

OPAC Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting Summary

Agate Beach Best Western, Newport, Oregon

3/27/2008 8:30 AM- 4:15 PM

MRWG members in attendance: Frank Warrens (MRWG chair), Ed Bowles, John Griffith, Jim Bergeron, Jack Brown, Brad Pettinger, Patty Burke, Jim Good, Laurel Hillmann, Robin Hartmann, Paul Engelymeyer, Cathy Tortorici, Roy Lowe and Paul Klarin. *Absent:* Randy Henry, Jeff Kroft

Other attendees: Jay Rasmussen (STAC chair), Roy Elicker (ODFW), Andy Lanier (DLCD), Jay Charland (DLCD), Selina Heppell (OSU/STAC), Jeff Feldner (Sea Grant), Chris Goldfinger (OSU), Barb Seekins (NOAA), Waldo Wakefield (NOAA), Arlene Merems (ODFW), Jeff Farm (OPRD), Megan Mackey (PMCC), Kitty Brigham (OSCC), Fran Recht (PSMFC), Mike Donnellan (ODFW), Jane Barth (Citizen), Jim Carlson (Tillamook Co CPAC), Susie Frank (Our Ocean), Hugh Link (ODCC), Nancy Fitzpatrick (OSC), Lucie LaBonte (Curry Co.), Greg Harlow (Assn of NW Steelheaders), Kathy Wall (Port of Coos Bay), Deborah Boone (State Rep. HD 32), Wendy Yorkshire (Steve Marks for Congress), Neal Coenen (self), Cindy Ashy (self), Walter Chuck (RFA/OR Anglers), John Holloway (RFA/OR Anglers), Ginny Goblirsch (Sea Grant), Charlie Plybon (Surfrider Foundation), Valerie Sovein (Depoe Bay NSAT), John O'Brien (Depoe Bay NSAT), Tony Meeker (Oregon Anglers), Dennis Richey (Oregon Anglers), Gus Gates (Our Ocean), Alicia Billings (POORT), Aaron Longton (POORT), Suzanna Stoike (POORT), Chris Aiello (POORT), Tony Stein (OPRD), Peg Reagan (CLN/Gold Beach), Brian Petersen (ODCC), Steve Bodner (Coos Bay Trawlers Assoc.), Nick Furman (ODCC), Ron Mason (citizen), Diane Plynch (citizen), Barry Nelson (OSC).

Note: Unless specified in the meeting summary that a decision was made on a particular topic or action, the minutes/notes that follow document MRWG meeting discussion only. Comments represented in this summary do not necessarily reflect MRWG consensus.

1.) Introductions (see above), Approval of Agenda, Announcements and Welcome from the Mayor.

2.) Report on the Coastal OSU Sea Grant Outreach Project (Ginny Goblirsch & Jeff Feldner, OSU Sea Grant)

- Printed copies of all the comments were provided to MRWG members. Pages to be discussed. After this meeting, SG will spend a couple of weeks making sure that the document is totally complete. Represents 100's of hours of student work to get it to this form. Need to read all of them. Sea Grant is not going to interpret this that is up to OPAC to do.
- Description of scoping meetings, used to figure out how best to do this outreach. Encouraged establishment of local working groups. People wanted to know that they were going to be heard. Previous meetings, felt comments went nowhere. Forums-helped to guide us in our decisions. Designing the forums was very challenging. Felt important to provide basic information, good education about the process, industry wanted people to understand the rules and regulations

- already operating under. More about state of nearshore. Science of marine reserves. Get people on the same page. Didn't know what kind of turnout would have. Open mike wasn't going to work. If for MR, wanted to have feedback and wanted to know more if not in favor of them. Not just "yes" or "no". More the quality of the comments, the thought behind it. Focus the questions and feedback.
- Designed the forums for 2 hours, each participant received a packet of information identified by OPAC and the planning committee.
 - FAQ, Draft PGD, ODFW briefing document, PISCO science of MR, STAC and OPAC roster. Did not want to get into dueling documents. Inclusive but not exhaustive.
 - 5 questions to focus on. People were encouraged to bring prepared documents. Cards were available. On the selection of the questions, there are no 5 perfect questions. 5 examples to generate comments.
 - Have not proofread the report yet but feel that even in places where things are missing, still get the message pretty good. Started in Coos Bay, let the communities choose their dates. Most of the audience was fishermen who had a lot to say. Didn't know how they would take having to write on cards, but assured that OPAC would read them and that the Governor would get them.
 - Evaluations. Information in the Power Points is really good. Lots of good information. Received overall a 4.25 (out of 5) for the sessions. All but 3 people felt they had been heard and all but 2 wanted more time to participate.
 - Public comments-Newport. 2 people that weren't involved went through and looked for common threads in the comments. Need to read all the comments. This isn't a vote. Need to ask what have I learned, what to do with it, how to convey that to the communities. How let people know that they have been heard. The prepared comments/letters are included as well. Excellent turnout. Each of the meetings was different. Varied with the flow of the meetings, differences in what was written.
 - Went over dominant observations for Newport (page 239). Newport-clear that it has some working groups that work with scientists, HMSC, Depoe Bay. Comes out more than for other ports. Some of the comments may look like would apply to one of the other questions, has to do with evolution of the discussion. Need to look at them as overall comments.
 - Highlight some specific comments (page 246-number 3).
 - Examples from Brookings. Page 370. Threads on 372 for dominant observations. Several come from people thinking that these are going to be no transit zones. A master plan came up several times, for the ocean not just marine reserves. Concern about unique coastline creating lots of reserves. Examples from page 380. Lot of questions about how many, how big. Once it is in, who's to say it won't get bigger. No parameters, don't know what is before them.
 - Examples from e-mail. Page 423 and 433 and 434.
 - Not offering as editorial comments, have some observations/reflections from the team.

Discussion, comments and questions

- Thanks from Patty about the work done. Hope everyone that sees the document will take the time to listen to what has been discovered.

- Thanks to all the partners and the individuals that helped to make this happen. List of people that helped to do this.
- Jack Brown-thanks to them for doing this. Did a great job. Can you summarize the sense of the feedback?
- Reflections from the outreach team passed out. Memo from Ginny (dated March 27th).
- Seemed like most people could get behind something. Nearshore mapping and research. People want to know that they would be heard. Many Port communities are putting together action teams. Might be room for test pilot. Need to be clear up front what the rules are. Not going to double in size in 6 months.
- Jim G.-. Suggestions on what we need to do as a WG and as a council to say what we heard?
- Ginny-Modifications to the process that reflect the suggestions. More outreach, local working groups, be specific and answer questions. Change up the process. Need to mend some fences.
- Jeff-message that people want to hear is that the process isn't so much being directed by the top, not so much for us to tell the state what to do. Allow us time to do this from the communities. Need to nurture the community efforts vs. telling the communities what to do.
- Jim G-reflection on time and energy and cost to do this small part of the effort. We haven't had any resources to do that in the past. Can't do the things that people are asking us to do without the staff, resources, expertise to follow-through. Are people cognizant of the limitations of the process so far?
- Ginny-recognize the need for funding, outreach. Basically SG/ODFW/OSU-if you added all that up, huge amount of money and just scratched the surface.
- Paul E. Share with everyone one of the things that I heard is a consistent respect for ODFW Marine Program but one thing that came up was a learning curve for the community. First time said out loud that we don't know the status of fish managed stocks. We have no clue. First time said in the communities. That leads us to that we aren't done with our outreach. Other thing- was an idea of the nearshore action teams. Do we have a list? A list of people wanted to help minimize when get to the stage of how to minimize the impact to the various fishing sectors?
- Jeff F-the groups are and were just being formed on the fly. Haven't tried to put together a list. Encouraged it. ODFW would value those types of things as a feedback mechanism. Time that we've had, haven't allowed us to put those down. Too early for that.
- Paul E-did we get any comments on the document?
- Do have one document that addresses that by John Holloway. Others did in bits and pieces.
- Ginny-funding is huge. Cross message, OPAC is saying the purpose is ecosystem management and habitats, but as soon as start talking about fisheries management, that is a different conversation. Hasn't been funding to do the fisheries management stock assessments. Look at other sets asides like the RCA where not much research is going on. Where is the money coming from for a whole new section of research? How do stock assessments fit into MRs?

- Paul E. Are the maps helpful for the next set of meetings? Next steps could be tools and materials that we could use in our communities?
- Ginny-yes mapping is important.
- Jeff-mapping goes beyond the physical properties. Mapping patterns of use is an enormous effort. Had a meeting in Newport, group of fishermen said lets map. Enormous task. How many pennies does a Bend sportfishermen get vs. someone that makes his living on the coast? Not something going to be able to do casually and quickly.
- Paul E-if go to the next step, facilitation will be critical.
- Need to be sensitive for funding. Takes money to do these things.
- Jim G-should we, if not sufficient resources, should we hold the process until the resources become available? Concern to provide false hopes on what to accomplish with the resources we have able to cobble together so far. The criticism is valid but should we move forward if resources aren't identified?
- Frank-will you stay the rest of the day? Would like to ask if you are available for follow-up questions. Nodded yes.
- Jay-thanks for fabulous amount of work. Like to ask that we have a round of applause.

3.) BREAK

4.) Announcements from the Governor's Office and brief Summary of the Chip Terhune Coastal Listening Tour (Roy Elicker, ODFW)

- Letter to OPAC. Result- much from Chip's visit to the coast. Key part is the bullet points. Establish minimum expectations, EO to focus agencies, extend deadline to Dec. 1st. Governor has gotten message about funding. Making point about 2009 legislature is the key for this. Based on limited resources, doesn't expect OPAC/STAC to fully evaluate the nominations. Not expecting that at this point. Would like, expect to initiate the nomination process, guidelines and criteria. Forward before December 2008. General guidelines for more thorough review. Funding from 2009 legislature. Section that addresses wave energy-Paul Klarin will address.
- Executive Order. ODFW will be the lead agency at this point. Me (Roy Elicker) and Ed Bowles as the key people along with Patty in her usual role. Expected to deliver, state agencies provide usual assistance; ask ODFW and OPAC to come up with a-g points (see EO).
- Ed Bowles-the key here is that believe it or not there is desire to reduce expectations for the OPAC product that is expected for this year, to recognize that the actual full vetting and review of nominations prior to funding is not do-able. Heard from Chip's tour, STAC memo and outreach process. Expectations for this year are to try and get a bottom up community based set of nominations based on information we currently have. Support those teams with what we have, biological/economic that we can generate. Get some areas to consider. Have OPAC work on basically a course filter for these. So don't get the wide extremes. Get them in the appropriate ball-park. Along with ideas about a more thorough set of criteria that OPAC would like to see in a legislative packet for them to consider coming out of that, assuming there is funding for additional work. Additional work to better understand the coastal habitats. That

would set the stage for future work, more thorough research, economic work, mapping. Then the rule-making that would follow, would including marriage of wave energy amendments to the TSP. This is intended to reduce expectations about angst and lack of information. But there is a need for some nominations to be in the ballpark of what is expected so that the legislature can help to react to that.

- Roy-reiterates that this is an OPAC process, OPAC will move through this process. As far as the timeline, that is up for discussion. Here to assist OPAC and STAC. Governor would like something in a rough-way by the end of the year. Details to be worked out by the folks on the table.
- Wave Energy (Paul Klarin). DLCD to amend the TSP for wave energy siting. Look at items 5-7 (EO) along with the letter from Governor to FERC. And the MOU between the state and FERC about how they will work together to review and permit any wave energy facilities. The NOI by OPT at Coos Bay demonstrates that WE siting by FERC is not something we can control. The other important component is that FERC will consider a comp plan from a state for siting and that, to some degree, think that should control where these can and can not go. OPAC has had a sub-group meeting to discuss amendments to the TSP. Governor is saying we need to do this. We need to deal with this now. Can't afford not to have a comp plan. Directs ODFW, OCZMA, and Sea Grant to get together and educate folks on wave energy and how this process works. Lot of elements that we don't have any flexibility or choice on. Need to be proactive as a state. Will start to have discussions about how to do that outreach.

Discussion, comments and questions

- Jack Brown-No territory would be put off limits just as a result of the nomination process, still need to go forward to get funding and determine criteria from OPAC. Want to stress that.
- Jim B-concern is going to these groups and getting something from them. Most of those groups do not exist. Took 6 years for Port Orford to get where they are. 2.5 for Depoe Bay. Not up on what's happening in our area but don't know that there is a group. Jay-SG did some exploratory look for wave energy. Was some interest, but don't know of an organized group.
- Jim B-those groups don't exist. Long time to get them. Not against MR, but think that there are correct ways that take a long time and there is the way we have been going about it.
- Frank-this is an incentive for the coastal groups to get moving and talking with one another.
- Brad P-how does that effect the Nearshore Plan?
- Ed-ODFW expectation is to support this process. Will have one more FTE. Will probably slow down other work. Can't give details, haven't had time yet.
- John G. Want to thank for letter to FERC. OPT going to a test site to fighting for a full on buoy power plant was an insult and a shock to the communities. Governor's response is terrific. Better than if I wrote it myself. Much of what is there in draft seems to be obsolete. Nomination form should utilize STAC expertise. That is going to set the process back on its heels. Had written up some recommended amendments because the south coast hadn't been involved. Didn't seem to reflect Governor's letters. Lot of language about habitat and special places.

- Jim G-question for Paul K. The EO talks about comp plan for WE siting, will that include general zones within which projects can occur. Will there be that type of predictability? Lot of public comment during outreach that say we need to look at MR and WE siting together because they both remove areas for fishing. Any comp notion suggests that things on the table need to look at together.
- Paul-we are just starting on this. Comp plan does imply some sort of spatial planning. For example, wouldn't want them to be where there are other uses. Not going to presuppose how we are going to get there. Clearly would have areas where prefer and not prefer.
- Cathy-had question about whether consulted with OPT before this. Their plan was to phase them in.
- OPT may have good intentions and that may be their plan but if have a license for 200, they can do 200. Not all applicants may be as willing to be cooperative and to work with the state. Not knowing who they may be or their attitudes may be, we need to prepare ourselves. Not directed solely to OPT. There may be others out there looking for licenses and we need something in place for the future.

5.) Public Comment

Rep. Deborah Boone- Thank everyone for what they have done so far. After reading the letter and the EO want to talk about a couple of things to get this process going. Need funding to do this right. Need to do the science, trust STAC. Need to meet the funding timeline. Need to rebuild trust. Might be a parallel track. Seafloor mapping-the need is urgent. After going to a conference at OSU, there are some opportunities out there federally. CA did create a coastal conservancy, an agency that addresses water issues. Were able to after years and years to get a statewide initiative. 90 million to help fund the mapping efforts (6-8 million). Need to make sure utilize local knowledge and expertise, local economic development councils, need to have enough money and resource expertise to do the monitoring. Enforcement needs to be realistic. Don't think appropriate to think they should add monitoring of marine reserves. The rural policy advisory council came out with a report. Nice editorial supporting its revitalization. All agencies using a place-based approach, one size does not fit all. An office of rural policy is important. Have a local "go to" person for local communities to call upon, answer questions. Roger Parsons from NOAA suggested local groups. Maybe you want it like an OWEB structure. Have watershed councils. Could have local groups in addition to existing groups, or in conjunction. Local group to answer questions, be liaisons. Issue is bigger than we think it is. Don't know if legislature will fund this. Pretty much used up the rainy day fund. If weigh this against other issues. Economic issues. Need to keep all this in mind. Brand Oregon-if support fisheries products on one hand, need to keep fishermen out there getting them.

Don Mann- Some positive steps have been taken. Thank you for ongoing concern about socioeconomic concerns. Governor's commitment to an ecosystem based approach is commendable and also to listen to the coastal communities. Recognize can't be an adverse socioeconomic impact. Commend the fearsome foursome. Progress has been made but still much to be done. Chip came to the coast to conduct forums. People are beginning to feel being heard but from outreach process still ask why we need MR and

want to know what the state is trying to fix. Unfunded mandate-that is critical. Want to know where the funding will come from. Avoid special interest group influence. Important to continue to be transparent. Opportunities for public comment. Will submit comments. Hope OPAC will be given enough time.

Tony Meeker-Oregon Anglers. Planned to come in and commend STAC for the memo about the need for scientific information as the front end. Planned to complement the 9 coastal legislators who sent letter that asked for slow down to follow STAC recommendations. Now need to say something else. Shared a story about dad in Missouri and mules. The coastal process failed to get the Governor's attention. Concerned about to start a process that is going to fail. Want this to work. Believe MR have a place in that but need to go in places where the science takes us. Afraid going to have sites before we have the information.

Gus Gates-Our Ocean (S. coast field organizer). Born and raised in Florence and still live there. Vast majority have no stock assessment, think that a science based network of marine reserves is needed for a sustainable fishing future. Need to end crisis based fisheries management. Common sense. Long overdue. Proactive insurance policy. Former ODFW employee, glad to hear tapping into that expertise. Mission statement is to enhance F&W and habitat for future generations, time for us to allow them to fulfill their mission in our ocean. Support the policy guidance document as it is and want to finalize and move forward. Continue with the nomination form using sound science.

Dennis Richey-Ex Director of Oregon Anglers. I have personally worked on MR that were very successful. In Costa Rica was formed for research on turtles. Lot of pre-research was done before it was established. If nomination process is first and the science is second, what if the science says this nomination isn't a good spot? Will we keep it? If we don't do the HW first, identify species that need help, this process will be meaningless. Public will ignore it. Need to be successful and efficient. Nomination before the information is irresponsible.

John O-Brian-Member of Depoe Bay NSAT. Concerned about cart before the horse, still. Little baseline on which to declare what is best for MR nomination process. Governor has given another month to come up with guidelines for what we want a MR to look like. Depoe Bay has in mind a proposal. As a member of that team, would be reluctant to go forward with that proposal but would hope would be able to come up with criteria. Hasn't been made clear up till now. Like to see this process go forward but not without scientific basis to do so.

Ron Mason-Evidently the Governor has come to the conclusion that he is trying to make it that it shouldn't be directed to him, but left to ODFW. Seems a way to reflect bad press he has been getting. Hope is that STAC will take time to do the science so that it can be successful. Artificial timeline that you've been told can't be met.

Peg Reagan-Coastal person following this since 2002. Refinements seem appropriate. Hope will move forward with nomination form, criteria and policy guidance document.

John Holloway-State Chair RFA. 30 sec review of documents. Rather disappointed. STAC wrote a letter that said don't have time to do the data gathering to do accurate determinations. Let's just do it now, that science stuff takes a long time and will do it after the fact. Read OR RFA position (provided previously) into the record.

Cindy Ashy-Live in Newport. Came to make comments that were similar to many that Ginny and Jeff presented so changed them. Appreciate the outreach process and the candid comments from Ginny and Jeff that came from citizens. So far has been a top down approach. Process has been not a good process, hasn't involved citizens. Someone asked-Jim Good-what could be done to repair the damage. Trust and frustration. One thought is that some humility needs to be expressed by the Governor's office and agency people, that have made comments about moving this process forward much too quickly. Agree moving too quickly without science isn't a good idea. Need to happen, in meetings and future forums, for the Governor, surrogates, OPAC, agencies to apologize for the process that has happened so far. Believe the only way for this to get back on track. If look at the history, going to have a sanctuary, changed to MR, definitions have changed. Every month it seems to change. Don't know what to expect. Such a top down approach. Need to be a several month process where statements are made that apologies and humility is shown that this process has been flawed. Want to mention spending money on public outreach is one of best ways to spend public money. Suggest a cheap way to get input-an online discussion board. A lot of people would be brought in.

Walter Chuck-Thank for efforts. Thank for starting the outreach and for STAC volunteer efforts. Wish Chip had given a summary himself. Many changes in direction but would like to continue to support this process. Fully support the STAC recommendations and the coastal caucus to slow down and ensure this is done correctly the first time. Thank Jim for comments on STAC memo. Advise Governor that the process is the problem. It is the proposal that is wrong. Ask to try and use the outreach of the beginning of a process. Create funding first and adequate staff. Do not use change in dynamics to continue to push process that polarizes this effort. MRWG and OPAC need to recommend that if ODFW is given the lead, unfair for them to be handed this process to resuscitate a dead horse. Need to have own plan and not be tied to unreasonable timeline.

Lucy LaBonte- Spoke to national sportfishing and boating council and federal agencies in DC. My task was to discuss the Oregon MR process, compared to CA MPA process. Know about this because of work with Klamath. STAC memo came out right before. Went over the history of the process. Sportfishers were left out of the process in CA. Felt good to say in Oregon people are taking back the process. May need help down the line on funding. Felt good to be an Oregonian. Folks were happy to hear that the public in Oregon going to have a voice. Concerned about nearshore fishery plan funding. Don't want that to get lost. Port Orford was listed as an Oregon Solutions project. Don't want to lose all of this. Concern about nomination process moving forward without the scientific research.

Nick Furman-Exec Director of Oregon Dungeness crab Commission. Limit comments to Wave Energy. Thank the team for the hard work did on the outreach process. In January OPT came to Coos Bay to discuss intent to do 20 buoy test site. 400/800 meters. March 7th phone call that expanded to 200, 593 acres. 158 feet tall, 60 feet wide, concrete blocks. Easier to deploy than retrieve-learned in Newport. Coos Bay has become epicenter for wave energy development for the west coast. Did us a favor, no longer asleep at the wheel. Formed a group called S. Oregon Ocean Resource Coalition. 501c3 entity. Port, county, commercial/rec fishing, processors, businesses, concerned citizens. Met with OPT last week. Fleets concerned not addressed in 10 buoys in Reedsport. Applaud Governor, need to get engaged in defining the process.

Note: Computer ran out of power and power cord didn't work. Needed to write by hand and notes are possibly less detailed as a result from now on.

Greg Harlow-Need science before nominations. Unclear which agency will be the lead for wave energy. What role does the Governor's Natural Resource Office have now?

6.) Discussion about MR Process and Timeline; April STAC Workshop.

- Jay R. passed around information about size and spacing workshop that STAC is hosting in Charleston in April. Open to the public but as is normal for STAC meetings, no opportunities for public comment.
- Some ideas about potential next steps (handout). Robin also handed out options as well.
- Jim-need to decide if/how can meet the EO based on what we've heard. Look at options and evaluate them. Look at trust. Science
- Knowing what the screening process should be is important
- Robin-Want to take the time and go over the whole report and take input and revised the policy guidance document

LUNCH (1/2 hour break)

7.) Discussion about Executive Order

Note: many of these comments are from ODFW (Ed Bowles primarily). However, the note taker, getting used to taking notes without her computer, didn't catch who said everything.

- Initial Sideboards
 - Less than 10
 - Minimal economic hardship
 - Turn over to communities, priority for them
 - Facilitate
 - Sea Grant is encouraged to continue with outreach
 - Desire is to help those groups with resources, ODFW/Sea Grant etc.
 - Economic development will forward \$
 - ODFW will have an additional person
 - Collaborative teams, many stakeholders
 - More traction if multiple interests
- Re-prioritization within OPAC, ODFW, Sea Grant, other agencies
- No later than July, have nomination form ready and course sideboards for filter

- Teams start forming immediately
- Intent is to minimize OPAC's role in developing nominations and reviewing them
- Most effort on teams from communities
- If can come up with set of nominations that have been filtered, agencies will develop more thorough criteria and evaluations
- Course filter. Not detailed criteria up front, but would recommend those but wouldn't actually happen till funding is available.
- What is a course filter? Not sure will tell us which ones are the right rokcs. May be able to comment on them based on filter
- If just get to "here's the ones that fit", range of comments, things that need to happen next
- Decision support tools-is that the next stage?
- Decision framework up front?
 - None in the EO-not prescriptive
 - Maybe build into the funding package in the future
- Need to focus on the course filter and getting groups started
- Nominations no later than July, no deadline for end as long as wrap up by December. EO doesn't prescribe but implies they do close. OPAC needs to figure out when based on need to go through course filter. Want as much time as possible for teams to come up with sites. No later than July, but probably no more than 2 months for OPAC review. Focus on helping teams meet the criteria. Up to OPAC but suggest more time for the teams.
- See "D" in EO
 - Potential economic development opportunities
 - i. What are opportunities that groups would want considered as part of MR
 - ii. Suggestions for the legislature to consider
 - iii. Not prescriptive but could ask legislature to fund economic development
 - iv. Intent not to have significant economic harm
 - v. Stimulate economic activity
- While groups looking at teams, nominations also a budget process looking at needs such as mapping, evaluation, \$ for initial implementation
 - Initial intent was to have the whole package ready, but now won't know sites before budget so focus on initial steps. Need follow up next legislative session.
 - Budget on OPAC state agencies concurrent with the nomination process. Budget due Nov. 1st
 - Detailed criteria by Jan 1 2009, but need some ideas for budget purposes
 - New budget not for full implementation
 - Now based on outreach and STAC input, learned have to have resources to do full evaluation
 - Get potential sites that warrant more thorough review
- Know less than 10, hopefully will know size and spacing (after STAC workshop)
- John-Looks like more of the same, still no demonstrated need
- This assumes OPAC will move forward looking for some sites to nominate
- What are the thoughts on MPAs combined with MR's?
- Focus is on MRs. How that fits into broader management could occur later. This is one nugget of management portfolio. This isn't intended to address MPAs

- John-3d in EO. Shall utilize STAC. Ask STAC to ID a scientific project that would need a MR to occur. Start at Whale Cove and build from there. Suggest some research. Need to narrow down to doable size.
- Jim G-What I heard is that MR will be able to look at the effects of fishing. Only way to do that. Core of principle things I heard.
- John-could do inventory at Whale Cove only, then open up.
- Jim-so small, don't know boats even go in there.
- Jay-difficulty with directives. Shall etc. With STAC, size and spacing will hopefully have information to give you types of size. These types of sizes will give you these types of benefits. Up to State to determine criteria. If this kind of size/configuration, you may get these kind of values
- Robin-under "d", the idea is to have STAC help review. Make sure we have questions that will help evaluate the nominations. Course filter.
- Paul-If bottom up, need to start working with the teams now. What kind of \$, materials are needed?
- Jim G-Course filter. Suggest objectives and principles we've been doing have a basis for that type of course filter. Size from STAC workshop. Community level support. We've been working on these criteria. Shouldn't throw away the work we've already done. Be consistent on what we're already agreed upon.
- Cathy T-EO is a framework of a timeline. Who is to be project manager to put the details in this? Got to be someone who takes charge to make it from "a" to "h". More public outreach? How weave in? GIS work? Teams? Who will help organize those? Liaison is needed. Think can do it if know who will take leadership.
- Real leader is OPAC, EO is to respond to concerns about full process without \$ by November. Group to figure out
- Help nearshore teams is the key to success. Request to SG and ODFW to help with some resources.
- Jack B-developing Depoe Bay team for 2 years. City staff is supporting the team. Serious activities. Take support and real money. All are recorded. Serious meetings. Someone needs to provide money.
- Ideally vision is to have the teams be community sanctioned but don't know if that is doable. May need to be more ad-hoc with collaborations.
- Jay-need to have reasonable expectations. Could be a variety of things-up to them how going to organize.
- Ginny-After outreach, know takes time to form. Timeframe is unrealistic. STAC to weigh in on basic guidelines, why couldn't focus be on guidelines with nomination as a goal. Not by December. Agency can do budget by working with STAC.
- Jim B-Suspect trust isn't going to be too high.
- Jim G. Trust test. What we come out with needs to meet that. Tell people we've heard. Option 3 from handout-is a few pilot marine reserves by December, then an outline for others in the future. Idea-a few to test and evaluate, do science for them. Not try to create a limited system or do we want a few test areas? Have funding to enforce and monitor. Treat like a research project rather than an ultimate system.
- Robin-still want to build into the timeline the time to take a look at the report. Form a small group to look at it. Look at the PGD between now and when we next meet
- Paul E.-EO is the direction we have. Need to ID tasks. What does the science say? Time for us to develop options, decision support tools.

- Jim B-Science said slow down. Science isn't there. Summary we heard...got a flavor of the comments.
- Paul E-Realize there are key pieces of science that are out there. Somewhat surprised it says there isn't science out there (STAC memo). Have clear direction.
- Jim B-We are advising the Governor. Slow down a little bit. That's what I've heard.
- Paul E-If did presentation in other parts of the state, would have heard a different message. All Oregonians need to participate.
- Brad P-People aren't given a true picture of stocks. Those that we are catching, we have a pretty good idea about. 95% of pounds landed-those species are assessed.
- Frank-Looking at the times. By July, we need a nomination form. We can figure out an end date. Probably the end of August. Gives us 3 months to get coarse filter. Need to do nomination form. Build in some guidelines. My intent is to move forward with the timeline. Can we get consensus on the timeline today?
 - Feel we need consensus on
 - i. Nomination form
 - ii. Criteria we feel is important
 - iii. Sept-begin to review nomination so see if they fit
 - iv. Look at option sheet
 - v. Absorb literature to figure out how to take shape
 - vi. Recognize coastal community groups, encourage groups to work together
- Jim G.-Need to decide what goal is within the EO. Option 3-pilot reserves. 0-3 or proceed with limited system up to 9. If limited system, need a system criteria as well. Need to finalize nomination form and PGD. Need staff assistance. Need workplan. Need that help to move forward. Can't do it ourselves. Need to know what our goal is.
- Ed-ODFW will be working on this. Just got the EO today so will begin to address. Will have the support you need to go forward with nomination.
- Robin-Don't want to do before size and spacing workshop. Need to think about this. Need to listen to the science. Too early to make those types of decisions.
- Jane-Are you going to do this task? Come up with the specifics?
- Paul K-Clear that with the change and new information looking for footing. Should take into account Robin's option (see handout) as well. Certain milestones. Not presuppose some option. If looking for ways to organize our thoughts, Robin did a good job.
- Cathy T-Robin laid out some detail on a general framework. How to fill it in? Make sure PGD and nomination form are finalized and all that is ready to go by July. Getting a handle on forming teams is critical. If need more from the GIS team-need feedback from folks.
- Can we agree to move forward with the EO as a basic framework? Fill in with details?
- Strong commitment not to have an unfunded mandate. Won't even begin designation before \$ is available for thorough review. If no \$, won't even be selected for rule-making.
- John G-STAC and the public said slow down. If agree to continue...an insult. Won't give consensus.
- Frank-if we had a consensus to go the route of a pilot? Smaller economic cost, if decided more practical solution.
- John G-Already gave a suggestion about Whale Cove.
- Patty B-Without knowing the size and spacing won't be able to make an informed decision. Whale Cove is too tiny. Size and spacing needs to inform this.

- Jay-Suggest we have heard so much make a commitment to get together in late May/early April. Can come back to revisit after the size and spacing workshop. Give time to see if there is \$ for outreach. For Sea Grant-outreach ends tomorrow. Need to find out about \$. Give time to digest. Look at Robin's option 3A (handout).
- Not ready to make decision today. Suggest in report to OPAC, present the discussion today and will pick a date in late April/early May.

BREAK (10 minutes)

8.) Presentation of the GIS Mapping Report and Instructions and Sea Floor Mapping Workshop (Chris Goldfinger, Andy Lanier, Arlene Merems, Barb Seekins).

- Andy Lanier provided an update about the Oregon Marine Reserves website (oregonmarinereserves.net). Contains the various documents including a link to the Sea Grant report. Has a template with placeholders for the process. Intended to be a gateway to resources. Will have nomination maps and directions. Will have resource maps to present the data we have now. Will have a caveat document/data dictionary.
- Barb Seekins presented on the maps created for human use/management. Many layers. Shows how things are located in relation to each other. For example, tow lanes, offshore energy preliminary permits, dredge disposal sites, submarine cables, marine managed areas.
- Arlene Merems presented on fishing regulation maps created in 2007. Many overlap, therefore need several maps. Can change up to 5/year (when the council meets). Hard to keep maps up to date with changing regulations.
- Chris Goldfinger presented on a "sneak peak" of a new habitat map for Oregon.
 - Previously undiscovered dataset, NOS "smoothsheets." Modern bathymetry are for only a small portion of the territorial sea (~5%). NOS collected 11,000 bottom samples on surveys that go back to 1858 (prior to this data, only had 305 points). Used this data and kelp data to create habitat maps. Back then they were exploring as well as mapping so did a lot more than they would do today. Did bottom roughness from the data points. Used kelp as a hard substrate proxy. Terry said map of Orford Reef is "scary good" at the seafloor mapping workshop. Now the error is less than 50 M. Created by hand (not automated). Sample density is very high, probably never to be replicated.
 - i. Southern half of Oregon has more rocky bottom. Some focus on rocky bottoms and near ports (NOS survey) but pretty uniform.
 - Seafloor Mapping Workshop held at OSU last week. Wide variety of participants 20 presentations and 17 posters. Handout passed around that shows the utility of mapping as a multi-use effort.
 - PACOOS is part of IOOS. Integrate data online. Provide data, catalogue services, habitat data, maps. Soon to include this new data. Raw data is available. Can draw a box and will query what is in that box (for example bottom type, list of fish based on EFH/EIS work...if you click on fish-get information about that fish). Plan to improve soon to include non-commercial species and invertebrates. ODFW/Waldo are collaborating to improve it. Waldo-currently focus on 82 groundfish species. Now will focus on the nearshore species as a starting point.
 - i. Gives you habitat suitability not abundance. Information about range and habitat preferences (lat/long). Gives an indication about who could be living there.

- *Discussion*
 - Terry asked a question about El Nino. Some fish will completely change, like Black Cod will come into shore during El Nino.
 - i. Climatologies could be added (biological and physical parameters)
 - Forage fish?
 - i. Maybe suitability could be added. Could vary a lot
 - Role for GIS support to help local groups to look at options once tentative area is decided upon. Use maps to characterize the site as best as possible. How does the query help you fill out a nomination?
 - i. One of the missing elements
 - ii. Terry had said once you have a habitat map, let's talk
 - Once you put down maps, fishermen will begin to correct it
 - If science is there to go forward, refer to STAC memo that the rate at which we are going will not have enough science
 - In some elements, better off than California
 - Selina-Chris and team haven't shared this with the STAC. Didn't have this information when wrote the memo. A big chunk is the social science. Don't know if can evaluate if minimizing social/economic without more data on that
 - What about data about assemblages of species, accumulation? Special places
 - i. Not really in there
 - This was supposed to be a way to get discussion going and get input
 - Where research reserves are an important step. Know a lot about commercial species, not about others. Ability to do repetition in studies.
 - Point/nonpoint source pollution? Outfall pipes?
 - i. Pipes are in there now
 - Surface pelagic trawl program data might be helpful. Have transect lines along the coast. Quite a bit about nearshore species. Long-term data in a database.
 - Reliability of the data? So long ago. How do we know it is reliable today?
 - i. For water deeper than 20 meters, doesn't change much. Much change within 10 meters.
 - ii. Definitely a smearing effect. Some seasonality.
 - iii. Metadata is available for all the data.

9.) Discuss Future Tasks and Meeting Schedule for MRWG

- Decided upon meeting on April 21st in Lincoln City.
- Interest in doing a STAC socioeconomic workshop
- Nomination form is high priority for next meeting
- Need to draft evaluation criteria
- Jim, Robin, Cathy, Frank and John G to hammer out draft criteria. Will distribute to MRWG members a week before next meeting.
- Ad-hoc group for local team organization: Paul, Sea Grant, Jack B. Barb from the GIS group will assist.