UNITED STATES of AMERICA

NATIONAL OCEANIC and ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

* * * * *

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SECOND MEETING, Day 2 of 3

* * * * *

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2003

* * * * *

SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA

The Committee reconvened at 8:30 a.m. in the Bay Bridge Conference Room, B and C, at the San Mateo Marriott San Francisco Airport Hotel, 1717 South Amphlett Boulevard, San Mateo, California.

Committee Members Present:

- Dr. Tundi Agary
- Mr. Robert L. Bendick, Jr.
- Mr. David Benton
- Dr. Daniel W. Bromley, Chairman
- Dr. Anthony C. Chatwin
- Dr. Michael J. Cruickshank
- Ms. Carol E. Dinkins, Esq.
- Dr. Rodney M. Fujita
- Dr. Delores (Dolly) A. Garza
- Mr. Eric L. Gilman
- 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
- Mr. Gilbert C. Radonski
- Dr. James P. Ray
- Dr. Daniel O. Suman
- Captain Thomas E. Thompson
- Mr. Robert F. Zales II

Ex-Office Members Present:

- Ms. Mary Glackin
- Ms. Patricia Morrison
- Ms. Jacqueline Schafer

Also Present:

- Ms. Mary Jean Comfort, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada
- Ms. Marjorie Ernst

From the National Marine Protected Areas Center:

Ms. Ginger Hinchcliff, Director, Training & Technical

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Mr. Joseph A. Uravitch, AICP, Director

Dr. Charles Wahle, Director, MPA Science Institute

NEAL R. GROSS

I-N-D-E-X

Call to Order and Opening Remarks	. 4
Subcommittee Designations	13
Plenary Reports from Subcommittees	48 55
General Discussion on the Subcommittees	69
Keynote Luncheon Speaker Mary Jean Comfort	85
Discussion on the Charter	142 162
Plenary Reports from Subcommittees: From Subcommittee/Group 1	172
Scheduling on the Subcommittees	219
End of Day's transcript	227

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee is called

MS.

ERNST:

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:

2

1

(8:30 o'clock a.m.)

This meeting of the Marine

Thank you, Maggie.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

back to order.

Maggie is the federal official that convenes our meetings and Maggie has the capacity to call us to order and to put us into recess. And we realize that the agenda says "adjourn" at the end of each day. That's a technical mistake. It should say "recess." So we're getting our technical stuff worked out as we go. I hope you will bear with us.

I want to make a few little statements and announcements before we get going for the day. There are two or three people who have not come. And I think we don't have their preferences for subcommittee.

So the issue of parliamentarian came up yesterday and I'd like to propose the following. And I'm always, as you know, willing to be overridden, but I would like to ask Dolly Garza to serve as our parliamentarian. The idea of finding some ex-officio

person who will be here all the time and give us continuity seems difficult.

So I'd like to see a show of hands of all of those who think Dolly cannot be trusted with this job.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Seeing none, thank you, Dolly.

I told her that I would buy a copy of Robert's Rules of Order for her. And so we will -- unless somebody objects to this, that would be my preference. Seeing none.

I do want to acknowledge, and I'm sort of getting my feet under me after the shock of yesterday, I think we should acknowledge the work that Joe and Maggie and John Ogden and the Agenda Committee did to give us a basic structure to move forward. So I think it's -- I think many people last night felt that we had made more progress than they thought we would. And I feel that as well. And much of that credit I think goes to Joe, Maggie and to John for their work, and the Agenda Committee. I forget the membership of it, but you know who you were and you're duly praised

NEAL R. GROSS

for your good work.

Let me just say I thought the social hour last night was marvelous. And I mentioned to Bonnie, who seems to be the one who gets things done, that -- sorry, Maggie, but you know if you want --

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: -- if you want something done you go see Bonnie, right, huh? Even Maggie does. Bonnie, she's the mojo, isn't she. And so I propose, and I'd like your reaction to it, that in the future that our -- the evening of our first day that we have a dinner, group dinner.

And I will tell you, there's nothing like sort of arguing with somebody during the day and getting very angry at them, and then having to sit next to them at dinner and drink wine and break bread. It's wonderful bonding. There's nothing more primal than eating.

And so we are going to see if we can pull this off. And I mean if there's anyone who thinks this is not a good idea please tell me, either publicly or privately. But I happen to think it would be a nice dinner if after our first day wherever we

NEAL R. GROSS

are if we go out sort of as a committee plus Bonnie and Maggie and the core staff and drink a little reasonable wine together.

And we either go individually and turn in an expense account or we do it as a group. So we're working on that unless somebody thinks it's not a good idea. But I thought last night, the bonding and so on was marvelous.

What I'd like to do today is get a little bit organized. I realized that there was a lot going on up here and I missed several people who wished to speak. And I realize it was a mixture of that projector in the face and that window over there with the glare coming from it and so on.

And although I haven't asked Bonnie privately but I'd ask her now: Would you help me keep track of whose hand is up when we're going along?

MS. ERNST: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that okay? And Maggie will continue to do what she has done which is to sort of be the informal secretary transcriber. We do have it on tape, but I realize that I need a little help up here so that we don't drop the ball as I did

NEAL R. GROSS

yesterday.

And I apologize to those who had their hand up and I missed it or we got you out of order.

And I'm going to ask Joe and Maggie to help me with clarification at times, and Mary Glackin and others, the ex-officio people. And I realize I think that it was a mistake yesterday when Joe had a clarification point, I put him in the queue rather than letting him clarify. Because I think we ended up spending time talking about something or things that perhaps didn't need to be talked about.

So unless there are objections, when I or somebody else feels a need for clarification or Joe signals to me or even Maggie signals to me, I would like to have the ability to recognize them to clarify things. You can overrule me on that if you'd like, but that's the way I'd prefer to proceed.

So they are not members of the Committee, so having them take their place in the queue with a clarification kind of answer strikes me as a bit odd.

And if I can get Bonnie to help me sort of be traffic cop and Maggie doing a nice job as she did yesterday, my job really is, as I see it, to watch and to listen

and to read the sense of the room and the body language and the fidgeting, and try to figure out when it's time to try to pull things to closure and when it's time to let them keep running.

And so that's the way I'd like to try to operate, so that if I don't have to keep track of who's in the queue and who's got their hand half up and who doesn't and who came before who, it allows me to sort of sit back and watch the discourse and figure out sort of how we might proceed. So that's what I would like to try to do.

We have to deal with the charter issue. There's language in the charter that must be addressed. Some people, several people said we might consider doing it now. I think my preference would be to let us get off in our subcommittees and get to work.

Nothing in the charter precludes the track we're on. All these subcommittees are ad hoc because they have not been approved by the competent officials. And so as long as we do not forget to get back to the charter some time they'd, would you mind if we hold off that language, wordsmithing for a bit?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Yes, Tony.
2	DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
3	don't mind if we leave it for some time today, but I'm
4	not going to be here tomorrow and I really would like
5	to be part of this discussion.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, all right. We'll
7	do it some time today. Thanks, Tony.
8	Is that okay with everybody?
9	(No audible response.)
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Today we have to
11	constitute subcommittees. You have to elect a chair.
12	In the agenda it says you elect a rapporteur, but I
13	think what is meant there is that you elect a
14	recorder.
15	Is that right? Whoever, John?
16	DR. OGDEN: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. I see a
18	rapporteur as something different from somebody who's
19	going to report back.
20	DR. OGDEN: Yes, right. Right.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: A rapporteur keeps you
22	from fighting with each other. And we may need a
23	rapporteur, but we do need a recorder. So you are to

elect a chair. You are to elect a recorder, a reporter, someone who will report back to us. And you have some tasks to fill out; we'll get to that in a minute.

Let me just remind you, at 10:45 those subcommittees are going to report back. And you will have an hour and 15 minutes to do that, and so that's about 75 minutes which means that there's 25 minutes each.

So each of your subcommittees, as I read this, will have about 25 minutes to report back what you have been discussing and what you make of it.

Am I right so far, Maggie?

We have lunch. We're quite honored to -not "quite" -- we're very honored, although the
English would say "quite honored" to have our lunch
speaker here, Mary Jean Comfort, in the Canadian red
there. Very happy to have you with us. She's from
the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in Canada. So,
Mary, welcome south of the border to California, which
we won't get into.

And that will be our lunch speaker. Then at 1:30 we will go back into our subcommittees and do

NEAL R. GROSS

1 more good work. And at 3:15 you will report back. 2 This time we have 105 minutes, which my calendar 3 indicates is 35 minutes for each group. 4 So today is a very different day from 5 You split up into small groups and do good yesterday. 6 work. 7 Any comments? 8 Yes, David. 9 I don't know if this MR. BENTON: 10 appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, but I think that at 11 some point we should have a bit of a discussion about 12 what we expect as a product out of the Committee's 13 work. 14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. And so we all go in with the 15 MR. BENTON: 16 same expectation. 17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. That's 18 right. We will do that before we send you away. 19 At this point I'd like to turn to the 20 matter of the display boards behind us and the yellow We ask each of you to put your first, second, 21 paper. 22 and third choice down. We have allocated people for 23 the most part to their first choice.

1 I believe we still have three people whose 2 preferences are not known to us. Wally -- where's Wally? Wally's not here. 3 4 Gil? 5 MR. RADONSKI: I gave mine to Bob. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, okay. 7 MR. [SPEAKER]: He wants the number 2. 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, okay. Good. And 9 Wally's not here. We'll put Wally here. 10 And George Lapointe? MR. [SPEAKER]: Not here yet. 11 12 CHAIRMAN **BROMLEY:** So we 13 subcommittee of Bonnie, Joe, Bob Zales. And Maggie and I looked at your first choice, the second choice, 14 15 third choice. And there was a heavy loading on number 16 1, less of a loading on 2, and a smaller loading on 3. 17 So we had to split people up, move them around a bit. 18 So here is the end product of that, subject to being overruled by those of you who got 19 20 Can you read from back there? moved. Can you read these notes? 21 22 MR. [SPEAKER]: No. 23 Okay. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So the way it

l l	
1	looks now, it is Steve Murray, Michael Cruickshank,
2	Max Peterson, Carol Dinkins, Jim Ray, Mary Glackin,
3	Bob Zales, Wally Pereyra, and George Lapointe is
4	unallocated. Jacqueline Schafer and Patricia Morrison
5	we have allocated?
6	MS. SCHAFER: Put me over on 3 if you
7	would, Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Thank you.
9	Okay. So this gives us ten, nine, nine
10	here.
11	In this second group then is Anthony
12	Chatwin, Terry O'Halloran, Dolly Garza, Rod Fujita,
13	John Ogden, Bob Moran, Bonnie McCay, Lelei Peau am
14	I doing this right, Lelei?
15	MR. PEAU: Lelei Peau.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah? Yeah.
17	Barbara Stevenson, who's not here, and
18	Gil. Is this okay, Gil? 2.
19	Okay. And in group 3: Bob Bendick; Dan
20	Suman; Tom Thompson; John Halsey; David Benton; Eric
21	Gilman; Mel Moon; Michael Nussman; Kay Williams, who's
22	not here; and Jacqueline Schafer.
23	So in no case do we have to put somebody

1	at their third choice. The reallocations are all
2	moving people from their first to their second choice.
3	Are there any concerns?
4	Yes, Bob.
5	MR. URAVITCH: Could you just go over the
6	names a little bit slower so
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You bet.
8	MR. URAVITCH: we can write them down.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I will do that.
10	MR. URAVITCH: Great.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Group number 1: Steve
12	Murray, Tundi Agary, Mark Hixon, Michael Cruickshank,
13	Max Peterson, Carol Dinkins, Jim Ray, Mary Glackin,
14	Bob Zales, and Walter Pereyra.
15	Group 2: Tony Chatwin, Terry O'Halloran,
16	Dolly Garza, Rod Fujita, Lelei Peau, Bonnie McCay, Bob
17	Moran, John Ogden, Barbara Stevenson, Gil Radonski.
18	Group 3: Bob Bendick, Dan Suman, Tom
19	Thompson, John Halsey, Mike Nussman, Mel Moon, Eric
20	Gilman, David Benton, Kay Williams, Jacqueline
21	Schafer.
22	Can you live with this?
23	MR. [SPEAKER]: Yes.

1	DR. MURRAY: Just a quick comment and
2	point. One of our new members, John, who's in the
3	audience,
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
5	DR. MURRAY: I think we all discussed
6	last time about not having as much maybe
7	anthropological sort of expertise. He brings that.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
9	DR. MURRAY: And in the first particular
10	subcommittee,
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
12	DR. MURRAY: there's a task of defining
13	cultural.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
15	DR. MURRAY: And I just raise that issue.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good.
17	VICE CHAIR McCAY: Dan, may I speak to
18	that?
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, you may. Bonnie.
20	VICE CHAIR McCAY: Yes. It's possible
21	I just talked with Joe, and apparently in the
22	construction of that it could have gone in several
23	ways. And so Joe agrees that the cultural question

1 can go under 3. And John would bring not only that 2 but also his interest in state-federal coordination. 3 DR. MURRAY: Wonderful. I just want it to 4 be fair, John. 5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Indeed. John, how do 6 you -- I will tell you the reason we had 1 as your 7 first choice, I think, and I think part of the reason 8 that we used to move you to 3 was your state-and-9 coordination federal and the issues, state 10 regional. So we were taking a slightly different cut 11 disciplinary. 12 Can you --DR. HALSEY: That's fine. 13 14 BROMLEY: You CHAIRMAN okay? And 15 remember, A, these subcommittees are only for this 16 meeting, right, because they have not been approved 17 yet. And the structure may not survive until the next 18 meeting. So this is new. 19 Yes, Rod. 20 DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Αt first glance this looks like a well balanced 21 22 there's balance between the various representatives in 23 the group. Can you speak to that? I don't know all

1 the people, so was there an attempt to ensure balanced 2 representation? CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: There was a serious 3 4 attempt to achieve balance. There was a sense in our 5 discussion that there was a heavy loading on number 1 6 among a particular sort of interest group. 7 to spread them out a little bit. 8 And then we looked for other kinds of I think we mentioned that Bob Moran and Jim 9 10 Ray have similar interests and similar commitments 11 perhaps. And we thought we wouldn't put them on the 12 same subcommittee, although Bob's not here today. that conversation went on. 13 14 Bob and Bonnie and Maggie and Joe, anybody 15 else that was here, please elaborate on this. Yes. 16 MS. MORRISON: Just looking at your 17 this is Patty Morrison -- looking at your choices 18 here, I'd probably be best on either the first or the 19 third, and I can leave it to your discretion. 20 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Yeah, we had --21 yeah, thanks, Patty. Just keep in mind. 22 MS. MORRISON: How about number 2? 23 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, how about number

1	or that's good. I mean I'm glad you brought
2	that up. We could you know I'm an economist, so we
3	could create a market here for slots. What are you
4	willing to pay?
5	(Laughter.)
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, let me think
7	about that.
8	Bob, would you back on the ballot
9	question.
10	MR. ZALES: Since Mary is on number 1 and
11	she's with Commerce,
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
13	MR. ZALES: being that Trish is with
14	Interior, maybe we should be
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
16	MR. BENTON: on one of the others so
17	that they're not on the same committee.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We would like to split
19	a little
20	MS. MORRISON: I don't have a distinct
21	preference.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that okay? So you
23	could go to 3?

1	MS. MORRISON: Sure.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.
3	Bonnie or Bob or Joe or Maggie, would you
4	care to respond to Rod's question? I think it's a
5	question that many people have in mind. How did you
6	deal with ballots?
7	MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. Your information
8	was about like mine, so we discussed it, the ins and
9	outs, different segments.
10	VICE CHAIR McCAY: Bonnie McCay. There's
11	no formula behind this.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
13	VICE CHAIR McCAY: So we didn't have very
14	much time. So if you do feel that there is an
15	imbalance here to be corrected, please
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Max.
17	MR. PETERSON: Just to your point that
18	these committees only exist for this meeting. I'm
19	assuming, though, that consultation will result in
20	approval so that we there could be a lot of work
21	done between now and the next meeting. So I hope they
22	don't disappear at the end of this meeting. Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. I mean

as I recall from the agenda, the Committee as a whole must approve --

MR. PETERSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: -- to send this forward to be signed off on. So I didn't mean to imply that these things evaporate at noon tomorrow, but that the presumption is that they are good starts or the structure is a good start. And I think it will serve us well to get started in small groups to be making a little bit of progress.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: David.

MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I thought I'd congratulate those of you that put that list together. I think you did a very good job. I think in some ways I really would like to hear what, if you all talked about it or this group, what our expectations or what we're going to get out of those subcommittees, because I think that the balance that we see there reflects where we're at, which is we're just getting started. And the product I think's important.

And then I believe, and I'm interested in your take on this, but I believe that whatever product

NEAL R. GROSS

that is, that's sort of a very preliminary kind of thing. It has to come back eventually to this body for further discussion and modification, changes. It's not a foregone conclusion that whatever comes out of a committee is going to be accepted by the full body.

Am I correct in that?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You are indeed correct.

My -- my operating principle here is that this full

Committee is the owner of the subcommittees, both

legally and operationally. We must do that.

And because anything that -- anything that comes out of this group must be agreed upon by all of us. So the subcommittees in no way are autonomous. They are in no way free agents. They report back to us and we must, as a committee of the whole I believe, approve their plan of work, their vision, their -- I guess we even have to approve their structure, their election of a chair. And in a public forum. I mean it will be done here in this room.

So does that cover it, David?

MR. BENTON: I understand.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Other questions

NEAL R. GROSS

about the structure? Yes, Eric?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I just wanted to suggest that MR. GILMAN: the members who have been put into the national system subcommittee, that when they meet today and they consider splitting that subcommittee into two, or want a separate subcommittee, would deal with gaps identifying selection criteria for additional protected areas to be added to the system. It seems like that first committee has probably a much larger laundry list of tasks than the other two committees, and it could easily split in half.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you. I'm reluctant to from here tell a subcommittee what they should do. I would like -- I would assume that those in group number 1 heard what you said. You're certainly free to corner them in the hallway and try to convince them to do that, but at this point I don't want to tell them how to set themselves up. Do you mind?

MR. GILMAN: I disagree. I think that part of the decision in having these ad hoc groups was to consider whether we like the structure on not.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. GILMAN: So that's part of their mandate already.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: My argument would be that they go away, each group goes away, constitutes itself as it believes it can best carry out the burden of its task and that it report back to us at the first time slot, 10:45. They're going to come back and they're going tell they to us how structured They're going to tell us what they did. themselves. And at that point we get a chance to say to them, gee, that's an odd arrangement, or why in the world did you do it that way.

So I'm sorry, Eric, I think unless there's a show of sentiment around the room that we should direct a particular subcommittee to constitute itself in a particular way, I'm inclined to leave them do it. With all due respect to your very insightful comments. It is not a testimony to your comment per se, it's just structural.

Yes, Jim.

DR. RAY: Mr. Chairman, I support the Chair's recommendation. I think the subcommittees need to have their first go-around, sit down and talk

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

1 about what's on their plate, --2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. -- and take the first pass at DR. RAY: 3 4 making recommendations as to how they should structure 5 to meet those tasks. If they feel there's more than 6 they can handle, then maybe they would recommend doing 7 a substrate internally, but I would let the committees 8 meet first. 9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Mel? 10 MR. MOON: Mel Moon. I think that the 11 bullet points are there for discussion to take place 12 as to the relevancy of people's feelings towards them. 13 But also I think the author or authors need to 14 their circulate to give us input about thought 15 processes of why they arrived at these certain bullet 16 points. 17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. That's 18 right. 19 MR. MOON: They could make themselves 20 just kind of float freely between each available, 21 committee would be very helpful. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. I'm going to 23 circulate and Joe will as well. Right, Joe?

1	MR. URAVITCH: We were thinking it might
2	make sense for me to sit primarily with the
3	Coordination and Communication Committee because
4	that's the primary responsibility of the Headquarters
5	Unit.
6	Charlie Wahle would be sitting with the
7	National System Group because he's been tasked
8	specifically to take that lead for us. And Ginger,
9	who runs our Training and Technical Assistance Group,
10	would sit with Stewardship.
11	But we're obviously available to all
12	committees if questions come up.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Tundi?
14	DR. AGARY: I don't want to open up a
15	Pandora's Box, but
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Then don't. But you
17	will, huh?
18	DR. AGARY: I wish we could all be on all
19	three committees. And I just want to reflect a
20	sentiment that Wally and I share, Wally not being
21	here, and since I'm in the first subcommittee I won't
22	be able to voice my opinion in the second and third
23	subcommittees, but as many of you know, we've been a

1 little bit. concerned about. t.he lack \circ f EPA 2 participation in this Federal Advisory Committee. 3 And both Wally and I feel it's 4 important that we look beyond just consumptive uses 5 and start to tackle some of the indirect impacts on 6 marine areas which, in essence, the EPA figures very 7 prominently in the Executive Order. 8 would just of So Ι urge all the to lose sight of 9 subcommittees not the pollution 10 aspect when they're deliberating about MPAs. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's a nice point. 12 I'm glad you brought it up. DR. AGARY: Yeah. 13 14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We have for too long 15 regarded the land as distinct from and separate from 16 what happens in the oceans and this is a serious 17 mistake. And I think the whole community is coming to 18 understand once we see what's happened in the Gulf of 19 Mexico that you cannot separate what happens on the 20 land from the water. So that's a very nice point, Tundi. We will address that. 21 22 And I see Joe wants to clarify. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

URAVITCH:

Joe Uravitch. Just to let you know the status of the EPA ex-officio representative.

We ran into some difficulties with the transition with the new administrator. And the letter from Secretary Evans to the EPA administrator sort of got lost in the process. So we've been making an effort to try and get EPA back on track. And we assume they will be here for the next meeting.

DR. AGARY: Yeah. I didn't mean in any way to criticize. I know all of you are very serious efforts to try and get EPA onboard, so it's not a reflection at all of how I feel about the work you're trying to do.

MR. URAVITCH: It wasn't taken that way.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No. It's important to get it on the record, Tundi. So I -- Mike, did you have your hand up -- oh, Bob's first. Okay, thanks.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. I agree on what Tundi said, but I would like to emphasize, because I too would like to be on multiple committees, but the purpose of the subcommittees reporting back here will give each of us an opportunity to discuss what each subcommittee has done. So I would think that we will

NEAL R. GROSS

1 have some adequate input on that. 2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Mike. 3 4 MR. NUSSMAN: Tundi's remark made me --5 brought up a question I had yesterday or made me 6 remember a question I had yesterday. And now would 7 seem to be a good time to address that. 8 What exactly -- while we each have a 9 subcommittee assignment, what exactly are our rights 10 and privileges regarding the other subcommittees? 11 think it's best to know that right now rather than to 12 make up the rules as we go. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I assume there's 13 14 technical, legal answer to that question then 15 there's sort of a pragmatic answer. Are there legal, technical things, Maggie, Joe? Anybody, Mary? 16 17 So I would interpret that to mean there 18 are no sideboards on what they can do. There are no 19 must-dos and must-not-dos. MR. NUSSMAN: All right. 20 So --21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And the question is 22 what shall they do. 23 MR. NUSSMAN: I think that's probably the

1 question we need some clarification on now, --2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. NUSSMAN: -- are we as Committee 3 4 Members entitled to go listen to the deliberations 5 should we desire and be able to? And of course the 6 next question is can we comment and be involved? 7 I don't know what the answers are. And I think we 8 would try -- at least I would certainly, whatever the 9 Chair ruled, would abide by. But we need some 10 guidance, I think. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I'm formulating 12 guidelines. Bob? 13 14 MR. ZALES: Mine -- are you --15 VICE CHAIR McCAY: I have a suggestion. 16 MR. ZALES: Yeah. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Bonnie. 17 18 VICE CHAIR McCAY: Bonnie McCay. Well, I suggest that in the first go-round, this morning's 19 20 work, that these committees meet without input, direct input from nonmembers so that they have a chance to 21 22 get to become familiar with each other. I think that 23 would be helpful. And then what happens next I think would be up to the committees and the whole body. That's my suggestion.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Bob?

MR. ZALES: Yeah, Bob Zales. And then some of what Mike was discussing and how Bonnie has described this too, I would think this initial section, obviously committee it's going be impossible for all three committees meeting at the same time to interchange with each other.

But at future meetings then to stagger these committees so that -- the way I envision the subcommittee system working with the overall Committee is that the subcommittees will work and they will make whatever recommendations they choose to make. And then will then report their recommendations to the full Committee. And then the full Committee discusses the recommendations of the subcommittee. And the full Committee can either accept those recommendations in total or they can modify them or they can totally reject them and do something entirely different. That's the project of the full Committee.

And as such if the committees are staggered then public input should be allowed, and I

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

think legally it has to be allowed. And then if as a 1 2 member of the full Committee you are then a member of the public and you can give input, I would think, to 3 4 the subcommittee discussion. 5 So that's just how I envision the process working, I don't know. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, that's very nice. 8 My sense is that this first little session between 9 when we leave this room and when we return at 10:45 is a constitutional sort of in the sense that each 10 11 subcommittee will figure out what its goals are, what 12 it -- I mean it can refer to this. I'm a little 13 hesitant at this point for us as a whole to try to 14 tell them under 1, 2 and 3 what they ought to do. 15 I would like for them to go formulate that themselves and come back and report to us. 16 17 we have that feedback, but maybe they need more direction. 18 19 But then on your other point about moving 20 around, we will try to structure the agenda next time to allow that. 21 22 David.

NEAL R. GROSS

BENTON:

MR.

Thank you,

23

Chairman.

Mr.

This sort of segues into the other issues that I brought up a little bit ago and I'm quite interested in and that is what kind of product do we expect to come out of these subcommittees.

And seeing how I'm not on it, I'm going to pick on number 1 just for example sake. expecting the Committee to, for example, develop the draft comments from this group on the list of MPAs or on the Federal Register Notice that's currently, I think, just closed on the criteria? Or are we asking the Committee to give us a workplan that would include say a time line and a process for developing those Because I think it's very important what comments? our expectations are. Are we expecting a set of draft criteria coming out of that committee or are expecting a workplan?

The two are very different, obviously. And I think we all -- and that goes for all the committees. Should we, for example in the committee that I'm on, try and come up with a list of who's who of who needs to be coordinated with and consulted with, or are we going to talk about sort of a way to get from here to there and then bring it back?

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

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You want an answer from me. I'm hoping someone will raise their hand and hope to speak. But -- Max, thanks.

I will answer, David, and Michael -- I have Max and Michael.

MR. PETERSON: Let me just suggest, Mr. Chairman, that about all we can do in the length of time we have is develop some kind of a work program where we have to go. I don't think anybody's prepared to deal with those kind of specifics of things right now.

Let me also express a little concern about the idea that the committees meet one right after the other. That takes an enormous amount of time. So I think in the interest of time for these future meetings, you're going to be forced to do concurrent sessions.

And let me further say that to me it would be -- let's say a committee's meeting and they feel like somebody else that's on the full Committee has some real significant input, too, that that they'd like to consult with. It seems to me that the committee takes the initiative to consult with

1 somebody, that's one thing. But just having people 2 roaming around to the different subcommittees I think 3 would be a very messy process and would probably 4 interfere with the work of the subcommittees. 5 all, the subcommittee products are coming back to us 6 for approval. 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. 8 MR. PETERSON: Okay. Just some thought for you while you're making up your mind. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. No, thank you. 11 I have Mike and Gil on the queue, so I can -- but I 12 think I like what you said, but let me not commit. So Michael and Gil and then Bob. 13 14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. DR. CRUICKSHANK: 15 think that because there are three distinct 16 committees with three distinct charges here that they 17 should get together and decide what and how they want to handle it, and come back. 18 They're going to have 19 three different -- each one is going to assist the other when we see it in the full Committee. 20 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. 22 DR. CRUICKSHANK: But I think they should 23 be individually decided at this time.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.
2	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I have Bob.
4	Maybe no, I had Gil. I've got two Bobs here. I've
5	got Gil next.
6	MR. RADONSKI: I like the way it's set up.
7	And I agree with what Max said, that you have to have
8	concurrent sessions. And I think we'll have enough to
9	do that people won't float.
-0	But one thing, it was stated that we are
.1	going to have a member of the staff at each one of the
.2	meetings. And I think they ought to be prepared to
.3	start the subcommittee meetings off and explain each
4	of the bullets, because some of them are rather
_5	cryptic. And I think if we're going to proceed we're
-6	going to have to have some elaboration on these
7	bullets.
-8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
_9	Okay, Bob.
20	MR. BENDICK: It looks to me like we've
21	got a little bit of a sequencing problem here.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: A little bit of a what?
23	MR. BENDICK: Sequencing problem.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Sequencing.

MR. BENDICK: The third subcommittee has to finalize the proposed terms and definitions of a classification system. And the first subcommittee has to inventory existing MPAs. It would seem that we ought to have the classification system done for the inventory to work. You're shaking your head no. Why?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wait a minute. Finish your point.

MR. BENDICK: Okay. Well, if we're going to have an inventory, it ought to be done in some systematic way and consistent through the way all the subcommittees work. And the definitions and classification system would seem to be the basis for doing that. And it doesn't make sense for two subcommittees to be sort of proceeding independently on something that's connected, as I understand it and the way I read this.

So since that's at the top of the list in each of two, it appears we need to sort that out.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm going to ask Joe to clarify. Then I'd like to make an observation. And then I'll call on Barbara -- Jim Ray.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. URAVITCH: You know the inventory process has been underway for two years now. And we're basically collecting information about all of the protected areas in the nation.

The classification system is just a means of organizing and sorting that information in different ways. So I mean that's the relationship. You don't need to know what that classification is.

And that system is done. We've been working on that for the past year. That's one of the handouts that we have. And that was that value-neutral approach to identifying the different ways of classifying MPAs that was presented at the June meeting.

What we're referring to here is more where we go with the next steps in terms of how we move inventory itself to developing beyond the the criteria, for example, for the list that's required in Order the Executive under Section 4 and for implementing by the agencies under Section 5.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could I make an observation and then I would recognize Jim? My observation is that we're tyrannized by the tangible,

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

1	if I can coin a phrase. The tangible meaning that Joe
2	and his colleagues at MPA have proposed standing
3	subcommittees. They have, as I would take it in their
4	best efforts, listed a number of things that seem
5	pertinent to that task. And I'm quite reluctant to
6	have us over prescribe and over determine what it is
7	the subcommittees will do.
8	I trust all of you in your smaller groups,
9	which are more effective, to sort of look at these and
10	work them out. There was a request yesterday to have,
11	what, the MPA center prioritize, which is not a word
12	but there it is anyway, prioritize bullets under each
13	category? I hope we don't do that.
14	I would just like to sort of turn you
15	folks loose in small rooms and let you get to work.
16	Sorry. Maybe I'm not allowed to editorialize.
17	But Jim, and then I have either have a
18	"yes" or a hand up, I don't know. So, anyway, I've
19	got Jim and then David.
20	DR. RAY: Mr. Chairman, I pass. Mr.
21	Uravitch answered my question.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. David.
23	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that

your guidance, I didn't see it as editorializing, I thought it was guidance, and I thought it was very appropriate.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's all free.

MR. BENTON: I think that I align myself

MR. BENTON: I think that I align myself with the comments of Max Peterson in terms of we're not going to be here developing the specific criteria or that kind of thing. We're looking at work plans.

And the only thing I would add, Mr. Chairman, is if there are areas of somewhat of overlap here, that's okay, because it's going to come back here and we can talk about it. And actually diversity is a benefit, so I think that's fine, too.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Let's not be tyrannized by the MPA Center's efforts to help us get started. It's a wonderful starting point. And you are free to restructure these things. And all you have to do as a subcommittee is come back and get the approval of all of us. That's the way I see this. And it seems to me the sooner we can split up the better.

Tundi.

DR. AGARY: I just have a quick procedural

NEAL R. GROSS

1	question.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
3	DR. AGARY: Is it the same situation that
4	the chair of the subcommittee can participate in the
5	discussion?
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, that sounds like
7	a FACA question. Can the chair of a subcommittee
8	participate in the discussion.
9	MS. GLACKIN: I don't think it's a FACA
LO	question, no.
L1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I meant kind of a legal
L2	thing.
L3	MS. GLACKIN: I mean it's a Robert's Rules
L4	question, I guess.
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I would
L6	MR. PETERSON: I guess Dolly's supposed to
L7	answer it. The chair can by stepping down from the
L8	chair
L9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
20	MR. PETERSON: and appointing somebody
21	else to take their place.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
23	MR. PETERSON: They can't engage in motion

1	or anything else.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
3	MR. PETERSON: They can't do it from the
4	chair.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I guess my preference
6	would be that the chairs of subcommittees have not
7	disenfranchised themselves by agreeing to serve as
8	chair, but I don't know if that's legal.
9	But, my goodness, let's not disenfranchise
10	one out of seven people in a small room.
11	Gil.
12	MR. RADONSKI: Gil Radonski. I assume
13	that will be handled in the reporting process. What I
14	see and is usually handled, when we come back, the
15	chair, the elected chair of the subcommittee will
16	assume the role of chair of the entire Committee
17	before
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Before us.
19	MR. RADONSKI: before the whole, yes.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, right.
21	MR. RADONSKI: And handle the discussion
22	for his report.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, they're going to
	1

1	have a recorder, so the
2	MR. RADONSKI: Yes, fine.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: recorder can do
4	that. And the chair can sit
5	MR. RADONSKI: But the chair of the
6	committee
7	MR. GURNEY: Yeah.
8	MR. RADONSKI: retains of the chair of
9	the Committee as a whole during the discussion of that
LO	report. That's the way it's usually handled.
L1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, okay, that's a
L2	proposal. Yeah. Okay, just a minute here. Bob
L3	Zales, Tony.
L4	MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. This is just a
L5	suggestion. What you may want to do is when you're
L6	doing the chair, similar to what we did on the full
L7	Committee, is do a vice chair. And maybe as part of
L8	the duties as vice chair, that vice chair will be the
L9	reporter.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, yeah.
21	MR. ZALES: And then that way the chair
22	can pass the information
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.

1 MR. ZALES: -- to -- or the gavel to the 2 vice chair and then make whatever comment --3 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. 4 MR. ZALES: -- he or she would like to 5 make. Yeah, that's fine. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 7 don't mind being pushed aside as chair, but neither do 8 why it is that we can't just have the see 9 subcommittees come back and report. But, you know, 10 gosh. Okay, David. 11 12 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry, Tony. MR. BENTON: Yeah, Tony was first. 14 15 Go ahead, Tony. 16 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 Once again on process, --18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. 19 DR. CHATWIN: -- are we expecting motions 20 to be made in these subcommittees and that they're 21 reporting back motions that are reported back to the 22 Committee and that motions that are approved in 23 subcommittee don't require a second when brought to

1	the full Committee? Or are we just going for an
2	election and a discussion?
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You can come back with
4	what you want, okay? You may come back with what you
5	wish. I would think at the early stages we are in the
6	trying-to-figure-it-out mode. But if you want to come
7	back with a motion, it will be heard and dispensed
8	with or approved by the whole Committee. Okay.
9	Dolly, is this a parliamentary
10	intervention? Okay, Dolly.
11	DR. GARZA: So the committee could come
12	back with a recommendation. And if they want it
13	approved, then it would require a motion from the full
14	Committee.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
16	DR. GARZA: So the subcommittee recommends
17	that they have a teleconference, blah-blah-blah,
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
19	DR. GARZA: something like that
20	probably would need a motion because unless it's a
21	funding expenditure then it has to go through Joe or
22	Maggie
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah

1 DR. GARZA: money, who does or 2 if it's something that we would everything. But 3 support then someone else in the Committee would say 4 support the recommendation of the we move to 5 subcommittees. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 6 I have -- David. 7 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 One is just to remind us of our conversation points. 9 we had yesterday on the operation of 10 subcommittees. We wanted them to be sort of perhaps 11 not as bound by the constraints, like we had the 12 discussion about are we going to require them to use Robert's Rules of Order. And this gets to your point 13 14 15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. about how they should 16 MR. BENTON: 17 And I think from my perspective they should operate. 18 try and have a reasonable and open dialogue amongst 19 themselves and try and get a product, and figure out 20 how to do that the best they can. 21 And if they establish a chair to run the 22 committee, that chair, given your interpretation,

which I support, should be available and free to enter

1 into the dialogue remembering that they are not to 2 dominate the dialogue. Their job is to foster a 3 dialoque. 4 My understanding going to the second part, 5 which is what Dolly, I think, was speaking to, is the 6 committees are supposed to come back to us with a 7 recommendation and a report. Now further action other 8 than report would require some action of endorsement 9 They may be: Great, fine. from this body. 10 need to have a motion, depending on the magnitude of 11 what comes out of it. Or: Maybe we move to adopt the 12 workplan by the subcommittee, or something like that. But we don't know what that's going to look like yet. 13 14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 15 MR. BENTON: I think that's correct. Am I 16 correct, Mr. Chairman, or Dolly? CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think so. 17 18 MR. BENTON: Okay. 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Bob, you had your hand 20 up. I'm okay. 21 MR. ZALES: 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I'd like to 23 repeat that it seems to me breaking into subcommittees

is a chance for us to get down to the level of substantive conversation.

And while I can't say that I don't want you bringing motions at 10:45, or whenever we come back together, it would be my hope that there's no rush to motions, that there is a framing. conversation about how you see your tasks. think David said, others, as and that the subcommittees come back and they say to the Committee: Gosh, this is how we interpret our mandate or this is how we interpret our writ. This is what we think is expected of us by you folks; is that right or wrong?

And that at this early going we're trying to get our feet under us and figure out what each subcommittee is going to contend with.

The thing I think we do not want to do is rush too quickly to motions that in a sense presume the work that needs to be done before we're ready to have motions. So this is sort of a plea to go out and talk and figure out what you think and come back at 10:45 and share with the rest of us what you're thinking about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 Are you ready to break up? Okay. Carol. 2 MS. DINKINS: Carol Dinkins. Would you 3 remind people, please, to take their name plates? 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Take your name 5 plates. 6 Okay. 7 MR. [SPEAKER]: Where do we go to? 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, where do you go. 9 Powell, Geary and Post, after We have three rooms: 10 three illustrious people in history. Let's just do 11 it: Group 1 goes to the Powell Room. They are 12 breakout rooms on this level, past registration. think that means around that way (indicating). 13 14 not sure, but... 15 On this level past registration, so group 16 1 goes to Powell. Group 2 goes to Geary. And group 3 17 goes to Post. 18 And we should be back here at what time? And the agenda calls for a break I 19 10:45. think somewhere in there, at 10:30. 20 Feel free to keep 21 working, whatever. You may take a break or not, but 22 we will be back here at 10:45.

Thank you very much and do good work.

(Meeting recessed into subcommittee meetings at 9:30 a.m. and resumed at 11:10 a.m.:)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Open our meeting and recess it, but I think can call us back to the table.

So I'm doing that. Since we didn't go into recess, please let's get moving.

We now are at ten past the hour. We will stop at noon so that we reserve and recognize our guests' time schedule and so on. So what we're doing is eating into the reporting time, which is fine because this is not the last time you will have to report.

My sense is that these are provisional feedback opportunities from each of the three groups.

And we should treat them in that way, if that's okay with you.

So the groups 1, 2 and 3, number 1 -- I'm going to shorthand them as the National System; group 2 is the Effectiveness of MPAs, which encompasses stewardship; and the third group is National/Regional Coordination, so we have nice sort of thinking about the national system. Are they effective and what is the regional/national coordination issues that arise.

1	So I'm going to ask group 1 to share with
2	us through their recorder or their chair, as they
3	wish, what they accomplished. Who's group 1? Who's
4	the responsible official for group 1?
5	DR. HIXON: I have the notes.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Michael.
7	DR. HIXON: I'm here.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're Mark?
9	DR. HIXON: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. You are who
11	are you, Mark?
12	DR. HIXON: So
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are you the recorder or
14	the chair?
15	DR. HIXON: I am Mark Hixon. I was
16	(Laughter.)
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, we know that
18	much, but I mean
19	DR. HIXON: I was elected ad hoc chair of
20	this ad hoc committee.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. And ad hoc
22	reporter.
23	DR. HIXON: Tundi Agary is the recorder.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see.

DR. HIXON: And Steve Murray will be taking her place tomorrow because she won't be here. So Tundi handed me the notes so I guess I'm going to report.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.

DR. HIXON: It was very clear that subcommittee number 1 has an incredibly difficult task in front of it. Our first order of discussion was to ask Charlie Wahle to describe exactly how the three subcommittees were formed in Joe's memo as well as to explain each of the bullets under this subcommittee and identify really what the priorities are.

If you examine the bullets you'll see there are some fairly nebulous, broad, sweeping items as well as some very fairly specific items that are more in the role of gathering information and organizing that information.

The key focus of our discussion had to do with the primary need that Charlie identified, and that was to examine very clearly an overview, a conceptual plan of a national system of MPAs. Exactly what is the overall vision, if you will, the criteria,

NEAL R. GROSS

the design, the process for taking an image of a national system of MPAs and making it tangible.

We spent the rest of our time essentially sharing our world views on this onerous task. And a variety of things were put on the table. Our intent after the break is to become more tangible and specific. But there were a number of concerns that different people expressed. And if I don't get your pet concern on the table, please raise your hand.

There was talk about examining the effectiveness of existing MPAs with quite a bit back and forth on exactly what's possible and what's not possible. Clearly an impossible task to do all existing MPAs and exactly how far one could go was a matter of question; perhaps separating that from this idea of then, after examining what we have out there now, what is going to be an overall vision.

The primary discussion had to do with this overall world view that people had. Very important was distinguishing the goals: What are the specific goals of a national system. What are the various goals; do they conflict, how they overlap. Things of that sort.

There was a philosophical discussion regarding the trade-off between practicality on one hand not becoming too esoteric, then sort of woo-woo visiony, versus a more idealistic, ambitious approach on the other hand. And there's clearly common ground that needs to be found still on that particular issue.

It was brought up that MPAs should be considered in the context of alternatives to MPAs for some types of management decisions, especially as they relate to fisheries. And quite a bit of discussion regarding a threats analysis, that is it's one thing to simply gather information that now exists in the inventories, but then to overlay on top of that exactly where the needs are in terms of how our marine resources are currently threatened.

So I'm not sure if I hit on everything, but that's my gist of the discussion as it now stands.

It was very free-wheeling at this point, just getting people's views out on the table and everyone did emphasize their intent that we become much more explicit and tangible after the break.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. We have 15 minutes for each group. That's very concise, Mark.

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you.

I guess my proposal would be that we have -- we have ten minutes. And do you want to -- in order to keep it moving, why don't we just, rather than arguing what they've said, let's have a discussion about clarification. People want to say why didn't you raise this, why did you raise that. But is that acceptable?

So are there reactions to this report from group number 1? Rod.

DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mark, I'm curious to know whether your group floated any visions for what would distinguish a national system of really managed areas or MPAs from the current array?

DR. HIXON: There was some discussion of that in not very specific terms, but it was certainly a national system is not simply inventorying what presently exists and saying that's our national system. But rather looking explicitly at alternative goals and within each goal examining what is presently there and how it addresses those particular goals, particularly in terms of threats and the desired

NEAL R. GROSS

outcome for the good of the nation.

So my sense was that it will be a matter of taking what presently exists, examining it carefully, which none of us have yet done, and overlaying then on top of that the goals and the threats as well as alternative approaches.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Tony Chatwin.

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just pointing to a clarification, when the group discussed goals and objectives, were those site-specific goals or were they goals and objectives for the national system?

DR. HIXON: We didn't get that explicit. Certainly there's three general categories of goals that all discussions have been based on. The inventory itself identifies those goals for each specific MPA, but we haven't gotten to a general discussion about specific versus general.

I believe that certainly when we're talking -- this is now just me speaking -- we're talking about a national system, presumably when one is discussing a national system we're talking about linkages among specific components. And at that point

NEAL R. GROSS

specific goals must be examined holistically, in terms of how the overall system works at least regionally. But we haven't gotten that far yet.

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Ιf Ι may ask а mentioned question. You your first effectiveness of existing MPAs. Was there discussion that there is a subcommittee number 2 that deals with stewardship and effectiveness? I mean how did you think about this?

DR. HIXON: There was some discussion about the fact that we could take this primary charge of this subcommittee and sort of subsume all the other subcommittees, and that certainly wasn't what we wanted to do.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We saw evidence of that this morning when everybody wanted to be on number 1.

DR. HIXON: So when it was brought out and agreed to that we really very much need to partition what this subcommittee's going to do versus the other two and effectiveness was seen as very problematic in terms of the amount of work involved. And I personally would just as soon hand it off to another

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

subcommittee.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I think I have David and then I have Tony. Did you have your hand up again, Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: No.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, okay. David.

MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mark, in the context I'm what struggling with in terms of framing this question is how to get it exactly right. What I'm interested in the context within which you discuss what national program should look like. And I'm assuming that you did it within the context of existing authorities existing authorities both and -to designate and existing authorities to regulate, and how you would take those existing authorities and try and see how they integrate or don't?

Or were you more theoretical than that and sort of talking about, well, maybe we need to have new authorities or legislative mandates, or something like that? Sort of the context here.

DR. HIXON: Yes. The agreement was that the reality is that the existing authorities will

NEAL R. GROSS

1	continue to be the relevant authorities. There was no
2	discussion of we're now going to start a new agency in
3	the federal government, or something like that.
4	The practicalities are that there are
5	multiple authorities that now are in place and they
6	will continue to be in place.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Other questions for
8	this group?
9	Do you feel you have more work to do this
LO	afternoon?
L1	DR. HIXON: We really didn't get started.
L2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You need any guidance
L3	in what you might do this afternoon?
L4	DR. HIXON: I'm sorry?
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do you need any
L6	guidance? I mean do you want any other feedback or
L7	you know where you're going?
L8	DR. HIXON: My belief is that our
L9	subcommittee is well rounded in the stakeholder groups
20	that are represented. Everyone is speaking and I'd
21	like to just go back to my subcommittee and start
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Keep going.
23	DR. HIXON: working some more.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's music to my
2	ears. Wonderful.
3	Okay. Group number 2, which I understand
4	concerns the Effectiveness, Stewardship and
5	Effectiveness of MPAs.
6	MR. PEAU: I was drafted as the ad hoc
7	chair for group number 2.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Lelei, okay,
9	good.
10	MR. PEAU: I will give an abbreviated
11	version of our report, then maybe defer to our
12	rapporteur for more detail.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
14	MR. PEAU: Our group, we open up with just
15	a general discussion of the issue, to allow all the
16	participants to provide their perspective or
17	interpretations of our assignment.
18	We found it very interesting that there
19	are a lot of overlapping and parallel in each of the
20	members. I'd like to highlight three elements or
21	processes that we have gone through.
22	One of the key factors in assisting for us
23	to move forward with our group discussions, the notion

of a budget did come up as one of the key elements to determine the level of staff support that is available to assist our subcommittee. The ability to meet as a group. We decided to request this funding to our general members, a breakdown of the detailed budget from each of the member federal agencies that are a party to this Executive Order.

This will then allow us to determine the level of participation from each of the members, but also really to help assist with our workplan.

Our group also has categorized the eight bullets under subcommittee 2. We agree that the two major key categories are stewardship and effectiveness. We also decided that as a guiding or working principle for our group, that for any of the MPA to become a part of the national system that we had to come up with some specific criteria so that there's some uniform or consistency throughout.

We recognize that each of the sitespecifics are different in terms of their goals and
objective, but in order to assist the National System,
we have to highlight some of the important or some of
the key elements that make each of these jurisdictions

NEAL R. GROSS

1 unique. I think there's great value or significant of 2 looking at the -- looking at site specific and extract 3 some of what's important. 4 We also have highlighted the assessment 5 report that was conducted a year or two ago. Wе 6 didn't really get into details on the specifics of the 7 report, but we did ask for some guidance in terms of 8 what are some of the caps or some of the problems that require some either resolutions or some response from 9 10 our committee. 11 Definitely I think there is a lot of work 12 that needs to be done, but this is just some of the 13 highlights or some of the framework that we have decided as a group, as I said, we categorized into 14 15 those two groups. The budget is certainly significant component to our future meetings. 16 17 We also decided on the next meeting of our 18 working group, but I would not reveal that until we know the budget. 19 20 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're not blackmailing 21 us, are you? Okay, is that it? 22 MR. PEAU: Yes. Yes. I'd also like to

open up to our members if there's --

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. PEAU: -- anything they'd like...

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are there others in group 2 who wish to elaborate on what was said? Tony. Hand up, Bonnie.

VICE CHAIR McCAY: Bonnie McCay. I will do this as recorder.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.

VICE CHAIR McCAY: I think that the essence has already been communicated with you, but I want to share that one thing is that the tasks that are outlined here in the document that Joe had prepared for us are those that come from the Center's own tasks.

And Ι think we agreed that it and Ginger certainly was important, part of this discussion, that it was important for us committee to provide broader thinking and to be able to add value to what the Center is doing. The Center certainly has its own fairly clear delimited mandate, but we felt we should not be constrained by that and that in not being constrained we would actually help the Center meet its goals.

NEAL R. GROSS

And, secondly, that in relationship to that, although much of the work that goes on, the training work, for example, is focused on individual sites and how they meet their objectives and how they can do a better job being effective. Several people felt it was very important that we think about effectiveness not simply in that regard but also in relationship to the larger system.

And then there was other, I thought, a very important and interesting discussion about the parallels with and the intersection with the developing ocean observing system. And there were some lessons to be learned that we discussed in that way.

In addition, we also agreed upon a working assumption about what a national system might be. I think that was helpful to us as a committee to be able to move ahead.

And I think that covers the rest of my notes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Other questions from the full Committee? Yes, Michael Cruickshank.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2	I was just curious about what your
3	assumptions were on the working National Committee.
4	VICE CHAIR McCAY: Perhaps Rod can express
5	that.
6	DR. FUJITA: I'd be happy to. Thank you,
7	Bonnie.
8	For the purposes of trying to get a grip
9	on how to assess the effectiveness of the current
10	array of managed areas as opposed to a system, which
11	implies some sort of systematic array with systemwide
12	goals, we decided to assume that the language in the
13	Executive Order that characterizes the system means to
14	us; that the system would include a representative of
15	habitats in each of the nation's biogeographical
16	zones.
17	That these remanaged areas would have
18	ecological connectivity. That they would have an
19	improved stakeholder-involvement component. Those I
20	think were the three main elements of our working
21	assumption.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Rod.
23	Yes, Terry O'Halloran.

1 MR. O'HALLORAN: I would just like to add, 2 Rod, that I think one of the things we were talking about too in the stakeholder involvement 3 is that 4 included the cultural aspect too, which I think is 5 something that we wanted to emphasize. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you. 7 Other elaborations or questions? 8 Wonderful. Are you ready to hear from --9 oh, yes, Gil. 10 MR. RADONSKI: I'm sorry to jump in so late, Chairman. 11 12 That's all right. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: MR. RADONSKI: One of the things we talked 13 14 about in there a point, though, is of concern to me, 15 we talked about outreach. As you will see, it's included in one of the bullets. 16 And we wanted to 17 emphasize the committee, subcommittee agreed that we would refer to it as interactive outreach. 18 19 We need programs that work both ways. Wе not only need to talk to the constituents, but we need 20 21 to have a feedback system. So we agreed that when we 22 talked about outreach it would be interactive 23 outreach.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Very good. Thanks,
2	Gil.
3	Other questions.
4	Okay, gosh, group 3. Who's the
5	responsible party here? Mel. Mel Moon. Are you the
6	chair, Mel?
7	MR. MOON: I am the chair.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.
9	MR. MOON: Thank you. Our group met. We
10	had
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: This is
12	National/Regional Coordination. Excuse me, Mel.
13	MR. MOON: Right. This is the
14	National/Regional Coordination of MPA Efforts
15	Subcommittee.
16	We began well, first off, let me
17	introduce that Mike Nussman is the vice chair of our
18	committee as well. And I welcome any of our committee
19	members to join in.
20	Our group started out with a discussion
21	through Joe Uravitch on the points that were in the
22	paper that were provided. He was able to give us some
23	of his thoughts and insights as to the issues

involved, in particular, the listing in the criteria.

We talked a little bit about Section 5 of the

Executive Order and what it really means.

We also talked about the -- Joe also indicated that there was a value in removing such issues as the reference to reserves or sanctuaries or parks, and to get clearer criteria on what an MPA is.

We talked about the public outreach, and one of the tools being the website. We talked about the Fishery Management Council. Some of them had been approached with the work that had been done with the Center, in particular the Pacific Fishery Management Council, the New England Council and the South Atlantic. We also talked about the emphasis for adding culture into the outreach as well.

Then we got into more substantive type of discussions with the focus on federal interagency involvement in defining purpose. There were a couple approaches that we were looking at in terms of the outreach, one from the MPA center and the other one from individual ongoing processes. And this was part of the dialogue that was ongoing in our forum.

We were advised that the -- the federal

NEAL R. GROSS

agencies were having monthly interagency meetings on marine managed areas as a regular part of internal discussions.

The other point that we were focused on was the need to have substance as the most important goal rather than process for federal involvement. for the committee included outreach issues and coordination issues; foster interagency how to coordination; and the possibility of regional workshops.

We had a couple of examples of other processes that were ongoing in terms of interagency concerns. One was the coordination of EPA in regards to oil spills and the coordination with managers to protected areas. Another example was the activities that were happening in the Florida Keys in terms of multi-agency work that had gone on in that area as examples.

The three goals and objectives I think with the limited time that we had to set some direction, although I think we needed a lot more discussion was to advise the Center on outreach and coordination and the distribution of classification

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

1	systems and related issues, again to foster
2	interagency coordination; and the responsibilities of
3	those different areas.
4	And then a third issue was a goal and
5	objective was the consumptive and nonconsumptive
6	issues, making sure that was included in the outreach
7	platforms.
8	So I think the last part was that we were
9	more aware that there was a Federal Register on the
10	listing that was out and published. We had some kind
11	of trailing discussion on the need to get more up to
12	speed on exactly what that has and what that says.
13	And with that I think we were interested in regrouping
14	and having further discussions.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Thank you,
16	Mel.
17	MR. MOON: Um-hum.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike, do you want to
19	add anything to that?
20	MR. NUSSMAN: I think the chairman handled
21	it very well. Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Questions,
23	clarifications? Yes, Michael Cruickshank.

1 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 Michael Cruickshank. This Federal Register publication, is it possible to get a copy of that to 3 4 each of the committees? 5 MR. [SPEAKER]: We can provide that. Wе 6 don't have it here; we can provide it. 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The answer was they 8 don't have it here, but it can be provided. And it's posted on the website; is that correct? 9 10 It is at mpa.com -- .gov. Well, maybe 11 it's closer to .com than you know, though. 12 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I dread that that's in 13 14 the record now, but... 15 Gil. 16 MR. RADONSKI: Thank you, Chairman. The 17 point I want to raise again is about outreach. And 18 since it spreads across more than the subcommittee I'm 19 part of, subcommittee 2, I guess it would fall into 20 the classification of definition. And I would hope 21 that for the purpose of the Committee as a whole when 22 we talk about outreach that it is understood that it's 23 a two-way street and that it's interactive outreach.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you. Maybe we need a better word than "outreach" because it does signify a one-way flow and keep realizing that it's communication and interaction, isn't it. It must be both ways. And "outreach" sounds one way.

Joe.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. URAVITCH: Joe Uravitch. Just one small point of clarification. The monthly interagency meetings that have been taking place routinely are solely related to the inventory process. We have not moved into re-establishing the full federal interagency working group yet. That's something we discussed two weeks ago when we convened the federal agency ex-officio member. So we hope to move forward soon on re-establishing the full federal interagency working group.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Bonnie.

VICE CHAIR McCAY: With respect to the outreach discussion, we also had -- and thanks for reminding us, Gil -- discussed the importance of inreach. And I think that's relevant to committee number 3's work as well as our own. Important in

NEAL R. GROSS

1 recognizing that agencies, the local groups that are involved in MPAs and so forth are all stakeholders. 2 3 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 4 Other points, clarification, questions? 5 Steve, yeah. Thank you. Steve Murray. 6 DR. MURRAY: This slightly may be 7 peripheral, but was there any discussion of EPA's 8 involvement in this process? I think it's something 9 that we should certainly capture as a group. 10 our second meeting, and I don't know that we've seen 11 what we asked for or think we might need from EPA. 12 Actually there was a specific MR. MOON: example of its relationship to oil spills and the 13 14 agency's, I think, its absence or need to be brought 15 So, yes, it was brought in. 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I have Rod, 17 Michael, and Jim Ray. 18 DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. just add on that point that in our subcommittee on 19 20 Stewardship and Effectiveness, explicitly we considered that to truly evaluate the effectiveness of 21 22 an MPA site or system, it's necessary to consider all 23 the threats including those under the purview of EPA

1 and other agencies. So it's just not fishing, it's 2 not just extraction. It's a comprehensive assessment 3 of all the threats. 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 5 Michael. This is a matter of 6 DR. CRUICKSHANK: 7 Mr. Chairman, on outreach and inreach, semantics. 8 what about cooperation, which implies a little bit more than just coordination. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 11 Jim Ray and then Wally. 12 DR. RAY: Jim Ray. Yes. Mr. Chairman, just as a point of clarification, with regards to 13 14 marine oil spills EPA has a minor role in that. 15 is under the purview, under the Coast Guard with NOAA 16 as the science support coordinator for that. 17 the lead authority per farm land and freshwater spills 18 above the high-tide mark. So in marine spills we have very little interface with EPA. 19 It's primarily with 20 the other agencies. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you for that 22 clarification.

Okay.

Wally and then Tony.

1	DR. PEREYRA: Following up on Steve's
2	comment about EPA, I was wondering if the Corps of
3	Engineers should also be somehow identified at some
4	point in time in interagency coordination, because
5	they certainly do have the potential for affecting an
6	effective MPA system.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Does anyone want to
8	touch that one? Joe.
9	MR. URAVITCH: Yes. Actually at the first
10	meeting of the federal ex-officio members we discussed
11	what agencies were missing, and the Corps of Engineers
12	was on that list of agencies we thought needed to be
13	there.
14	MR. [SPEAKER]: What others were?
15	MR. URAVITCH: I'm trying to remember. I
16	could see you were going to ask that question.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: While you're trying to
18	remember let's go to Tony. Yeah, Tony Chatwin.
19	DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20	Just on the issue of EPA, in my experience in New
21	England EPA Region 1 has acted on the Executive Order.
22	And they were revising the regulations in Section 403
23	of the Clean Water Act, which is a section which

1 permitting is granted to offshore drilling sites. 2 There is a section there that talks about special 3 So EPA has the authority to designate aquatic areas. 4 boundaries in marine environments and they can 5 regulate the water quality standards. And that's my understanding of it. 6 I'm 7 not a lawyer, but -- so I think I look forward to 8 having the Executive Order member of the EPA here because I think it is one authority that needs to be 9 10 represented. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Fine. 11 Thank you. 12 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Joe. 13 14 In addition to the Corps of MS. ERNST: 15 Engineers, other agencies that were recommended 16 join the working group were NASA, the Department of 17 Health and Human Services, and the Department 18 Education. 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Other questions, 20 comments? So how do you feel about how we're doing? 21 22 Are we doing okay? Is this structure serving you 23 well? Go back, and we're going to have a lunch, but I

mean was this reporting protocol acceptable to everyone? Are we doing all right?

Okay. You just bought yourself a "yes."

Tundi, yes. Oh, lots of points. Okay, Tundi, Wally. I knew I shouldn't ask a question, but there it is. Yes, Tundi.

DR. AGARY: Tundi Agary. I may be out of line, but I actually wanted to take advantage of the whole group being together now. And there was a little bit of pause. I was afraid you were going to say we could break early.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I was going to say that.

DR. AGARY: Well, good, then I had good intuition. But I just wanted to bring up a point that was discussed in the Agenda Committee some phone calls ago, which was the usefulness of providing the Committee, the full Committee with a recommended reading list so that we all had an equal basis of knowledge from which to move forward. And we dropped that idea because we realized it was going to be complicated enough to get the Committee together to elect a chair and so forth.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	But I would like to encourage the chairmen
2	to ask the MPA Center to begin to assemble lists and
3	maybe, I don't know what the protocol for such a thing
4	would be, but maybe the thing to do is to develop a
5	draft list and send it around to the Committee Members
6	and have Committee Members comment and add or subtract
7	from that list and get to some consensus on what a
8	primer on marine protected areas would be, including
9	the most recent updates coming out of the MPA Center.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.
11	Wally Pereyra.
12	DR. PEREYRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13	Wally Pereyra. One of the areas in our subcommittee,
14	which I think we identified late on the process is the
15	fact that we
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're in group 2,
17	Wally?
18	DR. PEREYRA: Group 1.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 1. Sorry.
20	DR. PEREYRA: 1 that we had differing
21	concepts on what an MPA was, what a system was, and so
22	forth. And this gave us an incongruent base from
23	which to develop our framework and so forth.

I see the same kind of discussion still sort of weaving itself insidiously within our overall Committee. And I think it would help us maybe at lunch, if not sooner, to think about how we want to deal with this, because I think that is really a generic issue that we have to collectively come to some agreement on so that we all are coming from the same base. I think it's going to be very important.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Thank you.

Lelei and then Tony and -- David, did your hand go up? Tony, are you... Lelei, go ahead.

MR. PEAU: Chairman, I have a question, if this is the right time to bring this issue, but I think it is really important as we move forward with our work. And I'd like to draw the attention on the report that was done by the Center on the need assessment.

Now I do not want to disqualify the hard work and the efforts, and I hope it's an oversight. But going through the report and the formulations, I think it's important that we need to validate. And in order to validate a report you've got to have fair representations of the stakeholders and the people

NEAL R. GROSS

throughout the region.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

islands have the been known for hundreds of years for their leadership and their commitment as well as cultural values, which I think is missing from the major and need is cap And it was really difficult for some of us involved in group 2 to sit through the exercise that we have just completed and then look through the report there. There's no representation recognizing those cultural and traditional of practices that has been occurring for centuries.

So through you, Mr. Chairman, that to ensure or to direct the Center to ensure that there is fair representations on all the work, on all the future works, which I think is an element that needs to be kept, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. We will make sure we pay attention to this.

Maggie, Joe. Tony.

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to respond to your question. I personally like the structure that we are following, but I think that we need to think as a committee and I'm agreeing

NEAL R. GROSS

1 with Wally that we need to talk about what is a 2 National System of MPAs. Because a lot of the work within the committees is going to result from -- or be 3 4 shaped by that definition. And I think that's 5 something we need to do outside of that committee 6 structure or we have to have a mandate for each of the 7 committees to come up with a definition. And then --8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. DR. CHATWIN: -- hash it out. 9 CHAIRMAN 10 BROMLEY: Let me ask you a 11 question, if I may be allowed to do so. You mean 12 rather than your group proposing to the full Committee what a national -- what it means when you talk about a 13 14 National System, you'd rather have the full Committee 15 tell you what -- give you the guidelines for that; am I understanding your question? 16 17 DR. CHATWIN: No. What I think we need to 18 do is have a gameplan to address the question of what 19 is --20 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: A National System. DR. CHATWIN: -- a National System. 21 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. 23

DR. CHATWIN: Fine with any structure that

1 the Committee agrees to, but I think we need to have a 2 specific mandate to deal with that issue. 3 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Dave and then I 4 have Terry O'Halloran I think, and then Bob. Just a 5 minute. Now wait a minute. Dave, Terry. Let me make 6 sure I have -- everybody's hand went up all of a 7 Dave will be next, then Terry and now Michael sudden. 8 Cruickshank and I believe there's another hand up. 9 Max and Dan Suman. Other hands went up that I might 10 have missed. 11 Okay, I knew we wouldn't break early. 12 Dave. MR. 13 BENTON: I'm going to pass, ${\tt Mr.}$ 14 Chairman. 15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're going to pass. 16 MR. BENTON: Yup. 17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Terry O'Halloran. 18 MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes. Thank you. I think 19 that what Tony brought up is a real good question 20 about how the committees work with each other. 21 it's a sequential question, that there 22 certain things that our committee in of terms 23 Effectiveness --

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Which one are you on,
2	please?
3	MR. O'HALLORAN: I'm on number 2.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: On number
5	MR. O'HALLORAN: On Stewardship and
6	Effectiveness.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
8	MR. O'HALLORAN: that knowing what the
9	goals of the National System are would be something
10	that we need, as Tony said, that we need in order to
11	address how we could effectively measure.
12	So there may be some other sequential
13	issues that these committees might need to look at to
14	let the other committees know so that we don't, I
15	guess, get on top of ourselves, that we're doing
16	things in a logical, effective way, and we eliminate
17	as much overlap, that there is some, but we eliminate
18	as much as possible.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
20	Okay, I have Michael Cruickshank, then
21	Max.
22	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23	There was a point that was brought up in our

committee that was not projected by the report and was overlooked, I think. That was the question of the oil and gas leases.

Now it's been reported in this document here in the classification as the question has been raised, and I would just like to re-raise it. the taking of nonrenewable resources for commercial gain in the classification as a potential liable extractive activity. And this is basically a question that needs to be resolved somewhere, probably by the Department of Interior, to whether they want totally exclude the oil and gas leases or to include Because every oil and gas lease has environmental attachment to it. Before issuance of an oil and gas lease, there has to be an environmental impact statement released in the IA to bypass that issue.

But there are hundreds if not thousands of volumes now of environmental reporting on these leases, which are a tremendous database of environmental issues.

And the other thing that came up was that if we could produce an easily-readable directory in 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

1 matrix form or something like that of all the existing 2 MPAs, which would be something to which we could defer 3 which category of anything see 4 important. 5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. And the response was 6 DR. CRUICKSHANK: 7 that this would be a mammoth task at this stage. And 8 it was my thought that, hey, NNS has authority to do 9 many things with oil leases and perhaps they could --10 it could be suggested to them, that they put the pressure on the states to produce these data for use 11 12 by the MPAs to put together such an index or a matrix. 13 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 14 DR. CRUICKSHANK: We may discuss it later 15 this afternoon --Yeah, okay. 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 17 DR. CRUICKSHANK: -- in our --18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It would be a very nice 19 specific recommendation to come back. 20 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes. Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Max Peterson. 22 MR. PETERSON: Let me just suggest that 23 committee 1 has the responsibility to at least propose

some kind of conceptual approach for a National System. And as a part of that presumably would look at everything in the existing inventory and what purposes they serve and how that is still some overall goals for the system.

Now in a nice neat main objective you start out with goals, objectives, and so on, but I think in this group of 30 we've probably got a hundred different goals that we have in mind. And I'm not sure it would be useful to debate that in the full Committee. To let it come out in group 1 would be my recommendation.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Dan Suman.

DR. SUMAN: I have a question that really concerns a topic that I wonder -- well, I wonder if any of the three subcommittees will consider. And that is the topic about federal agency activities that impact MPAs, which is mentioned in Section 1C, "where causing harm to MPAs through federally-conducted approved or funded activities," or in Section "agency responsibilities. Federal agencies whose actions affect resources shall identify actions."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I'm curious, I realize these are responsibilities of all federal agencies, but I'm curious whether any of the three subcommittees will address that issue in ways that could be helpful to the MPA Center. I don't see that it logically fits into any of the three topics for our subcommittees.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Very good question. what would wish to have is clear we sense identification of those things that we can pass onto Remember, Secretary. we are advising the Secretaries who will then push the MPA Center one way So I think your basic point is terribly or the other. important, but am I right, Joe, in saying that we're telling you what not going to be to do indirectly through the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior and other places? Is that right, Joe?

MR. URAVITCH: That is correct. Let's see, this is the way that goes. Just a point of clarification, the role of the Advisory Committee relates to Section 4 specifically. So you have to bear that in mind.

But the way that relates to the activities under Section 1 and Section 5, this is going to be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 really clear, is through the listing process, because 2 the listing process is what then triggers Section 5 and agency reports, which is a requirement under 3 4 Section 6, that we are required to post on 5 website. So there is a linkage back to Section 1 and 5, but 6 Section it's indirect through 7 subsections of 4. 8 DR. SUMAN: I quess then it really So the Coordination Subcommittee 9 be 10 closely addresses issue; is that correct? Well, or --11 12 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. -- number 1 then through the 13 DR. SUMAN: 14 National System. 15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm reluctant to answer I think the point has been made, Dan. 16 the question. 17 Let's let the groups figure it out, but please don't 18 let it drop. I mean if you don't hear it come back to 19 us from any of them, please raise it again. Let's see 20 what they think about how this might be dealt with; is 21 that correct okay? 22 DR. SUMAN: Sure.

NEAL R. GROSS

Good.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:

Bob Zales.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. Two comments and a question. One is on the exchange of information between constituents and this Committee Center and the various federal agencies.

I think the Center and some of the federal agencies, I know that the correct guy for the West Coast is here for the Fishery Service, they can get with individuals. I'll be more than happy to try to give them a list of people that I know and contact points to get information out to them about process and what they can and can't do.

the discussion And then about the definition or the classification of a system. The Center, which I guess everybody's got a copy of this, they -- this is the Classification System for Marine Protected Areas. They've got some, I guess, some pretty good suggestions in here. I would kind of like to see a discussion by the entire panel just to kind of get an idea from each individual as to what their concept of an MPA is, so that we can try to at least be not necessarily on the same page right off the bat but in the same book anyway.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 And then the other question is in the 2 procedural thing, at what point today do you intend to 3 get into the discussion about the charter? 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Ι had penciled 5 discussion about the charter at the end of the day before we adjourn, before we recess. 6 So after. 7 will be another period at 3:15 for reporting back. 8 And at that time I thought we would be ready to confront the charter. Is that okay? 9 10 MR. ZALES: Sure. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm happy to move it to 12 some other time, but I do have it penciled in at the last thing before we adjourn -- before we recess. 13 14 sorry. So okay. 15 Okay. Dave Benton. Mr. Chairman, Bob touched on 16 MR. BENTON: 17 what I was going to raise. 18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Are there 19 questions and comments? It's twelve o'clock, so I would propose we 20 21 recess for 15 minutes, grab your provisions and please come back at 12:15. 22 We have a very informative 23 presentation from Mary Jean Comfort from the Canadian

1 prospective. So thank you for a very productive 2 morning. (Recess taken from 12:04 p.m. to 12:19 3 4 p.m.) 5 URAVITCH: Okay. Well, thank you, MR. As I mentioned yesterday, the United States 6 7 is not the only country in the world that's looking at 8 the establishment of a National System of Marine 9 Protected Areas. And I thought it would be useful for 10 the Committee to learn more about what's happening 11 elsewhere in the world. 12 There's a brochure in your folders about 13 what's going on in Australia. And I also have today, 14 say, Mary Jean Comfort from I'm pleased to the 15 Department of Fisheries and Oceans in Canada. 16 She's had over 25 years of experience 17 environmental working on issues, both at the provincial and federal government levels in Canada as 18 19 well as internationally. She's been with the 20 Department of Fisheries and Oceans on and off for over 21 the past 20 years with several tours overseas as well. 22 She involved in the drafting of was 23 Canada's Ocean Act legislation and after that,

subsequently, she was involved in the federal policy development for the Ocean Act related to MPAs in Canada. And she has been the National Coordinator for MPAs in Canada since her return from Indonesia in 2000.

asked her because And we presentation she had made about a year ago at the California and the World Oceans Conference and thought it would be an interesting presentation because it puts into context Marine Protected Areas into a larger planning and management context, which is similar to what at least some of the drafts of the U.S. Ocean Commission reports seem to be heading toward. thought it would be interesting to see what another country is doing, and someone very articulate and knowledgeable about that, I'd like to welcome Mary Jean Comfort from our neighbors to the north.

(Applause.)

MS. COMFORT: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee and members of the audience, thank you very much for inviting me here.

It's always good, it's just starting to freeze up in Ottawa, so it's kind of good to get out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

and see what green looks like again before we set in for the big white for the next four months.

I'm delighted to be here for a couple of reasons because it's, one reason and particular reason is to be able to sit in on these kind of discussions and listen and absorb the kinds of thought, thinking that's going around your table, and to know at the end of the day that I don't have to go back to my desk and try to put it together and make sense of it. So I appreciate that one, too.

So when I was contacted Joe asked me if I could speak about three things: The vision that Canada has for its MPA System -- and I was sitting in on the National System Group earlier. And there was a lot of discussion about vision and what it might be. So I'll give you a little picture at least of ours. And the progress being made, its development, and how this might integrate into the larger view that Canada has for integrated ocean management.

So first I want to start by setting just a bit of context and our context in reality is the Oceans Act itself.

The other bit is I'd like to give you a

NEAL R. GROSS

little bit of the picture of the types of MPA tools, and that was a term that Charlie Wahle was using in the other room earlier too, that we have at our disposal.

And then I'm going to move on to tell you how we're trying to approach the development of the System.

And I'll start with a caveat, a big caveat is that we're only just beginning. There's not a lot of these MPAs on -- I was going to say on the ground -- but on the water in Canada right now. And so for better and worse, we're basically starting with a pretty clean slate.

So the Oceans Act was actually passed in 1997. And at its core it requires that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans develop an ocean management strategy. That's the sort of big umbrella of how we're trying to work.

It also states that "The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans shall lead in the development of integrated management plans in all our coasts and oceans, and including estuaries and coastal areas."

And, finally, you know if you just think

NEAL R. GROSS

you're looking at a microscope and you're just kind of zeroing in a little bit closer and closer, you're going deeper and deeper into this, nested within that mandate for providing leadership and establishing integrated management plans is the requirement the Act in fact tasks the Minister of Fisheries and Ocean, with establishing "leading and coordinating in the development and implementation of a National System."

Now I'll tell you that I use the term "system" and "network" interchangeably. And, in fact, I prefer the term "network" because I really feel like while "system" does give you the sense of a planned and systematic approach, I feel like "network" also infers some kind of connectivity, and I think that's an important element to include in any system or any network.

So the tools we have to develop the network in Canada are found in various pieces of legislation, administered by three different federal departments. Here it is. And I'll briefly just oversee it, describe these, but I'll go into these in a bit more depth later.

And I will tell you also that Fisheries

NEAL R. GROSS

and Oceans is the new kid on the block. With the Oceans Act we got the power to establish Marine Protected Areas, and -- under the Ocean Act. But prior to that Parks Canada had already embarked upon establishing what they call National Marine Conservation Areas which, in effect, are probably very similar to the U.S. National Marine Sanctuaries.

However they only just in the year 2002 passed the National Marine Conservation Areas Act. Prior to that they had been establishing marine areas under National Parks their Act and had learned how difficult it is unfortunately to take terrestrially based piece of legislation and try to apply it to the marine environment. It's a tough haul.

I've There are -included the Canada National Parks Act because there are national parks with marine components and most notably, probably for those of you on the West Coast, Pacific Rim National Park, on the West Coast Vancouver Island and British Columbia. And there's one other one called the Saginaws St. Lawrence Marine Park Act which established the Saginaws St. Lawrence Marine Park.

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

It's a bit of an anomaly because it's right in the St. Lawrence River and so therefore it is also within the jurisdiction of the provincial government of Quebec, so there are two parallel pieces of legislation that establish the same park.

Environment Canada has the Canada Wildlife Act under which they can establish marine wildlife areas. Marine wildlife areas are areas in the marine environment. They're very specifically related to the marine environment and they're beyond the 12-mile territorial sea, right out to 200 mile -- 2,000-mile territorial sea. Yahoo.

Migratory They also have the Birds Convention Act under which they establish migratory bird sanctuaries. And national wildlife areas also established under the Canada Wildlife Act. those are either land or out to the 12-mile on territorial sea, so we're into a little complexity. And in the Oceans Act we have Marine Protected Areas that can be established anywhere within out to the EEZ's end; and in collaboration with provincial governments, who do have jurisdiction to some extent within the 12 nautical miles and inland

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

waters.

And those of you who are familiar within close and the laws of the -- law of the sea will know about all the arcane bits and pieces of what constitutes inland and outland, and whatever.

Anyways.

I'll also say that Parks Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act applies also to the Great Lakes, but the Oceans Act doesn't. So they work there establishing the areas, but they don't -- we don't. However, we do have authorities there under our Fisheries Act, so.

Now what constitutes a network? In this slide I've basically got all the areas, both National Wildlife Areas, Marine Wildlife Areas, Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, Marine Protected Areas, National Marine Conservation Areas that are either being worked on or have already been established. And this was just pulled from a database.

And the sieve was: Which are the areas that have either a marine component or right up to the marine environment. So some of these may even just be on land, but they might be on the beach, right?

NEAL R. GROSS

Now does this work as a network, as a system? No, I don't think so. It's some nice little dots, but somehow we need to figure out how you connect those dots.

So we've -- and it was interesting to me to sit in the thing. A lot of people were talking about what is a network, what is a system, what would be the components of. And we've come to some conclusions.

First of all, we think there needs to be a diversity of types of Marine Protected Areas. There has to be the whole array. We need more than just representativity, which is something that we hear a lot about in the international community, systems of representative areas.

I look at representative areas as being really great at a particular scale. They take samples of the environment, but they don't target some of those areas that we think are really vital to the ecosystems we're trying to protect. We need areas that can protect those vital habitats. We need the areas that can protect vulnerable species, areas that are essential to life stages such as spawning,

NEAL R. GROSS

nursery, rearing areas.

And, finally, all of the components of a network or at least within the planning purview, all of the components of the network don't necessarily need to be Marine Protected Areas formally, but you need to make sure that whatever is going on around Marine Protected Areas, in and around Marine Protected Areas contributes or at least buttresses the protection that Marine Protected Areas provide.

But we know that there are other kinds of management measures, time area closures, timing of certain kinds of activities in the marine environment that can protect certain species. For example, the timing of seismic operations in particular areas where marine mammals might frequent.

We have an area in the Beaufort Sea that we're working on as a Marine Protected Area, but there are going to have to be additional types of measures put in place around that area with respect to the considerable amount of oil and gas activity, in particular exploration that's going on, to deal with the seasonal arrival of the beluga whales that spend three months of the summer there every year en masse.

NEAL R. GROSS

We also think that Marine Protected Areas should operate at a variety of scales. And that's taking the adage of think locally, act locally, but I really do believe that there are Marine Protected Areas that can protect a local area, local ecosystem, local vital piece of the ecosystem, and at the same time be operating on a continental or even global scale.

Our approach to developing network or the how is to use -- we're going to try to use the tools at hand. And we're developing a federal Marine Protected Area strategy. And I'll interject here to say that right now we're working on the federal elements of the Marine Protected Area sort of toolbox, but we will be reaching out and we are working in some provinces, actually already very closely with provincial governments and their protected area tools. But right now essentially we're trying to get our federal house in order.

And we're trying to do that to increase the ecological effectiveness of our individual MPAs, to increase the institutional effectiveness of our own agencies by kind of capitalizing on the synergies that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

exist. How can we work together to make our limited resources go a little bit further.

We also see that MPAs will be nested within large-scale, integrated management planning. So that's the approach we're taking. You folks are trying to figure out how a system's going to look like nationwide. And we've kind of wimped out, to be honest, and we're saying, you know what, we're going to try to tackle this on a kind of a manageable scale along the coastline through integrated management planning.

out this strategy to provide some clarity to the other ocean users. That's a big thing. But we get a lot of -- we heard it many times. You know when you're working on the establishment of one Marine Protected Area, some of the other stakeholders say, yeah, but where's the next one going to go. And unless you have that answer people don't feel real comfortable. They think that we're going to be papering the ocean -- papering the ocean? -- papering the ocean with Marine Protected Areas, or they're not certain of what the intent, the overall intent. They don't get what our

picture is. So we're trying to put this together to give a little bit of a bigger picture view.

So unfortunately right now I can't provide you with any concrete examples of how our network is coming together. I can provide you examples of where the three agencies, at least the three federal agencies are working very closely, where we have to work very closely. But just for fun I'd like to build a little bit of a hypothetical network along a hypothetical stretch of coastline, using the tools we have at hand.

hypothetical Here's our stretch The tools are federal Marine Protected coastline. the National Areas under the Ocean Act, Marine Wildlife Conservation Areas, Marine Wildlife Areas, Migratory Bird Sanctuaries. Now no particular stretch of coastline or very few would have all of those established in any one area, but that's what I'm going to do.

So the first thing is Parks Canada, a National Marine Conservation Area. Now Parks Canada has identified 29 marine regions in Canada. And in each of those they will be establishing a National

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

Marine Conservation Area, and that will be the end of their system when that's done. Theirs is a finite system.

The purpose of Parks Canada's National Marine Conservation Areas, their mandate is essentially "to conserve and protect for all time," so it's there in perpetuity, "marine areas that are representative of Canada's oceanic and Great Lakes environments, and to encourage public understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of the marine heritage." So they have a large role to play in terms of the whole outreach and communications elements of Marine Protected Areas.

With the passage of the National Marine Conservation Areas Act there are some very specific elements that are part and parcel. And every National Marine Conservation Area must have a core totally protected area. They may have more than one and they should be zoned. So they may have one more than one core area, but everyone's got to have one at least.

So that's kind of in this case is a little bit of an anchor.

Fisheries and Oceans, under the Ocean Act

NEAL R. GROSS

we can establish Marine Protected Areas to conserve and protect fisheries and marine mammal resources, species and habitat, endangered species and their habitats, unique habitats, and areas that are really high productivity areas or highly biodiverse. Those are some of the reasons.

We also have a fifth reason which says, "And any other reason for which the Minister may be responsible." So it's a nice little catch-all, but that would capture things like research areas, for example, if we were establishing a Marine Protected Area solely for the purposes of acting as a controlled research area, as controlled as you can get it in a marine environment.

So my hypothetical Oceans Act Marine
Protected Areas are a hydrothermal vent Marine
Protected Area that's a little bit -- that's offshore.
We have one of those. That's our first designed
Marine Protected Area under the Oceans Act.

Maybe the three along the islands there would be considered maybe a small network that would be done if we were on the West Coast, we might be looking at three rockfish closure areas, for example.

NEAL R. GROSS

That Marine Protected Area established specifically for a single or a species assemblage of rockfish.

Near-shore reef environments, for example.

And then we might also have one in an estuary that's dealing with juvenile salmon and the productivity that estuaries provide us: Herring, salmon. The East Coast, those might be lobster closure areas, for example.

And, finally, we've got out a Migratory Bird Sanctuary on the estuary, too. So we've got colocated marine protected areas potentially. This would be because the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries Act may only provide the ability for the Minister of Environment to manage those birds, to take action for the purposes of protecting migratory birds. might be really important is the habitat underneath. And Fisheries and Oceans, under both the Fisheries Act and the Oceans Act, has the authority to deal with the water column and fish habitat.

So you put these all together in the context of integrated management planning. And we connect those dots using the planning area.

As a hypothetical planning unit, the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Marine Protected Areas established within would be contributing to overarching ecosystem objectives that would be set for that planning area at the onset of any kind of planning initiative. And everything that would be done and every action and all the elements of the planning unit would be targeted, would be contributing to or would, at the very least, be trying to meet the ecosystem objective of the overall planning area.

At the same time that planning area allows us to address some conservation areas that aren't going to be geographically specific. They're not going to have a space you can draw a line around and say, this is important; we need to protect it. And that is kind of illustrated in the diagram, for example, as a migratory route of marine mammals, for example.

And within the planning context, on the terrestrial, people refer to corridors. They have protected areas, they have corridors. In the marine environment it's a little harder to identify where those corridors might be. But what you might need to do in those areas where you're dealing with migratory

NEAL R. GROSS

species, in particular, is institute management measures over a long stretch of coastline that deal with that.

For example, with marine mammals it might be whale-watching guidelines or certain guidelines for cruise ship activity within any given area to deal with the issue of whale conflicts, whale stress, for example.

And at the same time you can look at where you -- you can start thinking about how your Marine Protected Area operates on a continental scale. So this Migratory Bird Sanctuary is clearly going to be linked to other Migratory Bird Sanctuaries elsewhere along a coast continentally or even globally.

And what you have is a small, what you have is networking within your planning area that gives you the opportunity to maybe this core area is dealing with -- is linked to those three. Or potentially you may have -- the National Marine Conservation Area may also be able to capture important bird area, for example, and allow Canadian Wildlife Service who would normally have to deal with managing it or maybe potentially

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

establishing a Marine Protected Area for it, to expend their resources and their energy elsewhere. So it's a little bit about job sharing as well.

So this network within the planning unit is just a microcosm of what a larger network might look like, and how we build the national network will be dependent on those planning activities. It will be an incremental process hopefully.

An integrated management planning idea also provides context in where we can start to identify new areas as well. The process by which you go through when you're planning on a large scale like that is, firstly, we're trying to identify what we're calling ecologically significant areas. So that would be where you'd be identifying those areas, all areas that might in some way need additional conservation measures, not necessarily all areas that would become Marine Protected Areas.

And then the planning process allows you to sit around the table with all those involved, in particular the people that have the mandate, and decide which is the best tool to do the job. Does it really need to be a Marine Protected Area. Can it be

managed some other way. What are the threats. There are multiple threats. Maybe a Marine Protected Area is a way to go. If it's only one element that can be dealt with some other way, that's the way to go. But it gives you the opportunity to examine it in a rather more holistic way, rather than looking at it on a very just one Marine Protected Area at a time.

It also gives us an opportunity to decide where we might need to co-locate. And it also gives us an opportunity to decide where we can job share, where we can pick up the slack for another agency, if that's possible. So that slide represented, I guess, what people would call a vision.

I'm a really visual person, so when people talk about vision and then write a bunch of words down, it doesn't make any sense to me. So I like the pictures, and that's why we've kind of put it down in pictures.

But we're not there yet. Not by any stretch of the imagination.

We're currently working on the development of the federal strategy, as I mentioned before. It's -- it will be expanded at some point to include

NEAL R. GROSS

provinces and territories, aboriginal groups, communities, and other stakeholders.

We're initiating right now, though, we're still kind of forging ahead on individual Marine Protected Area sites that each of our individual already identified and had already agencies have determined that we were going to forge ahead on. at the same time we're trying to find areas and select areas where might be do some collaborative we through planning. So going that process of identifying the ecologically significant areas and determining whose tool is the best tool to use in any given situation, and where those linkages are.

And also trying to link onto the terrestrial planning activities and the whole idea of what the landbase sources of pollutions, the influence that has on dealing with our Marine Protected Areas.

We're continuing, as I said, to forge ahead on the identification and evaluation of kind of individual sites. And clearly and even in individual sites we have to collaborate quite a bit. In particular, Parks Canada and ourselves at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans because Fisheries

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

and Oceans is also responsible and one of its primary functions and has been since confederation has been the management of fisheries.

So, as I said, it's a huge undertaking, and I believe those are the exact words that Charlie used earlier in saying that it's a huge undertaking.

We do believe that it's the way to do it, requires a long-term and sort of sustained and commitment, not only to find protected areas and to protect them, but to manage the entire ocean in a way that is not only contributing to the protected areas management but that is we're managing our ocean in a sustainable fashion. And we are embarking integrated management planning processes in all three of our all coasts to try to figure out just exactly how we're going to do that. And we're in a process of learning by doing, but we're getting there.

But I think that ultimately we're -- I don't know how to say this, but I think ultimately we believe that approaching it in that kind of planning-unit basis, it will allow us to get to a national system over the long term and at the same time provide us, give us the opportunity to identify linkages both

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

at continental, global scales, and to move on and 1 2 provide the ability to buttress the protection in our 3 protected areas in the surrounding areas rather than 4 have these oasis in the ocean where anything else 5 goes. 6 Thank you. 7 (Applause.) 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I assume you'd be happy 9 to respond to questions? 10 MS. COMFORT: Absolutely. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Just a second 12 here. Dan Suman. DR. SUMAN: Could you give us any -- thank 13 14 Could you give us any indication of you very much. 15 how Canada integrates the landbase source pollution 16 issue, you know global program of action points, with 17 Marine Protected Areas? does impacts How on 18 Environment Canada coordinate with Fisheries 19 Oceans in that issue? 20 MS. COMFORT: We're not quite there yet. What we're hoping to do is to link into sort of 21 22 planning, watershed planning activities that 23 taking place on the -- and very often that's a

provincial-based element, in part because of the way our Constitution is laid out. And, in fact, provincial governments have environmental responsibilities and do а lot of stuff. And Environment Canada does do kind of nationally-based programs and may set national standards. But in a lot of cases that on-the-ground work is done by provincial governments.

And, in particular, in sort of -- there's a lot of -- British Columbia is very far along in that and it's been doing a lot of watershed planning and the coastal forestry work and things like that that's been going on.

We haven't done the linkages, made the direct linkages, but we are working on -- one of the areas that we're working on, an integrated management planning process right now in B.C. is in the Central Coast, which was directly linked to a landbase planning element that the provincial government did in the last two -- four years, I think. And they completed the landbase plan.

And so we went to the Central Coast in part to kind of abut it and see how that might work,

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

1	but that area, now because of the considerations of
2	lifting the oil and gas moratorium on B.C.'s coast,
3	that planning area is not extended right up into Queen
4	Charlotte Sound. And just because it's an opportunity
5	to start to identify ecologically significant area and
6	start to deal with what might be at issue if the
7	moratorium is lifted.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
9	DR. SUMAN: Thanks.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. We have Max
11	Peterson.
12	MR. PETERSON: I think the visual
13	presentation is very good, by the way. It helps us
14	visualize the network, but let me ask you two
15	questions.
16	It appears that you have MPAs with a
17	capital MPA and then you have other areas that you
18	consider part of the network that aren't called MPAs.
19	MS. COMFORT: Yeah.
20	MR. PETERSON: Is that correct?
21	MS. COMFORT: Well, in fact, as we've been
22	working on our federal strategy we are really only
23	dealing with MPAs, National Marine Conservation Areas,

Marine Wildlife Areas, and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries 1 and National Wildlife Areas. 2 In the planning context what we're looking 3 4 at is we're saying everything can contribute to the 5 ecosystem objectives of the planning unit. 6 MR. PETERSON: Okay. 7 MS. COMFORT: But we may not consider them 8 part of a national system. I think it becomes -- I 9 think we're trying to focus our effort and focus the 10 description of the system on the actual 11 elements of it, the formal Marine Protected Areas. 12 MR. PETERSON: One other question. You 13 mentioned a large oceans management area. 14 MS. COMFORT: Yeah. Now who has responsibility 15 MR. PETERSON: 16 for this large oceans management area since you're 17 saying it's all got to fit within that context? Who does that. 18 19 MS. COMFORT: Yeah. Well, I'll take a 20 step back to the Oceans Act. Ιt is а really 21 interesting piece of legislation because it doesn't 22 really tell you what to do. But it enables you to do 23 all sorts of very cool things.

And one of the -- but the caveat to that is that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Minister of Fisheries and Ocean with the responsibility for the Oceans Act is the ministry that is meant to lead and to coordinate and to facilitate. Those the words used in the legislation.

So what that means, though, and that's why I mentioned the whole idea of the Canada Ocean strategy, because that was a way to lay out the fact that there are multiple responsibilities. So in any large ocean management area Natural Resources Canada, who manages the nonrenewable resource development, oil and gas, and mineral resource development in the offshore, they're at the table and they have a very big role to play in anything that's going on there because they are the regulators of that particular industry.

We're the regulators of the fishing industry. Transport Canada is the regulator of the shipping industry. Coast Guard, which is part of Fisheries and Oceans -- you know all the elements are there. But we're kind of responsible for grabbing everybody by the reins and saying, come on, let's go

1	do this.
2	MR. PETERSON: Okay. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay. I
4	have Wally, John, Bob, Dolly, Bob, Terry, John, Rod,
5	and Gil. Wally.
6	DR. PEREYRA: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I tried to make a song
8	of it, but it didn't quite work.
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We've got Wally and
11	Dolly. That's a start.
12	DR. PEREYRA: First I'd like to thank
13	Canada for the lovely Marine Parks in the Gulf Islands
14	because I've availed myself of them on a few
15	occasions.
16	You show that in some situations you'll
17	have a co-designated area or site.
18	MS. COMFORT: Yeah.
19	DR. PEREYRA: What happens when you have
20	conflicting objectives, maybe sustainable use on one
21	side and protection on the other? How do you bridge
22	those differences and come to some common
23	understanding to manage use?

MS. COMFORT: Well, that's interesting because I mean the Saginaw St. Lawrence Marine Park, essentially as they worked through it, they came to -- the legislation, the provincial legislation and the federal legislation is apparently identical. So they worked through the common objectives. I think that was the whole idea.

The other co-designation, almost designation we have is that we as part of our initial run of pilot projects in the Marine Protected Area Program, we established a small one at Race Rocks, just off the coast of Vancouver Island. And it's very already a Provincial small. Ιt was Ecological Reserve, which is highly protected. But the province at that place has jurisdiction over the bottom, but not necessarily the water column.

So we established a Marine Protected Area to kind of deal with the water column and fish habitat, which is the authorities that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has, so that's how arcane this stuff gets.

And, again, a process was adopted to work through and set conservation objectives to determine

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

what you both wanted to do. And so there was a common agreement. So we haven't reached that portion where we couldn't get there, where the conflicts or the disagreements were so huge that they couldn't find a way through it yet.

DR. PEREYRA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: John Ogden.

DR. OGDEN: Thank you for a very interesting presentation that sort of -- your vision absolutely parallels mine, or the ones that I have held for quite a long time since we -- being involved in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

If I could use that Large Ocean Management Area that you showed as an example, let me just run a hypothetical by you, because in a sense you left out a lot of detail which I think we're grappling with, and tell me where you think I'm off or whether we're congruent or not.

You have in that -- if you're looking out through a window into a large ocean management area, which is universally valued by a whole bunch of stakeholders, for all different reasons, and it's universally perceived that that particular area,

NEAL R. GROSS

without certain types of protections and management, is going to basically decline. In fact, hypothetically we already know that some of these resources are in trouble.

So before we get to the point where we actually are drawing lines on the map and talking about MPAs and everything else, we essentially get out the chart and we sort of say, well, what are these resources that we all care about. And that's a stakeholder-involvement process and we essentially map them out.

And in my hypothetical a great deal is known about this. You know where the hydro thermal vents are. You know where the offshore oil platforms are. You know a lot about fisheries and so on, and you get all that together.

And then you essentially end up with a map of your large ocean area. And you simply role that out in front of the stakeholders and sort of say, well, okay, now what are we going to do here. We have these various kinds of potential protections and administrative arrangements and so on.

And visualization, as you pointed out,

NEAL R. GROSS

seems to me to be the key in this, to allow people to come to their own conclusion that this universally-valued resource can only be essentially protected by the institution of this type of management.

And then you -- then at that -- and only then at that point might you begin to timorously sketch in where the rockfish protection areas are and where the no-fishing zone is off the mouth of the estuary because it's a nursery and so and on and so on.

MS. COMFORT: Yeah.

DR. OGDEN: Is this some -- how do you feel about that scenario?

MS. COMFORT: Well, I guess that sort of pretty much captures what we're hoping to do in the planning areas. To kind of get at what's out there first and to find -- and everybody's come to the same conclusion that one of the first steps you need to do is you need to find out where those ecologically-valued areas, the vital organs, if you want, the engines of the ecosystem, if you want. Because that also gives you the opportunity to then start thinking about what kinds of targets you can hope to attain in

NEAL R. GROSS

your entire ocean management area, of these.

So that -- and then -- and at the same time once you've identified those significant areas, then you can start to figure out what the best tools are. And then you might even have another sieve if you want, that you go through where you set -- then you set priorities, because we're not operating in an environment and no government is operating in an environment where there are unlimited resources. So you're not going to be able to do everything now.

So what do you really need to do now and what's really important? And those kind of priority-setting exercises may differ from coast to coast. And that's why we try to kind of -- we will probably have some kind -- the national criteria are there and are evolving for what's important and what's ecologically significant.

And I don't think -- you could probably take five or six different papers that are out there right now on criteria for Marine Protected Areas and you wouldn't find a lot of difference. You would find probably, I would guess, 75 to 80 percent overlap on what people suggested to be criteria. Where the next

1 level would be criteria for what the priorities are, 2 and those may differ. In Atlantic Canada the priorities 3 4 probably going for areas protecting fish and fisheries 5 That would be my take. In British resources. Columbia it's a little bit different. 6 It's a whole 7 different view of the world, and partly because of the 8 species that are fished there as well. 9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you. 10 Bob Bendick. MR. BENDICK: I think Max covered it, but 11 12 the Oceans Agency convenes the planning process, is that right, for an area? 13 14 That is the intent, but it MS. COMFORT: 15 doesn't always necessarily mean that we would -- there 16 are some coastal-planning processes that are near 17 shore and not taking in. But the large ocean, the 18 ocean areas extending right out to the EEZ's end, 19 yeah, we're tagged. We're it. MR. BENDICK: Could you talk a little bit 20 21 more about how you encourage or enforce the other 22 agencies to cooperate in this process? 23 MS. COMFORT: My husband's a diplomat, I'm

not, so that's a really hard question. It's really difficult, but in fact in some cases, and because there is -- well, in some cases I think that there are a lot of -- and many of the agencies in the federal government recognize that we need to kind of get it together in the oceans.

Because there has been an endless series of conflicts in recent years, particularly with respect to oil and gas issues that have come up. And oil and gas versus fishing, and everything. So it's quite clear to people that somehow we need to try to get out in front of those kind of conflicts and try to figure out where, from whence they come, and try to divert them before they arrive, to try to figure out a way that we can achieve that wonderful, mythical, sustainable development goal in the oceans and not sort of disenfranchise anybody in the process.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Dolly.

DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We're probably all asking questions along the same line. In what I know about this process, I think that one of the major differences between the

NEAL R. GROSS

Canadians' process and ours is that there is a fair amount that's bottoms up.

I know in B.C. the Aboriginal Fishery Strategy included a report, which my husband authored, on native values, native values and input into MPAs for B.C.

But the question I have is what is the process for taking those reports up through these departments and figuring out what you can do? And if these reports suggest things like further closures to protect things like shellfish beds or particular important sites like Burnaby Narrows, beyond just negotiations, are there any mechanisms to require or encourage strongly someone like DFO to implement these types of closures or protections?

MS. COMFORT: Yeah. Well, a lot of it, and I'll be really honest, a lot of what we take on is right now being dictated by the amount of resources we have in our pocket and on the ground in terms of human resources, the number of people that can actually do this.

And our original intent when we developed the policy framework for MPAs was we could take

NEAL R. GROSS

suggestions from external sources as to where MPAs might be. And there are a number of NGOs in B.C. in particular that are doing some pretty amazing GIS work in terms of identifying areas.

But what we really realized is that it's there's a tidal wave of possibilities in people's drawers and on maps on walls all over the country. And we're not going to be able to deal with all of them, so that's why we think we really need to get at it in that planning context. And that means in that planning context you bring everybody to the table.

And so if people have areas that think -- and in that collective process you decide that you need -- these are the areas that need to be protected or managed in a particular way, then you work through it in that process.

We haven't gone through a whole planning process on a big scale yet. And so, you know, clearly the learn-by-doing process has got some -- there are going to be bumps along the way, but that's the way you get at getting all those things. And then you can sieve through it and you can determine which is better.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	There are places in B.C., for example,
2	where the provincial government is probably better
3	situated to deal with a protected area than any other
4	of the federal agencies are.
5	DR. GARZA: One of the interesting
6	comparisons between particularly B.C. and Alaska is in
7	B.C. people perceive this as an opportunity. And in
8	Alaska we're scared to death of it.
9	MS. COMFORT: Yeah.
10	DR. GARZA: You know it's just totally
11	opposite there.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I have Bob
13	Zales, Terry. I have John again, but we only have one
14	John here. And then Rod and Gil. So Bob Zales.
15	MR. ZALES: My question's been asked.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. Thank you.
18	Terry O'Halloran.
19	MR. O'HALLORAN: Actually my question has
20	been answered also.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, my gosh. Rod
22	Fujita.
23	DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you for that presentation. I was really impressed and I like the way DFO seems to be framing several really important issues, among them the idea that MPAs are a tool and that they're nested in some integrated ocean management system, which I suppose implies that the idea of different kinds of MPAs have different levels of protection.

And also this idea of expressing -- or providing some clarity and certainty to ocean users, I think that's really important.

My question is how does DFO and the other agencies communicate to the stakeholders on these concepts? Do you use sort of a zoning concept to communicate these ideas, or what kind of language to you use to kind of prevent polarization around misunderstandings of what MPAs are or are not?

MS. COMFORT: Okay. To be honest, we -in terms of MPAs individually we are zoning MPAs
individually, depending where we are. But the basis
of those zones -- but we are trying to avoid the idea
of zoning. And I think it's a semantic issue, but the
Oceans Act is based on three pinnacles, or whatever
they call -- pillars. It's the ecosystem principle

and the precautionary principle and the principle of integrated management.

And one of the -- putting that ecosystem approach into practice is proving to be quite challenging, but what we're trying to do is look at rather than zoning for this kind of activity can take place, we might set aside areas or we might identify areas where we will set what we're calling Marine Environmental Quality Objectives. And they might vary depending on the kind of resilience a particular ecosystem might have.

And I can use an example of that approach in a Marine Protected Area I've been working for the last little while in the Gully, it's at DT Canyon offshore of Nova Scotia. And we've identified the boundaries and we've decided that in reality there were three zones.

There was a core element, and what we were really trying to protect was that core element, which was a deep sea ecosystem. And the reason we noticed, and the Gully was brought to your attention was because of northern ballnose whales, and they congregated there.

NEAL R. GROSS

When we started looking at nobody knew why they congregated there. We just knew that they were there and they were there year round and they were there in numbers. So that zone became the focus, and the northern ballnose whales became the focus. But eventually what it turned out was there we had this incredibly complex deep water ecosystem within the water column. We still don't know what's on the bottom there because it's so deep.

And on the sides of the Gully what we realized is we had this incredible area, diversity of benthic organisms, just by virtue of the fact you were on slopes and you were getting this amazing diversity.

And you also had all these weird and wonderful currents and gyres operating on the Eastern Scotian Shelf that fed into the Gully.

And, finally, we included a couple of the shoulders of the Gully which are, in fact, part of the Eastern Scotian Shelf, which are areas that are already really highly dynamic ecosystems. And so the organisms that live there are pretty resilient. They can take a beating every once in a while. And that's how we looked at it.

So when we designed -- when we started dealing with the regulation, we didn't prohibited activities, prohibited the results we the activities. And we prohibited, for example, the disturbance or damage of the bottom in one zone. And we did the disturbance of the coming of the bottom and anything that might disturb or damage or contribute contaminants to the water column.

So we didn't -- because, you know what, if you say this activity we're not going to do, this is activity is not going to be allowed, in 20-years time who knows what kinds of things are going to be proposed for the ocean space. I mean 20 years ago I was working on a typewriter.

MS. COMFORT: Okay. Gil and then Tony.

MR. RADONSKI: Thank you for an excellent Ιf Ι remember, one presentation. of the biq differences between the Fisheries Organic Act Canada and our Organic Act, the Magnuson Act, is the Canadian Fisheries Act has a very strong habitat component, which we lack. We've been trying to put it into the act piecemeal over the years. Do you see that as an advantage?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And also layers of bureaucracy. We have the added, I don't know if it's cumbersome, method of dealing with things through regional management councils.

Could you address both that habitat issue and the council aspect?

MS. COMFORT: Well, I'm going to confess something. I worked for Fisheries and Oceans for 20 years. And most of my career has been in the habitat-management thing, so I can address that one. But I have never darkened the door of fisheries management.

I knew a little bit about it when I lived on the West Coast, particularly in the fisheries-management elements, but it's changing radically as we speak. There has been a whole huge policy review in Atlantic Canada recently, which I believe is probably going to change the direction of how we manage fisheries in Canada in general.

The habitat provisions, yes, I think it's probably safe to say that there are two provisions in the Fisheries Act that are probably, some have arguably stated that they are the strongest piece of environmental legislation we have. The first one says

NEAL R. GROSS

it essentially prohibits the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat. And fish are defined as just about anything that moves in the water.

So anywhere in Canada, and it extends right up into watersheds, in particularly in areas where there are anadromous fishes and where we have responsibility, as Fisheries and Oceans deals with anadromous fishes. Provinces have the landlock fish.

And the second provision is the -- it prohibits the deposit of deleterious substances into fish-bearing waters. And, in fact, in various -- and there's a tremendous amount of caselaw on this, and so in various court cases the deleterious substance has also applied to areas -- deposit of deleterious substances into waters that may run into fish-bearing water. So there didn't necessarily have to be the presence of a fish.

And deleterious substances in some cases could be counted as things like silt, in salmon streams would be considered deleterious to that particular species.

So the enforcement of that is, needless to

NEAL R. GROSS

say, very difficult. In a lot of cases we haven't applied as stringently those -- we've really focused a lot of on that salmon streams, the habitat protection provisions. But they are, they're very strong provisions, yeah, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Tundi.

DR. AGARY: M. J., I think you need to be commended not only for so clearly articulating what is a kind of complicated concept, both graphically and orally, but also I think people should know that you've been a one-man band up there in Canada really charging forward with this idea. And I think it's wonderful that you're leading the way in such a brave fashion.

I have a question for you, though. I wonder how you would respond to a person that would say that either we don't know enough ecologically to know where the ecologically significant areas are or that all areas of the ocean are ecologically significant?

MS. COMFORT: Actually I just heard a presentation on Saturday of somebody who said that they felt that we are reversing it. We shouldn't be

NEAL R. GROSS

doing Marine Protected Areas, we should be opening areas. It should be one thing.

But I think the amount of -- I don't necessarily believe we don't know enough. I don't think we know definitively and I don't think we can draw perfect boundaries around everything. you if you sat in a room with a group of scientists and you put headphones on all of them and didn't allow them to hear what everybody else said, again you'd end up with an incredible overlap on any given piece of ocean of where they believed were the really significant areas.

And I think there's a lot of indicators out there to try to figure out -- and then maybe -- I'm quite sure that there are some big profound gaps in our knowledge, too. But I don't think any of us are going to be trying to identify, be definitive at the first run anyways.

And I think that saying that the entire ocean is ecologically significant, I don't think anybody would disagree with that. I certainly wouldn't. And I think that's why we're trying to go the integrated management approach and set those

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ecosystem objectives, because what our role is as a department and what the Oceans Act tells us to do and where we've come out in our deliberations is that ultimately you need to maintain ecosystem structure and function, or else it all falls apart.

So what we're trying to do is maintain ecosystem structure and function and figure out what else can go on without compromising that definitive kind of backdrop.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Bonnie.

VICE CHAIR McCAY: Thank you very much. This has been a great presentation. I think it's been helpful too and inserting at least in my own mind the importance of looking at a mezzo scale approach to the problem as it were instead of saying that we must design a national system in some kind of genuine way. We really need to be thinking more and more about focusing on regional or even smaller systems that make sense ecologically and also make sense socially and culturally.

And to that last point I'm wondering how in your planning process you are bringing the

NEAL R. GROSS

nongovernmental, nonscientific stakeholders into it. What the experiences you've had or how you are planning to address the challenges involved in that.

MS. COMFORT: Well, this is another thing, I'm not an expert in all things, but I know that a number of our scientists have been working with fishing communities in Eastern Canada, for sure, on the whole concept of traditional ecological knowledge and bringing that into the mix, as well as with aboriginal peoples in bringing their traditional ecological knowledge, particularly in the Arctic is where a lot of work has gone on.

And I think really how we're trying to approach is it's a big table and everybody's got to be at it. And there are clearly some bumps in trying to translate traditional knowledge into -- and fit it into the, what I call, traditional science rubric, but there has been some work on doing that.

And a lot of what we're doing -- for example, I guess -- I'll give you an example, just to -- in the Beaufort Sea we're working on a Marine Protected Area that's comprised of three areas where beluga congregate, but it's also the areas where the

Inuvialuit hunt beluga. And those three areas were identified a number of years ago by the Fisheries Joint Management Committee, which is an Inuvialuit-run committee established under their land-claim agreement that identified those areas that needed to have no activity in them whatsoever, save for the ability, providing the ability for the Inuvialuit not only to practice their traditional hunt and to preserve the beluga whales in the area.

And so that essentially is just -- that is driving the MPA process. And the reason they had suggested to us that they wanted a Marine Protected Area there and that they wanted a more solidified protection is that they realized that these areas were de facto protected in a management plan, but the plan didn't have -- the Beluga Management Plan -- but it didn't have any legislative, it didn't have any authority other than that. And they felt that they were starting to be vulnerable as the interest in oil and gas exploration and things like that increased in the Beaufort Sea.

And there are other places where that kind of knowledge is coming into play. When we establish

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Marine Protected Areas under the Ocean Act and even 2 under the others, certainly Parks Canada is very much involved with the Haida in the establishment of -- on 3 4 the terrestrial park in the Queen Charlotte Island and on the establishments of Gwaii National Marine Park 5 6 Conservation Area. And their knowledge is being 7 brought into that process as well in delineating has 8 it's going to be managed. 9 MS. COMFORT: Thank you. 10 Terry O'Halloran. 11 MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you. I too very 12 much enjoyed your presentation. I learned a lot from it and mostly from the pictures. 13 14 MS. COMFORT: Lots of visual. 15 MR. O'HALLORAN: It's very helpful for me Dolly mentioned something that maybe you could 16 17 help us with and this may be a follow-on to what 18 Bonnie's question was. But Dolly made a comment that 19 the attitude in B.C. toward MPAs was rather positive. 20 And maybe you could talk to us about why 21 the attitudes among the stakeholders in B.C. 22 positive. Because this is an area that we struggle

with, is the stakeholder participation, interaction,

buy-in, and so maybe you could give us some of your thoughts.

MS. COMFORT: Well, I think Dolly said something about that in some ways that people looked at the planning process as an opportunity as opposed to -- and I don't think there's universally positive attitudes towards MPAs. I think a lot of people are still quite fearful. Fishing communities are often very fearful of even the concept of an MPA because there is a misconception that every MPA is going to be a marine reserve.

But I think that British Columbia -- I'm from B.C., right, and for whatever reason there is a real value placed on the environment there. And it may come from the historical attachment we have. I mean we are the hearers of water and the sorrows of logs in British Columbia. It is the land of lakes, rivers, and people who cut down trees, and that's how people lived.

And people lived in fairly small communities all over the thing, so there is a real attachment to both the land and I think to the ocean in B.C., just by virtue of that. But I wouldn't say

there is a universal embrace of the concept of MPAs. But there's certainly -- there's probably a lot more pressure put on my agency personally to establish more and better and faster MPAs in B.C.. And that stems from a fairly active -- a number of active NGO communities that are approaching it in a pretty holistic way.

And I think that the kind of work that's gone on to date on establishing protected areas in the marine environment has made people a little more comfortable with how it's gone on. Parks has been involved there for years in Long Beach and Pacific Rim National Park, which has a marine component. And they have been working in the Gulf Island on establishing a national marine conservation area and they've been working on the Queen Charlottes. And so there's a sense that people understand what the process is.

In terms of the planning and looking at it as an opportunity, I think both industries, certainly the oil and gas industry, looks at it as a way to get the areas that they're not going to be able to go out of the way, a priori, and they're going to know. And then it's not going to be -- and the regulators

NEAL R. GROSS

1	perceive it that way, too.
2	MR. O'HALLORAN: So if would it be fair
3	to say then having a clearly defined process in which
4	the stakeholders can understand has been beneficial?
5	MS. COMFORT: Yeah. I think transparency
6	is really important. I do think transparency and a
7	clear understanding of what it means and how they
8	might have input.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Jim Ray, did you
10	have your hand up?
11	DR. RAY: No.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So that I think it
13	exhausts the questions; am I correct?
14	Again let us thank Mary Jean Comfort.
15	(Applause.)
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We are ahead of
17	schedule, and Bonnie has whispered in my ear that
18	perhaps we should raise the charter discussion now,
19	which if it can be done in 12, 13 minutes, would allow
20	us to then proceed with our agenda. So if there's no
21	opposition, if you think everybody is here, maybe we
22	ought to have that discussion now.

Gil?

1	MR. RADONSKI: My good friend George
2	Lapointe just came into the room.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Indeed.
4	MR. RADONSKI: And since George has not
5	appeared before with us before,
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
7	MR. RADONSKI: I hope we could get him
8	introduced and have him make his usual statement about
9	MPAs.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Thanks,
11	Gil.
12	George Lapointe is indeed with us, and the
13	floor is yours, George. What we have done is sort of
14	explained who we are and why we're here, what we've
15	done. So we're glad to have you.
16	MR. LAPOINTE: My name is George Lapointe.
17	I'm the Commissioner of Marine Resources from the
18	State of Maine, the Gulf of Maine. In the Gulf of
19	Maine we've got a very strong interest in the MPA
20	issue. And it's my reason for being here.
21	Prior to being in the State of Maine,
22	where I've been now for five years, I worked for both
23	the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and a

2	Wildlife Agency. So I've worked with state fish and
3	wildlife agencies for my entire career. So thank you
4	for having me.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We're very happy to
6	have you here. We have assigned you to a
7	subcommittee.
8	MR. LAPOINTE: Which?
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I forget which one it
10	is, but we'll give you
11	MR. LAPOINTE: Later.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, we'll give you
13	the chance of negotiating. We're selling slots on
14	other committees, but we're very happy to have you
15	here, George.
16	MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Maggie says we have you
18	floating, so how's that?
19	MR. LAPOINTE: That's good for now.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: But we should try to
21	pin you down somehow.
22	So thanks, Gil, for calling that to my
23	attention.

group called the International Association of Fish and

1 Would it be all right with you if we visit 2 the charter issue and get it out of the way? Any 3 objections to that? 4 Wally. 5 DR. PEREYRA: No. We should say it's tab 6 3, please. 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Thank you. It's 8 at tab 3. 9 DR. PEREYRA: Visual. 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I've become very 11 sensitive to twitches in fingers and hands, and so 12 don't pick your nose or I might put you on the roster 13 to speak. So it is at tab 3. And tab 3 contains the 14 15 original charter plus a track changes version of our 16 thoughts. I gather, Maggie, from our June meeting 17 when we fussed about "shall" and "might" and "can" and "must" and "may not" and "may," and so here we are. 18 19 And I'm open to discussion about how you 20 wish to proceed to do this. Shall we -- the changes 21 appear in Objectives and Duties, paragraph 3, 22 paragraph 4 over on the next page, in paragraph 2, and 23 some other stuff. So shall we just -- Maggie, what --

do you have any advice for us?

Okay, yeah.

MS. ERNST: I did talk to Alice McKenna, our attorney-advisor in the Department of Commerce, who you heard from during the June meeting, who we go to for guidance on how to handle FACA, Federal Advisory Committee Act, and describe the kinds of changes you wanted to make under the Objectives and Duties, section 3 and 4.

And it was her opinion that you do not need to come back at this point and ask for recommended approval for recommended changes through an amendment to the charter, that she believes that you have the flexibility with the wording as it now stands to begin to come up with your substructure.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Does this mean that we could entertain a motion paragraph by paragraph or en masse to make these changes, Maggie; would that be in an order, a motion?

MS. ERNST: Yeah. I mean she's saying that you should just for the time being not propose coming in with a series of changes that wordsmith the charter, as you discussed back in the June meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 And that you do not need to set up working groups that are scientific as their sole focus. 2 That there is latitude to work within this wording. 3 4 And the other thing that I'll mention is 5 that, as Joe mentioned in his presentation yesterday, 6 this charter will come up for renewal. And we will be 7 triggered to start the renewal process in June. 8 at that point we will gather together a lot of those 9 kinds of changes that could be made and could be 10 handled. We would be able to handle those at that 11 point. 12 I had Dave and CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. then I had Bob. 13 14 MR. Chairman, first BENTON: Mr. 15 question and possibly -- well, first a question and 16 then possibly a statement, okay. 17 And the question is to Maggie: Did the 18 attorney say that we were prohibited from amending the 19 charter if we so desired? 20 MS. ERNST: No. You're not, but she'd 21 like there to be a warranted reason for going forward 22 with a change rather than just something that maybe 23 more perfunctory in her eyes. And that's, you know,

part of the learning process that we're going through in terms of trying to interpret FACA requirements.

MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, if I could follow up then?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. BENTON: Well, with all due respect, when I see something in writing that says "it shall be co-chaired by a scientist," that's pretty directive and explicit. And I'm not sure I would -- if we are not prohibited and we have an intention that we want to make the language clearer, our purposes clearer, then I would think that it is better to go ahead and amend it as you all basically discussed. And I looked at this thing, and it looked appropriate.

If that's the case, I mean I'm ready to make a motion to adopt the changes that you all recommended and get it done and get it overwith. I'm a little concerned if we don't do that, there's some language that was in the original that was very directive and quite limiting, I thought. And the changes, again I'm not a lawyer, but I've been around enough of them to know that a "shall" means that you will do this this way, period. And if somebody wants

1	to give you a hard time about, they've got something
2	to stand on and you don't.
3	If a motion's in order, Mr. Chairman, I'll
4	do it. If not, if you want to have further
5	discussion, I'll hold off.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Let's get the sense
7	here. You were specifically referring to the middle
8	of paragraph 3, weren't you, David, that says "any
9	working group created may" versus "shall,"
10	MR. BENTON: That's correct.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: right?
12	MR. BENTON: I wouldn't yeah, there's
13	that's
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Several of these?
15	MR. BENTON: Several of those, yes.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Bob?
17	MR. ZALES: Yeah. Bob Zales, and to
18	debate the point. And he was not at the first
19	meeting, but there was a lot of discussion on that
20	same feeling. And my question and also a statement
21	would be: In the changes that you're talking about,
22	Maggie, that they said we don't need to make, would
23	that be the ones that have been suggested here? That,

1 in other words, the attorney is saying that the 2 original language is flexible and we don't necessarily need this? 3 4 MS. ERNST: That was my impression of her 5 And that was a phone discussion where she statement. 6 didn't necessarily have the text in front of her. 7 was --8 ZALES: Okay. Well, then another MR. A phone discussion without 9 point in my statement. 10 anything in writing from that attorney saying that 11 there -- because I'm not an attorney either. But like 12 Dave, I've heard enough of them discuss things, and in 13 the Gulf of Mexico with specific language in the 14 Magnuson Act, and a red snapper had "Q," and "are," 15 "shalls," "ands" make a significant difference in how something is determined. 16 17 So when you see something that has said 18 "shall establish," that means in my mind you do it. 19 When we suggest changing it to "may" that we suggested 20 as a committee that we may not necessarily want to do 21 that, but if we want to we can. 22 And so if you want to make a motion later

on I'll second the motion, or whatever. But further

discussion, I would encourage at least these changes because I'm happy with these changes that are made here currently.

MS. ERNST: And these of course apply to your formation of working groups and not

your formation of working groups and not subcommittees.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right, okay. I have Max, Mark, Dolly, and Dave.

MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, Ι little about charters. If we amend this and have to go through the whole process through the Department of Commerce, through the Department of Interior, to GSA, and then file in the Federal Register as a charter amendment if you really want a charter amendment. I don't see that there's one needed, because it says "Any working group created," it applies only We don't have to create any if we working groups. don't want to.

I think every member of this Committee could be considered a scientist. It doesn't say a research scientist. It says a scientist. So I don't personally see the need to revise this. I think we'd be better off to gather up things we want to do and 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

year from now come in with revisions. It just seems 2 to me like a big exercise in futility. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okav. Thank you. 3 Ι 4 have Mark, Dolly, Dave, and Mike. And Wally. 5 DR. HIXON: Mark Hixon. My question had to do with clarification, and this is to Maggie. 6 7 Maggie, these changes that we hashed out 8 last time, these have not yet been approved then? 9 haven't gone through the process 10 approved changes to the charter; is that correct? 11 MS. ERNST: Right. As Max just mentioned, 12 I think there would have to be a determination of 13 whether these were major or minor amendments to the 14 And we elected to go forward with your charter. 15 request to add the provision for a vice chair, to 16 allow you to elect Bonnie McCay at this meeting. 17 rather than bundle them all up together and risk that 18 the possibility that it got bogged down and that you 19 didn't get at least that for this meeting, I just went 20 forward with one change to the charter. 21 DR. HIXON: Okay. Thanks. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Dolly. 23 Thank you, Mr. Chair. DR. GARZA: I would

1 speak in favor of going forward with changing the 2 And I think we can just keep working along charter. 3 as if it has been changed. 4 I think we worked pretty hard at making it 5 work for us. And while it could be argued whether or 6 not we are all scientists and whether or not someone 7 who didn't put it in writing would object or not 8 object, my experience has been that if it's not in 9 writing in front of you it will probably get re-10 reviewed by somebody higher who will have a different 11 opinion. And so my preference would be to go forward. 12 And I think we can come up with valid reasons why it should be changed. 13 14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I have Dave, 15 Mike, and Wally. Dave. 16 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to 17 take a stab at this just to move things along. 18 then have further discussion under the context 19 motion. But, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move that we 20 adopt the recommended changes in the charter as outlined in the document in our notebook. 21 22 Those are changes are -- and I'm moving to 23 adopt all the changes on the first page and the second

1	page. It doesn't look like there's any on the third.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
3	MR. BENTON: And if I have a second, I'll
4	speak to it briefly.
5	MR. ZALES: I'll second.
6	DR. GARZA: Second.
7	MR. BENTON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, may I
8	speak to you?
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
LO	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that we
L1	heard enough discussion to understand that there was a
L2	good rationale at the time when you all met at the
L3	first meeting to try and clarify there would be some
L 4	flexibility in how the Committee would set up working
L5	groups.
L6	My experience has been that directive
L7	language like "shall" is directive language. And
L8	language such as "may or" provides a bit of
L9	flexibility. In looking at this, I can well imagine
20	the discussions you all had. I think that it's
21	important. I notice two substantive issues that I
22	think are good.
23	One is that the change from "scientist" to

1	"member" so it's very clear there would be any Member
2	from the Committee. The other one is that "submitted
3	by scientific or other working groups." Right now we
4	may have working groups that are not scientific that
5	are important to our function.
6	And a clarification on the second page
7	with regard to setting up the chair and vice chair
8	elections I think is a good improvement. And I really
9	can't speak to the Department of Homeland Security, so
10	I won't. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.
12	Okay. I have Mike and Wally and then maybe some
13	others want to get in. So Bob Mike, you're up now.
14	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Chairman, I agree
15	fully with David's comments and therefore I withdraw
16	my statement and agreement.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.
18	Wally.
19	DR. PEREYRA: Mr. Chairman, if the maker
20	of the motion and the second would so agree I'd like
21	to offer a friendly amendment. That on page 2, item
22	number 2 under the listing of the ex-officio nonvoting
23	members that would be invited, I would like to add EPA

1	
2	MR. [SPEAKER]: It's there.
3	DR. PEREYRA: Excuse me the Corps of
4	Engineers.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.
6	DR. PEREYRA: Thank you. And if I could
7	I'll speak to that, Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The mover and the
9	seconder have shrugged their shoulders, so fine.
10	DR. PEREYRA: If I could for just a
11	moment, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
13	DR. PEREYRA: My reason for adding the
14	Corps of Engineers is, as I mentioned earlier, I do
15	feel that they are certainly an organization which can
16	help or hinder Marine Protected Areas, particularly in
17	the near-shore environment, so I'd just like to have
18	them included and give them the opportunity.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could I ask a
20	clarifying question of Joe, Maggie, and others
21	perhaps. This is a "shall" I think in the sense that
22	the "shall be granted to," it doesn't mean that they
	II

are obligated to send somebody, but do I read this

1	correctly that it's sort of an invitation list. Is
2	that how this would be interpreted?
3	MR. URAVITCH: That's no, those are the
4	agencies that are to be members of I guess I need a
5	point of clarification. My apologies for not being
6	here, but I'm trying to understand the process going
7	on here, because this is the agency's charter. So I
8	assume you're developing recommendations for the
9	agencies that you think we should consider?
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: This speaks just to
11	Wally's
12	MR. URAVITCH: No. I'm talking about the
13	process in general, because this is just a charter
14	that's developed by the departments for direction to
15	this Committee specifically. So are we in an effort
16	here to try and make some clarification?
17	MR. ZALES: To that point, Mr. Chairman,
18	the problem is it says the charter of the Marine
19	Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee, which
20	would be us, not the agency.
21	MR. URAVITCH: No. It's the charter the
22	agency has provided to you as the charter under which
23	you operate.

1 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Boy, here we go. 2 All right, just a minute. Wally, are you finished 3 with your --4 DR. PEREYRA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am. 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So now Ι have Bob 7 Zales, I have Ted, I have Lelei, I have Mike and --8 Mike, you're on the list. Others? 9 Okay, Bob Zales. 10 MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. In support of 11 David's motion and just to give a little background I 12 guess and to discuss what we did back at the first 13 Clearly -- and then a statement was made meeting. 14 that there has been many times that I would love to be 15 considered -- my testimony and advice be considered 16 scientific due to my years on the water, but it's just 17 always been told to me that due to the fact that I'm 18 not educated scientifically and I don't have that background, that my information's anecdotal. 19 20 (Laughter.) So where it clearly talks 21 ZALES: 22 about "strike the written language," that this 23 Committee would establish scientific working groups.

In our discussion at the first meeting, we -- and it was a considered discussion -- we separated "stuff" and "are working" -- and "working" to cover anecdotal people like myself.

So in that respect I would encourage us to submit this as an amendment to the charter. And I have a question for Joe I guess, because I still don't quite understand, and it may just be the way this reads and the title, but the way I read this title this is this Committee's charter. The agency created it, but it's the charter on how this Committee will operate under the law.

And if that is the case, then under 2, friendly amendment where the comes in, which I supported, the fact that the Committee shall extend an invitation to the Corps of Engineers, they don't have to accept it if they don't want to come. But I think that they should be a necessary part and they should understand that we as a committee think they should be an integral part of this process, especially like was stated in Initial Water, they're the ones that issue permits for official reefs and things like this which are going to be part of the MPA process. So they are

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

an integral player and assistant.

MR. URAVITCH: Right. I'm not disagreeing with that. All I'm suggesting is that the process you're working on would have to be in the form of recommendations to the departments, that the departments will consider in terms of how, if, or whether this charter will be amended. That's all I'm suggesting.

MR. ZALES: And I guess another question. Then as a recommendation to the Departments of Commerce and Interior that this charter be amended, if they refuse to do that for whatever reason, and I guess if the administrative record that we feel by discussion is not good enough, then what I understand that while this language stayed the same, then we would be operating -- we would have to establish a scientific working committee.

MS. ERNST: Well, yeah, Joe, I had explained in the beginning that I had gotten advice from Alice McKenna, our attorney-advisor, that she felt that there was flexibility in the wording as it stood to allow the Committee to create working groups that weren't solely scientific in nature. And that

1 was how we prefaced the start of this discussion, and 2 then went back to revisit the changes from the June meeting. 3 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Good. I have 5 Ted, Lelei, Mike, Jacqueline, and Dave. CAPT. THOMPSON: Thank you, Chairman. 6 7 I speak in support of the motion to adopt 8 these amendments. I think it's very important to 9 clarify the basis under which our work is 10 And this certainly would clarify several undertaken. 11 of the questions I had very early on. 12 My only point here, sir, would be in point 13 2 on page 2. We have Department of Transportation in 14 square brackets, and I don't think a recommendation 15 should go forward with square brackets in it. I would offer a friendly amendment that we remove the square 16 17 brackets, because I can see where the Department of 18 Transportation could very easily have an interest in 19 this process landside versus maritime and how those 20 connect. 21 Thank you, sir. 22 MS. ERNST: The Chairman is letting me 23 explain the nature of those brackets. When this

charter was first approved the Coast Guard was still in the Department of Transportation. And rather than, now that the Coast Guard is in the Department of Homeland Security, I bracketed that, because we still could make a decision that we might want to invite the Administration within the Maritime Department Transportation onto our --CAPT. THOMPSON: Yes, ma'am. Having spent

31 years in the Coast Guard I fully understand that. And I'm recommending that we do indeed remove those brackets to invite MRAD and whoever else may --

And the other thing in regard MS. ERNST: to what Wally Pereyra was discussing with the Corps of Engineers being invited in, when we did send our letter to the Department of Defense inviting them to designate an ex-officio rep, they determined that the Navy would become their lead for the purposes of this. But that does not preclude us from going back.

And our -- Commander Kohanowich, who was here yesterday, I think at our ex-officio meeting in October welcomed the opportunity for us to broach the subject of bringing in the Corps during that meeting.

> MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, there was 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

1 suggestion for friendly amendment by Ted. 2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. with MR. BENTON: And the Chair's 3 4 indulgence I'll accept that friendly amendment if my 5 second does. 6 MR. ZALES: I would. 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you, 8 David. 9 Okay, Lelei. 10 MR. PEAU: Chairman, just a point of 11 clarification, and I don't know if this also warrants 12 a friendly amendment, but it's been noted and it's 13 been set twice on the operating budget -- I do not 14 sight. Ιf looking want to lose we're for 15 recommendation to the two federal agencies, one of the 16 thing I noted here is that on the annual cost of 17 operations, I mean we went through our working group 18 this morning. It was one of the recommendation that 19 was before it, and this certainly needs some attention 20 by our group. And also I did raise a question yesterday 21 22 during David Smith's presentation in terms of how much

or if Department of Interior putting in any money to

this. And the quick response was yes. And then I did ask for a budget detail by staff so that we understand what kind of budget we're operating from.

The concern, Mr. Chairman, is that there's a lot of work that needs to be done. And I think certainly warrants some sort of increase -- I mean a recommendation by this body to the two agencies for an increase of operating budget. I think that's a window of opportunity. As we speak there's FY '04 budget is under review, and I think it's certainly warrants some sort of communication to DOI to ensure that there is some attention put on an increase of operating budget. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could I make an observation? The charter says estimated to be 250,000, which in a sense -- are you saying that we ought to change this in some way so that we...

Well, I guess my question really is a procedural one to Joe and to Maggie and others. What is the right mechanism whereby we would make the case that we need more money? I'm not sure the charter is the place to do that, but I would defer to Joe and Maggie and Mary and anybody else on this.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 I'm not trying to defeat your point, 2 Lelei, but --Oh, I think it might be 3 MR. URAVITCH: 4 appropriate to just discuss that with more 5 agencies external to the process of a formal charter. 6 And this charter's going to have to go through a 7 renewal process within, what, the year? 8 VICE CHAIR McCAY: We start in June. 9 MR. URAVITCH: We start in June. 10 would take several months to make charter amendments 11 regardless. So I think it's appropriate at this 12 point, if I may say so, to come up with some ideas on 13 where you think it would make this Committee function 14 it discussed with better and then can be the 15 departmental senior officials. And we could take 16 those things into consideration. 17 MR. PEAU: Mr. Chairman, may I follow up 18 on that? 19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Go ahead. MR. PEAU: Mr. Chair, again I do not want 20 21 to lose sight of the request that I put forward yesterday. And this is through you, Mr. Chair, to ask 22 23 for a budget detail breakdown from staff so that we

know what the actual cost and so we can also be assisting the subcommittee in terms of their work plans.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Maggie says why are you looking at me?

MS. ERNST: Well, one thing I can say is that our attorney-advisor did describe this figure of \$250,000 in annual operating costs as an estimate and not an obligation. So that's one aspect.

Another thing that we're required to do every year is to report to the General Services Administration, which has oversight over all of the FACA committees in the government on what our costs have been. That is put into an annual report, and we just went through that process. And we -- and we also have to project what we think our next year's costs are going to be.

So in the course of doing that exercise for what it would cost in terms of trying to hold in this case three Committee meetings this year, I came up with an estimate of \$315,000, which goes above this ceiling, which would be what we would roughly spend to hold this meeting and then two more during fiscal year

1	'04. So that gives you an idea of what the cost would
2	be if we were to ramp up to one more full meeting.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Are you
4	okay with that so far? Your point will not be lost.
5	Mike then Dave, Wally, Bob, Rod, Jim Ray,
6	and Max. Mike.
7	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
8	Chairman. It was my understanding that the Corps of
9	Engineers was an agency within the Department of
LO	Defense and therefore their inclusion in here would be
L1	redundant.
L2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry, Mike. I was
L3	writing down names in the queue. I missed your
L 4	would you make it again?
L5	DR. CRUICKSHANK: It is my understanding
L6	that the Corps of Engineers is an agency within the
L7	Department of Defense.
L8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That is
L9	DR. CRUICKSHANK: And so therefore their
20	inclusion in this amendment would be redundant.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, yeah.
22	MS. ERNST: Well, I think the Departments
23	of Commerce and Interior would need to determine

whether they should set a precedent in allowing a department out have several ex-officio reps and get down to having multiple bureaus represented. And that would be something that we've just started to discuss, but haven't started to directly follow up on.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks, Maggie.

Jacqueline.

MS. SCHAFER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some -- many years experience in federal and state government prior to the outline that I provided yesterday. And among the things that I learned is, number one, don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. And, number 2, forgiveness is easier to get than permission.

And Max is right on point. The point's been made, but I'm going to make it again for emphasis. The charter is the prerogative of the two agencies that set up -- were told to set up this Advisory Committee in the Executive Order. But in addition to those two agencies, charters go through an exquisite interagency process at the federal level that involves coordination by the Office of Management and Budget.

NEAL R. GROSS

And predict because the can of I've had in setting up FACAs experience that and charter for FACAs in other context, that this could be a multi-month process. And I would not advise you all to rely on these changes as you to try to plan the workload that you have for even the next six months or a year because it simply may not happen in that context.

And likely someone will remind the rest of us that, look, we're going to be in the process of revising this anyway. That process, I believe we've been told, June. So why not just let it to catch up.

I'm not speaking at all to the substantive changes that we want to make a recommendation of, only to the process that I'm familiar with. We might want to satisfy ourselves with working in the context of the existing charter and knowing that there are workarounds that the lawyers at Commerce have already invited us to use.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do I interpret this to mean that if we do not establish a working group, even though it says we shall, the penalty for that will be less than the anguish that we endure by starting down

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

this road?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SCHAFER: That would be my judgment call on this one, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Dave, Wally, Bob, Rod, Jim Ray, Max, and Steve. Dave.

MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to try and help with some of this discussion, to clarify the intent of the motion a bit. And I was anticipating Max Peterson's comments, which I think are going to mirror the ones we just heard.

And I certainly can understand them and I understand the certainly can notion of seeking forgiveness instead of asking permission. But having said that, I think it's important for us to be on record at least that we believe that this is the way we should be operating, and make that recommendation. And it is just a recommendation to the agencies that are responsible for setting this Committee up, so that they have a clear picture of what -- how we would like to see things operate.

And if -- if the attorney-advisor believes that we have the flexibility to operate this way in the interim before this is changed in this manner,

NEAL R. GROSS

then sobeit, and that's a great thing. I would note that -- and this is for the record, Mr. Chairman.

I would note that it has been pointed out that Corps of Engineers is а part of the Department of Defense and it would be the intent of the motion, and I'm looking at my second to make sure that this is correct, that could be worded so it would be "Department of Defense, including the Corps of That wouldn't exclude the Engineers." Navy, example, but it could include Corps of Engineers. That's a clarification. It's not a substantive change in that regard.

The only other thing that I wanted, I guess wanted to speak to just briefly, Mr. Chairman, is that while I understand that -- maybe this is a bit redundant -- while I understand that a process to kick off looking at this charter would be, you know, seven months or eight months from now, we could also look at this as frontloading this process and maybe this time we'll get it sort of looked at and it goes through the interagency process that the new revision would go through anyway, there would already be this in there, sort of in the mix so people would be thinking about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 the consequences of the words they put in the original 2 one. I don't know if it was intentional, the 3 4 way that some of the wording here was, but a number of 5 us, as Bob have pointed out, have had experience with 6 that in the past. And I'm pleased that the attorney 7 has given us an interpretation of this, that allows us 8 to be flexible, but I'm not comfortable personally with not taking some action at this point. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you. Wе 11 are now five minutes beyond what we thought we might 12 use to break up. We still have six names on the list, and I'd like to ask, if you can, to make your pro and 13 14 con comments brief and to the point. And let's see if 15 we can't reach closure on this. 16 Wally, Bob, Rod, Jim Ray, Max, and Steve. 17 DR. PEREYRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 I'll tilt my head a little bit on the side. 19 really sure what Dave said, but I totally agree with 20 it. 21 (Laughter.) 22 But, in any event, --DR. PEREYRA: 23 MR. BENTON: That happened years -- for

many years, Mr. Chairman, we were on the same council together.

DR. PEREYRA: I notice that this charter was filed in December of 2002 and it expires December 2004. So probably about the time this whole process goes through the mill the charter is going to be suspended anyway. So for what it's worth.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's worth a lot. I'm not sure what, but, yes, it's -- thank you.

Bob.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. And I agree with everything Dave said and also Wally. And I would just like to emphasize that, first off, I appreciate the verbal comment that the attorney made. And I would request that that comment and advise be put in writing and distributed to every Committee Member here to say that should this not happen.

And I've also been involved in other advisory committees and panels and various meetings, having told at times that what a committee may want to do is not going to be done. And I've always been reluctant to change what a recommendation as a whole body would be just because somebody with an agency

NEAL R. GROSS

1	said "We're not going to do it." So I think that that
2	message needs to be clear to clarify this Committee's
3	intent. And I'll accept the wrath of the process
4	going through rather than taking the ease of just kind
5	of ignoring the thing, especially under a verbal
6	commitment rather than a written one.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Fine. Thank you very
8	much.
9	Rod.
10	DR. FUJITA: I pass, Mr. Chairman.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Pass. Jim Ray. Jim
12	Ray is consulting his lawyer. Jim, you're on.
13	DR. RAY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure
14	if my order I'm still speaking to a motion or not.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You are.
16	DR. RAY: Just one other comment is I
17	think it would be very useful for the agencies to
18	discuss the budget with the Chair and the Co-Chair so
19	that as we go forward and we look into whether or not
20	we need to have funds available for work groups, etc.,
21	you know where we are and you can advise the
22	subcommittee chairs accordingly. Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.

Max.

MR. PETERSON: I want to move to amend the motion to say that we recommend these changes be considered in connection with the new charter. That's to be begun in June. And that there also be a look at potentially increasing the dollars in it to allow the work groups to have some money to function.

And, Mr. Chairman, if I get a second I'll make a few comments.

MR. RADONSKI: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's been seconded.

Gil Radonski seconded it, okay.

MR. PETERSON: Let me just say I'm in sympathy with the motion. I think they have stated the case quite right. This Committee was set up to do work. We spent about an hour monkeying with the fine points of the charter, which is not what we were asked to do. We were asked to provide advice to the Secretary of Interior and so on on Marine Protected Areas.

Now it doesn't preclude us from spending time on other things, but that's not our charter. I'd also point out that it says, "Any working group

NEAL R. GROSS

1	created," it doesn't require us to create one single
2	working group. Just a point of clarification.
3	I think we need to get on with our
4	business, send this out and let them be considered as
5	part of the new charter.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So if I
7	understand this there's been an amendment to the
8	motion which is that the changes that have been
9	proposed in the main motion be considered as the new
10	charter is being worked out. Do I understand that
11	correctly?
12	MR. PETERSON: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do you have that,
14	Maggie?
15	Is that what you seconded, Gil?
16	Gil's talking to his lawyer.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that okay?
18	MR. RADONSKI: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.
20	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, a question on
21	the amendment?
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
23	MR. BENTON: Can we ask a question on the

amendment?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. BENTON: If the amendment passes and the -- but the agency said -- agencies said, oh, these aren't that substantive. We can get this done in a few weeks. What would be the effect of the amendment?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could you repeat the question?

MR. BENTON: Okay. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. If the amendment passed. If it passes and then the main motion passes by a subsequent vote, but the agencies say, oh, we could get this done in a week or two, or a month. What would be the effect of the amendment?

MR. PETERSON: Well, if I could point out?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. PETERSON: There is a detailed process set out in federal law governing this, which the General Services Administration is responsible for. I can assure you every department that's cited in this will have to run it through their attorney, run it through the agencies involved. And it usually takes from four to six months to run this process. And it

1 doesn't matter how serious the changes are, it's a 2 process question that will simply eat up lots and lots 3 of time. 4 And think we need to do this in 5 connection with the new charter. We need to look at 6 the budget for it, which has not been incorporated 7 into your motion. And I think we can do all that in 8 connection with the new charter. That's the proposal. 9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 10 MR. PETERSON: I'm not against your motion 11 as such. I'm just --12 MR. BENTON: Oh, no, no. I --13 MR. PETERSON: -- looking at process. 14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you very 15 much. 16 Steve Murray. DR. MURRAY: I have another issue to raise 17 18 with respect to this, unfortunately. I think that on 19 item number 4, under "Members and Chairperson," you'll 20 note the Committee has been set up for each Member to 21 be appointed to two-year terms and no Member shall 22 serve more than two consecutive terms. 23 Now what that means as I read it, if we

follow the strict adherence to this charter is that by the end of the second year we're all gone and there's a whole new group of people.

And I think that usually what happens in these committees is that there's a rotation that's set up. And what's missing here is the fact that there's no rotation, because everyone was appointed at the same time.

So as consideration is given to revising this charter, it's likely that this first group should probably have another year and then some sort of rotation could be set up. Otherwise either half of us are rotated off after one year, which is coming up pretty quickly, or we're all rotated off after two years, if I read this correctly. So I hate to throw another sort of issue on the table, but I think that does need to be addressed if we're going to live by this.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Maggie points out to me it doesn't say that we are all, all of us, are limited to one two-year term. It says, "shall be appointed to two-year term and may serve no more than two." So, yeah, two consecutive terms. But, again,

NEAL R. GROSS

is this -- yeah, sorry. Bob Zales.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. And I may offer another amendment, but I'm going to see if I might be able to support this amendment if this caveat was added to it, because I'm still not comfortable with a verbal statement from the attorney through Maggie, for that amendment to include the advisory-attorney to stipulate in writing that the comments that Maggie said, that we don't necessarily have to adhere with everything in this charter, because -- and I mean that -- and to some people it may be a thing. But this is a very serious thing because in fisheries management I've been affected and people that I represent have been affected too many times by simple legal language and the way things are done.

When you get into the Federal Register process and give people -- and I've just recently gotten on the things where I read the Federal Register every day, but when you don't read the Federal Register and you have proposed rules come out many times, the simple language is changed, can dramatically change the outcome of a proposed rule or regulation.

Τ.	so I would feel much more comfortable and
2	could support that, but without that stipulation I'll
3	have to offer that as an amendment and see if I can
4	get a second. And the way I understand Robert's
5	Rules, that would be the final amendment, and then we
6	do have to take a vote or further discussion.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So is this offered as a
8	friendly amendment and did I see the mover, original
9	mover nodding in agreement; is that
10	MR. BENTON: No, I can't. It's his, here.
11	He's speaking to this amendment.
12	MR. PETERSON: Would you state what you'd
13	like to add?
14	MR. ZALES: That the advising attorney
15	issue in writing her legal opinion that the statement
16	that she made to Maggie on the phone, that Maggie
17	would have to reread it. I don't remember the exact
18	verbiage of it, where basically Maggie says is this
19	the the advising attorney said we don't have to
20	really comply with this the way it's stipulated.
21	MS. ERNST: You have the flexibility
22	MR. ZALES: Right.
23	MS. ERNST: to form working groups that

1	aren't scientific in focus.
2	MR. ZALES: Which in my mind says that
3	then where the MFAC "shall establish," means that we
4	don't have to do that.
5	MR. PETERSON: No. It says "any committee
6	that is established."
7	MR. ZALES: No, no. Read number 3, and
8	remove you remove the strike out of "shall" and you
9	remove "may," it says, "The MFAC shall establish
10	scientific working groups." That's the initial
11	reading of the charter, and that's my concern.
12	MS. ERNST: It doesn't say when. It just
13	says you shall. So
14	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, boy. This is
16	wonderful. David.
17	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman. Every so often
18	it's been my limited experience that a five-minute
19	stand-down to allow a couple of people to confer has
20	been very fruitful in getting out of the thorny webs
21	we weave sometimes. And I'm looking to the Chair.
22	And if we could have a five-minute stand-down perhaps
23	we could sort this out in a manner that will get us

done.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, I'm all in favor of standing down, but I also would like to have us move along. Now maybe if you -- someone wants to table all of this, which is then nondebatable, and we can get on with our work groups and so on, and then come back and revisit this at the end of the day, which is what we were going to do anyway, if that qualifies as a stand-down, that's fine.

So I don't know what to do. I would -- is there anybody who wants to call the question or not?

MR. ZALES: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to move to table the issue until prior to recess today, and that'll give you longer than five minutes, and we can --

MR. BENTON: I'd second that.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Okay. So it's been moved to table both the original motion and the amendment. And it's been seconded and is not debatable, I guess, I believe.

MR. ZALES: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So now thank you all very much. This was wonderful.

1	MR. BENTON: Call the question, Mr. Chair.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Call the question. All
3	in favor of tabling both the amendment and the main
4	motion say "Aye."
5	[MEMBERS]: Aye.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?
7	MR. [SPEAKER]: Aye.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Duly recorded. The
9	motion passed.
10	So now the agenda says at 1:45 I'm
11	supposed to tell you what to do. I'm going to say go
12	off and do good work. And we have let me see my
13	calendar here. We have you back here at 3:15,
14	committees. We will repeat the process. We will go
15	around and report.
16	And since we need only three months to
17	dispense with the charter issue, we will terminate
18	just shortly before 5:00, so we can dispense with the
19	charter discussion. Thank you. Please go back and be
20	creative in your groups.
21	(Meeting recessed into subcommittee
22	meetings at 2:08 p.m., and resumed at 3:50 p.m.:)
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are we ready to re-

assemble? I think we're close to having most people here.

Okay. It's now 3:50. We spent about 35 or 40 minutes on the charter. We decide to, as David put it, stand down or back off or take a breather. And it was, I think, good advice, good intervention.

The way I would propose to proceed now is that we have about 55 minutes, 3:50 to 4:45 I'm proposing for reports. You're going to do what we did earlier today, an elaboration, a clarification. I assume that your groups or the subcommittees have made nice progress.

And at 4:45 I would propose to reopen the conversation about the charter. Mary Glackin was not able to be here at the time we were doing it. talked with Mary and I think she has some insights and advice for us. So unless there are objections, I would propose that we start now with reports back from the three groups, three subcommittees, the presumption that we can do that in 55 minutes or 53 And at 4:45 we'll take up the charter minutes. conversation again. Is that acceptable to people?

Okay. So group 1, I think --

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

1	MR. [SPEAKER]: Again, Mark is just
2	finishing up, so
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We can go to group 2.
4	MR. [SPEAKER]: just pass us up.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We'll go to group 2.
6	Lelei, is that you?
7	MR. PEAU: That's right.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Sorry to have
9	caught you with candy in your mouth.
LO	MR. PEAU: We thought we had a minute.
L1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Or we can go to group 3
L2	if you'd rather.
L3	MR. PEAU: Oh, no, group 2 is doing a
L4	PowerPoint here.
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, my gosh.
L6	MR. PEAU: Okay. Group 2 was tasked to
L7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, my gosh, look at
L8	this. Are we ready for this?
L9	MR. PEAU: Okay. Group 2 was able to do
20	this with limited resources.
21	(Laughter.)
22	MR. PEAU: But we're happy to represent on
23	our deliberation this afternoon. You know group 2 is

of those members.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We decided to -- after going through the morning discussions, and I think our assignment this afternoon was to develop a workplan and assignments, and to move forward with our discussion, we decided to formulate our workplan or our plan of action by a better definitions of meaning of Stewardship and Effectiveness.

This followed the preamble, which the Stewardship can be defined in different ways, but we look at Stewardship as an outcome for long-term care or as a final product at the end of the process.

We were also operating from a working assumption about National System, that we view this is not a federal but a national system. With the National System of MPAs, which are working substantive -- a National System has to include representative habitats from biogeographical regions. It has to exhibit biological connectivity. And it has to include stakeholders' involvement.

Next slide. We also, in the morning, we did group the eight bullets that were included in our subcommittee into two, the Stewardship and also the

Effectiveness. Under the Stewardship, we assigned our members to planning processes, the technology tools, the follow up by the incentives for compliance and enforcement.

The members is in brackets in terms of tasks. The fourth one is under human dimension, which include cultural and community. And then of course we have education and outreach, and then the augment of the website.

Under the Effectiveness, assessing of Effectiveness, we also tasked three or four members to look at the compliance and enforcement. This is monitoring evaluations. It's followed by training managers in effectiveness. And then the third one is on monitoring tools.

The group also decided to have a clear procedure process in place so that as a guiding briefs, we're also to assist our members of our group to more focus on the details. We created an outline for each of the chapters. The time line which provide the definition of issues by our first time line is December 15th.

The definitions, we include titles,

NEAL R. GROSS

definitions of each of the issues within the chapter, and then the key terms so that members are operating from the same principles or the same quidelines.

Our second guideline is on January 30th, which we decided to have our draft working outline, to our members for their input. And then this will provide feedback to each of the offer, and then it will go back to each of the individual for further work.

This has to be submitted and revised by the 15th, and then we decided that a working outline back to the chair, who will then submit it to the whole Committee by March 15th.

submit the Our group three recommendations. Our group recommended the shall request the Secretary of Commerce to reach out to partner agencies for financial support, for hosting the next meeting. This is also in the line with what we submitted this morning. Also too I think it's really important that we do have the resources available to this body but also to our working group for implementations and to carry out their task.

We also recommend that the background

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

materials be available in CDs. This was noted by some of the members. It's really difficult not only to compile all the information and take it back. We want to make sure that everyone received the same -- the information at the same time and allowed the members optimum time to prepare for future meetings.

We also submit that either the subcommittee number 1 or the entire Committee shall define a National System of MPA as soon as possible. I think it's really important that this is dealt with. This will alleviate any confusions or duplications of efforts, but we see this as an urgent need, to get that solved as soon as possible.

There you have it, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All I can say is to groups 1 and 3: Top that if you can. Right?

There will be time for comments and questions. The way I see this is you have a set of working guidelines for yourselves. I mean those deadlines. They operate on you, and then you have three recommendations that you're bringing to us that you would like us to act upon. Do I read you correctly?

MR. PEAU: That's absolutely right.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The first part of that, we don't need to approve that. We need to say -- you either say, yes, that's wonderful, go do it. Or, that seems wrong-headed. But that's your own mandate, your own schedule, your own set-asides. These last three things are for us to consider. Is that right?

MR. PEAU: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. All right.

Reactions to this, questions for Lelei or anybody
else?

MR. [SPEAKER]: Good work.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Bob.

ZALES: Yeah. Bob Zales. MR. On the recommendations part, I especially like -- I like all three, but I especially like the first. In this would just add that not only just request the Secretary of Commerce, but I would also add the Secretary of Interior to, as a group, to give a look at the other agencies. I mean you have Fish and Wildlife or whoever under Interior, and possibly the Fishery Service under Commerce and maybe NOS or somebody that a recommendation could go so that if for some reason

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

1	or another we were to meet in an area where some
2	others are, that it may have joint resources there
3	that would help in the MPA Center with money as far as
4	meeting space and lodging, stuff like that.
5	MR. PEAU: Mr. Chairman, because of the
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, go ahead.
7	MR. PEAU: That is the intent of our
8	group, to include other federal partners.
9	I'd also like, Mr. Chair, for if I
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, please do.
11	MR. PEAU: I also would like to submit as
12	a recommendation for the whole body to accept the
13	report as submitted.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Thank you.
15	Okay. With that in mind why don't we back
16	up if I may suggest this. Could we back up and
17	look at your own internal recommendations, your own
18	internal structure of guidelines first, and we'll come
19	back to the recommendations. Is that okay if we do
20	that?
21	MR. PEAU: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So they're
23	proposing and I gather I hear them asking us to

1	approve, sign off on their own internal structure.
2	And it's changing before my eyes. I'm trying to
3	figure out what am I reading here. Move away from
4	that darn machine.
5	MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman?
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
7	MR. PETERSON: They made three specific
8	recommendations.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That did indeed.
10	MR. PETERSON: As I understood, that's
11	what they're asking us to accept.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, but
13	MR. PETERSON: But not three I don't
14	think we want to get into the internal organization of
15	the
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I fully agree. Thank
17	you, Max. But if they're going to come back to us on
18	March 15th with something and ask us to approve it, it
19	would behoove us, I think, to have discussed and
20	thought about that before they march off and then come
21	back to us on March 15th saying, well, you didn't
22	object to what we said we were going to do, and in
23	fact maybe we do.

So I'm trying to get a sense of the Committee. I don't know how quite we want to do that, but I do think we want to give them a go-ahead or a are-you-sure kind of reaction to their own internal structure. So that's my reason for having this conversation.

Gil, and then Bob has his hand up, and Mary.

MR. RADONSKI: Yeah. I'd like to elaborate on our internal program there. One thing that was omitted here, these chapters are going to be based on looking at the needs assessment document that was provided to us by the MPA Center.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.

MR. RADONSKI: And we, the individual members of our subcommittee will take those elements, as you see up on the screen, review the needs and assessment documents and any other pertinent documents that came to us as sort of winnowing out where the MPA Center thinks that this program is going and what it needs to do. And we are going to review that page by page and assemble these things, and that's what we're going to provide back.

And we were sort of hoping that the other subcommittees, we can't dictate to them obviously, but we encourage other members of the whole Committee to review that needs and assessment document maybe as it pertains to their charge within their subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. RADONSKI: So that we can get a feeling for if there is gaps in it, if it's going in the right direction. But we're going to take advantage of their effort to bring together a lot of people to distill these things that are distilled in

that document. That's where we're going with it.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thanks, Gil. Bob Zales.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. And to go along with what I guess Gil has been tasked with, outreach and education, and just kind of jump ahead a little bit, our committee, we didn't get to that point because that's something in the future for us maybe. I believe the stakeholder interest was there.

And one comment that I made at the end of our meeting was, and how to approach stakeholders.

And I'm a big fan of frontloading information with

NEAL R. GROSS

1	stakeholder input, and that goes along with education
2	and outreach.
3	And I would encourage this panel to look
4	at that to once we get basic ideas on where we're
5	headed and where we think we want to go, to on our
6	public hearing process for this Committee, to throw
7	that frontloading aspect in there, to get input, sort
8	of hear some ideas from us of what you all think they
9	tell us, the public tells us what they think. Then we
10	go and further work, and then at the end of the whole
11	process, bring them back to, okay, here's what we
12	thought, what do you all think we did, this kind of
13	thing.
14	MR. RADONSKI: Just follow up on that?
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
16	MR. RADONSKI: One thing we left of the
17	side, and I, and I've convinced my fellow Committee
18	Members to look at this as interactive outreach. It's
19	not a one-way street. It's a two-way street.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.
21	Mary.
22	MS. GLACKIN: I think I can pass. Gil's
23	comments really helped me in understanding what I was

seeing here.

2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Tundi.

DR. AGARY: I just had a question for Terry for looking at the human dimension and whether you all were -- Terry, whether you will and whether the committee, the subcommittee was already looking at the issue of how to identify heroes. You know, how to identify individuals who will be committed to Marine Protected Area effectiveness and how to identify incentives to keep those heroes working for the purpose of the Marine Protected Area.

Personally I think it's an incredibly important thing, and without individuals all of stewardship can fall by the wayside.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks, Tundi.

MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you, Tundi. I think myself and our committee, we concur that at the end of the day that the stewardship and the individuals are what will make an MPA system work or not, and so thank you for the comments. I captured heroes, incentives.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So let me see if we can't bring closure to this first part, which is their

1	own internal working thing. Is it the sense of the
2	Committee that we say to them: This looks fine and on
3	March 15th we look forward to receiving something from
4	you. Is that in order here? Is that the way we want
5	to proceed with the subcommittees?
6	MR. ZALES: Well, do you want to put a
7	date specific or just by the next meeting?
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, they have their
9	own deadline, but that we'll be done and that we'll
10	therefore be received by the full Committee when we
11	next meet, which we have to decide tomorrow morning.
12	MR. RADONSKI: That's what the target is,
13	Chairman.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Pardon me?
15	MR. RADONSKI: The target is the next
16	meeting.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Indeed, that's right.
18	Yeah. Is that okay?
19	All right. Could I Bonnie, I hope you
20	don't take this personally, if we're going to use
21	PowerPoint and so on, I love your backgrounds, but I
22	can't read the text in front of it. And would there
23	be if we're going to use PowerPoints, could we kind

of -- sorry, I have a hard time. And this is I can see, but when it's clouds and water and so on, I have a hard time reading the print. So if we're going to do PowerPoints, sorry. Okay.

Now we have three recommendations. In a sense, they are asking us as a committee to do three things. Or asking me. Seek more money to host the next meeting, background materials distributed on CD, and either a subcommittee 1 or the full Committee define a National System. These are recommendations to us, all right.

Yes, Jim.

DR. RAY: Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification. Why the request for additional funds from other agencies for the next morning? In our discussions earlier today we talked about the longer-term need for an increased budget to cover costs such as work groups and things of that -- but I didn't realize we had a budget shortfall for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, --

MR. RADONSKI: I'm glad you brought that up. Chairman, Maggie said that if we have two more

NEAL R. GROSS

1	meetings in this fiscal year, it would raise the
2	budget to 315,
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's correct.
4	MR. RADONSKI: instead of 250, And
5	we are trying to look for ways to come up with that
6	additional 65k.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. I'm
8	going to let Maggie and Joe talk.
9	MS. ERNST: I can just say that we paid
10	for this meeting with FY '03 funds, so technically we
11	would be having two meetings in FY '04 using that
12	fiscal year funding.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Joe, did you want to
14	MR. URAVITCH: Yes, if I may. I just
15	wanted to raise a question about the third
16	recommendation. I mean we're hopefully engaged in a
17	multi-year process to design the framework for a
18	National System of MPAs. So I'm sort of wondering
19	where that recommendation leads.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Terry.
21	MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, within our
22	committee, effectiveness is one of our charges. And
23	we discussed the fact that there are existing MPAs and

1 the effectiveness of those, we train the manager so 2 they can effectively measure and reach their objectives. So that those managers can be successful. 3 4 But we do have future MPAs that haven't 5 been designed yet that will be presumably part of some 6 national network or system and that the effectiveness 7 of those MPAs as they relate not necessarily to that 8 specific site but to the National System. We thought 9 it was important that we understand what the goals are 10 of a National System so that we might be able to 11 create ways that effectiveness might be measured on a 12 national basis. And Bonnie brought up the 13 MR. RADONSKI: 14 idea, and we wanted to stress it, that this is a 15 National System, not a federal system. 16 MR. O'HALLORAN: Right. 17 MR. RADONSKI: And a lot of people may 18 feel that because this is a program led by the federal 19 government and the Department of Commerce that it's a 20 federal system. And we want to make that clear, that 21 it's a National System. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, okay. I have 23 Jim, I have Bob Zales, and I have Rod, and we are

squeezing up against a time deadline here. So Jim Ray.

Okay, Bob Zales.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. I've just got a suggestion, and I don't want to take anything away from the chair of our committee, to you but this was committee 2. And that third recommendation I think we've tried to address somewhat in our committee. So you may want not go to the formal thing of tabling, but you may want to hold off on this recommendation and let Mark show you ours and show where we are, and then come back to this.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. ZALES: That may help in the process of understanding.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think I like that, if people will agree to it. Because in a sense we have, if I can find Wednesday morning's agenda, we have a 8:30 final discussion at in the morning of subcommittees, the discussion of the committee work, we only have a half an hour for that. But maybe we things should hear the other from the other subcommittees. Is that acceptable --

1	MR. RADONSKI: Sure. Sure.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: to number 2? Not to
3	take anything away from the marvelous work you've
4	done, but I think Bob has hit on something that's a
5	good idea. Let's just move on; may we do that?
6	Okay. So thank you, Lelei.
7	And, Bonnie, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to
8	the background of your PowerPoints are beautiful.
9	VICE CHAIR McCAY: I'm sorry. I didn't
_0	have time to adjust them.
.1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Please accept my
.2	apologies for my failing eyesight.
.3	Tony.
.4	DR. CHATWIN: Mr. Chair, just I'm sorry, I
_5	didn't quite understand what you just proposed. Are
-6	you proposing to postpone the discussion of these
7	recommendations till tomorrow?
-8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm proposing that we
.9	let groups 1 and 3 get their reports out before us and
20	then be mindful of the hour, because we do want to
21	dispense with the charter stuff. And all I'm saying
22	is we do have a half an hour in the morning where, as
2	Bob indicated maybe there is some overlap or some

1	implication for group number 1 that group number 2 is
2	suggesting.
3	DR. CHATWIN: Yeah. I think it's a good
4	idea to go with the other committees' reports. I'm
5	not going to be here and I understand other people
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see.
7	DR. CHATWIN: on the subcommittee are
8	not going to be here tomorrow.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
10	DR. CHATWIN: So the more we can do today
11	the better. Thanks.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Rod, I had you on the
13	list, I think, didn't I? And then Mel.
14	DR. FUJITA: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
15	Chairman. Just to comment and respond to Joe's
16	question. I think we're on the right track here. I
17	think the sense of the subcommittee with respect to
18	that recommendation was we recognize that it's going
19	to be a multi-year process to actually develop the
20	system, so our choice of terms may not have been
21	accurate there.
22	But the concept was in order to evaluate
23	the effectiveness of the system we need to know what

1	the attributes of the system are as opposed to the
2	attributes of individuals. And I just got this piece
3	of paper from, I guess, subcommittee 1 which I think
4	accomplishes that.
5	DR. CHATWIN: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
7	DR. CHATWIN: Yes, it does.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. So, Tony,
9	let's keep chugging on and maybe we can take care of
10	you, protect you, so you are here for that discussion.
11	Mark, are you ready to go? Are you number
12	1?
13	DR. HIXON: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry. Mel. I had
15	Mel on.
16	MR. MOON: Mr. Chairman, and I was going
17	to reserve this one to the tone that I had to talk
18	about in our committee discussions, but it did arrive
19	at a consideration for the structure of tomorrow's
20	meetings.
21	We're finding that it would be an
22	opportunity well spent if we were able to get together
23	again for a short period tomorrow morning. So I just

wanted to bring that to everybody's attention while
we're sort of talking about what's going to happen
tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. MOON: We could keep it in mind that
that is an option that we would like to entertain.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, I understand that.

Any others who would like to be heard before we switch to Mark?

Okay, Mark. Group 1, I gather.

DR. HIXON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So committee 1 met to grapple with this idea of a goal statement or some kind of vision statement of what exactly a national network of Marine Protected Areas would be. The discussion centered around two things, first the Executive Order itself. We carefully re-examined the wording of the Executive Order. And then we also borrowed Mary Jean Comfort's presentation which was inspiring to a number of the subcommittee members. Had a long discussion and actually a fairly productive discussion, given that our subcommittee represented a very diverse group of

NEAL R. GROSS

Thank you, Mel.

stakeholders.

And our intent was to provide a draft statement of these goals and visions for what a national network would look like, to get the discussion started and to serve as a starting point based on this cross-section of stakeholders.

So if we could get that up on the screen for the audience and somehow expand it.

Something we want to emphasize is that, first, this is our first stab at the draft. You'll recognize much of the wording again to be straight from the Executive Order as well as from some of the bullets from Mary Jean's presentation.

So once it's up there I will read it.

What we would like to draft to serve is as a starting point for discussion. One thing that uniformly within our subcommittee we request of the entire Committee is that we not get into wordsmithing but, rather, address the high level issues, the high level concepts that would go into the statement. So I'll read this into the record.

We never came up with a really good title, so we just are tentatively calling this some kind of

goal/vision statement for a national network of Marine Protected Areas.

qoal/vision is develop The to comprehensive network of effective MPAs, was in the broader ocean management framework that represents diverse U.S. marine ecosystems, safequards the and cultural marine nation's natural heritage, ecologically and economically sustainable promotes use, and raises awareness and knowledge of U.S. marine and coastal areas.

The national network may include but not be limited to areas representing different ecosystem types, areas closed to specific fishing activities and/or gear types, areas managed to protect at-risk and endangered species and supporting habitats, unique biophysical and geological features and cultural resources, and areas vital to particular species such as spawning, nursery, and feeding habitats.

This network would recognize and incorporate processes that maintain ecosystem structure and function, linkages between MPAs and the broader environment, and ecologically connectivity via larval dispersal and other movements of organisms.

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

1 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Is that it? 2 MR. [SPEAKER]: Wow, a good job. 3 DR. HIXON: That's it. 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 5 Thank you. DR. HIXON: 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. So I have 7 Bob, I have Gil, and Jacqueline. Bob. 8 MR. ZALES: Yeah. Bob Zales. I would 9 like to have the Committee discuss, I'd like to see 10 under the second bullet areas closed to specific 11 fishing activities and/or gear types. I'd like to see 12 the words "fishing and/or gear types" removed and just 13 basically it say "areas closed to specific 14 activities." 15 The reason for that is because there are 16 many activities besides fishing and gears that can 17 affect an MPA. You have boating, you have anchoring, 18 diving activities, things of this nature. So I think 19 if you just remove "fishing and/or gear types" and 20 just put "activities," it takes care of that broad spectrum of the various activities which can 21 22 involved.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could I ask a question

1 of information? I mean is this in the form now of 2 something you wished the full Committee to adopt at this moment or is it just sort of a working kind of 3 4 hypothesis? And the question I have is, okay, now 5 what are you folks going to do? I mean this is a statement -- we heard 6 7 from group 2 about all these tasks they're going to 8 And so the obvious question that I have is, okay, do. fine, but before we strike words and wordsmith this 9 10 thing, now what? DR. HIXON: A point of clarification. 11 12 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Sorry, but --Yeah. Our intent -- I tried 13 DR. HIXON: 14 to say this before. Our intent was to offer this as a 15 working document that would evolve after full 16 Committee input. 17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 18 DR. HIXON: Our intent is not to resort to 19 specific wordsmithing per se, although Bob was very 20 succinct, and I appreciated that. I mean his point was to talk about specific activities rather than 21 22 point out fishing, per se. That's the type of 23 discussion that I believe is appropriate.

I would like to add one other point that came up early on in our discussion and that is it is unclear in the Executive Order whether nonliving, nonrenewable resources are included under the Executive Order.

There was an initial statement that, well, no, oil, gas, minerals, and whatnot are not included. However the Executive Order specifically refers to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act which, in fact, addresses oil, gas, and minerals. So that's unclear to this subcommittee, and we would like the departments to clarify exactly whether those resources are part of our charge.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you. Gil.

MR. RADONSKI: Yeah. I back up what Bob just said. We need to eliminate that "fishing activity" or "gear types," or include others. And I was particularly concerned about extractive activities, but I can accept the remarks that Mr. Zales provided, and I think that's very constructive.

Also I am concerned in the first paragraph, the title of this thing is a national

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

network. And by saying "U.S. marine ecosystems" and "U.S. marine and coastal areas," smacks of federal again instead of national. And I think we could delete "U.S." in both those cases and still have this in a context of a national network.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Jacqueline.

MS. SCHAFER: Yes. I'd like to raise the question about the selection of the term "network" versus the term "system," which is found throughout the Executive Order. I don't see the term "network" anywhere. We've been using it I think relatively interchangeably, but I can wordsmith this to show a major distinction between the two. And I'd like the Committee to address why "network," as I would prefer to see "system" which is consistent with the Executive Order.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Mark, do you want to respond to that?

DR. HIXON: Yes. The discussion regarding "system" versus "network" was quite thorough and quite explicit. It was decided that after long discussion that "network" was a less loaded term politically.

1	That particularly at the state level, states would
2	react to being called part of a system more than they
3	would to being part of a network. So it was using
4	presumably using a word that was a little less or
5	cause a little less reaction.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I have David, I
7	have John, and I have Rod. Dave.
8	MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9	Dave Benton. I certainly understand and I support
10	what Bob Zales, the points he raised. I think he's
11	correct. But I also heard the response back, well,
12	we're not intended to wordsmith this. And I've got a
13	couple I could see immediately.
14	I sort of like this because in order to
15	qualify, an area would have to represent a different
16	ecosystem type; be close to specific activities;
17	manage, protect endangered biophysically, the cultural
18	resources, and be vital to particular species because
19	of the "ands" instead of the "ors." Just an editorial
20	comment.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: With reference to
22	nothing at all.
23	MR. BENTON: That's just a joke. It's

1	late in the day. But I didn't hear a response to your
2	question, Mr. Chairman, about sort of what the next
3	step is here. If this is a working definitional
4	document for the Committee to do something further,
5	without it being endorsed by the full body, then my
6	comfort level is won. If it's something that we're
7	asked to endorse, and I think we do need to do some
8	wordsmithing and I would certainly support what Bob is
9	saying, and I think if we did nothing else we would
10	want to send that message to the Committee even if we
11	weren't endorsing it. That's okay.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: My concern as well.
13	That's precisely why I raise the question.
14	MR. BENTON: So it might be useful to have
15	that discussion or presentation from the subcommittees
16	and see where we go from there.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think it would. And
18	there is time for it. The dilemma I face is when is
19	the time for that.
20	John, let's go on. John and Rod. John.
21	DR. OGDEN: Well, just a quick point of
22	clarification. What is the "broader ocean management
23	framework" in this document? Can you fill me in on

1 what --2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Sorry. Не was 3 distracting. You're going to have to repeat it. 4 DR. HIXON: I was distracting him. 5 DR. OGDEN: It's okay. The "broader ocean 6 management framework," what is that? 7 DR. HIXON: That refers to the existing 8 authorities that manage the U.S. territorial sea. The 9 idea was that in discussion that it's not politically 10 realistic to suggest that we're creating a new federal 11 department or agency dealing with MPAs, but rather 12 than there's already existing mandates and laws. Okay. Sort of the sum total 13 DR. OGDEN: 14 without detail? Okay. 15 DR. HIXON: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Rod. 17 DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 Two questions, Mark. Did the subcommittee 19 intend that the National System would sort of 20 proactively ensure or seek to ensure that representative habitats would be within the system? 21 Because the language as I read it right now doesn't 22 23 It's more the area could include indicate that to me.

representatives, but it doesn't have to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. HIXON: Yeah. Yes, that is the intent. And that's presumably included on the second line where it says that it represents diverse, U.S. marine ecosystems. So the intent there was making sure there was representation.

At one point the word "all" was in there, but we fell into definitional difficulties where, as you know, the definition of an ecosystem in the marine context is not explicit.

Thanks. DR. FUJITA: And the second pointed I'd like to make is I appreciate Mr. kind of framing of how to talk about what these areas are close to or what they're trying to achieve. And in addition to his intervention, I'd like to offer the construction that we heard from Mary Jean, which I And it's kind of a performance-based like a lot. approach. It's rather -- well, it's preventing adverse impacts in the matter of what the activity might be, is another way to think about that concept.

And the advantage of course is that it anticipates technical innovation and doesn't constrain the manager to any set of specific activities that's

laid down at the moment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Mike.

DR. CRUICKSHANK: There was another -- an issue that the Chairman mentioned just now about the inclusion of hard minerals and how there are known living resources in the gulfs. And we had prepared a couple of questions for the departments with regard to I'd like to read them. They're in draft just And if it's appropriate they can be produced in for another forum discussion by the complete Committee, the whole Committee.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.

DR. CRUICKSHANK: The first question to both. Clarification is needed from the Department of Interior and from the Department of Commerce on whether areas designated as leases or other set-asides under the Commercial Lands Act of 1978 and the Marine Hard Mineral Resources Development Act of 1966 be included or excluded wholly or selectively from the inventory of national MPAs. That question is whether to include or not include these particular areas, which are now existing.

1	The second question was with regard again
2	to money, I suppose, but it said this was to the
3	Department of Interior. In the development of a
4	national MPA inventory does the Department of Interior
5	through MMS have the authority to require coastal
6	states with leases held under the OCS Lands Act to
7	contribute data on existing MPAs which are adjacent to
8	the OCS leases but in their territorial or coastal
9	waters.
10	So this is a possibility that if the
11	department of the MMS has that authority to request
12	states provide the data, they could do that and there
13	would be a certain cost attached to it which perhaps
14	could transfer to this Committee in the event it was
15	required.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you.
17	Terry.
18	MR. O'HALLORAN: On the question of
19	endorsing this as a full Committee as a whole, in my
20	mind I think it's premature for us to tackle that.
21	And it is 4:30 and my brain is pretty well fried at
22	this moment.
23	I commend that committee for coming up

with a good draft here. And I think for the purposes at least of our subcommittee, we have at least enough to work on between now and the next meeting. And it gives us a chance to think about it and perhaps give recommendations back to that committee.

But rather than get bogged down into what is going to be a very long discussion I think, I think that we could accept this as kind of a working draft and go from there.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike.

MR. NUSSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will give these comments not in wordsmithing but in sort of trying to understand the process and also towards the last comment; I think that's the appropriate way to continue or to go ahead with this.

As I look at this, and I'm looking through the Executive Order and trying to understand where the different pieces and bits came from and trying to pull it all together. Much of it I can find fairly readily. But something that seems to be lost here, and maybe it's just the way I'm looking at it, but I looked to your last -- I'll call it the last piece, how's that -- "the national net would recognize and

NEAL R. GROSS

1 incorporate." I see some of these I can recognize, 2 but then I see the "ecological conductivity," the 3 "larval dispersal and other movements of organisms," 4 which I'm not quite sure what that is or where that 5 comes from. But then we've blocked out things like 6 7 monitoring and evaluation, components that are in the 8 Notice, threats in gap assessments, economic impacts. 9 And I'm wondering if that's just a -- am I missing 10 something or were these left out on purpose or is this 11 a further draft, that perhaps further drafting's 12 needed. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 13 Thank you. 14 A quick response and then I need to make a 15 16 DR. HIXON: Yes. All your points were 17 discussed, Mike. And the intent is that that is part 18 of the process. We started with the overarching goal 19 and vision. The process will include all those 20 things, but we didn't get there. 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Okay. May I say 22 the following, given the hour? I jokingly said, okay, 23 now what, and I think Terry O'Halloran anticipated a

1 little bit what I'd like to say. And that is that may 2 I say to you as a subcommittee that you've given us a nice goal and vision statement that needs more work. 3 4 And you've gathered that from the conversation. 5 There are a number of things that you 6 haven't done, and you know that. I don't mean that to 7 be critical. But in number 1 there's inventory, there's criteria. 8 There's some other stuff. Would 9 you mind if I ask that you, as group number 2 is going 10 to do, spend the period between now and March 15th 11 doing things that they didn't have time now to do? 12 Would it be all right if I asked on behalf Committee that 13 of the by March 15th you 14 consultation with all of us through email and through 15 other means of communication that you work on this a 16 little bit but also come back with some other things 17 that might be in the bullet? 18 What do you think, Mark? 19 DR. HIXON: Absolutely. In fact we did discuss that. 20 21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. 22 DR. HIXON: Two things right upfront that 23 we're going to grapple with is starting to form a

1	working group that provides information regarding some
2	of the issues Mike just brought up,
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
4	DR. HIXON: as well as providing
5	feedback on the Federal Register Notice providing
6	criteria for Marine Protected Areas.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Are you
8	comfortable allowing them to constitute a working
9	group, and you'll communicate by email or however you
10	wish to do it? There's no extra meeting implied by
11	this right now, is that right, or is there?
12	DR. HIXON: We did not plan a meeting as
13	yet, no.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Fine. Is that okay if
15	we are we within the law to ask them? Mary,
16	MS. GLACKIN: Well, I'm
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're looking eager.
18	MS. GLACKIN: I get up from my seat for a
19	second. So is this a working group like the
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, it's not a working
21	group. In fact, it's
22	(Laughter.)
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's why I asked.

1	You know, we are going to
2	MS. GLACKIN: So it's not a working group.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It is not a working
4	group. It is a rump group. That's group number 2
5	MS. GLACKIN: Wait a second.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I know. I've been
7	watching. The minute you jump up we're going to
8	switch something in.
9	So, Mark, is that consistent with what
-0	your group was thinking about doing?
.1	DR. HIXON: To my knowledge, yes.
.2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So does the
.3	Committee, the full Committee feel comfortable letting
4	them go ahead and work on this? John.
_5	MR. ZALES: Yes. Just one quick thing
-6	since I didn't hear any real objections to removing
7	"fishing and/or gear types," and the issue that Gil
-8	brought up striking "U.S." because it's a national
9	thing, could we go ahead and with the concurrence of
20	the subcommittee, I guess, and the full Committee,
21	just go ahead and strike that and then continue on
22	with the discussion on our own?
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I can see what happens

1	if that comes up as a motion. I guess I'd prefer to
2	assume that they heard you and that they will work on
3	it and modify it. And we will make sure when it comes
4	back to us at our next meeting that everybody in this
5	room is happy with the language they come back with.
6	DR. HIXON: And, Bob, since you're a
7	member of the subcommittee, I'm sure this will happen.
8	(Audio feed from the PA system to the
9	recorder malfunctioned. Transcription continues with
10	the static present on the recording:)
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: David, we need to get
12	to the next group.
13	MR. BENTON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We'll
14	move right along.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. Group 3.
16	MR. MOON: It's me, Mr. Chairman.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. I'm a
18	little frazzled at this time of day.
19	MR. MOON: It's getting late in the day.
20	Our discussion was started out with the three points
21	that we had arrived at earlier in the day, the
22	outreach and coordination with the MPA Center,
23	fostering interagency coordination and the concerns of

1	nonconsumptive uses and being included in that issue
2	
3	THE RECORDER: I'm sorry. With the sound
4	I'm getting a bunch of static. I can't record.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: record. There was
6	some implication in
7	THE RECORDER: Something fell and that's
8	where all the problems started. I'm sorry.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, that's fine.
10	(Static present on recording:)
11	THE RECORDER: I'm sorry about that.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, that's all right.
13	May we proceed?
14	THE RECORDER: I can't record.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You can't record. Help
16	is on the way.
17	Mark.
18	DR. HIXON: Yeah.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You do get a chance to
20	get back at me for that.
21	DR. HIXON: No, no, no problem.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Group 3, Mark.
23	DR. HIXON: Yeah. I understand before I

came that there was a motion or a suggestion that at 8:30 tomorrow rather than having a plenary discussion regarding the subcommittees, that we actually break out again. And subcommittee 1 would endorse that proposal.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. And I have heard from subcommittee 3 that they too would like that. And here is the dilemma that I see or here is the context in which I am going to try to address that.

At 8:30 in the morning we have one half-hour. At 8:30 in the morning we have one half-hour prior to the public comment period in which there is a final discussion of subcommittees and discussion of Committee work. What I would like to have happen in that half-hour is that all three of the groups come back to us for one ten-minute, one more ten-minute session each in which they tell us exactly what they plan to do between now and the next meeting.

Now group 2, I guess it is clear on that, right? And we've sort of endorsed that. Group 1 probably wants to come back and elaborate a little bit on what you think you might do?

DR. HIXON: Unless I can assemble my

NEAL R. GROSS

1	subcommittee
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Beforehand. Yes.
3	How do you feel about seven o'clock
4	breakfasts?
5	MS. DINKINS: I can't do that. I have
6	conference calls. I might be the only one, though,
7	who's otherwise packed up, but
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That was Carol Dinkins.
9	MS. DINKINS: Is the mic working again?
_0	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is there a chance this
.1	evening?
_2	Okay. I'd like to ask, Mel, why don't you
_3	go ahead and proceed with your group and group number
_4	1, think about whether you might be able, because Mel
_5	has asked for half an hour in which the groups could
-6	meet. And I've denied his request, but I can always
-7	be overruled. But I try it once.
-8	Yeah. Well, between 8:00 and 8:30 is
L9	sign-in time which is really dead time. And so,
20	Carol, could I ask you yeah, Mark.
21	DR. HIXON: Can I just make a request?
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
23	DR. HIXON: Subcommittee number 1, please

1	see me when we recess immediately.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And I think Mel is
3	going to ask his group the same thing. Is that right,
4	Mel?
5	MR. MOON: Yeah, that's right.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I'm sorry, but
7	
8	DR. HIXON: Everyone in subcommittee 1,
9	hear me and agree, please? Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We cannot meet into the
11	public comment period. By law we can't. And
12	appearances tell us that we should not do that. And
13	then we have a break which we can dispense with, but
14	then we have a discussion on the next meeting, venue
15	and dates. And can you imagine how long that's going
16	to take.
17	And then we have 45 minutes for an agenda
18	for the next meeting, and I can imagine how long
19	that's going to take. So I am very worried about
20	those things.
21	I'm sorry. There was a hand back here.
22	David, hand.
23	MR. BENTON: Yeah, I'm sorry, Mr.

1	Chairman. It sounds like, because I was over having a
2	I was conferring, but we're discussing we haven't
3	had the report from group 3 yet.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That is correct, we
5	have not.
6	MR. BENTON: All right. And are we going
7	to get the other issue that was tabled until it was
8	supposed to come back before us before we recessed
9	tonight.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. We're going to
11	get at that at 4:45.
12	MR. BENTON: Fine enough. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: But don't look at your
14	watch because it is now 4:45.
15	MR. BENTON: But we're still going to get
16	to that this evening.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I know that. I know
18	that.
19	MR. BENTON: Okay. No, that was the
20	question.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So we're going to hear
22	from group 3. And as long as Mary Glackin is still
23	here we're going to do the charter discussion. So,
	II

1	Mel.
2	MR. MOON: We met, went through the points
3	that earlier today. Seems like yesterday. The
4	outreach and coordination by the MPA Center, the
5	fostering and coordination
6	THE RECORDER: Got the same problem back.
7	MR. MOON: Okay.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry, Mel.
9	MS. ERNST: Does this microphone work?
10	Does it on the recorder's?
11	THE RECORDER: I'm trying.
12	(Static present on recording:)
13	THE RECORDER: All microphones have
14	static.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Static has set
16	in. Okay. What is your pleasure? We can't really
17	proceed. She's called.
18	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What, David?
20	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, is it a
21	requirement of statute that (static) be recorded?
22	Because I think we can all reach (static) go ahead and
23	proceed. It really comes down to (static).

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What does the law
2	require? Pardon me, Mary?
3	MS. GLACKIN: I don't believe it's
4	required to be recorded.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It is not required it
6	be recorded.
7	MR. [SPEAKER]: That is correct.
8	MR. BENTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would
9	recommend that we go ahead
LO	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Go ahead.
L1	MR. BENTON: and see
L2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And I'm sorry about the
L3	static. Can you just turn the volume down?
L 4	THE RECORDER: Yes.
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you for letting
L6	us know, but I think we're going to proceed.
L7	All right.
L8	MR. MOON: In regards to the consumptive
L9	and nonconsumptive uses and inclusion, we were offered
20	by John Halsey the ability to give a definition on
21	cultural resources, and we'll expect that later.
22	We talked about the time line of events
23	happening and how we may be able to blend in and

complement this process. And then we went with -- we had a proposal by one of our members on a process that I think we all felt was very useful. And that was to address the preliminary definition of the MPAs and then the kinds of MPAs and the functions and the overlaps and the co-management; deal with principles for coordination; and then get a sense of what is happening in the field now. Take a lessons-learned approach and then get to principles and move onto a recommendation.

We were informed that there was an effort that had gone on in regards to database that had been developed for the Pacific Coast, with the three states Oregon, Washington, and California, and that that was a potential example of data that we could access for identification of MPA issues.

(Static) process was very logical and (static) agreed to make the steps. It was Bob Bendick who had made the recommendation and appreciated his thoughts on this.

The first step was to do an adoption of the working definitions. Second step was to use MPA data (static) on the Pacific Coast and other

NEAL R. GROSS

discussion about documentation that existed about lessons learned and current MPAs and the functions and the overlaps. Build a strawman of objectives and principles.

Number 4 was to look at how coordination is done now. And look at what the statutes and regulations say and what's happening in the field.

Number 5 was to look at models for good coordination; and then number 6 was to look at examples of problems. And then step number 7 was to learn the lessons from all of this.

Step number 8 was to revisit the objectives, principles, and then revise. And then the ninth was to have the recommendations.

And so we were in agreement that we should move forward with that nine-step process.

We also had discussions about the Ocean Commission and the report that's going to be coming We talked about a time line of that and the out. information implications of the that we may be Joe Uravitch provided us providing. some perspectives that they had with the differing agencies and the authorities within the federal government with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

a whole mix of national policies.

We decided to ask for some assignments from the MPA Committee, which essentially was to provide a -- have the MPA Center provide a jurisdiction paper of the feds and who was responsible for what. And that's been agreed to.

We also asked for additional case studies, papers, which includes the lessons learned. It was -- and the Pacific Coast information and other information as could be made to the subcommittee.

We also asked for conflicts and a summary by the staff of conflicts, realizing that there's some limitations to that definition.

And then we were going to move with the -hopefully with that information at the next meeting to
develop a more clearer recommendation after reviewing
the objectives and principles of this information.

So that took care of two of the three parts that we were dealing with in our morning session.

It was mentioned that conflicts are varied and involve perceptions, so that was not really easy, black-and-white, tangible definitions that could be

developed. And then we moved onto stakeholder outreach and the need to do outreach and education through a distribution system.

We were informed that a system is in place or a contact system is in place. We've asked for a copy of that so we could see who that is. We had some discussions about the possibility of doing outreach to the Regional Fishery Management Councils. And then we moved into the discussion about attachments -- I mean about the definition of the Marine Protected Areas paper.

It was suggested that we consider the development of a letter from the MPA Center that clearly communicates what's been happening and why in the last three years. I think there's a lot of folks that are out there who are interested in getting some kind of tangible, "what are you guys really up to there" type of discussion. And now would be a good time to do that.

The question was in the attachments that we were looking at, in particular the classification documents and the definitions, that is what we needed more time to take a look at and get more involved

NEAL R. GROSS

1	tomorrow morning. So we're going to hold on a
2	recommendation on the letter and we and I would
3	suggest everybody else thoroughly go through these two
4	documents here, on classification and definition.
5	Because I think it's likely that we'll be coming up
6	with a recommendation for sending that letter out.
7	And that's it.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Thank you.
9	Are there questions for Mel's group?
10	I'll point out, Mel, that microphone.
11	They have isolated it and you're it. I think
12	everybody else seems to be fine, so I don't know what
13	we can do about that. The gentleman tells us that
14	everything seems to be working fine except your
15	microphone.
16	THE RECORDER: I was wrong, sir. It's
17	gone back to acting up again.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see.
19	THE RECORDER: I'm sorry.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Since Mary says it's
21	legal or illegal to proceed, won't be heard if we just
22	chug ahead.
23	Okay. Other questions for Mel, for

1 actions on this? 2 Okay. Here's the deal. Thank you, all three of you. 3 4 How is the problem that we have, like I 5 said, a half an hour in the morning, final discussions of subcommittees and discussion of committee work, 6 7 meeting plans for the next 12 to 24 months. 8 Number 2, subcommittee number 2 has their 9 set of tasks and they have three recommendations, 10 which I think one requires Committee action. 11 has requests almost of the MPA Center. CDs, and 12 either subcommittee 1 or the full Committee to try and 13 identify the system. But I believe that can collect 14 itself. 15 It sounds like group number 2 has sort of one action item for the full Committee. That pertains 16 17 to money. 18 Group number 1, subcommittee 1 has a nice start with a mission and vision statement, but you 19 20 also indicated that you have some problems set to 21 proceed with.

agreement was added and other stuff, a number of

Number 3 has, and I have heard it, and the

22

requests many of them of the MPA Center -- is that right, Mel? -- and some ideas.

So now may I ask that in a moment all three of you have and group 2 can meet in the hall. Can I ask that group 1 of 3 come back with sort of an executive summary, and Mark he can elaborate a little bit, almost on par with the other group, and present that to us here in an executive summary fashion, so that in five or ten minutes we will know what you intend to do. All right?

DR. HIXON: No problem.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And, number 2, you can think about yours overnight, refine it, or just say —but if you could give us that so at the end of the half-hour the full Committee can say to group 2: Yes, we can do what you're thinking about doing. Group 1, yes, we can do what you're thinking about doing. Number 3, yes. And we'll set this for the March 15 deadline for all.

And the requests that are of Gil or the MPA Center, we can sort of hand them to him; is that right? And then deal with one recommendation, which is we try to get in line. How is that? Good. Is

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that all right?
2	MR. [SPEAKER]: Fine.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do you think we can do
4	that in a half an hour? All right, Mark.
5	DR. HIXON: A clarification. This is the
6	work between now and
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. That's the
8	subcommittee work. That's your subcommittee work, at
9	no cost to the government. And
LO	DR. HIXON: Never think of that.
L1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Never think of that,
L2	right. But these are things you will do as a group,
L3	subcommittee, however you figure out to do them. How
L4	is that?
L5	Yes.
L6	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that
L7	the way to approach our discussion that you just laid
L8	out seems reasonable. And if I understand from what
L9	we do is we show up in the morning with sort of a
20	succinct action item list
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
22	MR. BENTON: from all the committees
23	that we got to submit
	T .

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Plus elaborate,
2	that kind of thing. Here's what we're going to do.
3	MR. BENTON: Right. And then it seems to
4	me would then have two actions before the Committee.
5	One is to give a nod or an endorsement to sort of
6	program that comes out of that.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The workplan of the
8	three subcommittees.
9	MR. BENTON: And the other one is a
LO	continuation of the Committee structure that we have,
L1	because the committee structure magically turns into a
L2	pumpkin after we leave here unless we do something.
L3	Correct? Do I have that right in that half-hour
L 4	period.
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Unless yeah, because
L6	we adopted these subcommittees for this meeting only.
L7	MR. BENTON: That's it.
L8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So, yeah. Thank you,
L9	David. We will need to, in a sense, legitimize the
20	continuation of these meetings, to do the work that
21	we're going to do.
22	MR. BENTON: Right.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that right?

1 MR. BENTON: That was my question, yes. 2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you. 3 MR. BENTON: And, Mr. Chairman? 4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. 5 MR. Could I ask one BENTON: other 6 If we have comments that we want to provide 7 to other subcommittees on their work products, how 8 would you recommend doing that? Shall we do that 9 through members of the subcommittee? Shall we do it 10 through chairs of the subcommittee? Do you want us to 11 bring it to the full or do you want us to just wait 12 and see what we come back with us in March? CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I would prefer they not 13 14 come to the meeting. I would prefer, unless they -- I 15 would prefer that each of you communicate with the 16 members, maybe the chairs between the subcommittee. 17 Presumably we see that we're going to legitimize them, 18 they are to continue. Is that okay? I mean let's just communicate with Mark and Mel and Lelei. 19 20 Yes, Bob. 21 MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. I guess this is a 22 legal question. Under FACA has does communicating this way work with the subcommittees? Obviously the 23

Committee Members are in play here, but is the public also allowed? I mean has does this information play out? How do we do that to be legal, I quess?

MS. ERNST: You don't have to share early drafts of your working documents, but as you get closer to a final draft it's presumed that you'll be bringing it back to the full Committee. And at that point the public would have an opportunity to see it later. But the subcommittees don't have to adhere to the same requirements that the full Committee does, as long as you come back and deliberate on what the subcommittees and share a close-to-final draft.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wally?

DR. PEREYRA: Yes. Going onto that, are there some -- Mr. Chairman, are there some restrictions or limitations on what we should be doing with this material? I mean how do we shape some of this draft form while stuff starts to show up on some websites?

MS. ERNST: Yes. Someone just slipped me a note and asked me we've all gotten your passwords now, I think through the instrument, but that's been going on. That's a website for you to place these

NEAL R. GROSS

1	materials. I mean you can place them in one place and
2	everyone should have an opportunity to look at them
3	and download them. And that would be an efficient way
4	for you to work on drafts rather than emailing files
5	back and forth.
6	MR. [SPEAKER]: Who can see passwords?
7	MR. ZALES: Yeah. Where do we pick these
8	up?
9	MS. ERNST: David. David made friends to
10	try and meet up with all of you at the meeting while
11	you're here in person to exchange those passwords.
12	MR. [SPEAKER]: Company have classified,
13	some people are leaving. We have security clearance
14	for this?
15	MR. [SPEAKER]: We do.
16	MS. ERNST: That took some while to work
17	out, but it is now.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Dave.
19	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, but going back
20	to going back to Wally's question for a moment,
21	irrespective of whether or not we have a secure web-
22	based way to communicate, that still begs the question
23	of whether somebody can take a copy of that and walk

over, do something else with it.

And I take the sense of Wally's question to be, and I certainly would support it if this was the case, that draft documents that we're working on right now are not for public distribution. And if somebody gets caught doing it, something bad happens to them, like they have to chair more committees, or something. I don't know what it is, Mr. Chairman.

(Laughter.)

MR. BENTON: I have an idea. We'll leave the pain and suffering for your vivid imagination, on how you're going to inflict it on them. But I believe it's a pretty serious thing. And I think it's important. And it's certainly not going to inspire trust and a good working relationship around this table if that occurs. That I think is the most important thing. I just wanted to emphasize that.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mary.

MS. GLACKIN: Mary Glackin. I agree with.

I'd like to point out that we're in a public setting and this material has all been shown to everybody, so this could be on the front page of whatever tomorrow.

MR. [SPEAKER]: Table B.

1 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: George. 2 MR. LAPOINTE: Maine has a very liberal 3 freedom-of-access law. Anything that you send to me 4 somebody can request, and there's a couple of journal 5 groupies who in fact do that. So it's just -- the key 6 to the extranet is the cure extranet so in fact it 7 doesn't work back to somebody else. 8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. The presumption is don't lie to me. We'll have to see it. 9 10 Tony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 DR. CHATWIN: 12 agree with the sentiments expressed. But I also think that we just have to acknowledge that whatever -- if 13 anything gets leaked it's a draft. We are working on 14 15 And it may change, it will change probably, so. Those of us who have 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 17 done expert work for lawyers have been told a long 18 time ago to create a header on our word processor that says "work product," "attorney work product" on it, by 19 work product will raise the -- but I think all of you 20 get the sense of that. 21 22 All right. May we move on? 23 (Transcription/recording ended for the day at 5:03 o'clock p.m. due to technical difficulties.)