVITCH: Well, we will cost out all
22	the island and the northern destinations and we `ll

report back to you at the next meeting. Yeah, Mark.

DR. HIXON: I have a sense that we have very important issues to deal with in our remaining time and that we're starting to micro-manage and I'd like to defer a lot of these decisions to staff for -- to then feed back to us, something like that and get on with the more difficult decisions.

DR. GARZA: I agree with that, but just in wrapping up the things on travel on these weeks of availability, if we could within a certain time say, "Okay, this is likely the week and this is likely the second week", because I have a list of six weeks, but they're going to fall out. So if you guys take two months to decide, half of those dates are going go be gone anyway. And so perhaps we should say we have to have it to Marjorie by a certain date and she'll figure it out and say, "Okay, these look like the options".

MS. ERNST: Let's say within one to two weeks from today's meeting, I get feedback from all of you on your first and second choices and then we'll start to narrow that down. Pick a date where --

1	MR. NUSSMAN: One more question. How many
2	days are we looking at, two days?
3	MS. ERNST: That's another subject for
4	discussion.
5	MR. NUSSMAN: Let's not discuss it, just
6	you tell us.
7	MS. ERNST: Not that I'm recommending that
8	you discuss it now. This was this two-day meeting
9	was considered to be short and to the point. We would
10	envision that future meetings might be longer than two
11	days but that's just speculation at this point. The
12	date that we'd appreciate getting feedback on your
13	schedules would be July 11th, by July 11th, I believe
14	that's a Friday.
15	MR. URAVITCH: Mike.
16	MR. NUSSMAN: I would also add, Marjorie,
17	you stated our first and second choices. If we're
18	going to find a date that we all can go, we need to
19	tell you every day we can be gone. Okay?
20	MS. ERNST: I'll accept all kinds of
21	feedback and work with whatever you give me.
22	MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Tundi and then Bob.

DR. AGARDY: Joe, I don't know if you were planning to break but can I suggest that we just stick with it and start talking about possible agenda items and the ordering of the agenda for the next meeting?

MR. URAVITCH: I think that's a good idea. Okay, there are things for the break in the Bob? back for committee members. Feel free to go back there if you wish, but why don't we continue with I see two things left on the agenda. the initial discussions for the agenda for the next The other is we do need to hear from Bunny meeting. Sparks, program assistant related to the our practicalities of processing your travel papers and it's important you hear from her in terms of making sure we do the paperwork right, so that you get reimbursed for your costs. So why don't we move onto -- Bob?

MR. ZALES: Okay, well, I have to leave in about 20 minutes, so I'd just like to make an appeal that the first order of business for our next meeting be the creation of a work plan to respond to the charge that we've been given.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. URAVITCH: Tundi?

DR. AGARDY: Just a minor point but I think the first order of business is the election of a chair. The second order of business can be the development of a work plan.

MR. URAVITCH: Other suggestions? Tundi?

DR. AGARDY: I think it's helpful that you've already outlined kind of what our mandate is and I think that we can -- I think it's been very helpful that the MPA Center has gone to the trouble of developing a kind of framework for looking at terms and definitions and getting our heads around the complexity of this issue and what the implications of it is.

So I would suggest after we talk about our mandate, we might spend a small amount of time going over terms and definitions and reaching some consensus on useful terms for our purposes over the next two years and the kind of common understanding about what it is we mean when we say X, Y or Z. Then, I think the difficult part begins because the other two things which are essentially thinking about the framework for

an expanded and strengthened national system, which arises out of first an understanding of what we already have in the inventory, I think that's going to take up quite a lot of time and I think we need to have really substantive discussions about how we understand threats both to existing Marine Protected Areas and areas outside Marine Protected Areas so that we can know whether Marine Protected Areas are the appropriate response to those threats.

love I'd really to have threat substantive threat discussion in there discussion, somewhere. And the last thing that you mentioned as part of our mandate is addressing these MPA manager needs and I don't really know how we can do without knowing kind of the effectiveness of MPAs without having asked that question to managers. don't know how we can make any kind of suggestions on how to strengthen existing MPAs but I suppose that we need to have that as an agenda item and then we can discuss it.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay, thank you. Dr. Cruickshank.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. CRUICKSHANK: At the same time we have to begin looking at these working groups, selection of that because, obviously, we have a wide variety of people here and we want to meld them together into an effective working group to progress in the working plan.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Bob.

MR. ZALES: I may be on the same page as Tundi right now, but and part of your definitions because what I would like to see is this committee kind of develop their definition of what an MPA is, whether or not there's a single definition, whether or not you have multiple uses of various things, so that we get away from this MPA as relates to no take, and define what we're talking about and what's there and what may be there in the future and what may not be there in the future, along that like, I guess so I'm right there. That's what I want.

MR. URAVITCH: Bob.

MR. DENDICK: Just expanding on what Tundi said, I'd love to see a presentation, if we're going to be on the West Coast, for the West Coast of mapping

of some critical marine resources, threats to those resources, an overlay of the existing MPA system by sort of type and function and some evaluation, this is probably the hardest part, of whether and to what extent those things are working so we have close at hand, some real information upon which to base our discussion.

Along the same lines, and DR. PEREYRA: following on Bob's suggestion, I think that when you're talking about the West Coast, I don't think we should limit it to just the three Pacific Coast states but I think we should also include Alaska, because I think the situations are different in both locations think it will give and Ι us а much fuller understanding of the whole issue that we're talking about here, so I would like to see that expanded to include also Alaska.

MR. URAVITCH: I would just note as a practical matter, in terms of the data we have available, we're not there yet with state information from Alaska. We do have the data from Oregon, Washington, California and a number of federal sites.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So we're not going to be able to do everything you're asking for at this point. We'll have some of that available.

Mike Nussman and then Dr. Garza.

MR. NUSSMAN: Towards the conversation that's focused on threats and specifics, I think it would be appropriate if we had the Fishery Service speak to us on the status of fishery resource as well as protected resources to let us start from the same place and the same level of understanding.

MR. URAVITCH: Dr. Garza.

DR. GARZA: Thank you. In terms of other things that we should look at as part of developing our work plan, I think I, at least, would like to see an increased discussion on the word "culture". I did look at the Executive Order and it did not limit it to submersed ships and so we need to look at native uses, customary and traditional uses and if we're going to use the West Coast as an example of this is what this cool mapping looks like, then perhaps, we need to talk colleague here if there's and see information that we can bring forward from the West

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Coast Tribes, perhaps the Washington area where there is significant uses that I would like to see that brought forward.

In terms of Alaska, Dave Benton is not here but Alaska has gone through major changes and cutbacks in AF&G (ph). The governor didn't disband but he stopped the whole -- the MPA state process and so I would be surprised if we see anything at any time soon.

DR. CRUICKSHANK: I may have mentioned this before, Joe, but the missing MMS information at the present time, there is nothing in the inventory on MMS management areas and should they be in there or are they specifically excluded from discussions or from the committee charter?

MR. KENDALL: Yeah, we've been talking about that, both within the Department, within MMS and with NOAA. Many of you may not be aware that MMS regulates the offshore industry on the OCS, that includes oil and gas as well as sand and gravel and maybe some day in the future, hydrates.

We do have a series of regulations,

NEAL R. GROSS

stipulations, notices to OSC's things of that nature, that establish no activity zones, various mitigations to protect things like topographic features, chemosynthetic communities, shipwrecks, but we'd like to see the Federal Register notice process on definitions come through to that that will help us focus on making decisions like that. For example, a sanctuary, the flower gardens, it's already on the MPA site. We have regulations that established shunting areas, activity areas. It would sort of overlap if we listed it.

The shipwrecks are protected by the National Historic Preservation Act. We find out about these through information that has to be submitted to us from the oil and gas industry and then we issue the regulations that say, "Don't touch that, leave it alone". I mean, that's required. So we're not really a land manager, although we have land management type authority in some cases. So we've been dealing with the issue. Once they define what an MMA is, and an MPA, then we can use those definitions with input from this committee, to say, "Okay, this is what MMS is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

doing and this falls right in line with this". Mel?

MR. URAVITCH: Mel?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MOON: Yeah, along the lines Walter MR. was suggesting about having a little more presentation form at the next meeting, I know one of the questions I would have is who would we have as the people that would be coming to make these presentations? they be federal representatives from NOAA fisheries or would they be counsels or would they be NGOs? would like would be а question I answered. And the other component to that we would --I would definitely like to offer trying to coordinate a travel perspective as well, if presentation is to be given at the next council meeting or next committee meeting.

MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, we would propose obviously, bringing in people from the programs specifically that are being asked, so someone from National Marine Fishery Service, obviously, would talk about fisheries resources and protected resources because it's a question of their sites that they're responsible for designating and managing and so we

would bring those people in.

MS. ERNST: Can I make a point here? We haven't really discussed how we will incorporate our ex officio federal representatives in the next meeting and how we could work with them to bring in some of the outside people you might want to hear about to talk to you about federal activities. So I'm just throwing that out in hopes that you'll also discuss that.

MR. URAVITCH: Let's see, we have quite a few hands up. Gil, Jim and then I think we had Bob and then we had Kay and we had Dan and who are we missing and Rod. Rod is leaving soon, if I may, wh don't we take Rod because I know he has to leave?

DR. FUJITA: Thanks, Joe. With respect to Mel's question, I concur, I think there's a need for diversity of perspectives in these presentations. Hearing only the agency talk about the status of fisheries or any other issue that comes before us gives us a limited view of the perspectives that are out there. So there's a couple different ways to do that. You know, one is to have a panel with the

agency rep and the NGO and the tribal rep and this and that. That's perfectly fine.

Another way to do it is to have some sort of -- someone who is perceived as a neutral and objective observer of the particular issue in question to provide an overview of the different kinds of perspectives that exist and show us the data upon which those inferences are made.

MR. URAVITCH: Thank you. Gil, please.

MR. RADONSKI: Well, I would speak support of Mike's suggestion that fisheries be brought to the next meeting. This would fall in line with some of the things that Dan Romley has said, bringing the agencies that have regulatory responsibility under this for MPAs before us and I don't know that we can do it all at one time. I don't know that independent for observer can speak the responsibilities under the Act, under -- not under the Act but under the provisions of administering EPAs which we are looking at those agencies, Commerce and Interior.

We need to hear from the people managing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the programs and get advice from them. And Marjorie,

I assume that we're going to have ex officio

representation at every meeting.

MR. URAVITCH: That's correct.

MS. ERNST: And we haven't really discussed with them the travel implications for the agencies that are involved.

MR. URAVITCH: Let's see, okay, Jim.

I think it's very important that the committee identify what kinds of information and topics they would like to hear presented at their But I want to make a caution that we have a meetings. lot of area to cover, a lot of things to discuss and I would hate to see a significant percentage of each of our meetings be taken up by presentations from others. I think we ought to limit a certain percentage of our meeting to outside presentations. For example, in a meeting like this, identify a few key areas that we'd like to have outside information brought to us and that's defined from that agenda and be sure we allow adequate time for us to really start digging into this and have the discussions and dialogue we need. So I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	just I make a plea that we keep a balance.
2	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, working our way down
3	the table.
4	DR. SUMAN: Okay, perhaps integrating a
5	couple other opinions and a couple of suggestions,
6	Robert's for instance, that we have information
7	presented or available to us on habitat on the West
8	Coast, habitat mapping, MPA, existing MPAs, overlays
9	and then threats.
10	May I suggest that we have available at
11	the next meeting information on, for instance,
12	maritime routes, MMS, offshore oil and gas lease sales
13	and their status, pollution hot spots on the West
14	Coast on fishing zones, fishing effort, specifying
15	threats and uses that we could also compare with
16	existing MPAs might allow us to target critical areas.
17	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, let's see, Bob?
18	MR. ZALES: Yeah, and mine's a question to
19	Mark because I want to be sure I understood what he's
20	talking about when he's asking for information from
21	the Fishery Service on protected resources and stuff
22	like that, are you suggesting having the Fishery

1	Service kind of give an update on the status of stocks
2	not only for just those but for essentially everything
3	that they have that's involved in managed areas and
4	whatnot? Is that what I understood?
5	DR. SUMAN: Perhaps, but I also would like
6	to see spacial comparison here and that's what Robert
7	suggested, too.
8	MR. ZALES: No, no, but my question was to
9	Mark Nussman.
10	MR. NUSSMAN: I think the answer to that
11	was I was looking for both the fishery as well as
12	marine mammal and other components, not wanting to
13	limit it to just fisheries and I'm perhaps I'm not
14	smart enough to say everything that we should ask them
15	to report on, but I think certainly fisheries and
16	marine mammal issues, particularly on the West Coast
17	would be appropriate.
18	MR. ZALES: Yeah, and I would support that
19	but my next question is, Mike, are you talking about
20	just limiting it to the information on the West Coast
21	or kind of in general?
22	MR. NUSSMAN: Certainly the West Coast

would be appropriate but I would look -- I personally would like to have all of the information, a broad presentation made.

MR. ZALES: Okay, because I would support the broad representation.

MR. KENDALL: One thing I'd like to add is, from what I've heard and taking notes here, you filled up probably agendas for the next six meetings with so many topics. One thing you might want to consider at your next meeting is that after you elect a chair and vice chair, the chair and vice chair work with the committee to determine what the priority topics are you would like to deal with, take those topics and priorities, up either issues and set working groups or subcommittees, whichever group can teleconference on their own as they see fit and then a chair of that subcommittee or working group reports back to the committee to save time.

And then if the issues go beyond that, then you can work on getting outside people assigned to these working groups and go from there. Because like in our case, we have a biologic, a social science

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

subcommittee, a deep water subcommittee, et cetera. They basically work on their own as they see fit, report back to the main committee. If there are issues that go beyond that, then they expand the discussions. Otherwise, as Jim has pointed out, you're ending up with nothing but two or three days of presentations and no time to discuss. Just a thought.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay, I'll start with Kay because she's been waiting the longest.

MS. WILLIAMS: I would like to see in our discussions somewhere I would like the NOAA attorneys as well as law enforcement and the Coast Guard to be incorporated into this process to give us their thoughts and ideas.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay. Bob.

MR. DENDICK: We've got sort of two things going at once here and I'm looking at our second charge which is the process to design some sort of national system for taking advantage of the national system, and I think it's really -- what I was thinking about was looking with a broad brush across the Pacific Coast at the data spatially array that you

mind, of looking at each of the have in sort regulatory or programs to determine whether they're working for the country as a whole and back and forth on that and whether the different kinds of protected areas or strategies are working is a little bit of a different problem and Ι think Ι would be more interested in focusing on sort of very specific case studies but more importantly, looking at how all these different things set up along the Pacific Coast than talking generically about fisheries management whether it's working for the country as a whole.

MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, let me note that a lot of what you're asking for right now doesn't exist. process Ι mean, that's what we're in the of developing. What you saw this morning in terms of the presentation on the inventory is where we are at this point. We're still working with the number of states to collect this information.

In terms of things like habitat characterization and the like, we're just initiating some projects to work with states, federal agencies and universities to get some of that information

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

together, so we can present to you what we have available but we're nowhere near where you all want to go in terms of some immediate answers to some questions. Yes.

I'm inspired by Jim Ray's DR. BROMLEY: observation and Jim Kendall, and I think we need to draw from their experience and I would like to see us think about this next meeting more carefully than we have and given how difficult it is with the number of us to make progress on substantive issues that I would -- I hope this isn't seen as micro managing, but I would like to urge us to, first of all somebody said we need to have longer meetings, many more days. if we go beyond two-day meetings, we're going to start to lose people and so I wonder if it isn't a good idea for us to think in terms of two-day meetings or two and a half day meeting and make sure at our next meeting that we have no more than one-half of a day devoted to this outside input and the rest of it is devoted to serious deliberations by this group about where we want to go, the questions, what our charge is, what our purpose is. This will take us much more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	time than we ever imagined to reach agreement on these
2	things. And so I think, Jim, is it right, Jim
3	Kendall?
4	MR. KENDALL: Yeah.
5	DR. BROMLEY: You've had experience with
6	these things. I think we should take your advice very
7	seriously and devote the vast majority of our time
8	next time to seriously sitting down to figure out how
9	we're going to operate, what questions we want to ask
10	and then use the subcommittees and the working groups
11	to get into this very specific stuff. Did I read you
12	correctly, Jim?
13	MR. KENDALL: That's right on, and once
14	you have a chair and a vice chair to run the show,
15	that takes a lot of the burden off of Joe and Maggie.
16	If things come up that require legal counsel, they
17	can run out and make the phone calls. But then the
18	chair and the vice chair, the burden is on their back,
19	so these are very busy positions. You will have work
20	to do and you have to keep everybody happy.
21	Steve, sorry, I'm
22	DR. MURRAY: I just simply wanted to tag

onto what Dan said. I mean, I think we're being a little overly optimistic with regard to what we floated as potential items on an agenda for our next meeting. I think we're suffering, you know, what all groups like this do, we're suffering a start-up cost and the start-up cost is exacerbated by the fact that there are almost 30 of us here, all of who have important things to say and opinions to offer. I think that obviously in situations like this, as time goes on and we get a better handle on where we're going and what strategies we're using to achieve certain objectives, that things fall out.

Those fallouts naturally involve subcommittee or working group efforts. We've been given -- I think, Joe, you articulated three sort of areas that we needed to consider with regard to our charge and we would likely come up with others, but I think it's important to recognize that those areas have been articulated in a very diffuse way.

One of our tasks is going to be to dig into each of those areas or others we may bring up and articulate very specific goals that we feel as a group

that we would like to pursue. Once we have those goals identified, then we can discuss what kinds of strategies that we would like to invoke to forward towards achieving some of those goals. Now, we can't do this by beginning to discuss various strategies before we have really gotten through the qoal issue. I think we would probably -- I know I would and I think maybe the rest of you would feel really good if we came away from our next meeting with a really clear understanding of what we were going to do, what we were going to try to achieve and that we had essentially cut some paths, some strategies that would lead us towards that. I think I would feel really good if we came away from out next meeting with that.

So I think it's really premature to look at all various kinds of information sets that might apply to this region or that region, although I would see that there's clearly a place for that, as we move along, but I would hope that what we would be able to do is to focus the agenda very strongly on identifying how we're going to plan for ourselves to move forward,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what kind of goals we're going to try to achieve within the framework of the suggestions that have been offered for us and how we're going to try to set ourselves up so that we can use all the talent that we have here and the diversity of opinions to really adopt viable strategies to producing something meaningful.

And I think we should devote our agenda to that. We should allow plenty of time for that. And we should break it off into that particular set of focused objectives.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay, John.

DR. OGDEN: I support what Steve just said and in light of that, it strikes me that one of the things that would be very helpful for us, assuming we meet on the California coast, which seems like a reasonable possibility, is that through the California Marine Life Protection Act, the Channel Islands Marine Sanctuary, the PISCO Project which everybody here may not be familiar with but which is a science based planning effort directed at Marine Protected Areas on the West Coast, and taking into account Bob's comments

consistently about the importance of the map and sort of the case study and this encompasses essentially the entire charge of this committee within a capsulized of people working, necessarily set not in coordinated, integrated way, the way we might imagine ourselves driving towards, but it strikes me that presentations centered on this -- these developments, that don't center specifically on fisheries but take into account fisheries, for example, take into account sources of pollution, other based things, and that this would make a very nice package for the next meeting.

That would be that half day of presentations that Dan talks about and then getting right into how in a case study essentially like this, leads this committee into a series of activities which then can encompass the rest of our -- the rest of our two-year charge. I mean, I think we can actually achieve that.

But I really think that this part of the country is a very good place to go for that, for those three developments there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Before I take the next MR. URAVITCH: comments, could I just ask for an indulgence. running out of time. We don't have a chair or a vice chair, obviously. Could we ask you to select a small agenda working group who can work with us to sort out some of these issues and start putting this agenda together for the next meeting? And I'd like to ask for some volunteers for that. Mark? We have -- it looks like everyone, all right. Are we all volunteers I mean, who would like to or are there comments? volunteer for the agenda working group? Please raise your hand and Maggie, if you'd just write the names, Oh, absolutely, this will be an down. Thank you. iterative process.

MR. DENDICK: I have a comment while people's hands are up. I'm certainly willing to obviously defer to what everybody decides but it strikes me that the members of this committee come into this process with very different perceptions about a lot of different things and if we start discussions about the shape of the future without trying to re-establish some common base of what is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

actually happening out on the ground, we run the risk of people just carrying their existing perceptions into a debate upon -- on things that people won't agree on.

If we take a case study or some piece of the landscape and examine it in as objective a way as possible with the facts we have before us, what's really happening out there, how these different things are interacting and then go from that common base during which process, I think we have the opportunity to re-examine our assumptions about these things, then I think we establish a better track for actually accomplishing something and finding some common ground.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Wally.

DR. PEREYRA: Yeah, following on Bob's suggestion, I think in order to do this and do this properly, I think we also need to have full understanding of what the problem is that particular test site is -- was set up to address and the problem occurred and what the some alternatives are that are associated with that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	don't think that we can do it out of context with the
2	blinders on. I don't think we would have the
3	understanding that would be required.
4	MR. URAVITCH: Kay?
5	MS. WILLIAMS: What if all of the members
6	sent in their top five suggestions and you just use
7	the top three and go with that? I mean, everyone has
8	their own priorities as to what they think is the most
9	important to them. They often do that in meetings.
10	MR. URAVITCH: That would be a good
11	starting point and then we can work from there. Is
12	that a motion?
13	MS. WILLIAMS: If we need one, that's the
14	motion.
15	MR. URAVITCH: Do we hear a second?
16	Discussion? All in favor or
17	DR. BROMLEY: Yeah, just the top five
18	issues, Kay? I'm sorry, I don't get it. I mean, why
19	not would you accept a friendly amendment that says
20	let an agenda let an agenda committee of which
21	there have been a number of people, let them do their

work, share that with the full committee and then let

people suggest issues that concern them that fit within the agenda. I hate -- I think I would hate to make an agenda predicated upon just everybody throwing in five of their favorite issues. So I find that a little bit frightening. Maybe I misunderstand what you have in mind.

MS. WILLIAMS: Actually what I had in mind, too, was we discussed that we were not going to -- or I thought that this panel had discussed -- it was kind of difficult for me to hear out in the audience at times, that we would have all of the members decide what the agenda was -- how it would be structured.

So if we know that we're still waiting on to get their clearance, and I just thought perhaps, if all of the committee could send in their top -- I don't care if it's the top five or the top Very often at the meetings, everyone gives their top five or 10 priorities and the top ones win out and those and that's how the meetings are structured. I mean, it really doesn't matter. Ι don't have heartburn one way or the other about it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just thought it was an idea to move us ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Jim.

MR. RAY: I'd just suggest that those that aren't on the agenda working groups send your comments to Marjorie, she'll send it out to the agenda working group and let the agenda working group consider that as they put the agenda together and that would cover it.

MR. URAVITCH: All agree to that? All right, thanks. We need to move very soon to Bunny Sparks to talk about wrapping up the administrative side of this. Bob?

I would suggest with the MR. ZALES: agenda working everything going group and with everybody having to send Marjorie a time line on what they're going to be available, times September, October, November, that this working group also get the agenda items in there in about the same time frame because it's going to take you time to get that done to get it the scheduling fixed to notify whoever is going to make whatever presentation and so on and so forth.

1	MR. URAVITCH: All right, so let's say
2	July the 11th then, by that time your suggestions for
3	the agenda items as well to us, please. Yes, Kay?
4	MS. WILLIAMS: One quick question; I
5	couldn't see everyone that wanted to be on the working
6	group. Could I have everyone hold their hand up so
7	that I can see, or just read their names? So it's
8	basically every one of us for about two or three?
9	Okay. Thanks.
10	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, I think for a few
11	minutes we need to turn this over to Bunny Sparks,
12	who's been one of the major organizers for this
13	meeting to deal with travel and other administrative
14	issues before we move into any final discussions and
15	adjournment. I'm sure many of you have spoken with
16	Bunny in terms of she's the one who has helped make
17	your arrangements and make this all possible, so here
18	she is.
19	MS. SPARKS: Mine is quick. First of all,
20	the green form that's in the back of your notebook,
21	that is your voucher reimbursement form. That's the
22	form that you will it's behind Tab 13. That's the

form you will use to let me know all your expenses, attach your receipts to that. If you have a receipt from your ticket, attach a copy of that to it also. Return that to me. If you have any questions while you're going through that, just give me a call or email me, and I'll get right back to you. Send that to me.

It usually takes one to two weeks to process. If you're not in the CAM system, because your reimbursement is by direct deposit, you fill out that form and send that also. You designate whether it's a checking account or a savings account, the account number and whatever else is on that form. That's also behind Tab 13. So fill that out and send that out also. The money will be deposited directly into your account. If you lose a receipt, don't panic, if it's just an \$8.00 taxi cab receipt. Still put it down on that green form.

Okay, let's see, the CAM form -- your meals are covered except for the breakfast and the lunch you received today and yesterday. But you will still get your M&IE which is your meals and

incidentals, you'll still get that for your dinner, but you'll see that x'd out for the breakfast and the dinner only from yesterday and today. You'll get the full -- there's a \$50.00 allowance for DC.

You'll see your reimbursement, you'll see

three-quarters for the first day of travel and three-quarters for the last day of travel. I know you probably won't remember all this, so just give me a call if it looks strange when you get it. Okay? But otherwise, you'll see your reimbursement for your other meals. You don't have to attach receipts for meals. Okay.

Let's see, you should get this back to me within a week or two, that's the best because we're getting up to September and we don't want to roll it over into the next budget.

MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, if it rolls over into the next fiscal year, it will be coming out of next year's money, so it's imperative that you get your paperwork in, please.

MS. SPARKS: Okay, if you have any questions --

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. HIXON: That was my it's not clear
2	to me about the CAMS form is required of everyone, did
3	you say that or
4	MS. SPARKS: Yes, if you're not some
5	people are already in the CAMS system. They've
6	already traveled for the government so they're already
7	in there. And if your account information changed,
8	then you would need to do another form. You will need
9	to do another one, but if your information is the
10	same, it's still the same account and that's where you
11	want it to go, then don't fill out another one.
12	MR. O'HALLORAN: Just so I understand, if
13	I'm a member of the Hawaii Humpback Whale Sanctuary
14	and I've traveled there. So you have the same
15	information so I don't have to do this.
16	MS. SPARKS: You should be in there, so
17	you shouldn't have to. If I put your information in
18	and I don't see that you're in there, I'll send you an
19	e-mail so that you can fax it to me.
19 20	e-mail so that you can fax it to me. DR. HIXON: Okay.

1	MS. SPARKS: Yes.
2	DR. GARZA: So what if we're under CAMS
3	for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
4	MS. SPARKS: It should show up, and again,
5	if it doesn't then I'll send you something but it
6	still should show up. If you're in the CAM system, it
7	should show up no matter where you are.
8	MR. RADONSKI: On the CAMS form, what kind
9	of payee are we?
10	MS. SPARKS: Invitational.
11	MR. RADONSKI: Invitational, thank you.
12	MR. URAVITCH: Bob?
13	MR. ZALES: I travel Metro back and forth
14	which is no receipt, so that's money I just put down
15	here, \$5.00?
16	MS. SPARKS: Right, just put down Metro.
17	MR. ZALES: Okay.
18	MS. SPARKS: Any more questions?
19	MR. URAVITCH: Any further questions?
20	PARTICIPANT: Can you read out the
21	address?
22	MS. SPARKS: 1305 East-West Highway, was

1	that the only line that was cut off? Yeah, 1305.
2	Also, was that everybody's question about travel?
3	Okay, I knew them all.
4	Another thing, if any of you would like
5	for me to mail your notebooks back to you rather than
6	carry them, let me know before you leave. Just give
7	them to me and let me know and I'd be glad to send
8	that to you.
9	PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible)
10	MS. SPARKS: Joe?
11	MR. URAVITCH: That will be gratis, we'll
12	absorb that cost. Okay.
13	DR. OGDEN: Bunny, on behalf of everybody,
14	thanks for running a great meeting and especially for
15	all that food in there, which I had a lot to
16	MS. SPARKS: You're welcome. Thank you.
17	It's very nice meeting all of you by the way.
18	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, we have about 10
19	minutes left leading up to adjournment. Bob?
20	MR. ZALES: Yes, just one other quick
21	point, and this has to do with because Bunny kind
22	of reminded me about sending books and whatnot, it

would be nice way prior to meeting that we go to, and I run into this on every advisory panel I've ever served on, it's historic that the Fishery Service or whoever gets you information two days before you're supposed to talk about it and obviously, information gets updated, you know, periodically, but it would be nice that whatever we choose, whatever the agenda is going to be, whatever information we're going to have, to try to get it to us just as early as you can so that we can disseminate that information prior to getting to the meeting.

MR. URAVITCH: It sounds like we need to set a performance standard for ourselves in terms of how many days ahead of time we want to get information to you and I'll discuss that with the staff and see what we think makes sense and then try and come up with a standard set that we'll try to meet. Maggie?

MS. ERNST: Joe, we had talked about a protected website and you know, we have the option of being able to set up an intra-net site for you that you could go into and look at documents like agendas and so I think that would serve that purpose. So

1	that's something we can explore after this meeting.
2	MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Kay.
3	MS. WILLIAMS: One quick question because
4	I've been asked this by many people that's not
5	necessarily at this table, what happened to the five
6	or six case studies that we were supposed to be
7	reviewing or looking at? Was that mailed to anyone?
8	I actually had it mailed to me from the council, but I
9	mean, it wasn't their charge to mail me those case
10	studies, that was mentioned in the e-mail to the
11	public or in the notification. Do you now know what
12	I'm talking about?
13	MS. ERNST: That doesn't ring a bell with
14	me, unless the Coastal Service Center case study was
15	sent out for comment, Brie Kessler's (ph) project.
16	MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, that's a completed
17	document. There was a recent publication from the
18	Training and Technical Assistance Institute that were
19	five case studies but they weren't sent out for
20	review. That was a final product.
21	MS. WILLIAMS: I'll show you the e-mail.
22	MR. URAVITCH: Okay, yeah, I'd like to see

it. I'm curious. Any other further issues for the committee? Maggie?

MS. ERNST: I have one small thing to bring up. I've received several requests to get everyone's addresses and phone numbers and I think it's customary in federal advisory committees to make that information public. And at some point, we would like to post that information on the MPA.gov website and when I called all of you back in December, I gathered information on how to contact you and got a variety of phone numbers, cell numbers, cell phone numbers, cell numbers, cell phone

And what I'd like to do is I will e-mail you an electronic version of what I call the contact list that I've been working on. That should be useful for all of you to be able to be able to phone or, you know, mail things to one another but I'd like to ask that you look at it and let me know which version of that you'd like to see posted for public use. I'll send it electronically to everyone.

MR. URAVITCH: Okay, any further questions or issues? Okay, well, I'd like to thank you all for

NEAL R. GROSS

coming and attending this first meeting of the MPA Federal Advisory Committee. I apologize for the problems we've had with the lighting and other things as well as to the members of the gang of six, now gang of five who aren't yet fully through the process. We'll keep you alerted as to the approval of your colleagues.

I guess I'd also like to thank Maggie Ernst, who's done an incredible amount of work over the past several months to pull this together along with Dan Topousis of our staff, who is our outreach person, who's also been heavily involved and Jim Kendall and Phyllis Clark of the Minerals Management Service, who have also been involved as people who have managed advisory committees in the past giving us advice on how to help set up a committee and make it work. They've been invaluable in their appreciate your indulgence experience and we in whatever rough edges we've had in this process. So thanks again.

Any further questions, comments? Okay, I'd like to thank the ex officio members from the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	federal agencies for attending and we'll be back in
2	touch with you all shortly in terms of as we go
3	through this planning process, making sure you're
4	involved in this process as well. Anything further?
5	If not we'll get the gavel going.
6	MS. ERNST: We adjourn this meeting.
7	(Whereupon, at 3:56 p.m. the above
8	entitled matter concluded.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	