

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, May 19, 2005

8:20 a.m. - 12:23 p.m.

Doubletree Hotel
Portland, Maine

PARTICIPANTS:

Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee:

Dr. Tundi Agardy
Sound Seas

Robert Bendick
The Nature Conservancy

David Benton
Commercial Fishing

Dr. Daniel Bromley
University of Wisconsin, Chair of FAC

Dr. Anthony Chatwin
The Nature Conservancy

Dr. Michael Cruickshank
Marine Minerals Technology Center Associates

Dr. Rod Fujita
Environmental Defense

Dr. Delores Garza
University of Alaska

Eric Gilman
National Audubon Society

Dr. John Halsey
Michigan Department of State

Dr. Mark Hixon
University of Oregon

George Lapointe
Maine Department of Marine Resources

Dr. Bonnie McCay
Rutgers University, Vice-Chair of FAC

Mel Moon
Quileute Natural Resources Department

Dr. Steven Murray
California State University, Fullerton

PARTICIPANTS (CONTINUED):

Michael Nussman
American Sportfishing Association

Terry O'Halloran
Recreation Industry (Hawaii)

Dr. John Ogden
Fl. Institute of Oceanography, Univ. of South Florida

Dr. Walter Pereyra
Commercial Fishing

Max Peterson
Intl. Assoc. of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (retired)

Gil Radonski
Sport Fishing

Dr. James Ray
Oceanic Environmental Solutions, LLC

Barbara Stevenson
Commercial Fishing

Kay Williams
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council

Robert Zales, II
Recreational Fishing

Federal Ex-Officio Representatives
Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee:

Tom Kitsos
Department of Commerce

Larry Maloney
Department of the Interior

Dr. Brian Melzian
Environmental Protection Agency

Jacqueline Schafer
U.S. Agency for International Development

PARTICIPANTS (CONTINUED):

Other Participants:

Bob Fletcher
Sportfishing Association of California

Bob Hayes
Coastal Conservation Association

Leslie Ann McGee
EFH/MPA Program

Heidi Recksiek
National MPA Center

Joseph Uravitch
National MPA Center

Dr. Charles Wahle
National MPA Center

Bobbi Walker
National Association of Charterboat Operators

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
Call to Order	6
Public Comment Period	
Dennis Heinemann, The Ocean Conservancy	8
Finalize Document Review	16
Discussion of Next FAC Charge with Departments of Commerce and Interior	151
Committee Business	
Logistics for next meeting	179
Discussion of Next FAC Charge with Departments of Commerce and Interior (Cont.)	183
Finalize Document Review (Cont.)	188
Discussion: Future Organization of FAC (Action to be taken at November 2005 Meeting)	
Leadership	193
Committee Business (Cont.)	
Review key agenda items for November meeting	204
Other items	214

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 DR. BROMLEY: Perhaps I should, with great
3 reluctance, call us to order. All of us were so
4 exhilarated to finish yesterday that I really hate to
5 start it all over again, but maybe we are at a
6 different place this morning and I think we are.

7 I was such a monster yesterday about keep
8 pushing that I think we will just open the meeting and
9 we will just sit here and do nothing for about a half
10 an hour. Would you like that? And if you average out
11 the pace at which we worked yesterday and this morning,
12 it would be just about right. At any rate, here we
13 are.

14 I am going to call the meeting to order. We
15 have a public comment period. We have one person who
16 has asked to appear before us and we are a bit late,
17 but you deserve it. Lauren, I am going to ask you, if
18 you would, do you have a few logistical issues to
19 address to us, please.

20 MS. WENZEL: Just for those who are going on
21 the field trip, if they could give Bonnie the \$10 for
22 lunch for tomorrow and if anyone -- again, just if any

1 plans changes, let us know because we are working out
2 transportation. And that will be at 8:00 tomorrow.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Do you want to talk about the
4 report or anything in particular?

5 MS. WENZEL: Sure. As far as other logistics,
6 I think you all have a copy of the version of the
7 report that was agreed to yesterday afternoon and I
8 just wanted to note that I made all the changes, but I
9 would like a chance to kind of go over it very
10 carefully and make sure that everything is correct and
11 also with an eye for the technical corrections that
12 were raised just to make sure that there aren't any
13 errors.

14 So what I would prefer to do, if it is okay
15 with the group, is to e-mail it out to you all early
16 next week. That way you all will have a version that,
17 you know, is close to -- is very final and then our
18 intention is, obviously, to have it laid out, have our
19 graphic designer help us make out a really nice copy of
20 it and then put it up on the website and distribute it
21 more broadly. Okay.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. The press release.

1 MS. WENZEL: Okay. And then I just also
2 wanted to mention that the Department of Commerce did
3 issue a press release or is going to issue a press
4 release today about the unanimous vote on the release
5 of the report.

6 (Applause.)

7 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you very much. Okay. We
8 have -- the public comment period is officially open
9 and Mr. Dennis Heinemann, please.

10 DR. HEINEMANN: Mr. Chairman and the
11 Committee, thank you again for the opportunity to speak
12 to you. I would like to commend this committee for its
13 diligent efforts over the last two years and really for
14 masterfully achieving a consensus yesterday. I think
15 it was -- the contrast between where you were on
16 Tuesday afternoon and where you were yesterday
17 afternoon was quite impressive.

18 I would like to revisit the comments that I
19 made on Tuesday just briefly. There I raised two
20 issues. One was that I felt that the raising access to
21 an objective of an MPA system was illogical and I also
22 suggested that appropriate, the modifier for access

1 needed criteria to define it.

2 I think you did an excellent job in providing
3 criteria by linking appropriate to the goals and
4 objectives to the system, and in particular MPA, and by
5 defining carefully the terms; however, it does not
6 change the fact that by adding that language, you have
7 elevated access and use to an objective of an MPA
8 system and for MPA's themselves.

9 There can be no question, and The Ocean
10 Conservancy completely agrees, that access and
11 different uses are going to be completely appropriate
12 in some areas in some circumstances, but not
13 necessarily in others.

14 Thus, we agree for the need to provide for
15 appropriate access and use, but we are deeply
16 concerned, The Ocean Conservancy is deeply concerned
17 that the FAC is recommending that the MPA system should
18 exist to provide access and use among other purposes
19 and that that will be -- that that recommendation will
20 be misused and establish the wrong precedent.

21 That said, we hope and urge you to emphasize
22 the system's goals and unique objectives. I say unique

1 objectives because access and use is something that is
2 inherent in the open access system we have always had
3 and will exist outside the system.

4 We also urge you to promote this idea of
5 appropriate access and use, gated and scaled by the
6 goals of stewardship protection and sustainability, as
7 a general principal of ocean governance to be applied
8 across all the borders that we establish in the ocean,
9 not just within MPA's. We are very supportive of the
10 goals to establish an MPA system and of the process
11 that you are engaged in.

12 I just want to say something about the next
13 phase, which we feel will be very important. Along
14 with grappling with the remaining knotty issues that
15 you have identified, TOC urges you to provide greater
16 vision and guidance as to when and how MPA's should be
17 used and to their unique suitability to certain tasks.

18 You all know about their unique suitability to
19 biodiversity and preservation, habitat and ecosystem
20 protection and resource recovery, but you may not have
21 heard of recent developments that could make -- could
22 create what would be the greatest benefit or potential

1 benefit to fisheries from MPA's and that is namely the
2 protection of age structure or what could be called
3 demographic integrity.

4 Recent research by Stephen Berkeley and
5 colleagues, including Dr. Hixon on your committee, have
6 identified the critical importance of large old
7 spawners in fish populations, what are known now as --
8 have been dubbed the BOFFs, the big, old, fat, fecund
9 females, the importance of these individuals in a
10 population, to that population's productivity and to its
11 viability.

12 The idea is, and this has been supported by
13 the research done by Berkeley and colleagues, is that
14 what has been found for a couple species of rockfish is
15 that the BOFFs produce the majority of recruits in
16 these populations. They do so because they produce
17 geometrically more eggs. Those eggs are larger. They
18 survive better, they grow faster as larvae and they
19 also have a protracted spawning period, which means
20 that it is much more likely that the offspring they
21 produce are going to encounter just the right
22 oceanographic conditions for survival and growth.

1 If generalized, if we find in the coming years
2 that this is a general situation with fish populations,
3 this could change, in a fundamental way, the way we do
4 fisheries management from focusing on actually fishing
5 down the BOFFs to increased productivity, as theory
6 tells us, to trying to protect the BOFFs.

7 The traditional measures, however, that we
8 have at hand are ill-suited to protect the oldest,
9 largest individuals in a population because fishing
10 inherently removes the largest individuals first and it
11 is very difficult to get around that. There is
12 virtually no way to do it except in a few special
13 cases.

14 However, MPA's are ideally suited to
15 protecting these old individuals. And it turns out
16 that these old individuals are as important in these --
17 in all fish populations, or many fish populations, as
18 they are in this rockfish -- as indicated in these
19 rockfish species. Then MPA's will have a unique and
20 important role in protecting those individuals and
21 therefore in achieving sustainable fisheries. So I
22 would urge you to keep an eye out for BOFFs to be

1 coming to your neighborhood and be ready to great them
2 with an MPA. Thank you.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. I am always on the
4 lookout for new stuff and BOFFs is now on my list.
5 Thank you.

6 Are there questions for Mr. Heinemann? Yes,
7 Mark.

8 DR. HIXON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you
9 Dr. Heinemann. Rather than a question, I guess I
10 request permission, at this point, to follow up on
11 Dr. Heinemann's comments. This is an issue I wanted to
12 broach at some time during our deliberations and I
13 didn't want to do it when we were doing our most
14 important work. Just a couple of minutes.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Sure.

16 DR. HIXON: Actually, I had the idea of doing
17 this after we heard from Dr. Ed Hood at the University
18 of Maryland who testified before us in Washington last
19 time about the natural science of sustainable
20 production MPA's. And Dr. Hood mentioned, in passing,
21 this issue of old growth age structure and the
22 importance of large, old spawners. And I didn't believe

1 at that time that it really came across particularly
2 effectively.

3 So I requested, after the D.C. meeting, that
4 our packet include two peer reviewed scientific
5 overviews of this issue. This is becoming an
6 increasingly important area of focus in scientific
7 research. So I call your attention to somewhere in our
8 packet a review paper published by Stephen Berkeley, et
9 al. -- I was one of the coauthors of that -- published
10 in The Journal Fisheries, which is a publication of the
11 American Fisheries' Society peer review journal, and
12 also a preprint of an up and coming paper in a journal
13 trends in ecology and evolution, which is also a peer
14 reviewed paper.

15 The increasing evidence -- it has been known
16 for many, many -- forever, basically, that larger
17 females produce more eggs. There is no surprise there.
18 That has always been known, but the new information
19 suggests that these large, old females not only produce
20 superior eggs, but recent studies are showing actually
21 that because of their more protracted spawning season,
22 that they act as sort of I would call it recruitment

1 insurance.

2 That is, because they spawn over a longer
3 period each year, there are actually year -- it has
4 been shown, now, with new genetic studies and other
5 studies that there are years when it is only the big,
6 old, fat females that produce young for that particular
7 cohort of that year. So retaining these fish some way
8 in a fishery is becoming -- it is becoming more clear
9 that that is very important.

10 So this is now an area of active research. I
11 would encourage the members of the panel to be aware of
12 this work as we come up for a second iteration,
13 especially those members who are involved in the
14 recreational and commercial fishing community, because
15 I believe this is an issue that will not go away and if
16 it is examined closely, it may help to alleviate some
17 of the fear of MPA's as a fisheries management tool.
18 Thank you.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Thanks, Mark. I -- we will have
20 a discussion later today on next steps, tranche, and it
21 would be good if you would make sure that we get this
22 on our list. Our capacity to exactly determine what we

1 will address in our next two-year period is a bit
2 limited, but we can certainly make suggestions to the
3 secretaries about issues, not only the things that we
4 left unresolved, which we will insist that we have a
5 chance to revisit, but these new issues. And so this
6 would be one that certainly would fit into some sort of
7 science-based work that we might do the next time
8 around. Go ahead, please.

9 DR. HIXON: Just one quick follow-up. The
10 recent studies are not just rockfish on the west coast.
11 There is a very definitive study that was done on
12 haddock here in the Atlantic. There is also evidence
13 from cod, striped bass and salmon at least. So these
14 are quite diverse species of fish. They actually are
15 in different orders, not just different generate
16 families of fish. So there is good evidence that this
17 may be a general phenomenon. Thank you.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. Okay. We have, as I
19 recall, two issues to revisit today. One would be the
20 specification and the elaboration of the language on
21 unresolved issues. Perhaps more importantly is the
22 overview language that we had a special subcommittee

1 craft this morning over breakfast. I think we ought to
2 start with the most important one of those, which is
3 the overview document of the Peterson subcommittee.
4 Max.

5 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We
6 are indebted to Lauren and Jonathan for helping us get
7 the computer system going so we could present it on
8 overhead. Tundi was on that -- worked with that group,
9 Mike Nussman, who had to leave, worked on that group.

10 What we decided to do in this overview is not
11 try to restate everything that is in the report and so
12 on, but purely do an overview. So it doesn't present
13 any new ideas. And this would go in the report. The
14 way we see it, you would have your letter of
15 transmittal, we would have a table of contents, which
16 would contain the details of the report, and then we
17 would have this overview.

18 And then we would just point out -- I will let
19 you read it -- that "The Committee met to provide the
20 30 people a diverse experience and background,
21 appointees provided by the executive order, met over
22 the course of the last two years at locations

1 throughout the U.S., visited several marine areas and
2 received detailed presentations by representative of
3 local, state, tribal and national organization
4 agencies, produced several drafts of a report and
5 unanimously adopted this final report at its meeting on
6 May 18th," yesterday.

7 And the report includes -- "The report
8 presents a statement of purpose for a national system,
9 outlines the benefits of such a system describes goals
10 and objectives, defines key terms, sets forth guiding
11 principles, outlines the importance of and mechanism
12 for promoting the stewardship and enhancing management
13 effectiveness, articulates a process for assessing
14 existing MPA's as well as proposing new sites for
15 inclusion in the national system and sets out key
16 facets of implementation."

17 And then we say, "The report recognizes that
18 incentives, including adequate funding, will be
19 essential to the success of this effort." That is the
20 only specific thing that we pulled out because that was
21 something we felt was important. And finally, the
22 report highlights some unresolved questions and

1 concerns that will need to be addressed by future FAC's
2 or by the agencies.

3 Now that is the one-page overview. And then
4 we go into the table of contents, which is taken
5 directly from the document, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry
6 we don't have a handout because we didn't have a
7 printer, but that is the report of the committee and
8 you can thank Tundi for being our, not just our scribe,
9 but she wrote quite a bit of this because she had the
10 right words at the right times.

11 DR. AGARDY: And I wrote and I --

12 MR. PETERSON: She wrote and edited. She
13 multitasked and she said a woman is quite able to do
14 that. Mr. Chairman, that is our report and --

15 DR. BROMLEY: No comment, Max, thank you.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. PETERSON: I am simply quoting her.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, I see.

19 MR. PETERSON: And I agree with her.

20 DR. BROMLEY: I still have no comment.

21 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, that is our
22 report and I don't know how you want to handle it.

1 DR. BROMLEY: I would like to just let people
2 look at it for a minute.

3 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

4 DR. BROMLEY: I see a hand up, Gil, and
5 others. Let's just look at it and think about it. Gil
6 and then Rod.

7 MR. RADONSKI: I think it is great. I mean,
8 you know, it is very concise and my hat is off to the
9 subcommittee for the quick turnaround. The only
10 comment I would make is if you can scroll down a little
11 to the "Finally," that is sort of a mea culpa statement
12 and I would like to put a more positive spin on it,
13 that, you know, not -- we are almost saying we are
14 sorry for not covering everything. I think we
15 identified issues that we didn't have time to cover and
16 it is just a spin thing, but I would like to have it be
17 a little more positive than as a mea culpa. Just an
18 observation.

19 MR. PETERSON: I think that is fine if you --

20 DR. BROMLEY: That is a good observation.

21 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Let's get some other comments

1 and then we will see how to do this because I have a
2 bit of that same thing. Rod and then I have Terry and
3 John.

4 DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I
5 like the overview too. Just a couple of things that I
6 think might help a little bit. One is it is great to
7 say we have diverse backgrounds and experience, but I
8 think it would punch it up a little bit if we could
9 just briefly describe the nature of the diversity. You
10 know, we had representatives of the sportfishing
11 groups, we had commercial fisheries interests here, we
12 had environmental groups, scientists. I think that
13 adds some human detail.

14 Another one is that, you know, and it is in
15 consulting with all those organizations and counsels
16 and stuff, we took a good deal of public comment, from
17 which I learned quite a bit, and I think we should
18 acknowledge that.

19 And I agree that, you know, the issues of
20 incentives and funding is a terribly important
21 recommendation of ours and essential to success, but I
22 would argue that a good deal of work and the consensus

1 that we built around the importance of participatory
2 processes and inclusions and good faith deliberations
3 is also one of those, you know, kind of above the line
4 recommendations. So I would suggest that we might want
5 to work that in somehow.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Lauren, are you scribing these
7 down?

8 MS. WENZEL: I am making notes, yes.

9 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Those are good
10 comments.

11 DR. BROMLEY: That is real nice.

12 Terry.

13 MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you. Rod had one of my
14 comments about the public input that we received. I
15 think that is an important component of it.

16 The other thing that might add a little punch
17 to this, too, is something -- some wording that says
18 about the analyst consensus that we achieved with this
19 that I think strengthens the fact that we are
20 diversified. And maybe that is in there. It is in the
21 second sentence.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, the second sentence,

1 unanimously adopted.

2 MR. O'HALLORAN: Okay. Great. Good. Thank
3 you.

4 DR. BROMLEY: John Halsey.

5 DR. HALSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
6 wonder if it would also be advisable to point out that
7 we did have, at least in ex officio capacities,
8 representatives from major federal agencies whose
9 advice and counsel was quite useful occasionally.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is great. Yes.

11 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, if you would -- I
12 would suggest we put a whole new paragraph, following
13 that first paragraph, and explain the diversity of the
14 groups and include the federal ex officio people.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

16 MR. PETERSON: And we did have public in there
17 at one time and we somehow lost it. We will put that
18 back in --

19 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

20 MR. PETERSON: -- that we did listen to the
21 public.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Right. Good.

1 MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Appreciate those
2 comments.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Kay.

4 Did you want to add a short comment?

5 MR. PETERSON: Whenever.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Let me call on Kay and then you
7 can -- okay.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: To the statement, we have do
9 have diverse backgrounds as far as the member sitting
10 around the table, but it was my understanding that we
11 did not have any commercial panelists come before us.
12 Am I mistaken on that?

13 DR. BROMLEY: We did not have a panel of
14 commercial fisherman, that is correct.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: All right. We had a panel of
16 recreational. So I would hate to say that we did when
17 we didn't.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Well, we heard from all of the
19 councils and perhaps a number of people -- yes, Wally.

20 DR. PEREYRA: Mr Chairman, I believe that one
21 of the keys to our success was the way in which we
22 organized our deliberations through three subcommittees

1 and I think in the second paragraph, that that might be
2 noted in some ways. I think that is an important part
3 of our success.

4 DR. BROMLEY: I do too. I absolutely agree
5 that -- we don't want to go into too much detail, but
6 putting small groups of people together in a room
7 repeatedly and seriously, we didn't lock the door on
8 you, but that is where the energy and that is where the
9 respect and the give and take occurred, isn't it, which
10 set the foundation for yesterday I think.

11 MR. PETERSON: Good comment. Very good
12 comment.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Somehow. Again, we don't want
14 all the gory details, but I think Wally is right, this
15 was a very important thing. Okay. I have now Gil,
16 Tundi.

17 MR. RADONSKI: Just a brief follow-up on that.
18 The thing I think that made those subcommittees work
19 was Joe found the money that we could have individual
20 meetings and I think that really cemented it. I know
21 our subcommittee three when we met in California,
22 was -- really made it. We just couldn't have done it

1 over the telephone. We had to have a face to face.
2 And a lot of trouble went into getting those face to
3 face meetings, but that was the key thing.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Let me ask this, just by way of
5 comment, and then I will turn to Joe because he had a
6 comment too. We want to think about whether this point
7 that Gil just brought up, the funding for us, is
8 important as we go forward because if we -- this point
9 that Wally made about that and then Gil's point about us
10 having chances to meet was very important, in terms of
11 the progress that we made, and under the budgetary
12 situation that I think we are going to be operating on
13 in the future, we may be hampered in that.

14 And so in a sense, you guys -- I would like
15 your thoughts. I am going to ask whether we want to
16 say something about the future success of this
17 operation is dependant upon that as well.

18 MR. RADONSKI: So the record is correct, Tony
19 reminded it was subcommittee two and it was in Seattle.

20 (Laughter.)

21 DR. BROMLEY: In light of this, I want to go
22 back and look at all the things that Gil proposed that

1 we adopt yesterday and reconsider. Wrong town, wrong
2 committee, Gil.

3 DR. MURRAY: So Gil, what is that other
4 subcommittee?

5 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, if I could
6 suggest what we didn't write and what we intended to was
7 a sentence that said we had very fine staff support.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. PETERSON: As well as participation of ex
10 officio members. And that staff support including
11 funding for the Committee was essential to its success
12 or something like that.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

14 MR. PETERSON: Because we really should say
15 something about the staff support and participation by
16 the other agencies. I think we can do that and not
17 look like we are just worried about our own funding.

18 DR. BROMLEY: That is correct.

19 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

20 DR. BROMLEY: That is right. Okay. I have
21 Tundi, Eric, Dolly and David Benton. Tundi.

22 DR. AGARDY: I am glad we are making progress

1 and I apologize for missing the -- it was my fault that
2 the public comment didn't get in there because we did
3 discuss it.

4 But these issues, I think, bring up the
5 question of whether the overview is meant to capture
6 what is in the report or introduce -- be a kind of
7 user-friendly way of introducing the reader to what is
8 coming in the report or whether it is meant to
9 introduce other things. And as far as I know, there is
10 no mention of subcommittees in the report; is that
11 right?

12 DR. BROMLEY: That is correct. There is no
13 mention.

14 DR. AGARDY: Nor is there any mention of
15 future funding for FAC or --

16 DR. BROMLEY: No, that is right.

17 DR. AGARDY: So I am wondering if that
18 belongs, actually, in the transmittal letter.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Maybe, yes.

20 DR. AGARDY: And just for the record --

21 MR. PETERSON: I think she is right. I think
22 that belongs in your transmittal letter.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, I do too. The funding
2 part. Now back to the subcommittee part --

3 MR. PETERSON: I think maybe the staff support
4 would be in your letter.

5 DR. BROMLEY: The staff support could be in
6 the letter of transmittal. That is right. But back to
7 the subcommittee thing. It is important and
8 interesting, but maybe irrelevant? I don't know.

9 DR. AGARDY: I mean, I don't -- I am not
10 objecting to mentioning the good work that we did in
11 the subcommittees.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Right. I am not either.

13 DR. AGARDY: It is just that I think it might
14 be confusing to the reader if we introduce things that
15 the reader can't, then, go to the report and find out
16 more about it.

17 MR. PETERSON: That could also be in the
18 letter of transmittal.

19 DR. BROMLEY: That could be in the letter of
20 transmittal. Gil or Wally.

21 DR. AGARDY: I am sorry. Can I just finish
22 because I meant to register --

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. I am getting their sense
2 about this.

3 DR. AGARDY: Okay. Yes.

4 DR. BROMLEY: I didn't mean to --

5 DR. AGARDY: No, that is okay. No, that is
6 all right. I am trying to be friendly, continue to be
7 friendly.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Trying to be friendly. So am I,
9 but I have a harder time than you do.

10 DR. AGARDY: I just wanted to register what
11 are my strong feelings that actually the document does
12 need an executive summary and I know that Max disagrees
13 and many, many -- probably the majority of people here
14 disagree, but as the report is written now, it is a
15 very, very difficult read. It is very poorly
16 organized.

17 I mean, I am not trying to criticize you guys
18 at all because I think you did a remarkable job in
19 pulling together the reports of the three
20 subcommittees, but it is very illogical and so I think
21 it needs, at a -- if we are not going to have an
22 executive summary, which we would hope that any

1 important decision-maker would, at a minimum, read,
2 then I think we have to give serious attention to
3 editing that report, changing the layout and creating a
4 document that is imminently more readable than it
5 currently is. Sorry.

6 DR. BROMLEY: We will excuse you for adding an
7 editorial intervention.

8 Eric.

9 MR. GILMAN: Just to make a comment. In order
10 to garner political support for implementing the
11 report, just two suggestions. One is to somehow make
12 it address the Ocean Action Plan. Perhaps -- I guess I
13 don't have a suggestion on how, if there was some way to
14 link it to the recommendations in the Ocean Action
15 Plan.

16 The other one is maybe to -- where we have the
17 comment about sustainable funding, if there were other
18 priority action items that we wanted to highlight to
19 add -- and again, I don't have any specific suggestions,
20 but there may be a way of highlighting the specific
21 actions we are looking for from the Departments of
22 Commerce and Interior.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Good. I am sorry, Joe, I
2 keep --

3 MR. URAVITCH: That is okay.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Go ahead. Make your comment.

5 MR. URAVITCH: Just a quick point. In
6 thinking of what Tundi said, if all people read is the
7 overview, I think you ought to consider putting in the
8 words "natural and cultural resources" because the
9 general leap is always to natural resources and we
10 really need to make sure people realize it is both.
11 And that doesn't show up anywhere in the overview.

12 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Dolly.

14 DR. GARZA: What also is missing is the
15 national network of marine protected areas. If this is
16 all I am reading, it is not in there. So we need to
17 have that in the second paragraph.

18 MR. PETERSON: It is in the first bullet as
19 the national system. Do you want to add something to
20 that?

21 DR. GARZA: Well, I think -- yes. What I was
22 looking at was at the second sentence, "The Committee

1 supports creation of a national network of marine
2 protected areas and unanimously adopted this report to
3 establish a framework for developing a national network
4 of marine protected areas." And that is actually what
5 we have done.

6 DR. BROMLEY: With all due respect, Dolly, we
7 have used the word "network" in a couple of different
8 ways and I think this language of yours changes a bit
9 of the "network" concept. I did not understand networks
10 as applying to the national system as much as to
11 ecological -- and somebody help me here, but we have
12 talked about networks as ecological phenomena, rather
13 than political phenomena I believe. I would be happy
14 to be corrected on that, but --

15 DR. GARZA: Okay. A national system, whatever
16 the correct word is, but we are not -- I mean, the
17 whole purpose was to create this national system, you
18 know, a framework for a national system of marine
19 protected areas, and we don't really say that as a
20 sentence even if it is a bullet. We are not saying
21 that as a sentence. And if you have nothing to do with
22 this and you pick up this report, it isn't self-evident,

1 this one page.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. David Benton. Is that
3 your name down there, David. Yes. Good morning,
4 David.

5 MR. BENTON: I was actually responding to your
6 comment about funding for the Committee and I, for one,
7 would be extremely uncomfortable with any language that
8 looks like we are feathering our own nests,
9 Mr. Chairman. I would leave it to you to figure out
10 how to word it. I like Max's approach of referring to
11 staff support or just support from the Center or
12 something like that.

13 I, for one, don't believe that we should say
14 anything about funding for this committee because it
15 just looks like we are feathering our own darn nests.
16 And that is a real bad position to be in. If we want
17 to go find the funding, I am all for that, but that is
18 just something you just do quietly and in an
19 appropriate manner.

20 DR. BROMLEY: I agree. We would not any of us
21 to look as if we are feathering our own nests in
22 anything we do, would we?

1 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest
2 something to Dolly here?

3 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

4 MR. PETERSON: On that -- where the Committee
5 proposed -- produced several drafts of report and
6 unanimously adopted a final report on establishing and
7 managing a national system on marine protected areas.
8 That is the title of our report and I think that adds a
9 little umph to that because just the report sounds a
10 little sterile. Would that do it, Dolly?

11 DR. GARZA: Yes.

12 MR. PETERSON: Establishing and managing a
13 national system of marine protected areas.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Something like that. That is
15 nice, Max.

16 MR. PETERSON: That is the actual title of the
17 report.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Lauren is making notes, but
19 our -- Tundi, are you also or -- no. Okay. We will --
20 great. Bob Zales.

21 MR. ZALES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was under
22 the impression that the reason why we didn't do a

1 summary, we did an overview, which basically was just a
2 very short one-and-a-half page deal, was not to have
3 people only read the one-and-a-half page deal, but to
4 strike interest to say, okay. This tells me what
5 should be in this report and I need to know more. So I
6 need to read the report.

7 MR. PETERSON: Right.

8 MR. ZALES: So I wouldn't be too up on
9 changing what has been done very much. Maybe a word or
10 two here or there, but not putting a whole lot in there
11 because I would hope that whoever gets this overview
12 would say, okay, gee, this just peaks my interest and
13 now I am going to go read the report.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. We want to be careful
15 loading it back up with lots of stuff. Thank you.

16 Terry.

17 MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, with -- I think this is
18 a real good report, but I find myself joining Tundi's
19 minority. There is some really important things in
20 this document that -- but reading it, I am very
21 interested in the subject and it is a difficult
22 document to get through even when you are vitally

1 interested in it.

2 And I guess my concern is that if we are going
3 to do it this way, we need -- it needs to be very
4 compelling to get them to this document, but so I am
5 kind of joining Tundi's minority regarding an executive
6 summary with the idea that a lot of the decision-makers
7 will read the shortest document they can and it has got
8 to have that kind of punch and it has got to have some
9 of the I think some of the highlights in there so that
10 they really understand what is really the essence of
11 this and not just necessarily what the outline of this
12 is. Thank you.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Wally and then Gil.

14 DR. PEREYRA: Gil can --

15 MR. RADONSKI: Thank you, Wally. I don't
16 disagree with Tundi. I think it would really be
17 helpful, but in the context that we wrote this report
18 to be presented to two secretaries, we are looking at
19 other uses of the report. The report with an overview
20 to the secretaries, I can guarantee you their staffs
21 are going to provide an executive summary for the
22 secretaries of important highlights. Maybe we can bum

1 one of those executive summaries and then use it.

2 But I think every group around this table that
3 has a constituency is going to prepare a brief summary
4 of this to their people and I think in the context that
5 we prepared this for the secretaries with a brief
6 overview would satisfy our minimum requirements.
7 Developing an executive summary would be helpful and
8 nice, I would love it, but I don't think it is really
9 necessary from the standpoint of meeting our
10 requirements.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Wally?

12 DR. PEREYRA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Then I have Barbara on the list.
14 Yes.

15 DR. PEREYRA: You know, as I read through the
16 report, I also can sympathize with a desire to have it
17 be more literal and easier to read and so forth. The
18 concern I have if we go that route, whether it is
19 through some sort of an executive summary or a total
20 reorganization and rewrite of the report, is we don't
21 have enough time and this report has now been,
22 essentially, released as I understand it.

1 To put together an executive summary, I think
2 we are going to be word smithing here for quite some
3 time and that concerns me. This -- I don't think is
4 something we can do hurriedly or we will have a
5 situation that is worse potentially.

6 MR. RADONSKI: Just a point of clarification
7 on what Wally just said -- I didn't think about it -- it
8 is not released. This essentially is embargoed until
9 it is submitted to the secretaries; is that correct?

10 MR. URAVITCH: That is correct.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. I have Barbara and then
12 Rod I believe.

13 MS. STEVENSON: Yes. Two quick points. You
14 have been changing that sentence --

15 DR. BROMLEY: Which sentence, please?

16 MS. STEVENSON: The one that says, "The
17 Committee produced."

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes.

19 MS. STEVENSON: When you read that, it implies
20 that the most amazing thing we did was produce several
21 drafts, which we might think is --

22 (Laughter.)

1 DR. BROMLEY: Perhaps it is, in hindsight,
2 Barbara.

3 MS. STEVENSON: That is correct, but we want
4 the people to get right to the point that we
5 unanimously approve. So I would suggest that we keep
6 our thoughts to ourselves and the Committee unanimously
7 adopted.

8 DR. BROMLEY: That is a great idea. That is a
9 great suggestion.

10 MS. STEVENSON: Okay. The second point, and
11 I -- Tundi has an easier life than I do if this is a
12 difficult report to read because, I mean, the ones that
13 I am used to reading, I am like, oh, this is wonderful.
14 You know, thousand page fishery management plans and
15 that kind of stuff.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

17 MS. STEVENSON: So and my -- I think that Gil
18 had an excellent suggestion because we all have
19 different views of what is truly important in here and
20 it is not productive for us to argue over what we think
21 is truly important because we all got what we think was
22 truly important in the document and what we pull out

1 and present to whomever our own groups are are going to
2 be different.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Thanks, Barbara.

4 Rod and then Steve Murray.

5 DR. FUJITA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
6 wonder whether that is true, Barbara. You know, we
7 worked through a lot of issues. I think some clearly
8 rose to the surface as top priorities. And I am just
9 wondering if as maybe an alternative to an executive
10 summary that would be literate and highly readable and
11 compelling, if we could simply list the major
12 recommendations that we are offering to the
13 secretaries.

14 I think that would be a major contribution.
15 Rather than having them wade through this short, but
16 highly dense report, if we could just have a list of,
17 you know, five, ten bulleted items for recommended
18 action, which would include things like apply
19 participatory processes, evaluate and monitor the
20 national system, use adaptive management to improve
21 management based on increasing knowledge and
22 understanding. I think it might be not impossible for

1 us to achieve consensus on that short list of
2 recommended actions.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you.

4 Steve Murray.

5 DR. MURRAY: And so we are trying to figure
6 out what to do here in the front of this document and
7 the efforts range everywhere from trying to generate
8 what we have traditionally thought of as an executive
9 summary, which would be pulling text from this and
10 essentially repeating it, highlighting recommendations,
11 to simply producing an overviewer and really an
12 abstract, as I would call it, of what the contents are.

13 All right. One of the issues that we are
14 having is that we want to make this more readable and
15 more accessible to, perhaps, higher level officials who
16 might look at it. So one of the compromises we could
17 make in that regard would be to move the tabled
18 material, which is under "Defining Marine Protected
19 Areas." There is two big tables and they are right in
20 the middle of the document. They are very important,
21 but they simply could be put at the end in which case,
22 you would be reducing this document down to about 14 or

1 so pages and most executive summaries are in the
2 10-page range I think.

3 And so now we are down to 14 of continuous
4 reading without being broken up by definitions. So I
5 would make that recommendation. I mean, I know that
6 this document is sort of sacrosanct, but that is not
7 making a change, it is just moving something from one
8 place to another.

9 The second point I would like to make is that
10 I think that this overview statement should contain the
11 italicized goal that we have on page 3 at what the
12 national system is. I mean, at least we should have
13 that in this overview statement. And notice also that
14 we have called this a goal, not goals. So we have only
15 one goal and that goal ought to be in this overview
16 statement as to what this national system is about and
17 it is only three lines. But I think that should be in
18 the overview statement.

19 And I think that when you look at the list
20 that is in the report, there are some bulleted sections
21 that have not -- that have been left out. Program
22 activities, for example, and, you know, they don't take

1 up much space and to be inclusive, they probably ought
2 to be in one of those little bulleted lists. I mean,
3 we have got -- for program activities, we have got
4 literally almost a page. So we ought to at least spell
5 it out. So move the tables to the end, create a
6 completely free reading document, get the goal
7 statement in there and call it a goal because it is one
8 goal.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Very good. I am
10 sympathetic to that. I have always found the tables in
11 the middle of it a little bit inconvenient, but we can
12 discuss that.

13 Okay. I have Tony, I have Dave Benton and I
14 have Mike Cruickshank.

15 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
16 would like to concur with Dr. Murray's suggestion, I
17 think they are good. My comment, though, is
18 independent of what we do to this text. I am reacting
19 to what I am hearing around the table, which is we
20 think that the -- our greatest accomplishment is this
21 report and now we are talking about, wow, should it
22 have had 15 pages or 10 pages and should the tables go

1 here or there.

2 I think the greatest accomplishment that we
3 have done in these two years is to come together to
4 find common ground. And so although I concur that the
5 presentation of the report is important, I think what
6 is most important is that we could come together, in a
7 very civilized fashion, and reach unanimous agreement.

8 And I think that what troubles me a bit is the
9 thoughts of us going off and highlighting this report
10 to our constituents just the things that we think are
11 important because I think what is important and what is
12 important for us to do, and I would go further and say
13 we have a collective responsibility to do, is to go
14 back to do is to go back to our constituents and also
15 say in addition to the things that we find important
16 here is to say that, "You know what? Those people who
17 have other values, we can talk to them and we can work
18 with them and we can do better than we have been doing
19 so far." And I think that that is the biggest
20 accomplishment of this committee. And so I would just
21 like to remind everybody of that. Thank you.

22 DR. BROMLEY: You bring tears to my mind,

1 Tony. That is right. That is right. What is on paper
2 is, in many respects, the least important thing. And I
3 think -- as you were talking, I was thinking that you
4 were kind of referring to going forward, but what you
5 really meant was that we can talk to these other
6 people, right? I mean, that was a nice point, Tony.
7 You know, we can talk to people who differ with us on
8 this topic and make headway. So, you know, I don't know
9 how you capture that, but --

10 MR. PETERSON: Let me, Mr. Chairman, if I
11 could.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, please do. I have Dave and
13 Mike Cruickshank.

14 MR. PETERSON: I don't think, certainly, Tundi
15 and I and Mike we would have loved to have had an
16 executive summary, but we looked at that and in some
17 places, there are recommendations that are stated as
18 recommendations. There are some places there are
19 actually recommendations that aren't called
20 recommendations. The goal statement is not called a
21 recommendation, for example. The objectives are not
22 called recommendations.

1 And so we looked at that and we figured that
2 if you wrote a reasonable executive summary, it would
3 be six pages long and then we would invite nobody to
4 ever read the big report. And so even though we don't
5 disagree with that, we didn't figure it was -- number
6 one, it wasn't feasible within the time limits we are
7 at.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. PETERSON: And number two, we were
10 reluctant to start down the line of presenting any
11 substance in this. It is really an outline. It is
12 really kind of an abstract. It is really kind of an
13 overview. And I do think that many of the suggestions
14 that are made, including this statement that was just
15 made by Tony, that just saying the Committee reached --
16 we could say the Committee found common ground and
17 unanimously adopted this report. That would give it a
18 little more umph, which is really kind of important.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

20 MR. PETERSON: And I would -- yesterday I, in
21 a motion, recommended that you all have permission to
22 do some editing of this report. For example, I think

1 moving Table 2, which is printed the other direction on
2 there, will be very good. Table 1 is almost -- it
3 almost is necessary to understand the rest of the
4 document. So if they don't read Table 1, they can't
5 interpret the rest of the document. And we discussed
6 that at some length.

7 But I would give you all the freedom, as we
8 did yesterday, to do some reorganization of the text
9 without changing substance. And I would just finally
10 say why don't you let us take these suggestions --
11 Lauren has got them and Tundi has got them -- we will
12 come back after a while with a new draft. Would that
13 be okay?

14 DR. BROMLEY: Wonderful. That is what I was
15 going to ask you to do.

16 MR. PETERSON: Thank you.

17 DR. BROMLEY: But let's -- we have --

18 MR. PETERSON: We have got some more comments.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, we have some more. We have
20 Dave Benton and Mike Cruickshank.

21 MR. BENTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, Max Peterson
22 took the words, almost verbatim, out of my mouth about

1 we are just repeating a bunch of stuff we talked about
2 yesterday and we are now repeating ourselves this
3 morning. I think the thing to do is take some of those
4 suggestions. These guys did a great job.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

6 MR. BENTON: I am happy with this thing. I
7 was ready to make the motion to adopt the darn thing
8 and move on. If you want to go do a little editing, I
9 don't care. If that is where you heading, that is my
10 comment. Let's get over it. Let's get beyond this one
11 and deal with the next agenda item.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, yes. That is great.

13 MR. BENTON: Good.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Mike and then I will make
15 an observation. Mike.

16 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
17 am in agreement with most of everything that has been
18 said this morning, but I am a little concerned with our
19 charge was to present expert advice and recommendations
20 to the secretaries. That was our basic charge. And
21 there is nowhere in this place where you could see what
22 our recommendations are because I was really searching.

1 I had a hard job figuring out which were
2 recommendations and which were just comments and
3 suggestions. So I would think that somewhere we should
4 present a list of recommendations that we are
5 presenting at this time.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

7 DR. CRUICKSHANK: I don't know how to do it,
8 but --

9 DR. BROMLEY: Well, that, I think, is what
10 hangs us up, Mike, how to do it.

11 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes.

12 DR. BROMLEY: So I respect your view, I
13 respect the views of those who want to see a list of
14 recommendations. I remind you of the strategic
15 importance of that list and whose interests are
16 represented in the list that gets produced because
17 recommendations are, in a sense, manifestations,
18 re-affectations of stuff in the report. And so I can
19 assure you it would be a whole new political issue
20 about what that list is, how that list is worded, which
21 comes first, which comes second. I don't think I want
22 to go there. So I respect that, Mike.

1 DR. CRUICKSHANK: I would be glad to work on
2 it just briefly.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Briefly. There is the
4 word I really like. Briefly. No disrespect, Mike, we
5 don't do anything briefly for good reason. It is hard.

6 George and then let's try to bring this to
7 closure.

8 MR. LAPOINTE: And I apologize for being late,
9 Mr. Chairman. So if I am saying something that people
10 have already heard, let me know and I will stop. It
11 strikes me that the entire report is, in essence, a
12 recommendation.

13 DR. BROMLEY: I said that yesterday, George.

14 MR. LAPOINTE: All right.

15 (Laughter.)

16 DR. BROMLEY: But please go ahead. I would
17 like to hear it again, it was so profound. Play it for
18 me again, George.

19 (Laughter.)

20 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Have you resigned from the
21 Committee?

22 MR. LAPOINTE: Yes.

1 (Laughter.)

2 DR. BROMLEY: Lauren.

3 MS. WENZEL: Just on that note, the first full
4 paragraph of the report says, "This report represents
5 the collective views of this Committee." And if people
6 felt strongly about the whole report being a
7 recommendation, it could say, "This report represents
8 the recommendations of this Committee."

9 MR. PETERSON: One thought we had was to pick
10 up our charge, which the report includes, expert advice
11 and recommendations, because that is what we were
12 charged to do.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

14 MR. PETERSON: Expert advice and
15 recommendations because it does include more than
16 recommendations. Would that work? Expert. That is
17 what -- my cohort to the right suggested we do that.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Do you want to try to work some
19 of that in?

20 MR. PETERSON: I think we can just say adopted
21 this final report, which includes expert advice and
22 recommendations --

1 DR. BROMLEY: And recommendations. Yes.

2 MR. PETERSON: -- on establishing and managing
3 a national system.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Whatever.

5 MR. PETERSON: Okay?

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Okay. I would like to ask
7 whether we can empower this Peterson committee to
8 produce the language that will comprise the opening
9 statement to the report and -- or do you want to have
10 them bring it back and do this again?

11 MR. PETERSON: We would like to bring it back
12 and just show it.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Show it? Yes, we would like to
14 see it.

15 MR. PETERSON: Yes, we would like to do that.

16 DR. BROMLEY: But we just sort of grant them
17 authority to craft something.

18 MR. PETERSON: Right.

19 DR. BROMLEY: And with the presumption, Max,
20 unless you guys really screw up, that we will adopt it.

21 MR. PETERSON: We will assume that.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

1 MR. PETERSON: We would even invite Bonnie to
2 sit with us if she would like to.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Well, that is your discretion.
4 Okay. I can understand why you might want that. All
5 right.

6 Are we okay with this? Does everybody feel
7 comfortable? Okay. We have some unresolved issues. I
8 guess we agreed to do that, Lauren. We were going to
9 look at these unresolved issues and I would remind us,
10 Max, and remind you of -- I think it was Gil's point
11 this morning the way you talk about those unresolved
12 issues, we would like you to spin that a little
13 differently than it is spun here. Can you ask Gil to
14 give you some inspiration in that department?

15 MR. PETERSON: Yes. We will, but also my
16 cohort here to the right suggested we just use
17 "additional." Not use -- unresolved sounds like we --

18 DR. BROMLEY: Additional issues? I think we
19 should talk about this just a minute.

20 MR. PETERSON: Yes. If you want to use the
21 word "additional" or whatever.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Barbara.

1 MS. STEVENSON: Just for those locals that
2 arrived late, could you flip up the screen so George
3 and I can read the rest of the report.

4 DR. BROMLEY: The maniacs have been excluded
5 from the --

6 MS. STEVENSON: Just so that we know what it
7 says. I am sure it is perfect, but -- thank you. That
8 part I have read.

9 MS. WENZEL: Okay.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Which part do you want to see?

11 MS. WENZEL: The part at the bottom.

12 DR. BROMLEY: The "Finally" sentence, Barbara,
13 or the --

14 MS. STEVENSON: I just didn't know when it
15 ended.

16 MS. WENZEL: Right. At the page break.

17 MR. PETERSON: We actually don't need the word
18 "unresolved" in there. We could just highlight some
19 problems and concerns that will need to be addressed by
20 a future FAC.

21 PARTICIPANT: Identifies.

22 MR. PETERSON: Identifies.

1 PARTICIPANT: Right. Say identifies.

2 MR. PETERSON: Say "identifies" rather than
3 "highlights" maybe. Identifies, which is what it does.
4 We don't want to give them any special -- would that be
5 okay?

6 DR. BROMLEY: Gil, what do you think?

7 MR. RADONSKI: My only concern was that it
8 didn't sound like a mea culpa. You know, I wanted it to
9 be more positive and I think it is getting there.

10 MR. PETERSON: I think it does. Okay. We
11 will go then and work.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Mike.

13 DR. CRUICKSHANK: I don't think that the
14 report itself identifies all these questions. They are
15 identified here, but not in the report.

16 DR. GARZA: They will be.

17 MR. PETERSON: They will be.

18 DR. BROMLEY: They will be. Those unresolved
19 issues, to which we now will turn attention, will be
20 identified in the report.

21 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Oh, they will.

22 DR. BROMLEY: They will appear with the

1 language that we are going to approve shortly as the
2 kind of the final section of the report.

3 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Okay.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Is that okay?

5 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Tundi.

7 DR. AGARDY: I am just worried that we are
8 emasculating it again. So now do we have a final
9 sentence that basically says there are some things that
10 we didn't do and these are the agencies -- or the next
11 FAC should take them up. To me, it needs some kind
12 of -- more punch and whether you call that key
13 questions -- I mean, I liked unresolved because it
14 suggested that they were controversial and they needed
15 serious --

16 DR. BROMLEY: That is what is missing here and
17 our whole conversation yesterday was to elevate these
18 important things, which were, in a sense, so important
19 that we spent a lot of time trying to -- we addressed
20 them as deal breakers or big deals.

21 MR. PETERSON: Would you buy the word key, key
22 questions?

1 DR. BROMLEY: I would like to leave the -- I
2 would like to convey the impression that a number of
3 our members approved this document with whole -- you
4 know, with lingering concerns about things that they
5 felt had not been adequately addressed. And I won't go
6 to the fishing guys, I will go to Mike Cruickshank and
7 sort of say, Mike feels strongly and he has told us
8 over and over again that we have not paid enough
9 attention to oil and gas issues in MPA's. Is that fair
10 enough, Mike?

11 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes.

12 DR. BROMLEY: And so that is -- these are kind
13 of at a different level than just, oh, here are some
14 key things we didn't get time to address.

15 MR. PETERSON: Well, what if you said key
16 questions and significant concerns? Key questions and
17 significant concerns.

18 DR. BROMLEY: I leave it up to you guys to
19 convey this idea.

20 MR. PETERSON: Okay. We will --

21 DR. BROMLEY: Barbara, your hand is up and
22 Dolly's.

1 MS. STEVENSON: Yes. I would propose that you
2 say something like was unable to resolve, either
3 through legal questions of province -- province isn't
4 the right word. That, for instance, there were legal
5 questions. We can't tell the secretaries who is going
6 to approve. There is things that we just absolutely
7 couldn't do. So we need to -- or because of the intense
8 nature to resolve the issues because they are two
9 separate groups. There are things that we need a whole
10 bunch more talking and there are things that we couldn't
11 do if we talked for the next century because we don't
12 have the tools to deal with them.

13 DR. BROMLEY: But did we deal with the second
14 point, Barbara, somewhere in our language about
15 authorities? How did we address that issue? We are
16 not sure we have legal opinion on that. So maybe -- I
17 don't know, but perhaps we addressed that first one.

18 MR. PETERSON: Yes, we started to put that in
19 there and we decided since it in the report --

20 DR. BROMLEY: That we didn't need to put it
21 here.

22 MR. PETERSON: We didn't need to put it here.

1 DR. BROMLEY: I believe it is in the report,
2 Barbara, that first category.

3 MS. STEVENSON: I just -- my concern with this
4 is that it looks like sort of like we just didn't get
5 time to do -- deal with the issues.

6 DR. BROMLEY: That is right.

7 MS. STEVENSON: And it is --

8 DR. BROMLEY: It is more than that.

9 MS. STEVENSON: It is more than that. We were
10 unable to resolve them and there are two reasons we
11 were unable to resolve them. And that is sort of
12 important rather than saying, you know, we just --
13 here, you all do this later.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, that is exactly right.
15 That is -- we have got to get it -- tip it to that
16 level of urgency. George?

17 MR. LAPOINTE: And again, you can tell me to
18 stop if you need to. Rather than key, are they ongoing
19 critical questions? I mean ongoing implies that they
20 are unresolved, but it is a little better than Gil's mea
21 culpa and key or critical. I mean, it strikes me as a
22 combination of the two. It highlights the importance,

1 but also says that they are -- ongoing is the lighter
2 term for lingering.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. Wonderful. Okay.
4 Dolly. No? All right.

5 Max, do you feel now that you have got what
6 you need?

7 MR. PETERSON: Yes, we will retreat. I think
8 we are getting now to a few words. And I think we have
9 heard enough and we can work on it.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Wonderful. Thank you so much.

11 Okay. Lauren, can you switch screens now
12 to -- my fear is people in the back won't quite be able
13 to read this; is that right, Bob? Is that a little
14 better? Can you read this now, Bob?

15 MR. ZALES: (Nodding.)

16 MS. WILLIAMS: Just barely.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Barely. Okay. Let me -- "The
18 Committee identified several key issues that it did not
19 address or resolve, but wanted to identify as important
20 for future consideration." That sounds like the things
21 we have just been worried about.

22 So here is some language around those issues.

1 "Section 5 of the executive order sets out agency
2 responsibilities, including requirements that federal
3 agencies shall avoid harm to natural and cultural
4 resources that are protected by an MPA. There was
5 concern that this is a fundamental provision that
6 requires future attention."

7 So the idea is just to raise the issue and
8 to -- there is need to develop -- "There is a need to
9 develop a process that will acknowledge Indian treaty
10 rights and will insure that creation of an MPA in a
11 national system will not diminish, affect or abrogate
12 such treaty rights, perhaps." It says Indian treaty
13 rights again.

14 Number 3. "The report discussed the
15 nomination process for the national system, but does
16 not recommend the appropriate entity to approve such
17 designation. This entity must be clearly identified"
18 or something like that. Okay. This is the tone that
19 we are trying to convey.

20 MR. PETERSON: I am opposed to putting that in
21 the overview because now we are getting in -- we are
22 at --

1 DR. BROMLEY: I am sorry, Max. This --

2 MR. PETERSON: Oh, I am sorry. I am sorry. I
3 am sorry.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, yes.

5 MR. PETERSON: I am sorry.

6 DR. BROMLEY: This is language that will be in
7 the final section of our report, to which your overview
8 is going to refer.

9 MR. PETERSON: Thank you.

10 DR. BROMLEY: These are the issues we haven't
11 yet figured out how to define.

12 MR. PETERSON: Thank you.

13 DR. BROMLEY: So number 2, number 3, "Discuss
14 the nomination process."

15 Number 4, financing and incentives. We need,
16 you know, we need a few articles in this -- "Financing
17 and incentives still need, in light of language" --

18 MS. WENZEL: Yes. That is just my question
19 because it was on the list and then we had a subsequent
20 discussion after that and we added language to the
21 guiding principles section about, you know, the
22 reasonable expectation of funding. So I just had a

1 question about whether it needed to be mentioned again.

2 MR. PETERSON: I don't think it needs to be in
3 here. In fact, I don't think the one on -- the
4 executive order says that nothing abrogates Indian
5 rights or diminishes them or anything like that. And
6 there is --

7 DR. BROMLEY: I don't think we need that
8 either.

9 MR. PETERSON: There is a jillion processes in
10 place that depends on the treaty, it -- I don't think
11 you can write a general process. So I don't know. And
12 we haven't discussed that at all. So I don't know how
13 we would put that in at this point.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Maybe it is the way the wording
15 is here. I mean, you are right, we know that nothing
16 we do can abrogate these, but I --

17 MR. PETERSON: That is in our report and it is
18 in the executive order both.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Maybe we have cast the issue
20 incorrectly. That is what I am saying, Max, and we
21 will just now hear about that. I have got Tony, Eric,
22 Dolly and Mel. So I think we will probably get some --

1 and pardon?

2 MS. WENZEL: Maybe start with Mel since that
3 is his --

4 MR. MOON: Could I respond to that?

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, please do, Mel.

6 MR. MOON: You know, I realize in the
7 executive order that it is clear that these activities
8 will not diminish, abrogate or affect treaty rights,
9 but the problem that I have is that there isn't a
10 process that is developed about how that will take
11 place and who understands who is being diminished or
12 abrogated.

13 At some point in time, there needs to be some
14 kind of described approach on how to deal with tribes
15 because we all understand how a state and a
16 municipality works, but very few of us understand the
17 dynamics of how a tribe operates in its governments.
18 So we need to -- the outreach and the education part is
19 how to approach a tribe, how their functions -- how
20 their governmental functions operate so you can have a
21 process for them to integrate in any activity that
22 takes place.

1 We are always in a situation where we are kind
2 of brought in after the fact. So this insures that
3 tribes are brought up at the front, understands who
4 they are and what process to use and that is the intent
5 of that particular statement. And that will take some
6 discussions and dialogue.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you, Mel. That is right.
8 I think we didn't really quite characterize the issue
9 correctly here. And that is the issue, which we have
10 not given adequate attention to.

11 MR. PETERSON: I agree with Mel's statement
12 there.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

14 MR. PETERSON: We need to develop a process
15 for how to --

16 DR. BROMLEY: We need a little better wording
17 on that.

18 MR. PETERSON: -- reach involvement of Indian
19 tribes in the process.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Mel, if you could help us
21 with that.

22 Okay. I have Tony, Eric, Dolly, Tundi, Bob

1 Zales and George.

2 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
3 comments go to the question raised whether or not we
4 should have financing incentives identified as an issue
5 that need further deliberation.

6 I think it is a very important issue. I think
7 we have acknowledged now that in principles that you
8 need financing to add new sites or to add sites to the
9 system, but I think we did not talk about incentives.
10 And incentives is a very -- it is a term that covers a
11 whole array of things and I think we really do -- we
12 need to do justice to incentives and keep it there and
13 discuss it further in the next duration.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Good. Thank you.

15 Okay. Eric Gilman.

16 MR. GILMAN: Just briefly, a comment on the
17 general design of the list. I think we should use the
18 filtered items that relate directly to a national
19 system of MPA's and items that don't deal specifically
20 with a system shouldn't be on this list. And there is
21 at least two bullets on there that I think don't deal
22 directly with that system.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you.

2 I have Dolly.

3 DR. GARZA: I think Mel said what I wanted to
4 say so I am working on some language.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Wonderful. Okay. And now
6 I have Tundi.

7 DR. AGARDY: I agree with Tony that I think
8 incentives needs to be discussed and I think I was the
9 one that made the proposal of putting this on the list
10 of the financing and incentives.

11 I have never been involved with any kind of
12 committee activity where we didn't come up with a budget
13 at the end of the process to articulate exactly what we
14 thought levels of funding that were needed to support
15 whatever we were recommending were. And so I think in
16 the next iteration, and maybe this is a discussion for
17 this afternoon and the next phase of the Committee, but
18 I think we have to discuss, you know, some kind of
19 determination of the levels of funding that are going
20 to be needed to implement a national system.

21 I think we need an analysis of alternative
22 financing mechanisms and I think we need, at a minimum,

1 a way of assessing incentives that include non-monetary
2 incentives for our participation in the system. So and
3 I would like to vote for a subcommittee to be formed to
4 cover those topics because I think it is really
5 critical.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Fine. Good. Okay. I have Bob
7 Zales, George, Terry, Barbara, Wally and Jim.

8 MR. ZALES: I pass.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Bob Zales passed. George.

10 MR. LAPOINTE: I guess in both regard to the
11 language about how to deal with tribal interests and
12 funding, we did mention those in the -- you could look
13 at the entire report as an unresolved issue because it
14 is a springboard. And so I take a more minimalist
15 approach on the pending continuing issues, whatever we
16 call them, and we have mentioned that funding is
17 critical. And that is going to be ongoing and we all
18 know that.

19 And we mention in the report a number of times
20 about identifying stakeholders and taking people's
21 interests into account. And again, there is no process
22 at this point to -- set up to deal with state issues,

1 you know, because I would argue that, as the tribes in
2 Maine probably operate differently than the tribes in
3 California, we mention, under co-management, how at
4 least two states, Alaska and Maine, are very different
5 than the other states that Max was talking about. And
6 so I have a tendency to think that we are cluttering
7 this list with those, Mr. Chairman.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you.

9 Terry.

10 MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, essentially I think
11 Tony and Tundi did it. My interest is in definitely
12 keeping financing and incentives in this one.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.

14 Barbara.

15 MS. STEVENSON: Yes. I have a problem with
16 the harm. I have no problem talking about it, but I
17 thought that yesterday we had agreed that the items
18 that were listed under 4 in the executive order were
19 not appropriate to be on the list and that is the only
20 reason that I would suggest it not be on this list
21 because if, given the charge from our makers to discuss
22 the other things on the list in the executive order, we

1 shall and if not given that charge, we shan't.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Do you want harm taken
3 off?

4 MS. STEVENSON: Yes, for that reason only.

5 DR. BROMLEY: For that reason only. Yes.
6 Okay. That is the section -- that is point number one
7 up here. Okay. Thank you.

8 Wally.

9 DR. PEREYRA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In listening
10 to Mel's, I think, thoughtful presentation on the issue
11 regarding tribes and Indian rights and then hearing
12 some of the comments that flowed after that, it came to
13 my attention that this is more than just this MPA
14 activity being transmitted in the direction of the
15 tribes.

16 I think there is a great need for information
17 to flow from the tribes, as to their structure, their
18 governance, and so forth, to flow back this way so
19 that, in fact, we have a two-way -- sort of a two-way
20 communication going on because I think that is the only
21 way we are truly going to come to realization on this
22 issue.

1 Too often in the past I have seen, it has
2 almost been -- I am kind of touched by the movie
3 Dancing with Wolves. And some of the message that came
4 through there, I sort of -- we are like the big brother
5 going forward and this is what is really good for you.

6 I think it needs to come the other way also. I just
7 want to make that point.

8 DR. BROMLEY: And you would like to have this
9 language reflect the idea that as we go -- as our group
10 goes forward, this is an activity that we have paid
11 insufficient attention to and we need to. That is what
12 this section --

13 DR. PEREYRA: Right.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Absolutely. Okay.

15 Jim Ray.

16 DR. RAY: Yes. If you could scroll that just
17 a little bit more. Yes. The issue I was struggling
18 with was the intent on bullet number 5. Could you
19 explain that one just a little bit exactly what was
20 intended there. The issue of how "The national system
21 of MPA's will relate to expiration, extraction of energy
22 and mineral resources."

1 MS. WENZEL: I will defer to Mike. This is
2 just sort of a placeholder language to acknowledge that
3 he had raised some issues.

4 DR. RAY: Okay. Just the reason I was
5 concerned with that, you know, after our discussions
6 yesterday when we came to consensus and voted on the
7 report, you know, it was my understanding that we
8 would -- had taken the approach that, you know, that in
9 the system of MPA's, that, you know, appropriate access,
10 you know, there would be an evaluation of the various
11 different users that potentially would use a marine
12 protected area and then as appropriate, they may or may
13 not be allowed these special rules.

14 I read that statement and it sounds like that
15 expiration and extraction were excluded and it is an
16 issue that has to be worked to get them included. I
17 just -- I am reading this bassackwards, I guess, but it
18 just leaves me puzzled from where we were yesterday.

19 DR. BROMLEY: I will take blame for the
20 wording because we had -- Mike gave us a nice long
21 version and he gave us a short version and then Lauren
22 looked at the short version and in the haste this

1 morning sort of came up with this, Jim. So I am
2 responsible for it. I am not happy with it either. We
3 need to figure out a better way --

4 DR. RAY: I am not the only one that is a
5 little confused by the words.

6 DR. BROMLEY: No.

7 MS. WENZEL: No. Maybe you and Mike could
8 develop it. We just basically wanted to acknowledge --

9 DR. RAY: Okay.

10 MS. WENZEL: -- that this was an outstanding
11 issue.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Mike gave us a page or half a
13 page and then he also said, but I, you know, here is
14 some language that was like a sentence and a half. I
15 wasn't too happy with it, but I -- you know, so Lauren
16 and I, you know, in the desperation to get organized
17 this morning, sort of came up with this and it is my
18 bad phrasing.

19 DR. RAY: I guess the point is that, you know,
20 depending on the type of MPA's you are talking about,
21 you have issues with all kinds of user groups. It is
22 not just the extraction of its resource.

1 DR. BROMLEY: That is right. Could you and
2 Mike come up with a couple of sentences.

3 DR. RAY: Yes. I did. I will talk with Mike
4 some more. I am just a little confused.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

6 DR. RAY: It just could be misunderstood.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Sure.

8 Mike.

9 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, Lauren, certainly that
10 brief sentence there looks okay to me. So I would be
11 glad to talk with you about it.

12 DR. RAY: Okay.

13 DR. BROMLEY: All right. Thank you.

14 Okay. Yes, Wally.

15 DR. PEREYRA: Lauren, could you scroll up a
16 second. I just want to see -- one of the issues that
17 came up yesterday that I think is in this category is
18 this issue of co-management or cooperative management.

19 And it is -- I am thinking of this in a much longer
20 context than just a state, federal or tribal.

21 In the North Pacific, we have developed a
22 co-management system in some of our fisheries that

1 embrace MPA's in a creative way where the industry
2 itself is actually involved in self-management, which
3 is part of an overall federal management process. And
4 I think that this is a rather important area that
5 offers great potential for enhancing the effect of this
6 implementation of a national system in the future. And
7 I think it needs to be highlighted for something in the
8 future for us to really address in a significant way
9 because I think it can bring a lot of benefit.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. If I am not mistaken, that
11 issue that you mentioned in Alaska was a legislative
12 empowerment kind of thing. I mean, you talk about the
13 American Fisheries Act and all of this. So I agree
14 with you, Wally, we need to talk about it, but my sense
15 is that the example you are mentioning is part of the
16 AFA and then embedded in the council structure and all
17 of this. Am I construing it too narrowly?

18 DR. PEREYRA: Well, in part, yes; in part, no.
19 Under certain cooperative activities in the pollock
20 fishery, in particular, that were facilitated through
21 the AFA, but the already existing cooperative
22 authority, under the Agricultural Cooperative Act, had

1 already been utilized in, for example, the whiting
2 fishery off of Washington, but I think that through
3 this process, new creative ways of co-management and so
4 forth have come forth.

5 And it is almost a firmament up there right
6 now. There is some things taking place in the Gulf of
7 Alaska with regards to community management and so
8 forth. And so I think that this is an area that we
9 need to look at in the future because I think we can
10 gain something from it in terms of management of MPA's
11 in implementing this.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Very good. Okay. I have Bob
13 Zales and then Dave Benton.

14 MR. ZALES: Yes. And I don't know if this is
15 the place to put this or if it would be in the
16 discussion for later on this afternoon, but -- and then
17 this may be something for Joe and Charlie to look into
18 too.

19 When we are dealing with MPA's and MMA's,
20 because of 9-11, you now have a security zone on
21 different areas of the country. You have platforms in
22 the Gulf of Mexico that have areas designated now to

1 where there is no activity other than putting qualified
2 vessels going in and out of the areas to pick people up
3 and offload equipment. But fishing has been told that
4 you can't get there.

5 There are port facilities, there are -- the
6 LNG thing is a controversial issue at the moment and I
7 suspect is going to be there. You have nuclear power
8 plants, you have other places in the country now that
9 have zones designated so many feet or so many miles
10 away from them where there is no activity unless you
11 are qualified to get in it. Those, in my mind, de
12 facto, become MPA's because of uses that have
13 traditionally been there are now stopped. So I think
14 some discussion needs to be in that area.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.

16 Dave Benton.

17 MR. BENTON: All I was going to add to the
18 conversation on the floor, Mr. Chairman, is that that
19 kind of similar effort was employed by the CEQ
20 community in their fishery to manage bycatch. It has
21 gone before the AFA. It was authorized by the council
22 and the council put together a similar program for crab

1 very recently.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

3 MR. BENTON: So it is not just legislative.
4 That is all.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Go ahead. Other
6 comments?

7 (No response.)

8 DR. BROMLEY: We have -- we have heard lots of
9 suggestions. Somehow we need to figure out how long
10 this list is going to be, don't we, Lauren?

11 MS. WENZEL: And also some people have already
12 said they are working on revised language.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

14 MS. WENZEL: So I don't know if you want to
15 take a break and let people revise the language.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Take a break? My goodness.
17 Take a break.

18 MS. WENZEL: Not a social break, a work break.

19 DR. BROMLEY: It is five minutes past our
20 designated break time. I propose we take a break and
21 be back here in two minutes? No-no. That was
22 yesterday's act. Please be back here at 10:45 more or

1 less. Thank you. Oh, it is only -- we need -- we don't
2 deserve a break at 9 --

3 MS. WENZEL: Well, I was just thinking that
4 way people could get --

5 DR. BROMLEY: We do need a break. Let's let
6 it sit for a minute.

7 (A brief recess was taken at 9:38 a.m. and the
8 meeting resumed at 10:00 a.m.)

9 DR. BROMLEY: Let's consider reconvening.
10 Perhaps we should start the engine here.

11 You will notice up on the screen our visages
12 from yesterday. You may notice that everybody is
13 smiling except me. I am the only one frowning.

14 (Laughter.)

15 DR. BROMLEY: Do you remember what yesterday
16 was like?

17 MR. ZALES: You can't tell if I am smiling or
18 not. I am only half there.

19 DR. BROMLEY: I am sorry, Bob, what?

20 MR. ZALES: You can't tell if I am smiling or
21 not. I am only half there.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, yes. Well, isn't that about

1 right, Bob? Just your right half.

2 (Laughter.)

3 DR. BROMLEY: A slimmed down Bob Zales. Oh,
4 there you are. Okay. Well, this -- some of you --
5 Dolly was not there for the photograph yesterday.

6 DR. GARZA: I was too.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. URAVITCH: She was sitting right next to
9 me. I know she was.

10 DR. BROMLEY: That is why she is frowning,
11 Steven. Actually, Dolly is in there twice. We just
12 haven't found her the second time, but Jim Ray did this.
13 Now you know how John Kerry ended up in Jane Fonda's
14 lap. It is the same sort of trick with digital
15 photography.

16 MS. WENZEL: So if there is anyone else you
17 would like to have on the Committee, just let Jim know.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, right. Dick Cheney,
19 whoever. We can put them in here.

20 PARTICIPANT: Jane Fonda.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Jane Fonda, yes.

22 MR. LAPOINTE: Osama.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Elvis. All right. On that
2 happy note, I think we are back in session now. We
3 weren't a moment ago. We are now.

4 Our overview committee, and I hope they come
5 up with a better word to describe what they are
6 writing, but anyway, they are still drafting and
7 crafting and we are back to our list of five. And I
8 think I see Dave Benton's hand. David.

9 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have
10 a growing concern that this is going to become a
11 Christmas tree effect and I believe pretty strongly
12 that we need to keep this list short and keep it to the
13 big ticket, fundamental issues and not make it a
14 Christmas tree. And I don't know if other people have
15 other items that they are going to try to put on there.

16 Mr. Chairman, I would not support putting new
17 items on here, I think, unless they are extremely big
18 ticket, big deal issues. All the rest of these things,
19 we have all got, you know, our own particular
20 interests, you know, things we are interested in. That
21 is for the next crowd. You know, we may be part of
22 that next crowd, we may not. I don't -- that is not our

1 business.

2 Looking at that list, Mr. Chairman, and in
3 keeping with what I have just said, I would propose
4 that we delete item number 6. It is a big issue, but
5 it wasn't a fundamental issue that we were sort of
6 grappling with, didn't get time to finish up on and was,
7 you know, as you were characterizing it the other day,
8 a deal breaker. I wouldn't call these deal breakers,
9 but I am trying to use a different way.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

11 MR. BENTON: Primary fundamental issue. I
12 suspect that that kind of issue will be -- might very
13 well become part of a charge that the agencies decide
14 they want the next FAC to deal with. So I would
15 suggest we drop number 6 and I am prepared to make
16 motions in that regard, but first I want to discuss a
17 couple of items.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Go ahead.

19 MR. BENTON: The -- I can't read these things
20 very well. I am going to come to a different
21 microphone.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Come up to the front here.

1 MR. BENTON: No, that is okay. I can --

2 DR. BROMLEY: I think we want to be able to
3 see all six of them.

4 MR. BENTON: Old age is catching up,
5 Mr. Chairman.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Tell me.

7 MR. BENTON: Item number 3, the issue about
8 who actually approves the designation was an issue that
9 floated and a lot of people raised it and I have gone
10 around the table and talked to a few folks about
11 whether or not we could drop that issue. And the
12 concern that I have heard that is most prominent is the
13 issue of if a site goes in the national system, we sort
14 of indicate in our document that funding goes along
15 with that and there is a concern that in some parts of
16 the country, there could be two competing regional
17 entities that might be within -- sort of within sort of
18 a cross region area and a site might get -- sites might
19 get designated by one regional entity that would steal
20 money from another area so to speak.

21 That is not words other people have used,
22 those are my words, but it is sort of a common

1 phenomena called, you know, robbing Peter to pay Paul.

2 And federal agencies and state agencies do this thing
3 quite regularly.

4 I, for one, believe that we could drop
5 number 3 because I think it is sort of embedded in the
6 executive order and it is embedded in our document, but
7 I am reluctant to do that given the funding issue. So
8 I am prepared to move to at least delete item number 6.

9 I would suggest we talk about whether or not we need
10 number 3 in there a bit. I, for one, personally would
11 support going ahead and removing it, but I am not
12 prepared to make a motion of that. So I am going to
13 move to delete number 6, Mr. Chairman, and kick this
14 off.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Fine. Thank you. Is
16 there a second to this?

17 DR. OGDEN: Second.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

19 MR. BENTON: Yes. I think I have spoken to
20 this. This was an issue that had been flagged by Bob
21 Zales, I believe, and I know a lot of people feel it is
22 important, I feel it is important, but I think it is

1 one of those things we can talk about under another
2 agenda item at this meeting here once we get past this.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Good. Thanks, David.

4 Yes, Eric.

5 MR. GILMAN: Just to be consistent with my
6 message from earlier that we use a filter of only
7 including items in this list that deal with the
8 national system, I concur with eliminating the sixth
9 one and I also think that the first bullet is in that
10 category. The first bullet doesn't deal specifically
11 with the national system. Those are the two ones that
12 I have a problem with.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. That was the harm
14 thing. The first one is the harm thing. Okay. So you
15 do support, you are speaking in support of dropping 6,
16 but you would like to extend it to 1 as well; is that
17 right?

18 MR. GILMAN: Yes.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Other comments on David's motion
20 about 6, number 6?

21 DR. CHATWIN: Mr. Chairman?

22 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, Tony.

1 DR. CHATWIN: Is it appropriate to have
2 motions and decisions when we have a subcommittee that
3 is not present?

4 DR. BROMLEY: Well, that is --

5 DR. CHATWIN: I would say it is inappropriate.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Fair enough. Good. Can
7 we -- then I think you are moving that we table the
8 motion, Tony. Is that what he is doing, David?

9 MR. ZALES: Mr. Chairman?

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

11 MR. ZALES: I might could help with that since
12 I was the one that brought issue number 6 up and I
13 talked to David about this. To me, it wasn't a
14 situation of a deal breaker, or whatever any other
15 thing. My concern is that it be considered and if it
16 has to be considered in the next FAC, whoever sits at
17 this table at that point to be sure that those issues
18 are covered, I don't have a problem with pulling it off.

19 And I don't know if you need a motion to --

20 DR. BROMLEY: That is right. Okay.

21 MR. ZALES: -- move it to the discussion this
22 afternoon. I would be happy with that and I don't know

1 if anybody is concerned with those issues very much,
2 but I am. I think that they are critical.

3 DR. BROMLEY: No, that is great. We won't
4 even have to wait until this afternoon, Bob, because we
5 are going to do it later this morning.

6 MR. ZALES: That is fine with me.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Tony, is that all right if
8 Bob pulls 6 off, then the motion from David is
9 immaterial. Is that okay?

10 DR. CHATWIN: I think that is fair for the
11 people who are not in the room.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Absolutely. Thank you for doing
13 that.

14 I have Barbara and then Mark Hixon.

15 MS. STEVENSON: Recognizing David's concerns
16 with 3, I am not going to propose that we withdraw it,
17 but perhaps that we change it where it says "to approve
18 designation." What we have in bullet 3 here is
19 "formally recognize." So if we change "approve" to
20 "formally recognize," we will be more consistent with
21 the document. We say that someone will formally
22 recognize, but we don't know who that is.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. But you still believe,
2 Barbara, that it is in the category of fundamental
3 importance that we talked around or but didn't come to a
4 resolution. So you are advocating that it stay on the
5 list.

6 MS. STEVENSON: Yes. Yes.

7 DR. BROMLEY: All right. Mark Hixon.

8 DR. HIXON: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I want to
9 extend my appreciation to Bob Zales for graciously
10 pulling off his item. I had similar items of my own
11 that I believe are important to be addressed from a
12 natural scientific perspective, but I don't believe they
13 are appropriate here and I agree with Mr. Benton's
14 proposal that we keep this list as short as we possibly
15 can. Thank you.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you. We are down
17 to five. Other comments?

18 Eric. Yes. Go ahead.

19 MR. GILMAN: Just a procedural question. I am
20 not sure how these original five or six now -- six, now
21 five, got on the list.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

1 MR. GILMAN: And if we are going to be voting
2 about specific ones, then I think we should just go
3 through the list and see if there is a consensus
4 about -- there is a large number of --

5 DR. BROMLEY: I know. I know. Yes.

6 MR. GILMAN: -- things that this committee
7 hasn't addressed that I think are important and these
8 five aren't --

9 DR. BROMLEY: Let me refresh our memory how
10 they came about. The list, the side list came about
11 because of the comments received by me, by Lauren, by
12 the executive committee in this review period in early
13 April. So these were issues that the executive
14 committee felt were of such importance and of such
15 complex nature that they deserved time of their own in
16 committee for discussion. And so the executive
17 committee created this side list and there were four, I
18 believe. Is that right, Lauren?

19 MS. WENZEL: (Nodding.)

20 DR. BROMLEY: And one of those four was what
21 is now called number 1. I think we had the word "harm."
22 That is all we really had and we had three others that

1 I don't remember. So Eric, that is the genesis of this
2 side list. Then yesterday we added to it and so it has
3 grown from four to six back down to five and that is
4 where we are.

5 I am very sympathetic to getting it down to
6 three or four. There is no magic number, but in a
7 sense, our characterization was that these are issues
8 that people on the Committee agreed to forebear so that
9 we could move forward, which is a different category of
10 stuff than gee, next time around, we really must spend
11 more time on something that we have. That is it, Eric.

12 David.

13 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 Currently because I haven't withdrawn it and we haven't
15 had a vote to table, there is a motion on the floor to
16 delete number 6 from that list.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

18 MR. BENTON: And there has not been any
19 motions to add things, which is -- I think is a good
20 thing. I am going to ask, with regard to item
21 number 4, I know the financing issue or funding issue
22 was an important one to folks, but somebody is supposed

1 to put together the language and I know some of those
2 folks are gone. I don't know if we have any language.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

4 MR. BENTON: Do we have language?

5 DR. BROMLEY: No, we don't have language.

6 MS. WENZEL: I think several of those folks
7 are on the other subcommittee.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. BENTON: Okay. So going, then, to the
10 point that I think Tony was making about subcommittees
11 working and whatnot, do you want to -- I am willing to
12 withdraw my motion or table it and do you want to not
13 take any further -- because if we do that, I think we
14 don't take any action on this and we move to something
15 else until all those folks get back in here.

16 DR. BROMLEY: That is right.

17 MR. BENTON: Is that what you want to do?

18 DR. BROMLEY: Well, yes. I mean, correct me
19 if I am wrong, but if Mr. Zales has asked to have
20 removed the thing that you moved to have removed, I
21 could consult my parliamentarians on this, but --

22 MR. BENTON: I could withdraw my motion if it

1 is easier.

2 DR. BROMLEY: -- I am loathe to do so. So I
3 think 6 is off as far as I am concerned. Are we
4 violating any procedural stuff?

5 MR. BENTON: The only thing I have got to do
6 is withdraw my motion and my second concur whoever
7 seconded it. I can't remember who seconded it.

8 DR. OGDEN: That is fine.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Fine. We are done with that.

10 MR. BENTON: Okay. Now, then, you don't have
11 to worry about that. That is why I asked.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Good. I mean, in a sense, what
13 some of you are saying is we shouldn't spend too much
14 more time on this list until we have our full
15 contingent back. Are you suggesting that we take
16 another break or that we start working --

17 MS. WENZEL: I don't know if other folks have
18 language they could -- and we could get it up here and
19 be prepared.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is right. Bob -- Jim
21 Ray and Mike were going to come up with some language.
22 Do you have it now, Jim?

1 DR. RAY: No. We have got more discussions to
2 have.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

4 DR. RAY: We are going back and forth and
5 talking to some other folks.

6 DR. BROMLEY: All right. And Mel and Dolly
7 were going to -- Mel, do you have some language?

8 MR. MOON: Actually, I do have some language.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Wonderful.

10 MR. MOON: If I could read it.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Why don't you do --

12 MR. MOON: Do you want me to read it?

13 DR. BROMLEY: How long is it? A long
14 sentence. Why don't you read it slowly and Lauren, can
15 you sort of work it in as he goes. Let's try this.

16 MR. MOON: It says, "Develop a process, per
17 Executive Order 13158, outlining government-tribal
18 relations to appropriately engage tribes in
19 contributing to, evaluating, and recommending MPA's or
20 other conservation measures."

21 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. For those of you whose
22 eyes are like mine, there is a need to develop a

1 process that will -- oh, gosh, I am sorry. Yes. Yes.

2 The alternative is, "Develop a process, per Executive
3 Order 13158, outlining government-tribal relations to
4 appropriately engage tribes in contributing to,
5 evaluating, and recommending MPA's or other conservation
6 measures."

7 PARTICIPANT: Mel, is that a motion or you
8 just had it or --

9 DR. BROMLEY: No, it is just a conversation
10 point. Can we keep it at that level? David -- George.

11 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you. Is "other
12 conservation measures" broader than our discussion on
13 developing an actual system of MPA's? That would be my
14 concern with the language, Mel.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Can we just strip it back to
16 MPA's. Is that your point, George.

17 MR. LAPOINTE: Or understanding what --

18 DR. BROMLEY: Those are.

19 MR. LAPOINTE: But the draft of the language
20 meant by "other conservation measures."

21 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

22 MR. LAPOINTE: Because I don't think it is --

1 DR. BROMLEY: All right. Dolly and then I
2 have David I guess.

3 DR. GARZA: The intent, Mr. Chairman, was in
4 our new document, we do say that MPA's may not always be
5 the best. So we have this review process of is the MPA
6 the best or should we have something else. So that
7 just recognizes that tribes may not always want MPA's
8 and that once we go through this review process, we may
9 decide that some other conversation measure is easier.

10 And then just as a side point, the executive
11 order mentioned here was one that was set up through
12 President Clinton recovering government to government
13 relationships between tribes and the government. So
14 NOAA and Fish and Wildlife Service do that anyway, but
15 it is good to have it here.

16 MS. WENZEL: I think I might have the wrong
17 executive order number in here. Okay.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, that is our executive order.

19 MS. WENZEL: Yes. You meant to cite a
20 different executive order, right?

21 DR. GARZA: Yes.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, that is ours. There is

1 another executive order that needs to be sent.

2 PARTICIPANT: Do you have the EO number?

3 MR. MOON: I don't have that.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Then the number is wrong
5 because this is our authorizing order I think.

6 MR. MOON: Right.

7 DR. BROMLEY: 158.

8 MR. MOON: Sorry.

9 DR. BROMLEY: All right. David and then
10 George.

11 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a
12 very good addition and a good change and I can
13 understand why the other conservation measures would be
14 in there. In addition to the reason that Ms. Garza
15 identified, is, you know, there may be a situation
16 where people are recommending conservation measures for
17 the management within an MPA. And the tribes may want
18 to be involved. And it helps to get at that as well.

19 The executive order citation, to me, the only
20 thing I would add to that is that tribes are also
21 mentioned in 13158 and do you want to -- I guess it
22 doesn't really matter. What I was getting at is, do you

1 want to mention both of them or does it matter?

2 DR. BROMLEY: Do we need to mention them at
3 all, Dolly? No? Do we need these authorities? Can we
4 just "Develop a process outlining government-tribal
5 relations to appropriately engage tribes and
6 contributing to evaluating and recommending MPA's?"

7 MR. MOON: The executive order that was listed
8 basically directs the agencies to work with tribes as
9 governments. That is really what is the foundation of
10 that and describes how that is going to be done.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

12 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, I think including
13 that executive order just makes it more clear as to
14 what sort of -- I think that outlines the process. And
15 so it will give us a basis upon which to start
16 developing this process and without it, we could be
17 spending all of our time spinning our wheels when
18 basically a wheel has been built.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is fine. I don't
20 think anybody wants to cause a big fuss over that. So
21 if we can list them both, something -- you would like
22 them both to be listed?

1 MR. MOON: Sure.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Is that okay with people?
3 George? Oh, I am sorry. I had -- what did I do. I
4 have George and then Bob Zales.

5 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

7 MR. LAPOINTE: Back to "other conservation
8 measures." I would be more comfortable, and I
9 understand what people are trying to do. Other
10 conservation measures related to the MPA nomination
11 process just because so it doesn't look like we are
12 trying to do an issue creep on things beyond our
13 purview.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Mel and Dolly, is that --
15 I mean, it is clear we are talking about MPA's.

16 MR. LAPOINTE: Yes.

17 DR. BROMLEY: And nothing beyond MPA's I
18 think.

19 MS. WENZEL: The nomination process?

20 MR. LAPOINTE: Nomination process because the
21 nomination process, I think our language now says we
22 are supposed to look at those alternatives. So it just

1 narrows it to the issue at hand.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

3 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you.

4 DR. BROMLEY: All right. Good. I think our
5 little subcommittee is mostly back, they are filtering
6 back. If there is some other word smithing that people
7 would like to do on this and then when we sort of feel
8 like we have most people here, we can treat them,
9 perhaps, as a package. John?

10 DR. OGDEN: Just a minor point.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, I forgot. No-no. I am
12 sorry, John. Bob Zales.

13 DR. OGDEN: Oh, sorry.

14 MR. ZALES: I still fail to see, and I hope I
15 don't offend anybody here, but I still fail to see where
16 this is necessary in this list, if we are trying to
17 concentrate this and narrow it down, because it appears
18 to me that in the document that as a committee, we have
19 made a substantial effort in recognizing cultural and
20 Native American rights and treaty rights because
21 throughout the document, it is specified in many cases.

22

1 So I would prefer to see something like this
2 in the next charge for the next FAC committee to play
3 with, not as necessarily a situation that would be
4 considered a deal breaker because I am not sure that
5 that was mentioned as a deal breaker.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Well, it could be the way -- if
7 I may, it could be the way that people who feel this so
8 strongly have chosen to communicate to us about it.
9 Maybe they are not as prone to cast things as deal
10 breakers as some of the rest of us are. And so it
11 could be something that is deeply held by some of our
12 members, but who chose not to put it in the language
13 of, might I say, threats and stuff. So I think, Bob --
14 I have said it.

15 John?

16 DR. OGDEN: Well, I think Mel explained I
17 think very clearly why this particular item ought to be
18 in here and I certainly accept that and understand that
19 very well.

20 I just want to suggest that MPA's are about
21 management conservation, it is not just about
22 conservation. And so if we should put "other

1 management and conservation.”

2 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. This I like. Yes. Okay.

3 I have George.

4 MR. LAPOINTE: I am going to Bob Zales’
5 comment because I made a similar comment earlier and
6 Mel and I had a conversation that convinced me that it
7 should be on this list and we have -- after we had our
8 initial colloquy, I went through and highlighted all
9 the sections on dealing with tribal interests and
10 tribal rights and whatnot and what Mel convinced me of
11 was that in spite of the fact that it is in there, it
12 would be worthy of further attention to have a section
13 dealing specifically with this issue because it is easy
14 to -- his experience has been, and my very limited
15 observation, is that it is an easy thing to gloss over
16 and an incredibly important thing not to gloss over.

17 And so as the FAC continues, to spend some
18 time making sure that we don’t recommend a process that
19 continues that glossing over. And so that was what
20 turned me around on it.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Thanks, George.

22 John Ogden. Yes, I am sorry.

1 DR. OGDEN: I have a list shrinking
2 suggestion, which maybe --

3 DR. BROMLEY: Consolidate all of them into
4 one.

5 DR. OGDEN: If you will look at 3 and 4,
6 essentially what we are talking about is the national
7 administration of the national system of MPA's and that
8 would include a number of things, including the idea
9 of, essentially, approving the designation or the
10 nomination process and the provision of financing
11 incentives. And so those two things, in my mind,
12 are -- would be, essentially, the administration of the
13 national system and could be one.

14 MS. WENZEL: I just wanted to note that there
15 are four people out in the hall working on financing
16 incentive language. So you can talk to that when they
17 come back in.

18 DR. BROMLEY: I think they are staying away
19 from us on purpose. Where are we, Lauren? What --
20 have we exhausted the work that we can do on this
21 suggestion until we get more of our members back?

22 DR. RAY: I need more time to caucus.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Yes. Why don't we now
2 look -- yes.

3 DR. GARZA: Since we probably will be voting
4 on this as a package, I think we could still, at this
5 time, recommend or I would move that we use the
6 substitute language for number 2 to just get us one
7 step closer.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. So that we don't have two
9 competing languages, Dolly, right? So let's -- is
10 that -- no, John?

11 DR. OGDEN: Well, I think David made the point
12 that we are missing a lot of key people and to continue
13 the process of voting --

14 DR. GARZA: Well, it would still be voted as a
15 package.

16 DR. OGDEN: Oh, I see what you are saying.
17 Well, I think to be clean, I think we ought to --

18 DR. GARZA: Okay.

19 DR. OGDEN: -- wait until we have --

20 DR. GARZA: I was just trying to use time.

21 DR. OGDEN: Yes, I know.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Would you like to look to

1 the future a little bit. Are you tired of the past?

2 How tired? Barbara is really tired of the past. Okay.

3 Here comes Max.

4 (Pause.)

5 DR. BROMLEY: It is my understanding that the
6 overview stuff is ready to be discussed. The people
7 who are not here are, in a sense, caucusing to craft
8 language about, what, Lauren, the funding and
9 incentives part. Would you mind if we started while --
10 procedurally would you mind if we started while there
11 is a caucus going on in the hall? Jim?

12 DR. RAY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a
13 request that if we are going to be voting on this list
14 in a little while, that I could get about 10 minutes to
15 take several people with me to caucus to resolve the
16 issue that Mike and I have been discussing.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. Do you want to do
18 that now?

19 DR. RAY: If we could, that would be very
20 nice.

21 DR. BROMLEY: You are excused.

22 DR. RAY: Thank you.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Another break?

2 MR. PETERSON: I have an item that is not a --
3 it is a suggested item that doesn't require action.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

5 MR. PETERSON: And that is that when our group
6 met, several people mentioned that they were probably
7 going to prepare a summary for their organization. And
8 it struck us that there probably ought to be sort of a
9 popularized version of this that would be suitable for
10 public distribution that would probably -- we are not
11 competent to determine where, but we always figure if
12 we don't know where, we suggest the MPA Center do it.

13 But maybe they are not the right people, but
14 somebody probably ought to do a three or four-page
15 popularized thing that would just contain the guts that
16 this committee reported and a little bit about it and
17 then say the full report is available on the web, you
18 know, and so on. And if you do a PowerPoint, if
19 somebody does it PowerPoint for use within the Agency,
20 like you all, maybe that could be shared.

21 DR. BROMLEY: You have been reading Brian
22 Melzian's mind.

1 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Or he has been reading yours.

3 MR. PETERSON: Brian actually was the one that
4 suggested it to us so I want to give him --

5 (Laughter.)

6 DR. BROMLEY: Oh.

7 MR. PETERSON: No, I give him credit for that
8 because we were grappling with that.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

10 MR. PETERSON: And we didn't quite know how to
11 do it and he came on right at the right time.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Good for Brian.

13 MR. PETERSON: But it doesn't make much sense
14 for all the agencies and everybody else to be redundant
15 on that. At least we ought to be able to use some
16 common stuff.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Well, my sense was that each
18 agency, just as each interest group if we call -- if we
19 wish, will produce their own sort of summary statement.

20 MR. PETERSON: Sure. Yes.

21 DR. BROMLEY: This would not be a substitute
22 for that.

1 MR. PETERSON: No.

2 DR. BROMLEY: That is going to happen. I
3 think the point that Brian made to me over the break,
4 and evidently conveyed to you, which is, we can't, as a
5 committee, direct the MPA Center to do anything.

6 MR. PETERSON: No. No.

7 DR. BROMLEY: We can merely enter into the
8 record that we think it would be --

9 MR. PETERSON: We think it should be done.

10 DR. BROMLEY: -- quite a nice idea if they did
11 that.

12 MR. PETERSON: And then if that was made
13 available, then, some of us who have the chore of
14 making a summary report could use that.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Could use it as a starting
16 point.

17 MR. PETERSON: As a starting point anyway.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is right, Max.

19 DR. MELZIAN: Thanks, Max and Dan. And as a
20 strong recommendation and an action item from an ex
21 officio member of this committee, I believe it would be
22 very useful if ex officio members worked with Joe and

1 the MPA Center sooner rather than later to come up with
2 some type of summary of this report that can be
3 disseminated throughout the country, throughout the
4 world, and of course to get you folks to at least have
5 an opportunity to review the draft.

6 And this, in fact, could be the de facto
7 executive summary of the document. So it won't hold up
8 this document being produced. So we will get this
9 summary out to the appropriate people. And the reason
10 why that is so important, there are 18,000 in EPA,
11 18,000 staff members. I will be the only one that
12 reads the entire document, but yet I need to work with
13 all 10 regional administrators and brief them, usually
14 a half hour or less, about the important aspects of
15 these activities. So that is just a friendly
16 suggestion to help the whole process along and I would
17 like to receive your input.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Thanks, Brian.

19 Joe.

20 MR. URAVITCH: Mr. Chairman, we are going to
21 have to do something like this anyway to brief our
22 leadership and the interagency working group as well.

1 So we would be more than happy to undertake this. I
2 think it would be appropriate to make sure it is run by
3 folks on this committee, though, so that we truly
4 represent what they were trying to -- you all were
5 trying to convey through this process.

6 DR. BROMLEY: You may run it by us, but you do
7 not want to ask us to vote on it.

8 (Laughter.)

9 DR. MELZIAN: We won't.

10 DR. BROMLEY: You are smarter than that. I
11 had some hands up now. Barbara and then George and Bob
12 Zales.

13 MS. STEVENSON: I think Kay has had her hand
14 up for a while.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: I will wait.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Sorry Kay.

17 MS. STEVENSON: I recognize that the Center is
18 going to make their summary and their presentation. I
19 have a lot of problems with our group urging some
20 entity, other than us, to do an executive summary,
21 which I had problems with our group doing an executive
22 summary because, for instance, the important things

1 from the EPA's point of view may not be the same that
2 are important to me.

3 They are all important and that is the
4 problem. The whole report is important to somebody or
5 it wouldn't be in there. We don't have any descriptors,
6 we don't have any history, we don't have any of that
7 stuff in there that aren't important. So -- I mean,
8 they are important to the understanding, but not to the
9 actions. So whereas I recognize this stuff will
10 happen, it is different than us saying, please do it
11 and this will be our official summary.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 MR. PETERSON: Yes. Please don't call it an
14 executive summary.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Rest assured, this is not -- we
16 are the only body that has the capacity to craft an
17 executive summary, right? This is not an executive
18 summary.

19 MS. STEVENSON: Yes. I was just getting to
20 the point of --

21 DR. BROMLEY: We don't care what they call it,
22 they better not call it an executive summary; is that

1 right? Does that cover your concern, Barbara?

2 MS. STEVENSON: Yes.

3 DR. BROMLEY: It is not that, it is their own
4 reading for their own audience.

5 MR. PETERSON: A popularized version.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Many, many people will do it.
7 But they can call it what they want, there is only two
8 words they may not use. Well, actually one. They may
9 call it a summary, but they may not call it an
10 executive summary. Okay.

11 DR. MELZIAN: Mr. Chairman, just a point of
12 clarification.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

14 DR. MELZIAN: The summary that I envision
15 being developed with the MPA Center, in consultation
16 with ex officio members, would, I believe, try to
17 represent, as best as we can in the federal government,
18 the entire agency -- the entire committee's
19 recommendations.

20 DR. BROMLEY: It better.

21 DR. MELZIAN: It would not be the EPA version
22 of it, it would be something that, to our best ability,

1 would represent the entire Federal Advisory Committee
2 and the report in total.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Not the Federal Advisory
4 Committee. I am sorry, Brian. What you will write --
5 what you ex officio people will put together will be
6 your interpretation of what this committee has adopted.

7 DR. MELZIAN: Correction. Interpretation of
8 the report that you produced.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. That is what you
10 folks can do.

11 MR. LAPOINTE: It will, in essence, be an
12 agency briefing summary.

13 DR. BROMLEY: All right. Yes.

14 MR. LAPOINTE: And I am actually -- I like the
15 idea because it -- of having as many of the ex officio
16 members participate in that so that there is a
17 consistent message going out within the federal
18 government from --

19 DR. BROMLEY: That is wonderful. I agree with
20 that. That is great, George. Okay. And then I have
21 Bob Zales.

22 MR. ZALES: And I guess I have got a

1 procedural question is that now that the report has
2 been voted on and with the exclusion of what is being
3 played with for the last page, where does it go?
4 Because I assumed that once we did our report, that --
5 and it was cleaned up and editorialized the way that
6 the staff has been given license to do, that it is then
7 going to be submitted to the two secretaries. And then
8 whoever --

9 DR. BROMLEY: Whoever is on the web I think
10 also.

11 MR. ZALES: Yes, but -- and I guess that is
12 the question. When does our report go forward to the
13 people that asked for it to begin with, the reason why
14 we were created?

15 DR. BROMLEY: Joe?

16 MR. ZALES: That is my first question and then
17 I would have a comment after that if I can get an
18 answer to that question.

19 MS. WENZEL: I think as soon as the final, you
20 know, editorial cleanup and the transmittal letter and
21 the overview are done, which would be in a matter of
22 days, we will be able to, you know, have Dan formally

1 transmit the report to the undersecretary of Commerce.

2 The charter states that the report goes to the
3 secretary through the undersecretary, the head of NOAA
4 and then his counterpart at the Department of Interior.

5 So that is how it will be transmitted and I would see
6 that happening, you know, within a week or so.

7 MR. ZALES: Okay. From the Commerce part, I
8 guess it would go to Adm. Lautenbacher first?

9 MS. WENZEL: That is correct.

10 MR. ZALES: And then whoever --

11 MS. WENZEL: And then Rebecca Watson at the
12 Department of Interior.

13 MR. ZALES: Okay. And so these ex officios
14 playing with it would be just like me playing with it,
15 I guess, for the people that I represent. I make my
16 own thing and it is my interpretation of the version of
17 this, but and, you know, I guess if I wanted to, I
18 could submit that to the two secretaries, too, and say,
19 "Well, this is how I interpret this on behalf of these
20 people," but I am not sure I would be comfortable with
21 anybody making an interpretation of this report in any
22 kind of summary on the behalf of this committee.

1 And I want to be sure that that is clear. I
2 mean, and I encourage everybody else to do their thing,
3 but I don't want my name tagged to it as, you know, them
4 telling somebody what I had to say. I hate for people
5 to always say well, this is what -- "Bob said this, but
6 this is what he really meant."

7 MS. WENZEL: What I heard people say was that
8 they are asking the MPA Center to do a summary, which
9 we will need to do anyway, as Joe points out, and it
10 will be an MPA Center document. So it will not be
11 represented as the Committee's work.

12 DR. BROMLEY: David Benton.

13 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess
14 my take on this is that the staff have to develop a
15 briefing document and that is their job and I am
16 totally comfortable with it and frankly, I am pleased
17 that they have indicated that they are willing to share
18 that with us just so we can see what they say about us.

19 And other than that, I think we should let them do
20 their job. I agree with Bob, I don't want people
21 putting words in my mouth, but this is their report to
22 their bosses and that is the way it ought to be.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Thanks.

2 Kay, is your hand up? Kay?

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: The minute we voted on this
6 document, if I speak to anyone on the Hill, this was
7 our work. I want to make sure that this document is
8 what we voted on, what I supported and what I will say
9 I supported. And this is the only thing that I have
10 supported is what is in front of me.

11 Now staff can go back and they can reorganize
12 and put the definitions where they want to, but if
13 anything changes from this document, then I want to be
14 very clear, I didn't vote it, I did not support it.
15 This is the only thing that I have supported to this
16 point and this is the document that I am going to go
17 forward with to everyone. This is what came out of
18 here regardless of any summaries that anybody writes.
19 This is what we did and to me, this is our work.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Absolutely. With two
21 exceptions, Kay. With the exception of the additions
22 that are now being worked on in this last section,

1 right, and with a little bit of linguistic clearing up.

2 MS. WILLIAMS: And that will be voted on.

3 DR. BROMLEY: The stuff that we are dealing
4 with today will be voted on. If Lauren finds a verb
5 and a noun that are not compatible, we are not going to
6 vote on that. Is that okay with you, Kay?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: I understand.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. I don't believe that any
9 of us are in any confusion about it. I am happy to
10 have you state it clearly like that.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Well, the reason I wanted to
12 state it clearly, Mr. Chairman, is very often we, in
13 the council process, have had staff go back and
14 reorganize things and what they thought they heard is
15 not what we said.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: So I just want to make very
18 certain this is what everyone --

19 DR. BROMLEY: Right. And I believe our
20 instructions to Lauren should be very clear that
21 despite what we have heard about how hard it is to read
22 and how badly organized it is, we don't want

1 reorganization. Is that right, Kay? We don't want
2 reorganization because you start reorganizing stuff and
3 then you realize, oh, well, we better introduce
4 something now because it is now out of order. And this
5 is what we want to avoid.

6 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Lauren, that is right. I
8 mean, Lauren is smart enough to have figured that out
9 already. David? Was your hand up, David?

10 MR. BENTON: Yes, it was, Mr. Chairman.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

12 MR. BENTON: I want to reemphasize what Kay
13 has said because I have had the same experience
14 multiple times and I trust the staff to do a good job
15 of making what I believe we need to emphasize are
16 minor, technical corrections to the document and that
17 is it.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. And if in doubt, leave it
19 alone.

20 MR. BENTON: And if in doubt, leave it alone.

21 DR. BROMLEY: There must be a compelling
22 reason why it has got to be changed. Is that okay,

1 Kay?

2 MS. WILLIAMS: That works for me. Thank you,
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. John?

5 DR. HALSEY: So does that mean that
6 reorganization is out?

7 DR. BROMLEY: I would -- yes. The moving of
8 the tables out of the text, putting them in an
9 appendix, was that your suggestion or John Ogden's? I
10 don't know. That -- are you okay with --

11 MR. PETERSON: That was part of our motion.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, that was part of a motion.
13 We are going to take --

14 MR. PETERSON: To move that table.

15 DR. BROMLEY: To put a table -- and I believe
16 it was Table 2 and there was some --

17 MR. PETERSON: Move Table 2 --

18 DR. BROMLEY: Table 2 only will go to an
19 appendix.

20 MR. PETERSON: -- to the appendix, but we are
21 not talking about changing one substantial thing in the
22 report or doing any major reorganization.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

2 MR. PETERSON: Or anything like that.

3 DR. BROMLEY: We don't want sections moved
4 around, paragraphs moved around.

5 MR. PETERSON: We are saying if we have used a
6 singular where it should have been plural, "were" where
7 it should have been "more," we ought to clean that up.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is right.

9 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, Bob?

11 MR. ZALES: Just a clarification. Table 2
12 will be in the back, but it will be before the glossary
13 or after the glossary?

14 MR. PETERSON: Before the glossary.

15 DR. BROMLEY: I don't know where tables go in
16 such things, but --

17 MR. PETERSON: We said before the glossary.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Before the glossary. Okay.

19 Thanks. Okay.

20 We find ourselves depleted by caucuses and I
21 feel an urge that we need to move forward. So let's
22 start talking about the future a little bit. Barbara

1 indicated she wouldn't mind. How would you like to
2 structure this?

3 Let me remind you that I would like to have us
4 offer to the secretaries a fairly brief and concise
5 list of activities that we think are necessary in order
6 for the procedural issues that we have addressed over
7 this first two-year period to make sense and in a
8 sense, maybe get the footing underneath what it is that
9 we have done here. That is one way of kind of thinking
10 about it.

11 There are some fundamental issues. Science
12 issues, cultural issues, other stuff on which our
13 procedural wording sort of sits and our recommendations
14 are embedded and could we have a little conversation
15 about that. What are the presumptions that we have
16 sort of put off to one side as we have done this and I
17 would like to get us to think about it in a kind of an
18 open, free-flowing thing. John Ogden. John Halsey. I
19 am sorry.

20 DR. HALSEY: I think one of the -- even before
21 we start talking about what the next FAC is going to
22 do, we need to know who the next FAC is going to be and

1 I think -- because that certainly -- if you have a new
2 slate of people, it is going to be very different in
3 the kind of order of business that you would expect
4 from -- coming from upper classmen here.

5 DR. BROMLEY: That does introduce a level of
6 circularity into our discussion. Are you saying that
7 we -- okay. Thanks.

8 MS. WENZEL: I can say a quick word about the
9 status of the Committee. You will probably remember
10 that I polled you all about your interest in continuing
11 to serve and I was really pleased to see that everyone
12 was interested in continuing to serve with the
13 exception of a couple of people who felt that they had
14 other commitments that pulled them away. And so we are
15 going to have three vacancies on the Committee.

16 I am sorry to say we will be saying goodbye to
17 Mel Moon and we dearly appreciate all of his
18 contributions, as well as Carol Dinkins, who has a lot
19 of other commitments, and Ted Thompson. And so those
20 are the three vacancies that we will be looking to
21 fill.

22 And for the rest of the Committee members, we

1 have sent forward a recommendation to both departments
2 that the Committee members be renewed for either a
3 two-year or a four-year term. And those are in the
4 process of being reviewed and we hope to get formal
5 approval of that very soon and then you all would
6 receive formal renomination letters. So that is where
7 that stands.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Why did you laugh, Barbara?

9 MS. STEVENSON: My compatriots on my left were
10 signaling how many years they were obligated to serve
11 as a sentence.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. STEVENSON: But I just have a question as
14 to how do you choose who gets two and who gets four?

15 MS. WENZEL: I anticipated that question. We
16 looked very much at geographic and interest group
17 balance. Well, we asked, but we also -- many people
18 said that they would be willing to serve for whatever
19 term they were assigned or recommended for. And so we
20 looked at the balance.

21 DR. BROMLEY: And your bid of three months,
22 Barbara, was thrown out as an outlier.

1 (Laughter.)

2 DR. BROMLEY: Because we figured that would
3 expire before we had our next meeting and we couldn't
4 quite figure out what you were saying to us.

5 MS. STEVENSON: That sort of was my point.
6 Some of us might be willing for two, but would be
7 highly uncertain about four.

8 DR. BROMLEY: You remember that you
9 communicated that to Lauren? Do each of you remember
10 that you were asked these questions?

11 MS. STEVENSON: That is why I am asking
12 because I can't remember.

13 DR. BROMLEY: I see.

14 MS. WENZEL: If anyone has comments they want
15 to make to me offline about that, please do.

16 DR. BROMLEY: David, is your hand up?

17 MR. BENTON: It was, Mr. Chairman, but I was
18 going to let this conversation conclude because I was
19 going to go to your point about, you know, sort of next
20 steps.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

22 MR. BENTON: If there is more that needs to be

1 discussed about the status of this committee, I will
2 defer until that time.

3 MS. WENZEL: Yes. I would just add more thing
4 about the status of the Committee, which is that we did
5 issue a federal register notice for the vacancies on
6 the Committee. We are actually issuing a new federal
7 register notice for the third vacancy and we are going
8 to go into a process, I think, of leaving the vacancies
9 open for a year so that we can just accept nominations
10 on an ongoing basis in case someone needs to step off
11 the Committee for an unanticipated reason.

12 So just to let you all know, I will send that
13 out when it has been approved, but if you know folks
14 who might want to just get in the queue or be made
15 aware of future vacancies, they can go ahead and send
16 information in.

17 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

19 MR. BENTON: So when are we going to know --
20 what is the process for reconfirming the folks around
21 the table here? Is it like months from now, is it --

22 MS. WENZEL: No. Most people's terms expire

1 June 23rd. And so we are leaning heavily on our folks
2 to approve them quickly.

3 MR. BENTON: Okay. Fair enough.

4 DR. BROMLEY: I think there is a hand over
5 here. Mark.

6 DR. HIXON: Yes. Lauren, would you please
7 provide some clarification. Did you just say that
8 the -- how many -- a couple of questions. Number one,
9 how many people on the current committee have already
10 said they will not serve again?

11 MS. WENZEL: Three.

12 DR. HIXON: Okay. Are you saying you are
13 holding those three open for another year before --

14 MS. WENZEL: No. I am sorry if I wasn't
15 clear.

16 DR. HIXON: Okay.

17 MS. WENZEL: First, we had two people who
18 stepped off. And so we issued a Federal Register
19 notice and we got nominations in and we sent
20 recommendations for those two positions forward --

21 DR. HIXON: Okay.

22 MS. WENZEL: -- for review within the two

1 departments. And then Mel let us know that he did not
2 plan to continue on the Committee. So we had a third
3 vacancy. So we are issuing a new Federal Register
4 notice. And that one -- basically to avoid more work
5 and to be more open, we decided to write it in such a
6 way that that notice will remain open for a year.

7 So we will note in the future if we have
8 specific needs on the Committee we are trying to fill.

9 We may use the website to do that, but legally that
10 way the notice will be open and anyone who wants to
11 send in a resume for future consideration for any
12 vacancy that might occur in the future can do so.

13 DR. HIXON: So the intention is that the two
14 vacancies will be filled by our next meeting?

15 MS. WENZEL: Yes. We hope that all three will
16 be filled by the next meeting.

17 DR. HIXON: Oh, okay. All three. All right.
18 Thank you.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Can I ask a clarifying question.
20 When we started in June of '03, we were, I believe,
21 unable to take action because we had not completed --
22 we were not full. Is that -- is my memory correct on

1 that? When we had a number of our folks who had not
2 yet been cleared. Let me put it this way. Will we be
3 able to proceed to do our business if we are not full?

4 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, you will. I believe that
5 was just the consensus of the group that there weren't
6 sufficient members there and there are a number of
7 members who hadn't gone through the background check
8 process and there were a sufficient number of them --

9 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

10 MR. URAVITCH: -- that the Committee felt
11 uncomfortable to proceed with things like election of
12 officers --

13 DR. BROMLEY: Without.

14 MR. URAVITCH: -- without them. And we
15 obviously will lean on the security of people, to the
16 degree one can, to clear the new three members that
17 will be coming onboard, but I would think with 27 out
18 of 30, even assuming those other three couldn't --

19 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

20 MR. URAVITCH: -- you all would proceed.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Good. All right. Do we have
22 language from the caucuses, Jim? Do you and Michael

1 have language and could we -- I would like to stop our
2 future and let's finish up the past if we can. We had
3 one caucus. We had -- is that all we had? Okay. And
4 Bonnie, were you working on some language too?

5 DR. MCCAY: Yes.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. So we are going to have
7 some language from two groups. Jim, do you and Michael
8 want to --

9 DR. RAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we caucused and
10 discussed the background for the number 5 that was on
11 the board.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 DR. RAY: And after reviewing the concerns
14 that Mike had and why it was put up there in the first
15 place, we really thought that those issues do not need
16 to be on that list, do not to be resolved here, and
17 some background work will be done and it is something
18 that can be taken up under the next FAC if we need to,
19 but at this point in time, Mike and I and the caucus
20 members that met with us are comfortable that this
21 should be taken off the list for now.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Any objection to

1 having -- on their recommendation, having item number 5
2 taken off. Is that okay? All right. Thank you.
3 Thank you. So that is gone and while some of you were
4 out of the room, perhaps, Bob Zales agreed that he
5 would be willing to pull number 6 off of the list; is
6 that right, at the -- we had a little discussion for
7 those of you who weren't here, but we didn't want to
8 pull it off without letting those of you who were
9 caucusing, at least look at it and think about it.

10 So there has been -- for those of you that
11 were out of the room, there has been a suggestion that
12 item 6 be taken off, the suggestion coming from Bob who
13 had wanted it to be on. Any opposition, for those of
14 you that were out of the room, to having number 6 taken
15 off? Without prejudice to its importance, but simply
16 it is a different category of thing.

17 (No response.)

18 DR. BROMLEY: So I believe we are down to
19 four.

20 DR. MCCAY: We tried to make it more legible.

21 DR. BROMLEY: So this is your proposed
22 language for item number 4, Bonnie; is that right?

1 DR. MCCAY: Yes.

2 DR. BROMLEY: And I believe while you were out
3 of the room, we did have a suggestion to combine 3 and
4 4, wasn't it, John, one of the Johns?

5 DR. OGDEN: Yes. Yes.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. You were hoping that we
7 might combine 3 and 4.

8 DR. OGDEN: Yes.

9 DR. BROMLEY: It looks like you have sort of
10 done that. Can everybody read this?

11 (Pause.)

12 DR. BROMLEY: Could I ask would it be better
13 not to have it not in the form of questions, but in the
14 form of assertions or propositions that the group is
15 under the view that these are important issues and here
16 they are, rather than question asking? David.

17 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that is an
18 excellent suggestion and I also recall that a number of
19 folks, like Mike Nussman and some others, the issue for
20 them wasn't more questions needed to get answered as
21 much as it was a statement that -- of concern about
22 getting stuck with MPA's that don't have adequate

1 funding.

2 DR. BROMLEY: I appreciate that.

3 MR. BENTON: The monitoring and compliance
4 aspects of the proposal. So this doesn't really get at
5 that.

6 DR. BROMLEY: This doesn't capture that.

7 MR. BENTON: It just does not capture that.

8 PARTICIPANT: It wasn't intended to.

9 DR. MCCAY: The reason that -- yes, we were
10 addressing, well, another dimension of the issue that
11 wasn't -- that we didn't capture in the document. I
12 thought was had already represented that -- the concern
13 that you just enunciated already in our report. It is
14 pretty clear in the report. So I mean, we -- honestly,
15 we didn't think about it just assuming it was already
16 there in the report and that this was not, in fact, in
17 the report yet.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. I think -- if I may, I
19 think the presumption was not quite correct, Bonnie.

20 DR. MCCAY: Yes.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Sorry.

22 DR. MCCAY: Yes. No, that is fine.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Is that okay.

2 DR. MCCAY: I am just saying that is what we
3 thought.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is right.

5 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

7 MR. PETERSON: I think if that is turned
8 around to a statement rather than a question, we could
9 work -- we are talking about the participation. We
10 could talk about including such things as law
11 enforcement, monitoring and so on.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

13 MR. PETERSON: We could enumerate a couple of
14 things. And I would suggest we have the Committee go
15 back and do that --

16 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

17 MR. PETERSON: -- and after we get other
18 ideas. And one final things. Both Tundi and I are
19 leaving at 12:00. So we need to get to that overview
20 at some point.

21 DR. BROMLEY: That is right. I am ready to do
22 that right now. So could I -- I believe we have four

1 items on our list now. I have no objection to dropping
2 6. So now I think we have 1, 2, 3 and 4; is that
3 right, Lauren?

4 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

5 DR. BROMLEY: And we still have some -- okay.

6 I would like to talk about the overview and Bonnie
7 can -- do you think your group could --

8 DR. MCCAY: Yes. If Lauren can put on the
9 screen --

10 DR. BROMLEY: You would like to do it now,
11 would you?

12 DR. MCCAY: Yes.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

14 DR. AGARDY: The last line was not meant to be
15 there.

16 MS. WENZEL: All right.

17 DR. AGARDY: It was my confusion. Thanks.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. I would like to ask those
19 of you that are too far away to see the screen, if you
20 could come forward. I don't want to read this. Could
21 you -- let's just take a second and look at it.

22 (Pause.)

1 MS. WENZEL: Are you all ready to scroll down?

2 (Pause.)

3 DR. MCCAY: So to get the discussion going, I
4 move that we accept the overview.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. Second?

6 MR. RADONSKI: Second.

7 DR. BROMLEY: It has been seconded, has it?

8 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you.

10 Mark.

11 DR. HIXON: I propose -- I don't know how to
12 do this Robert's stuff, but it would be a friendly
13 amendment. Since the glossary is at the end, I suggest
14 putting that statement about defining key terms as the
15 last bullet just for readability. And then secondly --

16 DR. BROMLEY: Wait a minute.

17 DR. HIXON: It says, "The report defines key
18 terms."

19 DR. BROMLEY: Move it to the last in the --

20 DR. HIXON: Yes. Just to the last spot just
21 because it refers to the glossary, which is at the end.

22 DR. BROMLEY: I think you have the word

1 "glossary" in there. "It defines key terms in the
2 glossary?"

3 DR. HIXON: Yes.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Put it last?

5 DR. HIXON: Just put it last.

6 MR. RADONSKI: The whole thing should be in
7 the order that they appear.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 DR. HIXON: And then --

10 DR. BROMLEY: Are you through, Mark.

11 DR. HIXON: I am just letting Lauren finish.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Is that --

13 DR. HIXON: That was it. And then at the very
14 end, the word "dealing" didn't -- that is just my editor
15 coming out. I think there could be a better word than
16 dealing.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Right. "The report recognizes
18 that time did not permit dealing with" --

19 DR. HIXON: Or consideration of.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Consideration of or resolution
21 of significant questions.

22 DR. HIXON: And I don't have that much

1 attachment to that. So I don't want to get into a big
2 debate about it.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

4 DR. HIXON: Thank you.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. Consideration --

6 MR. PETERSON: How about consideration of.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Consideration of. I have Kay
8 and then I have Tony.

9 MS. WILLIAMS: Just the language. Could you
10 scroll back down a little bit. Excuse me.

11 MR. PETERSON: Consideration of. Take out
12 dealing then.

13 MS. WENZEL: Was there a consensus on that? I
14 just wasn't --

15 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. Let's presume there
16 was consensus.

17 MR. O'HALLORAN: Excuse me. I think that if
18 we say that we did not permit consideration and then in
19 the next sentence, we talk about these unresolved
20 items, if they are unresolved, didn't we consider them?

21 DR. BROMLEY: Well, I said, "Resolution of."

22 MR. O'HALLORAN: Resolution? Yes.

1 DR. BROMLEY: The report recognizes that time
2 did not permit resolution of --

3 DR. MURRAY: How about, "Insufficient time to
4 adequately consider?" Resolution of?

5 DR. BROMLEY: That is a lot of words. You
6 talk like a dean.

7 (Laughter.)

8 DR. MURRAY: Is that worse than a lawyer?

9 (Laughter.)

10 DR. MURRAY: Or an economist?

11 DR. HIXON: So if someone doesn't read the
12 minutes today and believe that the Chair was being
13 insulting -- all right. I won't do it. There is truth
14 in the statement.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Well, we know what it means. We
16 insulted him.

17 (Laughter.)

18 DR. HIXON: Do we need "of some?"

19 DR. BROMLEY: No, we don't. "Of significant
20 issues and questions."

21 MR. PETERSON: Well, we thought we resolved a
22 lot, but we did want to --

1 DR. BROMLEY: Of a few. We did not have a
2 resolution of a few.

3 MR. PETERSON: Yes. I think it is better to
4 say a few.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

6 MR. PETERSON: Because we did resolve all --

7 DR. BROMLEY: "Resolution of a few significant
8 questions."

9 MR. PETERSON: I think Gil didn't want this to
10 be a mea culpa.

11 MS. STEVENSON: How about, "Of all significant
12 questions and concerns?" That makes it like we believe
13 we actually did a lot and --

14 DR. BROMLEY: Of all. Oh, okay. Of all.
15 Yes. Okay. That is nice.

16 Kay, did we --

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 I just had a question. Where it says, "Articulate a
19 process for accessing existing MPA's as well as proposed
20 new sites for inclusion," should that be proposing
21 instead of proposed? When I read it, it sounds like we
22 have already proposed new sites.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, you are right. As
2 proposing. You want proposing. That is correct, Kay.

3 MR. PETERSON: She is correct. She is
4 correct.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

6 MR. PETERSON: Mark the correction.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Since we were just there, if I
8 may, I know that I have Tony on the list, but facets,
9 I --

10 MR. PETERSON: You have got a better word?

11 DR. BROMLEY: I have got a better word.
12 Facets is technically a side of something, isn't it?

13 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Like diamonds, facets, right?

15 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

16 DR. BROMLEY: So I think what we want to get
17 rid of is sides, literally, and think about key issues
18 associated with aspects.

19 MR. PETERSON: "Aspects" is better.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you. The other editor is
21 looking at me and smiling. At least we are not deans,
22 Mark.

1 (Laughter.)

2 DR. BROMLEY: We are not even deanlets. That
3 is even better. Tony.

4 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
5 wanted to add a comment to the movement of the
6 definition of key terms in the glossary. I think -- I
7 mean, that is accurate and that location is accurate
8 for that, but one thing that we did to, which is one of
9 our great accomplishments, is to define and provide
10 further clarification of the definition of a marine
11 protected area. And that is section number three.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 DR. CHATWIN: And we should have it
14 specifically stated there and that is not in the
15 glossary.

16 DR. BROMLEY: I think that is wonderful. That
17 is right.

18 MR. PETERSON: That is a good idea.

19 DR. MCCAY: Very good, idea.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. We don't have to say what
21 it is, but we did do it.

22 MR. PETERSON: We defined lasting protection.

1 DR. CHATWIN: Defined marine protected areas.

2 MR. PETERSON: That is right. You are right.

3 DR. CHATWIN: Because I think that a lot of
4 decision-makers will be very interested, members of the
5 public too.

6 DR. BROMLEY: How are we doing? Is this okay
7 if we operate like this? Are you okay with --

8 MR. PETERSON: I think if Bonnie is willing to
9 as the maker.

10 DR. MCCAY: Oh, yes, this is very friendly.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Barbara.

12 MS. STEVENSON: You will note that the desire
13 to edit is not limited to academia.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. STEVENSON: In the "Articulate a process
16 for," the way I read that is that not only we are
17 articulating a process for existing, but we are
18 proposing new sites. So even though it is longer, I
19 would suggest we say "as well as articulating a process
20 for proposing new sites" so that it is clear what we
21 are saying.

22 DR. AGARDY: How about if you just said "both."

1 MS. STEVENSON: That would be fine.

2 MR. PETERSON: Both existing and --

3 DR. AGARDY: No. Both assessing existing
4 and --

5 MR. PETERSON: Yes. That is better. It is
6 shorter.

7 DR. MCCAY: It is processes then because it is
8 two different --

9 MR. PETERSON: Yes, it is processes.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Go back up and take out the --
11 "processes for assessing both" -- no, you want the "both"
12 to be in front of the "for."

13 DR. MCCAY: Both for assessing and for
14 proposing new.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Put "both" there.

16 MS. WENZEL: Put "both" here?

17 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

18 MR. PETERSON: That is the editor for sure.

19 DR. BROMLEY: "Both for assessing existing
20 MPA's as well as" --

21 DR. MCCAY: No "and." Get rid of "as well."
22 And for proposing.

1 MR. PETERSON: Good.

2 DR. BROMLEY: How is that Barbara?

3 MS. STEVENSON: Okay.

4 DR. BROMLEY: All right. We have some people
5 who want to leave -- have to leave at noon. We want to
6 talk about some future issues, but we also want to deal
7 with this. So how are people feeling?

8 PARTICIPANT: Hungry.

9 MR. PETERSON: I am ready to call for the
10 question.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Emerging consensus?

12 MR. PETERSON: I am ready to call for the
13 question.

14 MS. WENZEL: Let me go to the top.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Could I ask whether our
16 diverse experience and background is pertinent here? I
17 could regale you with my diverse background and
18 experiences, not very much of which would interest you.
19 Are we trying to capture something more fundamental
20 than that? Is it important to say diverse interests
21 and perspectives on the ocean, on the marine habitat,
22 not our backgrounds? That is not what this matters. I

1 mean, it makes for great comedy, but the issue here is
2 the interests we bring to the table.

3 MR. PETERSON: Well, you can say diverse
4 interest, experience and background.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Perspective. I would like the
6 word "perspective" in here. Jim?

7 DR. RAY: Well, it is perspective. Aside from
8 the experience here, it is also the representation of
9 the various interest and user groups.

10 DR. BROMLEY: That is what we -- that is what
11 I think that we want to get in here.

12 DR. RAY: The diversity in this group.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. We didn't just overcome
14 our backgrounds.

15 (Laughter.)

16 DR. BROMLEY: Some of us have backgrounds
17 which cannot be overcome. But we did overcome --

18 MR. PETERSON: I think some of us tried very
19 hard.

20 DR. BROMLEY: -- our differences of our
21 perspectives. Jim, are we picking up --

22 DR. RAY: Well, I feel --

1 DR. BROMLEY: -- representation --

2 DR. RAY: -- part of it is the fact that we
3 represent diversity --

4 DR. BROMLEY: We are here because we represent
5 interests.

6 DR. RAY: -- of the marine environment.

7 DR. AGARDY: I have a problem with taking out
8 "background" because we could all have commented this
9 with very different perspectives and very different
10 interests coming from the same background. We could
11 all be coming from one organization and have that wide
12 range of diversity, you know, and outlook on marine
13 areas. So I think "background" implies that we are
14 coming from different professional backgrounds
15 representing different user groups or whatever. I like
16 it.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Then maybe we need an adjective
18 in front of it. I mean, backgrounds -- I mean, that
19 is -- I am not opposed to backgrounds, but I --

20 MR. PETERSON: Let me -- the only reason we
21 have got non-federal scientists, resource managers and
22 other interested persons and organizations, that is

1 verbatim from the executive order. The executive order
2 doesn't talk about interests of different user groups
3 because we don't represent the full variety of interest
4 groups on this committee.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Well, I will --

6 MR. PETERSON: So anyway, that is a quote from
7 the executive order.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. PETERSON: That is the only reason we used
10 it.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Barbara, is your hand up?

12 MS. STEVENSON: I am struggling with this. I
13 would like "knowledge" in there because what we -- we
14 are not representing our interests, we are appointed
15 because of our diverse knowledge of different aspects.

16 I can stand with the current language. I couldn't -- I
17 had a problem with the original language so maybe I
18 should just shut up.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Eric.

20 MR. GILMAN: How about values? As a result of
21 our past --

22 DR. BROMLEY: Perspectives. That is not

1 captured by perspectives. It seems to me, perspectives
2 is a covering term for a lot of this stuff, but --
3 Tundi and then David Benton.

4 DR. AGARDY: I just wanted to remind us that
5 in the next paragraph, that is not up on the screen, we
6 actually try and capture the --

7 MR. PETERSON: Representative local and state
8 tribe on national organization --

9 DR. AGARDY: No. The one down from there is
10 where we actually talk about the divisive issues and
11 the common ground and I think -- actually, we had a
12 phrase in there that we took out, which was about us
13 coming to the table with different perspectives and
14 interests. But I mean, I tend to be very --

15 DR. BROMLEY: Are we working too hard on it
16 now? Okay. In economics we talk about diminishing
17 returns at the margin. David and then we will see if
18 can't do something. David.

19 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I sort of think
20 that there is 32 angels that dance on the head of a pin
21 and we can debate that, but I think we are done.

22 DR. BROMLEY: You okay?

1 MR. BENTON: I would hope that we could move
2 on.

3 DR. BROMLEY: You have a motion that we adopt
4 this?

5 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that we
6 adopt this in its entirety and move on.

7 MR. PETERSON: It is already moved.

8 DR. BROMLEY: It is already moved.

9 MR. BENTON: Yes.

10 DR. BROMLEY: It is on the table? Where is
11 it?

12 MR. PETERSON: It is already on the table.

13 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I call for the
14 question.

15 MR. PETERSON: Right. That is proper.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Do you want to bring it off the
17 table or do you just want to call for the question?

18 MR. BENTON: No, I just call for the question.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Call for the question. The
20 question has been called. All in favor say aye.

21 (Chorus of ayes.)

22 DR. BROMLEY: Opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you, Max, and your group.

3 MR. PETERSON: We appreciate Bonnie.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Bonnie, everybody. Again,
5 wonderful.

6 Okay. We have got the overview done. Where
7 are we? Now we have to go back to the list, Lauren; is
8 that correct?

9 MS. WENZEL: The incentives group has to --

10 DR. BROMLEY: The incentives group has to --
11 okay. Let's talk about the future. I am open to how
12 you want to get this discussion going. We have 11:15.
13 We already had our break so at lunch, we have 12:30
14 eat lunch, I presume across the hall, right? And we
15 have two options, depending on your sense of urgency.
16 We can bring our lunch back in here or we can go in
17 that room and relax.

18 So I think I would prefer that we just go in
19 the room and relax and not come back here and work over
20 lunch, but if people wish -- I think I pushed you hard
21 enough yesterday. I am trying now to make up for that.
22 But then at 1:30, we will have more time for this. So

1 let's see what bubbles up. Barbara?

2 MS. STEVENSON: I would like to hear what the
3 people who are going to charge us think that they would
4 like to suggest and then we can add to -- give some
5 recommendations that they consider adding to what they
6 are already --

7 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. So this would presume
8 that Tom and Larry Maloney -- is Larry here this
9 morning?

10 PARTICIPANT: He was earlier.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Dave deferred to Joe and we have
12 Brian here. Mark?

13 DR. HIXON: I agree with what Barbara just
14 proposed and I also would like to remind the Committee
15 that that is exactly what we did when we formed two
16 years ago. We asked the MPA Center what do you want.
17 What do you need. So I think it is a good place to
18 start and then modify as we see appropriate.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Qualified, if I may, by what we
20 want the MPA Center to do for us is to communicate to
21 us what the secretaries want and not what the MPA
22 Center wants. And I -- when we started, we had this

1 sort of thing, are we here to advise the MPA Center
2 and -- or are we here to let the MPA Center communicate
3 to us what the secretaries want.

4 DR. HIXON: I retract my wording.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Did you want to say
6 something, Joe?

7 MR. URAVITCH: Well, I was going to suggest
8 that the question --

9 DR. BROMLEY: Do.

10 MR. URAVITCH: -- on behalf of the agencies at
11 this point and we are going to be a little bit of a --

12 DR. BROMLEY: You are speaking, then, for Tom,
13 are you speaking for NOAA and --

14 MR. URAVITCH: Well, I think for both
15 agencies. We have already met --

16 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

17 MR. URAVITCH: -- and begun to discuss this
18 issue.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Good.

20 MR. URAVITCH: We have also raised this at the
21 interagency working group level to make sure that we
22 are hearing from the other departments that are

1 partners in this process.

2 Maybe I will talk a little bit about process
3 here at this point. One thing is we do want to hear
4 from you all in terms of what your thoughts are because
5 you have been diving into these issues, obviously, for
6 two years now. So that is crucial to us. We have
7 talked, both at the interagency and at the staff level,
8 about what we think is important and but we have not
9 yet formulated a list to go forward to the secretaries
10 in both departments.

11 We actually would like to hear what you all
12 have to say, as well, to make sure that we have a
13 robust set of ideas that we can work from, but the
14 process will be that we will meet with Interior and
15 come up with a list of issues that we think are
16 important for addressing by the new committee and that
17 will be based on what we hear from you, what we think
18 of as staff, as well as from the other agencies. And
19 we will go forward with that to Adm. Lautenbacher as
20 well as Rebecca Watson and other folks in both
21 agencies.

22 I am not going to raise specifics, in part

1 because they have not been approved by our leadership
2 or even run by them at this point, but what I would say
3 is that in our thinking about this, we have -- and
4 seeing how you function, we have talked about sort of
5 immediate things that need response, as well as
6 short-term and long-term issues, because there are
7 going to be people on for two to four years. And so
8 there may be some long duration things.

9 On the other hand, there are some things where
10 we would hope we can come to you for here is an issue.

11 Well, let's discuss it at one meeting and get some
12 thoughts from people on that. So we are going to be
13 looking at a variety of issues. We also appreciate and
14 would like to call on your continued participation in
15 the various public and organizational fora where you
16 have been incredibly helpful in moving this whole
17 effort along.

18 In terms of issues, I mean, just to throw out
19 some of the things we have thinking about, there is
20 obviously approaches to the whole -- the three focus
21 issues on natural heritage, sustainable production and
22 cultural heritage and how we are going to relate to

1 that. So that is obviously the three tracks to be
2 dealt with and I don't know how the Committee is going
3 to organize itself next time around, but we discussed
4 that.

5 There are obviously aspects of the national
6 system framework where we are going to need some help
7 to focus in on special sort of focus issues such as
8 monitoring evaluation effectiveness, how we are going
9 to make that happen, how we integrate across
10 governmental levels, what kind of governmental
11 mechanisms we could follow. I mean, sort of how do we
12 follow on to your report and how do we move forward
13 with this framework to actually make these things
14 happen.

15 So we would be looking towards guidance, we
16 think, and again, that is up to our leadership to tell
17 us what you all should be charged with, but we think
18 that these are the important things. So, you know, how
19 do we make this actually happen in the real world. And
20 I know we have discussed the various scientific efforts
21 being undertaken, resource characterization work, human
22 use and impacts, special studies that need to be done.

1 My personal belief is a lot needs to be done
2 on the cultural side. Right now we just have one
3 member from the sort of historic resources side on the
4 Committee. Obviously I would think you all are going
5 to need to think about a working group that may even
6 bring in some external parties to focus more on that.
7 And those are my general thoughts at this point.

8 I don't know if Larry had anything he wanted
9 to add about the whole charge issue to the new
10 committee. I have just described the process we are
11 going to go through in terms of elevation to
12 leadership.

13 MR. MALONEY: No.

14 MR. URAVITCH: No? Okay. Any members of --

15 MR. KITSOS: Mr. Chairman, this is my first
16 and, perhaps, last meeting with you and with this FAC
17 and I found it extraordinarily interesting and it has
18 been -- it has really been fascinating to me to see
19 this group go into excruciating detail about an issue
20 that the U.S. Commission just kind of skirted over.
21 Because of the executive order, we knew it was in good
22 hands with you. I applaud the hard work of everybody

1 here.

2 I do want to note -- and I don't know whether
3 I am stepping out of school with respect to my position
4 in the Administration, but I do want to make the
5 following note. Things in Washington change slowly,
6 but they are beginning to change. It started with the
7 MPA executive order and some other galvanization of
8 interests in Congress and in NGO communities, various
9 NGO communities and industry communities.

10 And of course it has sort of culminated in the
11 Commission and now the President's Ocean Action Plan.
12 And the reason I point this out is that for the next
13 FAC, one of the things that I think that group ought to
14 keep in mind is that the structure of decision-making
15 about oceans, in general, in Washington is changing.

16 It will change slowly. It is like one of
17 those big oil tankers, it takes a while to steer and to
18 move, but there is this new committee on ocean policy,
19 there are a number of boxes underneath that committee
20 and subcommittee. Mary Glackin is a co-chair on a very
21 important subcommittee.

22 And so keep the faith is what I am suggesting

1 to you, that, in fact, obviously an advisory committee
2 like this, just like the Ocean Commission, cannot make
3 decisions on its own, but the recommendations will have
4 an institution that should hear these, what you have to
5 say. And the old world where oceans is disbursed among
6 many different institutions still exists, but there is
7 an effort now to try to be more cohesive, to bring
8 things together and I think that there is a reason for
9 hope, not necessarily tomorrow, but down the road,
10 reasonably soon, and I appreciate the opportunity to
11 spend some time with you.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you, Tom. Some of us had
13 that sense of this emerging restructuring and we pick
14 it up from reading what you wrote and the Ocean
15 Commission and other places, but it is nice to have it
16 ratified from you that -- we do sit at a vicious time,
17 don't we.

18 Other thoughts? Yes, Brian.

19 DR. MELZIAN: Well, I would just like to
20 endorse what Tom just mentioned because EPA is actively
21 involved in this new ocean government structure. In
22 fact, our system administrator, Office of Water, sits

1 on the Aquabox, which is right underneath the committee
2 on ocean policy, which I believe had -- its cabinet
3 level had its first meeting on April 5th where no
4 representatives were allowed. This is a very high
5 profile now within the U.S. government and they -- and
6 there are time frames set out to accomplish various
7 activities. So I do agree that this is vicious time to
8 make some changes.

9 Regarding EPA's involvement with this
10 committee and perhaps in future consultation with this
11 committee, I point you to the executive order, actually
12 section 4-F. You don't have to read it right now, but
13 it specifically highlighted this agency, unlike any
14 other agencies in the executive order, with the
15 exception of DOC and DOI, regarding science-based
16 regulations and consult with agencies for marine water
17 quality standards.

18 This all relates to harm, things of that
19 nature, which I won't go into right now, but there was
20 some pretty strong language in here that my agency is
21 looking for guidance from you folks as far as if we
22 establish a marine protected area national system, how

1 can we protect these different environments. So this
2 is something that I would -- which really hasn't been
3 addressed yet is look at that specific part of the
4 executive order.

5 Secondly, two major activities, both of which
6 I am involved with, and they relate to the U.S. Ocean
7 Action Plan and they are very high profile. One is
8 Integrated Ocean Observing System, which Joe knows and
9 Lauren knows, and I work with Rick Spinrad at NOAA's
10 ocean U.S. executive committee.

11 This thing is starting to catch momentum and
12 is moving very rapidly down the road now and they
13 actually have a national federation of regional
14 associations, which are being developed as a state and
15 government plans, management plans and action plans.
16 And so I, representing the Agency, will go looking for
17 ways, perhaps in partnership with NOAA and others, how
18 some of the activities of this committee, especially
19 relating to monitoring and evaluation, could be
20 supplemental to the Integrated Ocean Observing System
21 and vice versa. There is some exciting opportunities
22 there.

1 Then lastly, and this is being tracked by the
2 Council on Environmental Quality and in fact a briefing
3 is now being prepared for these folks, which is the
4 CEQ, as you may be aware of, is the executive office of
5 the President. As required in the U.S. Ocean Action
6 Plan, a national water quality monitoring network is
7 now being developed and the plan needs to be submitted
8 to the CEQ by January 2006. And I am going to design a
9 work group of this National Water Quality Monitoring
10 Network, which does include the Great Lakes, the main
11 rivers in the U.S. and wetlands and coastal areas and
12 including to the EEZ.

13 So there is some opportunities there where
14 this network of marine protected areas could be nestled
15 within both of these major programs. In fact, in the
16 Ocean Action Plan, it is stipulated when you develop
17 this National Water Quality Monitoring Network, you
18 should have someone from IOOS on this committee so we
19 have those linkages and synergism. So we are looking
20 at ways at how can we compliment and help each other in
21 the future. Thank you.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Thanks very much, Brian.

1 Terry, your hand is up?

2 MR. O'HALLORAN: I have two thoughts about the
3 discussion about what the next FAC would do. And one,
4 I think it would be very important for us to hear from
5 the MPA Center about some of the things that they might
6 be thinking about that we could help them address. And
7 number 2 is the budget for the National Marine
8 Protected Area Center, which is threatened by almost \$2
9 million for FY '06, which would mean that it would
10 reduce the number of our meetings to two. And the
11 number of meetings that we would have certainly impacts
12 the amount of issues and the -- and how -- what we are
13 going to tackle and reasonably hope to accomplish. So
14 those are two.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. And thank you for bringing
16 that up because it will -- not only will it influence
17 how many meetings we -- this group might be able to
18 have in a year, but it will very much impact on how we
19 can operate because if we -- you might recall when we
20 started, there was, in our marching orders, a
21 discussion of working groups, scientific working groups
22 I think is the language. Something like that. We were

1 told we could, should create scientific working groups
2 and we didn't. We wanted to do this now.

3 But many believe that it is time that we do
4 that and that has profound budgetary implications
5 because we cannot ask scientific working groups to be
6 created and set up if there is no money for them to do
7 anything.

8 So this -- we will have to address that, both,
9 I mean, sort of this afternoon we have some structural
10 things. It is probably premature to talk about how we
11 want to structure ourselves because that structuring
12 ought to flow from the tasks that we have before us,
13 but this budget issue will very much determine what we
14 can do and we then may have to go to plan B in terms of
15 how we think we can operate over the next couple of
16 years.

17 I have Bonnie and then I have David.

18 DR. MCCAY: Well, one of the reasons that we
19 felt it was important to highlight funding issues in
20 the list of unresolved issues is that this was -- if
21 the nation is serious about ocean governance and marine
22 protected areas as part of that, then we really have to

1 be realistic about what the costs are. And so that is
2 one of the reasons that, I just want to underscore,
3 that we think those short paragraphs we have, sentences
4 there, are really, really critical and that a group
5 such as this, the amount of groups that actually looks
6 at these questions.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Could I ask -- I do have David
8 on the agenda, on the queue, but could I ask if in the
9 letter of transmittal, with the report, that I provide
10 some language about this, not begging for more money,
11 but stating that we, in this first period, did not
12 avail ourselves of scientific working groups and other
13 things because we wanted to get this other work done,
14 but now it is time that we must do that and we do not
15 see how we can do it under the current -- I mean, is
16 something like this appropriate in the transmittal
17 letter? But I go to David and then come to these other
18 people. David?

19 MR. BENTON: A couple of thoughts,
20 Mr. Chairman. I just reiterate my concern about us, in
21 any way, getting into the funding questions where it
22 could be construed that -- the term I used earlier was

1 feathering our own nest.

2 The question of whether or not we fund or --
3 not fund, whether or not we form scientific working
4 groups or other working groups, I think is a more
5 important question than this short discussion wants and
6 I would be very cautious about identifying that as
7 being something that we are going to do next.

8 And I do that in a couple of ways. Tying that
9 to the funding issue really starts to look like we are
10 blossoming out as some kind of bureaucracy and I don't
11 think we want to look that way. And secondly, we
12 need -- before we say we are going to fund -- not fund,
13 sorry, form or convene any kind of working group,
14 whether it is a scientific one, a stakeholder one,
15 whatever it is, we need to come up with the charge and
16 the purpose and why do we need them.

17 So I wouldn't signal that because if we just
18 say we are going to form working groups without going
19 through that deliberative process, we are going to look
20 like somebody that just wants to have a bunch of
21 meetings and get a bunch of people together and all of
22 that. So I would be very cautious about that.

1 And I go back to some of the earlier
2 discussions we had about where we were going to meet
3 and being worried about, gee, if we are in Hawaii,
4 would that look appropriate or other places. I just
5 remind us all of that.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

7 MR. BENTON: It is a cautionary thing. I
8 think the funding issue for the Center and the program
9 is a very legitimate issue, but my limited experience
10 of 20 plus years dealing with the Hill, and Max might
11 confirm this as -- oftentimes it is the quiet word that
12 gets something done more than it is a trumpet.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is fine.

14 Okay. George and then Gil. George is -- Gil.

15 MR. RADONSKI: Just some thoughts, not
16 direction, but thoughts. As this letter of transmittal
17 is being prepared, I would suggest that the preparer or
18 preparers review the statement from the Administration
19 and their response to the OC report. I forget the name
20 of it. What is the title of that? Pardon?

21 DR. BROMLEY: Action plan.

22 MR. RADONSKI: Action -- Ocean Action Plan.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

2 MR. RADONSKI: That be reviewed because that
3 is stated policy of the Administration and I don't say
4 that we should pandar to it with our report, but if we
5 can flavor our report showing that we are working in
6 that direction, I think that will highlight it.

7 I discussed this both with Larry Maloney and
8 Tom Kitsos and they said that as far as they are
9 concerned, that is the first thing that the
10 Administration is going to look at, how this comports
11 with that action plan. And so I think if we review it
12 and just make ourselves a little more familiar, it
13 would stand us in good stead.

14 DR. BROMLEY: That is good. That is good.

15 Other thoughts about things? Yes, Max.

16 MR. PETERSON: Let me just agree with David's
17 comments and suggest that Bonnie has several items that
18 we spotlighted this morning that were recommended for
19 the overview that we thought better belonged in the --

20 DR. BROMLEY: Transmittal?

21 MR. PETERSON: -- letter of transmittal. So
22 maybe you would like to have her articulate those so

1 the group, as a whole, knows what those are. Do you
2 have those written down in some form?

3 DR. MCCAY: I am not sure I do, Max.

4 MR. PETERSON: Well, you had some cryptic
5 notes there of the --

6 DR. MCCAY: They were very cryptic.

7 MR. PETERSON: Well, anyway, maybe you could
8 just -- without trying to write them out, just kind of
9 identify the things because I, too, would be very
10 concerned about a scientific working group unless we
11 know precisely what they are going to do.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 MR. PETERSON: And we are going to take away
14 funding from MPA Center if we do that within their
15 budget. So I would not want to do that unless we are
16 sure we need it.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Do you have that, Bonnie?

18 DR. MCCAY: I am really drawing a blank here
19 right now.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

21 DR. MCCAY: If you want to say that my
22 comments earlier were referring to not funding for us

1 as a committee as a whole.

2 MR. PETERSON: No. No-no. No.

3 DR. MCCAY: And I don't think any of us were
4 speaking of that.

5 MR. PETERSON: But several items we thought
6 could be in the transmittal.

7 DR. MCCAY: Yes.

8 MR. PETERSON: I know a couple of them was
9 appreciation to the staff and the support we received
10 from the staff is there.

11 DR. MCCAY: All of that.

12 MR. PETERSON: We had another item to
13 reflect --

14 DR. MCCAY: The importance of the
15 subcommittees that we formed and all that.

16 MR. PETERSON: -- the importance of the
17 subcommittees. Some of those things that are not in
18 the overview, and so on, that you could have carte
19 blanche to put in your letter of transmittal, as far as
20 we are concerned, so that you would have at least a few
21 things within the letter of transmittal. Okay,
22 Mr. Chairman?

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Okay. Wonderful.

2 Other ideas, other thoughts?

3 DR. MCCAY: I have one.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Sure, Bonnie. Please.

5 DR. MCCAY: Quite often now we have mentioned
6 the Ocean Action Plan. I just pulled it up here on my
7 screen, but would it make sense to briefly mention that
8 in the overview statement?

9 MR. PETERSON: I don't think it is in the
10 document at this point, is it?

11 DR. MCCAY: No, it is not. I am just
12 saying --

13 DR. BROMLEY: It maybe goes in the letter of
14 transmittal.

15 MR. PETERSON: I think it goes in the letter
16 of transmittal --

17 DR. MCCAY: Okay.

18 MR. PETERSON: -- because it is pretty hard to
19 put something in the overview that is not in the
20 document.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Gil.

22 MR. RADONSKI: I think the letter of

1 transmittal -- you know, we want to play this a little
2 coyly. We just don't want to say, like, those were our
3 marching orders and that is what we did.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

5 MR. RADONSKI: You know, wherever there is
6 agreement, I think it would be wise to allude to it,
7 but I wouldn't blare it out.

8 DR. BROMLEY: That is right.

9 Yes, Brian.

10 DR. MELZIAN: In the vein of the positive
11 attributes of this committee and why it is important to
12 meet face to face, perhaps in the transmittal letter,
13 however you would like to do this, you could just
14 mention how important it was for the subcommittees to
15 actually meet face to face and for this committee to
16 meet face to face versus conference calls.

17 We have this debate within the federal
18 agencies all the time, as I speak, about what is the
19 value added of actually meeting face to face versus
20 holding conference calls. And this is happening with
21 this National Water Quality Monitoring Network. So one
22 could just highlight the positive. You know, it is

1 very important that we can meet face to face. I can't
2 speak for NOAA, but I can speak for EPA. That has a
3 major bearing of how we use travel funds.

4 If you folks came back and say it is not
5 important for EPA to be here, we wouldn't be here. So
6 we actually allocate travel funds based on the need of
7 being there in person versus conference calls. So this
8 could be a way of just highlighting the positive, which
9 may help decisions in the future.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Good.

11 Other things? Yes, John.

12 DR. HALSEY: Well, I think just to support
13 Brian, is there anybody here who thinks that this could
14 have been accomplished through conference calls?

15 (Laughter.)

16 DR. HALSEY: I rest my case. Or e-mail.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. RADONSKI: It would have been easier for
19 Dan to ignore us when we raised our hand for a
20 conference call.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, right. Or just push a
22 number and it would go beep, beep, beep and say,

1 "Sorry, I didn't hear you."

2 Are people tired? Are you tired of this? We
3 have a whole afternoon and --

4 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

5 DR. BROMLEY: Because if we are not going to
6 have a conversation --

7 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. RADONSKI: Sometimes it is the gold star
10 for a chairman to say they adjourn their meeting early
11 because they got their business done.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 MR. RADONSKI: And I don't know if we are at
14 that point. I am not going to make a motion that way,
15 but --

16 DR. BROMLEY: We are not.

17 MR. RADONSKI: We are looking at you, but, you
18 know, we have done a lot, people are tired and I, for
19 one, sense that the conversation is lagging.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, it is lagging and that
21 is -- I see some hands. So now it won't lag, but we
22 have been -- we can stop this. We do have -- let's just

1 look at the agenda for a second and then I will
2 recognize the hands that are up. We have a future
3 organization of the FAC. You know, in a sense, maybe
4 we can't do that now. Subcommittee structure. That may
5 need to be postponed until November. I think that is
6 probably right.

7 MR. PETERSON: We need the next meeting dates
8 for sure.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. We do have to do that.
10 That is right.

11 DR. BROMLEY: We have something here about
12 leadership, identify others who would be interested in
13 serving as chair, vice-chair, et cetera. We can't hold
14 the elections until November. I believe Lauren -- are
15 you here, Lauren? So we will want to talk about that.
16 Lauren has an intervention for us about that.

17 And then we have review key agenda items for
18 the November meeting. Well, we are not really sure
19 about what we can do. The logistics for the next
20 meeting, that we can do. So those are the kinds of
21 things out there. Okay. I see Bob and I see Mel, but
22 I thought Mark had his hand up. Okay. Bob.

1 MR. ZALES: Yes, I have just got a question.
2 The short list that was up there that we put off to
3 discuss the overview letter --

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

5 MR. ZALES: -- do we have to finish that up or
6 is that just --

7 DR. BROMLEY: No, we do need to finish it, but
8 I am not sure where it stands.

9 MR. ZALES: And to get beyond that, I would
10 suggest that a lot of the items we discussed, as far as
11 chair and vice-chair, that the current chair and
12 vice-chair, they go forward until November and then we
13 discuss whatever happens then. The subcommittees can
14 be done then because we hopefully will have three new
15 people on the board.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. It is my understanding --

17 MR. ZALES: That may give a different
18 perspective to subcommittees and stuff like that. And
19 then agenda items, I would suggest that we can do by
20 e-mail and whatnot because we don't -- and I am assuming
21 that that meeting is still going to take place in
22 Texas?

1 DR. BROMLEY: Let us talk about that.

2 MS. WENZEL: The meeting is November 1st
3 through 3rd and it is going to be in the Gulf. We are
4 looking at Texas. New Orleans is also in the running.

5 MR. ZALES: Okay.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Good. Mel.

7 MR. MOON: Yes. I think Bob brought up the
8 same question I had. We had the list and it still
9 seems to be outstanding waiting for the other folks to
10 come together and we need to finish that up.

11 DR. BROMLEY: That is right. Yes. And they
12 are not quite ready I believe.

13 MR. MOON: Okay.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Mark?

15 DR. HIXON: One reason the conversation was
16 lagging for me is I wasn't certain where we are. Are we
17 still discussing next steps in general?

18 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, we are discussing the
19 future.

20 DR. HIXON: Okay. My general perspective on
21 that is that we have developed a document that is
22 basically an outline for future action and I would like

1 to see that outline developed more deeply. It includes
2 some of the items that Joe reviewed. You know, how
3 would the process look in a bit more detail.

4 I am thinking also in terms of developing some
5 of the scientific tools, in particular, that would be
6 useful for -- in terms of mapping GIS systems for
7 examining the distribution of resources, the
8 distributions of potential threats, gap analysis,
9 things of that sort. All of these things have been
10 mentioned before. Thanks.

11 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Dolly and then Barbara.

12 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I
13 wasn't -- I also wasn't sure quite where we were in
14 terms of next steps. I also think we --

15 DR. BROMLEY: We are kind of killing time
16 until this list is --

17 DR. GARZA: Okay. We need to -- I think we
18 need to hear from officials from NOAA, or whoever, as
19 to whether -- I don't know if they are supposed to
20 receive this report or accept this report or if it just
21 goes on a shelf and that is the end of it, but I think
22 we need some type of formal response.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Good. Barbara.

2 MS. STEVENSON: I was -- people are actually
3 coming forth for suggestions for the future now. When
4 there was a gap, I was going to suggest that after we
5 did the logistics, which took two seconds, we would
6 break, even though it is early, for lunch so that
7 people could get together their lists, because we are
8 all tired, so that after lunch we could come forward,
9 do the -- get the information, get the lists. And if
10 you don't have it then, you will have to wait until next
11 time to make one.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, that is a good idea.

13 Okay. Lauren, do you want to talk about
14 logistics?

15 MS. WENZEL: Yes. Barbara is right, it took
16 about two seconds. I mean, I -- we have the dates of
17 the next meeting, we are going to be looking at
18 locations. Jim Ray has been very helpful in giving me
19 some inside scoop on the Gulf and Bob has given me some
20 input as well. So we hope to have that nailed down
21 pretty soon.

22 And I think, you know, Alaska has been

1 mentioned as a possibility for the meeting after that.

2 So what I would like to do, I think, is -- as well as
3 the Great Lakes. So I think what I would like to do is
4 follow up with the members from Alaska and the Great
5 Lakes to talk about, you know, times of year and those
6 kinds of things and then work over e-mail to set a
7 spring meeting. So I think that is pretty much it.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Okay.

9 MS. WENZEL: I see someone from Alaska has
10 their hand up.

11 DR. BROMLEY: I can't imagine. Dolly.

12 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chairman, it seems like at the
13 last meeting we had talked that Alaska would actually
14 follow the Gulf. We were trying to actually get ahead
15 of them, but they didn't let us. And from the three
16 northern guides here, we were looking at hopefully the
17 early part of May in Sitka, which still has good king
18 salmon fishing, beautiful weather. They have a great
19 boat facility that could take us out to, like, the St.
20 Liziara, which is a bird watching site. It is
21 phenomenal. Let me see. What else can I say without
22 looking at Mr. Halsey.

1 DR. BROMLEY: So moved.

2 PARTICIPANT: Lots of whales.

3 DR. GARZA: Lots of whales. The one thing we
4 will have to check, though, is that the price does
5 spike and also there is a Sitka music summer festival,
6 which is like three weeks long and when it is going on,
7 you can't find a room. So we have to make sure we a
8 little bit precede that, although some people may want
9 to try and stay for part of it because it is a
10 phenomenal music festival. So that is our intent.

11 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, question.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 MR. PETERSON: Are those November dates locked
14 in concrete at this point?

15 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

16 MR. PETERSON: They are. Okay. They are
17 impossible for me. I don't know how many other people.

18 MS. WENZEL: It was the greatest good of the
19 greatest number.

20 MR. PETERSON: That is fine. That is fine.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Maximize the national benefit.

22 MR. PETERSON: I thought we said you couldn't

1 describe that so I am surprised.

2 DR. BROMLEY: You know it when you see it,
3 Max.

4 MR. PETERSON: That's right. Okay.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, David.

6 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I know you --
7 excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. BENTON: I know you have mentioned that
10 there are people working on a list and I was just
11 looking around the table trying to figure out who and
12 because it looks like everybody is here and I am just
13 wondering where that list might be and whether we can
14 get that done.

15 DR. BROMLEY: I wish we could. Who are the
16 people who are working on this list? Lauren?

17 MS. WENZEL: Well, we had asked the funding
18 and incentive people to turn their questions into
19 statements.

20 DR. BROMLEY: And they are doing that?

21 MS. WENZEL: I don't think they have had an
22 opportunity unless they have been working feverishly

1 while they --

2 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Okay. Steve Murray, you
3 had your hand up.

4 DR. MURRAY: Well, I was just simply going to
5 ask a question, I guess, of Joe and the Center. This
6 has to do with dealing with possible future tasks for
7 the -- you know, for the FAC. So one of the things it
8 says in the executive order is that we are to address
9 these various kinds of items -- there are eight of
10 them -- that are outlined in Section 4.

11 And there is a lot of science issues here that
12 are laid out in these numbers: science-based
13 identification and prioritization, integrated
14 assessment of ecological linkages, assessment of the
15 economic effects. These are, essentially, science and
16 approach and other kinds of questions and, you know, I
17 didn't hear any of these really surface in the list of
18 issues that the Center thought that we could all
19 provide help and guidance with regard to the FAC role.

20 MR. URAVITCH: I am going to defer to
21 Dr. Wahle on this one who is our guru for science.

22 DR. WAHLE: I have my own list and those are

1 on it. As you all know, we are -- now that we sort of
2 have the initial step taken care of, we are looking now
3 to begin the duties analyses and there are two ways --
4 well, first of all, we really look to you to work with
5 us on this. This is something we really need and are
6 seeking it.

7 But there are two ways we can do it. One is
8 to engage in the actual conduct of some of these
9 analyses, which, as you can imagine, is technical and
10 time consuming, maybe not all that rewarding, that kind
11 of thing, or to get your advice on how best to do it
12 and then some periodic oversight along the way.

13 My personal view is it is the latter that is
14 the most effective use of your time and interests and
15 we are right at that point right now. So I am hoping
16 that even in advance -- I don't know. I can't probably
17 say that, but sometime soon we would like to get some
18 conversation going about this. But these eight items,
19 or something like them in modern speak, is essentially
20 what we are -- my group in particular is posed to do.
21 So we are looking forward to that and working with you
22 on that.

1 DR. MURRAY: So I would just like them to make
2 the point, which I think we have made as well, but I
3 would like to just reemphasize it, that these tasks
4 that are laid out here are going to require some decent
5 dialogue and discussion. They may involve the need for
6 bringing additional people in.

7 We have had panels of folks this time through.
8 We may be looking at having panels or maybe teams of
9 people that are outside this group if we decide to go
10 there, but we also are clearly going to need the
11 frequency of meeting in person face to face to make
12 significant progress on this effort as we move forward,
13 particularly when it comes to these and other issues.

14 So, you know, I was involved with a Minerals
15 Management Service Advisory Panel and when I was, think
16 they were meeting three times a year and then it went
17 to two times a year. I think it is one time a year now
18 and it is real hard, I think, as an advisory group to
19 provide the kind of effort asked for and the results
20 that are asked for when you start to scale down the
21 kinds of meetings and the types of face to face
22 interactions that are so important to make these things

1 happen.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. I would -- that is right.

3 I would --

4 DR. MURRAY: But everybody knows that.

5 DR. BROMLEY: I am sorry. What?

6 DR. MURRAY: Everybody knows that.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, they know that and maybe
8 one of the things that we do in November is when we see
9 the list, see what they would like for us to do and we
10 have an idea about how many meetings we are going to be
11 able to have and essentially we will have a better idea
12 of what that -- at that point, we might need to just
13 communicate back to the secretaries that we can only do
14 one of these things. We intend to do one well rather
15 than three not very good at all. And what might be
16 good for this group to take a stand on.

17 We are not feathering our own nest, we are
18 simply saying, "Thanks very much. You have asked us to
19 do an impossible job and we decline the opportunity.
20 We would be really happy to do a crackup job on this
21 one and under the way things look, that is about all we
22 will be able to do."

1 Okay. We have this dilemma. The lunch was
2 organized for 12:30. I think we are trying to figure
3 out if we can be served early. Is the word --

4 PARTICIPANT: 12:15.

5 DR. BROMLEY: 12:15. Okay. What I would like
6 to do is recess us now.

7 DR. MCCAY: Excuse me. We have a brief
8 revision.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, you are ready now. Look
10 what it took. The threat of recess and all of a
11 sudden -- wait a minute. Are some people leaving? Do
12 some people have to go?

13 MR. PETERSON: Yes. Tundi and I have to go.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Tundi has to go, Max has to go.
15 I just want to thank them. I want to thank everybody
16 who has to go. If you don't have to go, you don't get
17 thanked, but if you have to go, we want to thank those
18 who are sneaking out, leaving, whatever for whatever
19 reason.

20 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. We couldn't have done it
22 without you.

1 MR. PETERSON: We couldn't have done it
2 without you obviously.

3 DR. MCCAY: Just before you two go, here is on
4 the screen what it now looks like for the incentives,
5 the funding and incentives part. It is just taken out
6 of question form. This is the funding and incentives
7 part that is taken out of the question format and put
8 into a declarative state.

9 MR. PETERSON: I think you have to go further
10 than just effective participation. I think we need to
11 spell out such things as some of the management stuff.

12 PARTICIPANT: Or bringing sites in.

13 DR. MCCAY: Well, we are trying to keep this
14 really short in line with the others here.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. I still -- well, would
16 people -- would you be willing to sit here for two or
17 three more minutes and maybe we can dispense with this
18 list or do you want to break? It looks like we are
19 sort of broken over here on the left. Maybe that is a
20 good time to move forward. Okay. Could people live
21 with this language? Dolly?

22 DR. GARZA: Mr. Chair, I think that I can live

1 with the language because as we start to work on it, we
2 will figure out how it needs to change.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. Is that okay? So
4 this would be number 4 then, Lauren, is that right?

5 MS. WENZEL: Right.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Could you zoom back out then.
7 Let's just presume that we are going to -- what does our
8 list look like then?

9 MS. WENZEL: Okay. Just to walk through it.
10 So 1 is the avoid harm language, 2 is the alternative
11 language that has been put together on tribal issues, 3
12 is the entity to formally recognize designation and 4
13 is the new financing and incentive language.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Lauren, why don't we
15 break.

16 David, go ahead.

17 MR. BENTON: I would like to make a motion.

18 DR. BROMLEY: If you are going to make a
19 motion, do so.

20 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
21 put this on the floor. Do you want to do that?

22 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. But you -- do it at

1 the microphone.

2 MR. BENTON: Could you scroll back to number
3 2, please, Lauren. Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would move
4 that we adopt the list that is on the screen, item
5 number 1. Item number 2, "Using the alternative
6 language, develop a process per executive order." That
7 one. Item number 3 -- could you scroll back up. There
8 we go. Item number 3 and item number 4 with the
9 language, the new language that is in larger type that
10 begins, "There is a need to identify existing or needed
11 monetary" and continuing onward.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 MR. BENTON: And is there anything under that,
14 Lauren?

15 MS. WENZEL: No.

16 MR. BENTON: And that is it, Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. ZALES: I second and call for the
18 question.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. So it has been moved and
20 seconded and you followed David's work there. Are you
21 ready for the question on this?

22 MS. STEVENSON: One quick clarification.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

2 MS. STEVENSON: On item 3, it is the new
3 language. There is crossed out and underlined
4 language. It is the underlined language, not the
5 combination of both.

6 MR. BENTON: As modified in the text.

7 MS. STEVENSON: Right. You didn't say that.

8 MR. BENTON: Sorry. As modified in the text,
9 Mr. Chairman, as consistent with the intent of my
10 motion.

11 DR. BROMLEY: The editor in me would like to
12 unsplit the infinitive and I would like to put the
13 "formally" in front of the "to approve," but you know how
14 editors are. "Formally to recognize" -- yes. So is
15 everybody okay with this? Are you ready for the
16 question?

17 PARTICIPANT: Yes.

18 DR. BROMLEY: All in favor say aye.

19 (Chorus of ayes.)

20 DR. BROMLEY: Opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Here is the deal. We

1 have until what, Lauren? We are going to eat lunch --
2 pardon me?

3 MS. WENZEL: Twenty minutes until lunch.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, we have 20 minutes until
5 lunch. I thin you can figure out what to do in that 20
6 minutes. Shall we reconvene at 1:30. And there is a
7 very good chance we will have a half an hour's worth of
8 stuff and we will be through.

9 MR. ZALES: That is kind of my point. If all
10 we are going to have 15 to 30 minutes of discussion, I
11 would think it would probably be more useful, let's
12 finish up.

13 DR. BROMLEY: To have it now?

14 MR. ZALES: And then everybody -- that way you
15 don't have to break up and come back. You can be done
16 with it.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Fair enough. What is left
18 to do, Lauren.

19 MS. WENZEL: It depends on whether the
20 Committee wants to discuss further the issues for the
21 future.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Right.

1 MR. BENTON: Is that the only thing that is
2 hanging out there, Mr. Chairman?

3 DR. BROMLEY: I believe it is. Is that right,
4 Lauren? She is saying that in terms of -- all of us
5 expire on the 23rd of June, or at least we -- our
6 official sanction expires on the 23rd of June, and that
7 includes the leadership. So somebody had earlier said
8 that, you know, we will go forward to the new structure
9 with our old leadership, but we won't; is that right,
10 Lauren?

11 MS. WENZEL: Yes. With the --

12 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

14 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

15 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

16 MR. BENTON: Over here.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, over there.

18 MR. BENTON: Yes. Me again.

19 DR. BROMLEY: You have got --

20 MR. BENTON: I am not going to move to
21 adjourn. I was going to actually do something about
22 the chairmanship.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

2 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I would actually
3 make a motion that you remain chair until a new chair
4 is appointed or you are not reappointed to the
5 Committee. And the reason --

6 MR. ZALES: And I would ask Bonnie to remain.
7 I would say both remain in their position until the
8 next meeting.

9 MR. BENTON: Fine.

10 MR. ZALES: And provided they are both --

11 MR. BENTON: Right.

12 MR. ZALES: Both back on the Committee.

13 MR. BENTON: And if I have a second to that --

14 MR. BENTON: Second.

15 MR. BENTON: I have a second to that.

16 Mr. Chair, and the reason for that is you are doing a
17 great job and we need some continuity and so there is
18 no ambiguity in this interim period until the
19 appointments are made and until the new FAC convenes
20 and does -- if they do something different, we have got
21 that all nailed down so then there is no ambiguity
22 about that.

1 DR. BROMLEY: I am not opposed to that, but I
2 don't know that it is legal. So I mean --

3 MR. BENTON: It is totally legal.

4 MS. WILLIAMS: I have a question. Did we ever
5 say how long our chair could serve as chair? Did we
6 ever -- because if we didn't, there are many other
7 organizations, such as the council, where some chairs
8 remain chairs for 12 years, some of them have 1 year
9 terms, some of them has 2 year terms.

10 DR. BROMLEY: We never specified that.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: We didn't say?

12 DR. BROMLEY: No.

13 MS. WILLIAMS: It shouldn't -- I don't see how
14 it can be a problem.

15 DR. BROMLEY: I guess my only -- I mean, if we
16 cease to exist as an official body on the 23rd of June,
17 do we do that?

18 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

19 DR. BROMLEY: Then how can Bonnie and I
20 continue as officers of a body that doesn't exist? This
21 is what I don't --

22 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman?

1 MR. ZALES: If we don't exist, we don't need
2 officers.

3 MR. BENTON: Mr Chairman?

4 DR. BROMLEY: That is true.

5 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Bob. And that was
6 what my motion said, Mr. Chairman.

7 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Let's let Lauren speak for
8 a second.

9 MS. WENZEL: I just wanted to say that granted
10 it is not possible to guarantee, but our intention is
11 to have no break in service and to reappoint all the
12 members before any members' terms expired and I have
13 been assured by our attorneys that if there is a small
14 break in service, that that is benignly overlooked and
15 that it would be only if there was a long break in
16 service of many months that it would be assumed that
17 the Committee was not intended to continue or that
18 those members were not intended to continue.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Steve.

20 David, did you make the motion?

21 MR. BENTON: I made the motion, Mr. Chairman.

22 All I was going to -- all I wanted to do is clarify

1 was the intent there a bit and that is that it is my
2 understanding that if the Committee ceases to exist
3 after the 23rd forever --

4 DR. BROMLEY: That is true.

5 MR. BENTON: -- we don't need officers, but
6 this is to insure continuity across a period of time
7 where there may not be certainty.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

9 MR. BENTON: All right? And so it is the
10 sense -- it is a sense that you -- it is a sense of the
11 body and it affirms that, and obviously there are
12 matters that may get -- legal matters that may get in
13 the way, but that would be the intention of the motion.

14 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. And has it been seconded?

15 MR. BENTON: Yes.

16 MS. WILLIAMS: I seconded it.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Sorry. Yes. Yes, Lauren?

18 MS. WENZEL: Just further clarification. I
19 just wanted to let people know that the charter does
20 specify that the chair and vice-chair have two-year
21 terms and they were elected in November of 2003. So
22 that would take us through November 2005 and the

1 intention at the November meeting would be to hold a
2 new election for the chair and vice-chair.

3 And one of the intentions behind this agenda
4 item was simply to announce that, to make it clear
5 about the process, and to also ask people to consider,
6 you know, whether or not they would be interested in
7 putting themselves forward for a leadership position
8 and to agree, as a committee, on the process, such as
9 encouraging those who would be interested in a
10 leadership position to make their intentions known
11 shortly before the meeting so that people could come
12 prepared to vote.

13 DR. BROMLEY: The nominations, if I may --

14 MS. WENZEL: Right.

15 DR. BROMLEY: I thought part of it was that if
16 you don't want to serve, but you would like to nominate
17 someone to do that, that that should take place now.
18 Is that correct, Lauren?

19 MS. WENZEL: Well, we were going to suggest
20 that, but not limit it to this meeting at all because I
21 know some people may not be prepared and obviously
22 people can nominate at the November meeting, but it

1 would be a benefit -- I think we did this at the last
2 election. People made their intentions known shortly
3 before the meeting and it was just helpful coming into
4 the meeting to know who was interested in serving in
5 those capacities.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

7 MR. BENTON: I call the question on my motion,
8 Mr. Chairman.

9 DR. BROMLEY: Is everyone clear on David's
10 motion that -- I guess it is -- David, why don't you
11 restate it.

12 MR. BENTON: My motion is that you and Bonnie
13 remain as chair and vice-chair through the period
14 leading up to the next meeting where the elections
15 would occur and that -- or you are not reappointed to
16 the Committee. In the event you are not reappointed to
17 the Committee after January 23rd, of course you couldn't
18 be an officer.

19 DR. BROMLEY: June 23rd.

20 MR. BENTON: But it would be -- it is
21 basically you and -- the current chair and current
22 vice-chair would remain that way until the November

1 meeting and the election and that there be no
2 uncertainty about that. And that is anticipation that
3 you do get reappointed and therefore you can serve in
4 that regard.

5 DR. BROMLEY: I guess everybody is clear. Is
6 that okay? Yes, Steven?

7 DR. MURRAY: Well, just let me ask this. In
8 the event that there is a lag time here between the
9 June termination and the next period -- what we really
10 want, I think, is for you folks to be our designated
11 representatives, whether there is a committee or not.
12 So I would say chair and/or the designated
13 representatives of this body.

14 MR. BENTON: I think it is a sense of the
15 body, it is not necessarily a legally binding kind of
16 thing.

17 DR. MURRAY: Yes. Exactly.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Can we vote? Kay, is
19 your hand up?

20 MS. WILLIAMS: I want to vote.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Vote. Okay. Are we ready to
22 vote. All in favor of the motion say aye.

1 (Chorus of ayes.)

2 DR. BROMLEY: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Were there any opposed?

5 PARTICIPANT: No.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. I am not offended if
7 there were, I just wasn't sure I heard.

8 MR. BENTON: And you want to know who it was.
9 We know what is going on.

10 (Laughter.)

11 DR. BROMLEY: David, I knew it was you. Your
12 hand was up. Oh, no.

13 (Laughter.)

14 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, Kay.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: A question for Lauren. Is New
16 Orleans or Texas set in stone or are there other Gulf
17 coastal areas that you maybe would consider such as
18 Mississippi?

19 MS. WENZEL: We were headed towards the
20 western gulf just because we have had meetings in
21 Florida, both the FAC and we have also had a state
22 workshop there. So we have had a large presence in

1 Florida. So we were thinking of just spreading our
2 presence around.

3 MS. WILLIAMS: I wasn't thinking of Florida.

4 DR. BROMLEY: Ms. Williams might want to
5 remind us that Mississippi is not Florida.

6 MS. WENZEL: Right. Right. But the western
7 gulf had come up. It is not yet set in stone, Kay. We
8 could talk about it.

9 MS. WILLIAMS: All right. Thanks.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, Brian, was your hand up.

11 DR. MELZIAN: Just a question. Can the
12 existing chair and co-chair be nominated again?

13 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

14 DR. MELZIAN: Okay.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Now where are we?

16 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, I am getting ready
17 to make a motion to adjourn unless Bob Zales, are you
18 going to do it?

19 MR. ZALES: Yes.

20 MR. BENTON: I will defer to my friend, Bob
21 Zales.

22 DR. BROMLEY: We have two emergent senses from

1 the ends of the horseshoe here, but anybody else before
2 we get back into that? Is there anything else that we
3 need to cover, talk about, say? No?

4 MR. ZALES: Motion to adjourn.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Well, wait a minute. I want to
6 thank -- did we vote on this?

7 MR. ZALES: Yes.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, we did.

9 MS. STEVENSON: Well, I have a question.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

11 MS. STEVENSON: Bob Zales had an issue and
12 somebody else had an issue that they wanted put on the
13 list of things that we were going -- we wished --
14 desired to be assigned to be discussed in the future
15 and we dropped the whole list, which is fine with me, I
16 don't have anything to go on the list, but I know some
17 other people said very strongly that they had things
18 that they wanted on that list. So, you know, it is do
19 the list now or never.

20 MR. ZALES: It is my understanding that that
21 stuff was going to be moved to the future discussions.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. That is right.

1 MS. STEVENSON: That is the list. The future
2 discussions that we have to ask -- I mean, to ask us to
3 talk about it.

4 MR. ZALES: Well, no. What I meant future,
5 was at future meetings, not here.

6 DR. BROMLEY: I think it is covered, Barbara.
7 I think it is -- we talked about it and they know
8 about it.

9 MR. ZALES: My concern is covered.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Dolly?

11 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I think
12 we are trying to rush a little bit too much to get out
13 of here and we are missing a few things. One is the
14 agenda items for the November meeting, whether or not
15 they would include those four topics that we just
16 approved or whether or not they would start to include
17 the things that we thought would roll over. I think
18 that is important for us. I mean, we have spent, you
19 know, a quarter of a day deciding what the next meeting
20 will look like and now we are ready to sort of swish
21 out of here.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. I am not quite ready to

1 adjourn. You can tell the restaurant 12:30 will suit
2 us just fine.

3 Yes, Wally.

4 DR. PEREYRA: Mr. Chairman, this goes back to
5 the whole issue of meeting sites. Given the fact that
6 coral reef environments are particularly, I think, good
7 candidates in many cases for MPA's of various sorts, is
8 there any possibility that in some time in the future
9 we might have a meeting in Puerto Rico or some
10 Caribbean location? I just throw this out because I
11 think that would be a very -- could be a very
12 instructive meeting for us.

13 DR. BROMLEY: We will take that under the
14 environment. It is a nice -- I thought maybe you were
15 going to propose that we not go to Alaska and I couldn't
16 quite imagine how this was going to be played out. It
17 is a future meeting, not a replacement.

18 Bonnie?

19 DR. MCCAY: One agenda item that we may want
20 to consider -- I am not sure how this goes, but it
21 seems to me that now that we have approved our report
22 and we have an overview and we don't have an executive

1 summary that, as several people have mentioned, people
2 will be putting together versions of summaries of the
3 report, PowerPoints and so forth. And I would imagine
4 that the MPA Center is going to be doing that.

5 So and I -- and you -- that the Center will
6 inform us about what -- how they are doing that. But I
7 mean, I guess what I would like to say is I urge the
8 Center to do that and that one of the things that we
9 may want to look at our next meeting is what that
10 comes -- you know, how that looks and whether or not we
11 like it and so on and so forth because I think people
12 will want to have some input into how it is
13 represented.

14 And I am not saying that the Center should
15 desist from doing it until it comes before the
16 Committee, but that certainly would be one of the
17 important items that we look at is the public
18 representation of our work.

19 DR. BROMLEY: George and then Kay and then
20 Jim.

21 MR. LAPOINTE: The issue of our future actions
22 is an important one. I am with you, Mr. Chairman, we

1 have got to have the issues of the undone things on
2 there.

3 DR. BROMLEY: That is right.

4 MR. LAPOINTE: I think we should all reflect
5 on the report and the executive order and look at those
6 things. Particularly the executive order. There is
7 some things there we probably haven't addressed. We
8 have mentioned a few things and we should allow the
9 two -- well, all the federal agencies, but the two
10 departments to reflect on the report and for them, as
11 well, to add things to the list about things that we
12 have not done to their satisfaction or that they think
13 need additional work.

14 So I think it is a combination of things. And
15 we will have new members who may reflect differently on
16 that list and should be able to it as well. So I would
17 think that over the -- prior to the November meeting,
18 staff could start sharing with the list of undone
19 things that the two departments have done that, as well
20 as soliciting our ideas.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Yes, that is right. I was going
22 to propose that. And this -- I mean, these things are

1 already there and these other things that have been
2 pulled off come back in and I think we can communicate
3 to the staff, we can communicate with Lauren with our
4 issues. We can kind of build that up.

5 Joe. I will come back to Kay and Jim, but
6 yes.

7 MR. URAVITCH: What I think would be useful is
8 for you to send the ideas you have to us at this point
9 because the process will be that we have to recommend
10 to leadership in both agencies what we are going to ask
11 you to address starting at the next meeting. These are
12 the questions that the Department of Commerce and the
13 Department of the Interior are going to want the
14 advisory committee to respond to so that if you have,
15 you know, issues you think are important based on what
16 you have accomplished and where you think we need to
17 go, we would like to hear those and we are going to
18 have to then go forward to the agencies and get their
19 views.

20 MR. LAPOINTE: One bit of follow-up. We have
21 had many presentations and we have had a lot of people
22 who have dedicated a lot of time to come and share

1 their ideas with us. I would ask that staff look
2 through the presentations and the views listed in
3 the -- by those various speakers to see if there are --
4 there may be a lot of ideas we don't like, but to see
5 their ideas about things that need to be done as well
6 so we can use that as we deliberate about moving
7 forward.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Very good. Thank you.

9 Okay. I have Kay and I have Jim and I have
10 Tony and I have Steven.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
12 think Bonnie was probably out of the room when we
13 talked about the executive summary and what was going
14 to go forward or did I misunderstand? I thought that
15 what we voted on is exactly what is going to go
16 forward, nothing more and nothing less, just this
17 document, the other items we just voted on. And as far
18 as the executive summary, I guess Lauren is going to do
19 that and that would be attached, but that is not going
20 to wait until the November meeting or are we waiting --

21 DR. BROMLEY: No. I am sorry.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: I may have misunderstood.

1 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. We are talking about -- if
2 I -- nothing changes from what we agreed with you
3 earlier.

4 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

5 DR. BROMLEY: Okay? Nothing changes. We are
6 not talking about the report anymore.

7 MS. WENZEL: There is no executive summary.

8 DR. BROMLEY: And there is no executive
9 summary and no one will write it. We are the only
10 people who can write an executive summary.

11 Now I guess I was distracted during the early
12 part of your comment, Kay. So I beg you to -- could
13 you restate it. What are your concerns?

14 MS. WILLIAMS: I heard Bonnie say something
15 about an executive summary and about different
16 people --

17 DR. BROMLEY: If she did, we will whip her
18 around.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: She didn't? Okay. I thought
20 she said something about executive summary and each one
21 would have their views as far as what would be in their
22 own summaries and I was concerned about how that was

1 going to be --

2 DR. MCCAY: No-no. I was just referring to
3 discussion about how various people will, you know,
4 will talk about this in different ways, and so on and
5 so forth. You know, I mean, there is nothing to
6 prevent that from happening, but that the MPA Center
7 will likely, besides putting our document on the
8 website, will probably be coming up with some sorts of
9 public documents, short documents, that refer to this
10 and represent it in some way.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I misunderstood.

12 DR. MCCAY: PowerPoint presentations that are
13 given and so forth.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I misunderstood. Thank
15 you.

16 DR. MCCAY: Yes.

17 DR. BROMLEY: Is that okay, Kay?

18 All right. I have Jim, Tony and Steve.

19 DR. RAY: Yes. I was essentially saying what
20 Bonnie just said and that it would be very useful if
21 between the MPA Center and their input from Interior,
22 to try to quickly come out with a PowerPoint

1 presentation, which essentially encapsulates this
2 entire report, and then share that with the Committee
3 members so those that don't want to reinvent the wheel,
4 can use that for presentations to their constituents,
5 et cetera.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Absolutely. Thank you.

7 Okay. I have Tony and then Steve.

8 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This
9 may be because I was out of the room and I missed
10 something, but did we talk about the next steps with
11 this document, what the actual steps would be?

12 DR. BROMLEY: With the document we just
13 approved?

14 DR. CHATWIN: Yes.

15 DR. BROMLEY: The next steps are it will be
16 posted on the website, it will be transmitted to the
17 secretaries.

18 MS. WENZEL: Yes. Reverse the order of those
19 two.

20 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. Yes. Lauren, you tell the
21 next steps.

22 MS. WENZEL: Yes. The next steps are,

1 basically, we would make sure that all the technical
2 corrections that might be -- need to be made, would be
3 made, and then put together -- Dan will put together
4 the transmittal letter and with the overview and the
5 completed document, it will be formally transmitted to
6 the two secretaries through the undersecretary of
7 Commerce and the counterpart at Department of Interior
8 is what the charter says.

9 Then after that, it will be a public document,
10 we will put it on the website. We also -- we didn't
11 talk about this earlier, but the comment about public
12 comment and presenters reminded me that we would send
13 the document to everyone who has provided public
14 comment and everyone who has come to present to the FAC
15 and obviously to a broader mailing list of folks to
16 make people aware of it, if not put it on mailing
17 lists. We have listservs to make folks aware of it.

18 DR. CHATWIN: Okay. Well, that is helpful.
19 Thank you. So right now there are no plans for a
20 public commentary, or something like that, on the
21 actual document, right?

22 MS. WENZEL: That is correct. I mean, we are

1 currently engaged in a public process to solicit input
2 on the framework for the national system and to ask for
3 comment on that and I think we will definitely make
4 people aware of the FAC's work as part of that public
5 process, but we hadn't envisioned the public comment
6 period, per se, on the FAC report.

7 DR. CHATWIN: Okay.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Okay, Tony?

9 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you.

10 DR. BROMLEY: All right. With luck, Steve
11 will have the last word.

12 DR. MURRAY: I just -- George just make a
13 comment a few moments ago that made me think of
14 something and that is, is there a reason for you, in
15 your letter of transmittal, to attach a list of all the
16 very fine folks who came before us and made
17 presentations? I mean, basically, there is a desire to
18 have a lot of consultations throughout the executive
19 order and maybe that ought to be moved forward. I won't
20 say anything beyond that except to --

21 DR. BROMLEY: What about -- it is a nice idea.
22 What if it serves as an appendix to the report, not in

1 the transmittal letter. Would that satisfy you, Steve?

2 Are people comfortable with this, that the MPA

3 Center -- I am sure you have a list, right, of

4 everybody who has come before us? We thank them. Let's

5 attach that as the group from whom we have heard.

6 DR. MURRAY: I think it is good to have that

7 as part of the record.

8 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. I agree.

9 DR. MURRAY: And the record intact with the
10 products that we have been --

11 DR. BROMLEY: Is that all right with people
12 who have approved the report that we append this to it?

13 Kay, is that okay?

14 MS. WILLIAMS: It is fine with, Mr. Chairman.

15 DR. BROMLEY: Dolly and then Wally and Mark.

16 You didn't have the last word, Steve.

17 DR. GARZA: I guess I wanted to follow up on
18 what Joe said. I wasn't sure when you said, you know,
19 what shall we be addressing first, that you would take
20 that, you know, to your bosses. So were you trying to
21 ask us to say something now that you would take forward
22 before the November meeting?

1 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, that is correct. I mean,
2 we -- as part of this discussion that was on the agenda
3 today, I mean, we are looking for ideas. We obviously
4 have some of our own, but it has got to be run through
5 leadership in Commerce and Interior, but we also value
6 your views on this, based on the work you have been
7 doing and where you see this heading, in terms of what
8 you think are important issues that need to be
9 addressed and would like to hear those so that we can
10 consider that as part of the package we are going to
11 put forward to leadership in both departments.

12 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

13 DR. GARZA: So following up on that, would the
14 logical first thing be what is those four things that
15 we just approved as well as the two that were moved to
16 future items?

17 DR. BROMLEY: Right. There are six things
18 right there.

19 MR. URAVITCH: Yes. That is exactly what we
20 were thinking.

21 DR. BROMLEY: And you are open to others.

22 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, we are.

1 DR. BROMLEY: After we have left here.

2 MR. URAVITCH: That is correct.

3 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

4 MR. URAVITCH: Because we are looking for
5 ideas basically.

6 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. So please, you know,
7 submit them. Wally.

8 DR. PEREYRA: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it
9 is the sense of the senate or not, but it seems to me
10 that it would also be helpful to have the full
11 committee designated as an appendix in the report also.

12 PARTICIPANT: And staff.

13 DR. PEREYRA: Yes, and staff. And with proper
14 noting the chairman, sub-chair -- vice-chair and also
15 the three subcommittee chairs.

16 DR. BROMLEY: Subcommittee chairs.

17 DR. PEREYRA: Yes.

18 DR. BROMLEY: And actually, Wally, if I may,
19 it should list the executive committee.

20 DR. PEREYRA: Yes.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Because each subcommittee had a
22 chair and a vice-chair and they comprised this -- the

1 executive committee. So that structure should be
2 there.

3 DR. PEREYRA: Depicting our committee and how
4 it --

5 DR. BROMLEY: That is another annex. Thank
6 you.

7 Mark?

8 DR. HIXON: Just a point of clarification.
9 The list of input, external input.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Yes.

11 DR. HIXON: That will be both the panel
12 members and the public comment speakers; is that
13 correct, or not?

14 MS. WENZEL: What is your wish?

15 DR. HIXON: My wish would be everyone.

16 DR. BROMLEY: People who appeared before us.
17 Dana has the roster of everyone who spoke. They should
18 be listed. Is that right?

19 DR. HIXON: Right.

20 DR. BROMLEY: This is an indication of the
21 extent to which we have listened to people. It should
22 be there. Okay. Barbara?

1 MS. STEVENSON: What becomes obvious when you
2 look at the list of presenters and panels is that there
3 are significant interests on this committee who have
4 not had panels before you and at one point, the
5 commercial and the recreational were going to be
6 covered by other cultural. We didn't have that panel.

7 And I am not suggesting the next meeting is
8 the appropriate time, but there are a number of
9 interests and users that it may be appropriate in the
10 future to have panelists and you should be very
11 conscious that some of us who wanted to have panels did
12 not have them to date.

13 DR. BROMLEY: Yes. And can you submit that to
14 us, Barbara, as ideas for --

15 MS. STEVENSON: That is just for whenever it
16 fits into the schedule. It is not something that I
17 believe that Joe and them have to tell us to do. It is
18 how we do it. And we just should recognize that
19 because of the process and because of timing, et
20 cetera, that not every appropriate group was heard
21 from.

22 DR. BROMLEY: Exactly.

1 MS. STEVENSON: Yes.

2 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. How are we doing now? Do
3 we need to a vote on all of these appendices that we
4 are going to attach? Do you feel comfortable with
5 them? Is it okay? Now what do people want to do?
6 Kay?

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Yes, Mr. Chairman. And
8 we are just putting their names. We are not actually
9 presenting their presentations.

10 DR. BROMLEY: Oh, no, we are just listing
11 them.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Only their names will be -- I
13 just keep worrying about this document growing. I want
14 to make sure people read what is important.

15 DR. BROMLEY: These are the annexes.

16 MS. WENZEL: I think names and affiliations is
17 what we usually do.

18 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

19 DR. BROMLEY: Is that okay, Kay?

20 MS. WILLIAMS: That is acceptable.

21 DR. BROMLEY: Name and affiliation. That is
22 all. We would not dare try to capture what they said

1 to us. Others? Okay. Before we -- yes, Terry?

2 MR. O'HALLORAN: I just -- I don't know if this
3 is the right time, but before we adjourn, I just want
4 to say I am really concerned with the budget of the MPA
5 Center being reduced, primarily the effect that that
6 will have on their capacity to do a lot of the things
7 that we are asking in our recommendations.

8 And so any kind of quiet words that might be
9 appropriate to different state congressional
10 delegations I think might be helpful. And I think this
11 is a time where we -- it is good for us to become
12 advocates of what we have just produced and we can't --
13 we won't be very effective with it if the MPA Center is
14 not effective with it and that is contingent upon their
15 budget and their ability to have capacity. So right at
16 the time we need capacity, we are looking at losing the
17 capacity from the Center and I am worried about that.

18 DR. BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you. Is that about
19 it? I would like to, again, thank the staff, all of
20 the staff, for everything they did for us. I would
21 like to acknowledge our loss going forward of a very
22 important member of our group, and that is Mel Moon,

1 who we will be impoverished without Mel, and we are
2 very grateful for your commitment to this enterprise.
3 Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 DR. BROMLEY: I only want to say also that it
6 was quite inspiring yesterday to see us come together.

7 Nobody got everything they wanted. I think everybody
8 got a little bit of what they felt good about and we
9 should feel good about ourselves. That is all I am
10 going to say.

11 I think there are at least two people who want
12 to move that we adjourn, but maybe there are more. Is
13 there a motion to adjourn?

14 MR. ZALES: I will make a motion to adjourn.

15 MR. BENTON: I guess I will second it again.
16 I wanted to go back to that --

17 (Laughter.)

18 DR. BROMLEY: All in favor of adjourning, say
19 aye.

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 DR. BROMLEY: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

1 DR. BROMLEY: Thank you very much. All of
2 you. We are adjourned.

3 (Whereupon at 12:23 p.m., the meeting was
4 concluded.)

5 * * * * *

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17