

OPAC Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting Minutes

Depoe Bay Community Center, Depoe Bay, OR

11/27/2006 1:40-4:45 PM

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

Non-OPAC member working group agency staff: Hal Weeks (ODFW) and Laurel Hillmann (OPRD). Absent: Paul Klarin (DLCD)

Other attendees: Terry Thompson (OPAC), Carolyn Waldron (Oregon Ocean), Peg Reagan (Conservation Leaders Network), Onno Husing (OPAC/OCZMA), Pete Stauffer (Surfrider), Steve Shipsey (OPAC/DOJ), Steve Bodner (Coos Bay Trawlers Association), Greg McMurray (OPAC staff/DLCD), Jay Rasmussen (STAC/Sea Grant), Craig Young (STAC/OIMB), and David Sampson (STAC/OSU)

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. Agenda items are numbered 1-7 and underlined. Discussion from the meeting is captured within each agenda item topic in as much detail as possible.

1.) Introductions by OPAC MRWG members

2.) Agenda was approved and Frank Warrens (chair) provided some opening comments

3.) Remarks and comments from Governor's office (Jessica Hamilton)

- Reminded us of our tasks from last meeting (*see notes from last meeting-now available online*)
 - One of her tasks was to start an assessment of resources available for this effort
 - The marine cabinet (non-voting OPAC agencies) met recently and discussions included the following topics relevant to OPAC MRWG issues:
 - What agencies can provide (for the MRWG) will depend on the goals and objectives of MR's, then the agencies will be able to better figure out what staffing needs are
 - Strong impression from agencies that they are interested in the opportunity and looking for direction from the Governor and OPAC for priorities and direction
 - Look towards next session to see what happens re: agency funding
 - Laurel is point person for agencies for this WG
 - Jessica is going to be looking at the MLPA for lessons learned re: process. Strengths and weaknesses. We can look at what they did and what we like and what we don't like. CA also looked at estimated costs.
 - Other potential resources

- OSU is working with Surfrider to look at a socioeconomic analysis of marine protected areas and the results are due sometime this summer.
 - Terry T. asked why them; Pete Stauffer (Surfrider) answered that it was a project that was initiated by their organization
 - PISCO is going to be updating the marine reserves pamphlet; it will include information about MRs on the west coast (the update is due sometime this fall)
 - Graduate student at OSU has looked at MPAs in Oregon. Jessica has requested a copy, doesn't have it yet.
 - Federal MPA center (www.mpa.gov) has an inventory of MPAs
 - However, it is more a 'list' of places; they don't really look at the types of activities managed
 - Habitat: Paul Engelmeyer mentioned Dick Vanderschaft from TNC is willing to come and give a presentation about their process looking at OR, WA, BC marine areas. Also Ben Enticknap (Oceana) has done a map which used a foundation of existing data.
 - Frank suggests we filter Oceana data to make sure it is correct if going to use it (one past report had to do with bycatch was largely incorrect)
 - Jim Good-the STAC advisory group could help us review information. Can look at metadata and can evaluate it
 - Paul E. suggested we chat with Ecotrust folks (Ed?). They would like to talk about datasets.
 - Terry Thompson expressed concern that we didn't go to the ODFW for information before going to outside sources
 - Jessica responded that was part of the marine cabinet discussion but that what she was going over right now was identification of *outside* resources
 - Jessica is still going to be point person for these resources for now
 - Jim G. says that Jessica shouldn't have to provide all this information. Can have the STAC and other people within this group provide information?
 - Jessica wants us to focus on structure and how going to tackle marine reserves (membership of advisory group, planning process, etc.)
 - Jessica to e-mail out the MLPA initiative links, or prepare packets for the MRWG to look at including the executive summary, the master plan etc.
 - Jim G. mentions the lessons learned from the first go around (in CA) documents and suggests we Google for "MLPA" to find information
- 4.) Report on the request to STAC for input on MRWG questions (Jay R., Hal W., Craig Young (OIMB-biological oceanographer at OIMB and David Sampson-fisheries at OSU))
- Jay points out that they will make a full report at tomorrow's full meeting
 - They are looking at two key items: Ocean mapping effort and our (MRWG) draft letter regarding marine reserves

- Pointed out it (MRWG draft letter) was a wonderful exercise in how to figure out how to respond to questions from OPAC
- Decided several members of STAC would meet (and did meet) with Frank and Hal to revise our letter so that it is easier to respond to
- Worked from a draft that Robin H. edited
- Jack Barth, Selina Heppel, Hal Weeks, Frank W., Craig Young, Jay R. on the conference call
- 4 versions of the letter to STAC before us on the table (handout provided at meeting)
- Original draft letter led to questions from WG and STAC about organization and completeness so Robin H. followed up by looking at it and that was what they based the conference call (last week) on
- Final letter has Robin's comments and then follow up items after the conference call.
- Real fundamental changes were to include some material from Goal 19 and the TSP as context and then grouped key questions under 6 bullets (what the conference call focused on)
 - Discussion about changes in the bulleted sections (see handout) ensued.

5.) Discussion on MRWG/STAC interaction and identification of issues to be addressed. Discussion of Jan/Feb meeting between the two groups.

- Helpful to have a dialogue with STAC (or appointed people) to have ongoing discussion about Marine Reserves
 - Propose having a STAC/OPAC workshop in late Jan/Feb to accomplish this (and a workshop later to discuss seafloor mapping specifically)
 - STAC just can't be on notice whenever OPAC wants but maybe only when they have meetings around 3 times per year (but would be able to say, have workshops to which OPAC members are invited)
- A lot of the questions depend on what the objectives are (scientific or policy).
- Concern was voiced that some things you want to know from a policy standpoint can't be understood based on the science alone
- Objectives depend on location selection
- Would be helpful to have scientists in the room that can help advise when looking at goals and objectives
- Before determining final objectives, the discussion order should be:
 - 1) OPAC
 - 2) Scientists discuss OPAC's proposal with OPAC
 - Might not be able to answer some policy questions
- Need an iterative process to look at what is/is not measurable
 - Jim G. mentions the 2 phase process (in the OPAC I recommendations) where some of the detail depends on the location and characteristics of the marine reserves and indicates that the issues could be different depending on this

- Identify the areas on the local level, that is where the detail comes in
 - Good to be able to ask the different types of questions
 - Detail may not happen until way down the line (2-3 years out)
- Jay (and the STAC) wants to know *the objectives* of the reserves. Are they conservation reserves or a system of research reserves where you want to find stuff out from (down the line)?
 - Craig is worried that the populations you are dealing with are “open populations”, where things go in and out of them. May be hard to look at effectiveness and may not be able to attribute improvements to the reserve because of other factors such as temporal variability etc.
 - Paul E. points out Goal 19 in the TSP. There are already established goals and objectives
 - Dave S. voiced concerns with the draft letter. Saw lack of connection between objectives satisfying the goals. Hard to see what trying to accomplish. Presume had questions but those haven’t been fully stated in the letter, so difficult to site them (reserves).
 - Robin points out the Goal (of marine reserves) was stated is to help meet the conservation objectives of Goal 19, long-term benefits etc. So when reviewing the letter she looked at Goal 19 objectives. Goal 19 in the TSP is not current (need to look at the DLCD website for the updated version)
 - Terry T. voiced concern about the changes. How were they changed?
 - Steve S. responded that they were adopted by the LCDC (who has the authority to adopt and amend) them. Revised in ~2000 for the first time since the late 70’s so that they would be consistent with current science and management
 - Robin H. brings up objectives of Goal 19: Protecting important areas
 - Habitat
 - Important fisheries
 - Robin wants to know if we have enough information to be able to answer questions based on the bullets in the updated Goal 19.
 - Craig points out that we may just not have the information we need
 - Jim G. brings up that we need an analysis of data gaps, what we know, related to everything. Some sort of profile of those different topics for the ocean. Thinks it will cost a few hundred thousand dollars to do it. Can’t ask the STAC to do it in their spare time.
 - Craig points out that there are some things that we are NEVER likely to be able to know (due to funding & experimental constraints). May have to rely on politics or other factors without the science at some point.
 - Dave points out a MR may be able to help us answer some of those questions we may never know without one

- Jim B. points out we need to not only fixate on the ocean bottom. There are things like the Columbia River plume. Currents and how they come in are just as important as some of the geological features and need to be taken into consideration
 - Craig points out he can't agree with him more, the water column is really important because 90% live up there in the water column.
 - Frank W. comments that reserves off the Oregon coast are nowhere near analogous to tropical areas or reef areas. Can't make direct comparisons to areas like the Tortugas. With regard to the dynamics off the Oregon coast...currents off OR (where they reverse etc.) play a big role in what we use as a basis/objectives for a reserve and what we can expect to happen in one.
 - Craig points out not only are there differences but there ARE some similarities so we can look at the studies for what is similar. Don't ignore them.
- Jim G. says the central coast process (in CA) did a profile to look at establishing marine reserves
 - STAC can help out in say a 1 day workshop. Make a skeleton of what a profile for Oregon might look like using some of the information from CA as a model
 - Jay mentions that not all mapping is equal, different formats, can't put all in one database. Some is based on experience; some is cause/effect...etc. Can discuss how to merge it so can get a holistic view of it.
 - Maybe we can get some CA folks up here to help us figure it out. What are the limitations? How do you have a holistic view of it?
 - Craig looked into central coast process. They looked at what dominant habitat is in every square mile and were able to do it there.
 - Terry says their shelf is much narrower. Frank says a lot of funding came from the PEW foundation.
- Discussion continued about the mapping of the seafloor. We are a long way off. We have ~ 5% mapped.
 - Jim said we will use the best available science. If no science-we need to know that, then it becomes a policy judgment.
 - If just talking about 3 miles, then the shelf doesn't matter. Terry said they may even have it harder (in CA) since there are more habitats.
- Jay suggests we look at other sections of Goal 19 and affix new questions for the STAC group, as well as possibly affixing the actual language of Goal 19. Right now there is an interest in putting together a scientific colloquium for sometime in January or February.

Workshop ideas for Jan/Feb science colloquium

- Craig hasn't thought of agenda items yet. The general idea is to get OPAC MRWG to get other folks input from OR/CA to have some exchange back and forth about this issue
- Suggestion was made that we should maybe invite people like Ralph Brown with on the ground experience and expertise with regard to habitat etc.
- Craig suggested that we have scientists like Alan Shanks at UO (expert in transport of larvae) and others at OSU. Would be useful to get those types in the room to help us with making the decisions with the expertise in the room.
- Jessica asked what Ralph Brown would bring to the science of marine reserves.
 - Response was that he would bring local knowledge about (for example) habitat, seafloor characteristics, stocks.
- Craig pointed out this workshop is not a debate about the values of marine reserves but an opportunity to pick the brains of folks with scientific expertise about these topics.
- Frank W. comments that this could be an exchange between scientists and those in this group (MRWG) as well as with people with on-the-ground experience.
- Jay suggests another way to do it would be to have STAC be the convener and they could be the question askers. Encourage other scientists to be involved. Let scientists to be the facilitators of the discussion
 - Dave S. suggests that STAC is not sure what OPAC is trying to accomplish. Need to make sure OPAC policy side is involved to make sure the scientists are focused on what we need to know.
- Jim B. said until they had a conference up on the Columbia River folks were on all on different levels coming into the topic. Need to get on everyone on the same level.
- Jim G. says there are some fundamental questions we want answers to. May want to tweak some of the OPAC I recommendations. Need to know where we are headed and we haven't had that discussion yet. Are we going to go implement what the Governor has asked us to do or are we going in another direction?
 - Thinks we need to go out to the public. Have some workshops.
 - Comments were made that if we can't figure it out...how can the public be expected to be able to do it?
 - The public is very varied as to what they know about the ocean.
- Jim B. pointed out that in the old OPAC there was a 1 day meeting between the scientists and 1 day from the practicing fishermen. It would be silly to lose all that. It should be a driver for this process.
 - Terry points out that the old information is not relevant. The ocean has changed a lot since then.
 - Greg M. confirmed that there should be a video of it (the old meetings).

- Some information is timeless, while some may be obsolete
- STAC didn't know if the 2 main goals in the OPAC I recommendations are the current ones?
- Would like to see a statewide profile done before we look at what we know so that we can look at it statewide not by bits and pieces.
 - Terry T.-says he has all ODFW, Lincoln county data, OSU data. Spatial and mapping data.
 - Jim G. says in addition to spatial data, we need other stuff (like diagrams) for which you use information to describe things. Need to start with a base of information that we think might be useful. Generally know the types of stuff that may be useful (for marine reserves). Jim wants to wait for a profile (base of information) before moving forward with the workshop between STAC/users, etc.
 - Paul E.-commented about network design and references areas.
 - ODFW nearshore management plan will help us answer some of those questions.
 - Don't have data on all species (out of 45 fish species, have status information on 8)
- Jay R. commented that STAC not in an enormous hurry to have this meeting. On hold until they hear from OPAC MRWG. Suggests we go through all of Goal 19 and look at other factors like economics etc.
- Jim G. says sees (in the current letter) socioencomics, scenarios etc. but nothing about the oceanographic characteristics of the nearshore ocean (currents, seasonal variability etc.). Biology, ecology, fisheries. We should be trying to link letter with an overall framework. Jim's letter (about data needs) and Hal's memo are not mutually exclusive. Lot more detail in the marine reserve letter. Need to look at the information needs of OPAC.
 - Terry says problem is that information isn't necessarily in a GIS format.
 - Craig said can't put much of the information we know about say intertidal ecology about Oregon in a GIS map. Need some narrative information to do it.
 - Who will do it?
 - Who will pay for it?
 - Need framework and folks to populate it and figure out how much it will costs (ballpark)
- STAC can't take vague questions. Not enough time. Need to know exactly what the committee needs to know. Discussion ensued.
 - Terry wants to know about size of a marine reserve in regards to larval transport. Craig says would be willing to bat it around. Would vary by species though.
 - Robin H. noted that Goal 19 describes the types of areas that need protection. She asks if STAC or a similar science group (such as consultants) look at these types of questions posed by Goal 19. Asks how we get these Goals ready for the scientists?

- May be conflicting goals that policy makers have to wrestle with. Can't be all things to all people/organisms/fish. May be able to protect some species but do a lousy job with others. Don't know what we are trying to accomplish.
- Need to know whether we are looking at fisheries or overall marine ecosystem protection. May be a great area for Dungeness crabs but lousy for anything else. There may be some great marine biodiversity areas but may not be very important for fisheries. Is biodiversity a major goal or are we talking about economics of certain species. May be multiple goals but need to pose specific scientific questions.
- Example of a goal: sustain fisheries populations. Then for each goal, you'd lay out objectives. Objectives are specific and measurable indicators of attainment.
- Need to know what the variables we are going to measure are before setting up an experiment (response variables)
- Jim G. says need to focus on broad goals such as biodiversity, sustainable fisheries, may be other major goals that we have. Then for each of these goals need to look at what types of things need to do to reach these goals (objectives). We could have indicators but are not at that point yet. Thinks we need to take this out to interest groups, expert groups, and the public. Before you even get to goals need to look at the issues. Very clear planning framework that we need to use to begin to make some progress.
- Jim B. wonders if we even know the problems. Points out the South Jetty situation where they looked into whether crabs are there or not. Do we really know the choke points in the ocean?
 - Jim G. says we need to ask those questions during the monitoring phase once a reserve is in place.
- Frank W. says one of Goal 19 goals is conservation. Begs the question that those are solutions looking for problems. Need to get over that. To what degree are we able to point to conservation problems that aren't already being looked at with EFH and other processes? We have made great strides in fisheries management. It would be helpful to know where there are big gaps in management for conservation for state water species. Do we have an inventory where we are lacking conservation efforts to bring back species of concern? Those are questions that are important specifically to be able to talk to the fishing community who we MUST have buy in from before establishing any type of marine reserve. They are going to say "show me where the problem is" and how we are going to fix it. Need to separate conservation reserves from an experimental reserve to enhance biodiversity to give us the biggest bang for the buck.

- Terry T. says that a research reserve is step 1 going to step 2.
- Frank says that if we have some serious conservation problem within the territorial sea, do we have any inventory of where conservation efforts are lacking in CURRENT management that could be helped by a reserve.
 - Hal W. Initiative to map the territorial sea at a fine scale (have about 5% done so far). If look at the info that ODFW has that emphasis is on the larger volume trawl fisheries. Only recently have they begun looking at the nearshore fisheries. Have put logbook program in place that will help us start to look at harvest. Wish we had those products from 20 yrs ago but we don't. Just starting. Answers to the questions we have are much more broad-brush.
 - Terry T. wants to know if there is a conservation problem.
 - Hal says that have 2 species that have been designated as depleted in the territorial sea: yelloweye and canary. So some would say "yes" to Terry's question. Not threatened or endangered. Other species in the territorial sea, some species doing much better (black; lingcod). Don't have much more data about other species. Terry says no evidence except for those 2 species.
 - Paul E. points out that there are a lot of old species that we don't have data for (ex: live to 95 years). Need to protect some habitat now, reference sites that will tell us a story for the future. Still hears us saying we aren't going to do this.
 - Terry wants some science to back up the need (for MRs)
 - Jack Brown wants to know what a conservation problem might be.
 - Jim B. says that salmon are highly reliable on the Columbia River plume and the dams have caused a lower flow so that it doesn't go very far out so that we now have a bird predation problem. Could severely affect salmon. Not a problem of fisheries though but could be considered a conservation problem.
- Frank supports the 'precautionary principle.'
- Craig wants to know if there is a feeling we shouldn't do anything until we have a conservation problem.
- Terry T. points out that if it's a research reserve it's a whole different animal.
- Dave S. suggests we could use these reserves to help us answer some of the questions we don't have answers to.

- Frank W. gives an example of the Pacific council and canary rockfish. Appears to be a lot more canary rockfish then has been for years.
- Dave says that operating without information should be something of concern for the fishing community. Need to recognize the potential benefits to the fishing community of a marine reserve. The opportunities vs. the problems.
- Jim B. gave example of stocks coming in and depleting a fished down species so no matter what you do could be other issues at hand that we can't control.
- Frank W. needs to craft goals and objectives with enough benefits for the fishing community so that we will be able to get fishing community buy-in. Need to be able to demonstrate positive value of reserves.
- Jay R.-what is the role of this? Likely can not be everything.
- Jim Good points out something that has been bugging him-what do we mean by a limited system of marine reserves (in the OPAC I recommendation). Do we want to see if they work to be able to solve problems? If they work does that mean we establish more? There is an elephant in the room. Is this phase one? If they work out well will we have more? Implication there. Maybe Scott can answer this (as he was in OPAC I).
- Scott-says limited meant to clearly indicate that we don't want to put in a big system until we see what the benefits are for the state of Oregon. Up at Everett saw depletion with a marine reserve. The tropics have seen lots of benefits. Want to see what will happen. Fair to say there would be interest if the marine reserves do everything the reserves do in say tropical waters. Don't have evidence here that they will have benefits.
- Greg M. suggests that the language (in the OPAC I recommendations) intended to say that it would be small for now; didn't want to set X square miles as a goal. Yes-if find out they don't work, then would get rid of them, and if they do work are likely to have more.
- Craig points out need to know what we mean by "does a marine reserve work"? If the question is to
 - 1) see if there is an increase in fisheries, then this may not be a result and therefore would not be a successful effort;
 - 2) to improve knowledge about stocks, then this could be a good opportunity.
- Paul E.- if going to do it based on Goal 19 then we need to look at specific questions. Would you be able to get buy in from the fishing community
 - Terry T. (going to beat up Sports, Charter and a few trawlers and the crab fishery). They will be displaced, (going to perceive it that way, will want to be compensated).
- Paul. E.—supports at some time having a colloquium some time in the future, looking at lessons learned and science.

- Question was voiced as to whether or not it will be obsolete in 4 years? The ocean will have changed? The science will change.
- Craig says if going to look at biodiversity it would be much easier (remarkable habitat with high biodiversity and say, looks like a good area for a reserve).
- Jessica pointed out there has been discussion in the past about dead zones, other impacts to marine reserves. If you establish 4 - 5 sites within a habitat type, would that be one way to address that issue/serve as reference areas?
- Jim points out need to make decisions based on the best science out there even if it isn't that great
- Jay wants several other agency folks to be involved in STAC. Commends Hal for helping out with the STAC.

Brief break, Reconvened at 3:40

- Steve S. gives a brief run-down about how this workgroup works.
 - Ideally the WG are here to identify issues. For example the MR can identify a series of options and the pros/cons associated with it and present them to the full council for actual policy recommendations.
 - Robin H. had question about the marine reserve planning committee (in the OPAC I recommendations). Would this group be the same? Would they provide options or would they do planning for marine reserves.
 - Frank W.-asks whether it (the planning committee) should be just this group? Word from the executive committee is that down the line may look at augmenting this group and then may be able to become the planning committee.
- 6.) Next Steps (to include Goals and Objectives for Marine Reserves). The group went around the table to discuss next steps and other issues
- Jim Good provided a handout looking at the 2 stage planning process he proposes we look at implementing in response to a task given to him at the last meeting. He was asked to look at a potential planning process for marine reserves. Mentions he had talked to Peg, Laurel and the new PISCO MR staff (Kristin Gorud-Colvert). Suggests that there are 4-5 sets of players as outlined in the handout.
 - Key Players: MRWG, MR Planning Committee (MRPC), MR Science Technical Advisory Tem (SAT), and MR State Agency Planning/Technical Staff Team (STAFF) and others (public, ocean users, conservationists, others)
 - Suggests we need a million dollar budget over the next biennium to move this forward.
 - Suggests we need a coastwide profile (to include a GIS)
 - Terry T. suggests we have some workshops up and down the coast and then we may be able to answer some of these questions and they (fishermen and others) may be able to line some of this out for us. Suggests we should be able to short circuit this. Get some fishermen together (sports, charter, commercial etc.) and see if there are

areas they could come to agreement on and we could then look at some areas once they have them laid out.

- Jessica H. suggests that we should look at next steps based on Jim's handout and process.
- Terry T. said could use Jim's handout as a guideline but thinks budget and time are both too much. Thinks if we move the discussion at the local level up front (needs to be done at a local level) it would be quicker. People in Brookings care about reserves off of Brookings not at Garibaldi.
- Robin H. asks where MRPC comes in to the picture. Phase 1 or 2? It's not clear.
- The core planning committee could identify candidate sites along whole coast which we could then look at the local level.
- Jack B. comments that he is still hung up on value of OPAC 2002 and the workshops with the fishermen and the scientists. Recommends we do revisit those notes.
- Paul E.-wants to focus on item "C" about the MR SAT. It's a no brainer. Need to have more folks engaged with this. Item "D", Identify Coastwide MR Design Considerations and Criteria. We need to look at decision making models and get those on the table.
- Jay R. suggests that STAC could help identify who those folks might be to provide specific work products. Says maybe shouldn't have so many acronyms and discussion about acronyms ensued.
 - Suggestion was made that we put the SAT under the STAC and have MR STAC. Jim G. suggests we could have subcommittees. Laurel H. suggested we could have *MRS* STAC (MR subcommittee of STAC).
- Jim brings up that we perhaps could add a step here. After we look at designing the committee we could identify candidate sites up and down the coast for areas that meet these criteria. There are advantages to our group looking at it. Say we have north, south, central coast groups and meet with them locally and begin to look at sites that we could then evaluate. Identify candidate sites to help us look at all the issues based on the criteria we identify.

Discussion about the make-up of the group begins for awhile

- Frank would like to keep the MRWG as the core planning group and can augment it if we so choose for consistency and application of our preliminary findings...this can be the core planning group with the addition of regional input.
- Jim G. points out we need to look at what interest groups are represented and not represented
- Jessica thinks we can open it up much broader and try to get more groups represented. Recognize that we are looking at much more than just fisheries. Need to brainstorm what types of folks we need at the table.
- Terry doesn't have a problem with what we are talking about. Thinks we could create them (MRs) a lot quicker and easier if we engage the fishing community much sooner. We need to know how they are going to receive this. Identify 1-3 different leads (for areas) that could support a MR...and engage a broad base of fish types. Get the leaders to buy-in and get something on the group much quicker. Something along the lines of establishing the EFH procedure. See what their reaction is (2-3 groups that are significantly impacted) then go to the more public process. Will need a designation before it moves forward.

- Laurel points out we need to figure out whether or not we are going to start with the 2002 recommendation which identifies who the people (in the MR planning committee) should be.
- Robin wants to have some interaction with the other folks in the room. Wants multiple regional based planning committees as we move into the Phase 2. Once in the planning phase we need to make sure we have regional representation.
- Jim B. wants to make sure the local groups are involved
- Jack Brown agrees with Jessica's model and then we need to also make sure the fishing communities are involved up front
- Frank comments that this group should be representative and balanced.
- Jim G. points out that we need to see who is represented now and who should be represented. Doesn't want anyone not willing to work with others and just saying yes and no.
- Paul points out he knows folks that are out there that are willing to participate. Still supports the idea of the MR planning group. Need to figure out how to solicit folks to participate then outline what would be anticipated of them.
- Frank W. asks how important is balance of interest in this group? We are going to have to engage fishing communities up front.
- Jim says we need to engage all communities up front. Key one is the fishing community but we can't just ask the fishing community.
- Robin H. gave an example from Idaho wilderness area designation process she was involved in. They solicited information that wouldn't be circulated and got it from folks (like loggers & environmentalists) and they provided some information.
- Jim G. points out that once we have goals and objectives we can go forth and start looking at some areas of interest.
- Frank W. states that before we go start picking and choosing we need to bring the committee on earlier rather than later to bring input to our WG to help narrow our goals and objectives.
- Suggestion was made that we shelve goals and objectives (for now) and can start to identify a list of folks.
- Could have this group as a core and then down the road having regional based planning committees?
- Get a colloquium out there at the regional level so that we can get people at the same level before we move forward
- Fishermen need to be engaged but not necessarily in the committee (Terry T.)

7.) Public Comments

Peg Reagan (Gold Beach resident)

- She agrees with a comment from Paul that we seem to be discussing whether to do or not do reserves. Follow Governors directive or not. Lots of going around in circles and no answers.
- Glad to see what has been happening in the last hour.
- Points out that it has been hard to hear what is happening in the meeting (heating noise).

- Points out that while she did speak with Jim (about his planning process), she wants to be clear that the handout isn't her work. Does agree with the need for clear players (items A to D). If you look at page 2 of OPAC 2002 recommendation you will see that a planning committee was to be created.
- Coastwide framework plan is clearly part of Phase 1. Doesn't agree with a long process with public involvement workshops up and down the coast. Agrees need to have something to bring to the public before have a public workshop series.
- Does support the 02 recommendation that the planning committee is separate from the WG. Doesn't think we can just augment this group. 2002 recommendation says science folks need to be part of the committee and thinks that is important.
- Need to work together to design the criteria, needs to take place simultaneously.
- Does think fishermen should be part of planning process. Doesn't think should be left out; at the very least we need to try to reach out to them.
 - Jim asks what size she thinks would be appropriate for the group. Peg replied 15-21 so it is still a manageable size.

Carolyn Waldron (Oregon Ocean)

- Will forward a paper by the AFS defining and implementing fisheries and environmental policy and management. Believes it will help move forward the STAC discussion.
- First step—a clear statement of objectives. Avoid haphazardness and ambiguousness. Important to get folks together to put together questions that we need to answer with science. It's a several hundred page document and will reference those when she forwards that to us. Identifies a 5 step process to interface policy and scientists.
- Appreciates Craig's comments. If establish an objective that will need it (the MR) to increase fishery population-is NOT an answerable question. This is about protecting habitat. Many things will benefit from that. The territorial sea is a nursery and a breeding ground. Important to heed his (Craig's) advice. Can't have a fishery focus as our main objective. We all want a sustainable fishery and coastal community. Objectives need to be much more comprehensive.
- Terry asks what type of habitat needs protecting
 - Carolyn replies that there will be increasing demands. Cabling and other industrial uses that will be evolving in the future in 10-20 years. Innovative uses will evolve and we will figure out to extract things from the ocean.
 - Need to set aside some habitat for conservation purposes like we do on the land. Like zoning in the landscape. Need to start looking at the ocean in the same way. Thinks zoning is going to happen because of increasing pressures from humans. Zoning as a type of human based management. One (zone) needs to be habitat protection.

Onno Husing (OCZMA/OPAC)

- Was part of 2002 recommendation process and doesn't want us to be stuck to that. Wants us to redefine these questions based on the types of conversation

we have. Doesn't mean he wants to move away from having this move forward. Needs to be integration with STAC on an ongoing basis. Whatever happened today needs to keep happening. Don't need to slavishly hold us to the '02 recommendations-not an objective moment at the time.

Steve Bodner (Coos Bay Trawlers Association)

- Believes fishermen can play an important role in this process and need to be involved. Can speak for the trawl fleet who are trying to help NMFS with EFH designation. They helped pick out some areas for EFH and there were areas the trawl fleet was willing to give up to settle a lawsuit. Went through the Oceana process and PMCC and wanting to freeze fishing. Once saw their maps they became resentful that they showed trawltracks within a 3 mile zone. The fishermen knew whose boats they were (based on tracks).
- Suggests we let them (fishermen) suggest areas where they think would be beneficial areas to close off, don't just go and tell them. There is a very small trawl fleet up and down the coast. Recreational fisheries are going to be the ones we are picking on here. Need to have them at the table and helping us define marine reserves. Need to get recreational fishermen to start to think about closing off areas.
- Trawl fleet would be able to tell us areas that would be okay with them, but not necessarily for the crabbers and the recreational folks. It will be the recreational folks that are going to be batting up against the science.
- The areas right around the ports are likely to be depleted but those are the areas where the recreational fishermen are. Have to bring all those players together. Have them suggest where they are willing to give up. Help us define what is going to be okay.
 - Jim points out that this is similar to planning process outlined
 - Terry T. wanted to know about legality out of Oceana work. Said should probably be in jail for what they did. In violation of state and federal laws. Don't know where that information was gathered from. Want to make sure the fishermen know where their data is going. Ecotrust was involved. Going to be a problem when working with the fishermen. Right to privacy act and other acts, their data should be kept private. Have to solve the privacy problem before that information is handed over to the states.

Next steps: Frank suggests need to continue this discussion with goal of attempting to define some of the more major goals and objectives at our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM

Every attempt was made to accurately convey the meeting content. For questions about these notes, please contact Laurel Hillmann, OPAC MRWG staff at laurel.hillmann@state.or.us.