UNITED STATES of AMERICA

NATIONAL OCEANIC and ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

* * * * *

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THIRD MEETING, DAY 3 OF 3

* * * * *

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 2004

* * * * *

KEY LARGO, FLORIDA

The Committee convened at 8:05 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

Announcements
Resolution
Subcommittee Reports
Panel Recommendation
Recess for the Day 104

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

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(8:05 o'clock a.m.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think we ought to get Terry, can you see if there are other started. principal parties out there in the room? Yes, thank you. Round them up. A quorum would be one more than half, is that right?

Who in the room can count?

I declare us in session.

There are some announcements before we get started. The first announcement is that we appear not to have any individuals who have signed up for public So that liberates a half an hour on the program and I have suggested that if you have the agenda in front of you, my proposal would be that we move everything from the 10:15 time slot forward with the exception of the Subcommittee Reports, so that we will discuss the next meeting, we will discuss timing, logistics and any other items that would come before us. Do that in this period.

And then the subcommittees will meet and they will have their -- whatever time we scheduled for them, I think an hour and twenty minutes or an hour and forty minutes, I guess -- twenty minutes, and then come back for the full Committee reports, and then we

1	can adjourn.
2	So if that's all right with people, we'll
3	make that adjustment. Fill in this immediate half
4	hour with other business.
5	So Lauren has yes, Tony?
6	DR. CHATWIN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
7	Thank you.
8	I think that sounds fine, but I think it
9	would be a good idea just to ask if there's anybody in
10	the audience who hasn't necessarily signed up but
11	would like an opportunity to speak. There may be
12	nobody but I think it would be important just to cover
13	our bases.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Joe, can we do
15	that? People can speak without having first
16	registered; is that correct?
17	MR. URAVITCH: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Are there
19	individuals in the audience that wish to make a public
20	comment for our consideration?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Seeing no indication of
23	that, we'll proceed. Thank you, Tony. That's fair
24	enough. That's good.
25	So Lauren is here. She's going to pass

around a large sheet of paper and we ask you, to the extent that you know your schedule -- here she comes -- to the extent that you know your fall schedule -and I believe that the time that we're looking at is September; for two reasons, that will give us enough time to get beyond the August period which is usually a difficult time to get people together, subcommittees time to do their work, and it comes before this magical date of September 30th, which for the Federal Government has overarching significance. It has something to do with the fiscal year. And I think Joe has money he needs to spend before September 30th and I think we can help him spend it.

So, a sheet's coming around. We would like, to the extent that you know it, your conflicts in September. We do need to have a bit of a discussion about the time frame for our spring meeting. So if it's all right with you I'd like to just open up that discussion for a minute, then we have a few other things to do here.

Joe, what -- you know, do you folks have any ideas about a spring date? I mean let's skip over the September. That seems to be rather locked in. But what constraints and priorities confront us about the spring?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. URAVITCH: I don't really see any difficulty in terms of timing. I think February or March might make sense, late winter or early spring. March, the only thing I can -- potential conflict in March is the annual Manager's Meeting for the Office of Ocean Coastal Resource Management. And I think those dates have been picked. I don't know what they are but I believe those were picked. I think the February through April time frame is pretty much open at this point. I can't think of any large conferences or anything else.

The biggest difficulty we have seen so far is that given the number of regional Fishery Management Councils, almost inevitably someone's meeting.

MR. BENTON: That's why you've got to plan ahead, Joe.

MR. URAVITCH: Literally every week someone's meeting. Well, when you see the September list, what you'll see is three out of four weeks Council meeting there's some somewhere two Councils that haven't even set up their meeting time I think the best thing we can do is we need to make sure that anybody who's on the Committee who's on a Council, you know, lets us know if they know when

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that Council is going to meet so that we can try and schedule around that. Because I think it is important for us to do our best to avoid conflicts for you as individuals who are trying to serve on two different Committees or Councils, and that we can do, but we can't avoid Council meetings in general because they're every week.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. And we are clear that when we meet in September, when we meet next spring, we intend to invite the Chairs of the Fisheries Management Councils to come and meet with us, those that can. So that's clearly on our agenda.

I guess what I would propose is that this sheet that Lauren's going to pass around, that's the September period, and that as soon as you get back to Washington, Lauren, if you could compile for the spring period, let's say February through -- Joe, let me ask you this. Do we run any risk if we push it further into the spring. I mean June `05 is a date that is on our mind. How close to the end of June can we go?

MR. URAVITCH: Well, it would then be difficult to do two meetings in the next fiscal year because we would have sponsored a June meeting and then where do you go from there? That takes us, say,

six months later into the fiscal year `05 -- `06.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see, right.

MR. URAVITCH: So it's really a matter of sequencing to make sure that you at least do two a year. We probably ought to schedule, if we can, the next three meetings. The reason I say that is because I think it makes it easier for people to plan and it allows us to go forward with locating facilities in the various cities, and the longer time we have the better places we'll get and the more likely we are to get something.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Then could we ask Lauren to look out, let's say until December 31st of `05; is that right, in the sense of seeing what you can find about meetings scheduled off into the future that we would wish to avoid. And I know that will take some time, Lauren, and then if you can send an email to all of us and we'll try to get these -- let's see, we need to pin down basically three future don't September meetings, we? and location. September of `04, the spring of `05 and the fall of And the fall of `05, is it correct, Joe, that you'd like to have that meeting before September 30th of `05?

MR. URAVITCH: Yes.

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 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. So not running into a new fiscal year. 2 3 Yes, David? MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 5 Is there any -- I'm trying to recall, and I cannot right at the moment, about when the terms of 6 7 all the members here expire? 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think it's June, `05. 9 MR. BENTON: It's June, `05. So in terms 10 of continuity and trying to get our job done and you 11 know, expecting that maybe there's a turnover here, I 12 think that really should consider trying we 13 schedule the spring meeting early enough that if a subsequent meeting before that June, `05 date rolls 14 15 around, could finish a product. It's really worth 16 And let them worry about the fall meeting. 17 could have that discussion in the spring. I'd leave 18 enough latitude to finish up the job before that other 19 date. 20 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I like that, David, yes. 21 This group, it doesn't do us a lot of good to pin 22 down a September, `05 meeting if a third of us or half 23 of us won't be here, and Joe, would that be okay 24 legally if we --

MR. URAVITCH: Oh, yes, that's no problem.

1 You might want to consider then the February time frame, I think, which would then give you a few months 2 before June. We might actually want to plan on having 3 4 a meeting in say February and in June to make sure 5 that the thing's complete. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. So that 7 would be February of `05 and then June of `05, or 8 approximately, something like that. 9 John? 10 DR. HALSEY: Well, I would certainly 11 recommend that whatever mechanisms are necessary to 12 get people re-appointed, if they want to be re-13 appointed, certainly should be initiated as soon as 14 possible. 15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. How does that 16 work, Joe; do you know? 17 MR. URAVITCH: Sorry? 18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Re-appointment and 19 continuation. Do you have any idea about that? 20 MR. URAVITCH: That's something we're going 21 to have to discuss in the two departments, starting 22 fairly soon. It's time for us to start looking at the 23 renewal of the existing charter which expires next 24 December, as well as membership. And there's some 25 issues relating to that from the charter in terms of

1	staggered terms that need to be dealt with. But under
2	the current charter existing members may be re-
3	appointed for another term of two years, and, you
4	know, that's the standing rule that we have, but we
5	have not yet begun discussions on re-appointments.
6	DR. HALSEY: That doesn't require any kind
7	of re-submission of interest or
8	MR. URAVITCH: No. No, it does not. I
9	think once you
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: On second thought. So
11	then, Lauren, I think your task is simplified
12	somewhat. We're looking at conflicting meetings,
13	commitments, for February and maybe the first two
14	weeks of March of `05; is that right, or maybe
15	February and March of `05, perhaps. Let's do it that
16	way. And then May and June of `05. I know that
17	sounds close if you think of March and May, but let's
18	give ourselves two months, February and March, and
19	then May and June of `05.
20	MS. WENZEL: Let me just ask, if people
21	already know that they have a conflict in that period,
22	they can let me know.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Since we're on
24	this, let's discuss venue. Is that okay with people?

The sheet that Lauren's passing around has off to the

right of it, as I recall, Lauren, it has -- how do you have that set up, locational preference, by Northeast, Northwest, Pacific, South of France? No France.

(Laughter.)

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

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that how it is,

Terry, it's asking for general --

MR. O'HALLORAN: It's asking for the -- available in the fall and then your preference, one, two, three.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Okay. So let's have a little discussion, not about the September meeting, although we have a kind of а recursive problem here, but depending on where we meet September, it might have some bearing on the two meetings for the spring of `05. Are there thoughts about that, independent of where we any September? Do you have any -- I will say my arm has been approached by the Pacific Island contingent about considering the Pacific and I think the place is called Hawaii, is that right, Terry, for September But we've also had a discussion about meeting. meeting in New England at some time, perhaps I thought it was this fall but I may be mistaken in a sense of some of the Fisheries Management Group because believe they're meeting in the fall in New England.

15 1 But I'd like to have a little bit of a discussion about how you think we ought to think about that 2 3 location for upcoming meetings. Any thoughts on this? Yes, Dan? 4 5 DR. SUMAN: I would recommend that one of our meetings in 2005 be back in Washington, because if 6 7 you remember, we really have never had a great deal of 8 public participation, but of the meetings we've had, 9 the greatest was in Washington, the very first 10 meeting. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. 12 DR. SUMAN: Ι think national many 13 organizations would be represented there and would

like to hear what we're doing.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, good. Terry?

MR. O'HALLORAN: Regarding public participation, frankly I'm a bit surprised that we had a significant lack, you know, of participation here. One thing I can say to the Committee, I think that if you do come to Hawaii, I think that you will find a lot of public participation and that if we do that, that we should adequately plan for that. I think that there would be a lot of interest in the public in Hawaii to speak and interact with this Committee.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Maybe the absence of

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	public comment in this neighborhood suggests that
2	things are working rather well and that all of the
3	deeply vested stakeholders, I believe we call them,
4	have come to grips with it and rather like it. Is
5	that possible?
6	MR. O'HALLORAN: That was my
7	interpretation, that Billy Causey has done such an
8	excellent job here and everyone is totally happy.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All is not well. I
10	mean Dan Clark and Stephanie and others, you know,
11	pointed out some problems, but
12	MR. O'HALLORAN: Mr. Chairman, you just
13	used you called them stakeholders again.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You didn't notice the
15	smile on my face? Sorry.
16	MR. O'HALLORAN: I think that's a very good
17	word actually.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You do? Okay, we'll
19	have to talk later.
20	George? You're fine, okay.
21	Yes, Mark?
22	DR. HIXON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
23	The thoughts I had were that the last
24	meeting of this iteration of this Committee, I'm not
25	sure exactly if we're all going to be re-appointed or

what, should be in Washington. I agree with Dan that that makes sense. It also seems that we've sort of done the Northeast, the Southeast, if you want to call San Francisco the Southwest, so maybe the remaining areas in my mind are the Northwest which would be Oregon, Washington, Alaska, that's how I define the Northwest, and then the Pacific region for September, to get regional coverage.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Max?

MR. PETERSON: I'm thinking about two meetings. Maybe the ideal thing would be to meet in New England and then September, I'm thinking if we want to do anything outside, February and March is still winter time in the Northeast, and -- so if we met, say in New England in September and then met either the Pacific Northwest or Hawaii in March, then we could meet in D.C. in June.

I would also point out that September will be in the middle of an election year and going to Hawaii might be considered a -- might be on a radar screen of people looking for junkets. Keep that in mind.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could I just ask, is there any reason -- I mean Dan's proposal and several of the rest of you have said that our last meeting

might be in Washington. Would there be any reason to have our next to the last meeting in Washington so that the groups that Dan mentioned, the interest groups, the Federal agencies, whoever else is there, so that we do have a chance to hear from them before we've crafted our, you know, before we go the final step, because perhaps June -- we meet in June, that might be a bit late. So I just throw that out for you to think about.

Okay, now we have George, we have Barbara, we have Mel, now we have Tony, and Bonnie?

MR. LAPOINTE: I'm less interested in the Washington interest groups than I am in getting out into the rest of the country. We'll get our interest and they'll have their in-put, you can rest assured. So I'm less interested in going to Washington for them because there are ways for them to make their views known. So from that perspective, I'm more interested in the rest of the countryside, regardless of where that location is.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Barbara?

MS. STEVENSON: Same conclusion, but for a different reason. When you go to Washington, everybody goes, "Oh, since you're going to Washington, can you take care of this, can you do this?" And you

have other interests, and those of us on the Committee are -- and end up doing or having to do or having pressures on us that we don't have in other places, and it's important for the Committee to act as a Committee, so it's important for us to be together.

And while I'm pushing for New England, anywhere but Washington is better than Washington.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right, Mel.

MR. MOON: Yeah, I think -- I agree with George. I think a better idea would be to get out to different areas and I know we have sort of situated a, you know, a plan earlier on a East Coast/West Coast and are kind of going back and forth. So I think in maintaining that sort of goal we've put out there, when we finalized it, but it was talked about quite a bit, it would be probably prudent to continue planning in that manner.

The other comment I had was in regards to the upcoming meeting. If we are to agree on a panel that we've been having discussions on and it were to include Pacific Islanders, would it be logical to have it in their place, along with West Coast tribes? Just some rationale I guess for the vote for the Hawaii meeting in September.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.0

Tony?

2.0

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think discussions of what geographic location the next meetings takes place is important, but it's, in relation to the last meeting, the geographic location is secondary to the actual purpose, objective of that meeting. If that meeting is one in which we're going to deliver our report, then I think it makes sense for it to be in Washington since we're advising the two Departments.

Another issue in relation -- I have no preference for a geographic location. I do, though, have a comment in terms of length of time available for meeting in sub-groups. And I think that this meeting -- I've enjoyed this meeting very much. It's being very constructive. But I think that we've had too little time to actually build the momentum and get the work done within the subcommittees.

So for the next meeting -- and this is not a vote to do away with a field trip, because I think that was very educational, but it is that we focus on getting enough time for subcommittees to do their work, because really we've had -- we can count up the number of hours that we've had at subcommittees. So I make a pitch for making a longer meeting with more

1	continuous time within subcommittees.
2	Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right, I'm a
4	firm believer that we make progress in subcommittees
5	and we know that yesterday afternoon cost us
6	something, but we gained immensely from it, didn't we,
7	and that's right. So that's well taken.
8	Bonnie? Joe, did you want to make a
9	MR. URAVITCH: Just on that point. One
0 .	issue, one thing that we've discussed at the staff
.1	level is maybe in the future holding these kinds of
L2	site visits before or after the meeting so that those
L3	who do have the time and do wish to do that can
L4	participate. And this way we don't break up the
L5	continuity of the meeting itself.
L6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, right.
L7	John Ogden, wouldn't you like to join us
L8	at the table here? Are you sending us a message,
L9	John, by disassociation?
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: This is a club to which
22	you do not wish to belong. Okay.
23	Bonnie? You pass?
24	DR. McCAY: I pass.
25	MR. BOWMAN: I just wanted to point out

that we need to take the Great Lakes into consideration. All the discussion seems to be ocean focused, but in fact that's a part of our charge and that's an area in which the public is perhaps less used to this term of Marine Protected Areas and the whole thing and that might be more productive from several perspectives.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The hotels in Madison are empty in January.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, thank you.

And Terry?

MR. O'HALLORAN: Two -- three points.

One, Max's comment regarding a September meeting in Hawaii being seen as a junket. That's been expressed here a few times, about going to Hawaii as being a junket. It seems that if there were an Advisory Committee to NASA meeting in Hawaii, that certainly could be considered a junket. However, our Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee in Hawaii that it would be meeting seems appropriate and I would think someone would have a difficult time making a point that it would be a junket for us to visit Hawaii, which is a very active area in terms of Marine Protected 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

Number two, I agree with Tony that we have -- I feel like we are still going through some of our forming/storming stages within our subcommittees, getting to know each other a bit, and I feel like we made a lot of progress here at this meeting, and it would have been nice to actually have more face to face time because we were, I think, getting to really roll and get some things accomplished. So I would endorse more time at the next meeting, which brings me to my third point.

If it were to be in Hawaii, I happen to know a few people in Hawaii that we might be able to do field trips either pre, post-Committee meeting so that we can devote full time and consideration to our important work and then after that, give people opportunities to have excursions to Marine Protected Areas in relevant places after.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, thank you.

George?

MR. LAPOINTE: Just in the context of where we travel and whatnot, I will tell you the J word was used, junket, with some people in Maine with this trip as well. I mean if you go anywhere where the conditions are better than your hometown, that's going to happen.

2.0

(Laughter.)

2.0

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's why Madison in January would absolve us of any -- that would convince them that we are honest people.

We have Mike Cruickshank.

DR. CRUICKSHANK: One of my comments was on Hawaii, that I agree with Terry. The first year I was living in Hawaii they had a meeting of the Flag Islands, the principals, and also adjacent country Prime Ministers in Honolulu to which Senator Akaka and Senator Inouye and the principal legislators from the Congress, Congresspeople came over. But they weren't on the plane before there were headlines in the Washington Post for the crime of external racketeering.

On the other hand, at the meetings there was so much public in-put from the island folks, how great this was to have a meeting and go face to face with the Congress. It decried the idea of this being a junket. I think we just have to face it, that whatever they're thinking in the surrounding -- about a trip like that. I think it's very, very useful.

The other issue I have is with regard to the Great Lakes. Would you have Canada involved?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Quebec in January?

NEAL R. GROSS

That tops Madison.

(Laughter).

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: Okay. Good, I think I'd like to stop it here. It cannot be in doubt that we will meet in the Pacific region. We have three meetings to settle on, don't we, and so the issue I think is not whether or not we will do it. I think the issue for us to work out is which meeting it will be. Okay?

Again, I think that we're not going to settle it now. I don't think it's the right way to do that. What we need to do is let Lauren put together schedule and let you vote, both on availability in those future time slots, as well as your preferences for location, and Lauren and Joe will synthesize that for us. The Executive Committee, which is myself and Bonnie and the three subcommittee Chairs, will take that under consideration and I guess we'll just have to make a decision. And if you want us to decide that and then have to defend it before you, we're prepared to do it. If you insist that we give it to you for approval, we'll do that.

So, any comments on that? Yes, Steve?

DR. MURRAY: I would support that you and the group go ahead and make the decisions and inform

NEAL R. GROSS

1 We've all had our in-put. All the issues have us. been laid out on the table and logistics are going to 2 be a driver for this as well as schedule. 3 4 leave it up to you and go with it from there. 5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that okay with 6 everybody? 7 (MEMBERS): Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I promise we will try to 9 mobilize good reasons for the decisions that 10 reached and those reasons will be available to all of 11 you to disagree with. 12 Okay. 13 MR. O'HALLORAN: One caveat, that Madison is not included. 14 15 (Laughter.) 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. That's quite 17 understood. 18 It is 8:35. If we can burn up five 19 more minutes we can get right back on schedule. 20 have one more issue that I think ought to be easy to 21 address, and that is, our subcommittee working drafts, 22 the papers that the subcommittees are working with and 23 from, they need to be made available to the observers in the room, and some of you have done this and so on, 24

but each of the subcommittees, and as a group I think

1 we need to instruct the subcommittees on protocols for making sure that the working materials that you have 2 3 are available to everybody who chooses to come and sit That's nice, but I think 4 in and observe our business. 5 it's also legally required. Is that right? 6 7 Actually, MS. WENZEL: because 8 subcommittee materials are pre-decisional, they're not 9 required to be handed out to the public. So it's more 10 a question of what you choose to do. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. I'd like to 12 urge that as a full Federal Advisory Committee, that 13 we make every effort at the subcommittee level to have 14 sufficient paper that the observers in the room can 15 see what it is being talked about. 16 It's my understanding, Joe, and again I 17 read that yesterday, but I failed to understand it, 18 in the room may not take part 19 decision making of the subcommittees. May they make 2.0 Sorry, but yesterday afternoon fried my comments? 21 brain and I forgot what we decided in the morning. 22 What is that wonderful language there? 23 MR. URAVITCH: All right, I will read the 24 language.

may

be

"Non-members

25

make

invited to

1	presentations or comments to the subcommittee"
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: "May be invited." This
3	seems to me critical language.
4	MR. URAVITCH: "but should not
5	participate in subcommittee discussions or the
6	development of recommendations to be forwarded to the
7	full Committee."
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: "May be invited." Okay,
9	that seems the operative clause there; that is, that
10	they may not intervene without invitation.
11	MR. URAVITCH: Right, and they may not help
12	develop the recommendation. If they do, then they are
13	in effect a member of the Advisory Committee and
14	that's not legal.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So this means that I
16	guess I would ask the subcommittee Chairs and others
17	on the subcommittees to be attentive to the body
18	language of people in the room, and if you believe
19	that the time is right to get their comment on
20	something, you invite them. You don't have to, but I
21	think that's within the letter of the law.
22	And that means that somehow we should have
23	documentation available to them so they can follow
24	along and see what it is that's being done. Some of
25	you, I guess, are working with Power Point things,

1 some are not. I would just ask subcommittee Chairs to 2 figure out a way to do this. Now the question then becomes, what of 3 4 this working material that perhaps is handed out to an 5 observer, Joe, that walks out of the room with the 6 observer? Is this a problem? How do we deal with 7 this? 8 MR. URAVITCH: I can't say officially. 9 I don't think it should be a problem don't know. 10 since it's pre-decisional; it's not a decision of the 11 Committee, but we'll have to check with counsel. 12 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'd like to suggest 13 that subcommittee Chairs, all of the paper work that 14 you produce have a header on it, which those of us 15 that are involved in litigation do, and the language 16 is something like "attorney work product, not for 17 public discussion." You don't need to put the word 18 attorney in there, but if all of your written material 19 could have a header on every page that says "work 2.0 product, first draft, " right? Pardon? 21 MS. PHELPS: Pre-decisional. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Pre-decisional. Oh. 23 That's a long header. "Pre-decisional work good. 24 product, not for public discussion, draft, tentative, 25 confused."

Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: I think you should add "the contents of these documents will change." "Draft, the contents of these documents will change." Then there's no misinterpretation.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Lauren, I have an idea.

Max, go ahead.

MR. PETERSON: It's not unusual in this type of thing to give something to people who are attending with a condition that they return it after the meeting, because otherwise it's liable to end up in places that people don't understand. So I think it would be better to either use a Power Point to provide material or give it to people and say, "Please return this before you leave the meeting." Because otherwise if you don't, this stuff will be all over and I don't care what it says on the header, people will ignore that.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Terry, is your hand up?

MR. O'HALLORAN: I think Max had a very good comment there about Power Point. I know in one of our sessions in our subcommittee we did have access to a projector and that worked very well, not only for — it worked very well for the Committee, but it also brought in the public. So if in future meetings for

	subcommittees, if at all possible, it would be a very
2	good tool for us to have Power Point capabilities at
3	our subcommittees.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: As an ongoing revision
5	process, but you know, people still like to be able to
6	look through the two or three or four pages. You
7	can't get that on a Power Point. So I think Power
8	Point might be a good tool for the dynamic part of it,
9	but for the material that is first developed,
10	something like that.
11	Let me say, I would like to suggest, and I
12	know we have some people in the queue, but let me
13	propose that we ask Lauren and Joe and others to
14	develop a set of language that should go on headers,
15	what words are necessary, which words are redundant,
16	how can we get some language on there, and then
17	perhaps Max's point about not leaving the room, it
18	could say on there that "this document"
19	MR. PETERSON: Should be returned.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Must be returned. Must
21	be returned to the Chair of the subcommittee.
22	So, Mark?
23	DR. HIXON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24	I'm sorry, but my belief is as soon as you
25	put on a document "return," it will be secreted away

1 no matter what. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Because it takes on an 2 extraordinary value. 3 DR. HIXON: That's my belief, yeah. 4 5 I want to second what Terry said about having Power Point in every Committee room. It's been 6 7 inconsistent, is what I've noticed, and also sometime 8 there's conflict with the computer. For example, the 9 staff person who's trying to take the minutes of the 10 meeting has one computer that's also that we want to 11 use for a Power Point presentation or whatever. 12 the resources can be mustered to have a dedicated 13 computer and dedicated Power Point projector in every 14 subcommittee room, I believe that's by far the most 15 effective means of allowing the audience to 16 exactly what the subcommittee is seeing. 17 Another reason I mention that is that 18 reiterations, at least within our subcommittee, go so 19 rapidly that making meaningful handouts is just going 2.0 to be a waste of trees. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right? Yes. 22 Okay. 23 Barbara? Pass.

NEAL R. GROSS

George? Pass.

Okay, David Benton.

24

MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, just a quick comment with respect to my understanding. I can understand that, but I'm also quite sensitive to the pains the staff go through to help organize meetings, get equipment here, get us here, go home, and if that means that staff not having to carry around three or four extra computers and projectors and a lot of extra stuff, over and above what they're already trying to get here, especially given logistics being an issue, I just urge caution in that regard. I'm sensitive to what kind of burden we've put on people that are trying to help us do what we're doing. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, that's nice.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, that's nice.
Thank you.

Do you want to say something, Bonnie?

DR. McCAY: I just want to say I think -I fully agree that we need Power Point in the
subcommittees, and the flip chart system is -- well,
it's primitive, but it's hard to maintain any
continuity with that. So I don't really like that.

I also think that I do appreciate that the staff has a tremendous burden and I know I carry around my laptop. I'm sure that there are a few others of you around here who do the same thing. So that should not be the limiting factor. I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

having a projector in the room is the limiting factor and critical.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Rod? Pass.

Yeah, Terry?

MR. O'HALLORAN: And I think that it would probably be -- we could arrange for Power Point projectors at a meeting location so that the staff didn't have to carry them. I think that wouldn't be a difficult thing. Because I think David's comment of sensitivity to the staff is correct and I agree with that, but I think that -

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could we arrange for one of the staff to be taking the minutes, as they are, and then let one member of the subcommittee be the Power Point person and so on. Does that help or do people feel that takes them out of the game? We don't need to decide this now, but I think David makes a great point, that we want to be careful of the burdens that we put on them, and Bonnie's right, most everyone here brings a computer with them and it already has Power Point loaded on it. So we ought to be able to handle that ourselves, maybe, and then let the staff take the minutes. That's what they do, right, they transcribe conversation. Is that okay?

All right. I think that takes care of

everything that I had on my list. Are there other
comments or for those of you that came in late, we
didn't have any sign-ups for public comments so we
went ahead and pulled a few of the items out of the
10:15 slot. So now as I look at this, what we have
left at 10:15 is for the subcommittees to come back
and report to us in a way that will allow us to ratify
what you intend to do over the next period between
meetings. We'd like for you to come back with
concrete points about things you're going to pursue,
what you're going to do. I know one subcommittee has
a recommendation in terms of a panel for a future
meeting, our next meeting. So that, in a sense, is
what we'd like to accomplish at 10:15. And we have a
resolution that will be introduced at 10:15 for some
business and -

DR. FUJITA: Mr. Chairman, since we have disposed of a couple of items at the 10:15 heading, would it make sense to move that to be later so that we have a little bit more time in the subcommittees?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, we could move it to 10:30. Well, I want to leave time -- the problem is -- no, I appreciate that. My expectation is that when the subcommittee reports come in, we have three of them, and we might like to be able to spend fifteen

	minutes on each one, or twenty, maybe not. I mean
2	this is hard. I agree with you, Rod, the more time we
3	have at subcommittees the better, but yet I know that
4	at 12:00 we're going to start to lose people and in
5	fact I already have been alerted that we're going to
6	lose people before 12:00. So we're let me ask the
7	three subcommittee Chairs, what sort of time do you
8	think you would like to have? Mark and Mel and Tony,
9	are you sitting in for Lelei? Okay. What how do
10	you see your reporting period?
11	DR. HIXON: My presentation would probably
12	take five minutes. The reason I do that is, I'm
13	certain that whatever we present will form the
14	foundation for a considerable discussion.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What does that mean?
16	DR. HIXON: Well, there will be a lot of
17	questions and answers and comments.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see, okay. So that
19	means you need an hour; is that right, Mark?
20	DR. HIXON: Well, it's definitely a trade
21	off.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, we appreciate the
23	five minute part.
24	DR. HIXON: Yeah, and I definitely believe
25	that maximizing the subcommittee time is very

	Important.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Tony, what is
3	your thought?
4	DR. CHATWIN: I think that the actual
5	presentation of our discussions and our stressing
6	steps is going to be very short. We may have some
7	discussion.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So you're sort of like
9	Mark, maybe five minutes to make a presentation?
10	DR. CHATWIN: If that long.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And I think we do want
12	to leave a lot of time for discussion. I mean that's
13	why we're reporting back now, so that we do not want
14	to squeeze that down.
15	Mel?
16	MR. MOON: I think Rod's suggestion of
17	10:30 would work well. We have some organization that
18	needs to take place in the committee, but I don't see
19	the report being real long.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Any other on this
21	computer screen it says "me" announcement. Yes?
22	DR. WAHLE: Someone left a black organizer
23	daybook thing on the boat yesterday. Was it one of
24	you? I have it, so if, I'll bring it back at the
25	break and if it looks familiar you can claim it.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Anything interesting in
2	it?
3	DR. WAHLE: I looked for a name and after
4	that I didn't want to look any further.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. All right. Why
6	don't we Bonnie and I discussed it very briefly.
7	Why don't we have you come back at 10:30? Is that
8	what we agreed to, Bonnie?
9	DR. McCAY: Uh-hmm.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 10:30. And the break
11	part of the agenda is gone. I mean the coffee is
12	there, the calories are there. Help yourself. We
13	won't have a formal break. You have from now until
14	10:30. So it's about an hour and something.
15	Bonnie?
16	DR. McCAY: Could I just raise one more
17	meeting kind of question? Is it possible to get for
18	breakfast something that's a little less sweet and a
19	little more nutritious?
20	(Laughter.)
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We'll that's fine.
22	That's right. We'll talk to Lauren and Bonnie and see
23	what we can do.
24	(Whereupon a recess was taken until 10:30
25	a.m.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I apologize for one very serious oversight. We tried to think of everything, and one thing I realized we forgot to do is to give the toilet janitor a copy of our agenda so that he or she, and I think in this case it is a she, that she would know when we're going to descend on the loo. And so we did have a line of crises here a minute ago, but a lot of people headed for the bathroom only to find we couldn't use it. So maybe that's an excuse for a little bit of a late start. We'll try to do better next time on that.

I have what I would regard as several, excuse me, information items before we get to the subcommittee report, and that is at your place you should have three handouts. Jacqueline Schafer I think brought them to our attention what USAID is doing about coral reefs, Governments and Marine and Coastal Protected Areas. So that's this.

I have received what was referred to earlier, I think it's the work product of John Halsey, right, about recommendations for the definition of cultural resources and Marine Protected Areas. I take this as a sort of a submission at this point, John, it's not --

DR. HALSEY: All members should have one.

NEAL R. GROSS

2.0

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You should have one at
2	your spot. And at this point, it's just for our
3	information and rumination; is that right, John?
4	Thank you.
5	There is, I guess, one action item which
6	I'd like to now yes, George?
7	MR. LAPOINTE: This is kind of a trivial
8	item, but do we know when check-out time is?
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do you know when check-
10	out time is? We're not going to worry about check-out
11	time. This hotel should be grateful for an enormous
12	amount of business. They will cut us some slack, I
13	promise. If they don't we'll sic Bunny on them. Can
14	you imagine that?
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: They would do most
17	anything to avoid having Bunny down their throat.
18	So, thank you, George, but we're not going
19	to worry about one. With Bunny on our side, we don't
20	worry.
21	Okay. Terry?
22	MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23	Thank you. I'd like to introduce a resolution. As I
24	mentioned in the first day, there was a regional
25	workshop in Hawaii of the Pacific Islands to identify

-- it was a social science research workshop that Charlie and researchers were doing regionally, and at the beginning of that workshop they -- people were attending from the various Pacific islands and they came to the workshop feeling that it was -- there were some good things that might be able to come out of that.

At the end of the workshop, the reason I'm -- I've got a resolution -- at the end of this workshop the enthusiasm, particularly on the part of the managers, that they exhibited that if these research projects that they identified could get funded in terms of understanding the social science side of MPA's, how important that would be to them in order to help them make decisions on planning MPA's and on managing MPA's. And what they did, at the end of the workshop, they wrote a resolution that they asked that we introduce to this subcommittee, or to this Committee, and I'd like to pass that out now, if I might.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, go ahead and pass it around.

MR. O'HALLORAN: The resolution is on the front and I've got a motion that is attached as a second page so that you can read the motion. Maybe

1 while this is being passed out, may I read this? CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The motion? 2 3 MR. O'HALLORAN: Read the --4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The resolution? 5 MR. O'HALLORAN: The resolution. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, quickly. 7 MR. O'HALLORAN: "Whereas, participants in 8 Pacific Islands Regional MPA Social Science 9 Research workshop met in Waikoloa, Hawaii from March 30 to April 1, 2004 and have highlighted the critical 10 11 importance of social science in the interdisciplinary 12 planning, management and evaluation of Marine Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands; and 13 14 "Whereas, workshop participants identified 15 social science research projects focusing on 16 governance, economics, attitudes, perceptions 17 beliefs, cultural heritage resources, use patterns, 18 and communities; and 19 "Whereas, most resource management is 2.0 largely people management, the findings of the 21 projects will be invaluable to resource managers, resource users and decision makers and the success of 22 23 Marine Protected Areas insuring the conservation of 24 our marine resources; and 25 "Whereas, effective Marine Protected Areas

43 management is becoming increasingly recognized essential to insuring the sustainability of marine resources and the livelihood of those who depend on those resources. "Now, therefore, be it resolved that the recommendations from this workshop, when finalized, be formally transmitted to the MPA Federal Advisory Committee for their information, consideration and endorsement. "And therefore be it further resolved, that participants request the endorsement from the MPA FAC for funding support for projects identified by the workshop. "Finally, be it further resolved that participants request that the recommendations of the workshop be included in the MPA Federal Advisory Committee report to the Secretaries of Commerce and of the Interior." That the resolution from the was participants.

My motion is that I wish -- and I'll just read that. "I wish to present a resolution from the participants of the recent Pacific Islands Regional MPA Social Science Workshop and move that the MPA Federal Advisory Committee acknowledge receipt of 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

1	resolution. Additionally, at such time that the
2	recommendations from the workshop are finalized, that
3	these recommendations be transmitted to the
4	appropriate MPA Federal Advisory Committee
5	subcommittee or committees for their review,
6	consideration and possible endorsement to the full
7	Committee."
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, thank you. Is
9	there a second to the motion?
10	MR. LAPOINTE: Seconded.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, the motion has
12	been seconded. George Lapointe seconded it. You wish
13	to speak?
14	MR. LAPOINTE: I do. I was going to
15	express some concern about the substance, but given
16	Terry's statement of the motion that it be put to a
17	subcommittee for resolution, I'm comfortable with
18	that. It shows good work on the part of people out
19	there, it shows the need for moving forward and we can
20	deal with
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Others wish to comment?
22	Jim?
23	DR. RAY: I guess I'm a little puzzled as
24	to the role of this Committee in making
25	recommendations to support funding for programs in

Hawaii. You know, you followed our first meeting, and we had a petition, as I recall, from some fishing organizations Coast on the West to endorse recommend funding for some of the, you know, programs they were doing, and I guess I'm just concerned, this really opens Pandora's Box if a variety of different folks with very worthwhile programs and projects look to this Committee as а support and make recommendations to the government. I have a concern about that. I think it's probably a great program, but I'm just concerned with the overall precedent that we'd be setting --

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George?

MR. LAPOINTE: That was my concern too in looking at their resolution. I don't think -- I don't want to spend my time looking at competing funding requests. But there's other things in there, and again given the motion to refer to a subcommittee, and if it came to my subcommittee, or a subcommittee of which I'm a member, I would fix that part in a heartbeat, because -- I don't want to get into it, but there's other things in here. So I think we can handle it without getting into the ultimate position of the competing funding requests.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Wally?

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	DR. PEREYRA: Mr. Chairman, briefly. I
2	totally agree with George's comments, but the way I
3	read the resolution is that we are not endorsing the
4	outcome of the conference or the funding requests, so
5	on that basis, and assuming that our resolution,
6	support of our resolution, would not infer that, I can
7	support your resolution.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, Barbara?
9	MS. STEVENSON: My only problem goes back
10	to our discussion of reviewing other items, and for
11	instance, the subcommittees for their consideration, I
12	would have absolutely no problem. I don't know what
13	review is and I don't know whether that obligates us
14	to a formal comment. Consideration should cover it
15	all.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
17	MR. O'HALLORAN: Mr. Chair, I would be
18	happy to remove the
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Put a period after the
20	word consideration?
21	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George, is that
23	acceptable to you?
24	MR. LAPOINTE: Yeah.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, thank you.

Yeah? Mike?

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. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chair, I think we should -- the motion to come to the Committee for full consideration. It does not imply any responsibility on our part.

Okay, yeah that was --CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Terry -- when I talked with and Terry mean, yesterday about their resolution, I reminded him that we really couldn't do what they had asked us to do, and Terry understood that and graciously drafted this alternative motion, which in a sense, I understand that we do it on a risk of being seen as a pipeline, yet we can't close, I don't think, we can't close ourselves off from whoever it is that has ideas about research that they think pertain to our deliberation, and I believe the modified motion does precisely that and nothing more, I think.

George?

MR. LAPOINTE: I agree with the Chairman.

I mean this is a very focused type of stakeholder input and I think it's important.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, Max?

MR. PETERSON: Let me just suggest really doing two things, acknowledge receipt of the resolution as being considered. That's all we're

NEAL R. GROSS

48 1 doing. I would, Mr Chairman, call for the question. The question's been called. You're ready for the 2 3 question. All in favor of the 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 5 motion as amended so that in a sense the motion that you have in front of you would end with the word 6 7 "consideration" and the rest of that 8 Everybody clear on the motion? Barbara? Oh, okay. 9 So the motion, I better read it. I'm going to read it 10 from the -- the first sentence is, I think, fine. 11 going to read it from "Additionally, at such time as 12 the recommendations from the workshop are finalized,

13 these recommendations be transmitted to

FAC subcommittees for their appropriate MPA

15 consideration."

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is that right? I'd like to offer now, as I read this, I'd like to offer an amendment. I think That these recommendations come to the it's safe. full FAC for distribution to the appropriate subcommittees. We make the determination which subcommittee is pertinent. Is that all right?

(MEMBERS): Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So then we would need that these recommendations be transmitted to the MPA FAC -- I'm speechless now, can you imagine

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that for consideration by the appropriate
2	subcommittee.
3	Okay. So it would be transmitted to the
4	MPA FAC for consideration I think that's where we
5	stop. We can do that. It comes to us and we'll
6	decide which subcommittee gets it.
7	How are we doing? Ten more minutes we
8	won't have any words left in this motion.
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And then we can have a
11	good fight about that one, couldn't we?
12	Okay. Is everyone clear about what we're
13	voting on?
14	All right. All in favor of the motion as-
15	- "Additionally, at such time that the recommendations
16	from the workshop are finalized, that these
17	recommendations be transmitted to the MPA FAC for
18	consideration."
19	Is that okay? All in favor of the motion
20	say "aye."
21	(MEMBERS): Aye.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?
23	(No audible response.)
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. Thank you,
25	Terry, very much.

All right, so now we're at the 11:00 hour and we have three subcommittee reports. Which order do you wish to proceed? One, Two, Three?

Okay, Mark?

2.0

DR. HIXON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Subcommittee One is grappling with the issue of a National System of Marine Protected Areas. In particular, we're developing a vision and goal statement which will be about one page in length. Previous versions of this are already on the secure web page and the versions we produced here in this meeting will be on the secure web page very shortly. And the most recent iterations, we've added a glossary, which we believe is essential to clarify the meaning of key words and concepts that are mentioned in this particular document. And that's going to be the bulk of our work after this meeting.

So again, as we go through each iteration, we will put these on the secure web page, and I don't care -- the Committee does not want to read them to the full Committee at this time, because it is in such a state of flux. However, I would like to summarize the types of things that we've been looking at most recently in this vision and goal statement.

One is to clarify the difference between

the vision and the goals. The vision is pretty much the same as we've seen in all the documents we've gotten before us. The specific goals are where things become more particular and we've virtually reached a unanimous agreement on what those goals are, and again, they're already posted on the secure web page or will be shortly.

Some of the issues that would be of immediate interest to the full Committee, we believe, are things such as, we concur that there are three broad categories of MPA to be considered, natural heritage, cultural heritage and sustainable production of MPA's, and we're working on the more explicit definitions of those, but we concur that those three categories do exist.

And we are grappling with the -- well, we've actually finished grappling with the issue of what lasting protection means in the Federal definition of MPA, and that's what I want to spend most of my time on now.

Before I get to that particular issue, our plans for the immediate future are to not only continue our neverending e-mail exchanges, but to have a face to face meeting of our subcommittee between now and September. We're planning that as soon as we can

pull it together, probably at the MPA Center in Monterey, which is sort of a geographically reasonably central place, given the make-up of our diverse subcommittee. At that time we intend to finalize the vision and goal statement and pass it forward very shortly thereafter to the full FAC, well before the September meeting, so that full debate on that particular document can be done at that time.

What we'd like to present today is our near-final conclusions based on a huge amount of discussion during this meeting on what does lasting protection mean for Marine Protected Areas. A lot of thought has gone into this and I'm going to distill it down to the point where it may sound simplistic, but believe me, there's a lot behind this.

Our intent is to finalize a very short document on these definitions and forward them to the full FAC very soon after this meeting. We just need to have another couple go-arounds on e-mail to really make sure we've word-smithed this as appropriately as possible before full consideration. But we want to put on the table now where we are.

The background for defining lasting protection is that the Federal Government at some point has to take the inventory of MMA's that is

2.0

already nearing completion and pass it through a filter. That filter will then define what the existing MPA's are in this country, and that filter has to do with the minimum duration of protection for existing MMA's and which of those meet that criterion and therefore can be considered MPA's. We are not talking about the level of protection afforded. We are talking solely about the duration of protection. Has this entity been in existence for a sufficient number of years to be considered to be an MPA?

Now when we examine the three categories of MPA, we immediately saw that there could be subcategories within those that could have different levels potentially or different minimal times of protection potentially. So that's what we've been working our way through.

So one last thing before going through that list. In all these, we're considering that adaptive management is in place; that is, that there will be periodic reviews of each MPA that involves public notification, public in-put, peer review, monitoring, things of that sort. And it's also implicit that any MPA can be changed through acts of God, acts of Congress and acts of the public at large.

So, with that in mind, I'll summarize this

as well as I can. First, considering natural heritage MPA's. There's a definition given in the many handouts we've gotten. We're starting with that definition and clarifying that, but we've subdivided natural heritage into three categories, three subcategories.

One is living natural resources. So natural heritage involves living things. Then large scale non-living natural resources. And then small scale non-living natural resources.

first, starting with living, we're essentially talking about living systems, living organisms and their habitats. And the duration of protection that we believe is appropriate is ten years in this particular case; that is, an MPA that's been established -- or an MMA that's been established to protect living natural heritage would have to endure for at least a decade to be considered Our rationale for that decision is based on an MPA. two different sets of criteria. The first is procedural; that is, that there's time required for public notification, for boundaries to be placed on maps and distributed to the public. That is just to get the information and implementation in place. envision at least five years of scientific monitoring

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

required to determine the trajectory and the status of that living system. And that's truly very much a minimal time. Ecologically it was acknowledged that the generation time of key organisms or focal organisms for following demographic trajectories is essential.

So after reasonable amount of monitoring, at least five years, there would be some review and analysis of kind of that monitoring, followed by public involvement and adaptive an management process. And just -- by the time this is done, a decade has taken place anyway. So that's the purely procedural reason for doing that.

Then the second region, again, is getting more, focusing on the ecological reasons for at least a decade, and that has to do with the fact that the response rate of populations, communities and ecosystems is determined by generation time of focal or index species. That's a purely natural science reason. And generation times are all over the map. By and large, the larger the organism or the more slowly growing the organism, the longer the generation time. And there's a whole bunch of work that could still be done on that.

So that's what we suggest for living

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	natural resources.
2	Large scale non-living natural resources.
3	We're considering to be geological or geophysical
4	features that are sufficiently large that they're
5	already very well documented. Things like submarine
6	canyons, volcanic features, pinnacle sea-mounts,
7	things of that sort. And they're also prominent from
8	a human perspective. These things are not apt to
9	disappear even with substantial earthquakes and
10	anything short of asteroid impacts.
11	So we believe that if these are found to
12	be sufficiently representative, unique, rare or
13	uncommon, that they are valued by the public to be
14	conserved for present and future generations. That
15	protection should be indefinite for these features.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: How much more time do
17	you have? You've gone the five minutes. I love this,
18	but
19	DR. HIXON: I don't recall promising. I
20	said five minutes but I didn't promise five minutes.
21	(Laughter).
22	DR. HIXON: I'll speed up, Mr. Chair. I

Small scale non-living natural resources may be poorly documented or may be ephemeral from a

apologize for going over five minutes.

23

24

25

П

human prospective. We're talking about things like hydrothermal events, methane seeps, underwater springs and what not. They may be more common than previously assumed because they're not fully documented, therefore the rarity in question. with may be additional monitoring, again may be ephemeral. So again, there's time required to get these on maps, to be monitored for the level of permanence, things of that sort, and again, we're suggesting a minimum of ten years, minimum protection time to be defined as an MPA.

Cultural heritage, extremely we were hesitant to discuss, because we do not have that expertise on our subcommittee. So for cultural heritage MPA's, our initial thoughts were that the minimum amount of time we're talking is getting up around twenty-five years. But we really didn't want to touch that one. What we are requesting expertise from other subcommittees to meet the culture, whatever it basically that is. the cultural ad hoc subcommittee be formalized. Wally Pereyra and George Lapointe have volunteered to be the two members of Subcommittee One to serve on that ad hoc subcommittee and grapple with that issue.

Finally, sustainable production MPA's is a

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

Τ.	category. These are basically fisheries and fisheries
2	type of MPA's. Again, we're getting down to the same
3	sorts of issues as having to do with living natural
4	heritage MPA's, and we see ten years again as being a
5	minimal time period. Again, because of the procedural
6	constraints that it takes to get these up and running
7	and monitor them for at least five years. And
8	secondly, the ecological constraints of generation
9	times and the time it takes to detect whether or not
10	the goals of that particular MPA are being met.
11	I'll stop there. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, thank you. David
13	and Tony.
14	MR. BENTON: Just a small point of
15	clarification, Mr. Chairman.
16	On the ten year time frame, was that they
17	had to be in existence for ten years or they had to be
18	designated for ten years and it could start today but
19	the designation was for ten years?
20	DR. HIXON: Thanks for that question,
21	Dave.
22	We wanted to emphasize that Marine Managed
23	Areas that occur or are in existence for less than a
24	decade are extremely valuable entities, especially for
25	sustainable production fisheries type of questions,

1	emergency closures, temporary closures, things of that
2	sort. So we want to encourage those sorts of things
3	to exist.
4	However, we believe that a Marine
5	Protected Area is a longer term management tool and
6	therefore, to be called that, to be called an MPA,
7	would have the filter of being in existence for at
8	least a decade.
9	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman. I'm just
10	curious about the start date, whether or not it really
11	is a start date of when you count the ten years.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Charlie wants to get in
13	here.
14	DR. WAHLE: To add a little clarification
15	to that. Basically what we're looking for is a filter
16	which Mark described that will allow us to look at a
17	Marine Managed Area and decide whether it fits the
18	criteria for a Marine Protected Area. And the
19	duration issue is whether it has been established, the
20	expectation of a ten-year life span or a legal
21	mechanism.
22	MR. BENTON: So a designation that is for
23	ten or more years that starts two days ago would
24	count.

DR. WAHLE: Right.

60
MR. LAPOINTE: I think we talked about the
MPA designation for ten years, I think for all the
reasons Mark said. If you have something up David's
way or up in the Gulf of Maine that had already had
protection longer than ten years, that doesn't mean it
wouldn't fit in this category. But when we eventually
put this national network together, that in fact if
you're going to go through the trouble of an
additional designation, you want whatever management,
you know, protections and measures are included in
that MPA to continue for at least another decade to
make it worth the while.
CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Tony, your
hand was up.
DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and

thank you for the description of your work. It's very interesting.

My question, one was on the start date, but -- I have two questions. One is if I understand established under this concept. Ιf an area is fishery's management for habitat protection purposes and the intent that it's a long term area but that it's going to be revisited in three years, so it may change in three years time, what is that?

> DR. HIXON: If there is an original

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	designation is that after three years it would end and
2	then be re-evaluated, then it would not be an MPA, it
3	would be an MMA. If there is no designation that
4	would be monitoring, it would exist for at least a
5	decade before the decision would be made whether or
6	not to continue that designation, then it would be an
7	MPA. So in other words, if the entity itself exists
8	for at least a decade before potentially being thrown
9	out.
10	DR. CHATWIN: And my second question,
11	thank you, my second question, is I understand the
12	concept of having a screen that's based on lasting
13	on the lasting piece, the words in the Executive
14	Order; however, lasting goes to protection and that
15	infers the screen should also have the sort of level
16	of protection associated with it. Have you had any
17	discussions about adding the level of protection to
18	that screen?
19	DR. HIXON: We have not at this time.
20	We've slowly grappled with the issue of duration of
21	protection.
22	DR. CHATWIN: Are you planning to address
23	that?
24	DR. HIXON: Not yet. And the reason being
25	that one can envision the diversity of particular

could potentially be meaningless. Especially -- well, 2 3 the discussion within our group -- George, you want to add to this, and Wally? 4 5 MR. LAPOINTE: Ι do. Because it's 6 specifically to this question. The degree of 7 protection would be dictated by the goal 8 particular MPA, and so we don't want to dictate up 9 front what that level of protection is. And it would 10 be an inherent part of the governance of the MPA to 11 say we're protecting it for this, and therefore, 12 because of that goal, you need, you know, the degree 13 of protection would have to be dictated by that. 14 for us to ascribe that up front, we thought was not a 15 useful exercise. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, Terry and then 16 17 Barbara and then Wally. 18 DR. CHATWIN: I had a follow-up point. 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 20 DR. CHATWIN: My last one, Mr. Chairman. 21 So, just so I understand it, you have the 22 three categories of Marine Protected Areas. 23 of a dump site, okay, that's being designated often 24 longer it fit than ten years, but doesn't 25 necessarily into one of those, but it may be

MPA's being so great that offering specific advice

	sustainable production so that it's not everywhere:
2	DR. HIXON: A dump site is not an MPA.
3	DR. CHATWIN: It's a Marine Managed Area.
4	DR. HIXON: It's not a Marine Managed
5	Area.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Terry, Barbara, Wally.
7	We only have about three minutes left for this group.
8	MR. O'HALLORAN: Again, a clarification.
9	We have some sites that are what I call on and off
10	again. In other words, they're protected for a year
11	and then the same area is opened up for some extracted
12	uses for a year, then closed, and there's also
13	consideration of what I would call roving or moving
14	MPA where an area is protected and then it's moved,
15	but it's essentially under the same umbrella. How do
16	you see that fitting in?
17	MR. HIXON: We see those as being very
18	useful Marine Managed Areas, but not Marine Protected
19	Areas.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, I guess there's a
21	disagreement on the Committee.
22	DR. HIXON: There seems to be disagreement
23	on the subcommittee, but the consensus that was
24	reached at the time was that a particular area would
25	be in place for ten years to be considered an MPA, and

1 I'd like to defer to Wally for dissension. DR. Pereyra: In this particular specific 2 3 example, I would argue that the MPA is still in place. It's just that it is being a Marine Protected Area in 4 5 a, sort of a dynamic sense. If you can vision it from that standpoint. I mean the area itself is not -- and 6 7 this is going to get into my whole discussion of 8 adaptive management, but I don't know if you want me 9 to make that now. 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I don't want anybody to 11 do anything now except be quiet. 12 (Laughter.) 13 DR. HIXON: A potential can of worms here 14 is whether or not the protection completely ceases and 15 we've not discussed that yet. If the protection 16 completely ceases, then this is open to debate. 17 MR. O'HALLORAN: Maybe I could ask that 18 your committee consider that as a management regime 19 that might be -- that you might want to discuss a 2.0 little bit. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What I'm going to ask, and we really are out of time, what I'm going to ask 22 23 is this wonderful discussion indicates to all of us that there's still a lot of work to be done, okay. 24 25 And I urge that all of you who had your hand up in

1 hopes of speaking would communicate to Mark your concerns. Is that okay, Barbara? No. 2 Very, very quickly. 3 MS. STEVENSON: My concern was we have MPA's that will fit the filter 4 5 currently, that are in the process of the areas being redefined. From the point of view of protection, that 6 7 there would be continuing protection. But under your 8 definition they wouldn't comply. So I'd like you to 9 reconsider that also. 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And Barbara, could you send 11 Mark this, okay? I mean his subcommittee needs to 12 hear -- and Wally, you are in the queue, so we'll give 13 you a chance. Go ahead. This is the last one. 14 DR. PEREYRA: This is sort of following on 15 Tony's remarks, that we have to keep in mind that this 16 is not a static designation. There is monitoring 17 going on and there's adaptive management. 18 can be levels as you go through. It's still a Marine 19 Protected Area, so it's not without potential for 20 change during that time frame. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: This is great. 22 DR. HIXON: I just want to follow up and I 23 want to reiterate that this is semi-final at this We will have a document that will be on the 24 point. 25 secure web page soon, as soon as possible, and at that

1 point we definitely want feedback from everyone. 2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Everyone, yeah. 3 Wonderful. Thank you, Mark. Is that okay with 4 people? This is good. 5 Now, as you went through that I heard one kind of decision item, which is you people wish to 6 7 have a meeting in Monterey; is that correct? 8 DR. HIXON: That's correct. 9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Between now and 10 And so I think we need authorization from 11 the full FAC for you to do that. And it seems to me, 12 without Joe here, and maybe Lauren knows this, but we 13 do -- we will have some budgetary implications from 14 this. I don't know what our budget situation is, and 15 So I could imagine us perhaps authorizing the 16 Subcommittee One to meet, and I think they've told us what they would intend to do, but I don't know whether 17 18 there's money to do it and I don't know, pardon --19 there is money. 20 We consulted with the MPA DR. HIXON: 21 Center before deciding that we wanted to do that. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You did. Is there 23 money if also Group Two and Three wishes to have a 24 meeting? 25 DR. WAHLE: I think so.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You think so. Okay.
2	All right. Then let's do this. Let's if you wish,
3	let's hear a motion that Subcommittee One be allowed
4	to hold a meeting in Monterey.
5	MR. PETERSON: I so move.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's been moved. Is
7	there a second to the motion?
8	MR. MURRAY: I second.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Second. Subject to
10	budget negotiations and let's leave it at that. Is
11	that okay?
12	Yes, David?
13	MR. BENTON: The only problem that I can
14	see with that is the hesitancy by Charlie about the
15	other subcommittees. I think all the subcommittees
16	need to be treated equally in this regard.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, they will be.
18	MR. BENTON: So the motion as you stated
19	it has some difficulties, because what it really needs
20	to be is, first I need to go and see if they have the
21	money for all three subcommittees to meet, if they
22	want to. I'm not saying that the others want to.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right.
24	MR. BENTON: And if that works, then the
25	authorization for Subcommittee One to meet would be

appropriate.

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: I think what I meant by Executive motion is that the Committee my authorized by the Full Advisory Committee to, once we hear from Groups Two and Three, and we learn more about the budget situation, that we be empowered to authorize them to meet, subject to the consideration that it might -- depending on the budget, maybe a subset of the subcommittee would get together if -because I could imagine that perhaps not all ten of your people would be available to go and what have you.

So that's what I meant by the motion. George?

MR. LAPOINTE: I think the other thing that's important for people to recognize is what we talked about with the subcommittee meeting. We've all expressed the concern that at these meetings we don't have enough time to meet. What we were talking about was starting at eight in the morning and going until eight at night. So trying to maximize people's times and minimize budget as well.

MR. PETERSON: I would amend my motion to say that we would -- that we ask that the Executive Committee consulting with the Marine Center look at

1	all three subcommittees to meet if they wish to do so,
2	if there's funding available, and let you all make the
3	final decision.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: David, are you does
5	that meet your concerns? Who seconded the motion? I
6	forget.
7	MR. MURRAY: I did.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, so it's been
9	moved and seconded that we do what Max said. All in
10	favor of doing what Max said say "aye."
11	(MEMBERS): Aye.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?
13	(No audible response.)
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I knew no one would
15	oppose Max. Thank you.
16	Okay. So we've got that done. Number
17	Two, Tony.
18	DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19	I'd like to extend apologies from the Chair of that
20	subcommittee who wasn't able to be here due to time
21	constraint, so I as Vice-Chair claim his role.
22	Subcommittee Two is tasked with
23	stewardship and effectiveness aspects of MPA's. And
24	we too have gone through a process, it's slightly
25	different to the process that Subcommittee One has

_	gone chroagh. We just very briefly. He the last
2	meeting we identified a number of issues that should
3	be examined under the stewardship and effectiveness.
4	We delegated that task to come up with an outline for
5	each of those issues. We compiled those outlines and
6	came here. We discussed those outlines. We re-
7	arranged the outlines and identified and sort of
8	consolidated it into topics. Those topics that relate
9	we talked about yesterday but they are
LO	constituency building, planning, compliance,
11	monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management and
12	we're still working on the term.
L3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could you repeat those?
L4	There are a lot of words. How many are there, four?
15	DR. CHATWIN: Four. It could be five.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Constituent building,
L7	planning and what?
18	DR. CHATWIN: Planning, compliance and
19	then we had monitoring, evaluation and adaptive
20	management as one.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: As one, monitoring,
22	evaluation and adaptive management.
23	DR. CHATWIN: It's one, but it could be
24	two.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's fine

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. CHATWIN: It doesn't really matter.

And our idea is not to write a report on these, but to sort of focus into areas that we want to come up with

recommendations for, for review of the Committee.

-- this process has been very And in useful that we have come across issues, issues and terms that that require are clarification and that are more contentious, and I think we've been working towards identifying those issues so that we can work through them within the subcommittee. And we are very open to hearing from the Committee if there are issues that we are not addressing or if there are concerns among the other subcommittees that be addressing we may not important aspects of stewardship and effectiveness.

We -- in particular we spent a significant amount of time at this meeting talking about constituency building and planning. We weren't able to spend as much time going into as much detail into the other issues. In our discussions we talked about the public, identifying and assessing the public as opposed to stakeholders. Stakeholders is a word that there a different levels of conflict with, and so we have one of our tasks from here on is to define, or to find a term that everybody feels comfortable with.

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

Actually, there are a number of terms which are tasked for clarification.

We also discussed a planning process and the issue of major contention there is who exactly does -- is involved in the planning process. And so we sort of -- you identify the public, you assess the level of interest from the public, and then recognize that a public process -- MPA's have to be either created or managed under a public process context. But there was recognition that for the process to be effective, and this is not the public process of the MPA management, we may require a planning team, and we talked about who should be on that planning team. this was an area of much debate. And we haven't reached any conclusions on that. But what was effective the recognized is that to be planning process within the public process has to be comprised of people who want to participate in a constructive And that's as far as we got. The idea of manner. having participation of people were there to undermine the process wasn't seen as constructive.

It's a delicate issue in terms of political feasibility, because we didn't envision a closed process at all, but if we're going to come up with recommendations how to make planning processes

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

effective for MPA, this is one of the aspects that we're trying to learn from previous experiences.

So we wanted to share this with the Committee because it is one of those hot issues in terms of stewardship and effectiveness that require -- so we are working on those.

And we also looked at impediments to public participation, things that we need to grapple with as well. One thing, maybe that the process doesn't incorporate enough public participation. It could be that agencies that are involved in MPA-related processes have legal constraints on how much public participation they can allow, and those are issues that we haven't gone into much detail, but we've put them on the radar screen as things that we need to grapple.

The other thing, the big area that we've been looking at, and again we need a lot more work on, is incentives. We discussed incentives for participation in public processes relating to MPA's, incentives for Federal, state and local entities that have authority over Marine Protected Areas to be part of the National System. What are the incentives? And these incentives -- and I think there's a lot of them. Incentives to comply, incentives for effectiveness of

1 Marine Protected Areas as related to compliance, have we insured the processes, include the incentives for 2 3 compliance. And this is another area that we have 4 5 again find it needs further work. We have assigned tasks related to these 6 7 different areas, and we have agreed to have a followup conference call on the 7th of May. The different 8 9 tasks have to be ready by the 2nd of May. We'll review them on the 7th of May and our intent is then to post 10 the information that we have gathered to that date on 11 12 the secure website shortly thereafter. We did not consider the possibility of 13 14 meeting in person, which was a shame. I mean, I'm 15 glad that Subcommittee One considered that 16 possibility. I think there may be interest in the subcommittee to follow suit, so we'd like to explore 17 18 that possibility. We had a lot of healthy discussion and 19 20 those are the highlights of what we've done to date. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Very nice. Thank you. 22 Okay, we have George, Randy, Rod. 23 My first question MR. LAPOINTE: 24 answered when things were going to go up on the secure

website.

75 The other one, the constituency building, planning process, I have a concern about pre-building. It looks like you're trying to pre-build advocacy into this process and I'm concerned about Government's role in that, but when I see what you've written we can follow up on that more. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, thank you. DR. CHATWIN: Just a clarification. We

discussed, thoroughly discussed the issue of different interests versus constructive roles, differentiated the two. So the idea was not to exclude any interests that should be represented. So it wasn't a question of what shape the advocacy that's going to take place around this process, but it was to insure that the process was going to be a functional one.

MR. LAPOINTE: I guess my point stands, I'm not concerned about shaping the advocacy, concerned that we're trying to build it in. I meant the advocacy should come from somewhere else and we shouldn't say, "You will be advocates." That would just be a concern have as I look at the documents and move forward.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Randy and then Max.

Actually to follow-up MR. BOWMAN:

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

that, for better or worse, the role of the public in
these matters is provided for by Federal law for the
Federal agencies, I presume by state law for the state
agencies, similarly, how the comment and the process
works and who is involved in it. And there is simply
no way which I think you could propose recommendations
to us that could possibly be acceptable, or legally
acceptable regardless of inclinations of the Agency,
that would allow limiting participation to people who
the managers or others think are constructive. I
think the idea of how to improve or remove obstacles
to public participation is an area that could be
extremely fruitful, because the Agency tends to get in
a rut and just do things the way they've always done
them. But the question of how the process goes and
how the planning process goes is largely set by the
law in the Federal end, I believe it is on the state
end, and it's not clear to me that that's a productive
use of your time

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Rod and then Max.

DR. FUJITA: Yeah. It causes us to wonder what other Federal representatives might think about. We don't want to waste time on this. We've seen that from past experience the -- you know, the structure of

the process is really important, but also the kind of people who are involved in the process are really important as well. And so the attempt here is not to insure that the process is adopted by MPA advocates. The intent is to encourage full expression of all viewpoints, including opposition, to the MPA and major concerns with the design of the MPA, but to insure that all of those interests are represented by people who are going to discuss these issues in good faith and not obstruct intentionally.

MR. BOWMAN: Fortunately, that's not legally possible from the Federal end.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Max?

MR. PETERSON: Randy largely covered what I was going to say. You can't pre-decide who's going to be constructive. Some of your critics may be the most constructive in the end and you can't decide that Rod's not going to be constructive in this case because the last time he was an obstructionist, but this time he might be constructive.

Let me say one other thing. State and Federal agencies can create a planning team that's made up of Federal and state and local agencies that have legal responsibility. The minute you start including interest groups, you've created a FACA

2.0

	78
	Committee, and you cannot designate interest groups to
	be a formal part of planning groups without running
	afoul of FACA. Now you can have an open process that
	has those people involved and they can be involved,
	but you can't say, "I want to have Joe and George and
	Mary to be a part of the planning team because they
	represent a particular interest." That's illegal in
	our system of involving the public.
	And so I think Randy's point is well
	taken, you're kind of you can talk about having an
	open planning process that involves people, but you
١	

can't say we're going to select people who we'll allow to be on the planning team. That's where you run afoul of the law.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, thank you. Rod? DR. FUJITA: We may be getting bulloxed up in terms.

> CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wrapped around the axle DR. FUJITA: Wrapped around the axle.

I think what we meant by planning team could also be called an interest -- representative group of stakeholders, if we want to return to that term for a moment. The Marine Reserve working group in the Channel Islands, you know, various other bodies that have been convened to design MPA's, are those

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

included?

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. PETERSON: Whatever you call them. You can call them a working group, you an call them ad hoc, you can call them anything you want to, but if you formalize them -- now an outside group, an outside organization like Friends of MMA, they can create a group to provide in-put, but the minute the state or Federal Government create a group, they've created an advisory group, regardless of what it's called, that's very clear in the law.

DR. FUJITA: I have one other comment.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, quickly.

FUJITA: He did an excellent job summarizing it, but he left out one thing which I'd love Committee in-put on, and that is, Subcommittee Two has agreed to take on the task of addressing the National System, since all have been about individual MPA sites. So what we're thinking of doing is addressing the National System in each of the four categories of stewardship and effectiveness that we're going to focus on. So we'll talk about building a constituency for the National System, we'll talk about planning the National System, we'll talk about monitoring, evaluating, adaptive management, cetera.

So I just wanted to put that on the table to just let you know that we are intending to address those, and what we'd like to do is use the system attributes -- developing the drive of all that. That will become the criteria that we will focus on.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, Tony, you were going to get the last word but you passed, so Terry can have the last word.

MR. O'HALLORAN: One of the other considerations that we were discussing was the need to develop a -- or think about rewards for other state, local, tribal jurisdictions, why they would want to belong to a Federal system -- to a National System. In fact, there might be some areas, some state areas, that in fact would not want to become part of the National System, and so we need to consider that, why, you know, what's in it for me? Why would I want to become part of the National System?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks. Wally?

DR. PEREYRA: Just briefly. In listening to the discussion regarding the National System, it sounds like we're moving in the direction of trying to establish some new authority to create some kind of a coordinated body of MPA's, and I just would like to emphasize that the Executive Order which we are, you

1 know, charged with making recommendations under, very specifically speaks to that issue, that that is not 2 3 what they were looking for, all the various regulatory agencies and so forth that have responsibilities for 4 5 MPA -CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We're going to have to 6 7 stop. Thank you. I got to stop. 8 DR. CHATWIN: We're not considering --9 BROMLEY: That's fine. CHAIRMAN 10 Wonderful. Thanks. 11 Okay, Mel. 12 MR. MOON: We have a Power Point, at least 13 a couple of slides that we want to put up 14 referencing for the entire group. And we did, too, 15 have lively discussions over the past few days in 16 regards to the inter-governmental coordination issues. What we were able to do was move towards 17 18 some tasking after the couple of days that we had in 19 terms of talking of the issues in detail, and were 2.0 able to have subcommittees, sub-subcommittees I quess 21 you could call them, or work groups, that were formed 22 to bring back some additional recommendations back to 23 full Committee, targeted primarily for the 24 September meetings.

NEAL R. GROSS

But our first discussion was in regards to

the panel that was -- that had provided an idea to be able to provide a panel that deals with indigenous rights and the practices of those people as it relates to Marine Protected Areas. Realizing that this is a section that exists within the Executive Order and that it is a part of the consultation process that's required along with the non-diminishment process, and also that we seem to be mixing up the cultural issues along with the rights issues. And that there needed to be some definition and focus and clarity brought into that.

That seemed an ideal opportunity to bring to the full Committee some cross-representations, not all, but partial representations of various parts of the country where rights are firmly in place, or will soon be in place, and the perspectives of those peoples.

We had a meeting of a small group last night between four of us and -- myself, Lelei, John Halsey and Bonnie, and tried to get some more definition as to what the purpose of this process would be, and I think we were in agreement that it would be a good opportunity to get into place to incorporate this to the full Committee. And then we talked about the length of a presentation, how it

would fit into the entire full group process. And we are, I guess, about two hours at this point, if we were to include a Great Lakes representative, a Northwest representative, and a Pacific Islanders' representative, from at least a list of three.

We are still in discussion about the inclusion of Alaska. It has great diversity. And Dolly Garza is not here and we wanted to have her on the committee as well, ad hoc-wise, to do some planning.

So my suggestion I guess right now is that I would like to propose a motion for a panel to be created and developed on indigenous rights, to be formed by a working group. Primarily I would suspect myself, Lelei and Dolly Garza, to put the group together to work with the MPA Center for the next meeting. And also that would be contingent on the meeting taking place in the West. I would say that that would be a condition. I know at some point in time, if we don't have the next meeting in the West, that at some point in time we will, and we'd like to make this a part of that function.

So I'd like to make that motion to have the panel.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could we go ahead with

your report and come back to that; is that okay?

MR. MOON: That's fine.

2.0

The other portion deals with the cultural resources definition. We had an assignment of having definitions provided to the full group and everybody got a copy of that for their use. We were a little concerned about the creation of a fourth subcommittee that would take people out of the various committees to work just on social science issues and cultural issues. We felt that it's an important element but it needs to remain inside the three existing committees and we can work on sub-group levels in the future. So we kind of moved off of that track of saying that we needed a fourth subcommittee. Perhaps we can do ad

But in addition to that, once this paper work is discussed, and I may need to have John come in on this, but John and Bonnie have been working together on the two pieces of this information on definition. And the first piece is a piece that deals more on the natural -- on National Register and Historical Places. And there's an additional piece that would be required in terms of intangible issues, beliefs, values, experiences, that we feel that needed to be, and they felt needed to be included for more

hoc if that need be.

information to the other three groups. But we're suggesting that the second part of this be the cultural resources of those intangible products and that Bonnie and John continue to work on that, and I suspect that this is all going to be put on the website for people to review.

The other pieces that we're dealing with of the tasks have to deal with the Ocean Commission Report and an evaluation and the analysis of the sections that are relating to the inter-governmental coordination of MPA's. We expect a two-to-three page report to be provided, and that task has been assigned and we'll expect to have some product by the next meeting.

The other two pieces we have, I will ask

Bob Bendick and Jackie Schafer to speak on. They're

essentially on operational and creation portions. And

I guess that we could perhaps start with Jackie.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Can we do this in about two minutes, because we want to leave time for action and discussion. Sorry to put you on the spot, but -

MS. SCHAFER: We created a sub-group of the subcommittee that will be working on developing a plan for the inter-governmental coordination to develop the National System of Marine Protected Areas.

The charge of this group will be to prepare draft how the U.S. Secretaries recommendations on of and Interior should lead Federal Commerce the Government's coordination, the Governors and other leaders of states, commonwealths, territories tribes through their respective designees to successfully engage them in their subdivision, such as counties or cities, in the establishment of the National System.

The approach that we're going to take is to identify mechanisms for a successful Federal interagency coordination and recommend models for assuring appropriate Federal agency participation in National System. Once we are able to describe to the other state and tribal and territorial leaders what the vision is, would outline a recommended we communication plan and ongoing coordinating mechanism facilitate their engagement in creating the National System.

The next one will require some coordination with the other subcommittees, of course, because we're focused on process, but substance has to be determined before we can outline the process for a plan of action and milestones for identifying the existing Marine Managed Areas and how they would be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

transformed into a Marine Protected Area and then adding new protected areas under the Federal, state and other jurisdictions to become again part of the National System.

And then the fourth, to identify opportunities for coordination with international Marine Protected Area programs as is outlined in the Executive Order and brought up yesterday by Tundi.

Finally, we would propose looking at identifying barriers to successful participation by state, territories, tribes and others that might require budget or legislative action in order to effect the overall National System of MPA's.

identified Wе also attributes of successful inter-governmental coordination, one being the acknowledgment of the sovereignty the or independent authority or the special expertise states, territories, tribes and others to a consistent constructive participation by individuals and agencies level, respectively. consistent transparent communication for user friendly forums to set goals, track progress and correct course and we were working around the edges to get some specific detail on how to engage these individual entities to participate in this process, and we will

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	have some suggestions on how to do that.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
3	MR. MOON: Thank you, Jackie. And this is
4	a working draft that we had some amendments to this
5	morning, so we'll post that on the web as soon as we
6	get done.
7	MS. SCHAFER: Let me also emphasize, I am
8	an ex-officio member, as Mel and Bartz is. Our
9	Chairman, Mike Nussman, of this little sub-group, left
10	early and our other member, Dave Benton, arrived late,
11	so I felt the need to do this drafting.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You've done remarkably
13	well with no one to help.
14	MS. SCHAFER: I want to be sure that all
15	of those folks are involved in this process and also
16	we expect to be engaging Mr. Peterson.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The fewer people you
18	have the easier it is to get agreement, Jackie. And
19	now we have Bob Bendick.
20	MR. BENDICK: This is stepping down to the
21	inter-governmental cooperation at the operational
22	level, at the MPA level, and it's clear that there are
23	cases where cooperation among agencies can be improved
24	to achieve the goals of MPA's, sort of the issue
25	statement that this sub-subcommittee is working on.

So our purpose of this sub-subcommittee is to make recommendations on how agencies involved in managing MPA's can coordinate and integrate their work How we're going to go about identified four planning, enforcement, areas, monitoring and evaluation, education outreach similar to the previous subcommittee, that we need to look at. We defined the attributes of success, what does good cooperation and coordination mean in each of those areas, examine a few case studies, hopefully those already prepared by the MPA Center, to look successes and failures and extract some lessons and from those to propose best practices cooperation and coordination.

Finally, this is an example under enforcement of what we mean by attributes of success, what are those characteristics of a good enforcement program that represent good cooperation and coordination. So all of this, we had a number of additions this morning to our little issue paper and that will all be -- those will all be put into the paper and sent out, posted on the website, I guess. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Bob. Okay.

We have a decision item presented to us

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

and I would like to move on that first and then come back. Is that okay, then we have our discussion. Is that okay, Mel?

This Committee recommended a panel at the next meeting and what I would like to do would be to ask for, if I might nudge it just a little bit, Mel. I worry that culture -- let me back up.

We lost here from indigenous peoples and interest about this dimension. I would like for that discussion to be embedded in a larger conversation the full Committee has about culture, and I worry that the way I thought I heard it was that it was going to split that off. What I would like to ask, Mel, if your group would be amenable to an approach in which we would designate two hours or two and a half hours at the meeting to be held in the West for a group to work out a program for us which would bring to us conversations, representations, testimonials, about only indigenous issues, indigenous not issues, but the broader spectrum of what culture is, because that is clearly one of the bridging issues that concerns all of us. And I would like to ask your Bonnie chair а subcommittee permission to have consisting of herself, John Halsey, Dolly Garza, Mel, Lelei, Barbara Stevenson and George Lapointe, to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comprise a program planning committee for that two hours or two and a half hours in which we will hear about culture in the broadest possible interpretation, part of which would be indigenous issues and part of which would be the John Halsey stuff and these other things.

How do you react to that, Mel?

MR. MOON: Well, I'm a little worried that there's a overlay that is combining the cultural issues with the legal principals of the rights that these people have, and so that is really the reason why the -- how it's being brought out, so that you can have a clear definition of the distinction of the differences and how to keep them separate, because often what happens is, you get a draw towards the cultural side of things to describe those people, and there is something there but the reality is there's a legal definition to what rights they hold and how they practice them and how they manage those resources that they have.

So they're two different subject matters, and I was hoping to bring that clarity out in the series of panel discussions.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Nothing in my statement precludes the panel. Nothing in my statement

precludes the presentation of exactly what you've just talked about. I see you guys getting together to work out a program, two hours, two and a half hours, of which that would be a part, but it would not be the only part, is all I'm asking. I want to broaden, cast a wider net over this thing called culture, if I could, of which indigenous rights and practices and meanings are central to it.

David, is your?

BENTON: Mr. Chairman. I'm very sympathetic to Ι think what you're trying to accomplish, and I think that there are very important issues under the heading of culture that are different than the issues that surround specifically indigenous peoples and their legal rights. And what I was going to suggest is maybe the group that you designated, identified, was a good group. They may want to look at setting up one panel at one of our meetings, because we have multiple meetings we're planning for, that would deal with indigenous rights, and a second presentation at a different meeting, especially if we're going to have one on the West Coast and one up in New England, that we look at the other context of culture, the broader context of the Antiquities Act and issues that George and Barbara have brought up, at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a different meeting, so that we have sufficient time to give both of those subject matters adequate attention.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, fair enough.

Barbara?

2.0

MS. STEVENSON: I just have a quick question on the process. I haven't been involved in setting up the meetings and we haven't been doing anything at night, and it seemed to me that some of these things would be very appropriate for us to have sessions at night on, in which case we might actually end up having say, in a three day meeting, two nights, one on one and one on the other, and have it very reasonably in-depth. Is there some reason that we don't --

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, yeah, because I hear that the subcommittees want more time and I know subcommittees have worked at night, and I think our preliminary sessions need to be during the day -- I mean my gut says that they ought to be during the day so the evenings are free for subcommittees to elaborate their work, follow up, send off groups to do certain tasks. So I'm a little reluctant, Barbara, to schedule that, but -

I guess Rod had his hand up -- Mel, go

ahead.

2.0

MR. MOON: I was just thinking that that is a good panel that you have put together in regards to dealing with culture, and all facets of culture in the broadest context. So I'm supportive of it being an active ad hoc committee, perhaps working on the second paper that deals with the beliefs and the views and non-tangible types of things, and I would even be supportive of the group helping out in the planning process of the, you know, how the theme is going to be developed and what is the outreach objective.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Max?

MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I am a little reluctant to see us try to develop a program for future meetings as a full group. I would rather see us give the responsibility for looking about how to schedule these things to the Executive Committee with advice from this new committee and so on, but not -- and it makes sense to do it in the West, but I think we've heard all that, but I would be reluctant to pass a motion that says we're going to do this when we -- one of the things we haven't heard from recently is our -- we're supposed to be giving advice to two departments and we need to look again at what advice they're asking us for and seeing that everything we

put on the program ought to be related to the advice we're expected to give them.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. I would -- Rod and then George?

DR. FUJITA: I support this motion separating the cultural presentations the or discussions from those about indigenous rights, but I would ask that subcommittee consider expanding the dialogue or the presentations of the panel to include, not just indigenous rights, but also responsibilities and interests. What are the real interests responsibilities pertaining to MPA? And the reason germane to the mission I think recommendations that, you know, to insure an intergovernmental coordination everybody has to be clear on what the rights, responsibilities and interests are of the different Governmental entities.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George?

MR. LAPOINTE: I'm unclear about it exactly. But as Mel goes forward on the structure on indigenous rights and responsibilities and what not, although our mountains are smaller and our trees are smaller, we do have some tribal interest in these too. So if you could just cycle in, so we can make sure that those concerns are represented as well.

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	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I would like to come
2	back to my proposal, which is that we create a
3	subcommittee on this broader issue and let that
4	subcommittee, under the Chairpersonship of Bonnie,
5	take on board everything they've heard here about at
6	two separate meetings, at one meeting, and let them
7	report back to the Executive Committee of the FAC.
8	Do I have your approval to constitute
9	MR. BENTON: Do you want a motion?
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'd love a motion.
11	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I move for what
12	you said.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
14	MR. PETERSON: I second.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's been seconded.
16	And that is, they will clearly take into consideration
17	Mel's position, Rod, all of this, and advise the
18	Executive Committee on how to approach this.
19	DR. McCAY: And it's John Halsey, Dolly
20	Garza, Mel
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right, Lelei,
22	Barbara Stevenson and George Lapointe. Is that okay?
23	All in favor of the motion say "aye."
24	(MEMBERS): Aye
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?

(No audible response.)

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: All right. Now we have to go back to the comments. Wally, I think you had a question about Mel's. Let's try to sort of do it in three or four minutes and then we can go. Wally.

Under the Executive Order, MR. PEREYRA: in the purposes section, the last purpose was to look at this whole issue of avoiding the causing of harm to MPA's through Federally conducted, approved or funded activities. And when we're talking about coordination, inter-governmental coordination, it seems to me we've been trying to get our arms around the various organizations that have responsibility for MPA's and how they interact. This seems to go beyond that to organizations like the Department of Defense, for example, could have activities that would seriously damage, you know, the purpose, function and so forth of MPA's. And I think that maybe that subcommittee or sub-subcommittee needs to look at that issue.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, thank you. Other comments?

Let me try to summarize where I think we are and what I'd like to see.

Each of you is going to post up on the

NEAL R. GROSS

web, the secure website. Please do so. I would be very happy if by August 1st you have posted there decision items from each of your subcommittees that you plan to bring to us for action in September, and that you also post what I will call early versions of material still in progress, still works in progress, so that by the 1st of August all of us will have a very clear idea, to the extent possible, of what's going to be on our plate in September.

Now we have heard an interest in having more time for subcommittee work, but it is also very clear that in September we are going to need time in this setting, the full group, to act on those things that you believe are now ready for action. So do not be surprised in September if you don't have more time for subcommittee work than you had here, because we will need to re-allocate our time a bit so that we're in this room to act on the things that you folks have done.

So we cannot promise that you will have any more minutes or hours from what you had this time. We have agreed, I believe, that we would not have a field trip in the middle of our work session so that we would have two and a half days or something, right Lauren, maybe three, depending on that, and then have

a field trip afterwards, wherever we are. But we will need more time as a full group in September, I think, to act and discuss and deliberate. Is that clear?

about the bridging kinds of issues, you know, which things are you connecting with other subcommittees, clearly the cultural issue is an over-arching thing. There are some others. Please be attentive to that. But we want an early warning on the website of the action issues, all right, that in September we might have as our first general preliminary meeting getting those things dealt with, and then you can see if we have struggles with them, we can feed them back to you and you can come back and revise them.

So my thinking is as I think ahead to September is, we would want to have a chunk of time the first day to bring those actionable items to us for consideration, and then you'll have a second tier of things that will be -- by the end of our September meeting that will be in the category of actionable decision items, right. Is that okay with people? And we will not be able to do everything, but what are the things we can get our minds around and act on them.

Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: I think, Mr. Chairman, I

NEAL R. GROSS

2.0

think that it's great that you laid out things with respect to products. I think that's great.

I would also like to put once again to the Committee, to request, and I could make it in the form of a motion if you want, but to request guidance from the MPA Center in collaboration with other agencies. I think -- to request guidance on how we can construct useful recommendations, how the recommendations should be structured, because I think we still are operating in some darkness in relation to -- you know, we could provide a list of bullets and say these are things you need to consider, but I don't know how useful that's going to be. So I think we need some guidance.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Please remember that we are not advising the MPA Center. We are advising the Secretaries, and I don't -- I guess I might be reluctant to ask the MPA Center to tell us how to structure our recommendations. I would be comfortable having some feedback, but we -- is that We are advising the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, and other competent should say, Government agencies -- pertinent, I Government agencies.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I knew when I corrected

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	that, you would notice. That is a term that the
2	Government agencies competent this and competent
3	that.
4	DR. CHATWIN: What I can imply from the
5	response is that there is no communication that we can
6	have, the Departments that we're supposed to advise,
7	so we're just supposed to operate
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, no. Mary Glackin,
9	you know the Interior representative.
10	DR. CHATWIN: My request was that the
11	Center staff coordinate this -
12	MR. BOWMAN: It occurred to me after being
13	here, again this being my first meeting, but I had
14	already planned to go back and discuss with the
15	Assistant Secretaries of the Interior whether we might
16	perhaps send a letter to the group that spelled out
17	some of the specific types of advice that we are
18	looking for, not to preclude you from doing other
19	things or telling you how to pass the advice, but just
20	to try to clarify what it is that we are looking for,
21	perhaps even time sequence, some of that.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And the format, Randy.
23	I mean you can help us that way as well. That's
24	right. That's good. And Mary, you can be involved
25	with Mary in this discussion.

Okay, David and then Terry.

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. Chairman, you laid out MR. BENTON: what I thought was a good sort of approach in terms of moving things along. One thing that occurred to me listening to what you were saying, maybe this was your intention, is point the work of the at some subcommittees, the product of the subcommittees, draft product, will obviously be the subject of a lot of discussion around this table, and I think that maybe you -- maybe through you and the Executive Committee, sort of a schedule of events that could be put on the website might be a helpful guide for those of us who are scattered all over the country, in terms of how this might unfold.

What I'm really getting at is, I think that we may want to have the work products from the subcommittees, the draft work products from the subcommittees available on that website a few weeks before that September meeting so that everybody could read them and think about them before they show up so you don't get them cold and you can maximize the use of the deliberations at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Does August 1^{st} meet your condition?

MR. BENTON: You're the boss.

NEAL R. GROSS

_	CHAIRMAN BROMLET. I CHOUGHT I SAID BY
2	August 1 st .
3	MR. BENTON: I wasn't clear about work
4	products or
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Sorry. I called them
6	decision items, what it is they would like us to
7	deliberate and act on and then the other, I guess I
8	called them works in progress. But I like my
9	terminology better than work product, because I want
10	closure, and work product sounds like, you know, they
11	still want to work on it some more. I want closure by
12	the 1 st of August on whichever issues on which they
13	reached closure.
14	MR. BENTON: Okay, absolutely.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. Terry, your
16	hand up?
17	MR. O'HALLORAN: This is a question about
18	a discussion board on our website. I know some talk
19	had been done about having a discussion board on the
20	secure website.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: A chat room.
22	MR. O'HALLORAN: A chat room well, I
23	don't think it's a chat room, but a discussion board
24	where if you're not on a subcommittee you can make
25	just throw up some comments, you know, that we can

_	Kind of Communicate that way. That might be
2	beneficial to us and I don't know what the feasibility
3	of that is.
4	(UNKNOWN SPEAKER): The Government has
5	problems with software that you can't do that right
6	now. We're investigating ways to make that possible,
7	but the Government has very specific rules about
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Part of the Homeland
9	Security.
10	(UNKNOWN SPEAKER:) A person who is not an
11	employee posting something on a Federal website,
12	there's rules against that. So we have been working
13	with our IT department on that.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: But he means members of
15	the subcommittee. He means us. That's still a
16	problem.
17	MS. WENZEL: Generally, you all have to
18	send us information to post for you on the website.
19	You don't have access.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What you can do is, you
21	can e-mail, we can e-mail.
22	MR. O'HALLORAN: If we have a question
23	that we want to post on this discussion board we send
24	it to Dana and she puts them up there. I mean, it's
25	another step, but it could accomplish the same

1	purpose.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I think in
3	deference to everybody's schedule, Charlie, do you
4	have a gavel available? Are we ready to have Charlie
5	do I hear an objection to adjournment?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Hearing none
8	DR. WAHLE: I adjourn this meeting.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.
10	We've had a great time.
11	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
12	12:15 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	