

OPAC Marine Reserve Working Group Meeting Summary
North Mall Office Building, Room 124 A, Salem, OR
3/13/2007, 1-5 PM

OPAC working group members in attendance: Frank Warrens (chair), Jessica Hamilton, Jim Bergeron, Jim Good, Robin Hartmann, and Paul Engelmeyer. *Absent:* Jack Brown and Brad Bettinger

Non-OPAC member working group agency staff: Kristen Don (ODFW), Paul Klarin (DLCD), Laurel Hillmann (OPRD)

Other attendees: Fred Sickler (OPAC), Greg McMurray (DLCD/OPAC), Steve Shipsey (OPAC), Pete Stauffer (Surfrider), Lisa Mulcahy (OSU-PISCO), Cheryl Coon (Portland Audubon), Arlene Merems (ODFW), John Holloway (Recreational Fishing Alliance)

Note: Unless specified in the meeting summary that a decision was made on a particular topic or action, the notes that follow document MRWG meeting discussion only. Comments represented in this summary do not necessarily reflect MRWG consensus on the topic. Discussion from this meeting is captured in summary format per input that notes need not be as extensive as they have been in the past.

- 1.) Self-introductions of MRWG and public attendees
- 2.) Approval of agenda & discussion about how to distinguish MRWG members vs. other OPAC members who choose to sit at the table
 - Decided that in the beginning of each meeting, all MRWG members would introduce themselves as such. If not actually on the MRWG, but are on OPAC, need to say so.
 - Decided to refer to the executive committee to make a final call on who would be allowed “at the table” and whether or not other OPAC members would be able to put their name forward for inclusion in the WG when the call for more members is announced.
- 3.) Briefing on the ad-hoc meeting held on 2/21/07 (Frank Warrens)
 - Frank called the meeting to get council from Steve Shipsey regarding legal requirements to follow the OPAC I recommendations and for help developing the agenda for this meeting. Briefly discussed status of the budget, potential MRWG expansion and potential need for facilitator “down the road.”
- 4.) Update on the proposed MR budget (Jessica Hamilton & Paul Engelmeyer)
 - There was a March 2nd conference call to follow up on budget strategy. Jessica noted opportunities & challenges for funding. Economic forecast was flat, so there is no extra money for marine reserves in the Governor’s budget. However, there are some other opportunities. OPAC can not lobby the legislature; however, individual members can do what they want

to do as individuals. Suggested that a portion of our goals may be accomplished via the proposed budget for seafloor mapping.

- While this budget is for 2007-2009, it would be possible to work on a budget for the next biennium; however, the Governor's office wants us to continue with current level of funding for OPAC (travel related, base of ~20K).
- General discussion about potential funding sources ensued as several members felt not much could be done without extra funding, especially since there may not even be enough to pay for travel if the workgroup is expanded for marine reserves planning purposes. Many members expressed frustration that it isn't possible to do this as a bunch of ad-hoc volunteers.

5.) Briefing on the NOAA NMFS GIS Mapping Project (Frank Warrens)

- Discussed GIS opportunities and ways for NOAA to help out with our desire to have maps to show current fishing closures, regulatory restrictions, cable landings, shipping lanes etc.
- Mapping project will go from 0-12 miles off the coast to see where the restrictions are currently. So, once we have defined MR goals and objectives, will help us make sense of where to establish them. Probably will take a few months, may have some information at the next meeting on April 19th. Valuable tool for once we decide what we want to accomplish.

6.) Discussion of expansion of MRWG membership and confirmation of selection committee (Jim Good)

- Draft solicitation letter was distributed and general discussion ensued.
 - i. Frank would suggest not more than 18-22 people. Currently have 11 members.
 - ii. In drafting the letter, looked at the 2002 OPAC recommendation, looked for missing interests, then made a new list to try and be consistent with the 2002 process.
 - iii. Discussion about whether to go forward if there is no money. However, maybe we shouldn't go much further without expanding the group, because then we would have to either backtrack or expect them to agree with our past actions.
 - iv. If we get the potential candidates ready for consideration at the next OPAC Meeting, would probably want to include a start date on the solicitation notice (say beginning in July 2007?)
 - v. General consensus to go forward
 - vi. **NOTE:** *Following this meeting, the Governor's office decided to hold off on moving forward given the concern about lack of funding*

7.) Presentation on Preliminary Work Plan (focus on section 3.1, identifying goals/objectives for marine reserves in Oregon), followed by discussion

- OPAC 2002 definition seems to allow for different types of activities, different types of protection. OPAC I didn't talk too much about specific goals and objectives, more a conceptual recommendation about the system/network. Want to move forward to present day.
- We can come up with the reserve design criteria and then, when go out to stakeholders would modify and refine.
- Work Plan
 - i. Task 1.3-hard to do without funding and agency support, Task 1.4-could move ahead with this but need to provide MR STAC with the same caveat that we don't have a current budget so wouldn't be able to pay for their participation/travel at this point.
 - a. Want STAC to identify the MR-STAC. They would help formulate this group as a subcommittee.
 - b. Jay would recommend, approve by executive committee (as with any OPAC subcommittee).
 - c. Need to go to Jay and the STAC and ask them for positions, types of expertise and/or people's names, also pose to the public, feed that into the STAC and they then pose to full OPAC.
 - ii. Task 2.1. MR-STAFF and MR-STAC come up with an outline. What types of resources are out there, what don't we have?
 - iii. Task 3.1. Would develop a draft and then go out to individual groups, ports etc. Then after working that through, we could have the public meetings, then final draft, and then take to full OPAC.
- Went over the 2002 OPAC recommendation: "a limited system of marine reserves in order to test and evaluate their effectiveness in meeting marine resource conservation objectives"
 - i. Brief discussion about new conservation objectives
 - ii. What would our system goal be? To help meet the conservation objectives of Goal 19?
- OPAC I mandated that marine reserves would have to have enforcement, monitoring, funding, and continued evaluation.
- Could have a subcommittee in the phase II plan to get the local level input. Exactly how you do that is yet to be determined. Local planning groups could get input from stakeholders.
- We could do a presentation and explain the global picture, discuss what's going on in federal waters, then discuss how OPAC is focusing on the state waters. Possibly have an informational session before that.
- Most agree we are pretty much there on the overall purpose & goals (given discussion at the last meeting). Need to critique them strongly. May need to reorganize. Need to have a discussion with STAC. We need to figure out how can we get to a purpose/goals/objectives document.

8.) BREAK

9.) Public Comment Period

- **Pete Stauffer** (Oregon Surfrider): Congratulates us on workplan & budget, however, it was a little later than would have liked but appreciates the effort. In regards to the composition of workgroup, need to look at other places in the country, need to represent all members of the public. Understands we don't want to have more than 22. We have OPAC. OPAC's role in the process would be to entertain alternatives. If have a heavily loaded OPAC MRWG making alternatives for OPAC to consider, wouldn't have the full public represented. Let's really think carefully what these slots may be. How many slots to each interest-may want to delineate.
- Surfrider is supporting the ocean floor mapping bill and urges us as individuals to do so. Can leverage that task. Not just for tsunamis. Respectfully, while testing & evaluation is crucial, and do need funding and monitoring, that was from 2002. We aren't beholden to that recommendation. Need to recognize what has changed. In terms of science, MR science has progressed significantly. Maybe in 2002 the objective was to test them, but now may have some more science/evidence, including from temperate regions. Absolutely support it as one objective, but NOT the sole purpose of the process. Should be left an open question.
- **Lisa Mulcahy** (PISCO/OSU): Main focus of my job is to work on Marine Reserves. Specifically to try to provide/broker PISCO science as it applies to Marine Reserves. Coming out with a new MR Science Booklet in October with more examples, including temperate ones. Scientific presentations given for science basis for the MLPA in CA that can be circulated to others. Websites and some data are available on near-shore & underwater habitat monitoring could feed into our GIS (won't be available for awhile but will be available). Have FAQ on hypoxia. Not here as an advocate, doesn't have a particular agenda. Just here to broker the science. PISCO has tools we may need to make decisions, please use us as a resource.
- **Arlene Merems** (ODFW): Mostly here to observe. Did see Satie (PISCO) give a talk on the process in CA on the MLPA. Really good presentation on the process. Spoke on upfront steps of time & energy spent to educate the team on the science of reserves. Had speakers to help inform people on the marine reserve concept.
- **John Holloway** (Recreational Fishing Alliance): Likes the OPAC process, is an open process, doesn't see a lot of outside political pressure, everyone seems to be pretty cooperative; people don't seem to try and run over each other. The culture of this group is good, careful not to expand, if make it too large would run the risk of getting stuck in a rut if there are too many people with different opinions. Some consolidation may be necessary. May need a maximum of 20. On a group of 18 and they manage OK but wouldn't want it to be much bigger. Federal jurisdiction goes from 0-200 miles, they do ultimately control the fisheries within 3 miles as well. State can go more conservative but can't be more liberal.

10.) Roundtable

- Paul E. Need to incorporate conservation planning. We all signed off on the consensus statement for the seafloor mapping. It had multiple objectives. Is it appropriate for OPAC to support the need for the mapping? Steve S. pointed out OPAC has no role for lobbying. Can say it as an individual, not on behalf of OPAC. OPAC doesn't have express authority to respond to legislative questions.
- Fred S. Still need to do research but we can use information that is available now and make that the starting point.
- Steve S. Important when do goals & objectives to use Goal 19 as an anchor. Agencies will have to measure standards against Goal 19. The more you can use the language, helpful to the agencies that are charged with implementing it.
- Paul K. Happy with the culture of MRWG. Don't see many groups beyond 20 or so that maintain the functionality of this group. Notes the impact that expanding the group would have on a limited budget. Do we get a treasurers report? Frank-No. Paul K. will get us one.

11.) Next steps

- Go forward with a letter to OWET.
- Paul and Frank going to talk to Cathy T. (NOAA) for potential funding sources
- Paul to contact folks about potential conduits for outside funds
- Jim G. will draft a note to the STAC on a MR STAC
- Jim G. will circulate the purpose/goals and objective list. Will ask how we would modify it. Look at our goals discussion. Is there something missing? Good to be able to take that to OPAC on April 19th, assuming we are meeting on the 18th. Here is our first take on our overall purpose. We would like you to bless that so we can get on to design considerations.
- Paul K. will ask for a Treasurer's report on OPAC send us the NOAA fellow work-plan.
- Laurel H. will type up the meeting notes but will summarize more than in previous versions (per MRWG input).