### UNITED STATES of AMERICA

### NATIONAL OCEANIC and ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

\* \* \* \* \*

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THIRD MEETING, DAY 1 OF 3

\* \* \* \* \*

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 2004

\* \* \* \* \*

KEY LARGO, FLORIDA

The Committee convened at 8:35 a.m. in the African Queen Room, at the Holiday Inn Key Largo, 99701 Overseas Highway, Key Largo, Florida.

#### Committee Members Present:

- Dr. Tundi Agary
- Mr. Robert L. Bendick, Jr.
- Mr. David Benton
- Dr. Daniel W. Bromley, Chairman
- Dr. Anthony Chatwin
- Dr. Michael J. Cruickshank
- Dr. Rodney M. Fujita
- Dr. John R. Halsey
- Dr. Mark A. Hixon
- Mr. George D. Lapointe
- Dr. Bonnie J. McCay, Vice Chair
- Mr. Melvin E. Moon, Jr.
- Mr. Robert J. Moran
- Dr. Steven N. Murray
- Mr. Michael Nussman
- Dr. John Ogden
- Mr. Terry O'Halloran
- Mr. Lelei Peau
- Dr. Walter T. Pereyra
- Mr. R. Max Peterson
- Ms. Barbara Stevenson
- Dr. James P. Ray
- Dr. Daniel Suman
- Captain Thomas E. Thompson

# Ex-Office Members Present:

- Ms. Mary Glackin
- Ms. Jacqueline Schafer
- Mr. Merlin Bartz
- Ms. Lisa Phelps
- Mr. Jeffrey Pearson
- Mr. Randall Bowman

#### Also Present:

Dr. James Kendall Lauren Wenzel

### From the National MPA Center:

Ms. Ginger Hinchcliff, Director, Training & Technical Assistance Institute

Mr. Joseph A. Uravitch, AICP, Director

Dr. Charles Wahle, Director, MPA Science Institute

### Panel Members

- Billy Causey, Superintendent, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
- Kacky Andrews, Director, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas
- Linda Canzanelli, Superintendent, Biscayne National Park
- Bill Kruczynski, US Environmental Protection Agency Program Manager, KFNMS, Water Quality Protection Program
- Bob Howard, Resource Manager, Everglades and Dry Tortugas National Bank
- Rick Spinrad, Assistant Administrator for National Ocean Service

## I-N-D-E-X

Call to Order and Opening Remarks 5
Introduction of Members 8
Agenda
Charge to Subcommittees
Speaker Rick Spinrad, NOAA
Afternoon Session
Report by Subcommittees
Public Comments  Speaker Dan Clark, Cry of the Water
Announcements
Recess for the Day 125

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(8:35 o'clock a.m.)
3	DR. WAHLE: My name is Charlie Wahle. I
4	work with NOAA, National Protected Area Center.
5	Welcome to the third meeting of the Marine
6	Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee,
7	I will be the acting Designated Federal
8	Official for this meeting, and it seem this meeting
9	only, mercifully.
10	And at this point I would like to formally
11	open the meeting and turn over the Chair
12	responsibilities to our Committee Chair, Dan Bromley.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Charlie.
14	I'd like the record to show that this
15	train runs on time.
16	We have two and a half days of discussion
17	and deliberation over Marine Protected Areas issues.
18	I see we have some guests as well. So this is a nice
19	venue and we're very happy to be here.
20	Our first order of business is to approve
21	the minutes of our meeting in November of 2003, and so
22	I would entertain a motion to that effect from the
23	Committee.
24	MR. LAPOINTE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George Lapointe

25

has

1	moved that we approve the minutes of the meeting in
2	November; is that right, George?
3	MR. LAPOINTE: Right.
4	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike Cruickshank
6	seconded that motion.
7	Is there any discussion of the minutes?
8	Yes, Walter?
9	DR. PEREYRA: I didn't see any reference in
10	the minutes to the fact that we agreed, I believe, at
11	the last meeting that we would endeavor not to have
12	these meetings timed at the time of the council
13	meetings.
14	The reason I raise that issue is because I
15	know that at least one council member from Alaska is
16	going to be late, in part as a result of the ongoing
17	council meeting there.
18	I just wanted to raise that.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do you want to amend the
20	minutes to record that?
21	DR. PEREYRA: I don't know if they need to
22	be formally amended or not. It just needs to be so
23	noted in the minutes of this meeting.
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So we'll let that
25	be " and that is something that we all agree with.

1	Other discussion about the minutes from
2	November?
3	Yes?
4	MR. THOMPSON: I would ask that my name be
5	reflected as Mr. Ted Thompson, and retired be taken
6	out, because that implies that I'm retired and I'm
7	not. I retired from the Coast Guard but I represent
8	the International Counsel of "
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So you'd like the RET
10	removed from the minutes?
11	MR. THOMPSON: Change the Captain to Mr.
12	and remove the retired. I'd appreciate that.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that acceptable to
14	the movers and seconders?
15	MR. (SPEAKER): Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are we ready to call the
17	question on the minutes?
18	All in favor of adopting the minutes from
19	November, please say "aye".
20	MEMBERS: Aye.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?
22	(No audible response.)
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Motion passed. Thank
24	you.
25	Okay. We have the happy occasion to

1 formally install our newest member, John Halsey. 2 John Halsey is here. Lauren and Charlie, do we need to do 3 anything other than what we've just done? Do we need 4 5 to make him swear to tell the truth? 6 (Laughter.) 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Which these days would 8 be quite out of fashion. We are happy to have you, 9 and I think we're done with that. 10 We have new or substituting ex-officio 11 members, Merlin Bartz from the Department of 12 Agriculture. Thank you, we're happy to have you. 13 Jeff Pearson. 14 MR. PEARSON: The Coast Guard. 15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I thought that might be 16 it. Glad to have you with us, sir. And Lisa Phelps from the Navy. Thank you 17 18 for being here. We're happy to have you with us. 19 We notice that we do not yet have an ex-20 officio from EPA. Lauren, Joe, where do we stand on 21 this? LAUREN: We have been working with EPA on 22 23 this they still in their internal and are 24 deliberations. We're very hopeful that they'll give 25 me " (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful.

Okay, I'm going to go over the agenda very briefly. The Committee meets tonight at six for dinner. That's noted in the formal agenda, in Bogie's, which I think is just there. Then to remind the members that dress tomorrow is casual, because we're going out on the boat at noon tomorrow, so you're free to dress as you believe you'll be comfortable out on the water.

As Mr. Materi and Dolly Garza are not here, I've asked Max Peterson if he would fill that role and he has said he would be happy to do that. So if something arises in which we need the advice of the Parliamentarian, Max will do that, unless there are objections.

Is that okay if we proceed along that assumption?

Okay. We are very fortunate to have Rick Spinrad, the Assistant Administrator for the National Ocean Service, NOAA. He's going to speak with us a bit later. Rick, where are you?

MR. SPINRAD: Right over here.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, good. We're happy you're here. We have a spot for you in about an hour, Rick. We might get there sooner.

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

2.0

MR. SPINRAD: I'll work on my notes quicker then.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. The agent now says that we're going to discuss the charge to the subcommittees and I believe in your packet you have that material. Is that correct, that you do have guidelines? Yeah. Marine Protected Area Federal Advisory Committee focus areas for subcommittees, March 16, `04.

I'd like to spend some time going over this. It is my sense that we will be most effective as an Advisory Committee to the Federal Government if we accomplish the bulk of our work subcommittees as they have been constituted. The Executive Committee, consisting of myself, Bonnie, the Chairs of the three subcommittees, and Joe and Lauren and Charlie participating as ex-officios, have spent with the Committee structure some time and its mandates that we had in San Mateo.

So what you have before you is a revision and a clarification and elaboration of the three tasks that were spelled out for the three subcommittees.

I want to just go through this very briefly to make sure that we're all in agreement as to what we intend to do in our subcommittees.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Subcommittee One is entitled Developing a National System of MPA's. We have noted some long-term goals for us as a Federal Advisory Committee, to advise the Department of Commerce and Interior on the framework for a National System of MPA's. June, 2005, a year and a bit off into the future, is a critical date for us to have reached some decisions on these, and it pertains to all three subcommittees.

So what you'll notice under Subcommittee One, this subcommittees job is to advise the Federal Government on how it envisions the concept and the practice of a National System of MPA's as a tool for the management and protection of critical ocean habitats and what goals the nation should seek through such management and protection.

So this in a sense is the broad covering mandate to Subcommittee One. And what I think we need is recommendations for identifying critical ocean habitats and assets, including cultural assets, and we'll come back to this issue of culture, because it does show up in several of the subcommittees.

is But the idea here that this subcommittee would help our full Committee understand issues pertaining to a system or a National of Marine Protected These network Areas.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 recommendations would be developed in existing efforts by various bodies, and that's in a 2 sense the task for Subcommittee One. 3 Let's look 4 at Two for minute. 5 Stewardship and effectiveness. Oh, sorry, Wally? 6 7 DR. PEREYRA: I don't want to appear like a 8 stickler, but I think this is an important issue, and 9 that is, how do subcommittees works get transmitted to 10 the Federal Government? It's my understanding, based 11 on the guidelines that we had before us for our Committee and subcommittees and also for discussions 12 13 we had the last meeting, that the subcommittee work reports finalized by the subcommittee would then go to 14 15 the full FAC for debate, approval, whatever, before 16 they would be transmitted in final form to the Federal 17 Government. Is that still the process? 18 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It is. 20 DR. PEREYRA: It's improperly stated in 21 It's a little confusing in this document. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I was going to 23 elaborate on that procedural issue after we sort of went through this, if that's okay? 24 Thank you for

bringing it up. We do need to have a conversation

about that, but what I'm trying to do here is alert the subcommittees to this, I would call it, clarification of what their charge is, and then we'll come back to procedure.

Okay, Subcommittee Two, Stewardship and Effectiveness, and you'll notice that the way it's stated, long-term goal for the FAC, not for subcommittee, for us as a Committee is to advice Interior and Commerce on ways to improve stewardship and effectiveness. And the task here subcommittee is to advise the Government, that is, bring to us recommendations which we would then approve for the improvement of the management of MPA's so that the founding purposes of each of these protected areas and its role within the National System could be obtained in a most cost effective way and most efficacious.

The assessment of the effectiveness and the impact of MPA's, advising on how to improve program planning, public participation, technologies that might enhance the effectiveness of management, and providing guidance on questions of general compliance with MPA implication.

So Subcommittee Two in a sense is looking at effectiveness measures, how to help

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

administratively accomplish what it is that MPA's are intended to do.

Subcommittee Three, National and Regional Coordination, as we know and as we will see tomorrow, there are elaborate inter-connected structures that are already in place for managing the oceans, Subcommittee Three is tasked in a sense with helping us assess the issues in coordination, collaboration, conflicts where they might occur, what have you. the point here is to advise "to bring recommendations to us to advise the Government, make sure that the system or network, under various names, works well, inter-jurisdictional issues do not become pretentious and in a sense debilitating.

That's the charge that we come to you with. I want to make a few other observations and get to Wally's point here.

The subcommittees in a sense are the place where our work is going to be done, it would seem to me. I can't imagine in a group this size that we will be able to dig in at the depth necessary to come to grips with many of the issues in these three, and I believe it is our sense on the Executive Committee, the more work that can be done at the subcommittee level, the better off we will be.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

have issues of decision-making. the things that has come One of up is minority reports, majority reports. I would hope that as the subcommittees go about their work, they would focus on two or three priority issues, that they would identify those, they would come back to us as a full Committee to tell us what it is they see, the two or things that they believe they want to focus on. And I say this now because we're going to start this morning down that road, and the first step, it would seem to me, is for the subcommittees to identify those priority issues that they plan to address.

Now the issue is going to arise, what if we get in a position in our subcommittees where we cannot reach agreement, where we have It seems to me, the first thing one might think about when you find yourself in that position is, you might want to go back and look at the language of the particular proposition that causes the division among you and see if you can't work that out. My hope subcommittees would be that when the bring recommendations to the full group, that they have worked as hard as possible to avoid a situation in which votes or positions are firmly entrenched, that the subcommittee is almost evenly divided, and to look

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

for ways to compromise on language, look for ways to re-work what it is you think you have before you, so that when it does come time for a vote, we don't expect unanimity. We understand there are going to be times when there will be strong disagreements that you cannot mediate, but the harder we can work in our subcommittees to re-craft language to bring to the full Advisory Committee, clear and generally agreed upon ideas, the better off we're going to be. I can't imagine it would do any of our principals; that is, Secretary Palmer, Secretary of Interior, Ι can't imagine it would do them any good for us to send forward recommendations that are split down middle. If I was one of those folks I would believe that, you know, okay, thanks a lot, this doesn't help me.

And so my hope is that we can, in our subcommittees, struggle with these things that do seem divisive, keep working on them in small groups. That's the advantage of work groups of eight or nine, ten people. And keep going over the same ground, looking for points of contention, and then coming to us with these recommendations, that are for the most part highly consensual, which is a little bit short of unanimity. That's what' consensual means to me. And

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

17 1 I understand that some people use consensual synonym for unanimous, but I don't, and I think 2 3 unanimity is too much to ask for on important issues, 4 but we ought to try to get close. 5 Now, Wally, I don't know if this really 6 point, but everything that addresses your the 7 subcommittees do must come to us for approval. Is 8 that "

DR. PEREYRA: That's what I wanted.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We as a full group, in a sense as we said in San Mateo, it is our job to in a sense approve the work plans of the subcommittee. What are the points that you intend to dig into and I would hope that as we go through these next two and a half days that we would set in motion a way of operating into the future so that the subcommittees are clear that they report back to us and as a full Committee. We are the ones that in a sense say, "You know, maybe you don't want to spend so much time on this thing right here, but why aren't you looking more at that?"

That is also something that this full group ought to do, I think. Okay. Is that okay?

DR. PEREYRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Subcommittees do nothing

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 on their own, and yet they do everything on their own. But we must approve everything that they do. 2 3 Do you want me to repeat that? 4 do nothing without us, but we can do nothing without 5 them. 6 (Laughter.) 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: When you're in a hole, 8 stop digging they say. So let me just leave it there. 9 You get the picture, right. They work for us and 10 they do our work. Is that okay with everyone? 11 will " is your hand up, Lelei? 12 accustomed to looking at students and their fingers 13 and often not sure they want to raise their hands. 14 when I see pencils in motion I get nervous. Lelei? 15 DR. PEAU: Thank you, Chair. 16 I noted that you skipped the other item on 17 the Committee business and I was wondering if I can 18 make a suggestion. 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. I'm not through, 20 but go ahead. Please, go ahead. 21 DR. PEAU: I have a proposal on the agenda. 22 Three of the Committee members attended the Regional 23 Meeting in Kuna last week and I suggested a proposal that we set aside a few minutes before the break-out 24 25 session and allow Charlie to report on some of the

	19
1	findings or highlights of what transpired last week.
2	I think it would be valuable information to all the
3	three subcommittees and I'm sure some of those could
4	be discussed more in detail during the break-out
5	session. But I would like to suggest that we have a
6	few minutes for Charlie to highlight some of those.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's fine.
8	DR. PEAU: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that okay with
10	everyone?
11	Go ahead, Charlie.
12	DR. WAHLE: We have a brief power point
13	together in response to this. Would you like me to do
14	that or I can just speak from my notes, whichever.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What is your preference?
16	DR. WAHLE: I prefer to do the power point.
17	It should be about five minutes.
18	It's probably no news to all of you that
19	MPA's are a very complicated and often contentious
20	endeavor and central to that are the human being
21	involved in the system, and so we've developed a
22	social science research program to begin to address
23	some of the issues underlying people's engagement in
24	MPA's, both pro and con.

And this has been going on for a couple of

years, principally with Sarah Lyons and Anna Spaulding The key piece to this is a national on our staff. strategy for social sciences of MPA's, and the purpose of that strategy which was published late last year is to strengthen the use of social science and MPA planning, design, management and evaluation. we're going about that is, or target, if you will, is to increase both the use, but also the allocation of critical resources people and dollars to the of the understanding of the development dimension that will allow us to do a better job with MPA's.

The audience for this strategy is really for the high level group, decision-makers, funders, ultimately Congress, and academia who may use this very general strategy as a way to both frame their projects as well as to allocate and prioritize their resources. And again, it was published last year. We have copies here, I believe.

Next please. The strategy which was developed with in-put from a variety of scientists and practitioners and stake-holders over a couple of different workshops identifies and focuses on six somewhat distinct themes. One is use patterns, which is exactly how it sounds, how people use and interact

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with the ocean and its resources. The second one is economics. The third is attitudes, perceptions and beliefs about how people actually value and perceive the ocean, which is often fundamental to all the others. The fourth has to do with cultural heritage and resources, that's the artifacts as well as the more complicated and maybe more interesting aspect of the traditional approaches of coastal societies to the ocean.

Next is communities, how groups of people, both geographically and by user sector, are organized, how they interact, how they transfer information. And finally, one on governance, which of course is the big one, where the rubber hits the road, how MPA's are planned and how they're managed.

example of what is Just an in the strategy, we lay out under each of those broad themes, topics for essential research project, and for each we provide what we believe is useful information on the relative utility and importance of these different topics at difference phases of an MPA's life cycle, planning phase and management, as well as some of generalized estimates practical matters on complexity and cost an duration. And the aim here again, is to give an agency person some clue about

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

what they're getting into if they want to devise a research program on any of these themes and topics.

Next please. Finally, in the strategy we go beyond the topics and talk about what's in effect program building, cross-cutting needs that have been identified across the board for things like baselines, date and monitoring of the human dimension, ways to value effectiveness, ways to manage and make accessible data, and tools and methods for better understanding the human dimension.

We also talk a bit about developing agency expertise, which is a serious issue, and developing a National Research Program which integrates ultimately the social and natural sciences.

This then led us to the next step, which is where we are now, is making this document a little The National Strategy is, as you can more real. imagine, very general, conceptual. What we're doing now is a series of workshops around the country in different regions, aimed at taking these very broad identifying within them concepts and regionally relative priorities for MPA research. And in those together stakeholders meetings bring we and practitioners and social scientists to develop real projects.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

We've done three so far. We just finished one in the Pacific Islands, and we're thinking the next one will be on the Pacific coast.

The way this works is, we take the National Strategy, the six themes on your left, and on a regional scale take one of those themes, break it out into a number of questions, and then for each of those questions develop specific research projects. These are all done by the people in the region.

And then finally, this is sort of where we are right now. We've done three. These workshops are very broad based in their participation. In advance of the workshop we provide some means of existing science research projects social in the region. Institutions and resources and the regulatory framework for MPA is in a list of the existing managed areas of the region, to give the participant sort of a universe within which to work.

So far what we're seeing is, we're getting a lot of projects out of each region. They vary quite as you might imagine, within broad themes. Some of the common threads that are emerging interestingly all across the regions are the importance of the historical and current uses, the way which information flows within among in and

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 communities, the way participatory processes are structured and managed, and finally, and this 2 was 3 particularly important in the Pacific Region, is the role of indigenous and native people's approaches to 4 5 marine conservation in the MPA arena. We're very pleased with the way things are 6 going and we hope that we will be coming to one of 7 8 your regions soon. 9 That's it. 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 11 Lelei, do you want to elaborate on that? 12 DR. PEAU: I think Terry. 13 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Terry? Okay. 14 MR. O'HALLORAN: I'd just like to say that 15 I would encourage any of the Committee members when 16 there is a workshop in your region to attend. this extremely valuable. I learned a lot. And I also 17 18 want to basically say that I think what Charlie and 19 Sarah and those folks are doing are extremely critical 2.0 to the overall success of our efforts. 21 So I really encourage everyone to attend 22 those and see and understand the importance of what 23 Charlie's work is. One other thing, and I'm not sure where 24

the appropriate time would be, Mr. Chair, but the

1	participants at that workshop developed a reso that
2	they would like to introduce to this Committee, of
3	which I have copies here. I'm not sure when that
4	time, or whether this is the right time.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could we hold that off
6	and bring it maybe later today or tomorrow morning?
7	MR. O'HALLORAN: Certainly, that would be
8	fine.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George?
10	MR. LAPOINTE: Charlie, when do you plan to
11	bring the show to this region?
12	DR. WAHLE: Sarah, you can correct me if I
13	get this wrong. The next one we believe is the
14	Pacific coast in the early fall, right?
15	MS. LYONS: No, it's not early fall.
16	DR. WAHLE: And what's after that?
17	MS. LYONS: No, I'm not sure. I think we
18	had talked about New England.
19	DR. WAHLE: We were thinking New England
20	might be next. We would like to get some feedback
21	from you and others about whether that's appropriate
22	and when the best time might be.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay, thank
24	you very much.
25	Let's get back to the subcommittees. One

of the things that you're probably aware of is that we have been urging, we, meaning the Executive Committee, have been urging the subcommittees to create a structure that in a sense mirrors what we have with the full Committee, which is an Executive Committee, and I think you're at different stages in that process. I think the point here was to help share the burden of work and organization at the subcommittee level, beyond just the Chair or the Vice Chair.

And so one of the things that I believe we want to move forward on at this meeting is the firming up and the formalization of that structure at the subcommittee level. I will be "when we do break out into subcommittees I will move among the three and when I come in to your room I'd like to visit with you again about this and about some other things.

Let me just talk about the scope of our work a moment, and let me go back to the decision rules issue, because on of the things that we keep hearing is what if we can't agree. And one of the things I'd like to propose is, as you think about the recommendations you're struggling with, as you think about these issues that you hold in your mind, a decision rule that's sort of super majority. In other words, you work hard towards crafting things you

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

2.0

believe 75 percent of your members can agree to, so that we get out of the box of simple majority voting and so on. It's just a suggestion. There are "it is up to you to decide how you want to settle these matters, but if you go into an issue with the idea that you need a super majority of some sort, then it causes you to think hard, as I said a moment ago, about the language.

We have, it seems to me, some decision points that I'd like to remind you of, all of us; and that is, we have one more meeting in the fall some time, probably September. We'll be finding out from you what works best for you. We will have a meeting in the spring of 2005, and as you notice in the charge to the subcommittees, June, `05 is indicated as a critical time.

And one of the things that I'd like to ask you to do as you think about your work, is to be conscious of the schedule. It may be asking too much, at this leading, for you to have anything definitive that you wish us to act upon, but it would be marvelous if by the time we leave and as we go forward, you could come back and visit with the full group about what you're working on, where you see it going, where you "how you see the timing work, so that

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

2.0

by September we would have before us, the full group would have before us, most everything that you believe, your subcommittees believe, we ought to act And so that by September it would be very nice to have that so that then we could spend time as a full group looking at that, reflecting it, discussing it, sending it back to you for more work, so that by our spring meeting we will sort of have a second reading, as it were, of those things and be in a position to act. Because by April or May of `05 we do need to be ready to come to closure on those issues that all of us agree must be addressed.

So we have this meeting which you could treat as a serious effort to set your own agendas, your own rough outlines of what it is you wish to address, the fall meeting which ought to be, as I say, kind of the first meeting, the first broad discussion of those issues, and the idea being that when we go to our spring meeting in `05, there's nothing new before us and we then have time for a serious deliberation on those issues.

Is there any discussion about that? Would any of you like to pursue the scheduling and the way that I spelled this out? I'm open to your suggestions. This is just offered as kind of a

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

working model of how we might do this.

Yes?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a question and maybe you've yet to address it, but the way you described it, it seems that we're going to continue working within the subcommittees under the themes that are being established and mandate, but then there are also these bridging issues, and that has some procedural implications.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. If one looks at the final page of the charge to the subcommittees, showing in a sense where the three subcommittees connect, where they link, where bridging is required, it is our hope that early on in this process, today, tomorrow, each subcommittee thinks about what these linkages are with other subcommittees. You talk with the leadership of the other subcommittees, you figure out when it is and what it is you believe you need to meet jointly to iron out. You may "you can do this as you wish. You might ask a subcommittee of your subcommittees to interact with the subcommittee of another subcommittee. I don't think we're constrained in terms of how we operate and that would be, it seems to me, in this very first section this morning, one wants to think not only about these bridging, these

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

intersections where you connect, but with the larger subcommittee tasks.

So I'll leave that "I think we can leave that to the subcommittees to figure out how best to work out that collaboration. For instance, I mean one of the obvious ones is cultural resources, you know, the term shows up in a number of places and it has a special meaning in Subcommittee Three, but it also has a special meaning in One and Two. And there are mean that shows up here. resources has a Three and an asterisk, so it means that it sort of fits in Three at the moment but it's pertinent to the others. You're free to do that as you wish.

#### Terry?

MR. O'HALLORAN: Regarding cultural resources and the defining of cultural resources, in the Subcommittee One the term is used as cultural assets. And I think it's important early on that we understand how we are defining cultural resources. I know in the Pacific Region side the term assets probably doesn't apply. There we're talking about a lot of native uses, historical traditional uses. So it might be worthwhile to make sure that we all I think understand how we're referring to that and maybe

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

using the same terminology and all of that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Subcommittee One, as Bart has already told me, he's struggling with a glossary just for his own work, and we do need "we need to come to an agreement on what these terms mean.

Bonnie and then Mark.

DR. McCAY: In that light too, we have cultural assets and cultural resources, and so far not appearing in the charges but certainly evident in Subcommittee Two and others, is cultural values, for example. We may want to have a discussion at some point about how we want it and how we want to deal with these.

#### CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mark?

DR. HIXON: Just to finish up this discussion briefly. My subcommittee, Subcommittee One, is "does not want to deal with the cultural resource definition, mainly because our subcommittee doesn't have the expertise. So we would like to defer Subcommittee Three and whatever in-put Subcommittee Two is on defining that particular issue. Because I believe actually the charge, it's one of the primary goals for Subcommittee Three. So that's how our subcommittee would like to deal with it, is give us your definition and we'll incorporate it into

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

our work.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think the timing that you've laid out makes sense if we're going to try to seek closure in June. I would just note two things.

that monitoring listed as cutting issue here, as it should be, I would just note that Subcommittee Two has had some discussion about monitoring in terms of indicators to measure metrics, to use an adaptive management move, technologies. haven't got that far but it's in our outline and I just wanted that that other to put out so subcommittees know where we're at.

The second thing I would say is that I think it's possible for the subcommittees to make a lot of progress between meetings through e-mail exchanges. We found that to be a bit of a useful way to communicate and to bat ideas and get the things down on paper.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: John Halsey.

DR. HALSEY: It's my understanding in talking to Joe that really our domain consists of what's underwater in these various sanctuaries, preserves. I know that there's an increasing movement in many areas to talk about cultural landscapes when

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

dealing with maritime resources, not only the shipwrecks and resources or assets that may be on the bottom, but the shoreline communities, the lighthouses, whatever other appurtenances go along with living next to the water. And I just want to be sure that we all understand that there are limits to what our charge can be. We can't go very far beyond the beach; is that correct, Joe?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: How far beyond the beach can we go?

MR. URAVITCH: Well, we are charged specifically with looking at Marine Protected Areas, and so we're basically out in the water and up into the basically mean high tide. So we're not looking at areas specifically in terms of Marine Protected Areas that have a land-side component. I mean there are obviously historical relationships, et cetera. for example, if you had a coastal lighthouse that's in a state park, if there was no even inner-tidal area that was part of the boundary of that area, then we would not consider that a Marine Protected Area.

So technically speaking, in terms of designating Marine Protected Areas as defined under this Executive Order, that those would not count.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So we're going to end up

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

just through the limits of what our charge is. 2 I think those could be 3 URAVITCH: MR. 4 noted, but you'd have to " and in terms of what we need 5 to do in terms of the Executive Order, we understand the connection, but the section such as the MPA list, 6 7 the National System would look like, 8 probably exclude any of those land areas. 9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks, Joe. 10 I have John Ogden, Tony and Bonnie. So 11 John? 12 DR. OGDEN: Cultural ethics aside, I fail to see how we could possibly define Marine Protected 13 14 Areas without including the singular in-put of land-15 based sources of pollution. I mean take this 16 sanctuary as an example. It's one of the two key 17 action plans that we have in order to try to protect 18 those marine resources. So, you know, I understand 19 there's a problem here, but I think this requires 2.0 resolution across the board. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Joe, you want to " 22 MR. URAVITCH: I'm not saying you exclude 23 those considerations because those are obviously part 24 of the stresses and threats to the System. 25 formally in terms of when we get down to developing

slicing off some major portions of the cultural whole,

the official list of Marine Protected Areas or defining what areas might be gaps in a National System, the land-based side would not be included. But you'd certainly consider land-based sources of pollution, for example, as a stressor on the System that we'd be concerned about.

DR. OGDEN: Or the linkage between "I mean it would strike me that where we have the opportunity within the debate that will happen in this group to link a substantial protected area on land with a substantial protected area at sea under our definitions, this would not be easily overlooked, or should not be easily overlooked.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a question and a comment, and they're not related to this present discussion. It's more toward the work of the subcommittees and what we're working towards in terms of "

We're charged with coming up with recommendations, but we haven't really discussed what format those recommendations are going "would be most useful for those recommendations. And I see that we have this interesting diagram here that shows the decision pathway for that recommendation. But I think

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

in addition to talking about the pathway, I think it would help the work of the subcommittees if we will all have in mind the same vision of what the product is that we're going to develop. And it might not be something that we can resolve right now, but I think it's an issue that we need to address, because we might end up with three very different products from these subcommittees, although they come back to " it might be more efficient.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's a nice point. would propose that one of the other first things each subcommittee does is think about what it "how it sees its recommendation coming, how it sees It's very clear we do not want product. documents. We don't need them. There may be lots of background material, lots of background stuff, but maybe the thing that each subcommittee wishes to do is independently formulate what it thinks its out-put ought to look like. And we can talk about that. to talk about it in the abstract, I agree with you, Tony, maybe now is not the time.

DR. CHATWIN: Just to follow up on that.

Another thing that would be useful is to get the input from the receiving parties, what product would be most useful to fit into this decision pathway, in

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 addition to us thinking about it at subcommittees. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. 2 Mary sees me 3 looking at her. I would "Mary, are you probably 4 you're familiar with one subcommittee? You are, 5 aren't you? 6 MS. GLACKIN: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're on " 8 MS. GLACKIN: Subcommittee One. 9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: On one, yeah. It might 10 be nice if you could, roam among the other two as I'm 11 going to do. Maybe not at the same time I am, but I 12 think it would be nice if Mary and others who have 13 some idea about what the demand side of this market looks like. 14 15 MS. GLACKIN: I'd be happy to do that. 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think we're back to 17 Bonnie. DR. McCAY: I think this topic is a very 18 19 key one, but I just want to say for the record that 2.0 cultural resources is one phenomenon that 21 charged to deal with, but cultural "there are other 22 aspects of culture that come up, and certainly in 23 Subcommittee Two this is a very key area because we're the effectiveness of 24 MPA's and their looking at

effectiveness will depend on cultural use patterns, on

cultural heritage, all of those things that Charlie had put up there on the slide and those are not encompassed by the underwater definition necessarily. They include that but they're not limited by it.

"I mean we've been "I'm intrigued that this cultural assets and cultural resources both sort of have an economic spin to it and I'd like to say the first thing we might need to do is define culture and then we can turn our attention to other assets or resources or values. And I think we're all in favor of culture and we're just not sure we know it when we see it.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: If we're going to get clarity on this, and I know it's kind of humorous, the point is we want to be very clear what we mean by culture, first of all. Can you help us with that?

DR. McCAY: Yes. I will be the token anthropologist on this.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You are anyway, whether you want to be or not. That would be nice, before we get to assets and resources and values, if we could offer clarity about what it is we mean when we talk about culture.

One final thing. In terms of the charge

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

to the subcommittees, there are other events going on around us. The National Ocean Commission is going to come forth with something in a week or two. The PEW Ocean Commission is out there. I would imagine that one of the most valuable things we might do would be to as subcommittees, but ultimately then as a full Committee, to look at what they have done, what they will report, and dig into their work and their recommendations as it pertains to each of the three subcommittees, and formulate our own reaction to what we see there, because one of the things I could easily imagine is that the Government officials to whom we supposed to send recommendations might understandably curious if we have views about what the National Ocean Commission said about Marine Protected Areas, what PEW said about it.

So that's another sort of thing on our plate here, is that each of our subcommittees needs to look very hard at these other events that have come out and that will come out in two or three weeks and figure out what you like and don't like, we like and don't like about those as they pertain to Marine Protected Areas.

Does that make sense to you? George?

DR. LAPOINTE: Except in timing, Mr.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Chairman. I mean the recommendations of the National Ocean Commission are supposed to come out on the  $20^{\rm th}$ . We have a thirty day comment period so we have to set up some structure, if we want to come in formally.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, I'm sorry. I wasn't very clear. Thank you.

I don't mean that we become a body that comments during that thirty day comment period. I mean any of us as individuals are free to enter into the business of commenting, and I'm glad you brought that up, George.

My point is that when the National Ocean Commission report comes out, we will not have a meeting again until September, but there are ways for your individuals members to get your hands on this, to look at it, to have e-mail discussions about "Gee, did you know this Recommendation 14 on Page 27, that bears on what our subcommittee's thinking about," and fold that into your conversations so that in September you will come to the September meeting, we will come there, with our thoughts roughly formulated about these different recommendations and be able to discuss it and bring your reactions to us as a group.

Is that okay? Michael? Oh, I'm sorry. Barbara and then Michael. Barbara?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

$4\bot$
MS. STEVENSON: I have a lot of concern
about the suggestion in that where simply setting
aside our main objective, which is to do the task
assigned to us, we have a limited amount of time, we
have a limited amount of resources, and how do we
chose which other external forces, reports that we're
going to read and review? Do we review them? Do we
review other ones? I think that we should stick to
the task that we're assigned.
Obviously some of the information that are
in those reports will be germane to our discussion,
but that's very different than reviewing the reports.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. Go ahead. Mike?

MR. NUSSMAN: I will speak to that issue, at least briefly, perhaps disagree, but speak to it nonetheless.

It would strike me that when they release the Ocean Commission here in a couple weeks, our works tends to be "the work of this Committee may well be thrown into something of a turmoil, depending on what that broader group does. Now with regard to the other reports out there, obviously we as individuals or we as subcommittees can use or not use them as we please. We're reporting to two secretaries. This is a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Presidential level commission that's been set up, so somehow, some way, I think we're in that mix and we have to pay attention to those specific comments.

What I would like to ask is, it seems to me that obviously as that commission works towards "makes recommendations, only a small piece of them will focus on Marine Protected Areas, and I know Joe and his staff have thought about this, but it would help us as Committee members to understand, have someone to analyze those recommendations and feed to us sort of what that broader commission is saying on Marine Protected Areas so we wouldn't have to spend a huge amount of time trying to do "each one of us do that analysis.

So I know Joe must have thought about this, although I haven't talked to him. I'm hoping Joe has. So Joe, tell us what you're thinking. Can you provide us with some fairly quick turnaround and some review of this document?

MR. URAVITCH: I don't see that as a problem at all. I mean obviously the PEW Commission report's been out for awhile and it was fairly specific on its recommendations and we've been following the Ocean Commission. So I'm sure that we could generate a short document. But again, this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

43
Committee has to make its own decision on what these
things mean. I mean we can't " and it might not be
appropriate for us to produce something for you, given
that this whole effort is being chaired by the
President's Council on Environmental Quality. All the
comments on the report that are coming out of the
Administration, coming out of the Council on
Environmental Quality.
So I think what we can do is excerpt the
appropriate sections of these documents and provide
those. But I don't think it would be appropriate for
us as members of the Administration to try and even

tailor those in any way or do any analysis, because that's being done across Executive branch level.

MR. NUSSMAN: Perhaps my term analysis is a bit over-stated. What I'm really asking is someone to maybe more collate and bring to our attention the materials.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, we can certainly do that. We will identify the appropriate sections and pull those together in a rational fashion and make those available as soon as we can.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks, Mike.

Barbara, do you feel better with this?

MS. STEVENSON: Well now we are going to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 provided information on it as opposed to review, right? If that's correct, then that's fine. 2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And what I took from 3 this was that Joe and his staff will organize some 4 5 summary of what they think is pertinent to the MPA, 6 and that summary needs to come to us, as a whole 7 group, to be acted upon and to say, "Okay, this looks like it fits in the purview of Subcommittee One, this 8 9 thing sort of looks like Three." 10 Would that be acceptable to you, if we 11 sort of did that, and then this whole group would in a 12 sense send those tasks off to the subcommittees. Ιt 13 doesn't mean that a subcommittee couldn't say, "We'd like to think about that one as well." 14 15 What do you think? Okay, Mike had his 16 hand up, and then we've got Ted and then Rod and then 17 Max Peterson. Michael? DR. CRUICKSHANK: I assume that this whole 18 19 document will be on the internet. 2.0 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's my understanding. 21 Okay, Ted? 22 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. 23 Several weeks ago there was a National 24 meeting of the Directors of the National 25 Sanctuaries. And it seems to me a lot of the things

that they're looking at are very similar to what we're looking at, how to manage their sanctuaries, what the issues are, what regulatory actions are needed and whatnot.

How does that activity or how should that activity relate to what we're doing here? How do we interface with those Directors of the National Marine Sanctuaries and make sure that our activities are coordinated and we're not stepping on each other's toes, et cetera?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm looking out of the corner of my eye to see if Joe has raised his hand, but in the absence of that, it would seem to me that we would want to make arrangements to visit with them, just as we want to make arrangements to visit with the Council Chair's of the Fishery's Management Councils or whatever.

Is this a plausible sort of assumption, that this is "that this group represents one of a number of people who would like to meet with us and that it would be good for us to meet with them somehow?

MR. THOMPSON: Could we get the minutes of those meetings and see just what it is they're doing?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Joe, please?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. URAVITCH: I will talk to Dan Boston, the Director of that office, and see what can be arranged and made available. And Billy Causey, the Superintendent of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, he's obviously at that meeting, might have some insight to that. If you don't mind, Billy?

MR. CAUSEY: Sure. Welcome to the Florida Keys.

My comment is I think it would be an

My comment is I think it would be an excellent opportunity for us to integrate some of the activities, and I think we should try to get on one another's agendas at different times. I just want to welcome all of you to the Florida Keys and I'm looking forward to the next three days and working with you.

Ι think beside the National Marine Sanctuary Program, we also have the Estuarine Research Reserves, we have other entities that are in fact viewed in various ways as Marine Protected Areas. Here in this area we are located, we have national parks, state parks, aquatic preserves. So I think there's ways that each of us sanctuary superintendents and managers can bring to you areas that we have identified as areas to network with in our various So I think that's an excellent idea. regions.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, thank you very

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

much.

2

1

I guess we have Rod?

3

DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just want to get back for a minute to of the PEW and U.S. Commission Reports. I

the issue of the PEW and U.S. Commission Reports. Ι think it's an excellent suggestion for us be briefed on that by the MPA Center and to use what we will in developing our own recommendation. I think it's important for us to do that. I just want to emphasize though that there's much more in those they reports than just MPA's, and address particularly the U.S. Commission Report is comprehensive review, all ocean policy, and includes Governments, the integration of Federal jurisdiction, resource management, both living and non-living. I think that if you limit the information that's gleaned from those reports as to the MPA's, we'll be missing a lot of context that will be really important for us to think about as we develop our recommendations. There's going to be lots of linkages between the recommendations and those two reports and whatever we come up with.

So I just wanted to urge the MPA Center as they develop their synthesis of information for us and all of us Committee members who review this thing

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

broadly about all the stuff that's on both of those reports.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Very good. And I would second that. I would hope that each of us in our role both on this as well as members of subcommittees would be reading those reports, would be flagging those issues that you believe are pertinent to your own subcommittee or to some other subcommittee, and that at our meeting in September not only would we have the MPA Center's list of issues, but many of us also would have issues or connections that we wanted to explore or that we thought the group ought to look at.

But the only reason I talk about it in this way, is that I do believe it is important that this full Advisory Committee in a sense ratify those things that our individuals members believe that it is important for us to dig into and think about, so that we're not just getting this thing too big, too out of control. So I think we ought to be open for suggestions, not only that Joe and the Center will bring to us, but that others will bring, either as subcommittee positions, once they've looked at these reports and come back or individuals, but I think we wanted to follow through here and then back to the subcommittees for further deliberation. That would be

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 my hope. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Max Peterson and then 2 3 John Halsey. Max? MR. PETERSON: I'm just going to simply ask 4 5 Joe when that Commission report comes out if he could simply advise us as to where it's posted so we can 6 7 look at it, because you might take a little time to 8 make your little report and it's only thirty days. So 9 it would be helpful when it's posted to let us know. 10 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, sir, we'll be glad to 11 do that. We'll send out an e-mail as soon as we have 12 the web location. MR. PETERSON: And then if somebody wants 13 14 to read the whole thing or spend a lot of time on it, 15 as Rodney has suggested, they can do that. 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Max. That's 17 good. 18 John? 19 DR. HALSEY: Mr. Chairman, I remind you 2.0 that last meeting we were advised the Department of and the National Park Service also 21 Interior 22 enormous underwater holdings in the forms of national 23 parks and protected areas. It ought to certainly be 24 given equal consideration to the National Marine 25 Sanctuaries.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good.

2 Okay, other questions?

Is there any "we have a few minutes. Is there any interest in discussing subcommittee work, subcommittee challenges, subcommittee structures, because in a sense we're going to have Rick Spinrad and then we're going to have Joe talk and then we have our break and then you go into your subcommittees. So this is our last change for awhile to make sure that everyone feels comfortable with what it is we would like to get from our subcommittees.

Bonnie?

DR. McCAY: Just in relationship to the discussion of the National Sanctuaries and the Estuarine Reserves and Interior and so forth, the website has very, very detailed information about existing Marine Protected Areas and their location within different agencies of Government and it's available to all of us.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Bob?

MR. BENDICK: I just think it's important that we try to crystalize the subcommittee recommendations so they have sort of an action or come down to the ground aspect to them, that they're not just theoretical or general in nature, that they

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

actually end up being usable by the people in the field. And I think we need to keep that in mind. There's a tendency to be sort of theoretical or philosophical and I think if we're to be of real use we've got to be practical also.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And on that same vein, it seems to me we want clear, concise recommendations with perhaps elaborations and then maybe supporting materials. So I can envision these things having three pieces, the recommendation which is brief, clear, an elaboration, and kind of a justification that might be at most a half a page or one page, and then whatever other supporting materials.

So I agree with you, Bob, that we want them to be practical, we want them to be able to stand on their own, but then there can be supporting stuff.

Rod, was your hand up?

DR. FUJITA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that before we go into the subcommittee break-out groups, there's an opportunity for us to avoid duplication of effort, depending on how far the subcommittees have gotten. Subcommittee Two, for example, has kind of already discussed priority issues and developed an outline for our recommendations. If the other subcommittees have

2.0

gotten to some point similar, maybe there's a way that we can each use a minute to just make sure that we're not, you know, duplicating efforts, we're not talking about " or we're not dealing with the same issues in each subcommittee or, you know, streamline our efforts somehow.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That scares me a little bit, Rod. I would ask your permission to hold off on that a little bit. I think there's enough early going for the subcommittees that if I may, I'd like to ask that we perhaps do that at one o'clock before we go back, but I think we've been away from each other for months, maybe we need some time subcommittees to sort of "I don't think this morning we're going to get a great deal of redundant effort coming out of the three groups. We may, but I'd be Is that okay, Rod? surprised.

DR. FUJITA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thanks.

Mel Moon.

MR. MOON: I think that there's going to be some lively discussion that's going to take place in the subcommittees. I'm looking forward to it. But there are a couple of points that I thought were very meaningful in terms of getting some place in this

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

process, and that was the work product, what is it that we are trying to do that has some similarities between each other, and the Agency and the Center need for information, a real clear sort of an understanding of what would be helpful and what format that would be needed to be the most helpful. Those are two key questions that are still kind of "that's what's going to be somewhat lively, I think, as part of the discussions, along with, you know, I mean this is helpful that we have, you know, some guidance in terms of trying to go in on the subject matter in three parts.

But it still seems a little left open. We're going to be having a lot of discussions about those two points and I'm not clear in my mind, anyhow, as to what the deliverable really is, what the Agency's needs are and how we're going to answer those questions without a little more in-put.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. That's fair enough. That's why I say, I plan to rotate among the three subcommittees this morning, not that I have the final word on that, but that will be a chance for us to visit about it a little bit. And again, I think that's something we could, after our initial get together this morning, we could meet as a group at

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

_	one. In fact, I would like to soft of amend the
2	agenda, if I may, to take account of Rod's
3	intervention idea as well so that one o'clock we start
4	here for a brief time, rather than just going right
5	into subcommittees. Let's meet here at one o'clock as
6	a full Committee with the idea that we will spend ten
7	minutes, fifteen minutes at most, and then get on back
8	to work. Is that okay, Mel?
9	MR. MOON: Yeah.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, Mike Cruickshank,
11	was your hand up?
12	DR. CRUICKSHANK: No.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No. Okay.
14	Other issues you'd like to raise? Yes,
15	Tony?
16	DR. CHATWIN: It's not an issue. It's a
17	question. Are we at some point going to go get an
18	explanation from someone on this flow chart?
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Yes.
20	DR. CHATWIN: Thanks.
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It calls for explanation
23	and we will have it, but not right now.
24	Lelei?
25	MR. PEAU: I just want to follow up on

discussions on the process. I'm glad that we decided to come back in the afternoon and do some sort of realty check, make sure that everyone's on the same At the same time there are some issues that need to be "like definitions, discussions that we had Do you presume that will be done at one earlier. o'clock, because I think that will help facilitate some of the discussions that we have in the I'd also like subcommittees. to get some clarification, Mr. Chair, in of the terms expectations. The afternoon you just want to where are we at in terms of our deliberations within the subcommittee, because that will help determine some discussion in the afternoon. Then tomorrow I presume that we'll continue deliberations in terms of whatever feedback we get from the group as a whole.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.

MR. PEAU: So then you envision that the final presentations of reports will be on Wednesday "
I'm sorry, on Thursday morning in terms of whatever we decided as a group. Because I think we've come to this meeting with the hope that we can iron out some of those discussions and some of those issues within our subcommittee deliberations.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

MR. PEAU: The only suggestion, Mr. Chair, I would like to put forward is that we have a little more time for the Committee as a whole to maybe perhaps review whatever progress we made before we go into the third day of our meeting. That way I think it will help all of us to make sure that we are operating on the same guidelines, we all have the same expectations in terms of what "

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. I'd call your attention to the agenda for tomorrow morning at 8:35, full Committee receives provisional reports from subcommittees. That is a wonderful time for us as a full group to hear back from you, saying "Here are the things that we feel we're clear about, I mean in a sense we haven't reached agreement, but these are the things we're clear we need to do. Here are some things we are still a little bit vague about in our own mind. We would appreciate some clarity from the full Advisory Committee."

So I could imagine that the time tomorrow at 8:35 being used for precisely that. The idea here seems to me is that the subcommittees figure out today what it is they believe they want to do. Some subcommittees are a bit further along than others. In that period tomorrow morning some could come and say,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

2	good about that."
3	My preference would be rather than acting
4	on that at the moment, that we say, "Fine, that's
5	good. Let's put that over in the column called
6	completed, more or less," and then they say, "Here are
7	some other issues that we still want to work on some
8	more," and people around this table will say, "Yes,
9	but; yes, but; yes, but, "okay. And that then maybe I
10	guess if we look ahead to Thursday morning, we have
11	time for the subcommittees to report back to the full
12	Committee.
13	So I assure you we will have lots of time
14	over the next two and a half days to interact with the
15	subcommittees in this room about questions they have,
16	about where they believe they've reached closure, and
17	they can put that to one side and keep bringing along
18	the other stuff.
19	Is that okay?
20	Okay, Terry?
21	MR. O'HALLORAN: Just a clarification for
22	my own mind is, in our subcommittee meetings will
23	representatives from the MPA Center be at each of the
24	different committees?
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think they have

"You know, we've reached closure on this. We feel

allocated themselves, yes.

2.0

MR. O'HALLORAN: Because I know they've done a lot of work and I only would want to make sure that we access that information.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right.

Rick looks completed, ready, and the clock says it's time for Rick Spinrad. So welcome, Rick, and please come up. Joe is going to introduce you.

MR. URAVITCH: I'm really pleased to have the opportunity to introduce my boss, Dr. Richard Spinrad. He is NOAA's Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management, a title you don't hear very often, but certainly in terms of this group the Ocean Services is important and so is Coastal Zone Management. That tends to get to that land-based sources of pollution and other kinds of issues that we've discussed earlier here in the Committee.

Rick is a native of one of the nation's oldest seaports and still a major international port and center of cultural heritage, New York City. He did his undergraduate work at Johns Hopkins University and holds both a Doctoral and Master Degree in Oceanography from Oregon State University. He's been in the NGO community serving as Executive Director for

	59
1	Research and Education at the Consortium for
2	Oceanographic Research and Education. He has a long
3	distinguished career as a researcher with the
4	Department of the Navy. And before joining us,
5	slightly over a year ago in NOAA, he was the Technical
6	Director to the Oceanographer of the Navy.
7	And it's my pleasure to introduce Dr. Rick
8	Spinrad, a great guy and a great boss.
9	MR. SPINRAD: Thanks, Joe.
10	(Applause.)
11	MR. SPINRAD: I'll take it now because I
12	won't get it later.
13	(Laughter.)
14	MR. SPINRAD: And I just have a few brief
15	comments. It shouldn't take me more than about ninety
16	minutes. I'm sure that's okay.
17	(Laughter.)
18	MR. SPINRAD: Thank you all. It really is
19	a pleasure to be working with you again. I'm looking
20	forward to this. I'm also looking forward to, based
21	on your discussion earlier, the Committee's definition
22	of culture, and when you're done with that simple
23	problem I'd like you to work on the definition of NOAA
24	culture.

It's

nice to see that

25

of

most

the

Committee members are here today, and many of our exofficio representatives. I hope I've got it, got it right. We've got the Department of Interior here, obviously. We've got DHS Coast Guard here as well. We've got Navy. We've got Agriculture. AID. National Science Foundation, are they here yet? They will be, I suppose. And I want to welcome all the rest of the folks as well.

This is obviously a critical activity. I also want to make a special mention and nod to my colleague, my co-AA at NOAA, Mary Glackin, who I know joins me with the Department of Interior in supporting the activities of the Committee, and especially their definitions and activities of the subcommittees. These are critical functions and I'm really looking forward to what comes out of the subcommittees.

I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about some of the things that are going on with NOS, the National Ocean Service, NOAA's National Ocean Service, including what's being done at Committee relevant to the MPA activity.

The first thing I want to point out is, as

Joe indicated, I started just about a year ago, and

one of the first things I wanted to do was engage with

a diversity of constituents. Those of you who know

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the National Ocean Service know that it's a rather diverse and broad portfolio that we hold, everything from sustaining and maintaining many of the Nation's navigation and transportation services, to dealing with a variety of resource issues, to of course, as Joe pointed out, the Coastal Zone Management issues. So it's rather diverse, and I'm convinced that nobody coming into the NOS Assistant Administrator position brings a broad enough base of expertise and to fully understand the sweep of issues.

So we engaged in a series of roundtables. They're still going on right now. Let me just give you a flavor of what those roundtables are focusing We've had roundtables on marine transportation, safety charting and navigation. We've had roundtable on advancing our understanding oceans, on enhancing ocean value and vitality, which is where we focused on many of the MPA related issues, and we've had one on living on the edge, which is dealing with a lot of the Coastal Zone Management We're going to have upcoming roundtables on international issues, on promoting ocean awareness and a stewardship effort, really the educational focus, and then the future, sustaining a national ocean That last one will take place some time policy.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

probably in June and you can see we are thinking about alignment with the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy as well, and I'll have a couple more things to say about that, including some specific recommendations.

And before I get, www.oceancommission.gov. somebody asked about where will you see the report released. Among other places it will be released on that website. How do I know that? Because NOAA runs that website for the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

There are some other things we've done within NOS. One of the things that I'm striving to work towards within NOS is that the National Ocean Service really become the National Ocean Service, not the National Ocean Services. When you think of the weather service, you think of a service. That's the goal we need to obtain within the National Ocean Service, which means integrating many of these kinds of activities that I described earlier, NAV Services, Resource Management, Coastal Zone Management.

And so what we have worked on over the last six to nine months is development of that cohesive vision for the National Ocean Service in a manner consistent with the broad NOAA strategy. And that vision is something we call Global Leadership for Integrated Management of the Oceans, which encompasses

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

everything from the NAV Services, Coast Survey,
National Geodetic Survey, Response and Restoration,
Coastal Zone Management, Marine Protected Areas,
Sanctuaries, all of these are encompassed in this
Global Leadership for Integrated Management of the
Ocean.

Specific focal points for this leadership vision including things like modeling, observations, partnerships, watersheds. I mean that in the literal sense. What is our responsibility in terms of management of watersheds? And then technology is part of that as well. So you can see that those kinds of themes for this Global Leadership for Integrated Management of the Ocean transcend the individual program offices that are the responsibility of NOS.

help That's going to us set some priorities. That's going to help us express our responsibilities better, whether it's to the Hill, to the American public, the stakeholders in general. It's a vision we are developing. And so one of the am really keen about is looking things I activities of this Federal Advisory Committee in the context of strengthening that vision. So there's a lot of feedback going to take place between the Committee and between what we're trying to do in NOS.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Obviously an important part of these efforts will be the three MPA programs housed within the National Ocean Service. Of course, that's the MPA Center and the Sanctuary Program.

The activities of the MPA Center, I think you're all reasonably aware of what Joe and his staff have been doing. You'll get a chance to hear a little bit more a little bit later, but clearly, focus on Subcommittee One's activity associated with the framework in establishing the framework the National System of MPA's, of the inventory for that activity. The Center expects to complete that inventory in 2005; right Joe, and then it will undergo an assessment from which the list of MPA's called for in the Executive Order will be developed, and developing the criteria for the list will be a public That's an important point. process.

Of course you're going to hear a little bit more about the role that technology has. We already hear a little bit of some of that discussion earlier today. That's going to be a critical component of the subcommittee discussions as well.

Let me take a slight diversion and talk budgets for a minute. We've got to do that. We're at a stage right now where we are in fact defending our `05

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

budget submission on the Hill right now. The Assistant Administrators in the Leadership of NOAA are spending a lot of time talking to staff, members in Congress, a variety of folks, explaining the details of the budget.

There is one point I want to make clear. Some of you may have seen rather dramatic articles about NOAA's 35 percent reduction in its ocean services. Let's clarify it. In fact, what we're seeing is, even by some measures, a slight growth in the National Ocean Service budget. When you look at what our submission was in 2004 and our submission in 2005 and you consider the earmarks and the adjustment to base, in fact we are seeing about a ten million dollar increase within the NOS budget. We are a heavily "we are the "NOS is the most heavily earmarked line office within NOAA in the 2004 appropriation, nearly two hundred million dollars of earmarks. So let's be careful when we consider the reference point in terms of what's happening with the budget.

That's an important point, because Admiral Laudenbacher (Phonetic) has made it clear it is his intent to strengthen NOAA's ocean responsibilities. There's some things that we're doing; I'll talk about them in a few minutes, that reflect 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

22

23

24

strengthening. So I want people walking out of here understanding that NOAA is working towards a very healthy ocean budget, but we're working with the Hill to try to insure that we can handle stability in the budget and we can also work with the earmarks.

If I talk specifically about the MPA center. It's a three million dollar request. It's level with the President's request for FY04, but it is a million below the `04 appropriation. So that is symptomatic of what I just described for all of NOS, level in the request.

The MPA Center plans to continue its outreach activity, obviously. It's going to continue supporting research and analysis, maintaining the public information web access and providing technical and training assistance as called for.

There's also some important points. I know Billy Causey had a chance to talk to you earlier and you'll get a chance to hear a little bit more about some of the connections. I was intrigued by the question and the small discussion earlier about conactivity between sanctuaries, between NEARS. I would argue, let's take that same sense " and the MPA activities " let's take that same sense and consider the con-activity across the board. I am interested in

knowing what is the con-activity between activities, Coastal Services for example, of our Center, activities of our Office of Response and Restoration. Where does the Coast Survey activity fit in here? I'll give you a hint. We're looking at integrated ocean mapping right now. One of the critical issues MPA's is accurate characterization environment through mapping. We're going to have to involve components of Coastal survey to do that.

I think you get the sense of what I'm looking for in terms of the cohesive development of the NOS portfolio.

Let me make a final comment along the lines of the opportunities. As I told all the folks within NOS, and I want to share with you all, this is a seminal time in the business of marine policy, marine operations, marine research. It's probably the once in a career time for many of us from the standpoint of the convergence of any number of activities.

As a shopping list, we talked about PEW Commission, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. There's abundant legislation coming out. There are some new forums for discussion. I'll go through each of these bullets briefly, new forums for discussion in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Federal sector, and then within NOAA there is a strong push towards even better strategic planning and development.

Let me talk about each of those in a little bit more detail.

The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy is probably the most important thing that the Web site of NOAA is facing right now, so much so that I can tell you it's thirteen days and twenty-two hours before we're going to look at that Web site. And figure out, April 20<sup>th</sup> at eight 0'clock in the morning is when we're going to be paying attention to the report coming out.

There is a thirty day public response period and the states have that same thirty day period, so May 21<sup>st</sup>. Then it's not clear how long the Commission will take to revise, revamp, edit the report, but every indication is it will take about two months. So we're looking something in the neighborhood of the end of July before report is officially delivered, the final report.

The Administration then has ninety days, August, September, October. The Administration is going to be pretty busy toward the end of October with some other stuff, but nevertheless, we are pushing

2.0

hard, and I will tell you, within NOAA we have set up, there are at least six FTE's working full-time on our development, NOAA's contribution to the Administration Response to the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. has also established for this first time an Ocean Council, which is an across the organization forum for discussing how to deal with a number of issues, like the Commission. We have now developed within NOAA our responses to the Commission's recommendations. We haven't seen the recommendations, but we've developed our responses, and this is based on the best information that's available, and we all have access to that information, the mid-term report, the table of contents, the responding briefings that have been given by any number of Commissioners as well Advisory bodies. Based on that we've identified some forty-three themes, we've identified the several hundred potential recommendations, and what we believe our response should be. And we are working closely with CEQ in the development of that response. CEO does have the lead.

So I was intrigued by the discussion you all had earlier, and Joe knows all the background on this and what's going on within the Council. We need to find out where is that nexus between the Federal

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Advisory Committee you all are different from the
public in the sense of the role and responsibilities.
Where is that nexus between what we are trying to do
within the Administration, what the fact the Committee
here is doing. At the very least, during the next
several months what I have argued with any number of
groups, including these roundtable discussions I've
had is, let's be cognizant of the focal points, let's
be cognizant of what the hot issues are, and let's
recognize where the areas of unanimity may lie within
the community and where the areas that are going to
have some rough bumps might lie. Because I guarantee
you that those areas where there is significant
disagreement will probably be the toughest ones to
convince anyone to take action on. But the areas
where there is consistent agreement, we can really
make some hay. And so let's learn early on what some
of those areas of consistent agreement are, and I will
be glad to task Joe with finding out what's the right
mechanism for establishing the linkage between what
we're doing within NOAA and the Administration. And I
say that on behalf of CEQ, and all of the Agencies
around the table as well as another dozen more are
sitting at the table with CEQ to develop that
Administration response. Let's find out where the

linkages are between them.

2.0

I know at the very least, for example, we can share what our definition of the forty-three themes is that we suspect the Commission report will focus on. That's a highly charged discussion, no doubt.

Legislation. If I can real briefly, there's a window of opportunity here. Oceans and Human Health just passed the Senate about two weeks ago. Every indication is that this is part of what will be Senator Hawling's (Phonetic) swan song.

Ocean Observations, this is Senator Snow's S1400. It's been referred to four committees on the House side. A lot of discussion about CZMA reauthorization. There is abundant legislative activity that is specific to the ocean community. We need to make sure it's well connected with your discussions and deliberations. Your advisory role could be critical in terms of things like Agency response, Agency opinions, views letters, that sort of thing.

So as long as we can work the timing, we're counting on your advice on a number of these issues.

I talked about active bodies within DC. Finally, we have within the Office of Science and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Technology Policy a group with ocean in its name, and it's the Joint Subcommittee on Oceanography. That is the subcommittee or the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources and the Committee on Science. We never had that until about six months ago. That's a body that we can take advantage of. It's also well represented by every agency that has a penny in investment in ocean science.

finally, And NOAA's strategic plan development, and Mary can certainly give you all you want to know about where we're going with strategic development. I am extremely impressed with what we are trying to do within NOAA in terms of bringing together the forces to bear on a wide range of seemingly disparate societal needs, and the strategic plan development. If you have not seen our strategic plans from last year, please take a quick look. It's a readable read. It explains in clear terms what we're trying to do. The further development of that is going to depend on the good advice that we get, especially from Committees like this.

So closing that point. There are any number of legislative policy organizational programmatic opportunities that we can take advantage of, and we are counting on the advice of 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

22

23

24

Committee to help us. I say that with two hats on. 1 One, the broad Administration hat, and then two, the 2 3 specific NOS hat. 4 So let me just close by reiterating that 5 we are looking forward to your critical work, your 6 important work. I'm going to try to wander as well 7 among some of the subcommittees, if I can, over the 8 next few hours, and just am delighted to have had the 9 opportunity to take a few minutes to talk with you. 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks, Rick. 12 (Applause.) 13 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And I'm happy that you 14 will be here at least for part of the day to visit 15 with the subcommittees. I think that's marvelous. 16 Okay, Joe, you have something? 17 MR. URAVITCH: Thank you. I was asked to 18 make a very brief presentation on where we are in 19 terms of the action items from the last Committee 20 meeting and any major issues or activities that the 21 MPA Center is involved with that you ought to know 22 about. 23 In your folder there is a hand-out on the 24 action items that says MPA Federal Advisory Committee 25 Action Items from November 2003 meeting. And next

slide, please. If someone could get the lights.

This is the list of the action items. The first was to recruit an EPA ex-officio member. We're almost there. We've been in discussion with EPA over the past several months. There was a formal letter sent over and we hope to have an EPA member at the next meeting.

We were asked to investigate the potential for an Army Corps of Engineers member. We did have a Federal inter-agency working group meeting that was attended by Lynn Martin of the Corps. The charter right now does not call for a member from the Army Corps of Engineers, but we'll discuss that with the Department of the Interior when we move forward with developing the next charter for the Committee. But we do have Corps involvement now at the Federal interagency level.

We work with the NOAA library, developed the list of MPA related articles for the Advisory Committee and those are available via the internet site.

Let's see, subcommittee work plans. I don't think we have seen all of those at this point. So that's left open as an action item, but I think that's really your action item and not ours.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Consult legal counsel on the Advisory

Committee and motions on the Charter. We did consult

the counsel and that is now clear and approved.

You asked that we prepare a letter and information document for the stakeholders. We've done that. We have not mailed it out yet, but you have an advance copy. We did a special hard version of our monthly newsletter, MPA Connections, and that will be going out shortly to the various stakeholder communities.

You asked that we clarify issues related to the OCS areas. That's still under deliberation at the policy level within the Department of the Interior, but there's been considerable progress made on that and we'll have a report for you at our next meeting.

The official approval of the subcommittee structure that you all proposed at the last meeting has been given by both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce.

And you asked for a flow chart on how NOAA will review Federal Advisory Committee recommendations, and that was the one that was asked about earlier today, with all the arrows and boxes which I believe will be discussed later.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Next slide, please. I thought I'd just bring a couple other things to your attention, because I think they are related to the work of this Committee and its activities that I've become involved with since the last Committee.

Obviously " and this relates the National System development efforts. Obviously, you all are working with us on the framework for the U.S. However, I have recently become National System. involved with two other activities. Commission for Environmental Cooperation which U.S., Canada and Mexico. It's an environmental side agreement to NAFTA and I'm now the NOAA representative on the group meetings to develop the North American MPA Network, and Mel Moon and I were actually at a San Francisco meeting in two weeks ago on that specific issue.

The other thing that has happened is now that the U.S. had rejoined UNESCO, the U.S. Man of the Biosphere Program is reconstituting itself, and I was the NOAA representative when the Committee existed before and I've been sort of revived again. We are going to be meeting in St. Louis, Missouri the first week in May, and in looking at the draft agenda that they had, I noticed that they had something called a

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Biosphere Reserve Network for North America, and so given the fact that we're working on National System and the NAFTA side agreement is working on a North American network and now I see the Biosphere Reserve Programs talking about it, I thought it made sense for me to try and make some sense about these three networks. So I will report back to you on what I hear from these other meetings. But that's really all I know at this point.

Next slide, please. This should just be one slide. Just keep going until we fill in "there we go. Just keep filling it in.

The other thing we did is at the annual meeting of NOS' Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, we did a quick kick-off on where we are in the process for the development of a National System, and I just wanted to lay out for you the activities that are taking place long-term. This includes the goals, definitions, inventory analysis, science and network design, but you can see that we've begun the the process for laying out various steps and activities that are taking place or will take place related to the design of the National System.

And I won't go through all this today. We'll provide you with a copy of this, but you've seen

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

78 1 over the past year how we've been evolving in terms of this National System process. And these are just some 2 3 of the specific activities that are taking place in 4 terms of design of this system. 5 Next slide. And that is it. I thought I'd leave some time open for questions, if people had 6 7 any questions on our activities or future activities. 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Tony? 9 DR. CHATWIN: It's not necessarily 10

DR. CHATWIN: It's not necessarily a question, but in identifying the other ethics that are underway that have relevance to the United States, there's also under the Catahana (Phonetic) Convention, the SPAWL, Special Protected Area and Wild Life. They're having a meeting in Guadalupe later this month which I'm going to attend, where they're talking about criteria for identifying protected areas that will meet the SPAWL designation. And that has relevance to the U.S. in terms of the U.S. Carribean.

MR. URAVITCH: Yes, and as a matter of fact, we commented on that proposal last week, and Arthur Patterson from the International Office and National Ocean Service will be attending that on behalf of NOAA. So we are aware of that, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George?

MR. LAPOINTE: In terms of the CEC and the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

UNESCO efforts, what's the timing line, Joe?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. URAVITCH: UNESCO, I don't know. The group has never met. The first meeting will be the first week in May. And so right now they're just developing the agenda for that. So I think that the timing on that is unclear.

But Man of the Biosphere has not met for four or five years, so my guess is it's way down the road at this point.

In terms of the CEC work, we agreed basically to look at a sort of pilot representative activity from Baha to Behring on the west coast, built around the corridor traveled by the gray whale. there's been really little effort focused on the east coast of the United States at this point. It's one of the things that we've talked about internally within that the Commission Environmental NOAA, on Cooperation's work has really been focused on the They really focused on two efforts. water looking at protected areas, corridor, network, a pilot one, in this case based on the gray whale, as well as focusing on three species, leatherback turtle, the humpback whale and the pink-footed shearwater, from the bird side of all this. And it runs parallel to a land-based effort that's being done which is

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

_	carred for, which is carred reflowscome to fundif,
2	which is focusing on a natural resources corridor
3	going from mid-U.S. all the way up to the Yukon. They
4	have not laid out a specific time table on how they're
5	going to proceed to the east coast, but we, for
6	example, have been talking to the sanctuaries program
7	as well as folks from the Gulf of Maine, Department of
8	Fisheries Ocean in Canada, on integrating our U.S.
9	inventory work with Canadian inventory work, and we're
10	hoping to co-fund a project, pull together information
11	for the Maritimes and the Gulf of Maine this year.
12	MR. LAPOINTE: If I may, Mr. Chairman. In
13	terms of what you described on the west coast and the
14	east coast, as that relates to this Committee, is it
15	safe to assume that they'll be slower than we are?
16	MR. URAVITCH: Yes, I believe that's
17	certainly the case. We're trying to get three
18	countries to agree on something, so I think we'll
19	actually proceed faster.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I was going to say maybe
21	we should look forward to Havana to Halifax.
22	So, 10:15. I think we're scheduled for a
23	break. Other comments?
24	MR. BENDRICK: Just that last slide, Joe,
25	development of the National System. There seem to be

a lot of specific issues there that obviously interface closely with the Committee, and we've got our three subcommittees, but I'm not sure how what's behind me here meshes exactly with the Committee and potential in-put from the Committee on specific items that are part of that work program.

MR. URAVITCH: Why don't I turn the response to this over to Charlie Wahle who's the lead in the science and analysis part of this effort.

DR. WAHLE: Much of this is in the broad purview of Subcommittee One; not all, there's some overlap. But at this meeting we'll be specifically talking about the row of goals, both the draft and the development ultimately of the final goals for the system. Under the definitions row we're beginning to just very preliminarily talk about some of the key components of the definition of the Marine Protected Area as opposed to the broader umbrella of marine managed area. And chief among those is the idea of this lasting protection, what do we really mean by that.

And then finally, down on the analysis row, the fourth one, if time permits and we may not get there, but we plan to hear a preliminary discussion about the ways in which we might go about

1	documenting and analyzing the potential impacts of
2	human uses which will ultimately be folded into
3	information on the contribution of existing sites to
4	identify gaps in protection, which will ultimately
5	lead us to identifying priorities of MPA actions,
6	which is of course many years away.
7	But one of the key steps is what is the
8	problem we are seeking to solve with this tool. So
9	those are the things that we'll be beginning to kick
10	around in a substantive way here today.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks, very much.
12	Okay, I think we need to keep on schedule.
13	That was a great discussion. Joe, thank you, and
14	Charlie and Rick, again, thanks for your presentation.
15	We have a break scheduled, 10:15. At
16	10:30 we are to meet in subcommittees. Subcommittee
17	One meets in the African Queen Room. That's the
18	African Queen Room. Subcommittee Two meets in
19	Casablanca II, there, and Subcommittee Three meets in
20	this room. There's a table right there for you.
21	Thank you very much. We had a nice start
22	and we'll see you back in your individual sections.
23	(Recess taken from 10:15 a.m. to 1:05
24	p.m.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

2

1

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(1:05 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We're a bit shorthanded, but may we resume for a brief, I guess you might call it reconnaissance conversation. The idea in the morning was that after the first little go-around with the subcommittees that we have just a brief chance here before we go back into subcommittees to share in a preliminary way what we're thinking about, where we are and so, and Rob proposed that and I think it's a nice idea.

So I will ask Mark Hixon from One and then Lelei from Two and Mel from Three to very briefly share with us what they're thinking about.

Mark is not here. Lelei is here and Mel So Lelei, can we ask you to go ahead? is here. a couple of minutes or three minutes, and some limited questions if there are and then we'll go back into our subcommittees.

MR. PEAU: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Our Committee, as you know, we met this morning and we went over each individual's outline from our last meeting. Each member were tasked to provide an outline addressing the issue pertaining to effectiveness and stewardship. And then we " as we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

were going through each of the outlines there were specific recommendations that fall out from that process. We were able "we were only able to go through half of our tasks this morning. But the whole "at the end of this exercise we were generating some specific recommendations or highlights that will be submitted for the Committee as a whole for validations and also reactions.

We felt that "and we certainly appreciate this opportunity to see where everybody is at in terms of their progress, but we continue to struggle in terms of we don't want this to turn into a thesis or anybody's report, but we recognize that this will all be consolidated or complied by staff, but "specific recommendation at the end of the process. I think I'll defer to specific recommendation until we complete our exercise.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, thank you. Are there any questions of Lelei in Group Two?

MR. PEAU: Or is there anyone from Group

Two that would like to add?

DR. FUJITA: I would say, Lelei, that I think we did, or at least we discussed the idea of four major elements that are going to be discussed in our recommendation. And if I recall correctly, one of

1 them was about education and constituencies for MPA's. What was the other one, Lelei? 2 3 MR. PEAU: Planning. 4 DR. FUJITA: Oh, planning, processing and a 5 third was compliance and enforcement. So basically what I had in mind was a lay-out with a very general 6 7 like that and to see if we're tackling 8 separate elements or whether some integration is 9 required. 10 MR. BENDICK: The question came up in our 11 group, to what extent is your Committee going to deal 12 with the issue of inter-governmental coordination on things like enforcement or planning? We're trying to 13 wrestle with what our subcommittee is supposed to be 14 15 doing. 16 CHATWIN: We haven't really DR. talked 17 inter-governmental coordination in about our 18 discussions. I think the approach that we're taking 19 is recognizing that many different agencies have 2.0 different mandates and that you guys are going to be 21 addressing how the coordination between those agencies 22 happens. We had finally come up with the guide to 23 improve stewardship and effectiveness for whatever 24 agency would be, mainly within Commerce and Interior.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Good, thank you.

Mel, do you want to continue?

MR. MOON: Well, we discussed what had been on the agenda from San Mateo and the response by the Committee for some of the proposed modification from the e-mails that we had received from them in the past. We also followed up on some of the other assignments that we had in terms of cultural papers that had been developed John Halsey in that document that had been presented to the group in San Mateo, and the letter that had been requested to be forwarded, and then we revisited again the Group Number Three charge of purpose or function, you know, are we still on the same track.

I think we were able to get a little bit of feedback on some of the issues that were important to the MPA Center and the Federal Agencies, such as inter-jurisdictional issues and gaps where conflicts exist. And then we were able to reaffirm our desire to get some work groups together on inter-governmental coordination and culture, in particular.

We had a lot of good discussions about parts of that topic that we could move forward with. I think we were willing to look at it in two parts. One part would be that which would be recommendations that would come to this group on Thursday. The other

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

part would be more of an assignment based approach that would be more long-term with specific subjects such as legislation, enforcement, monitoring, coordination, things of that nature.

So I think we're ready to talk about specific assignments. We were going to break out by two's. Specifically, we were talking about the cultural aspects, inter-governmental coordination, things of that nature.

So that's kind of what we've got so far.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay, Mark, you want to talk a little bit about Group one?

DR. HIXON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being delayed.

Subcommittee One is focusing on deepening and finishing a vision and goal statement for National System of MPA's. Over the past six months we've been working through a one-page document throughout that we've been posting on the secure web page. We're now going deeply within that document and grappling with key concepts and terms that tend to have nebulous multiple definitions, depending upon who the reader is, and our intent is to come up with very explicit definitions for some of these key thorny terms before proceeding onward.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

1 So, for example, what's on the table right now is what is lasting protection and the definition 2 of a Marine Protected Area, which is what we're going 3 to start with after lunch. 4 5 This morning we discussed the differences and similarities between a system of Marine Protected 6 7 Areas versus a network of Marine Protected Areas, 8 things of that sort. 9 intent thereafter is Our to once 10 completing this vision and goal statement with an 11 attendant glossary, to then forward that to the full 12 Committee for consideration and then go on to the 13 issues of approaches for implementing those goals and 14 eventually examining approaches for documenting and 15 analyzing human uses and impacts on the U.S. ocean. 16 Would anyone from my subcommittee like to 17 add anything? 18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Then are you 19 ready to go back to work? Before you do, I've been 2.0 asked to announce that there seems to be room on the 21 boat tomorrow if your spouse or good friend is with 22 you, I think there's capacity on the boat. Is that 23 right, Lauren? MS. WENZEL: Yes, there's a few spots. 24

if people would like to bring their spouse, just let

me know.

2.0

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, please let Lauren know.

So, there we are. We are to be back here at three o'clock. I ask that you be quite punctual both at three and 3:15, because 3:15 starts our public comment period and we wouldn't want the public to think that we don't run on time. We want the public to think we do run on time. So please let's go to work and be back in the next room for your break at three and then we're ready to go at 3;15.

(A recess was taken until 3:15 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think we are ready to reconvene from our recess. This is the public comment period. We have instructed people who wish to speak that they would have five minutes. We have only four speakers. So in an early show aggressive generosity we've given them seven minutes each. And even so, with four, you can see that unless things get entirely out of hand, we're going to finish a bit early, finish that is with the public comment period. And so when that happens, and I think it might be around quarter til four, four o'clock, something like that, depending on how things go, I'll have some announcements to make and then I think we might be finished for the day. I

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

won't use the word adjourned because I don't believe we adjourn until Thursday. I believe we go into overnight recess or something. Is that right, Charlie, because if we adjourn then we're in trouble. We'd have to bang the gavel again.

So we have four individuals who signed up And the first is Mr. Dan to make public comments. Clark who's with Cry of the Water, and Stephanie Clark will be part of this presentation. They have a video they want to show us and we have an agreement that the video will go for ten minutes; is that right, Dan, is that agreement, taking three minutes from our Stephanie Clark, but she's promised to finish off. I think we will within seven minutes for the two of them should be just about right on schedule.

So our first individual making to wish public comment is Dan Clark from Coral Springs and he represents Cry of the Water.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. I'm going to show some video here. This video is taken two counties north of here, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida for a reference for all of you from out of town.

The first portion of this video, if it comes up and plays here I believe, this is taken in 2001. This reef still looks pretty much the same as

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this. We've been out in the fall and early winter and went out and surveyed these reefs and they're pretty much the same. As you can see, these are in a very big way essential fish habitats. We have some really remarkable corals here. Everything you see in this video is going to be what was shot from beach dives. All these huge corals and these great resources are right off the beaches in Ft. Lauderdale.

Unfortunately, these reefs are currently threatened by a proposed dredge and fill project up there where they take and they dredge sand from offshore pile pits and they pump that sand onto the beaches to make the beaches wider.

We've seen past projects destroy many of these same near short reefs. What happens is the fill material that the use, it's high in silt content. I've got a bottle here. I took this bottle of sand of a Boca beach which was done about a month ago. I'm going to shake this bottle up. First I'm just going to move it a little bit, move it around, and you'll see the silt that gets re-suspended off the bottom here, this is the problem with this fill material. It has a lot of this silt content in it, and every wave event this silt fills these near shore reefs out.

Now this area I'm showing you here has

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

never seen a beach project and it's probably some of the best near shore beach diveable coral reefs left anywhere in the country. There's some really ancient corals here. Some of these corals are decades "I'm sorry, centuries old, some of these big ones. And it's one of the only places left in the country where you can take your snorkel and go off the beach and see some of these things. Most of this is in twelve to about eighteen or nineteen feet of water.

It's a pretty diverse area, as you can see here. They're not all great big huge corals like that, but then we have good coral cover and once again you can see a lot of juvenile fish in here. really important to our local marine fisheries, and not just our local fishery in Broward County, fisheries all up and down the east coast, because like this field of serva cornish (phonetic) you see here, juvenile fish habitat and it's а huge the pelagic species like important to even the sailfish and the marlin, and it's stuff the big guys in their sport fishers chase because even though those fish, we don't see them in these shallow reefs, the stuff they eat, the grunts and all that kind of stuff, grow up in these shallow reefs, and they supply food for the whole food chain out there and the whole part

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the ecosystem.

2.0

So if we lose these near shore habitats, we're going to lose part of our fisheries. It's going to have a cascading effect as well. And here in the middle of all this serva cornish you still see some nice mound corals.

These areas are being impacted two-fold. One, by nutrients in the water. Let me get to that here in a little bit. Here's some more of that serva cornish though. The color's not real good here. Maybe it's the projector. We've got a little bit better color on the screen down here. But as you can see, once again, this is in a big, big way a juvenile fish habitat. It's crucial to marine fisheries. If we lose these near shore habitats it's going to have a cascading effect.

Now here in the Keys you have the bay side and the grass flats and all that. We've lost most of that up there to developments. These near shore reefs kind of fill that glitch, and there will be some more of that stuff coming up here in just a minute.

But these reefs are currently, like I said, being impacted by nutrients. You've seen some of that. This was taken back in September. This is a local dive operator out there trying to save his

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

livelihood. We're actually trying to pick the bacteria off the reef there. All this red fuzzy stuff looks like cotton candy. It doesn't belong there. It's there from too many nutrients in the water.

Now this reef is getting a double whammy. It's also near a sewer out-fall pipe. We pump millions of gallons a day of treated affluent to sea in Broward County. We need to better treat this affluent. Here you can see even after pulling this stuff off, we got a permit from the state to pull this stuff off, but as you can see, the tissue is dead underneath, so we kind of gave up on it. It really wasn't doing a whole lot of good to go out and try to harvest the stuff off the reef. We're able to save some corals. But much of the stuff after the sunlight's blocked out for a short period of time, the tissue underneath was dead by the time we pulled it off.

But the real solution is to clean up the out-falls and what's coming out of these out-fall pipes. It's only secondary treated. We need advance water treatment.

Here you can see some serva cornish.

There's talk of putting this on the endangered species

list, and here you see the serva cornish being

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

smothered by that same bacteria.

2.0

Now years ago this used to be just around the actual sewer out-falls, but it's migrating further and further, now it goes miles up and down the reef. And if we don't address this and make this job one, we're not going to have a whole lot to make an MPA out of up there and save.

As you've seen earlier, some of those really nice corals, I mean that should be the number one MPA priority in this country. It's some of the best stuff left anywhere.

Here, this really surprised us. This is a pillar coral with that same bacteria growing upon it. We were really surprised because we figured the pillar coral with its tentacles usually extended, we figured it could sluff this stuff off. But in this case, as you can see here, even the pillar corals aren't immune to this stuff. Once the nutrient level gets so high it just grows on them and smothers them. In fact, most of that pillar was killed afterward. Steven was back there. This first portion of the video is compliments of Vone Research and he went back there and most of that pillar coral was destroyed after that video was taken.

Here again, you see a big eel in the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

middle of all of this stuff. Again, none of this red stuff belongs there. It makes good cover for the eel when he wants to stick his head in and hide, but it doesn't do anything for the gargonians and things living around them. They're being smothered and killed.

We probably walked about a third of this particular reef this past summer into the fall, the nutrients and the algae growing over things. The problem now is they proposed to go and dredge next to this "this is right between the two borrow sites for the proposed beach projects. And when they dredge, this is what it does to the water, okay, and all the water will stay milky until tomorrow sometime and then that layer of silt will be back on the top. This is the big problem with the dredging.

Okay, besides the area that have the really great corals and all that, we also have things that are going to be buried by these dredge projects. They're going to bury "they were going to bury initially thirty-eight acres. Got them down to about thirteen that they admit to. The scientist tells us it's going to be more than that. And these areas are essential fish habitats. In the case of the red grouper like these, they'll stay there for about the

first three or four years of their life before moving out. You see him laying on his side up under a hole. These areas are highly leafed, but in the case of the red grouper they'll use them for about three or four years.

Also juvenile fish habitat in a very, very big was, juvenile french angel, and a lot of these holes and crevices are where these juvenile fish are growing up. Here's another red grouper.

Almost every dive we do in these near short habitats, we'll see multiple reds there. This one's actually got a hole excavated. You see the sand in the foreground. He's actually got a hole excavated up under the rock that he's going to use and go and hide in here in a second. And once again, not a lot of highly leaf, but very crucial and important part of the ecosystem and the food chain up there.

Also, here it's hard to see in this video, but there's a lot of little tiny fish. They're almost transparent. You can barely see them. But again, this is essential fish habitat. We don't have the flats and stuff like you have here in the Keys, so it fills that niche. Here's one of the small corals growing in these hard bottoms that will be buried. Again, not a highly leaf, not a huge coral, but there

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

are corals there. And we see also see some bigger critters that come in and visit these near shore hard bottoms as well.

Again, the creature you would typically see here in the Keys in the bay side or in the flat side here, and they're using these near short hard bottoms instead because it kind of fills that niche.

Also, green sea turtles. Almost every dive we do off of Ft. Lauderdale area, they're going to bury these areas too, are forging grounds for adolescent greens. Sometimes we see more than one at a time here. There was a ship grounding there last week, a 550 some foot freighter blew in under the reef there and there were so many turtles there that the ship actually flattened a turtle when it blew in under the reef. So that will give you an idea of the turtle population. The odds of that happening have got to be pretty long, I would think, for a ship to blow up on the reef and actually kill a turtle, flatten a turtle like that.

The turtles that have been tagged here have been found nesting back in Costa Rica. We weren't aware that they go that far, but they actually go back that far, they migrate that far and nest. They spend their adolescent years here in these flats

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

and near short hard bottoms and they actually migrate I guess back to wherever they had come from. I'm not quite sure how that works. There's probably some turtle people in the room that could tell you more about that.

actually have an agreement with the Costa Rican Government. They objected to these areas being buried because we have an international they'll protect says that turtle agreement that We have filed a grievance with the task force about burying these areas.

Also, another areas that's going to be buried, this is John Lloyd Park. There's a large population of conch there. If they do bury this area we'd like to have people in the Keys come up and look and perhaps come and take some of these conch. They could add to their gene pool here in the Keys. We did a single dive here. They're hard to see when they're covered with algae like this. But we did a single dive in this location and counted fifty in a single And we've been up there just in the past few dive. weeks near shore and seen little three, four inch long by the beach. So it is a conchs up breeding population there and we hope that if this area does become buried that somebody will come along and maybe

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

scoop some of these up and try to save them, bring them down here, add to your gene pool or something here in the Keys.

this is another issue that Once again, wasn't put in the EIS or any of those things. Again, not highly leaf here but you can see how it holds a lot of juvenile fish. Right here in the middle of the screen, here's another one of those red groupers. He's got his cammy's on. You can't see him until he He's going to take his camouflage off here in a minute. This is pretty cool. Watch, he'll change. There he goes. And once again, these near shore habitats are in a very, very big way a red grouper habitat, and important to a lot of other species as well. We're as much concerned about the burial of these areas as we are to the secondary impact from silt, sediment and turbidity to the reefs that lie just beyond them.

Like I showed you this bottle, you see it still ain't cleared up here. It's all still all white and milky. And once this happens, these reefs are already stressed from the nutrients and such. Here's a coral "this coral is bigger than any vehicle you drove in here today in, okay. This is centuries old. And this is really one of the redwoods of the sea, if

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	you will, and this area should get the utmost
2	importance as far as MPA. This should be on your
3	radar screens. If we're not protecting this area,
4	what are we doing here? I mean seriously, there is no
5	protection for this area right now. There's no
6	management in place for these reefs, okay.
7	I challenge you to go out here in the
8	sanctuary tomorrow and find anything that looks like
9	this. There may be a few but I don't know if you'll
10	see any tomorrow. There is stuff in the Tortugas that
11	looks like this, but once again, this area deserves
12	protection and we hope that it will be on your radar
13	screens and you'll do what you can. Okay.
14	I'm going to get out of here and leave.
15	Stephanie will just let this play. And the rest of
16	this, just kind of look and see the coral cover here.
17	These aren't monster coral heads, but once again,
18	there's lots of it.
19	MS. CLARK: Can talk up here?
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Sure. Now
21	this is Stephanie Clark.
22	MS. CLARK: Thank you very much for giving
23	us the time.
24	We're going to submit the video and a
25	petition asking for the protection of our reefs in

Broward County to the official record. I sat in on the stewardship and MPA effectiveness Group Number Two in there for the afternoon, part of the afternoon, and I wanted to make a couple of comments.

One of them is that NOAA was part of a socioeconomic study of the reef that was done for Broward County and the four southern counties, Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade and Monroe, and Broward County generated 2.1 billion, the reefs generated, which was more than Monroe, the Keys, West Palm Beach or Miami. So I just wanted to put in that we do have socioeconomic study of the reef that was done by NOAA.

And also, part of that study took a poll of users and the majority of the people they polled also said that they would support an MPA in Broward County.

The other things I had to say about the meeting this afternoon was I wanted to thank you about talking about public comments and how early and often engagement of stakeholders and the importance of engaging the stakeholders in these meetings. And they also talked about managed marine areas and how "basically I was just really happy to see that you wanted to engage us and have our comments and use our comments. That was one of the things, not to just

1	listen to us and " but to actually take them and
2	incorporate comments into what you were doing.
3	We have a local action strategies formed
4	for the area, West Palm Beach, Miami-Dade and Broward
5	from the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force, and we could use
6	a little more of that early and often engagement in
7	the meetings, not just meetings where we go and speak,
8	but actually engaging us in the process of putting
9	everything together.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Thank you
12	very much, both of you.
13	Okay, wonderful, thank you. Don't forget
14	your sediment, ma'am. That has great value.
15	Wonderful.
16	Okay, our next speaker " yes, Tim?
17	MR. THOMPSON: Could we ask any questions?
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think so. Yes, I know
19	so. We're legally allowed, yes. So please, do.
20	MR. THOMPSON: How far off shore does this
21	reef go?
22	MR. CLARK: There's actually three reef
23	structures in Broward County. Everything I showed you
24	was on the twenty foot or less reef. The outside edge
25	of the twenty foot reef, it varies. In places it's

probably I'd say anywhere from 1100 to 1500 feet from the shore. But you actually encounter the near shore edge of the hard bottoms in places about 400 to 450 feet from the beach. And then you'll start on the flat hard bottom and then you'll come to kind of like a little rise, and most of all those big corals you see around that rise, that real high coral cover is the outside ledge of those ridges, which is probably about anywhere from 1100 to 1500 feet.

MR. THOMPSON: The second question I had is, has there been any water testing down to show what the nutrient level is in those areas that have that bacteria growing on the coral?

MR. CLARK: No. In fact, we're trying to get some grant money right now to go out and do some real time instrumentation stuff from a boat, using the same kind of instruments actually used in the water treatment industry. We can drop probes over the side and get some real time numbers.

The EPA was there. They brought the Anderson in the fall. They were there right after that video was taken in fact, the following week or two. They did bring the Anderson and I gave them the marks for those reefs, and they did go dive those outfalls and the reefs around them, but they've been

pretty tight lipped about what's going on there. They haven't given any report. So if you've got some connections with the EPA you can get more answers than I've gotten. They have elevated on the beach project though. Because one of the problems we saw with the beach project was, they weren't looking at the current condition of those reefs when they want to start adding the silt and sediment and all those things to them.

MR. THOMPSON: One other question. How far from the out-fall do you see the bacteria growing?

MR. CLARK: Further and further all the time. Also there's beginning to be places where there's non-point sources. What we think is that it's possibly percolating up from the deep well injection They put just about equal amounts a day of treated affluent into the ground, as what they pump to sea, and there's places "one of the places we call the caves where the sharks sleep on the bottom, you see sharks laying there over the years, and we thought water had come out of these caves over the years. also the old time fishermen talk about there used to be a fresh water boil there, or some of the old And we think now this summer, that became covered with the same bacteria. So we're thinking

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 that maybe some of this stuff is percolating up, that's in the thirty foot reef, the next ridge out. 2 3 And possibly non-point sources are showing up because 4 we've got places where there's other concentrations of 5 it that we can't put our finger on, we can't find, there's no out-fall pipe, there's no inlet per se. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Yes, Rod? 8 DR. FUJITA: Just one comment. Thanks for 9 that, it was great. 10 I believe there was tracer studies that 11 have been done here in Monroe County that show a 12 linkage between septic tanks, et cetera, it's on land, 13 and submarine discharge in the near shore reefs, 14 because of the carbonate geology of the Keys. I don't 15 know what the geology is in Broward County, but that 16 might be a factor, not just the deep well injection, 17 but all the stuff that goes into the sediment. MR. CLARK: The old part of Florida does 18 19 have some septic as well, and that's a possibility as 2.0 well, it might be percolating up from those. 21 DR. FUJITA: Right. My other question is, 22 I think you mentioned that some or all of the habitat 23 you're talking about is essential fish habitat. you mean that as the official designation under the 24 25 Fishery Management Council?

	MR.	CLARK:	Yes.	Actua	lly,	unde	r Fish	and
Management	" off	icial	" eve	rything	, now	is	officia	ι1 "
Fish and	Manage	ement,	this	is es	sent	ial h	nabitat	of
particular	conce	ern as	desi	gnated	by	the	Managen	nent
Council								

DR. FUJITA: So since it's an AKPC, have you initiated formal consultations with the Army Corps and EPA about these external threats?

MR. CLARK: Well, if you call filing "yes, I have " we have tried to work with the Corps. Basically, the Corps said that their agenda is to do this beach project. The beach project that's proposed is twelve miles of our coast and that's been their number one priority. And we haven't got a whole lot of satisfaction out of them. I sent a letter to Colonel Carpenter showing him some of this video and the pictures and all that, and basically he sent us something back saying that it didn't have "that they really weren't interested, that the project was going to go forward. And it was at that point that we filed a grievance with the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force and we're hoping for some sort of mediation. If we don't get that, the next correspondence with the Corps will probably be litigation over what's going on up there.

DR. FUJITA: I heard the thing about the

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	Task Force, but the body with jurisdiction over ESH is
2	the Regional Council and Commerce because it's a part
3	of the Magnussen-Stevens Act, that's the statute under
4	which its actionable, I think. If the consultation
5	process doesn't proceed in a way that's acceptable to
6	you, then that's where legal action could occur.
7	MR. CLARK: I would follow that "
8	DR. FUJITA: Under Magnussen-Stevens,
9	because the ESH is a mandate under that Act which
10	governs the Regional Fish and Management Counsel and
11	NOAA.
12	MR. CLARK: We thought NEPH (phonetic) was
13	going to elevate on this. In fact, they did or
14	threatened to, and then there was some political
15	maneuvering that went on and that objection was
16	dropped awhile back.
17	DR. FUJITA: All right, thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, are there other
19	questions?
20	If not, our third speaker is Cheri Recchia
21	from the Ocean Conservancy.
22	MS. RECCHIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
23	thank you to the Committee for the opportunity to
24	speak. It's nice to see you all here today. I think
25	that this, at least from my personal perspective, is

somewhat more salubrious surroundings than San Mateo, with no offense to my California colleagues.

I am Cheri Recchia, Director of the Ecosystem Protection Program at the Ocean Conservancy, for those of you who don't know me, and a colleague from our Key West office, Nancy Klingener, will speak later. So I will try to keep my comments quite brief.

Ι have one process comment based sitting in on the deliberations of Subcommittee Number One earlier today. And the subcommittee during one of their sessions was discussing a draft document which was not distributed to the audience and the rationale given for this was that this document was a work in evolving very quickly and progress and was obsolete almost the moment it was handed out and so forth. And Ι think there also are some confidentiality which Ι concerns respect and appreciate.

However, I'm wondering if there can be some other approach that is reached, because obviously if subcommittee members are discussing Line 73 and Line 17 and so forth, not only is the audience completely incapable of following the discussion, having any sense of what the subcommittee is discussing, we also can't provide informed in-put, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I think that could be useful to the Committee and the subcommittees in their deliberations. So I'm hoping there may be some alternative to that and I'm sure Committee members who have experience with other kinds of committees might have some other approaches that are valid.

The other thing is I noticed that tomorrow you're having a briefing on inter-agency coordination for the Florida Keys Sanctuary. I think that's terrific. I think there are some other things going on right now in the U.S. that might be useful for the Committee to consider as it moves forward in its deliberations.

One that I would point you to is some of the crime to date going on around the northwestern Hawaiian Islands where there is a proposed national sanctuary moving forward. And one of the really interesting things that's happening there that is new in the history of the sanctuaries is consideration of an explicit goal and in protecting the natural character of those ecosystems. And one of the reasons that's so exciting is because protecting natural character, it basically excludes the possibility of conventional fisheries management which seeks deliberately to reduce target fish populations to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

maximize	productivity.
	Producering.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Ι think both kinds of goals are legitimate, and we need both areas, but this is one of the first times in a substantial area and certainly in a national sanctuary context where there's explicit consideration of setting a place aside to protect allowing national character and uses consistent with that but not going with the sort of same old, same old approach that we considered everywhere else.

We're not saying that's what should be done everywhere. The northwestern Hawaiian Islands is a very special and specific case. But I would just highlight that for the Committee as you continue to move forward considering a ride range of MPA options, goals, opportunities, and therefore levels and types of management.

And I will stop there.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.

Are there questions for Ms. Recchia?

Yes, Rod?

DR. FUJITA: Thank you, that was very interesting. I hadn't heard that.

My first question is, what was the status of that objective? Is it being headed by the Reserve

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Operations Council or the Sanctuary Program or what?

MS. RECCHIA: Yes. The objective initially comes from the Executive Orders that establish the Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve and has been adopted in the Reserve Operations Plan. The final Reserve Operations Plan has recently been made public and it's available for public comment up until I believe May 15<sup>th</sup>.

The Reserve Advisory Council has wholeheartedly embraced this goal and in fact has implemented it in a draft mission statement for the sanctuary which has been approved by the full Reserve Advisory Council and forwarded on to the Sanctuary Program for their consideration.

So they are not only happy with that, they are seeing "implementing that, delivering that level of protection, in part through an approach that is, if you like, closed and less open. In other words, taking the approach that activities that are not specifically allowed are prohibited, which is the flip of the usual approach, was that everything's okay until it's specifically ruled out.

So the Reserve Advisory Council is very strongly behind this goal.

DR. FUJITA: And the second question,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

1	Cheri, is what basic justification or rationale for
2	that kind of a goal? Is it to help protect the base-
3	line, the ecological base-line? Is it for future
4	generations legacy? Did whoever developed this goal
5	provide the justification or rationale?
6	MS. RECCHIA: I think, as I recall the
7	language in the Executive Orders, and I actually have
8	the final Reserve Operation Plan, a copy of it with
9	me, which includes the two Executive Orders that
10	together establish the Ecosystem Reserve, so I could
11	look it up for you specifically. But it talks about
12	the importance of the areas from a sort of heritage or
13	legacy perspective and also recognizes that the
14	northwestern Hawaiian Islands is one of the last, if
15	not the last, intact apex predator dominated
16	ecosystems in the U.S.
17	So as I would interpret the overall
18	objective of the Executive Orders, this place is
19	really special and it's not messed up yet, so let's
20	stop it from being messed up for culture reasons,
21	scientific reasons, and legacy reasons.
22	DR. FUJITA: Thanks.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Wally?
24	DR. PEREYRA: Thank you very much. A

question I had is, how are they dealing with the

recreational fisheries with regards to this Ecosystem Reserve?

MS. RECCHIA: I think they haven't decided intent of the Executive Orders is that recreational fishing, and indeed I think all fishing, be capped at levels approximating what was occurring time or in the years preceding implementation of the Executive Orders, which the first Order was issued in December of 2000 and the second in January of 2001. And the Secretary is to make a determination on what constitutes capping. the first area of focus is on the commercial bottom fishery which comprises approximately nine active boats at the moment.

So I believe there will be a Federal Register notice forthcoming sometime relatively soon on determining the caps for the commercial fishing industry. I think people haven't yet wrestled with the recreational fishing industry and how to really manage that at this point. And of course, there's been a change in the situation with the closure of the recreational fishing activity of the Midway Island, which at this moment is not proceeding.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Mark?

DR. HIXON: As Chair of Subcommittee One,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	I just wanted to make it clear that in restricting the
2	distribution of documents, my intent is to " one is to
3	make the context of our discussion clear to the
4	audience and clearly, I haven't done a very good job
5	of that. So I'd like to assure you that I will
6	redouble my efforts to make sure that what we're
7	talking about is fairly obvious.
8	MS. RECCHIA: That's great, and I
9	appreciate there are sensitivities, so I recognize
10	that.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
12	MS. (SPEAKER): I would just suggest that
13	perhaps at future meetings we can pass things out and
14	ask that they be returned at the end.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Other
16	questions, comments?
17	Thank you very much, Ms. Recchia.
18	Our last registered commentor is Nancy
19	Klingener. I guess the local representative of the
20	Ocean Conservancy; is that right? Is Key West local?
21	(Laughter.)
22	MS. KLINGENER: My name is Nancy Klingener.
23	I'm the Florida Keys Program Manager for the Ocean
24	Conservancy and I'd like to welcome you here to the
25	beautiful Florida Keys and thank you for coming down

here to see firsthand that you can establish marine reserves in the United States and live through it. And I think the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary specifically, superintendent Billy Causey, and the State of Florida, deserve enormous credit for persevering and for doing the right thing in the Keys.

Tomorrow I believe you have a social mixer with the Sanctuary Advisory Council. I serve on the Sanctuary Advisory Council. I will not be able to be here tomorrow because the Monroe County Marine and Port Advisory Council scheduled a meeting for the same time and I'm a member of that as well. That's where I'll be, but I hope you really learn a lot from our The Sanctuary Advisory Council is colleagues. really interesting, diverse group of folks and we all get together every other month and talk about what's It was through going on in the Keys ecosystem. working with that process that we did establish reserves here in the Keys, and especially the Tortugas Ecological Reserve. I hope you've learned about that process and that you'll learn some more over the next couple of days, because I think that's just fantastic example of how stakeholders, scientists and just the general public can really work together to work in favor of our marine areas.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I also wanted to mention in advance of tomorrow afternoon, I think you're getting a panel on going Florida. some efforts on here in South Specifically my concern is about the Management Plan Reviews for Biscayne National Park. Biscayne is adjacent to the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and in fact a working group formed under the Sanctuary Advisory Council is currently examining the Fishery Management Plan and the Ocean Conservancy has a representative on that group.

We're somewhat concerned that marine reserves are not even on the table in that process right now, and one of the reasons we're very concerned about that is because in 2001 the National Park Service issued a report from their National Park System Advisory Board titled "Rethinking the National Parks for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." And this report in some ways really anticipated what we heard from the PEW Commission last year and I think what we might expect to hear very soon from the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and I'll just read you some very brief excerpts.

"If human stewardship has been lax on land it's been even worse in the sea. A separate

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 environment lies beneath the water off our shores, but we know little of it and seem to care less because it 2 3 cannot readily be seen." 4 Later it goes on to say, "To insure the 5 long-term survival and health of our marine systems we must create a strategically designed system of no-take 6 7 reserves covering а broad range 8 representative marine habitats, especially those 9 important to spawning. The Park Service is one of the 10 Federal Agencies focused on conserving wild life for 11 future generations should play a leadership role in 12 developing and implementing such a system." 13 And I think if you look into what's going 14 on at Biscayne, you'll see that the science is there, the socioeconomic research is under way, and that 15 16 there's a really good case for at least considering them, which is really what we're asking for. 17 18 So I'd just like you to keep that in mind 19 tomorrow when you're hearing about the current efforts 2.0 under way in South Florida. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much. 22 All of you were very punctual. 23 Yes? MR. CLARK: Somebody asked me how far off 24 25 shore those reefs stopped. I was talking about the

1	first reef. I didn't want to give you misconception
2	that 1500 feet off shore there's no more reefs in
3	Broward County. There's a different depth reef
4	structure. There's a mid reef and deep reef, and the
5	deep reef actually goes out to just about a mile off
6	shore.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks for doing that.
8	Other questions for Ms. Klingener? Yes,
9	Rod?
10	DR. FUJITA: Yes, I have one, Nancy,
11	thanks.
12	I'm wondering as someone who's lived
13	through the marine reserve designation process here in
14	the Keys " I left during the height of accomplishment.
15	I don't know what happened later. When I left
16	everybody kind of hated each other. Have things
17	changed? Have attitudes "
18	MS. KLINGENER: Yes. I haven't seen any
19	effigies of NOAA along the highway lately.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MS. KLINGENER: Things have definitely
22	improved. Yeah, absolutely. And I think Tortugas is
23	actually an excellent example where things as you
24	experienced really sort of came to a head in the mid
25	`90's and NOAA said "Wait a minute you know this is

1 not working. Let's go back to the beginning. Let's make sure we have the science. Let's make sure all 2 3 the stakeholders are involved. Let's really do this 4 right." 5 And I think the unanimous approvals you saw for Tortugas pretty much all the way up the line 6 7 demonstrate that. 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Other questions? 9 Yes, Bonnie? 10 DR. McCAY: Again Nancy, thank you for the 11 presentation, and maybe thank you for leading me to 12 this question. 13 Why are marine reserves not on the agenda 14 for Biscayne? 15 MS. KLINGENER: I think that's a question 16 you should probably direct towards the Park Service. 17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Oh, yes, Dan 18 Suman. 19 DR. SUMAN: I'm on that Committee and I 20 think it's an interesting case, a test case to a certain extent, between "well, for the Department of 21 Interior and the National Park Service and 22 the 23 Fisheries Management, because of course it seems like the main experience with Marine Protected Areas and 24 25 fishery management has been through NOAA and the

Department of Commerce.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But here we have an Interior led attempt to manage fisheries. With Biscayne National Park, through legislation, there is joint management over at fisheries between the Florida Fish and Wild Life Commission Conservation and the Department of And there also is an MOU between the Fish Commission and Wild Life Conservation and the Department of the Interior which would consider "which suggests that marine reserves would be considered as a fishery management tool of last resort.

So the story remains to be seen what will happen there. Of course the Fishery Management Plan is only one part of the general management plan and it's possible that some other type of closed area could be used, it could approximate a marine reserve, but not specifically for fishing. It might be for protecting reefs for divers, or separating uses.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Michael?

MR. NUSSMAN: I had a question on the question. Would you "I heard the marine reserves were the last resort, but clarify for me, if you would, from whose perspective was that coming?

DR. SUMAN: I believe that it's an MOU between the State and the Department of Interior. I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

believe.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes? Identify yourself, please.

MR. CRABTREE: I'm Roy Crabtree. is between the Florida Fish and Wild Life Commission and the Department of Interior. And in Biscayne National Park it was conveyed to the park service in a couple of pieces, and some of the conveyances, State of Florida retained all of the fishing rights, and then in other conveyances the Secretary of Interior had rights to put in fishery regulations in consultation with the State of Florida. And when the MOU with the State of Florida was put in place and it was discussed at the Florida Commission, it was agreed that in the portions of the park that were subject to the MOU and where Florida retained fishing rights that as she said, that no fishing zones essentially would be a method of last resort. But there is a center portion of the park where the Secretary of Interior would have jurisdiction and consultation. They put fishing regulations in place.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Could I ask a clarifying question about what last resort means?

MR. CRABTREE: I'm the say guy who wants to know what culture is.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	CHAIRMAN BROMBEI: WE VE HEARD IT IIOM CWO
2	witnesses, that's enough. Last resort, would that
3	mean, Dan, do you think it means, and maybe others
4	know the answer to this, it means that when the fish
5	have disappeared or are on the cusp of disappearing or
6	when the best science suggests that we're on a
7	trajectory that will deliver bad outcomes if we don't
8	do something soon. What is last resort; do you know?
9	MR. BOWMAN: I would just suggest that the
10	Superintendent will be here tomorrow as part of the
11	panel and should be able to answer that.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Michael?
13	MR. NUSSMAN: I was going to answer it, but
14	I'll actually leave it to someone who knows.
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Now there's a precedent
17	worth following. That's a wonderful thing, Michael.
18	Can you imagine that?
19	Okay. Other questions? If not, I guess I
20	can declare the public comment period over.
21	We do have some business as a Committee,
22	not much. May we go ahead and do that, Joe? Is that
23	your understanding?
24	MR. URAVITCH: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: They're basically some

1 announcements; that is, that those of you who have spouses with you, they are welcome at our dinner 2 3 tonight, the Committee dinner. The trip tomorrow for the members of the Committee will be " it says here 4 5 will be а snorkeling one and you should dress 6 accordingly. And if you have a spouse, he or she 7 should do likewise. Are snorkels provided? 8 And spouses are also welcome "oh, I guess 9 I've done that. It's all about spouses here, 10 Committee dinner, the boat trip tomorrow, snorkeling. 11 How am I doing? Have I gotten everything? 12 Oh, yes, those of you that are going to 13 snorkel, you need to let the Federal Government off 14 the hook and that means that there's a form you have. 15 MS. WENZEL: There's a form in your packet 16 you sign it and leave and have to it at the 17 registration table where you came in so we can make 18 sure that we have them all in hand before you set out. 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So that your children 2.0 may not sue the Government. 21 And then I have one more announcement and 22 that pertains to our discussion tomorrow morning. 23 say this now because some of you are going to go back 24 into your subcommittees. The period between 10:15 and 25 11:15 tomorrow, there will be a chance for a sub-group

	125
1	of each of the three subcommittees to meet and to
2	discuss culture. And so I think we have two
3	volunteers from each of the three subcommittees that
4	will do that, so in a sense what we will have tomorrow
5	will be four break-out groups and maybe the small
6	group working on culture can meet up at this end of
7	this room, perhaps.
8	So that would be something that you might
9	want to think about this evening. I think two of you
10	plan to go back and meet for a little bit yet this
11	evening on stuff. So I want you to be aware that
12	that's in the offering for tomorrow morning.
13	Are there other things that need to be
14	raised?
15	Do I declare a recess? I declare a recess
16	until eight o'clock tomorrow morning.
17	(Whereupon, the meeting was in recess at
18	4:00 p.m. until 8:00 a.m., Wednesday, April 7, 2004.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	II