### UNITED STATES of AMERICA

### NATIONAL OCEANIC and ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

\* \* \* \* \*

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SECOND MEETING, Day 3 of 3

\* \* \* \* \*

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2003

\* \* \* \* \*

SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA

The Committee reconvened at 8:43 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:

- Mr. Robert L. Bendick, Jr.
- Mr. David Benton
- Dr. Daniel W. Bromley, Chairman
- Dr. Michael J. Cruickshank
- 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
- Captain Thomas E. Thompson
- Mr. Robert F. Zales II

### Ex-Office Members Present:

- Ms. Mary Glackin
- Ms. Jacqueline Schafer

#### Also Present:

- Ms. Marjorie Ernst
- Dr. James Kendall

### From the National MPA Center:

- Ms. Ginger Hinchcliff, Director, Training & Technical Assistance Institute
- Mr. Joseph A. Uravitch, AICP, Director
- Dr. Charles Wahle, Director, MPA Science Institute

### Public Comment Speakers:

Donna Parker, commercial fishing
Jessica Hamilton, Ocean Conservancy
Jesus Ruiz, YMCA Scuba
Cheri Recchia, Ocean Conservancy
Kate Wing, Natural Resources Defense Council
Fleur O'Neill, Save Our Shores
Jamie Wine, diver
Yasaman Golban, San Francisco resident
Bart Hall, Fred Hall & Associates and anglers
Jane DeLay, Monterey resident
Robert Osborn, United Anglers of Southern California
Bob Strickland, President, United Anglers
of California
Roger Thomas, Golden Gate Fisherman's Association

## I-N-D-E-X

Call to Order and Opening Remarks 5
Discussion on the Charter
Final Discussion on the Subcommittees
Public Comments
Regarding Subcommittees 70 Group 1 87 Motion 95 Vote on Motion 100
Discussion on Subcommittee Communication 105
Legal Issue 113
Discussion of the Agenda and Next Meeting 114
Discussion of Next Meeting's Venue
Adjournment of the Second Meeting 158

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

2

1

4

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

(8:43 o'clock a.m.)

This meeting of the MPA ERNST:

Federal Advisory Committee is reconvened.

MS.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Maggie.

Our program is, this morning, between now and nine o'clock, which is the public comment period, we had set aside for final discussion of subcommittee and the discussion of the committee work. We will do that, but at the end of business yesterday we tabled a motion concerning the charter. And Mary Glackin has to leave some time and so Ι would, with your permission, would like to dispense one way or the other with the motion that was tabled yesterday.

And would you like me to read the motion we tabled? I think it's been distributed. that Everybody should have a copy in front of you. floor is open for, I would hope, brief reactions to the motion. And then let's deal with it one way or the other so that we can move on.

Dolly.

DR. GARZA: I would move that we put the motion back on the record table.

> CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you.

Is there a second to that motion?

1	MR. [SPEAKER]: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's been moved and
3	seconded that the motion come back before us.
4	Thank you, Dolly.
5	Comments on it.
6	MR. PETERSON: Call the question.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Call the question. Are
8	you ready for the question?
9	Am I doing okay, Dolly?
10	Are you ready for the question?
11	Okay. Just for the record I will read the
12	motions, so that there can be no doubt what we're
13	doing. "The Committee recommends"
14	DR. GARZA: No, no. All we're doing is
15	putting it back on the table, so then we have to vote
16	on the motion after.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry. I missed
18	this. Yeah.
19	DR. GARZA: So it's just a technicality.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Okay. It's back
21	on the table.
22	DR. GARZA: No, we have to go.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
24	MR. BENTON: Ask if there's any objection
25	to the motion, to bring it back before us.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Are there any
2	objections to I'm sorry, Dolly. I'm focused on a
3	lot of stuff here. Please tell me what to do, okay?
4	DR. GARZA: You say, "Hearing no
5	objections,"
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Hearing no objections,
7	
8	DR. GARZA: "the motion before us."
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: the motion before
10	us. All in favor of the motion now and then call
11	the question; is that right?
12	MR. LAPOINTE: You've taken action on
13	that, Mr. Chairman, and with no objection, the motion
14	to call it to to put it back on the table is done.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
16	MR. BENTON: And it's back before us. Now
17	do you want us to read the motion back to the body and
18	then
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I want to dispense with
20	this as quickly as I can.
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Max.
23	MR. PETERSON: Since Dolly is the maker of
24	the motion and is also the parliamentarian, let me
25	help out by

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
2	MR. PETERSON: her motion at table is
3	nondebatable
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
5	MR. PETERSON: and it does not require
6	in fact is not debatable, it immediately goes to a
7	vote.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, okay.
9	MR. BENTON: We're ready to vote.
10	MR. LAPOINTE: I thought, Mr. Chairman,
11	that we already voted. I mean when you asked for no
12	objections, if there are no objections, the motion's
13	dispensed with, and so now we're on the substance of
14	it.
15	MR. ZALES: We're on the substance of the
16	motion,
17	MR. LAPOINTE: Good.
18	MR. ZALES: the way I understand
19	DR. GARZA: So, Mr. Chairman?
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
21	DR. GARZA: I will read the motion.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
23	DR. GARZA: Okay. The motion that we now
24	have on the table before us, "The Committee recommends
25	to the Department of Commerce and the Interior the

1 changes to the charter presented in our notebook and discussed on November 17th, 2003. The Committee 2 3 believes the changed as proposed are important to have a clear understanding of our procedural rules. 4 5 "The Committee understands and accepts the verbal advice received from counsel that we have the 6 7 flexibility under the existing charter to operate as described in the proposed changes and we intend to 8 9 operate accordingly. 10 "The Committee recommends that the 11 Department of Commerce and Interior amend the 12 charter upon renewal as proposed. If further advice 13 of counsel indicates we cannot operate accordingly, we 14 encourage the agencies to work to make the necessary 15 adjustments as expeditiously as possible so we can 16 perform our duties." This is the motion before us, Mr. Chair. 17 18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 19 Is everybody clear on this? 20 Are you ready to vote on the motion? 21 DR. GARZA: I call for the question. 22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The question's been 23 All in favor of the motion as printed before called. 24 you and as read by Dolly say, "Aye."

[MEMBERS]: Aye.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?
2	(No audible response.)
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The motion passes.
4	Thank you very much.
5	So we have 15 minutes for a final
6	discussion of subcommittees and discussion of the
7	committee work. And I understand that some of you
8	had, the three subcommittees, had counted on more time
9	than that. Would you like to proceed with Groups 1
10	and 2, and get as far as we can, and then we'll come
11	back to this and squeeze it into another part of the
12	agenda; is that acceptable?
13	DR. HIXON: We're ready, group 1.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Group 3's ready to go.
15	Group 1 is ready to go. Group 2 is ready to go.
16	Why don't we start now with group 3.
17	Let's go in reverse order, and see how much time you
18	take. Try and do it in five or so minutes and maybe
19	you can get it done here.
20	MR. MOON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mel
21	Moon.
22	We met this morning. We have provided a
23	outline of some of the discussions that we've had
24	starting with the tasks that we've identified for the
25	Committee.

Second part is a recommendation for the Committee to take into consideration which would be to develop a letter to be sent to the governors, the executive directors of the Regional Fishery Management Councils, the tribal entities, scientific institutions, professional organizations. Essentially we wanted to get it as far as we could and leave nobody out.

The letter would have a cover letter. It would have four documents attached. The first document would be the Executive Order. The second document would be a description, a two-page description of what's happened to date with the MPA Center and some of the activities of what's been going on with the Committee, this Committee.

And then the two documents that we talked about, the classification system for Marine Protected Areas and the user's quide for Marine Protected Area types and terms. These would go out as drafts and the solicit would be to comments on these purpose particular drafts. So that is a recommendation from the committee to the full Committee.

And then the second part is that we have a process that we are going to follow to reach clarification on MPA coordination. I think it speaks

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	for itself. We do have two subcommittees that we see
2	coming up into the future. We have not officially
3	created them, but to give everybody a heads-up on the
4	strawman for performance goals and principles, and
5	also the subcommittee for the definitions of cultural
6	resources. And we have internal work being done on
7	what exactly that would be, but more or less we wanted
8	to give a heads-up.
9	So we do have one item for a
10	recommendation to the full committee on the submission
11	of the letter for outreach purposes.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Very good. That's it?
13	MR. MOON: That's it.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So your item
15	number 3, "Create a subcommittee to complete
16	definitions for cultural resources" is something you
17	plan to do internally and
18	MR. MOON: Yes, that's correct.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Okay, very good.
20	Can we withhold action on that? Would it
21	be all right with the Committee if we withhold action
22	on that and hear from the other groups and then we'll
23	have all of our decision items before us?
24	Yes, Bob.
25	MR. ZALES: I just would like I've got

1	a couple questions about the number 1 item.
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Please do go
3	ahead.
4	MR. ZALES: Can I do that now?
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, indeed.
6	MR. ZALES: Do that now?
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. No, let's do
8	that now.
9	MR. ZALES: Where you're talking about the
LO	governors Bob Zales for the record is that
l1	governors of coastal states or the entire 50 states?
12	MR. MOON: Governors of coastal states.
L3	MR. ZALES: Only coastal states?
14	MR. MOON: Well, and the Great Lakes.
15	MR. ZALES: Okay. And how about like
16	states up the Mississippi and
17	MR. MOON: Actually I would say that this
18	is that list is the list that's going to be
19	developed by the Center. We haven't looked at that.
20	And I know there's ongoing work on defining that list,
21	so it would probably be more accurate to ask.
22	MR. ZALES: Okay. And the next one is
23	you've got the executive directors of Regional Fishery
24	Management Councils. How about the RAs of the
25	Regional Centers for the Fishery Service?

1 MR. MOON: It's not meant to be exclusive to anybody. In fact what we would like to do is send 2 3 it to everybody, but we're trying to be as inclusive 4 as possible, and practical at the same time. 5 MR. ZALES: Okay. Mr. Chairman? DR. OGDEN: 6 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, Dave. 8 MR. BENTON: If I could add just a little 9 bit to that. I think part of the discussion was that some of the documents like the criteria documents and 10 11 the descriptive documents for MPAs that have been 12 developed by the Center, have gone through NOAA and 13 NMFS, and some of the agencies, but not some of these 14 external entities. And that was really part of the 15 discussion of what we were trying to get at. So 16 that's why we identified the governors, Fish Management Councils and others. 17 18 And, as Mel said, it's not intended to be 19 exclusive, as representational. But there is a fair 2.0 amount of dialogue within the federal system, 21 nearly as much with some of the other entities, and 22 maybe we were trying to get to that. 23 And I just call your attention to,

"professional

We also had the public there. And the Center

example,

NGOs."

it

says

24

25

and

organizations

1	had indicated that what they were really talking about
2	was some kind of a fairly broad vetting of some of
3	these documents in draft form to solicit public
4	comment as well as I understand it. Am I correct?
5	So, for example, the professional
6	organizations would also be like trade associations,
7	that kind of thing.
8	MR. ZALES: To that point very quickly. I
9	just wanted to see, because it's my impression that
10	not all of the Regional Fishery Centers, even though
11	NMFS as an entity through NOAA and Silver Spring has
12	gotten the information, I don't think it's been
13	clearly distributed amongst the others. And I want
14	that broad coverage. I think most everybody here
15	does.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
17	Other comments?
18	Let me ask a clarifying question. If this
19	letter, which would go to quite a few people, is being
20	prompted by us as a body, is it important that we as a
21	body approve the exact nature and content of this
22	letter? What is the are there legal things here as
23	well as how you prefer to operate kinds of issues?
24	Mary?
25	MS. GLACKIN: Well, again, coming back to

1	the advisory nature of this committee, I don't think
2	you could approve this letter. You could comment on
3	it, provide comments on it.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Yeah. But could
5	we, would we need to as a committee sort of structure
6	the way the request is made and so on, or is it not
7	necessary to do that?
8	MS. GLACKIN: I think that we could take
9	advice or input on that. Joe, do you agree?
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
11	MS. GLACKIN: Yeah.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks.
13	Gil.
14	MR. RADONSKI: Gil Radonski. I'm not on
15	that subcommittee, but the way I read it, this is just
16	an outreach mechanism. I think trying to fine tune
17	the letter is not a prerogative nor should we even
18	worry about it. But we are concerned about reaching
19	out to these people and telling them what's going on
20	and raise the level of awareness.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, that's fine.
22	Dolly and then Dave.
23	DR. GARZA: And I think there was a
24	technical question which I think Mary was addressing,
25	is can EACA committees write their own letter and send

	it out without going through the Departments which
2	they are technically under?
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. And, Mel, and I
4	thought I heard Mel sort of saying something about the
5	MPA Center being involved in this. So I
6	MR. MOON: That's right.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are we telling the MPA
8	Center to do something? I'd like to know
9	MR. MOON: We're making a recommendation
10	to the Departments to write the letter. which is not
11	coming from FACA. It's from the departments, to
12	recommend that they write the letter and make the
13	outreach approach. I just want to make that clear.
14	MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman?
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I have Dave, Mike, and
16	Jim on the queue, please. Dave.
17	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman. The
18	discussion's correct. I mean it's a recommendation to
19	the Departments.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
21	MR. BENTON: The letter was simply really a
22	cover letter to have a packet behind it, and it sort
23	of dropped out of these notes, I believe. And the
24	packet included things like the classification system
25	and user's guide documents. It was clearly stamped

1	"Draft," as I remember our discussion at least, to
2	solicit comments on these kinds of documents, plus
3	some informative materials to say here's what's been
4	going on.
5	So the letter itself is a cover. The
6	intention was to advise the fact to the Departments
7	that there would be a cover letter with a packet to
8	inform these entities and other entities that solicit
9	
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thanks, David.
11	You seem to have a charming effect on the sound system
12	around here.
13	MR. BENTON: Yesterday it wasn't me.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are you sure?
15	MR. BENTON: I'm sure.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike.
17	DR. CRUICKSHANK: I think that covers the
18	points I was going to make.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. Thank you.
20	Jim. Jim Ray and then Max.
21	DR. RAY: My points have been covered.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Max.
23	MR. PETERSON: I was just going to suggest
24	you post this kind of thing on the secure web so we
25	know about it. It seems to me like it's providing

1	something to the Department. I would think we want to
2	be more formal on that.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Good point. Is
4	everybody comfortable with this?
5	Mel, do you have any other
6	MR. MOON: I guess you're interested in
7	holding this off, or we could have a consensus here
8	for that to go forward. It's your call.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, if people are
10	ready to sign off on that, I think that's fine.
11	Jacqueline has her hand up.
12	MS. SCHAFER: One item I just want to
13	cover. We discussed it in our subcommittee, but the
14	timing on this, we would certainly like this done in a
15	way that we would get the benefit of the response back
16	by the next time we meet. I think the Department's
17	aware of that, but I just wanted to bring it out for
18	the purpose of the Members.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What's the sense of the
20	Committee, is that so they proceed with this; is
21	that okay?
22	MR. [SPEAKER]: Yes.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, Mel, you have
24	your marching orders.
25	MR. MOON: All right. Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
2	We have five minutes before the public
3	comment period. Would group 1 or 2 like to try to
4	squeeze something in or would you rather hold it off
5	for later? Lelei.
6	MR. PEAU: Mr. Chairman, just a quick
7	amendment to the recommendation.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Yesterday, okay.
9	MR. PEAU: I'd like to draw your attention
LO	to the bullet number 1.
L1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: This is what was on the
L2	screen yesterday.
L3	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes, on the screen. And
L4	but Bonnie isn't our PowerPoint person.
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could you just read
L6	bullet number 1 to us?
L7	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yeah.
L8	MR. PEAU: As it stands right now, Mr.
L9	Chair, the chairs shall request Secretaries of
20	Commerce and of the Interior to reach out to partner
21	agencies for financial support for hosting the next
22	meeting.
23	The proposed change, Mr. Chair, is that we
24	drop for hosting the next meeting and replace it with
25	for financial support to the Committee as a whole,

1	that financial needed for staff support for the
2	subcommittee.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could you read that
4	last there are two pieces there, support for
5	Committee as a whole and support for
6	MR. PEAU: And the staff support for
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And the staff support
8	for the subcommittee, for your subcommittee?
9	MR. PEAU: Three. Three subcommittees.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All three
11	subcommittees. Okay. And this, as I recall, would
12	stand as your recommendation needing group approval,
13	where the other two things were sort of suggestions
14	that the MPA Center might view. As I recall there was
15	one about posting stuff on the web or CD material, or
16	what was it?
17	Sorry, I don't have it in front of me, and
18	I was working off the screen. Background material on
19	CDs.
20	MR. PEAU: Background materials be made
21	available on CDs.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Oh, yes. Wonderful.
23	Okay. So the recommendation now reads: "The Chair
24	shall request Secretaries of Commerce and of the
25	Interior to reach out to partner agencies for

1	financial support for this Committee as a whole and
2	for staff support for the subcommittees." Am I
3	MR. PEAU: That's correct.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: capturing that
5	correctly?
6	Okay. Mary, do you want to help us think
7	about this?
8	MS. GLACKIN: I'll try. I don't know how
9	
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
11	MS. GLACKIN: helpful I can be.
12	Actually I've learned quite a bit in the last two days
13	with this Committee in terms of different perspectives
14	people bring.
15	And I'm continually struck and actually
16	kind of awed by how willing people are to roll up
17	their sleeves and do the work that's laid out in this
18	Executive Order. And I feel a little bit like a
19	broken record to keep reminding it that it is not the
20	charge to this Committee to implement this Executive
21	Order, to produce documents or that type of thing.
22	It's really to comment and provide advice on things
23	the government is doing.
24	So I know that there are models that
25	people have past experience with or current experience

with, like Fisheries Management Council where you're really asked to produce something, but that's not what the charge of this Committee is. The charge of this Committee is to provide advice. So we're really not looking for voluminous things coming out of here but more commenting on products that we're producing.

And I think along those lines the documents that are in the Federal Register now, we would plan to come to you with approaches for how to do other things. So you can pass this motion. We're in tight fiscal constraints. I think everybody knows that here, but I guess I'm more worried about maybe what's driving this recommendation versus the actual recommendation itself.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The "C" in our Committee stands for John Calvin. You know we have a lot of people ready to roll up their sleeves and go to do hard work here, right? We're very Calvinistic.

And you're reminding us, I mean as I think about group 2 and what they had proposed to do, you're sort of, if I may put words in your mouth, you're sort of wondering why they're going to do all this. Is that right? I mean they're going to produce stuff rather than comment on stuff, right?

How do I react, Lelei? Roll your sleeves

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

back down, huh?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PEAU: Well, I'm kind of taken aback with the comment, with all due respect. When we have our breakout sessions in subcommittees, certainly we were called for help by the staff themself to provide them with guidance and identify gaps so that they can move forward with the agenda.

And certainly we cannot take the work that we have be presented to us and offer guidance without going more deep into the subject matter and learn more about it. And you do that by doing research and putting more time into the work in order for us to properly provide guidance. It certainly requires a lot more research and sitting down and investigate what the rationale behind the bullets that have been given to us.

I mean I certainly can speak for our group that I think everyone's prepared to move forward. we look at the staff, the staff is also hampered with their own day job. And they cannot continue to provide the level of support that is needed. And therefore we feel that it is only fair that they provide some sort of financial support in order to continue that dialoque and continue that participation.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. We are at nine
2	o'clock and I think out of courtesy to our public
3	commenters, we do need to suspend the conversation, if
4	I may. But I have Gil
5	MR. RADONSKI: Mr. Chairman?
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. I have Gil and
7	Dolly and Bob, but, yes, Gil.
8	MR. RADONSKI: I'll try and be very brief,
9	but this speaks exactly to Mary's point.
LO	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
L1	MR. RADONSKI: And I agree with what Mary
L2	said. And the other day when we accepted the protocol
L3	that Joe provided on the committees, I stated that
L4	these apparent since they are coming from Joe and
L5	his work plan apparently is approved in the
L6	Department, I treated that as Joe was asking advice,
L7	not Joe but the Department. And that's how we
L8	attacked and formed these three subcommittees, based
L9	on a request from the Department vis-a-vis Joe's
20	proposal for the subcommittee structure.
21	So I think we're proceeding on the basis
22	of what you said, that we're here to provide advice
23	and recommendations. So that's how we are proceeding.
24	So are we wrong in doing this?

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Let me -- well, I'd

1 like to get Mary off the hook, but maybe she doesn't want to be off the hook. So --2 MR. RADONSKI: I don't think it's being on 3 4 the hook. I think we have to set procedures for 5 dealing with this. 6 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I fully agree. 7 And what I'd ask Gil is: Would you allow me to move 8 us to the public comment period? And when that is 9 finished, we will come back, Gil, and I will recognize 10 you first and we'll pick this right up. 11 Now the risk is that Mary has to catch a 12 plane, but that's all right. We can -- she may not be 13 here, which will give us more latitude to talk about 14 her. 15 (Laughter.) 16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: But we do have to sort 17 this out. It's very clear. And I think part of it is 18 more misunderstanding than is necessary, but I think 19 we do have to now out of courtesy to our speakers, 2.0 turn to that. Is that okay with everybody? 21 We are now a few minutes past 9:00. 22 And this is the period in which we are open for 23 public comment. And I will read a set of instructions 24 for those making public comments to the Federal 25 Advisory Committee on Marine Protected Areas.

Is that all right if I read this, Maggie, is that the presumption?

We have 11 people who have signed up. The idea is that each person would have five minutes to speak. This is subject to change depending upon the number of registered speakers. At the moment with 11 times five we're within the time limit that we had allocated.

Maggie here on my left, from your perspective, has two cards. She has a yellow card, which will be raised at the four-minute mark. At the four-and-a-half-minute mark a red card will be raised in a horizontal position. And then once the red card turns to vertical, this means that your time is up.

So we're grateful for those of you that signed up that came here, disrupted your schedule to speak to us, and I would now like to call the first speaker. There's a microphone there. And if you're terribly tall we have one over here for the basketball players. But try to use the one in the middle, for the most part.

The first person is Donna Parker. Would you please identify yourself and if you represent -- no, you can use that one there. Oh, you're going to add some. I'm sorry -- identify yourself and if you

2.0

represent an organization, it would be nice if you would share that with the group. Thank you.

MS. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of this Committee. My name is Donna Parker. Today I'm representing myself, however I am a long-time participant in the North Pacific fisheries. My husband and I have a salmon-gill netter in southeast Alaska. I am the Director of Government Relations for a fishing company in the North Pacific.

I am a board member of several fishing and processing organizations as well as the Marine Conservation Alliance. I'm on a number of council committees, including the Ecosystem Committee and the By-Catch Reduction Committee, and I am a federally-appointed member of the Stellar Sea Lion Recovery Team.

So from my background you could see that I'm familiar with the jurisdiction and managerial issues both in state waters and federal waters in the North Pacific.

The map that I passed out to you represents the MPAs already in existence in the North Pacific. They were installed over a long period of time, served many purposes, but for one reason or another, all protect habitat as well. It represents

over 130,000 square miles. Those dark areas there meet your criteria of being closed for more than three months out of the year. Most of them are closed all year round to all or most gear types.

I would argue that the entire EEZ is a marine-managed area. There are quotas. There is enforcement. There are closures. And many of the regulations in place to manage them which did not exist before the Magnuson-Stevens Act, these I would say are MPAs which are more tightly managed and have specific goals and objectives.

Having said all that, I want to say I hope this map speaks for itself, that we welcome MPAs in the North Pacific. We're not afraid of them. We regularly use them in our toolbox to manage the fisheries in a sustainable way.

Currently the Council is focusing quite a bit on the development of essential fish habitat and habitat areas of particular concern, as our other councils, which will mean additional closures are likely.

The Board of Fish in Alaska, which manages the state waters, has appointed an MPA committee and they too are moving ahead in this regard.

The point is that this is part of a large

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

	30
1	toolbox. We also have things that the National
2	Academy of Science panels have recommended and impacts
3	to benthic habitats that MPAs are one tool. Other
4	tools are gear modifications as well as effort
5	reductions.
6	The ecosystem recommendations made by the
7	National Academy of Sciences include MPAs, but they
8	also include monitoring catch and by-catch, reducing
9	capacity, additional research and institutionalization

of scientific and stakeholder participation in the 11 transparent process.

> It's all part of the toolbox that's used in order to sustain our fisheries.

> The point is that MPAs are important, but they are not effective unless used in conjunction with other tools.

> Based on that I'd like to make a few specific recommendations to this group.

> Number one, prioritize your task completing an inventory of existing MPAs, finalizing your criteria, identifying the type of habitat and the protections afforded both stated and unstated, and give the MPA Center its marching orders so they can proceed in this capacity.

> > Number two, at this stage do not try to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

assess the effectiveness of MPAs. Simply, this just an impossible task. We have tried to do this lion regulations, under stellar setting sea experimental zones. It's а very frustrating experience, one that you should not be engaged in at this time because it will be reduced to a subjective judgment until proper efficacy criteria are developed within the existing jurisdictions.

Don't try and manage the fisheries. There are existing structures. The Councils exist, the Boards of Fish exist. They have designated authority and jurisdiction. These are complex and comprehensive management tools. They have strong agency scientific support and strong stakeholder participation. Do not distract or impose MPA process on top or outside of these processes.

Three, do not -- do, however, communicate with these decisionmaking bodies to seek the proper partnerships and guidance from them and how they might coordinate your efforts.

Communicate with them as soon as possible.

There's a lot of speculation about what the MPA group is about and the MPA Center. I think it should be made clear to them what your mission is and the specific examples of how you plan to interact with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	them in the ruture are provided directly to them and
2	on your website.
3	Ask that the group specifically direct the
4	MPA website to eliminate a specific statement that I
5	think one of your Members mentioned early on in this
6	meeting, declaring that less than one percent of the
7	marine areas are protected. This is alarming and
8	inaccurate. It misleads the public.
9	I think under the criteria that you have
10	there it's significantly more. I know in the map that
11	I sent out to you, over 25 percent of the fishing
12	shelf is closed.
13	Finally, in the future please include
14	public comment before the end of the meeting. Thank
15	you.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks very much, Ms.
17	Parker. Okay.
18	MR. ZALES: Mr. Chairman, and I'm sorry I
19	failed to ask this earlier, are we going to be able to
20	ask questions of the public or no?
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: My understanding is
22	that we are here to take comments from the public, to
23	receive comments from the public.
24	MR. ZALES: Okay.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Not to ask questions of

1	the public.
2	Okay. The next individual is Jessica
3	Hamilton.
4	DR. RAY: Mr. Chairman?
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
6	DR. RAY: The way the Ocean Commissions
7	handles this at theirs was they do not question. They
8	do take comment. But if that person that presented it
9	or organization provides a written copy of it, they
10	will provide it to the members.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
12	DR. RAY: So I think if we would offer
13	them the opportunity, if they provide the written
14	statement,
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
16	DR. RAY: that it would be provided to
17	the members of the committee.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Indeed. I mean if any
19	speaker here or if you know someone who was unable to
20	be here, is that right, wishes to submit written
21	comments to us, we will receive them and be happy to
22	do so.
23	Okay. Ms. Hamilton.
24	MS. HAMILTON: Good morning. Can you all
25	hear me okay? Hi, my name is Jessica Hamilton, and

I'm the Pacific Ecosystem Manager for the Ocean Conservancy right here in San Francisco.

We are advocates for wild, healthy oceans, and we have approximately 150,000 members nationwide.

And we really appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today and support your efforts to strengthen and enhance the network of Marine Protected Areas across the country.

And California has been the center of a lot of excitement lately. We've had wildfires. We've had a new governor, but I also want to share you with some of the exiting things that have been happening in California regarding oceans, and hope that some of these can provide support for some of your deliberations around ocean protection.

So the first one is the Marine Life Protection Act, and some of you may have already heard about it. It's been kind of held up as a model for implementing Marine Protected Areas in other parts of the country. And it basically requires that the state develop a master plan for Marine Protected Areas.

And the specific goals of the act are ones that I think you all could also consider in your work:

Provide ecosystem protection, represent a diversity of habitats, improve the existing array of MPAs within

the state, and ensure that the new system functions as a network.

And so I did bring a few copies of the MLPA. I don't know if you need a whole bunch more reading to do, but I'll be sure to leave that with Chairman Bromley and maybe the staff if you're interested.

Islands. And some of the speakers did mention that on Monday. And basically there's been an ongoing joint federal-state process to establish marine reserves within the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. This was started in 1988 when a nonprofit sport fishing group put in a petition to establish these marine reserves within the National Marine Sanctuary.

They developed a 17-member stakeholder group, a little bit smaller than the group here today, and they helped develop some goals for the Channel Islands that also possibly could support your work. And some of these goals, first of all, would be ecosystem biodiversity, to protect representative and unique marine habitats, ecological processes, and populations of interest.

Another goal is to support sustainable fisheries, to achieve sustainable fisheries by

2.0

integrating in marine reserves into fisheries management. National and cultural heritage is another To maintain areas for visitor, spiritual, and

recreational opportunities that include cultural and

And, lastly, for education, to foster stewardship of the marine environment by providing educational opportunities, to increase awareness and encourage responsible use of resources.

And so while -- you know so much of the debate around Marine Protected Areas is focused on fisheries, there are other reasons to establish Marine Protected Areas. But with that said, I did want to talk a little bit about fisheries and MPAs.

And as Deputy Director of NOAA Fisheries, Rebecca Lent mentioned on Monday during her talk many fishermen will tell you that there already are a lot of Marine Protected Areas in California due to the groundfish closures. And they ask way additional MPAs are needed.

Well, the reasons for these emergency closures is because the fisheries are in serious collapse. And scientists have determined that California species such as the bocaccio, cowcod,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ecological features.

canary rockfish, some of these fisheries will take nearly 100 years to rebuild.

And rebuilding really only means bringing it back to fraction of its original abundance. And actually yesterday -- or Monday, excuse me, when the governor was signed in, he signed an executive order which essentially puts pending groundfish closure on hold. And these types of actions that really point to the importance of having Marine Protected Areas that are permanent.

I just wanted to say that we believe MPAs are a vital part of the tools that we have to manage fisheries. And that's not a quote from me. That's a quote from Dr. Bill Hogarth, Director of NOAA Fisheries, when he presented to the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy in Los Angeles about a year ago. So we certainly support him in that.

So just in terms of, it's really important to look at the big picture here. You can no longer stand on the edge of the ocean and look out and think that it's vast and limitless. And we need to recognize that there are certainly limits to what we can do. We certainly look forward to working with you and can certainly provide any information that you need.

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much,
Ms. Hamilton.

Our third speaker is Jesus Ruiz.

MR. RUIZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name is Jesus Ruiz. I am the State Coordinator for the YMCA of the USA National Scuba Program. I'm also a member of the California Marine Life Protection Act Regional Working Group for Monterey.

The previous speaker addressed what the MLPA is. I won't go too much into it other than to point out that Dr. Fujita is also a working member of the MLPA Regional Working Group up in San Francisco, and I'm sure he can be a valuable resource to you on MPAs in California.

I wanted to primarily point out to you that there is no representative of the scuba industry in your panel. I understand and I might be wrong, but my understanding is that there was an individual selected from the scuba industry to sit on the panel. And then when the panel was reshuffled again that that individual was replaced by somebody else.

I just want to point out to you that there needs to be a consciousness of the fact that that scuba industry, the recreational scuba industry, is a

large stakeholder in MPAs and marine activities.

2.0

I know that Dr. Fujita is a diver. And I'm wondering if there is any other recreational divers on the panel. Is there?

Thank you very much. I now request that you also keep in mind that when you're addressing this issue that you carry the water for the recreational scuba divers. And I distinguish that from commercial diving or technical diving out scientific diving, because those are different interest.

And the reason that we need to keep in mind that there is a major stakeholder, in California alone there is 1.2 million Certified Recreational Divers. And I'm not sure what the exact number is nationwide. I think it's over five million, but it's a large stakeholder.

A lot of divers go to tropical areas to dive, though California in itself is a dive destination. Different type of diving, colder water, but it is a dive destination. And there are other parts in the Territories of the United States that are dive destinations. And this is something you should keep in mind when designing a recommendation or making recommendations regarding the establishment of MPAs.

As the previous speaker alluded to, the

process of implementation or recommendations for the work in process for the Marine Life Protection Act in California is moving as fast as a petrified fish, basically still in the water.

First, I know there is a reluctance for the federal government to get involved in this state jurisdiction, within the three-mile range. But there are ways in which the federal government can assist the state. The Channel Islands is a good example of it.

I know the Sanctuaries might also be a possibility, but there are other areas that are not covered by the Sanctuaries that might be areas for recommendation for Marine Protected Areas.

And I request or recommend that the panel here look into possibilities where the federal government might be able to come in and assist the state if not actually do some of the work themselves.

Usually the -- oh, what's the name of it -- the National Monuments Act that the Executive Order from the previous administration was enacted. That's a possibility as well.

The other issue I'd like to bring up is that in all the presentations that were made previously, for example, by Dr. David Smith from the

2.0

of

list

the

2	participants of partners that were listed, the
3	recreational divers were not listed as one of them.
4	And I'd like to see the outreach, somebody
5	asked, well, where do you get your list of
6	stakeholders or people to outreach to. I'd like to
7	make sure that when you do develop that list, that the
8	recreational scuba industry organization, certifying
9	agencies, and the national organization DEMA, some
10	of you know what that is that stands for Diving
11	Equipment and Manufacturer Association, is the
12	national organization, that these organizations be
13	contacted. And I left my contact information at the
14	front.
15	So I'd like as a state representative for
16	one of the certifying agencies, I'd like to be on that
17	contact list.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Ruiz.
19	Your time is about up. Can you wrap up quickly?
20	MR. RUIZ: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I'm sorry.
22	MR. RUIZ: First, very quickly, two short
23	items. Please make a distinction between consumptive
24	and nonconsumptive users when you're talking about
25	diving. That is very important. And I was going to

Parks Service, of all

National

1 elaborate on that, but for the sake of time I won't. And my last point is I really would like 2 to commend Dr. Charlie Wahle from the MPA Center here 3 4 for reaching out to the community and being 5 assistance. He and the staff have been wonderful in 6 this area. Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. your enthusiasm for the staff of the MPA Center. 8 9 Don't we, Joe? 10 MR. URAVITCH: Completely. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The next speaker is 12 Howard Egan. Mr. Egan. 13 Okav. Then I'm going to move ahead to Ms. 14 Cheri Recchia. 15 MS. RECCHIA: Good morning. My name is 16 Cheri Recchia. Ι am Director of the Ecosystem 17 Protection Program with the Ocean Conservancy. 18 you heard from my colleague a little bit earlier, my 19 San Francisco-based colleague Jessica Hamilton, about 2.0 t.he  $\circ$ f conservation sort. context from my 21 organization's perspective. So I'm going to provide, 22 if I might, some more technical comments based on what 23 I've been hearing in the Committee's deliberations 24 over the last two days or so.

providing these

And

I'm

25

comments

as

someone who has been working for nearly a decade now on MPA policy, MPA site and system design and planning, predominantly in Canada, Australia, and now the United States.

Т think I'd like to begin by congratulating the Committee, really, after what seemed to me and perhaps some of you as kind of a bumpy start. I think, particularly yesterday, there was really some good work done. And I would like to congratulate you on coming together and starting to have some I think really productive and fruitful discussions about matters of substance.

I am quite impressed, I was a little, in all honesty, hesitant about the subcommittee structure that was proposed by the MPA Center, but I think on reflection and on seeing it operating, that it actually is quite a pragmatic solution. I think you cut this cake a number of different ways, and this particular way, from my opinion, looks like it's going pretty well and will facilitate work consideration of products to date by the MPA Center and future activities. And I think that will just everything slot into the work that's help been undertaken already by Joe and his colleagues.

So I would urge you to retain that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

committee structure if you feel that it's working for you. And I think that it offers a lot of flexibility. So from my perspective I congratulate you on making that work so far and I urge you to retain it.

I've also heard some discussion about possibly looking at the Federal Register Notice on the MMA inventory and criteria. I don't know if the Committee has decided to look at that, but I would encourage you to do so. I think looking at that will help you understand some of the issues that have been considered in trying to decide what is and isn't an MPA and ultimately what a national MPA system or network might look like.

In particular this issue of how do we deal with fisheries closures, how are we cognizant of the fact that there is this important tool out there and that fisheries closure established for a fisheriesmanagement purpose can clearly serve other nonfisheries purposes as well and make an important contribution to a national network. That clearly is recognized by Members of the Committee, understanding how to integrate that piece with other pieces, such as endangered species closures and the variety of other tools that are out there, National Marine Sanctuaries, National Parks, National Wildlife

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Refuges, National Monuments, etc., etc., to say nothing of all the state designations, that's a bit tricky. And I think Joe and his colleagues have done some really good thinking on that so far. Some of that thinking is revealed in the MMA inventory, the Federal Register Notice, and supporting documents.

So I think that might be useful for the Committee and I would urge all of you or perhaps one of the subcommittees to look at that.

The last thing that I wanted to say is that, as I'm sure many Committee Members are aware, there has been a lot of work trying to figure out how to assess MPA effectiveness. And one initiative that NOAA is involved in is being launched by IUCN, WWF, NOAA and some other partners, and it looks, for example, at different indicators relating to governance, socioeconomics, and biophysical aspects. So there's a lot of out there.

And for the subcommittee number 2, if that's retained, I think there are some raw materials that might be helpful you to become familiar with and to consider in your deliberations as you move forward.

In considering what a national MPA system might look like, I think subcommittee number 1, which I had the opportunity to observe yesterday, made a

really good start in developing a vision or a goal statement, or whatever you think of it, and I urge the Committee to remember that I think the very good comment I heard yesterday, being careful about the perfect being the enemy of the good, and recognizing I think, a lot that you could spend, of time deliberating the exact wording of that, I think you made a very good start. And I look forward to hearing more about that as that moves forward. So think I will close

So I think I will close there and congratulate the Committee again on starting to roll up their sleeves and get to work. And certainly my organization and others I know are eager to hear more about your products moving forward. And I reiterate my colleague's offer to help in any way I can. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much, and my apologies to you for butchering your name.

Our next speaker is Kate Wing, and there's a name I can handle.

MS. WING: Thank you very much. Good morning, Members of the Committee. Thank you for giving us this opportunity to provide public comment today. My name is Kate Wing. I'm with the Natural Resources Defense Council. I work on ocean policy out

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the San Francisco office here. And we have over half a million members nationwide and over a hundred thousand members here in California. And I'm here representing those people today.

I want to let you know that there was a recent poll conducted or released just last week that shows that 75 percent of Californians support creating marine reserves, fully protected areas even when they were told that it might restrict their own commercial or recreational fishing opportunities.

There's a high level of support for not just MPAs but marine reserves in the state of California and by the members of the public and by Americans overall. And we have seen that in survey after survey, year after year, particularly on the West Coast.

So the work that you are doing is certainly timely. And I would remind you that it's not just for the user groups, as we usually think of them, and the stakeholders that many of you here are representing, but also for everyone and all members of the public, because it is a public resource. And this is part of how we invest in our public resource for the future.

I want to speak on a couple of things

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

particular to California since that's where we're lucky to have you at this meeting, and who knows where you will be put in the midst of these budget crises next time. Perhaps someplace not quite as scenic, but one can hope.

We believe that the Marine Life Protection Act is still a good model. You know we got some problems in California. We don't really have any money. We've got some budget crises. We've got a new governor who's still trying to figure out who's going to make things work.

But we think the bones of the MLPA are still sound. And we think that its processes for evaluating, reviewing and looking at public input as a way to design a network of Marine Protected Areas, looking at that kind of synthesis, trying to create a set-up that balances scientific input as well as public input and that looks at trying to walk that tightrope between respecting what the local community knowledge is, respecting what the needs of local people are, and respecting what the habitats locally are with the larger issues: How do they work together, how does the larval dispersal interact, how does this affect pelagic species, how does this affect the entire coastline out to the EEZ.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

How do all of these things interact and how can we create a process that gives you some type of a plan, a master plan, a master guideline, a master set of standards to meet for a lasting Marine Protected Area, and still takes into account what the people who live there and the people who use the area think.

On some level that is what you as a committee are being asked to come up with on a national level, and I don't envy you that task. It's very difficult.

And while we have this framework in California for how we're going to attempt to do that, as you can see, we still haven't managed to pull it off. We have a couple more years. And we still plan to do that, but it's still going to be an uphill task.

And I expect that and I hope that whatever ends up coming out of the national recommendations will respect what is going on in California and allow the processes that we already have in place here to be additive to that process and not have to be reinvented to fit a new national protocol.

I also want to comment actually briefly on the motion that is up for discussion that you'll be returning to at the end of our commentary, because I

2.0

think that the comments that were made by Ms. Parker are also illuminating for a number of reasons.

I too work extensively with the Councils, particularly with the Pacific Council. And many of the people in this room, I know as well, were at the meeting that NMFS held for their constituents last week in Washington, D.C.

And I would say I think that the Councils are not all that clear on what it is you are doing, that many of the Councils expect you to solve all of their problems for them. And some of the Council members think that you're going to fix every MPA issue and that they aren't going to have to deal with it. And they say things like, Well, we don't have to talk about that because that Federal Register Committee is going to figure that all out and then they're going to come back and tell us what to do.

So if you are not going to do that, you should tell the Councils. You should perhaps let them know in that letter. And if you are, in fact, going to be very constrained as an advisory body and really constrain your advice and not -- maybe only roll up your sleeves part way, but if you are going to constrain that, I think it also behooves you to let the other federal groups that are going to be involved

2.0

in this process know as well.

Because many people are looking to you to really be the beacon for where the federal government is going to go; where the two hands of NOAA, NMFS and NOS, are going to go, to make peace and move forward on MPAs that work for all the species in the ocean, not just whoever you happen to have regulatory authority on that day.

So I encourage you and I thank you for your work. And I encourage you to make clear as you go along what your path is going to be, both to the public and to the other federal agencies so at the end of this we really end up with something that works for the public and the state and the feds and the fish. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.

All of you have been very punctual; we are grateful for that.

The next speaker is Fleur O'Neill.

MS. O'NEILL: Good morning, Members of the Federal Advisory Committee. Thank you for providing the opportunity to make public comment this morning. My name is Fleur O'Neill and I work for Save Our Shores. We're a local nonprofit situated in Santa Cruz and Half Moon Bay. And we work to protect and

promote the ecological integrity of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

Save Our Shores and our many members throughout the Central California Coast support a network of well designed and enforced marine reserves to proactively protect the sustainability of ocean resources. By promoting an ecosystem approach to protection, Marine Protected Areas, particularly marine reserves, are proving to be an effective management tool in mitigating resource depletion and habitat devastation.

In the last two years Save Our Shores has been working to help diverse stakeholders become constructively involved in the implementation of reserves along the Central California coastline, particularly within the boundaries of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

In March 2002 Save Our Shores produced the first to have a Central Californian's Fisherman's Forum on Marine Protected Areas. More than 170 fisherman, scientists, environmentalists, and resource managers attended this two-day workshop.

The forum underscored the value of efforts to keep communication channels open during every stage of the MPA process. Most importantly the forum

revealed significant areas for common interests regarding MPAs.

Building on last year's success, next month Save Our Shores will begin a series of Fisherman Straight Talk Sessions. Each session will provide an opportunity for informal dialogue about Marine Protected Areas between fishermen, harbor personnel, and the marine science community.

Straight Talk Sessions will take place in local harbors. Beer and pizza will be provided for the fishermen, and the fishermen will be heard. A website containing a bulletin board or online forum will be posted or will be developed to keep the dialogue going and to keep the comments by the fishermen active.

In addition to reaching out to the fishermen, Save Our Shores will be forming a land-to-sea coalition. As you're well aware, MPAs require clean water. So it's extremely important to involve those who are involved in water quality protection and watershed restoration in the discussion on Marine Protected Areas.

A final objective of Save Our Shores' work in the next year is to educate various audiences within the general public about the benefits of Marine

1 Protected Areas. However, as Kate Wing pointed out, it seems Californians are already pro-reserves, and 75 2 percent of them stated their support for the creation 3 of reserves off the California coast in the recent 4 5 survey conducted by the Public Policy Institute. In support of MPAs, SOS or Save Our Shores 6 7 will continue to work towards the creation of a marine reserves network that is supported by the communities 8 and stakeholders that will benefit most from it. 9 10 Thanks very much. 11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Ms. O'Neill. 12 Our next speaker is Mr. Jamie Wine. 13 WINE: Good morning. I'd like to 14 thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is 15 Jamie Wine. I hold a B.S. in marine biology and a 16 in environmental studies, and Ι work 17 scientific aide at the Department of Fish and Game in 18 the Environmental Toxicology Lab. 19 I'm a scuba diver and a seafood lover, and 2.0 this Advisory Committee, what you're addressing, is 21 extremely important to me as a member of the public. 22 As you probably already know, a network of 23 marine reserves would provide multiple ends to a goal 24 of protecting the Ιt would increase ocean. 25 biodiversity, an abundance of species, and individuals

within those species groups. And it would provide an intrinsic beauty that hasn't really been addressed today or, as I've seen in general. Mostly we're looking at functionality.

And as a diver I've diven in -- dove in the Florida Keys and inside and outside of protected areas; in Costa Rica inside and outside of protected areas. And here in California I don't really dive outside of protected areas because there's really not that much to see.

And I think that that ecosystem value and the beauty of that biodiversity is an extremely important thing to consider. And that should be a stakeholder as well, but it's very hard to quantify and analyze what that means. And I'd like you to consider that in your advisory role.

I've I've seen these seen, things firsthand, and I like to see more of it. lifetime I've never known a time without beach I've never known a time without collapsed fisheries and I've never known a time without there being abundant lobster or abalone that I could go out and snorkel in and pick off the ocean floor and enjoy it with my family and with my friends.

And I don't know if some of you have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Τ	experienced that, but I would like to get back to a
2	point where those benefits exist and we can get rid of
3	the nasty things that are going on in our ocean.
4	I'd like to thank you for the time that
5	you're putting into this effort and I hope that you
6	are successful in bringing together the multiple
7	stakeholders in this process in designing Marine
8	Protected Areas on a federal level. Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much,
10	Mr. Wine.
11	The next speaker is Yasaman Golban.
12	MS. GOLBAN: Good morning. My name's
13	Yasaman Golban, and thank you for the opportunity to
14	allow me to speak this morning.
15	I'm speaking today simply representing
16	myself. I am a resident of San Francisco.
17	I've lived in coastal California most of
18	my life. I spent the first half of my life growing up
19	in Southern California. Sorry, I have a cold. And
20	the second half of my life growing up around here in
21	Northern California.
22	I first began learning about fisheries
23	issues in a college course a few years ago. And since
24	then I've grown increasingly concerned about the
25	health of our oceans. As many of you well know,

1 rampant pollution, widespread ecosystem damage, fisheries closures are all realities of my lifetime. 2 3 Today I simply want to register my strong support for networks of MPAs and marine reserves as 4 5 part of the solution to our ailing ocean ecosystems. I believe they are a critical tool to be 6 7 used and should be used more frequently than they are 8 today. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to 9 speak. 10 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much. 11 The next speaker is Bart Hall. Mr. Hall. 12 MR. HALL: I don't think I need that one. 13 I'll just turn this up a little bit. My name is Bart Hall and I'm the producer of consumer fishing shows in 14 15 California. And we produce the largest consumer 16 fishing show in the western United States. I sit on the board of directors of groups 17 18 with way too many letters in our acronyms and I've 19 spent a lot of money over the years trying to make 20 more fish in clean water. 21 that's important And an part for 22 recreational anglers: More fish and clean water. 23 Because we're really lousy at what we do. We use hook 24 and line, and we don't catch very many fish. 25 order to be successful we got to have good water and lots of fish.

2.0

So it's very important to us that the work you do here leads to more fish, but I would urge you to reject the model that you've seen in Southern California of marine reserves. That is a terrible model and it's not a model that's going to allow you to bring the recreational anglers into your fold.

And early on in the process, I find this very funny, the folks who were more extreme than I am in terms of conservation were saying that we want to create the Yosemite of the seas in Southern California. Well, I had the opportunity to respond to that because I just got back from Yosemite.

And I said, you know that is a great idea because one interesting thing about Yosemite is you could still fish there. And you can fish there. You can't use a net and you can't use a spear, but you could use a hook and line.

And in creating areas in the south I would urge you to look at the park model, because recreational anglers can be your steward in that environment, and we can follow the rules. We can use bag limits, slot limits, etc., etc., and only hook and line. And we can catch and release fish that we catch on hook and line if we manage to catch some.

	59
And, finally, as we	stand here today
talking about how terrible the con	ditions are in the
oceans, I've just returned from S	Southern California
where today they are catching white	sea bass in record
numbers, halibut in record number	s, calico bass in
record numbers. They are cat	ching marlin off
California this week in numbers we	haven't seen in a
long time.	
And so the problems	with fishing are
relative to other problems in red	creational anglers,
but if you want to include us do	not use the models

relative to other problems in recreational anglers, but if you want to include us do not use the models that you used in Southern California. The good thing that it did, it galvanized us a group. But we want to go forward and make more fish, and we want to make sure there's clean water. But we want to do it in a setting that allows recreational anglers to do what they do. And what they do does not negatively impact the environment. We can be the stewards to help that work.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Hall.

The next speaker is Ms. Jane DeLay.

MS. DeLAY: Good morning. And thank you for being here and thank you for inviting all of us to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

come and speak to you this morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I am here to speak not in my capacity, I'm Director of Policy for Save Our Shores, but instead I'm here to speak as a resident of Monterey, as a mother, as an educator, as a community leader, and as an artist in my community.

And I'm here to speak in support of Marine Protected Areas and the work that we are all here to do, to set aside areas of our ocean to protect them, because I think they offer the best opportunities to secure our future in terms of abundant biodiversity, healthy ocean ecosystems, our chances to improve our understandings of the ocean systems, as well as for maintaining sustainable multiple use.

And I'm here to speak because there are lots of authorities behind me. I have such great for my colleagues in the environmental respect community, for the fishing community with whom I have established relationships for, with all of you, and with the citizens of Monterey. Excuse me. it's more terrifying to come up and speak, from the emotional standpoint, than to have your notes in front of you. Thank you.

Anyway, I was inspired last night by a speaker who I heard speak, and it wasn't about marine

reserves, it was about the continuum of life and our role in that continuum of life, that we are not here to use and abuse the natural resources, rather we are a part of it.

And I believe that Marine Protected Areas assist us in understanding that and moving to be more a part of our natural systems in the flow of it. And he spoke about the consciousness of that continuum of life in terms of our consciousness of our past, our awareness of the present, and our hope for the future.

And Marine Protected Areas, as I said before, offer us that hope for the future. And he spoke and reminded us about the indigenous populations and their awareness of what was going on, and their intuitive response to protecting the resources by setting aside areas where once they thought they were depleted and they were no longer providing the support that they had in the past, that they were just set aside as tabu. They didn't need all the science and the fancy public meetings and all the things that we're going through, although I think that we need them now. But I wanted to remind us of that intuitive need to this is something that's worthwhile protecting and setting it aside works.

So please continue with the work that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

62 1 you're doing. Please continue to support the public process and allow the public to come and speak to you. 2 3 Certainly look to the Marine Protected Area and the work that all of us are doing to see that process go 4 5 forward in a very positive and inclusive way. And, once again, thank you for being here. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much. 8 The next speaker is Mr. Bob Osborn. 9 MR. OSBORN: Thank you for the opportunity 10 to speak today. My name is Robert Osborn, and I 11 represent the United Anglers of Southern California. 12 USAC is the largest association of dues-13 paying recreational fishermen in California. 14 various United Angler associations now total nearly

20,000 members and are affiliated with numerous other clubs, with memberships approaching 70,000 members.

USAC has been deeply involved in the MPA process in California since 1998. We have represented the angler point of view on MPAs through the entire Channel Island National Marine Sanctuary (phonetic) Process. We also have been involved with the California Marine Life Protection Act that was first brought into the public arena in 2001.

We have distributed information on Marine Protected hundreds of thousands of Areas to

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

recreational anglers. We solicited the input of over 60,000 recreational anglers for their opinions on Marine Protected Areas.

We obtained the signatures of over 40,000 concerned California citizens who were concerned about their access the ocean and protested the to establishment of massive marine reserves in California. This petition drive was conducted at sport fishing landings during the fall of 2001, which not a prime time for participation in sport fishing. Yet the drive quickly resulted in the removal of maps for a system of reserves in California.

It is important to note that the primary reason there was such an adverse political reaction to marine reserves is because the specific viewpoints of the California marine recreational angler was deliberately not included in the process of developing policies for Marine Protected Areas.

The West Coast is unique. It is unique in many ways. Geologically it's the young coast and it is still forming. Unlike the East and Gulf Coast it is characterized by very sprawled continental shelf. The continental shelf on the West Coast averages about 20 miles, which is a small fraction of the average width of the shelves in other U.S. coasts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Because of the geological use of the West Coast, it is also supports a smaller variety of geological features. Fewer exposures to major climate changes results in fewer unique features.

When a California policy was developed for marine in multiple replicating reserves locations unrepresentative of physical habitats, it failed to consider that in some cases only one or two instances feature The of appeal geological may exist. uniqueness of the West Coast demands unique solutions for its protection.

California anglers far and away represent the largest on-the-water public use and interest in California's marine living resources. Approximately 90 percent of trips on the ocean to view or utilize marine resources are by recreational anglers for the purpose of fishing.

California's the second largest state in Union for participation οf marine angling. According to the Marine Angler Expenditure Study in 2000, prepared Pacific Coast Region the National Marine Fishery Service, California marine anglers annually expend two and a half billion dollars in California on ocean angling. Oregon and Washington anglers combined spend annually another \$2 billion on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

ocean angling.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

The loss of recreational fishing opportunities would have devastating economic effects on coastal communities along the West Coast. These communities depend upon the business of recreational anglers to maintain the vitality of their communities. We have grave concerns that are representative of West Coast recreational anglers, who were not selected for participation on this important panel.

We believe it would be a huge mistake to move forward with the development of a national policy of Marine Protected Areas without ensuring that West Coast recreational fishermen are afforded an adequate opportunity to provide a full measure of input into the process.

this Committee provide We urge to information to the Secretary of Commerce the on existence of representation in gaps such as this as soon as possible. We believe that the only way a successful policy for Marine Protected Areas can be developed is by ensuring that are stakeholders have an opportunity to fully participate. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Indeed, thank you very much.

The next speaker is Mr. Bob Strickland.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. STRICKLAND: Good morning. My name is Bob Strickland. I'm the President of the United Anglers of California. And a lot of people have said what I wanted to say, but I'm going to just digress a little bit -- that might not be the right word.

But, anyway, we first heard about Marine Protected Areas, I was one of the people on the FMP, the Fisheries Management Plan, for the rockfish in California. And in the middle of our monthly meetings up pops MPAs.

Well, MPAs came to us as three things: A closed area, a park, and a conservation area. Now all we hear is closed areas. And we're not against MPAs, but like Bart Hall said, we're not causing the problem. We would like to see parks where we can still fish. Rod and reel are not hurting our fisheries.

There is destructive fishing out there that are doing the damage, and it's not us. And I'd like you guys to really look at that.

The other thing I'm going to tell you, and I know this for a fact. The second illegal thing in California is poaching. And that's because we don't have enough wardens to protect our resources here in California. Now to bring in these more MPAs, I don't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

1	know how we're going to protect those.
2	So there's a lot here to consider and I
3	hope you will take the time to consider these things.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.
6	I would like that's the last of our
7	registered commenters. I'd like to ask if Mr. Howard
8	Egan has re-entered the room, because we had your
9	name, but didn't notice you.
10	Seeing no sign of Mr. Egan, I believe we
11	have gone through the list of people who had signed up
12	to speak.
13	Maggie, do I now declare the public
14	comment period closed? I'm sorry, I'm still learning
15	the ropes here.
16	Yes, all of the comments we received will
17	be in the transcript. And if any of you have written
18	comments that you wish to submit to us, we will make
19	sure that all Members of the Committee do receive
20	them.
21	I've just been notified that there is an
22	individual in the room who wishes to speak on behalf
23	of, I presume that's the right word, Mr. Howard Egan,
24	and the name is Robert Thomas; is that correct?
25	MR. THOMAS: No. My name is Roger Thomas,

and --

2.0

2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Roger Thomas.

MR. THOMAS: Roger Thomas, and I represent the Golden Gate Fisherman's Association. Our association has approximately 70 commercial passenger fishing vessels from Fort Bragg through Monterey, carrying approximately 250,000 anglers yearly to our offshore fishing grounds.

We're also associated very closely with SAC, which is our Southern California counterpart, and they carry 750,000 marine recreational anglers yearly to the offshore fishing grounds.

I'm also a member of the Pacific Fisheries

Management Council and I also sat on one of the

Regional Committees for California, MLPA stuff. And

that has come to screeching halt for one reason:

There is no money to support the thing.

All of us were working towards solutions and supported the activity of having Marine Protected Areas in our toolbox to get the job done.

When I bring up financial matters and fiscal matters, my big concern with all the MPAs is that we look at areas we think we should close, I think we need to make sure that we have the money and the funds to inventory what is in the areas, to take a

look and make a final determination if it's scientifically valid to close it.

We need to have the money to enforce the closure. We need to set goals of what we want to establish by the closures and be able to open the areas up if our goals are met.

The Councils, the state regulators have set lots of regulations to manage fisheries. We probably have the largest closed zone on the West Coast, 20 fathoms out to 250 fathoms in most areas of the coast is totally closed to commercial and recreational groundfish fishing.

In Southern California you have the 4700square-mile cowcod closure and you also have the Sanctuary closure. And these are all done by management agencies. The Council has restricted drastically on limits recreational fishermen, there's lots of activities. And all these closures are to protect four different fish: Bocaccio, canary, yelloweye and cowcod. And we feel with these closures we have a great chance of them coming back.

In fact, the bocaccio on recent surveys had showed a dramatic increase, and will be able to the Council level -- to have a limited fishery on bocaccio next year.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Τ.	we certainly support having it in our
2	toolbox. And I would urge this Committee when making
3	recommendations, if the money isn't there to support
4	it, let's get the funds somehow. Because if it is
5	this done properly I don't believe it will work.
6	Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.
8	I think that exhausts the list of people
9	now that had signed up to speak. And the public
10	comment period is closed. Is that all, Maggie?
11	Thank you. Again thank all of you and my
12	apologies to those of you whose names I butchered.
13	I'd ask Dana in the future for a little bit of
14	phonetic help for some of them so maybe next time I
15	can do better. Thank you again.
16	Okay. I guess we're back. Mary, how much
17	time do you have time before you have to go?
18	MS. GLACKIN: If I'm out of here at
19	quarter of 11:00.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Quarter of 11:00, okay.
21	We ended we interrupted, I should say,
22	our deliberations. We interrupted our deliberations,
23	I guess, I fear in a sense of a little consternation
24	and confusion and some concern, I guess, right? Is
25	that fair enough, Lelei, from your group.

And let me see if I can't capture where I think we are. And then I do have a promise to Gil and Dolly and Bob to speak. I have you on the list, but let me say that it seems to me the issue here is we are structured, we are set up to offer advice and comment to the Secretaries.

And my guess is that several of the groups are intent on producing work products, and maybe that's the sense. And I think group 2 articulated that in a very tangible way in the sense that they feel they need staff support to do the kind of work that they envision -- or that all of the subcommittees envision doing.

And I will defer it to Mary in a minute. And I will go to Gil and Dolly and Bob, but it seems to me the reconciliation of these two visions, which need not be in conflict, is that the work products that are produced as long as they are in the manner of generating the information base to offer advice, offer comment, then we don't have a problem.

But if it means this Committee going back to ask for more money to allow extraordinary work to be done, obviously we have a bit of an issue that has to be discussed.

So, Gil, I promise to go back to you. I

2.0

will recognize Dolly, Bob, Terry, who wants to speak.

And I think there may be others, Bob. So let me -let's see, I've got Gil, Dolly, Bob, Terry, and Bob
Bendick.

MR. RADONSKI: Well, I stated what I saw as a problem on Monday when we talked about setting up subcommittees. I said that we do need to develop a procedure how we are going to receive requests from the two Secretaries to provide advice and recommendations.

And at that time I stated I saw Joe's proposal as the only recommendation or piece of paper that we've received from the Department for advice. That's how I saw those requests within the subcommittees.

still think our first order business should be to develop procedures for how we are going to receive requests from the Secretaries and how they're going to be dispatched. I think that probably what we did in the subcommittees was a little over ambitious, but it's a worthwhile product. The Secretaries already have received the needs That's a document that's a basis assessment. subcommittees to recommendations. We're going to try and sort that out and identify gaps. I think that's a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

legitimate piece of advice and recommendation to the Secretaries.

That being said, I think when we -- one of the reasons we're in the predicament we are is because the way the FACA Committee started up. We had an abomination of a meeting in Washington, D.C. that was replete with poor facilities and poor guidance, and everything else.

We came to our Second Meeting and we elected a chairman. Now my personal feeling is the Chairman is not a referee. Anybody can referee this meeting. The Chairman who's going to provide guidance to this Committee and he's going to depend on strong staff support from the Department to relay to us what our agenda is and how we're going to handle these requests.

We have received just about nothing in the way of guidance from staff. I just think we've had a horrible start. We've got to set up our procedures for how we're going to deal with the departmental requests, because that should be our number one item. That's what it says. The Executive Order is very clear. And Mary has pointed this out very succinctly.

That's the end of my comments.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Dolly. Dolly passes. Bob Zales.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. I agree a lot of what Gil has said, and I quess I need clarification because I can consider this several If all we're going to do is give advice and ways. recommendations, I mean do we do that just verbally? We just sit here and then give our comments to the two Secretaries and to the Secretary of Commerce predominantly, and do we let it go at that? Or do we actually do work and give advice on information that's provided to us and put it in a written format, something that is documented and is tangible and it can be read and distributed later?

And I guess that's the key question, because if you're going to do this in writing, unless we all write it ourselves and depending on the size of what's going to be done, then I would suggest that some staff help is going to be necessary.

I mean in my mind if all we're going to do is give verbal advice and recommendations, why do we have subcommittees? I mean we can do that as a committee as a whole.

So I guess I'm trying to get some guidance and some clarification on that.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Terry O'Halloran.

2.0

MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My response to that in subcommittee 2 is a couple of things. We did get this guidance from the MPA Center for the subcommittees.

We had eight items in there that they would like some assistance and advice on. And we ordered our subcommittee in order that we might address those.

In terms of product I think what we're trying to do, and this is my interpretation, is that we do go back and we do roll up our sleeves, we do educate ourselves and we produce a product not to go to the Secretary but to come to this body in which to help us formulate whatever recommendations this body might deem appropriate to the Secretaries. So that's the process that I see that we're doing in our subcommittee.

And I see us as being very proactive rather than reactive. I don't feel the part of our -- that our only role here is to wait until we're asked a question and then react to that question. That we are a proactive group and to give advice in areas that perhaps the Secretaries might not even have been able to formulate the question. So we'll give you the

answer and then let you come up with the question.

In terms of the finances, it was not in order to get a larger budget in which to do more, just simply do more work. I see our financial crunch coming in our meetings, in the number of meetings we can have and where those meetings might be conducted, because of the different budgetary -- the different costs in different locations.

And I think that that is one of the reasons why we would like to see an increased budget, so that we might perhaps have some flexibility in more meetings and in some places that might be considered more expensive. Because, from my mind, some of those locations are going to be important for us to go and visit and hear from the local communities in those regions.

The other thing about staff support is that during our subcommittee meeting we had our recorder, which was Bonnie, and we found that she was spending her time trying to record what our comments were rather than participating. And her participation to us was very important.

And we find that we need to have that staff support so that the Committee Members in the subcommittees are free to participate actively and

proactively to do our work. And that the MPA Center's, they've got full plates. Each of those members, the staff, I'm amazed at the amount of work that you're able to produce with the number -- I was surprised that you only had something like five FTEs.

The amount of work that comes out of that MPA Center, I'm amazed. I think you guys should be commended with what you're able to do. So as a subcommittee if we go to the MPA Center and we request information that might require research, a little extra work, I think that that's additional work levels that they may need additional support for and that drives to the resources. So that's kind of may take on some of the comments that Mary made.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Very good.

Rod, could you?

DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First let me just say that I shared Terry's belief, the work plan developed by subcommittee 2 is intended to be responsive to Joe's guidance and the subcommittee structure and the bullets that we adopted as a full Committee. I don't think we intended it to be a de novo product, that it's not responsive and does not provide advice and comment.

So it really is trying to focus on the

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

2.0

Center is specifically asking for guidance on. 2 3 I also just -- I think that maybe the conflict here arises from different interpretations of 4 5 what the nature of the comment is. You know there's passive comment on existing documents and strategies, 6 7 which we could just do verbally as individuals. 8 I think the work plan that we've outlined gives our subcommittee and maybe other subcommittees 9 10 an opportunity to think more creatively, a little bit 11 more out of the box, and in a little more proactive 12 fashion, perhaps to be more thoughtful about how we 13 address these questions and issues. Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks. 15 Let's see, Wally and then, Joe, do you 16 want to make a clarifying comment? 17 MR. URAVITCH: Just one short clarifying 18 This pertains to the charges specifically to 19 the Committee that were presented in June and at this 20 meeting. 21 This is not something we made up. 22 maybe it wasn't clear, that we didn't put it into a 23 memorialized document such as a transmittal letter 24 from someone in the agencies to the committees, but 25 the three specific tasks we asked were those from the

specific questions and points, the issues that the MPA

1	Department leadership. They're not from me, they're
2	not from the MPA Center.
3	Maybe what we need to do in future is put
4	them in the form of a letter to the Chair from the
5	leadership of the agency so that it's clear that
6	that's what that is. But the specific charges I
7	presented both in June and here are directly from
8	leadership in Commerce and Interior. It's not us.
9	MR. RADONSKI: Can I clarify my point on
LO	that, Chair?
L1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes, you may.
L2	MR. RADONSKI: I agree with Joe and I
L3	cased it I put it in those words. It did come from
L4	an approved work program. And I thought it was very
L5	legitimate and I am very proud of the way working
L6	group 2, subcommittee 2 handled it. I think it's a
L7	model. It is a roll-up-your-sleeves, it is a lot of
L8	work, but it does comport with the directive in the
L9	Executive Order.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Mary, I
21	recognize.
22	MS. GLACKIN: Mr. Chair,
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And then Wally, but I
24	Mary has a special position here.
25	MS. GLACKIN: Well, I was just going to

1	say, Mr. Chairman, I found all of these comments here
2	very helpful and really encourages me that I do think
3	that the Committee settled into some consensus on the
4	role and the approach to the role and one that I think
5	the government welcomes.
6	So, as I said before, my concern wasn't
7	with the particular recommendation itself. And these
8	comments and all that have been made I think are
9	have been very helpful.
10	MR. RADONSKI: Mary, can we get some
11	guidance from the Department on how we should handle
12	these, just as the question that Joe raised
13	MS. GLACKIN: Thank you. I meant to go
14	on. I knew I had one more thing I wanted to say.
15	I think that we do have start-up issues, I
16	mean June notwithstanding. You know we're developing
17	things. I think we should feel good about how far
18	we've come in the last couple of days, but I think we
19	clearly need to do more. And we can go back and look
20	at that and come forward with approaches. And I think
21	that's quite appropriate.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good, okay. Wally.
23	DR. PEREYRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
24	I appreciate it. And I certainly appreciate the
25	comments of my colleagues that preceded me on this

important issue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to say, though, that from my perspective in looking over the Executive Order, I see the Center as being the organism that does the work. I don't see us becoming another Center. I think that could be counterproductive. I think we could be working at cross purposes.

I think our greatest value that we can in fact, provide the advice provide is to, and recommendations. And these recommendations may be recommendations to the Center to consider certain other approaches or ways of looking or addressing a certain particular issue. But for us to get involved in going and doing research and so on and so forth, I mean I have another job. I have several jobs. In fact, I have too many jobs at the present time that require a great deal of my time. And I cannot be spending 40 hours a week, so forth, or even 20 hours a week working on a big work job.

So from my perspective I'm more than willing and excited about providing advice and consent to the Department and to the Center on this important issue, but I think we should focus in that direction.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.

Are there any other comments? Bob --

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

sorry, Bob. Yeah.

2.0

MR. BENDICK: Just very briefly. I think the strength of this Committee is its diversity. That's the value it brings to the Departments. And we're talking about a proactive versus reactive approach.

We could each from our own perspectives provide comments. And that may be of some value, but not the real value we could bring to this enterprise. It's only if we can work together to find some common understanding and do that around specific charges or issues as has been done in the subcommittees, that we bring real value in bridging the gaps among us and being able to offer to the Departments some meaningful basis for policy compromise.

Now that also comes in the sort of rough and tumble of public hearings and meetings, but we can try to avoid that. We can try to be proactive. And we can only do that if we produce some product that brings us together to comment rather than doing that separately.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Yes, Max.

MR. PETERSON: Let me suggest a couple things. Number one, I think the staff has done a very good job in recognizing the 30 of us that have

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

different perceptions on what the staff might have done. I thought the staff have done a real fine job.

I think Mary's help here has been good. I think other staff, I think Joe's help has been very good.

So I don't want to leave any impression that the Committee is somehow dissatisfied with the staff, because I think the majority of the Committee is very satisfied with the staff.

When you have 30 people that are very divergent you have a certain amount of thrashing around, which we saw the first couple of days. I think we have settled down.

I did a little calculations quickly, and this Committee cost probably about \$100 a minute if you calculate any value at all to our time. So I think we need -- the only thing that's frustrating to me is I think we need to move on. I think that we need to get going on the agenda.

I don't think we need any more advice. The Executive Order outlines a whole bunch of things that we're expected to do. I think we need to get cracking. It's clear to me that the recommendation of the subcommittees go to the full Committee, and then they go to the Secretaries as advice, not action but as advice.

2.0

1 If they want more advice from us, please But I'm not going to sit around and wait for 2 ask. 3 I think we've got enough to keep us busy for a 4 couple of years. Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. 6 Maggie asked to follow up on a question 7 Terry O'Halloran raised. 8 MS. ERNST: Terry, you raised a question 9 at the June meeting about whether we could accept in-10 kind services --11 MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes. 12 MS. ERNST: -- as a means to help stretch 13 our budget. 14 MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes. 15 MS. ERNST: And I did get an answer for 16 And I'd just like to put that on the record now. you. 17 And that is that the Department can accept gifts 18 under certain circumstances to support Advisory 19 Committee meetings. 20 But the point would be that the Department 21 or NOAA would be the ones accepting it, and not the Committee itself. And this has usually been in the 22 23 form of in-kind gifts like meeting space, things that 24 would have otherwise had to have paid 25 ourselves.

1	There are some caveats. We don't accept
2	gifts from grantees or contractors, or pay any source
3	where acceptance of a gift would create an appearance
4	of impropriety. And so we can start looking at those
5	kinds of opportunities to stretch the budget for
6	meetings.
7	MR. O'HALLORAN: Excellent.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you. It's
9	10:15. We have a break scheduled at 10:30. We will
10	need to discuss that.
11	We have to hear yet from group 2 again.
12	Do you right? I mean and group 1. Mark, we
13	never did bring you back this morning, did we? No.
14	Group 3 is finished.
15	Group 2, do you regard yourselves as
16	finished or do you want a little more time?
17	MR. PEAU: Well, I
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: But let me just yes
19	or no right now.
20	MR. PEAU: No.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No. So we have to hear
22	from group 1, Mark. We have to discuss the next
23	meeting. We have to discuss the venue and the dates.
24	And a comment was made that you didn't want a
25	chairman who was a referee as opposed to a leader.

And let me only say that in that vein I would very much be grateful if group 2 would reconsider its focus on more money and more budget. And I, too, thought that yesterday we were on a very good trajectory. I thought when the groups got together that there was a lot of excitement, a lot of creativity coming out of them, ideas about what was going to be done next. I'm not as pessimistic as some evidently that this meeting has not been very good. And so I would urge that the groups go

And so I would urge that the groups go back and continue, as you've said you were going to do. And I guess I wished that the budgetary question could put to one side at this moment, but that's only a request on my part.

I think, as Max and others have said, Wally has said, we do have a good trajectory. We have wonderful ideas that have come from subcommittees. And it seems to me that March 15th is a useful date by which the subcommittees will formulate, crystallize what it is they think they wish to do. Before we leave here today we need to ratify or sign off on their general work plans. And let's move forward.

Mark, would you like to try to report for group 1?

DR. HIXON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Thanks.

DR. HIXON: I apologize for not having a document for the rest of the Committee. Our committee met right up to the meeting time this morning.

We've been working very closely with our ex-officio Members, Charlie Wahle and Mary Glackin.

And we propose to the full Committee a work plan between now and March 15th that entails three things.

First, the draft goals/vision statement that we presented yesterday we will continue to revise among ourselves until we have reached consensus. Then post that on the secure webpage for the consideration of the full Committee for a continued discussion up to and including our next meeting. That's the first item.

The second item is to provide feedback for the Notice in the Federal Register regarding MMA criteria, the document that we've all received copies of before. The Center, MPA Center has requested our subcommittee to provide formal feedback about that document. And later in the process to provide feedback on the Center's responses to public comment on that document, that public comment period now being closed. So we propose to do that as well.

And, finally, our third item that we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.0

1	propose is to help the MPA Center start to formulate a
2	process whereby human impacts in the U.S. EEZ can
3	somehow be assessed. This will be a very long-term
4	process in the long run, but begin to define and work
5	with the Center on exactly what that process would
6	entail. That's our proposal. Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Any
8	comments to that? David and Michael.
9	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat
10	confused with that report. I thought that the
11	subcommittees maybe I misinterpreted what was said,
12	but I thought that the subcommittees were to prepare
13	materials to come back to the full Committee. For
14	example, feedback on the MMA criteria. It sounded
15	like the subcommittee was going to work directly with
16	the Center and represent us as a body or represent the
17	subcommittee and give them comments. That's what is
18	I need some clarification on that.
19	Similarly,
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Would you clarify that
21	for us?
22	DR. HIXON: Yes, I'd be happy to clarify.
23	Implicitly, all subcommittees report to
24	the full Committee. So each item in our work plan
25	will come back to the full Committee for

1	consideration.
2	MR. BENTON: Before it goes to the Center?
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
4	MR. BENTON: Okay. Fair enough.
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I have Mike and then
6	Rod and Maggie reminds me, it comes back here. We
7	deliberate on any work product, anything that the
8	subcommittees
9	DR. HIXON: Absolutely.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's clear in your
11	DR. HIXON: That's absolutely clear to our
12	subcommittee.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
14	DR. HIXON: I'd also like to Mike now
15	has the floor
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No.
17	DR. HIXON: I thought he did.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, I did, and David
19	said he wants to elaborate, so
20	DR. HIXON: Oh, okay.
21	MR. BENTON: Just seeking just a little
22	bit more clarification, Mr. Chairman.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.
24	MR. BENTON: So, for example, if you also
25	said you were going to formulate a process with the

1	Center on how to assess human impacts, before that
2	goes to the Center as a recommendation, that's going
3	to come back here for review and possible
4	modification?
5	DR. HIXON: That is correct.
6	MR. BENTON: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay.
8	MS. GLACKIN: Could I?
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, Mary, please.
10	MS. GLACKIN: Yeah. Because this kind of
11	gets to the point. What's actually going to happen
12	here is the Center is drafting an approach for doing
13	that. And we're going to do an iteration here, but it
14	to get something that's good enough to come to the
15	full Committee.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
17	MS. GLACKIN: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Wonderful.
19	Okay, Mike has the floor.
20	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you
21	DR. HIXON: Mike, you had asked me to
22	introduce you; is that correct?
23	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes.
24	DR. HIXON: Okay. There's been an issue
25	before our subcommittee regarding the status of

Mike

And

2	Cruickshank has proposed three explicit questions he
3	wants to be read into the record.
4	So, Mike.
5	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Jim.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Could I just ask a
7	clarification question? Is this essential to your
8	going forward? Is it part of your intended work plan?
9	I appreciate needing to get something in the record,
10	but if it is a bit aside, tangential to the permission
11	that you folks need to proceed, I would like to know
12	whether now is the right time to do this.
13	DR. HIXON: It's not explicitly in the
14	three items we propose at this time, although it's
15	certainly an item that must be addressed.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Must be addressed.
17	DR. HIXON: And is certainly relevant to
18	the overall goals and vision statement.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Is that okay?
20	We hear from Mike?
21	Go ahead, Mike.
22	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23	This is drafts of requests for clarification
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Will you be able if
25	it's long will you be able to provide us written

nonliving, nonrenewable resources.

1 DR. CRUICKSHANK: At 1:30. You have it in front of you, Mr. Chairman. 2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I have it in front of 3 4 me. 5 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Or you had. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, well, I've got a 6 7 lot of stuff in front of me here. 8 DR. CRUICKSHANK: I gave one to each of 9 the subcommittee members. That's not enough to go 10 right around the full Committee. So this is a draft 11 of request for clarification from the Secretaries of 12 the Departments of Interior and Commerce. Clarification is requested 13 Ouestion 1: 14 from the Secretary of the Department of Interior on 15 whether the areas designated as leases or other set-16 asides under the authority of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act as amended in '97 be included or 17 18 excluded wholly or selectively from the inventory and the subsequent list of national MPAs. 19 2.0 The second question: Clarification is 21 requested from the Secretary of the Department 22 Commerce on whether the areas designated as leases or 23 other set-asides under the authority of the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act of 1966 be included 24

or excluded wholly or selectively from the inventory

	and bubbequene libe of macronal minb.
2	Question 3: Clarification is requested
3	from the Secretary of the Department of Interior on
4	whether the MMS, or Minerals Management Service, has
5	the authority to require that coastal states with
6	existing MPAs in their territorial waters adjacent to
7	active OCS leases contribute data to the MPA Centers
8	in the development of a national MPA inventory at no
9	cost to the MPAs.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
11	DR. CRUICKSHANK: And those are the three
12	requests. I did make a couple of additions that had
13	been given to me in review, which you may have noted
14	there. And I will give you the reserved piece.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
16	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Now I don't know what to
17	do with this, Mr. Chairman, to present it now as a
18	proposal and perhaps
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, as my question,
20	does the Committee wish to consider these requests in
21	more detail before they're passed on? And, if so, we
22	have a bit of a problem in terms of time?
23	And is there an urgency, Mark? I come
24	back to you for help on this.
25	Mike, would you be content to have that

_	Come here and then at the next meeting deliberate and
2	discuss this in some detail?
3	DR. CRUICKSHANK: I think so. And I think
4	it's also important that I was approached by and
5	representative of the Minerals Management Service, who
6	asked that they be apprised of this proposal
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
8	DR. CRUICKSHANK: early on.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
LO	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Before it becomes cast
L1	in concrete so that they may comment on it.
L2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. These are
L3	important issues. They are important questions. The
L <b>4</b>	issue I have before me is the urgency of it now versus
L5	at our next meeting.
L6	DR. CRUICKSHANK: I think that the next
L7	meeting would probably be a sufficient time for it to
L8	have the stamp of approval, but I've had if we have
L9	the okay to pass it out to MMS.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Could I be
21	reassured, Maggie and Joe, that this will show up in
22	the book for the next meeting?
23	MS. ERNST: Conveyed.
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, be conveyed to
25	MMS and get prompted for deliberation by this

1	Committee before it goes as a request of the
2	Committee. Is that okay?
3	DR. CRUICKSHANK: That's
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike, is that fine?
5	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Rod Fujita. No?
7	Okay. It's 10:30. We have to take a
8	break or we cannot take a break. I'll do whatever
9	your wishes suggest.
10	We do have to discuss the next meeting. I
11	would like to have us now come back and, in a sense,
12	synthesize in our mind what we think we heard from the
13	three groups. One way to do this is to ask you
14	whether you heard anything this morning from groups 1,
15	2, or 3 that cause you anxiety, that you want to
16	revisit.
17	I've expressed one form of anxiety that I
18	have about budgets. And then let them go forward, or
19	we can go back and item by item give them authority to
20	proceed.
21	I'll open it up to your wishes here. Max.
22	MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that
23	we tell the subcommittees to go ahead and do good
24	things.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Go ahead and do good

1	things.
2	MR. O'HALLORAN: I second it.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's been moved and I
4	think it's been seconded by Terry O'Halloran that the
5	subcommittees be authorized to go do good work. Is
6	that do I capture the essence of this, Max?
7	MR. PETERSON: Yes, sir. And in
8	accordance with their work plan.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: In accordance with
10	their work plan spelled out to us.
11	MR. PETERSON: Right.
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike, is this a
13	comment?
14	MR. NUSSMAN: It's a comment toward that
15	motion, and I would certainly support that motion
16	because I am totally in favor of good things.
17	That being said, Mr. Chairman,
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Which distinguishes you
19	from
20	MR. NUSSMAN: Virtually everybody else in
21	this group I would say.
22	At any rate, I do think that the point you
23	made raises an interesting concern. As we go down the
24	road, by the very nature of our meeting and the way we
25	meet and the way we move things forward. I think there

1	needs to be a process we think through, so we actually
2	know collectively when we're doing things that really
3	count.
4	In other words, this is the last view.
5	We're going to move towards this recommendation.
6	We're going to do this. I'm not sure how we
7	accomplish that. I know other advisory committees and
8	other groups have mechanisms that it has to be in
9	writing and we do it at this point in time during the
10	meeting, but we need to think through that. I don't
11	think we're anywhere close to that unfortunately right
12	now, but I think we will be in one day. And I would
13	urge us to think through the process of how we sort of
14	identify major decision points we make. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. I worry
16	about that as well.
17	David, your hand is up, and then Rod.
18	MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19	Sorry I stepped out for just a second. Is it and
20	this is just a point of clarification. Yesterday I
21	believe it was group 1 said that they were in a
22	process of forming technically a work group under the
23	FACA.
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well,
25	MR. BENTON: At one point they've said

	chae and I iii
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: They used that word and
3	Mark withdrew the word "working" the minute it was out
4	of his mouth within our subcommittee.
5	MR. BENTON: Okay. So we're not looking
6	at a subcommittee going off and forming a work group
7	under FACA? Perfect.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We are not, but Mark
9	would like to elaborate as clarification?
10	MR. BENTON: I'm satisfied, Mr. Chairman.
11	DR. HIXON: To clarify that, Mr. Chairman,
12	we actually did discuss a bona fide working group at
13	our initial meeting, but later reconsidered that. So
14	at this time we are not discussing forming a working
15	group as defined. We always use the word as it was
16	originally defined. Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Yes, David.
18	MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19	Just being a stickler for details then. So by saying
20	"going off and doing good work and consistent with the
21	work plan, " no work groups no subcommittee's going
22	to put together a work group without coming back here.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's correct.
24	MR. BENTON: And the products of the
25	subcommittees are going to come back here for review,

1	approval before they become anything approaching quasi
2	official to the agencies and
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That is absolutely
4	true.
5	MR. BENTON: Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That has been our
7	operating procedure since we started. Thanks for
8	clarifying it, David. That is exactly what will
9	happen.
10	There will be no work product, no anything
11	from any subcommittee that is not reviewed and
12	discussed at some length by this group.
13	So we have a motion before us that the
14	committees go do good work. Rod? I'm sorry, I did
15	have you on the list, yes.
16	DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
17	too am in favor of good work, but I do have a question
18	for subcommittee 1 regarding their proposed workplan.
19	Mark, from a quick glance at the bullets
20	under subcommittee 1, Subcommittee Structure, it looks
21	like the three that you've selected to focus on the
22	draft goal/vision statement, feedback on MMA criteria,
23	and this process to assess human impact kind of
24	captured most of those bullets, right.
25	I'm wondering if the identification of

	priority habitats or important resources and habitats,
2	those two bullets, are those worked into those three
3	proposed work elements or were they explicitly
4	excluded and, if so, why?
5	DR. HIXON: Mark Hixon. They were not
6	explicitly excluded. And would implicitly ultimately
7	be part of a human impacts analysis.
8	These were identified by the ex-officio
9	Members as their most pressing needs at the present
10	time, again between now and March 15th.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Other discussion
12	of the motion?
13	All in favor of the motion as stated say
14	"aye."
15	[MEMBERS]: Aye.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?
17	(No audible response.)
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good work wins out,
19	Mike.
20	MR. PETERSON: Well, I was surprised by
21	that.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Let me say that what I
23	would like to have happen would be that Maggie and Joe
24	and the three chairs of the subcommittees would work
25	together to distill down and, Mark, you did a
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

	101
	wonderful job sort of giving us three points all of
	you did. I don't mean to distinguish but that was
	very clear, 1, 2, and 3. That would be wonderful, I
	believe, if this were posted on the website so that
	Members of the Committee could get into it and have a
	reference point so they could see exactly what 2 is
	going to do and 1 is going to do and 3 is going to do,
	okay?
	And it can be as brief as what you did,
	Mark, or it could be as elaborated as what Mel did, so
	that everybody on the Committee here can, if they wake
Ш	

up in the middle of the night terrified by what one of the subcommittees is doing, they can go see it and be reassured that they know what's going to happen.

And in a sense this will provide all of us with a roadmap and also kind of an agenda item that we know what we can expect to deliberate at our next We will not be surprised when these work meeting. products appear before us. Is that all right?

Would you like that? Is there anything else you would like? Mark?

I just want my subcommittee to DR. HIXON: know that I'll put that workplan past them before posting it on the web.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Mel.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. MOON: Yeah. I think the question of
2	the forwarding of this information to the Department
3	of Interior and Department of Commerce, I assume
4	that's going to be forwarded by you as the Chairman to
5	minutes or a letter transmittal?
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
7	MR. MOON: Okay. I just wanted
8	clarification.
9	I think it would be good if we were to get
LO	a response back, and I guess that could be part of our
L1	letter, to encourage us to give us some guidance, that
L2	we give you good information, is this the kind of
L3	thing that you are looking for, so that we can get
L4	some communication back and forth.
L5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.
L6	Yes, ted.
L7	CAPT. THOMPSON: Ted Thompson. A number
L8	of us were torn between which subcommittee we would be
L9	like to be on and could obviously only participate on
20	one during this meeting. But during the
21	intercessional, between meetings I for one, and I
22	assume others, may like to be at least at least
23	have a watching brief as to what is happening in
24	subcommittee 1, in particular, in my case, and would

it be possible for us to at least be on the email

1 exchange list to watch what's going on as that's being 2 developed. Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. 4 Yes, Mark. 5 DR. HIXON: In response to Ted's request, 6 our committee discussed that issue, especially the 7 goal/vision statement, which is such a general thing. 8 But every step along the way, what our subcommittee 9 decided to do, my belief is that we would hash out 10 within find documents our group, а 11 statement, then post that on the secure webpage, at 12 which time the entire Committee has access to it. So 13 basically we'd be putting things forward as opposed to 14 opening up all our email discussions to all Committee 15 Members. 16 first We've chosen to operate а subcommittee and take our first drafts, our first cut 17 18 at things, and then put them out there for the entire 19 Committee. 20 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Ted, is that all right? 21 CAPT. THOMPSON: At that point is the rest 22 of the Committee going to have opportunity to discuss 23 intercessionally before it is finalized 24 bringing it back to the next meeting? 25 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.

1	CAPT. THOMPSON: Then that would be
2	satisfactory.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Would there be may I
4	ask of everyone, there be a mechanism whereby when one
5	of the subcommittees posts new things on the website
6	that a general alert email goes out to all of us?
7	Because like Wally, some of us have three or four
8	jobs. And sitting around consulting websites is
9	something that we do when we can squeeze it in.
10	So, Maggie, is that going to be possible,
11	that there could be some mechanism so that a blanket
12	email goes out to all of us that says there's a new
13	posting on the website. You don't even need to say
14	what it is, just alert us.
15	MS. ERNST: We'll say what it is.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, you can, but
17	minimize your work burden. Ted, that then alerts all
18	of us, that there's new stuff posted there, go consult
19	it.
20	Mark.
21	DR. HIXON: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that
22	the subcommittee chairs then notify Maggie
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
24	DR. HIXON: to make those general
25	announcements.

1	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. Yes,
2	that's a good
3	DR. HIXON: As items become available.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that all right?
5	Okay. Tell you what, why don't we take a
6	three-minute break, allow you to do the necessities.
7	And try to get back here at 10:45. We have to discuss
8	the next meeting, the venue, the dates, and the
9	agenda.
10	(Recess taken from 10:42 a.m. to 10:55
11	a.m.)
12	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Unless I missed
13	something we have three issues to address, and then
14	I'll bring up the fourth. But right now yes, Bob.
15	MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. Mr. Chairman, I
16	hate to do this, but I need to bring something up to
17	try to get a little further clarification.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.
19	MR. ZALES: But I have a concern about how
20	do subcommittees communicate back and forth to the
21	Center and the rest of the full Committee is out. And
22	it's my understanding as a member of committee 1 that
23	in our deliberations on the past that we're going
24	over, that there's going to be communication between
25	the Center and us. But it's my understanding that

that information is going to be out.

2.0

So it's not necessarily that the Members of the full Committee can comment on every little thing that's done, but they can kind of watch the process. And if they see something that they have a concern with or something, they can communicate with one of the other Committee Members or the Chairman or something. And I just want to be sure that that's clear.

And there may be a couple other comments from other Members of the full Committee about this, but I just want to be sure that my understanding is clear.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Mike.

MR. NUSSMAN: Mr. Chairman, this goes back to the question I asked yesterday which was what are, in fact, our rights and privileges as a Committee Member versus a subcommittee we don't serve on. And I want -- I guess the question is what are -- let's make sure we understand those and have a good feel for that.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. I'll give you an operational impression and then maybe there are technical issues. It would seem to me that any Member of this full Committee is entitled to and encouraged

1	to watch and contribute to the deliberations of any of
2	the subcommittees. I would hope that's what we can
3	do.
4	That's Bob's concern. Right, Bob?
5	MR. ZALES: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And you're sort of
7	thinking, okay, how do we get this done. It's your
8	concern. And I don't see anything in any I'm not
9	aware of anything that would prevent that from going
10	forward. And I should think we ought to encourage i
11	MR. NUSSMAN: That's very good, Mr.
12	Chairman. I think that addresses the question I have.
13	Obviously I don't think we want to turn a
14	subcommittee into the full Committee.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No.
16	MR. NUSSMAN: But to the extent we can
17	watch and have our voice heard by members of that
18	subcommittee,
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.
20	MR. NUSSMAN: then we would make, just
21	on an efficiency perspective, it would make the work
22	of the Committee far more complete
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: My vision here is that
24	the role of the subcommittee is to delegate all the
25	way along the line. Not to delegate autonomy or

authority, but to delegate tasks, to delegate the more detailed work. But subcommittees are always owned by, controlled by and creatures of the full Committee. And full Members of the Committee have the right to participate in those deliberations.

Mark.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

DR. HIXON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to emphasize for all Members of the full Committee that the members of committee 1 are well aware of the general nature of the tasks that have been put before us. And our intent is to be completely open through all stages of our proceedings.

That said we will be doing a lot of give and take within our committee and our ex-officio members, but those will always be available to anyone on the full Committee at any time. Thanks.

I'd like to ask and CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: then -- David, I would like to ask all three committee chairs, that keep good records of the you interventions that come to you from other Members of If they the Committee somehow. Some written form. come as emails, you save them someplace. So that the three of you acknowledge publicly that you received this.

And as you bring your deliberations to

1	closure, I think it would be very nice if you would
2	keep revisiting these interventions that have come to
3	you and be prepared. You better be prepared given
4	what's going to happen here. You better be prepared
5	to say to Bob Zales or to anybody, yes, Bob, thank you
6	for your intervention. We decided to ignore it, and
7	here's why. Huh?
8	You owe that to Bob. You owe it to
9	anybody.
10	I pick on you, Bob, only because there you
11	are and it's your question.
12	But you know you want to be prepared to
13	say to all of us who have taken time to send in
14	comments, that was a great comment, but we don't see
15	how it fits. And then Bob has a chance to say, well,
16	it fits because " so you're protecting yourself. Is
17	that right, Bob and Mike?
18	Yeah, go ahead.
19	MR. NUSSMAN: Toward that end, Mr.
20	Chairman, I would ask the staff to make sure there's a
21	list on the website of the different subcommittees,
22	the members and the chairs, so that we can actually
23	have some ability to do that. So thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What we're going to
25	have on the website is exactly that, Mike. And plus

110 1 we're going to have for you a written version of how they see their marching orders between now and March 2 3 15th. 4 Maggie. 5 Yeah. We will be beginning MS. ERNST: getting endorsement 6 the of for the process 7 subcommittee structure. And we will be providing a 8 list of the composition of the different subcommittees 9 on that. 10 And I guess I'd make one comment about the use of the term "deliberation." As I understand it in 11 12 FACA, that the full committee is the place where you 13 deliberate and the subcommittees are just developing 14 preliminary findings and canvassing members of the 15 full Committee to provide input on that. But the work 16 that goes onto the extranet place should be viewed in a technical sense as nondeliberative in nature. 17 18 And I just wanted to point out the use of 19 the word "deliberative," you know has the distinct 2.0 meeting under FACA. And the full Committee definitely 21 deliberate, but the subcommittee does qets 22 something short of that. 23 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. How's that, Bob? 24 MR. BENDICK: That's good.

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

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

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike?

25

Is everybody

	Sacisfied with that:
2	Okay, David.
3	MR. BENTON: I have just sort of a
4	technical thing, Mr. Chairman. So the work of a
5	subcommittee that's done through email exchanges
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Or by telephone.
7	MR. BENTON: Well, telephone's one thing,
8	but just at least the email exchanges will be
9	transparent. I mean we'll be able even though
10	we're not on the subcommittee we can see it,
11	recognizing the caveats that you and Mike have said,
12	which is we don't want this to become a committee of
13	the whole, but at least it's transparent. The
14	workings of the subcommittee will be transparent to
15	the rest of the full Committee and we can interact
16	with them through the chair of that subcommittee or
17	through a member of that subcommittee, as appropriate.
18	Is that right?
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
20	Yes, Mike.
21	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Is it my understanding
22	that the workings of the subcommittee itself are not
23	necessarily transparent. They're on the email, but
24	anything that comes out of the subcommittee in
25	agreement goes on the website, is then available to

_	everybody else. Because not every time you come back
2	and say, hey, Bob, that was indicate its worth
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No.
4	DR. CRUICKSHANK: would be on
5	everybody's email, because that's
6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: But how do we put it,
7	intermittent work products, intermittent gelling and
8	crystallization of things. That's what gets
9	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Subcommittee work
10	products, not individuals.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
12	MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chair, I think that's
13	extremely important. You would drive us all to drink
14	if all the email traffic between all the subcommittees
15	was sent to the full Committee.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Yeah.
17	MR. PETERSON: I mean that could be
18	several hundred emails per day, or something. We
19	don't want something like that.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Don't want that. But
21	we want some trigger mechanism when tentative work
22	products or tentative crystallization of ideas or
23	what-have-you is reached by a subcommittee.
24	MR. PETERSON: Right.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is that okay with

everybody? Mark
-----------------

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. DR. HIXON: Α suggestion I have is given at least for subcommittee number 1 that we're working on documents that at any time any full Committee Member can request the draft that currently are working with. And then eventually once our subcommittee is satisfied with a consensus statement for our subcommittee, we then post it on the secure webpage. And we're -- basically then passed it forward to the entire Committee. time any working draft, would be happy to forward to anyone for comment.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

DR. HIXON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is everyone comfortable with this?

Okay. We have one legal issue that needs to be addressed, and I propose to deal with it as expeditiously as I can. And that is the subcommittees were established for the purpose of this meeting only. And we already have a motion that we've approved which empowers them to proceed to do their work.

So unless I hear objections to the contrary, we have already in a sense ratified our subcommittee structure and their membership. And we

1	will now proceed once the meeting is over to get
2	formal authorization for the ratification of that from
3	the government. Is that all right?
4	So do I hear objections to this
5	expeditious dealing with this particular matter?
6	(No audible response.)
7	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.
8	All right. Our next meeting. We have a
9	venue issue yes, Bob.
10	MR. ZALES: Go ahead.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: No, no, please.
12	MR. ZALES: I was going to make a
13	suggestion about the next meeting.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see. All right. Do
15	let me proceed with my list.
16	We have a venue question, we have a
17	windows-of-time question, and we have an agenda
18	question.
19	And what I would like to propose is that
20	we deal with the agenda thing first, that we deal with
21	the window-of-time thing second very quickly, and then
22	the venue thing. Bob, so it's just my preference to
23	do it that way. Let me see how quickly it might go.
24	Let me propose this. Let me ask your
25	permission to do this. The agenda, Mel is not here.

I guess Mel perhaps -- he had to leave. What I was going to do was to ask the three subcommittee chairs to work with me and with Bonnie and with Joe and Maggie to constitute the Agenda Committee for the next meeting.

And I will very soon, if you approve this, I will very soon send emails to all of you asking for your ideas about how the agenda ought to be put together. If you have thoughts about that right now, we can certainly do it. I'd like to kind of see them in writing so that I can put them all together.

So is this an acceptable -- and I've talked to Lelei and I've talked to Mark, and they've agreed to do this. Bonnie got away before I could ask her, but I can't imagine her saying no. And, Mel, I can't imagine him saying no.

So that's my proposal, that the agenda be put together by a subcommittee rather as it was for this meeting and since we're on that. I want to commend again John and Maggie and Joe and the others of you on the Agenda Committee. You did give us a wonderful structure to work from. So this is my proposal.

Steve and then Mike, your hand's up. Or are you scratching your forehead. Steve and Mike.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	DR. MURRAY: I'd just like to speak in
2	favor of that strategy. I think that it's the most
3	logical thing to do given that we've identified
4	subcommittees. And at least for the next meeting
5	we're going to see that whatever agendized items that
6	we're going to be looking at are going to be really
7	directed in part by those subcommittees. And the
8	chairs are the best representatives of that. So I'd
9	like to see if we can as quickly as possible dispense
10	with this and move on.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Mike.
12	MR. NUSSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd speak in
13	support of that idea. I would offer a slight
14	variation on it. And it would be that it would
15	seem to me that the agenda for the next Committee is
16	something that we will not know until or will not
17	be able to set with any sort of comfort level till we
18	see how the work products for the different
19	subcommittees has proceeded.
20	So there will be a point in time once we
21	set a next meeting when the agenda will have to be
22	produced.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
24	MR. NUSSMAN: What I would urge you to do

is to pull together the group you've just discussed.

1	And at a date that's announced to everyone, to the
2	full Committee, have that Agenda Committee meet. And
3	prior to that meeting, if anybody on the full
4	Committee has particular thoughts about what should or
5	shouldn't be or whatever else, anything else about the
6	agenda, they would be forewarned and be able to get to
7	
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
9	MR. NUSSMAN: the Agenda Committee
10	prior to its meeting.
11	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wonderful. Thanks,
12	Mike.
13	Rod.
14	DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	Yeah, I like this idea, too. And I agree with Mike
16	Nussman that we really can't figure out the agenda in
17	any detail until we know where the subcommittees are.
18	But let me offer a couple of thoughts on
19	the general framework, if I may.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah, please.
21	DR. FUJITA: I think it would be useful
22	for us to hear from local folks, to get their
23	perspective on how MPAs are perceived and what their
24	substantive issues are, to feed into our
25	deliberations.

	118
1	I think it's logical also to consider some
2	kind of report from the subcommittees as part of the
3	agenda.
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
5	DR. FUJITA: And I would ask that we
6	include a public comment period early in the agenda,
7	prior to our deliberations and any action items, so
8	that we can consider and take into account the useful
9	comments that the public makes. Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. I was going
11	to ask you that, whether you'd like to have the public
12	comment come early in our deliberations rather than at
13	the end. So thank you, Rod.
14	I have Dave and then I have Bob.
15	MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rod
16	hit on one of the two points I was going to make
17	about, and that's the public comment period.
18	And the other one is in your thinking and
19	in the thinking of the Committee, I think what you
20	propose is a good idea. I would stress minimizing
21	reports from sort of we've had a lot of
22	presentations. I'd stress minimizing that and
23	emphasize maybe doing work maybe through our Committee
24	structure. That's it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: You're reading my mind.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Bob.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. And I agree with everything that's been said. And on the public testimony part, what you may want establishing the agenda is once you do the procedural things of adoption and minutes, or whatever, however you're going to go through, that the next, before we even get into the business of the Committee, is to then allow the public testimony, period. And then maybe do Committee stuff after that and then get into the working thing.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. ZALES: One thing I would like just to throw out just for consideration, because it's been mentioned here and I'm a big fan of this, is the interactive part of outreach and frontloading, and stuff like that. To maybe consider allotting enough time for public testimony to allow limited questioning from Committee Members to the public to try to clarify various points and things like that. Just to consider it.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. ZALES: But I think it would be --

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We will. And I want to ask what the legal issue is here, if there is one.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. ERNST: I think exchanges are allowed with the public. I think the public making comments have an opportunity to ask questions of the Committee and develop a dialogue between you. And I double checked that with our attorney this morning, as a matter of fact. And I think it might be good to get some of those guidelines out so that people that come to these public meetings know that there is an opportunity for exchange.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay, good. I have Gil and I have Dave, now I have Rod and I have Tim. Gil, go ahead.

MR. RADONSKI: Thank you, Chairman. Ι heard a comment here, you know, cut -- David, I don't know exactly what you meant, but on the informational stuff. Ι think I was a member of the Agenda I know I provided feedback to John and I Committee. requested that we have some sort of information, some feedback from the refuges and from National Park And that was incorporated, and I thought Service. that David Smith did an excellent job.

And I would like to see that as a model. Perhaps keeping it as a luncheon type speaker, if that's what they want to do. But I think we ought to progressively move through the groups, have Mineral

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	Management Service provide a similar presentation and
2	the various element, programmatic elements within the
3	Departments, the partnership, lay out, start laying
4	out what their programs are.
5	I think that this was effectively done,
6	again by David Smith. And I think we could do this on
7	an incremental basis over our various meetings, so we
8	get a feel for the programs that are in place. We
9	have an opportunity to ask questions. I think that's
LO	an extremely important element. And we ought to take
L1	advantage of it.
L2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
L3	Dave.
L4	MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm
L5	really responding to Bob Zales, but I can't I want
L6	to respond a little bit to, Gil.
L7	And I don't disagree with that, Gil, other
L8	than that instead of eating up almost a full day or
L9	the majority of our time right now. I mean the
20	Chairman all I was asking was that the Chairman
21	look at that and sort of balance it out
22	MR. RADONSKI: Sure. Oh, I agree
23	MR. BENTON: with emphasis on our work
24	part.
25	But I wanted to speak to the point raised

1	by Bob Zales about asking questions of the public, and
2	I support that. But I also know from experience,
3	especially with a large group, that we're going to
4	need a chairman to save us from ourselves on that.
5	And as you think about it, Mr. Chairman,
6	one thing you might want to consider is some rules for
7	us that we empower you with so you don't and you
8	would aggressively pursue them like, for example,
9	maybe we only get one question per witness and no
0	softball questions that could lead into 20-minute more
L1	dialogue or statements. That kind of thing.
_2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
.3	MR. BENTON: Because I think the back-and-
_4	forth is real important, but it can also become a real
L5	time eater-upper.
-6	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And if I may
L7	MR. ZALES: To that point, that was my
-8	caveat
9	MR. BENTON: Yeah.
20	MR. ZALES: of limited time.
21	MR. BENTON: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And there is an issue
23	of clarification questions versus elaboration and
24	defend-your-position kind of question. And, you know,
25	why do you say that. I mean yeah, and I know you

want to avoid that. That's in your off-limits category, mine as well. So we will work on that.

And I assure you that I do want some guidelines from you because we will need to keep it confined.

Rod and then Ted.

DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Real briefly. I'm just responding to Bob Zales' suggestion that the public comment period come right after administrative stuff and before any substantive discussion.

I think it's actually more useful to have the public comment after they kind of have some understanding of what the subcommittees have been doing. They're not going to be privy to the website. They're not going to be privy to those subcommittee products prior to the meeting, I don't think.

So rather than just guess at what we're going to be working on and trying to provide some informative input, I think it's probably better to give them a chance to hear what the subcommittees have been doing and then comment on that and whatever other issues they want to comment on just prior to our discussion of that work and any deliberations we actually may take.

2.0

1 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you. Okay, Ted. 2 CAPT. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 4 Just a procedural comment. In reading our charter, I 5 note it says "Subcommittees may be established subject 6 provision of the Department of Commerce the 7 Committee Management Handbook." To the extent that 8 that management handbook may impact on the procedures 9 and deliberations of our subcommittees, could I ask 10 Maggie to maybe review that and get those provisions to us so we'd understand what that restriction is in 11 12 our --13 MS. ERNST: I was going to provide a copy of the handbook to the Chairman. And that involves 14 15 the endorsement process in writing of the subcommittee 16 structure and the composition. The handbook is in the process of being revised. It was written in 1985 and 17 18 there is -- the attorneys are still reviewing the 19 final version, or we would just give it out and it 2.0 would be a perfect resource for us. But I was going 21 to do that through the Chair, and then he will convey 22 what he thinks would be useful for the full Committee 23 to have under their belt as far as the handbook.

24 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:

Could I ask a question? We had -- and it

Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

goes back to David's question and comment. I just need your advice about the agenda. Rod made nice points about let the public comment be later, somebody wants it first. We will work on that.

I did notice that this time the guest speakers did take 20 percent of our meeting time and both lunches. And I don't think I counted the lunches in the 20 percent. So maybe more than that. And I would appreciate some guidance from you.

I do agree that it is wonderful to hear from one or two representatives of something or other, but I also happen to believe that this group would very much benefit from having a lunch time when we might get our sandwiches and come back here and talk and so on. And so I would appreciate some guidance from you.

Do you want free lunches one day out of this? And what is an acceptable proportion of these PowerPoint presentations? That's my question to you. Let's deal with it quickly. Sort of yes, no. No long answers. I just need your help.

Max, Bob. Wait a minute, I'm sorry. I had Lelei on before I gave my little speech there. So you get the first crack. You can either respond to my question or what you were going to say.

2.0

And then I've got -- who had their hands up? Max, Bob, Rod, Dolly, and George. Okay. Lelei, go ahead.

MR. PEAU: Mr. Chairman, this is really a procedure matter.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

MR. PEAU: My dedication is also in favor of deferring public comment until the end of our meeting. I think it's a real opportunity to allow the public to sit in and listen to our deliberations, and then formulate their position based on what they heard. And oftentimes I think they will make a case without having the information.

Secondly, I think we need to have some sort of procedure in place in terms of how we address the public comment. I think we need to have some procedures in writing to ensure that if the public would like an official response from the Committee, that requires some sort of written statement so that there's no confusion. And I do not want to spend a whole hour of listening and no action taken based on the comments presented before us.

Thirdly, I would like to see our future meetings to have an opportunity to get out at some of the sites. I mean there's some really good

2.0

1	opportunity. I really hate to come all the way here
2	and not be able to visit the Center. After all, this
3	is the place that is providing us technical
4	information and providing I want to see how these
5	guys operate in action.
6	We're here and we're not having that
7	opportunity. So I strongly encourage that future
8	meetings that allow full Members to get out and visit
9	some of those sites. Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. We'll take
11	that into consideration.
12	Okay. I presume this other queue is in
13	response to my request for guidance on PowerPoint
14	presentations.
15	MR. PETERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me
16	comment first that I thought you put together a super
17	committee to develop the next agenda. I'm not sure
18	you need any more advice.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
20	MR. PETERSON: I think the comments that
21	have been made are good.
22	I think on the business of making
23	presentations, many PowerPoint presentations, if they
24	simply have been provided to the Committee in advance,
25	could be read. They don't need much embellishment.

1	So I think in terms of efficiency, unless there's a
2	real need to understand a program or we need the
3	person present, it's a long ways to where we meet to
4	have somebody come to make a 30-minute PowerPoint
5	presentation.
6	But I'm comfortable with delegating it to
7	you and your committee. I would suggest you submit
8	send out a draft agenda so at least
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
10	MR. PETERSON: to have an opportunity
11	to look at it. But other than that I'm comfortable
12	for you all to go ahead.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay. Bob.
14	MR. BENDICK: I thought the balance was
15	about right at this meeting. And I think it's really
16	important that we learn together about what's
17	happening out there for some proportion of the
18	meeting.
19	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Rod.
20	DR. FUJITA: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Just
21	reiterate that I think it's important to have some
22	presentations. I'd rather see them focus on the local
23	issues and limited to maybe one or two lunchtime
24	presentations rather than 20 percent of the meeting.

Also I have a suggestion as to how to make

the presentations more useful, perhaps. Now that we have subcommittee structure, you might were to reconsider asking the subcommittees to submit names of folks that could give a smaller scale presentation to the subcommittee to help them specifically with their work products.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Yes, that's

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Yes, that's nice. Thank you.

Okay, Dolly, George, and Dave.

DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a couple of comments. In terms of the public comment, I'm not as concerned about the time that it should be at. Certainly last is not the best.

In terms of the interactive, my concern is that if we start even with just one question per person to the first person is going to take the whole time. And so I think we need to hear from all of the public first and then have our questions written down so that we could ask someone to come back up to clarify something. So that would be my recommendation.

In terms of presentations from agencies or from more *federales*, nonprofits, whatever. I think that what we had today certainly was necessary because we're trying to get the big picture, but I agree with

1	my colleague right here that in future ones I guess I
2	would like to hear from some on from the Council or
3	from an MPA or from somewhere that's trying to deal
4	with a big issue. And if, as stated earlier, they're
5	looking for us for response, then I would like to hear
6	from them to say this is what we think you were
7	supposed to do through this Executive Order process.
8	I think that would be excellent.
9	I also support Lelei. I think that it's
10	just to me it's terrible that we got this far and
11	we're not going to Santa Cruz, we're not going to see
12	what these guys are doing, because I think that would
13	help us in our subcommittees, at least subcommittee 2,
14	to figure out how we should be assisting and providing
15	recommendations through them to the two Departments.
16	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right. Thank you so
18	much.
19	George.
20	MR. LAPOINTE: Enough has been said, Mr.
21	Chairman. Thanks.
22	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Dave.
23	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, the only other
24	thing that you raise, I agree with Max. You've got a
25	super committee and I've got every faith that you're

1	going to do a good job in figuring out the balance on
2	presentations. And the other thing you asked though
3	was about lunch?
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
5	MR. BENTON: Working lunch. And I would,
6	for one, strongly support that we have at least one
7	working lunch and it not be the one on the last day.
8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
9	MR. BENTON: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. And by "working
11	lunch," do you mean that we work during it or that we
12	have a chance to visit and socialize. What is your
13	MR. BENTON: What I mean by a "working
14	lunch" is the way you described it, where we without
15	having a presentation, have an opportunity to sit here
16	and discuss things,
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
18	MR. BENTON: whatever those are that
19	are on our mind over a lunch, without it being eaten
20	up by a presentation.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Yeah, I
22	think that would be valuable.
23	Okay. All right. Are we okay on the
24	agenda side of things, huh?
25	We have windows of time. We have venue.

1 Joe has asked for a minute before too many people get away. And I'm going to give to Joe for his thing, and 2 then we'll do these other things. 3 MR. URAVITCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 5 didn't intend to interrupt here. I thought I was 6 going to be last. 7 That's all right. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: 8 MR. URAVITCH: But just on behalf of the two Departments, Jim Kendall and myself, we just 9 10 wanted to thank you all for the really excellent two 11 and a half days that we've had here. 12 We're very excited about the work you're 13 doing. think we've accomplished more than 14 thought could be accomplished, just given the size and 15 diversity of the group. And we're just really pleased 16 with the foundation work that you're laying both for the near-term and the long-term, for the U.S. and the 17 18 management of its ocean and coastal waters. 19 And so I really want to thank you all for 2.0 work you've been doing and hard I really appreciate the direct comments. I'm sort of a blunt 21 22 person myself, as you may have noticed, so I don't 23 mind hearing that from others. I think it's helpful. 24 And I'd also just like to thank Maggie

Ernst and all of our staff who put an incredible

amount of work together to make this happen. And thank you all again.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Joe. On behalf of the Committee I want to thank you and Maggie and Dana and Bunnie -- and who else -- yeah, everyone, Charlie Wahle and Ginger Hinchcliff. And all of the people, some of whom, I'm sorry, I don't even know their names, who made this thing work here and who put together for us I think a fantastic launching pad by which we can do good work. So thank you all.

I think some of us perhaps under appreciate how complicated doing one of these is, from where Maggie sits and Joe sits. I couldn't function. Some of you may not think I am functioning here, but I couldn't function without Maggie here slipping me notes, kicking made under the table, and keeping me on track.

And I'm also grateful to the parliamentarians in the room. I can do a lot of things, but keeping track of which motions are on the floor and are on the table and halfway between, I got a little befuddled this morning. I apologize for that. I will try to do better in the future, but I got a lot of good help. And I'm happy to receive it

from all of you.

2.0

The other thing I do appreciate, let me say this, is that at breaks some of you come up and say, now, Dan, don't figure to do this. And please don't ever hesitate to come up and say, Dan, don't forget, we still haven't addressed this, we still haven't addressed that.

I have a lot of paper up here, I have a lot of stuff going on, and so I do beg you to come up and say, look, we haven't dealt with that yet, or what-have-you. So please do that.

Okay. Let's go to venue, okay. The venue issue. And then we'll deal with the time issue.

Bob. I sort of pushed Bob off.

MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. I just want to reiterate a suggestion I made at the first meeting, that our next meeting be held in Hawaii in conjunction with the hearing. And to kind of explain that a little bit further is, and as we heard comments today from the public, that Councils -- and my personal experience and knowledge of the various people I represent across the country, and I think it's more than probably just the Council here and the Council in the Gulf, there is severe concern, serious concern about what this Committee is going to recommend and

advise the two Secretaries to do regarding MPAs.

2.0

And I think that it would be very prudent for this panel and also for the Council to have an opportunity to meet in a location such as Hawaii, which then gives our friend from American Samoa and the people in Hawaii, who obviously for public comment, they're not going to travel here to give public comment, so it would give us a way to hear from people in areas that we probably would not hear otherwise.

From what I understand, the Hawaiian Islands and the Western Pacific, there's extensive knowledge and expertise and information about the various marine managed areas, reserve, sanctuaries, whatever, that I think this Committee could benefit from.

And I just see a tremendous opportunity to interact not necessarily on a daily basis, but to be able to have like one day to better actions between the Council chair meeting and this panel. We do our business whenever, before or after that day. They do their business before or after that day.

From what I understand that meeting will be held on the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday after Easter, in April, which Easter I believe is April

11th.

2.0

So my suggestion would be for us to meet like on that Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, or that Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, so that it wouldn't interfere with anybody's vacation or religious situation with Easter. You could leave on that Monday or that Tuesday, and work in conjunction with, I think, the lead Council would be the Western Pacific Council, which would be Kim Sanders, and work with the Fishery Service.

And even though when you're looking at the information provided to us, it's the least expensive of the most expensive. I believe the cost benefit from the knowledge that can be gained by everybody with the interchange of information is immeasurable, really.

And I really believe that overall government expense that it's probably cheaper, because you're going to have a lot of people that are already going to be at that meeting that would attend -- some of those people would attend our meeting, so that you could kind of combine it. So I just throw that out in that rationale for discussion and see where it goes.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Dolly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. DR. GARZA: Ι have an alternative suggestion, although I have no As I stated and I've stated opposition to that one. every chance I could, that I was really disappointed that we did not get to Santa Cruz here. I would support having a meeting in Charleston so that we can at least see one of the facilities -- it is Charleston, isn't it? Okay. Because I think that's what need to know in terms of part we recommendations that we need to make.

On the point of the costs of these, I don't think that that should be as important to us. I think we should find the money if we decide where we're going to meet.

As an example, and this is just a side note, for the Alaska costs, the hotel costs per night, those are the summer rates. Those are not the winter rates. I've been meeting up in Anchorage sort of endlessly, and our average rate right now is between 80 and \$90. So the cost for the meeting in Anchorage is highly exaggerated, as is with Sitka. As soon as the summer's over, those guys will do anything to get you guys up there.

And so I don't want us to be the number

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 one in terms of most expensive. We should be the number one in terms of destination desired. 2 Thank 3 you. CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That means that I could 4 5 stay at Fairbanks tonight for \$26; is that right? Let's see, I have Terry on the 6 7 list, but let me get Mike and David and Rod. 8 others? Okay. Dave -- Terry. 9 MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ι 10 support Bob Zales' comments about our next meeting 11 being in Hawaii. And I'm not saying that because I am 12 from Hawaii and it means that I don't have to travel, which I would like, but there are several things that 13 Hawaii can offer this Committee. 14 15 First of all, we are the only island state And we have several MPAs from all 16 in the Union. different levels of government. And we also have the 17 18 cultural aspects in Hawaii that weigh very heavily on 19 decision-making. 20 We also have, from my perception in Hawaii 21 currently, a very anti-MPA posture. I mean it's very 22 strong. And I think it would be very helpful for our 23 Committee to go to an area where there's a lot of 24 ocean area, there are existing MPAs, there's cultural 25 issues, and we also have a lot of concerns about MPAs.

1	And I think that that's something that we need to as
2	a committee need to understand better.
3	I don't know that necessarily everyone
4	sitting around this table has all the perspectives
5	that might be presented from persons that are in
6	Hawaii that might want to talk with us.
7	In addition, we are a Center where my
8	colleagues from American Samoa and some of the other
9	island around the area could participate more easily
LO	and present an island perspective to the Committee,
L1	which again I think is important.
L2	And as it relates to costs, I feel very
L3	confident that we can, now that Maggie, thank you
L <b>4</b>	for checking on that that we can get some in-kind
L5	support. I feel very confident that we could get some
L6	in-kind support specifically in hotel rooms to reduce
L7	our cost for that venue. Thank you.
L8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
L9	Mike.
20	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes. I felt a little
21	bit about different suggesting Hawaii and I certainly
22	endorse both Bob's and Terry's
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay.
24	DR. CRUICKSHANK: endorsement of that
25	issue. And one thing about the Hawaiian Islands is

that for many, many years the holding of a government meeting there has brought wrath from the local residents of Washington, D.C. on all the Members present, which is unfortunate, because they have -- I've traveled in the Islands a great deal, and we have a poor image in the United States and of being supportive of their activities.

And not only are they, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, but we have close association with the Marshall Islands and with Taiwan. And there's a tremendous element there valuable to the fisheries in those areas which somebody has to look at because there's also a Forum Fisheries Agency in the South Pacific. And I think that we should make contact with them and with all the relevant players there, because there are some very important issues that need to be discussed, and I'm delighted. I would certainly support that.

In terms of cost, I -- I believe there's a varying cost off the season. I'm not sure Easter is -- it may be the very high, I'm not sure, but you can look into that. Sometime we should venue there, I believe.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.

DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much.

I have David and then Rod.

MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I strongly support the recommendation that Bob Zales has made and for all the reasons that have been said but for another one as well. I think that it's important for us as we go forward with our work that we not become centric on Washington, D.C. and that we actually go to the various regions around the country for the very reason that Rod Fujita brought up about public comment and hearing about local situations.

And I support Bob's proposal -- I mean all things being equal, I wouldn't care when we go to Hawaii or to the Western Pacific. I think we need to go through and should go there and would be remiss if we did not go there. But because the Council chairs are going to be there, a lot of senior NOAA officials will be there, I can guarantee you pretty much that there will also be some members representing their respective committees in Congress that have jurisdiction will also be there, because they go to the meeting of the chairs of the Councils and they attend those meetings because that's who they interact with.

So you can kill a lot of birds with one

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	stone with this one meeting. Otherwise it wouldn't
2	matter when, but I think this is the opportunity to
3	really be most efficient if we're going to do our job
4	about going out to the Western Pacific and hearing
5	what they have to say.
6	So it just makes a heck of a lot of sense
7	to me to go out there and go to meeting and hear
8	have it be where we can interact with the Councils, as
9	Bob said before.
10	And I know that I talked with I think all
11	the I think all the chairs or their executive
12	directors last week about MPAs and what's going on. I
13	think Bob may have done the same thing. And they're
14	actually pretty interested in having such a joint
15	interaction to clear the air on some issues and see
16	how they fit in and how we fit in.
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Thank you.
18	Rod.
19	DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
20	think Hawaii would be a wonderful venue for many of
21	our Committee, for the local expertise, because
22	there's active MPA issues there, particularly in the
23	northwest Hawaiian Islands.
24	However, I am troubled by the idea of our

Committee meeting jointly or in some forum with the

committee chairs -- the Council chairs. I think there's a lot of groups who are intensely interested in the work of the Committee. I don't think it's wise for us to affiliate ourselves with any particular group.

I think there are other ways to consult with and fully engage the Councils, who are going to be important players in the implementation of any questioned of MPA policy. But I don't think it's a good idea for us to meet with them at their Council chairs meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good. Let me see if I can capture what I've heard. I hope it's the same thing you've heard.

The suggestion for Hawaii brings together three things. It brings together place, it brings together time, and it brings together an issue of ripeness or readiness. And we will not be able to resolve those three.

What I mean by ripeness or readiness is a little different from what Rod said. It's not unrelated. The issue is will we be at a point in our deliberations at which we are ready to sit down constructively with Council chairs or indeed anyone and meet jointly. That, I believe, is an issue for

us.

2.0

Leaving that aside, it seems to me that the two issues then, and I believe cost off the table, I think cost is no object. That's not an issue that we need to worry about, I guess. It's easy for me to say. That's somebody else's job, to find the money, but it does not figure in my calculation.

What figures in my calculation is the commitment to meet with the chairs of the Fisheries Management Council puts us in a window with no latitude. And what are we to do if we -- and my hope is that we do not have to settle this today.

My hope is that we take these invitations, these arguments under advisement, and that we do as we did for the previous meeting -- I'm sorry -- as we did for this meeting, that the Agenda Committee and Maggie will have to do the timing, we take these under advisement. But what are we to do if it turns out that we sort of have a mental commitment to meet with the chairs of the Council and seven or eight or nine of our Members are unable to make this particular meeting?

This I think is a serious issue for us. I just throw that out.

David, Bob, and Max.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I think those are all valid points. What I would suggest perhaps is, and maybe this is overstepping it, I sense -- and maybe I'm wrong about this -- but I sort of sense that there is at least a fairly strong sentiment of trying to pursue the idea that Bob put forward.

And that you could through your Committee put that out through to the group to see who couldn't make it. I mean we're all going to have conflicts. The one advantage of doing it at that time is that none of the Councils will be meeting in their formal session. And a lot of folks have to go to those and participate, so it has that advantage as well.

I don't think that it's time that we put a motion in front of us to say this is when and where we're going to meet, or something like that. But I think it would be useful to take that as our initial place we're going to do it and what we're going to do, and put it out there and see what kind of response we get. And I would leave that to you all to work out.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Well, it does privilege one proposal that's before us, and there are several other proposals before us. And I have to think about how I wish to privilege that one in terms of putting it out as the default position unless it's defeated.

2.0

So I recognize Bob. I'll recognize Max, but I'm going to need a little more guidance before I feel comfortable going forward saying, okay, here's the one or up and down. And then we'll retreat and try to figure out another one or we'll accept it.

I a little reluctant to privilege one. So let me stop there. Dolly -- but first I have Bob Zales. Let's try it. Now we're running up against the time, so let's make our interventions brief, to the point, please.

MR. ZALES: Yes. Bob Zales. And I agree with what Dave said and I would just like to add a couple of things. I may have misspoken when I said kind of a joint meeting. I don't mean it as a joint way of exchange.

It would be a limited exchange on our part, but it would be more knowledge gathering on our part from the various Councils as to -- and in my mind this is a good time to do this for the reasons of we're looking to identify right now MPAs, what they do, what they don't do, how they impact and how they don't impact.

Each region and each Council I think has its own kind of set of guidelines as to how they do it. I think that's why we're here, because

2.0

	everything s kind of dystanctionar. That what this
2	would do, this would then allow those Councils through
3	their chairs and vice chairs to come to this panel and
4	say, this is our concept. This is what we do. Here
5	are our areas. Here's the identity. Here's what they
6	do. Here's the amount, here's what they don't do.
7	And then we can gather all that
8	information and put that in our storage box of working
9	to try to come up with the recommendations that we're
10	charged to do at a future date.
11	And so I would also like to say my
12	impression of the Council process through all is that
13	they're going to be critical players in what happens
14	with MPAs in the future, because they're the ones who
15	have established in the various jurisdictions they
16	have so far. And I see that continuing. I don't see
17	their authority being diminished.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. I have Max, Gil,
19	Dolly, and Terry.
20	MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, in the
21	interest of time I would suggest we let the Committee
22	that you previously established look at this question.
23	For example, how often do those committee chairs
24	meet. I think maybe they meet twice a year.

It might be that the ripeness question

25

1	would fit better later. Isn't that right, George,
2	they meet twice a year?
3	I do think it's important that they be
4	specifically consulted with at some point. I'm not
5	sure whether we're ready in April. I would support
6	the idea, but I would suggest we delegate to your
7	Committee to come up with a couple of proposals.
8	Otherwise I don't feel secure in deciding it here.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. It's my
10	understanding that Barbara Stevenson has pointed out
11	to us that when in the future will they meet again?
12	In the New England area?
13	MS. ERNST: I believe a year from April.
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: A year from April.
15	MS. ERNST: The Council chairs are to be
16	meeting in Maine?
17	MR. PETERSON: Do they meet twice a year
18	now?
19	MR. ZALES: Well, now to that point.
20	Normally they do meet twice a year. For whatever
21	reasons, budget or whatever, this year they, from what
22	I understand, have been told they only have one
23	meeting this coming year.
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So they're meeting
25	April 2004 and then
	1

1	MR. ZALES: 2004 and then		
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: spring of 2005 in		
3	New England.		
4	MR. ZALES: March, April, May of 2005.		
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.		
6	Okay. Gil.		
7	MR. RADONSKI: For the record, I support		
8	Bob's proposal. I do think for all the reasons that		
9	have been stated it would be a good idea.		
LO	But one of the things you know we're		
L1	sitting here today in November 2003 and shortly the		
L2	Commission on Ocean Policy is going to issue a report.		
L3	And this whole picture is going to change		
L4	dramatically, the level of debate, the topics of		
L5	discussion, a lot of it is going to be driven by that,		
L6	so the Agenda Committee is going to have a lot of		
L7	flexibility.		
L8	And I suspect we are going to be looking		
L9	we would be looking for a presentation from		
20	somebody that's knowledgeable about the Commission on		
21	Ocean Policy and their report, to brief us on what the		
22	report says and how it's going to be disposed of		
23	through national policy.		
24	So, again, I endorse Bob Zales' proposal.		
25	I think it would be a good use of funds. It would be		

1	very beneficial for all the reasons given, but I think
2	we have to be flexible.
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
4	I have Dolly and Terry.
5	DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think
6	that Max summarized fairly well what my concerns are.
7	I had perceived this next meeting as pretty much a
8	working meeting, where the subcommittees will report
9	and we'll have some work to do. And I think that
10	would be difficult to do, in my mind, when you have
11	the chair Council meeting going on.
12	And so sort of in terms of timing that may
13	be better later. And that could be something that the
14	Agenda Committee can address. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.
16	Terry.
17	MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you. My suggestion
18	about Hawaii isn't necessarily tied to a joint
19	meeting.
20	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. I
21	understand.
22	MR. O'HALLORAN: And I
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's good that you make
24	that clear.
25	MR. O'HALLORAN: And I think that a joint
- 1	

1	meeting with any organization at this moment I think
2	would not serve us well, because the minute we do with
3	one we disenfranchise others. And we do have a lot of
4	work to do.
5	Having said that, I still want to put
6	forward the suggestion that Hawaii be the next venue,
7	because all it has to offer. And I know when you say
8	Hawaii, everyone thinks vacation, sun, and fun. And,
9	yes, we have that. But there are those of us in
10	Hawaii who work very hard.
11	(Laughter.)
12	MR. O'HALLORAN: And I think that this
13	Committee would work very hard. And so
14	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: His sunburned forehead
15	is a testament to how hard he works.
16	MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, it doesn't mean
17	that we don't do our work outside.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right.
19	MR. O'HALLORAN: But so I would like to
20	keep that suggestion for Hawaii. I think it would be
21	a very valuable venue for us. And, anyway, I think
22	that's good.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Good.
24	MR. O'HALLORAN: Thanks.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right. David,

maybe this is the last comment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BENTON: Just a very brief comment, Mr. Chairman. I would just note for the record that we're here in San Francisco in the same kind of concerns about, hey, sun, fun, and go down to San Francisco, hang out on Fisherman's -- you know, all that applies. And we're here and we've been locked in these rooms for two and a half days and done our work. And I think that's important.

And the other thing is that the Councils are a regulatory body. I think that's distinctly different than other -- like the environmental groups or something that might feel like, hey, why are you meeting with them. We're meeting with them because they're a regulatory body. It wouldn't be -- I agree with Terry. It wouldn't be a joint meeting, but have opportunity to interact with them in the some appropriate fashion that the Chair works out I think would be important.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. May I try to capture the sense of the discussion here? And that is I would ask your permission to do as we did before, and as I recall this repeats a little bit of what we did in June where we had people making presentations to us. And that's fantastic. I think that's the way

	chat it ought to be done. And i in happy it became as
2	it did rather than as motions in which it gets tied up
3	in all of that. I think this is fantastic, Bob.
4	Thank you. We're getting ideas out on the table.
5	And all of you who did these, I think
6	that's the way it ought to be done.
7	It seems to me we have but one choice,
8	Hobson's Choice, which is to canvass the entire
9	Committee by email for dates and have and venues,
10	and have the Agenda Committee take all that under
11	advisement and make a determination.
12	MR. [SPEAKER]: Sounds great.
13	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: May I proceed to do
14	that?
15	MR. [SPEAKER]: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Pardon me?
17	CAPT. THOMPSON: Just do it quickly.
18	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Do it quickly.
19	CAPT. THOMPSON: April is just around the
20	corner.
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It is indeed. I
22	promise you it will be done very expeditiously.
23	And we limit the time window to the month
24	of April. Is that part of your sense, or why? I
25	mean
1	

1	MR. O'HALLORAN: May I offer?
2	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
3	MR. O'HALLORAN: We have set some internal
4	deadlines of March 15
5	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: March 15th.
6	MR. O'HALLORAN: And so it seems that
7	April would be the appropriate time to have it. If we
8	delay it then our work will sit for a while, and we
9	don't have that much
LO	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right. So we will ask
L1	in terms of time, we will confine it to the month
_2	of April, is that what people want?
_3	Okay. That still leaves us with the
L4	dilemma. If 12 people say April is out for some
L5	reason, we're going to have to we will come back to
L6	you.
L7	MR. O'HALLORAN: Yeah, sure.
L8	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mike and Bonnie, I
L9	guess. Yes, Mike.
20	DR. CRUICKSHANK: A suggestion. That
21	instead of having hour-long presentations, we could do
22	what a lot of these conferences do, a ten-minute
23	presentation, hand out paper, which will give us a lot
24	more information to mull over in the time we have.
25	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I see. You're back to

1	where we do PowerPoint presentations
2	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Right. Because I'm
3	thinking about that
4	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That's right. And all
5	the PowerPoints we had we also received a sheet of
6	paper.
7	DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yeah. And if we could
8	have the people there to ask questions to.
9	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay. I
10	have Bob and then I have Dave.
11	MR. ZALES: Bob Zales. To the point about
12	the time constraints, because I think that was an
13	issue and yesterday as to whether or not this March
14	15th date, where it came from and whether to leave it.
15	What I could see, working with that now, is for these
16	committees to do their work and to use that March 15th
17	as a deadline, that would then give the Committee a
18	little bit of time to play with it. And it would also
19	then give adequate time for the Center to get it
20	disseminated prior to the meeting time so that we
21	don't arrive at the meeting with the information. We
22	actually have it several days ahead of time to carry
23	it with us.
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. That's good.
25	And I congratulated Maggie when we first

1	started on the thinness of the meeting book. I
2	thought it was marvelous to get a meeting book that
3	had 22 pages in it at most, rather than three inches.
4	And so I encourage them to keep it brief but, yes,
5	this Bob, this is an essential kind of input. So,
6	yeah.
7	David.
8	MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, going back to
9	your point about April,
10	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes.
11	MR. BENTON: I think that's an
12	excellent suggestion. I'd be remiss if I don't do the
13	paid political ad I was asked to do and which is Wally
14	wanted me to tell you he can't do it in March. So
15	I've discharged my duty.
16	(Laughter.)
17	MR. BENTON: The only thing I would ask is
18	that we set this up in such a way that it does not
19	conflict with meetings of Regional Fishery Management
20	Councils, because I know we have a lot of
21	representation around this table of folks that go to
22	those.
23	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.
24	MR. BENTON: And a lot of those meet in
25	late March, some in early April, and some I think in

1	mid- to late April, but I'm not sure. But, anyway, if	
2	you would factor that in in your thinking.	
3	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. March will not	
4	be one of our options, David. I think that takes care	
5	of some of the Councils. That goes back to the fact	
6	that our subcommittees won't have work products till	
7	March 15th. There's no reason to rush it. So it will	
8	be we will do April and see how it turns out.	
9	Is that all right?	
10	And if it turns out we have a problem only	
11	in terms of membership ability, then we will come back	
12	to you. How's that?	
13	Any other items you'd like to discuss?	
14	Maggie, have I are there things? Joe, Steve?	
15	MR. O'HALLORAN: Dan, thanks. A good job.	
16	DR. FUJITA: Yes.	
17	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you.	
18	DR. HIXON: I'll second that.	
19	MR. BENTON: Are you ready for a motion to	
20	adjourn?	
21	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I think we could	
22	entertain a motion to adjourn.	
23	MR. BENTON: I'd move we adjourn.	
24	CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is there a second to	
25	the motion?	

1		MR. [SPEAKER]: Second.
2		CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All in favor say "aye."
3		[MEMBERS]: Aye.
4		MS. ERNST: This meeting is adjourned.
5		(The Second Meeting was adjourned at 12:00
6	noon.)	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		