

**Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC)**  
**Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG) Meeting Notes**  
Port Orford City Hall, Port Orford, OR  
01/29/2007 1:40-5:00 PM

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

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

*Other attendees:* Terry Thompson (OPAC), Onno Husing (OPAC), Craig Young (STAC/OIMB), Steve Shipsey (OPAC/DOJ), Dalton Hobbs (OPAC/ODA), Lisa Mulcahy (PISCO), Darci Connor (OSU), Leesa Cobb (POORT), John Holloway (RFA/Oregon Anglers), Aaron Longton (Commercial Fisherman/POORT), Peter Stauffer (Surfrider), Peg Reagan (Conservation Leaders Network), Rachel Moore (NMFS Observer), Don Cross (Agness resident), John Schaefer (OSU), John Griffith (Coos County), Jennifer Bloeser (PMCC), Greg McMurray (DLCD), Charles Steinbeck (Ecotrust), Jeff Kroft (DSL), Cathy Tortorici (NOAA Fisheries), Scott McMullen (OPAC), Patty Burke (ODFW), Linda Tarr (Kalmiopsis Audobon Society), Jared Tarr (Port Orford resident), Jay Rasmussen (Sea Grant/OPAC), Julie Barr (Sea Grant), Liz Brower (OIMB), John Meyer (COMPASS), Jonathan Allan (DOGAMI), and Fred Sickler (OPAC).

*Note:* Unless specified below or 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 the meeting is captured within each agenda item topic in as much detail as possible.

#### MRWG Decisions 1-29-07

1. MRWG approved by consensus the Oregon Marine Reserve Work Plan (Phase I) and timeline as a “preliminary” work plan, acknowledging that changes and refinements will be made as the process proceeds. NOTE: On January 30, 2007, the full OPAC similarly approved the *preliminary* work plan and timeline with the same understanding
2. The OPAC MRWG agreed by consensus that the MRWG is the core of the “Marine Reserve Planning Committee” envisioned in the 2002 OPAC 1 recommendation. The MRWG also decided to move ahead with MRWG membership expansion to conform more closely to the 2002 marine reserve recommendation. To expand membership, the MRWG agreed to identify needed categories of new members, considering existing membership, and figure out how to solicit nominees for consideration by the next MRWG meeting and ultimately the full OPAC. They also agreed that membership should be kept as small as

- possible to facilitate the conduct of business, but recognizing that key interests need to be at the table
3. The MRWG also agreed to ask Oregon state agency department heads (assuming funding or existing resources are available) to identify a Marine Reserve Staff Team (MR-STAFF) to support the MRWG in the development of a *Coastwide Marine Reserve Framework Plan*. Federal liaisons to the MR-STAFF also need to be identified as appropriate (Task 1.3)
  4. A budget group was identified to move the MR process forward. This included: Paul Engelmeyer, Jessica Hamilton, Terry Thompson, Jim Good and Onno Husing, & Greg McMurray.
  5. The MRWG also agreed to request that the STAC establish a scientific and technical subcommittee (MR-STAC) following the process laid out in the work plan (Task 1.4), as modified by the STAC chair.

*Agenda items are numbered 1-9 and underlined.*

- 1.) Introductions by OPAC MRWG members
- 2.) Agenda was approved and Frank Warrens (chair) provided some opening comments
- 3.) Remarks and comments from the Governor's natural resources office & Marine Cabinet (Jessica Hamilton)
  - At the last full OPAC, the WG wanted to start to develop budgets to present to the Governor's office to get funding for OPAC
  - Marine Cabinet (agencies also on OPAC) talked about the budget Paul E. submitted, think it's a good straw-man and would like the agencies to continue to work on developing a budget that will work for everyone, including the agencies
  - WG only has a few representatives from the agencies
- 4.) Update from the Science & Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)
  - Craig said that a couple of the STAC agreed they would work with OPAC and are excited about upcoming activities. Some folks will be invited from CA to provide some technical advice
  - Jay provided an update on the marine reserves science workshop. Had planned on having a 1/2 day workshop then a STAC meeting on Feb 20<sup>th</sup>, but some problems with schedules resulted in it being put off until sometime in March. Details to follow
  - Selina Heppell (OSU) has taken the lead for the STAC to develop a response to the working group's letter. Hope to have it available at the next STAC meeting.
  - Jack Barth (OSU-COAS) is taking the lead on doing an ocean mapping workshop as part of it. Dawn Wright & Chris Goldfinger are also involved (OSU). Fits into what Dawn and Chris are preparing for support for the marine mapping. There may be a bill dropped to help fund that effort.

- Introduced Sea Grant project working with Sea Grant's plan on research & information needs. Julie Barr from Sea Grant will do a presentation tomorrow about that effort.
- Frank asked whether anyone had specific questions for Craig Young. No questions.

5.) Briefing on request by Surfrider for OSU to conduct a socioeconomic information gathering for MPAs

- Don't have any detailed information for the Surfrider study, still scoping that study.
- Darci Connor with Oregon State University's Marine Resource Management (MRM) program is doing her MS project looking at ways to use socioeconomic data to inform decision making, strategies for public involvement, integration and mitigation options.
- Darcy will do public comment tomorrow. Last 4 months has looked at case studies, literature search, and looking at different approaches that have been used. Next step is that she would like to talk with folks from OPAC (Pete Stauffer-Surfrider).
- Darci said this is a way to have the best available information available, recognizes that there are already closed fishing areas that can already be causing economic impact. Wants to look for an MPA that would fulfill Goal 19 goals. Wants to know what Oregonians feel about MPAs. Look for ways to improve the process.
- Paul E. asked a question about definitions. How are you going to bring everyone to the same page on the concept of marine protected areas?
  - Working with social scientists to get the right questions (in the survey). Important to go through and interview each OPAC member, look at background information, develop a framework. Then check back and see if "did we hit it", did we get the information correct?

6.) Presentation of Phase I – Proposed Work Plan and discussion (Jim Good)

- Draft Phase I planning and proposed work-plan for marine reserves.
- Jim handed out a hand-out (Draft for MRWG/OPAC Review of the Proposed Work Plan)
- Jim showed a brief PowerPoint presentation on the "Phase I Marine Reserve Draft Planning Process, Coastwide Framework Plan"

Purposes:

- To formalize work plan, staffing needs, and budget/timeline
- To generate a realistic budget & enable funding

Assumptions:

- Will take 2 years (beginning July 2007) to develop a Coastwide Framework Plan
- Can only do Tasks 1, 2.1, and 3.1 w/o new funds

Presentation:

- Discussed tasks 1 (getting started) through 8 (OPAC Review and Approval of Phase I Coastwide Framework Plan) shown in hand-out (*note: see below for brief summary*)
- Discussed planning timeline for each task
- Jim proposes we review the draft plan, and agree that it is a prototype, this will link to our discussion of a budget, lists a few decisions that relate that involve the getting started tasks

#### Decisions needed

- 1.) Agree (or not) that the MRWG is the MR planning committee (from 2002 OPAC)
  - 2.) Agree to move ahead with MRWG expansion to conform to the 2002 recommendation
  - 3.) Modify (as necessary) and endorse (or not) the proposed work plan for Marine Reserves planning Phase I
  - 4.) Identify a sub-group to work with the STAC to identify potential members for a MR-STAC subcommittee
  - 5.) Identify a sub-group to work with key OPAC agencies and Federal liaisons for an Agency Leadership Team
- Need to agree that the MRWG is the planning committee envisioned in the 2002 OPAC I group, Jim suggests that the MRWG be the core of the planning committee, but that we would need to add additional interests to meet the spirit of the 2002 recommendation. The alternative is to do another group, but feels that would take us backwards.

### **PROPOSED PLANNING PROCESS** (summary)

#### **Task 1:** Getting Started (1.1-1.4)

- Thinks we have a core for the STAC (e.g. Craig and Selina) but need additional persons/representation

#### **Task 2:** Prepare Coastwide Ecological & Socioeconomic Profile/GIS for MR Planning

**Task 3:** ID MR issues, problems and opportunities, goals and objectives, specific design criteria. For example, no MR within so many miles w/in a mouth of a major fishing port because it would impact that group severely. Then develop a stakeholder based draft of these issues. 3.3 develop a final draft after stakeholder and WG and STAC involvement. Then move forward.

**Task 4:** ID regions and/or sites. 2002 report anticipated that in the coastwide framework, we may identify sites, but in the 2 phase process anticipated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase would be a local process but it wasn't clear what that would mean (e.g., county? N, C, S?) What it is, is the last task in his Phase I process. Jim anticipates want to at least have the opportunity for stakeholders to have opportunity to comment on where these locations are.

- Terry T. said have to get it up there as soon as possible, get local buy-in in the process. Early the better, better chance to get a collaborative agreement.
- Jim-if going to go out there, people are probably going to want to point out specific areas. May be reserves designated in Phase I. Lot of offshoots that may happen. Don't want to stop a process, say a local process to happen.

**Task 5:** Define formal approval process for adoption. Audit and Options

**Task 6:** Assess potential ecological, social, economic and other impacts etc.

Probably need to look at in Phase I and II. Project that Pete and Darcy spoke on would be helpful on the socioeconomic side of things.

**Task 7:** Phase II planning process based on Phase I.

**Task 8:** Review and Approve.

*Discussion about draft planning process:*

- Jack B. pointed out that in the OPAC I, big fights was that we would choose sites and then look at impacts. Want to know impacts and then look at siting.
- Frank W. comments-clearly this is a draft, and I think it needs direct comments after this meeting; re-order priorities and revise as necessary. As long as we understand that this is a working draft, will be refined in future meetings.
- Jim put up a “fantasy” timeline. We need to get a group together to look at the profile/GIS (Task 2). Recognize that the groups involved depending on the location will of course be different. Timeline starting Jan 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007.
- Terry T. points out we have a timeline, asks how much money to do this? Jim says that Paul will take that up next. Want to just get a general sense of what the WG and STAC would be doing over the next few years. Then how much going to cost, Paul will provide info. Next. Terry T-is this fantasy land all-together. Jim says if have say 4 million which is a ballpark budget if pull out the mapping...if that level of staffing and support were available, this could be done really well with that sort of funding with this sort of timeline.
- Frank W. comments-go to the timeline. Strongly suggest establish a fishing group, following the expansion or in conjunction with the coordination of the expanded working group. Extremely important once we define more specific goals. Somewhere between 1.2-1.3, id subgroup including recreational and commercial fishing interests.
- Terry T.-how big a group envisioning? When do coastwide planning it gets all confused because the issues between ports are different
- Frank-important we ID some specific goals of MR, what do we intend for them to accomplish? Given that, then the fishing groups can have comments before we begin the siting, they could provide input that would limit/minimal economic impacts to the fishing groups. Terry T. Agrees.
- Onno-anticipates there will be local anchored groups like POORT and the Depoe Bay group. Those groups aren't in this budget.
  - Jim-thinks that task 3 outline fits that (3.1) this group would internally develop a working draft, problems/goals/objectives/maybe design considerations. Then ID fishing and other ocean interest groups and go out to stakeholder groups and have meetings with them, then those ideas would come back to the WG and then sift through and decide where we are. Good to organize on a coastwide basis but if Terry's right may want to do a more community based process. Jim-this process would identify stakeholders Idea would be to identify a whole listing of groups of people that are interested in this.

- Frank W- there are number of people with decades of experience and once we decide what we want to accomplish they would be able to help us meet those goals at the same time minimize the impact to existing fisheries. That's a fairly small group of people with the expertise and experience able to address that issue. If we ID w/in each community or affected port area, identify those people up and down the coast, where we could best site a reserve and have a minimal impact on existing fisheries.
  - Jim-specifics need to be worked out. End result siting wouldn't occur until over 2 years from now. Really important to feel good about those sites before we go forward.
- Jessica-be cautious that the STAC would be the main folks with the science. Need to make sure we have the right scientists plugged in at the right time. Still need to figure out structure stuff.
- Jack said that the scientists and the fishermen are on the same page, can't expect them to participate on their own dime. If going to participate, need to pay them
  - Frank said we could look at that in the budget
- Terry-suggests that the *port liaison project (PLP)* has found itself in reimbursement like this for the wave action generators. Funding is loose...worked to develop this. ACTION NEEDED: Suggested one function this group could do is to put a letter of support for the port liaison project to NMFS and explain how it is critical in MR planning and the wave action generators. Funding is important for the kind of work we are going to need in the future. Katy Coba is here. Need to get a letter there as soon as possible. Jim said he would mention the PLP in the next version of the planning work plan. Paul said we can talk about it in the future budget discussions.
- Jim-Should be money to support travel expenses.
- Jay- said that the STAC looks like a separate unit. Said its fine for the WG to suggest what kind of expertise we need (including experiential knowledge). Says that could be a function that STAC could do. Try to respond to our needs and establish a WG that can work with us, a subcommittee that can work on those items. This is something you ASK, not appoint.
  - Frank-with that thought, going to ask each of WG members to provide comments on the timeline and work plan.
    - Jay has some language modifications for the work plan.
    - Frank asks the group to say okay with it as a working copy and solicit request for input on the plan.
    - Robin-do we want to leave as a working document?
    - Frank-asks group to approve it as a working document.
    - Jim-MR agency staff down the line will modify this.
    - Terry-when do we want the motion to go through?
    - Would like suggestions between now and the next meeting so can compile them for discussion at the next meeting. Can iron out conflicting stuff at next meeting.
    - Paul says that we need to move quicker. Can't wait until the next OPAC meeting. We aren't going to fine-detail this work-plan. It is going to be the agencies.

- Terry T.-take this as a living document. At this point, understand can be changed. Going to have to go before committee pretty soon.
- Paul-idea that we would endorse this as a working document. Are we going to do a larger planning committee-and some other things, we need to decide now, but it is up to the agencies to go about other fine-tuning.
- Jim-propose adopt as a preliminary work plan. If people have edits/heartburn with parts of it, Jim can fit them into the next version. Every attempt has been made to get comments from last meeting incorporated in this version of the document.

7.) Presentation and discussion of draft MR budget and identification of funds needed in current budget process (Paul Engelmeyer)

- See draft budget handout
- Acknowledges it is going to change. Need to just look at the categories and agree that we need to fund those categories.
- Categories: Science Support, Planning & Design, Education & Outreach, One-time start-up for implementation and research equipment, Operations/Management, Monitoring, Enforcement, Adaptive Management, Refresh equipment, etc., Unallocated

*Discussion about draft proposed budget*

- Identified the different agencies that we think are the logical ones to be involved in the 2 phased approach. Some of this will be socioeconomic support. A lot to be worked out by the departments.
- Need to get someone that is involved to get the fishermen engaged.
- These 10 items come from other processes, like the MLPA, Dry Tortugas, etc. how the cost categories were worked out.
- Need to look at those cost categories and want to decide if we are missing anyone?
- Terry-lots of basic science that needs to go along.
- Robin-who would be doing these tasks?
- Jim-there is a direct link between the tasks that Jim talked on and this budget. Points out that some of the agencies will be doing the science. Federal funding for the seafloor mapping. Basic science will be done after the reserves are identified, doing baseline profiles, setting up a monitoring plan to get reserve questions-done in phase II.
- Greg explained the FTE's staff. Jim said that the budget could be re-worked to get contracts to do work instead of agencies.
- Terry T-is there a way to not create these as permanent positions. LD positions because it is a start-up or is this away to establish it as permanent.
- Paul-Good point. He thinks we need a more robust ocean program. Lots of status unknown. That's an oceans program that is working with multiple departments. One piece to get us moving in that way.
- Frank-W. Phase II could be the elephant in the room.

- Paul-we didn't go there. Wait until have the departments look at this. We still need a clear statement so the funds for the mapping effort go into a request for the Governor to get the federal funding. Can't be put off. Want to make sure it is in the budget. Still needs to happen. Not be able to fund unless we have an effective workplan and timeline for funding sources, such as NOAA. Increased federal budget nationwide. EPA, NOAA processes out there. Sees there are federal funding sources. State funding sources. Foundation support is an option if we have a good program.
- Jim-going to design the process for Phase II as a part of Phase I. Don't know how many and where marine reserves are. Number of marine reserves will determine the budget to a great degree.
- Frank W. If this, for example, I'm *not proposing this*, but if there were 12 reserves, albeit not large reserves, would there be a step in the process, to scale those back that more closely fit the budget or would it be a no-go for the whole thing. Assume we would fit the reserve to more or less fit a budget that we see as a realistic budget. Include all element of Phase II.
- Jim-OCZMA said that they wouldn't support MR implementation unless there is \$ for monitoring them, to understand if they are working.
- Robin-Got to go get the funding to have it in place to be able to manage a system of marine reserves.
- Onno-belief at the time, if crafted a recommendation, would enhance the recommendation to include the requirement for funding. Becomes an empty exercise. Unfortunately was perceived that it was a "poison pill".
- Jim-legislature is likely to ask about Phase II funding requirements. Can say it depends but we should have a response for that. Phase II is likely to cost 2-3 times as much as Phase I for a biennium, then it may fall down for ongoing monitoring. Enforcement is important and not cheap
- Robin-points out that they looked at the CA expenditures from marine reserves and sanctuary sites everywhere, they looked at these same items, if the legislature asks, there is some work on other sites. Give them some idea what it costs other places.
- Terry T. Tropical not the same as here. Was recently in Hawaii and they had a new marine reserve, the big boats are now all out of the grounds, but not enough enforcement so small boats going in there. All it did was create a reserve for the honest fishermen. Worried that could happen here. Are going to need major enforcement components. This isn't a tropical ocean.
- Frank W. Until we get input and buy-in from each coastal community, and fishermen, that would imply that down the road there would be some self-policing. Without that, the Hawaii example is a definite risk. Needs to be something we consider here. Keep number of reserves flexible to meet up with the budget we get.
- Dalton Hobbs. Reality check for legislature. Things moving quickly there. Have to have clear deliverables and objectives and have to fall into line with the Oregon benchmarks. If not, don't even bother coming to the legislature. At this point, going to have to require a Herculean effort. To be honest, don't know if there is



enough time, given their pace. Problematic at this point for a state agency to take this on.

- Terry T-if the Governor's office takes this on as a priority, if he wants it bad enough, there is a way to come to the co-chairs.
- Paul-would have liked to do it 6 months ago. Go as a group to the legislature and say it is a priority.
- Robin-aren't there ocean benchmarks? Greg-yes there are ocean benchmarks.
- Jessica-going to have to go fight for the priorities that were already in the Governor's budget.
- Onno-not in the dire straits that we were in the past. Group we haven't had mentioned is the coastal caucus. We are up against a wall, time-wise. Do have to kick-out a package by tomorrow and head to the capital ASAP. Decision on the part of the coastal legislators, and we won't know until late in the game. All we can do is lay-out a work-plan and then lobby the package. They will come back and say what will you really need? Doesn't think we have enough time. What can we actually get out of it?
- Terry T. Big player in the capital is the new committee on safety & ocean services? Will want to come out with something. Ideal issue for them. Direct line. Mostly coastal legislators. More power for the budget package we propose.
- Greg M. Someone will come back to the agencies and ask them about the budget. Agencies need to turn it back in a week or so.
- Dalton H.-Need position descriptions. Pay scale etc.
- Onno-may be easier to do block funding for contracts.
- Greg-agencies already have their budgets done.
- Dalton-when enter agency land. FTE is one part. Money is another. Got to be carefully crafted as to how the ask is asked for. New unique capacity. Without that, dead on arrival.
- Robin-could the agencies shape it up so it looks like a good package?
- Terry-can go to the legislative fiscal office if have a letter from a legislature. That's the way to create an unusual package like that.
- Jim-we need a small sub-group to identify what we need to do with that.
- Frank-would like the WG to recommend to the full group, what we just said, makes sense to create a smaller group to effectively handle the situation.
- Tomorrow will request full OPAC to move the package and strategy on how to approach it. Lay out the steps we need to formally establish a package to move it through the budget process.
- Jessica-agencies haven't already all signed off on the budget. So need to make sure they are okay before go forward with it. Need a week at a minimum
- Onno-coastal caucus can be engaged. It would be helpful if Jessica would run up the flag-pole that this is coming. Have a discussion. Policy option packages to add to the budget. Parallel discussions within the Governor's office, provide some cover from the agencies, and get the agencies to cooperate.
- Paul-Joint Emergency and Ocean committee is waiting for something to happen.
- Jessica-need to make sure the agencies are on top of it, and agree with the budget before it goes forward to the legislature.

- Onno-need to have an understanding in a week or so as to how we are going to move forward. Legislature needs to give us some feedback.

*Discussion about this group vs. the planning committee per the 2002 recommendations:*

- Jim-we need to decide if this group is the appropriate planning committee?  
Handed out a hand-out that has WG membership expansion and proposed solicitation.
  - Proposed potential interest(s) represented: Charter fishing, conservation, public interest, conservation, ports and harbors, commercial fishing (trawl), coastal community/local official, DSL, Governor's NRO, ODFW, OPRD, DLCD, DEQ, DOGAMI, NOAA Fisheries, Tribal, Commercial fishing (crab/nearshore), private recreational fishing, other ocean recreation (e.g., surfing/kayaking), marine transportation (e.g., towboat), public interest, marine science (ecology, oceanography, fisheries, socioeconomics, spatial information), coastal tourism (e.g., whale-watch), marine education, student, other?
- Frank W. Committee members to give some thought about additional members and how key they would be. How big the group should be?
- Robin-commented about the marine sanctuary group (isn't still ongoing, several OPAC members on it that aren't on MRWG)
- Jim-willing to take in additional interests groups.
- Frank-need to keep the size of the group manageable.
- Paul-would like to open it up further and make sure there is representation on this group. Can send a letter out. Goal to establish a network of marine reserves.
- Frank-important to continue the continuity of this group.
- Jim quoted from the recommendations about the planning committee. Need to think about who might be interested. Decide how big the committee should be. Needs to be open and transparent.
- Frank-Cheryl Coon from Portland Audobon has made a similar group with a parallel path to this group.
- Greg-we don't have the authority to decide on people and the size of the group; Has to be the full OPAC. We can make recommendations to full OPAC.
- Jim-moves that we say that OPAC MRWG is the core of the planning committee that was envisioned in the OPAC I recommendations & authority to expand as appropriate if we come to them & ask them to approve it (whatever that may be).

8.) Discussion by MRWG to identify and narrow specific goals and objectives for Marine Reserves in state waters (Frank Warrens)

- 1.) What do I think a Marine Reserve should or would not be designed to do?
  - a. Take off the table, not managing fisheries for fisheries management
  - b. Expect this to go through a few meetings.
  - c. Exercise to narrow the purpose & goals
  - d. Hal suggested that we ask, what specific changes do I expect to see as a result of marine reserves? Inside and outside of reserves.

- e. Narrow the focus on what marine reserves should not be established to do.

*OPAC MRWG member comments:*

- Jim B: Should not be designed to just do the least damage. Well put them out there where they won't hurt anyone. In some cases, they are going to have to be areas that are important in the ocean
- Jack B.-should not be designed for a select community. Should be designed for Oregonians and the country. Should not be incorporated to just let people analyze the performance. Should have traditional users and selected scientists look at them. Should not exist just for a select group of people like the scientists.
- Robin H.-a MR should not be a place where a development project is put in the water, such as a wave park, just because another use is there. Could be a special use is there. May provide habitat but that shouldn't be confused with marine reserves
- Brad P.-not just so we are feeling good about ourselves. Need clear goals and objectives. Shouldn't be doing it because others are doing it.
- Paul E. -shouldn't design a network with unattainable goals.
- Jim G.-don't think we should have marine reserves for any purpose except the conservation objectives of Goal 19. Fundamentally what 2002 recommendation said. Don't think we should be establishing MR with the objective of improving fisheries outside of MR. Not fisheries management tools. Don't have authority to do that. Build off what Craig said at our last meeting, would be very difficult to suggest there will be fishery management related benefits-take that off the table.
- Frank W.-all know that in some areas, in tropical seas, absent fishery management, have put in place marine reserves, in most cases pretty positive results in these areas. Clearly these are different areas. For purpose of improving fisheries, or stocks that fisheries use. In my opinion, given current management regime for the entire west coast. Ray Hilborn-would have to close off huge areas to restore some of the fish stocks. Other fishery management techniques are making great strides. Fishery management would be at the bottom of the positive results from a marine reserve.

*Other comments:*

- Terry T. Should not be designed without consideration of the cumulative effect of Wave action generations and MR. Have to consider both. Worried about the cumulative effects of both. Can't zone fishermen completely out of existence. Should NOT be created without public buy-in. Would just be a war. Money thrown down the tube. Should not be created unless we have established some stable funding for research and enforcement
- Onno H.-So often run through the fishery management lens. A place where you can't fish. Other things are coming down the pipe (like aquaculture). Need to find the ecological hot-spots for a number of key species. Did that for salmon recovery.

*Discussion ensued:*

- Craig-Like to clarify point made last time. Didn't say that fisheries might not be augmented by marine reserves. If just rely on that to see if they are working then doomed to failure. Important to have other kinds of goals. Not make increasing fisheries as the primary goal.
- Jim G.-should be mindful that there are other zones in the ocean already. Dredge material, tow boat crabber lanes, variety of other things, navigation channels etc. Need to be aware of ad-hoc zoning in place in much of the ocean. Much of the fishery stuff is outside the territorial sea.
- Frank-helpful to have a map of our territorial sea that indicates established closure areas. Need an overlay that shows all of these collectively. What activities occur where. Zones that are already established. Help with rationale and justification of a marine reserve.
  - Terry T-just did this in Lincoln Co. mapped out the basic grounds what the fishing industry is fishing. Pretty amazing how it all overlaps. Did it to 12 miles off of Lincoln Co. Wasn't any spot that isn't fished. Lot of them overlap pretty thoroughly.
  - Jim-need to overlay other things.
- Terry- Crab lanes outside of 3 miles, dredge sites are outside most of the time and they move.
- Frank-will do an overall of places that exclude fishery activities within the 3 miles.
- Greg-don't think should be established solely to solve problems. Huge opportunity to understand our ecosystems. Limit ourselves if we limit it to solving problems.

Frank: Given exclusions discussed in last question. Go around and state your primary **objective** for establishing a MR in the TS.

- Paul E. A network that protects critical habitat types and biological assemblages that depend on those habitats. Establish baseline and reference areas for future management decisions
- Brad P. Long-term baseline data collection areas. Might not give us something tomorrow. Long-term look at what's going on in the ocean for reference areas in the ocean. 5-10-20 years to get data
- Robin H-Easiest thing to protect ecosystems. 2002 recommendations. Goal 19 lists a lot of objectives. To protect biological diversity of marine life and functional integrity of marine ecosystems
- Jack B. to establish ocean areas not affected by human activity, including pollution, so we can study ocean life existence without external forces.
- Jim B., to see a variety of habitat types, each one different protected
- Jim Good. Most of the things in goal 19 and the 2002 recommendation. Goal 19 goals but one not mentioned is the Goal to increase understanding and awareness of Oregon's ocean resources. Venues for public education. Video-cams of what's going on, online sites to see what is happening in a marine reserve.

- Terry T. Goal to make sure this is realistically done. Some unrealistic perspectives of what it does. If have a research perspective, this coast is so different we can learn a lot. A lot of our rocky areas assume there are coral and all this life. If have a big storm, all it is, is a bunch of tube worms. Not the abundance we have in a tropical reef. People can understand and become more realistic about what is actually in the ocean here in Oregon. So much misconception. Not realistic

Discussion ensued:

- Hal-ROV is a good tool to go some places and see what is down there.
- Craig-Goal 19 that Jim said refers to understanding. Not only public, but also society and science at large. Nobody understands everything about what is really going on. Paul and Robin articulated what thinks should be main goals- biodiversity and genetic continuity between populations, maintain remarkable areas for Oregonians, fishery standpoint-buffer effects of fisheries so that if fisheries decline, control areas for scientific studies. Can't know what is going on without these control areas.
- Frank-will this discussion help us convey to the STAC about our rationale? Get an understanding about diverse feelings from folks around the table.
- Greg-when established in sufficient breadth, representative habitat types, to allow us to understand the impacts or effects of human activities as compared to natural disturbances and better able to manage and ecological vulnerability of the Territorial Sea. Given these areas and a sufficient research budget. Hedge bets, try to find place where not a lot of Oxygen depleted waters, but if it does can look at natural disturbances. Can only manage human activities.
- Robin-Goal 19 says to look at vulnerable areas. Should we as we locate these areas, be concerned where threats are? As we look for marine reserve sites, look where current threats are? Kind of like what Jack was saying, want to be aware of pollution. Overlay map that shows where important ecosystems are that are close to potential threat.
  - Terry-should have threats mapped. Map critical habitat. Almost put an outfall site into a spawning ground in Lincoln Co.
  - Jim-DEQ probably has those mapped out with a database. Terry-they can also give you a plume for certain areas for point source pollution.
  - Paul-need to support letter for the port liaison program. Potential funding for it. Frank will follow up on that.

Group feels we have accomplished a lot to getting us on the same page.

- Frank W. Last question. If we establish a marine reserve. If it fails in a given period of time to achieve those goals. After what period in time, acceptable to sunset the reserve if over an adequate period of time? With adequate monitoring and enforcement. Determine a trend in 5-10 years?
  - Paul-what is the failure?
  - Terry T. if no difference between protected area and non-protected areas then it is a failure.

- Frank asked Hal and Craig. Would it be appropriate to replace the area with another area or remove it?
  - Hal-said given life history, need to think on the lines of the longer periods of time. Reluctant to make a decision on one reserve. Would want an “0 for 3” to be really convincing. Could just be bad luck; put it in the wrong spot.
  - Craig-the kinds of goals we have been talking about, can’t fail. Can’t fail to protect critical habitat, to protect diversity and populations. If just focus on a few fishery species, can fail. As someone who has published many papers on the tubeworms, happen to be a tubeworm activist.
- Terry-is it worth it if they don’t do anything.
- Frank-OPAC I established that if for whatever reason they fail, then there is a sunset clause
- Jim-think that just talking about negative side of it. What if they are tremendously successful? Thinks we need to use adaptive management, learn from the science work that happens in them. Must include adaptive management. Thorough monitoring, at least every 5 years. La Nina/PDO etc. over time. Can’t pick exact timeframes ahead of time.
- Robin-feel like we’ve done a great job moving forward. Stop on a positive note.
- Greg-rubber stamp on what Hal said. Need the 20 years. Most seem to agree that a 20 year timeframe is a good amount of time at the least.
- Craig-really hard to predict what is going to happen. Need to have a low level of commitment for monitoring and enforcement. Future legacy for Oregon. See it as a baseline, control area to use for monitoring in perpetuity.

Next steps: Next meeting start to narrow focus on more of the specifics of the objectives

#### 9.) Public Comment

- Lisa Cobbs (POORT)
  - Encouraging to hear talk about representative people to be added to the working group. Other stakeholders. Community input and buy-in is important. Will continue to participate. Reception at the community building tonight was announced (near the playground)
- Gary Wickham (Port Orford).
  - Whatever is going to work must be brought into the communities. Don’t want to save junk. Experience free-diving since the middle 1950’s. When started, life was so abundant. Things that shouldn’t have disappeared are gone. Abalone is overfished. Urchin fishery. Abalone diving. People didn’t care about the long-haul. Came up from San Diego. This is something that needs to get done. This is just a start. There is a lot of money to be made for things in the future. Things are going to be changing. This is just a facet of the change. Worked for

University of California, dove with a lot of folks. Dove in an underwater park down there. Life was abundant in that area. Lot of spill-over. The old days are gone. I'm looking forward positive. If you have the wisdom to start it. Admit doesn't know a lot about the fishery (here in Oregon).

- Carolyn Waldron (Oregon Ocean).
  - Really appreciate work on planning process and the budget etc. Sees this meeting as the first effort to move forward following the 2002 recommendations. Comment on the budget discussion. Not sure that Dalton Hobbs was heard. Oregon Ocean testified in writing because of the budget process and OPAC is advisory to the Governor, said that the OPAC should delegate to the agencies to get ready for August 2005. Mention it because were aware that this is an elaborate process. Suggests the process is the process. Encourage to move forward on the process. Don't think going to get it through this legislative process. Encourage to move on a parallel track. Short and long-term need and then look at the reality that the legislature is moving forward, agencies are already invested in the Governor's budget. Need to go through Governor's budget to quickly identify dollars to start with helping with the Phase I process. Elaborate process with FTEs not going to pass. 30 million for federal government to look at protecting habitat, some states have already secured some of this money. Money is on the table now. If we want to protect some habitat need to start getting smart to leveraging some dollars. TS mapping and other priority topics of the federal government.
    - i. Jim asked how much you think we can do without any staff support. If we don't get some resources can't get it done.
    - ii. Carolyn agrees. Thinks should ID through Governors office to get some support that in short order can move this forward. Hopes the Governor and the legislature recognize that. Doesn't see we are going to get \$6 million. May be able to get some essential support.
    - iii. Onno comments on the Bush handout. State of the Union. Not necessarily going to happen! Gulf States already have some of the \$. Carolyn W. -CSO already identified which states are moving forward on obtaining some of this money.

**5:00 p.m. ADJOURN**