

**Oregon International Port of Coos Bay
Marine Reserves Recommendation Committee
July 28, 2010; 5:30pm**

**North Bend City/Coos Curry Housing Authorities
1700 Monroe Street, North Bend, OR 97459**

MINUTES

Attendance: Mike Boehme; Wayne Butler; Gus Gates; Mike Graybill; Mike Helfrich; Jan Hodder; Dave Lacey; Mike Lane; Matt LeDoux; Bob Main; Don Peabody; Valerie Pena; Jim Pex Sr.; Bill Poppe; Reg Pullen; Steve Rumrill; Alan Shanks; Dean Warner; Margie Whitmer;

Non-Voting Members: Crystal Shoji, Facilitator; Jamie Doyle, Oregon Sea Grant; Cristen Don, ODF&W; Rodger Craddock, City of Coos Bay; Kathy Wall, Port; Donna Scholl, Port.

Guests: Whit Sheard, Oceana; Susan Allen, Our Ocean

Opening: The meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Chairman Pex.

Opening Remarks & Updates

Jim asked for self-introductions for the record.

Approval of Minutes of June 16, 2010

Jim Pex asked for comments on the minutes. Hearing none he asked for a motion for approval.

Upon a motion by Mike Helfrich (seconded by Bob Main) the minutes of June 16, 2010 were approved.

Presentation of Confirmed Ongoing Process to Date

Jim asked to look at the affirmed process the committee has been going through and the agreement the committee had on how to proceed. He read through the items beginning at (a). He said the committee is now at step (f) which is to “develop one or more ideas for a committee recommendation. Jim continued reading steps (g through i) where he felt at (i) the committee would be looking at a pivotal vote and finalize a recommendation to the Port Commission. Jim said that he and Don Peabody had been talking about how to proceed with the recommendations and asked Kathy how many she had. Kathy responded that two had been submitted to her but that she expected at least two more tonight. She then asked committee members if there were any additional presentations which resulted in a total of five. Jim then reviewed the steps for proposal presentation allowing for individuals to ask questions regarding the proposals and presenters to have five minutes for delivering their information in order to get through all of them. Jim said at the end of the presentations, Crystal would go over them and guide the committee

discussion on what to do next with the proposals. Don asked for clarification of all presenters and the number of proposals as follows: one from Gus, one from Mr. Lacey, Dr. Hodder, Dr. Rumrill, and Alan Shanks together for a total of three scenarios, and one each written and submitted by absentee committee members Mr. Griffith and Dr. Shimotakahara for a total of seven.

Response from ODF&W Regarding Geographic Scope

Jim talked about his presentation at the last OPAC meeting where he discussed the continuing efforts of this committee and where he raised a question about this committee's venue. He said that OPAC's legal advisor replied that the language is quite clear and says at Cape Arago, Seven Devils. Jim wasn't sure why this wasn't clear but stated that this is the legal interpretation. Jim said he gave a presentation to OPAC regarding this committee's successes. He also spoke about the committee's processes and how he feels this committee is ahead of the other groups that fall under HB 3013. Some of the other group's participants are having difficulty in understanding the process. Jim said that one of the things Ed Bowles provided was the sideboard, context and decision points for community team recommendations. He referred to the back page of a document "decision points for the recommendations" for whatever comes out of the committees and read the following: Are there issues with OPAC recommended boundaries relative to the sideboards, which hit this group directly, what are our boundaries? If so, what modifications do you recommend fixing this situation? Jim felt that this is where there has been a great deal of confusion. He went on to talk about step (2a), do the boundaries need to be expanded, contracted, rejected or otherwise altered to fix an issue. Does an MPA help fix an issue? If yes, what activities would be allowed? Could an alternative site help fix this issue and if so, where? Are these modifications needed to meet the sideboards of the Marine Reserves individually or collectively along the coast that are (1) large enough to allow scientific evaluation for ecological benefits, and (2) small enough to avoid significant economic and social impacts? Step (3) what is the justification for the recommended changes to OPAC if there are such. Step (4) some reassessment, what are the socio economic impacts if something is put forward. What are the specific goals for any site that is put forward? And, report how the final recommendation was arrived at either by a voting process and degree of level for support. In the letter from the Governor to the committee there is an issue in the letter where he states how seriously our proposal will be accepted depends on the degree of consensus within the group. Jim said he stated before OPAC "I don't know how you do that." He went on to say no matter what you propose it is unlikely we are going to have 100% consensus. So we go through a vote. If we vote on an issue and it passes why is 51% any different than 75%, or 85% or 63%? It is still a Democratic process and I don't know how you quantify that. He said there was an introduction that came out just before the meeting that was a national ocean policy, a federal policy on oceans. Jim said that he had read a lot of pros and cons on the internet on this ocean policy. The last thing that was brought up at the OPAC meeting is that they will all remain there until the Governor leaves office. There was one other contentious issue that came up which was the Nearshore Research Task Force. There was a proposal to put together a scientific technical advisory committee. Under OPAC there is a staff committee of scientific advisors that advises OPAC on a variety of issues. It was put forward that this become a

permanent part of Oregon government designed after the National Academy of Sciences outline. Some of the key features of this outline are the scientific committee would be expanded from 12 members to 15 to 20 members with all nominations to be on the committee coming from within the committee with no outside input. The other point is that there is an executive committee that would seek private funding for public use. If you look at the list of persons, it was agency designees for the State of Oregon and one person at large. This proposal was not well received and it had the look of what has been acquired in California. Betsy Johnson, a Senator from the north coast spent 30 minutes going over the proposals and talking about why she didn't like them. That concluded the presentation by Jim who asked for comments.

Gus wanted to make clarifications. He said that he and Mike sit on the Near Shore Research Task Force and stated he heard some of the concerns that were brought forward. He said there was a Task Force meeting last week, and as far as the committee makeup, there are State Agencies and there was a recommendation to further expand the committee. Gus said it was hard to determine what was going to happen with that recommendation during the next phase with the legislature. He also said the Task Force recommendation was that it be a seven member committee consisting of the three main agencies that work on issues, a representative from OPAC, a representative from STAC, a representative from the fishing community, a representative from the conservation community, as well as a public at large. Regarding the nomination process for STAC committee members, he definitely heard an interest in having open nominations from the public. He felt scientists should be a key piece. If anyone is interested in reviewing the recommendations or submitting comments you can do so by visiting web site oregonfishing.info. Gus felt a lot of the concern had been clarified and that the issue wasn't as controversial as it once was. Jim felt the recommended changes would be good. Don asked who had made the proposal. Gus responded that it was part of HB 3106 which established the Near Shore Research Task Force which has 14 members. Don asked who sponsored HB 3106. Gus responded that it was their representative caucus.

Alan Shanks said that he had been discussing how ODF&W doesn't have much money for actual research studies. A lot of their money is used for a variety of management issues so that is why a variety of research projects are left unstudied. It is difficult for ODF&W to do that type of work because they would need to hire people and keeping them on staff, so a suggestion was made that perhaps the State could put up the money toward research to be developed to further our understanding of coastal resources. He also said what they had in mind is something along the lines of the National Science Foundation and Ling cod research where an RFP would be developed and the research community would put out proposals which would then get funded. This would be a less expensive way to accomplish research needs without ODF&W acquiring a bunch of infrastructure. That proposal ended up morphing into what we see now.

Facilitated Discussion with Crystal Shoji, Facilitator

Crystal said as Jim had pointed out the process is moving along. The first item under facilitated discussion includes discussion about the upcoming town hall meetings. Kathy, Jim and Crystal have been talking about some different ways to conduct the town hall meetings including the traditional method like a public hearing where people come forward and say what they think and second would be information stations. A decision doesn't need to be made tonight. Some of how the town hall meetings are structured will come from whatever the recommendations are for the alternatives that this group decides. We can take input at this time if anyone has something to say or suggest or we can just move on. Mike Helfrich asked Kathy if she anticipated when this group makes its final recommendation that the Commission will hold some type of public hearing. Kathy responded that the Commission would wait for the group to come up with their proposal, taking it out to their constituents, hear from the public at the town hall meetings, and then the committee decides what the alternatives are and then make the final recommendation to the Commission.

Wayne Butler commented that Kathy made a key comment regarding hearing from the public. SEA GRANT stepped up to the plate a long time ago and held a meeting in Coos Bay where most of the people left very upset. Wayne said it is a very arduous process to listen to a lot of testimony. When presentations were given, questions were put up on the board and comment cards were handed out so people could leave the room. Wayne felt that wasn't the kind of input people wanted to give. He felt whatever the committee recommends that it is going to be long and tough but that people need to have the opportunity to voice their opinions.

Jim also commented on the SEA GRANT meeting and how some of the information they were given to present was not accurate. They were told that we were to have Marine Reserves and this was basically a meeting to take information on where and when and how large. They were unaware that no reserve was an option so understandably people were upset.

Cristen Don offered OFD&W services to help as a resource for outreach and listen to public comment. ODF&W can reach out to commercial and charter people but sport anglers are a lot more difficult. It could be sent to everyone who buys a license but a lot of those people are fishing inland and there is not a separate salt water fishing license. Cristen felt ODF&W could come up with some other ways to reach out to the sport fishermen. Mike Helfrich commented that there were some separate mailing lists for people who fish halibut and those coming out of Newport which would hit most of the people who fish commercially.

Jamie Doyle commented that a lot of different types of public input would be useful, not just comment cards or on-line, but more than one option.

Kathy spoke about the scoping meetings for one of the Port's channel projects where they talked about using a court reporter or transcriptionist to record comments. For example if there were an alternative for a location and a no alternative, there would be two separate people taking comments on this place or this option.

Mike Graybill felt it was important to have an opportunity for public input. And if people show up who don't like this committee's proposal or recommendation is there an expectation that we do anything but report what the public's views of those opinions are or is there an expectation of those public views and opinions and we go back to the drawing table and we should do something about that. Crystal said that is kind of the question when the pivotal vote occurs.

Jim said we put forth the presentations and in hearing the public comment where people come up with ideas that the committee had not considered but that the committee likes we could always come back to it in the next step of the process. Mike Graybill felt that the committee should then agree that the purpose is public input because if we are a committee to the Port and the Port wants the committee to manage the public input process we can make a recommendation to them and manage the public input process and provide them with what we found and what input we got from the public and what our recommendation is but our recommendations don't necessarily have to be reflective of public input. Mike said he was trying to get in his mind when we are saying how we want to collect all of the public input what obligation we will have or expectation there is of us to do anything with it besides report it to the Port.

Jim said in answering Mike's question when we have public input, we don't have an obligation to the public at all. In the OPAC side boards I read to you, do the map boundaries need to be expanded, retracted, rejected or otherwise altered to fix an issue? During public comment people might come up with some good ideas we might want to make some modifications to. Mike replied that we don't have an obligation for our recommendation to be responsive. Crystal asked Mike if he was suggesting that if the committee made a recommendation and we do the pivotal vote before we go to public input and then the intent would be to take that pivotal vote recommendation to the Port, take it to the public for public input and then take the public input to the Port with it. Mike responded right. Crystal replied that would be another concept so at some point before we have the pivotal vote we need to decide is it going to go this way, or is it going to go where we have a recommendation. Mike said he was reminding himself that his role here was to be advisory to the Port Commission. They make the decision we make the recommendation to them, and if I am making a recommendation and I recognize that we put a lot of effort and energy into analyzing this thing and we go out for public comment and there are all kinds of sparks and noise that come from people who are less familiar and less time to have a thoughtful dialog about it, then I don't want public comment to intervene with our obligation to provide a report and recommendation to the Commission. Crystal asked him if he would favor this. Mike responded that he was just trying to get clarity and that he would play the game by any rules you make but he just wanted to be clear on the rules.

Don Peabody said that we are here representing the public and to not cut the public out. Mike Graybill responded that we are not cutting the public out. Don replied that is exactly what Mike just said by saying the public doesn't have familiarity with this process and issue but we do and that is highly untrue. There are a lot of people out there in this community who knew more than us about this issue and to not hear from them

advocates our responsibilities as a body. Don would like to see us take two to three proposals out to the public for input, coming back, modifying those two to three the proposals in some way, having our pivotal vote, coming out with one, can be done with public input. He said if you start telling the Port of Bandon, the Port of Coos Bay, the City of Bandon, the City of Reedsport and a member of the public at large that the public doesn't have any part in this process then he has real problems with that. Mike responded with that was not what he was suggesting.

Crystal said to her there were at least three options that have been brought forth which do not have to be decided tonight but where we are heading as a process:

1. Committee makes recommendation to the Port, it goes to public input, and the public input goes back to the Port.
2. Committee makes a recommendation, goes out to the public for input, the committee reviews, and that goes to the Port as a recommendation.
Kathy said that is the way she has seen it done. Mike Helfrich said this is (f), (g) and (h) on the combined outline which were approved a long time ago. Kathy asked while we are talking tonight does the committee want to carry a couple of alternatives to a public meeting or do you want to talk about one thing. Crystal said we are not going to be getting to a point of selection tonight because the intent of this meeting is to get all these things in front of us and then see if we need more information.
3. Committee recommends alternatives, public input, pivotal vote.

Matt LaDoux felt the committee needed to focus on a timeline because when the committee was originally formed there was an October deadline and if we start talking about taking it out to the public it is going to have to be out for a certain amount of time. What we need to focus on is if we are going to do something with the public and we have an October deadline we need to be thinking about doing that pretty soon. Jim said the October timeline is soft so there is some time.

Proposals for MR/MPA

Crystal set the guidelines for the proposals allowing everyone approximately 5 minutes to present with 5 minutes for questions like what was done with the procedures proposals. The questions should be specific without argument. Jim expressed that we get through the proposals and then discuss them all. Crystal said there were seven proposals and that there were a couple of people not present and suggested that those presentations go last just in case the presenters were to show up. **All presentations are attached at the end of these minutes.**

- ◆ Presentation of Individual Proposals
 1. Steve Rumrill presented first. He said the proposals included a few Marine Protected Area scenarios moving from very modest and small to larger and more complicated areas. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is included with these minutes. The first slide was the Simpson Reef Great Kelp Study Area (Marine Reserve) focusing on Cape Arago with the area being proposed as a Marine

Reserve. Steve said this area contains a rare great kelp bed with key features only found in the State of Oregon. The second slide for this scenario depicted Ecological Features and Existing Human Uses. This is an isolated kelp bed with a technical listing as List 3; G5/S2 status in the rare, threatened and endangered species of Oregon. He went on to read the content of slide two. Slide three reviewed the listing status. Steve said this was a modest tightly focused marine reserve that focuses on the *Macrocystis integrifolia*. Slide four depicts the offshore and inshore boundaries. The inshore boundary will start 50 feet off shore from low tide to allow for anglers casting lines outside and to alleviate concerns about working in the inter tidal zones. The total distance is very small at 3400 feet along the shoreline with a total area of 0.24 square miles. Jim asked about sea urchins and the fact that they uproot kelp. Steve explained that sea urchins have been historically harvested in the area and they are also harvested by marine mammals. He said that this kelp bed has been doing okay for a very long time and that not all kelp beds are subject to destruction by urchins. Steve explained that urchins go through a complex series of buildups. Someone asked why Steve was calling this presentation an MPA scenario and then calling it a Marine Reserve. Steve reminded everyone that a Marine Reserve is a sub-type of a Marine Protected Area. Not all Marine Protected Areas are Marine Reserves. So these were titled Marine Protected Areas scenarios. I'm proposing this as a Marine Reserve with a Marine Protected Area associated with it. Don Peabody asked if the area appears on the list 3; G5/S2 is it already protected because it is a threatened and endangered species? Cristen Don responded that it is not protected. Don asked if since this was the only spot do we actually consider that part of it's range or do we consider it as an invasive species? Steve responded that this was considered part of its range so it appears north and south of us but it is the only bed in Oregon to his knowledge. Don then pointed to a range within two points on the map and Steve responded by pointing to a section on the map saying that to his knowledge the primary bed was up here and that this species does get up into the shallow sub tidal and intra tidal zone north of us. Steve said this was a different species than the giant kelp in Southern California. Dean Warner asked if this bed was deteriorating at the present or is it sustaining itself. Steve responded that all of the questions were excellent but that there weren't answers as far as he knew so that is why it is in the review status, that not much is known about it. Cristen responded that ODF&W is going to be doing a state-wide aerial kelp survey in 2010 and that they haven't done one since 1990 so they are unsure how the kelp beds have changed in the last 20 years. Steve stated again that the questions were excellent and that this area represented a modest marine reserve that would be a focal area for studies. Steve moved on to the second proposal.

2. Gregory Point/Sunset Rocks Study Area just a little north of here. The slide showed the boundaries of the study area. It is an important fishing area for our community near Baltimore Rock. There is an existing ODF&W urchin reserve in an area he pointed to on the slide. The next slide describes the key Ecological Features and the Existing Human Uses. The third slide described the offshore and

inshore boundaries. Baltimore Rock would be left out of the area. Steve indicated that this area was still a small foot print of 0.53 square miles. Mike Helfrich ask if Steve was saying that there isn't much recreational fishing in this area. Steve said he didn't know and that is why he was bringing this proposal to the committee. Mike said there is a lot of recreational use in this area, particularly in the northern wedge. Reg said from Sunset Bay there is a growing number of kayak users who are sport fishing and this area would be quite controversial with them because it is the only place they can go where it is safe. Both Crystal and Jim asked the group to hold the discussion until the end. Don Peabody asked what were the expected species that would be protected in this area? Steve said there were rare urchins, ling cod, perch and other types of fish. Jan Hodder said there were over 200 species of invertebrates plus close to 100 species of algae. Don also asked if there were current research being done in the area. Mike Graybill said there has been some historic research done there; that there was a sub tidal reef with tube worms where the reef is made of the rocky shells of tube forming worms. Steve felt that this was a great process focusing on an area, putting something on the map and then asking questions as we move forward.

3. Steve presented the third MPA scenario of the South Cove Study Area which consists of a little more complicated marine reserve coupled with a MPA so the scale on the map is a little larger focusing on the south down toward the Seven Devils Cliffs, and down toward Bandon. The next slide showed the Ecological Features and Existing Human Uses. Access to the area is very limited due to the steep cliffs and shoreline. The next slide depicted the Marine Reserve proposed area in gray. The Marine Protected Area would be immediately off shore. Jim asked what the depth was at the western boundary of this proposed Marine Reserve. Jan Hodder responded that they did not have any data. Steve said the intent of the proposals was to look at some areas, think about them, and if there wasn't further concern they would pull together further information. Don Peabody asked if there were any species of concern in this particular area. Steve said there were none of special status that he was aware of. Jan Hodder said she didn't know if anyone had ever been looked at this area. Steve said that is was a very difficult area to get to and that the beach to the south was a boulder field. Don Peabody said given that and not having been there for 30 years what would the benefit of that Marine Reserve be since it is so difficult to get to and how would that justify shutting off the fishing. Steve responded that if we were to propose this and were successful establishing it as a special research area then we would put a much bigger effort into getting down there. Alan said that we are describing at this point as getting down there by foot over boulders or by kayak where you could easily take a boat from the harbor down there and do research scuba diving or swimming. Getting there by land would be difficult.
4. Steve reviewed the last proposal as the Cape Arago Study Areas as a Cluster Marine Reserve linking the areas together which would increase the overall size. The areas wouldn't necessarily have to be adjacent.

A 10 minute break was called for at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 6:40 p.m.

The second proposal presentation was given by Dave Lacey. The map he used is attached as part of these minutes. Dave said he was fortunate to have attended the last SOORC meeting where they presented the wave energy study based on the SOORC maps. Looking at the map where there wasn't an area of red, his idea was to start at the cables and go down north of Bandon. Dave said he doesn't have a real good proposal yet because he wanted to make this a scenario where the committee could adjust the boundaries. Dave pointed to areas on the map without drawing additional lines. Dave said he wanted to make the reserves fit the size and spacing balance needing about 3 miles comparing the area to the size of a pencil relative to the map. He said there were 3 miles of coast line with some good habitat and rocky reef and critical habitat. Dave talked about encompassing some additional rocky reef on the map. He referred to an area making it an MPA which would allow some trolling, possibly crabbing and recreational fishing. Dave then talked about moving the area a little higher leaving the Coquille Point area alone. He then referred to the squiggly line on the map and played with the boundaries. He recapped that his proposal included a MR up north followed by a MPA down below. Dave said it was his understanding that you cannot drag on the bottom through the cables. Wayne Butler said you can lay crab pots just below South Cove all the way across the bar in Bandon. Dave then talked about the yellow area on the SOORC map. He commented about hearing complaints from fishermen that the wave energy people were not listening to them on the SOORC maps. Wayne made clarification about the SOORC maps that when you look at areas that are red and yellow a lot of those areas include salmon fishing, trolling and net dragging. So when you have an area that is excluded from trolling it is naturally going to show less effort but it doesn't mean that it isn't the highest impact area for certain segments of the industry. Mike Boehme asked if there were specific species in the area to be concerned about. Dave responded that it is critical habitat but he wasn't sure what the dark red areas indicated on the map were and asked if anyone knew what they were since they weren't indicated on the legend. Cristen thought they might be rocky versus sandy areas. Mike Graybill said there are two ways you can configure a special management area. One way is if it has a focal species. The other is if it is representative of the typical kind of conditions that you find. He felt it was worthy to identify whether or not there were any potential focal species in these proposals but it is equally worthy to ask if that area is representative of the kinds of circumstances that we find in this portion of the coast line. And in which case being unremarkable may actually be something that would make it worthy of consideration because it is representative of the kinds of places that we find here. Dave said there are plenty of rock fish in the area. Others responded that there are lots of species of fish that are caught in the area. Dave then spoke about an area called Whiskey Run. Valerie Pena said she couldn't see how far out Dave had drawn his lines and asked for clarification. Dave responded the lines would go all the way out to the Territorial Sea Boundary, or 3 miles out. In another area on the map Dave indicated that it was a little less than 3 miles out. Dave responded this is something the committee needs to talk about. Mike asked does it include the shoreline. Cristen said that inter tidal cannot be

included in a marine reserve. Crystal said we will discuss the proposal in further detail later since the area was a little less defined. Someone commented that they would like to see the boundaries better defined because it was vague for him right now. Dave explained that he thought that is what the committee would do later and that the proposals were to be areas to talk about. Jim told Dave that as a proposal he needed to come up with general boundaries to give to Kathy so as we go forward in the meetings there are some general boundaries to provide to the public. Dave said that he would put a real map together. Bill Poppe asked where Seven Devils fell on the map. Dave pointed to an area that he defined as Seven Devils State Park. Someone asked if the committee was restricted to Cape Arago Seven Devils. Dave asked wasn't our mission from the Port to go from Bandon to Reedsport, Seven Devils area? Mike Graybill responded with given what they have just said it sounded like they made it quite specific, like it was from Seven Devils around Cape Arago, is it really that specific. Cristen said that the committee needs to stick to that general area. Mike Graybill asked if north of Coos Bay was not under consideration. Jim said that is what it means. Dave asked if he should put together an official map with an exact size. Crystal suggested that a discussion take place a little later. Wayne Butler asked Dave if he realized that the distance between Bandon and Baltimore Point is 14 miles from one point to the other and that 6 miles is approximately 50% of the area. Jim suggested letting Dave put together his proposal. Mike Graybill asked for a point of clarification on the discussion being limited to Cape Arago and Seven Devils area only. Jim responded with yes. Mike Graybill said then this area is too far south. Jim said when the committee was set up there were members on the committee from Reedsport to Bandon and the basic outline was that we are to consider everything in that area. Jim said, in fact it wasn't clear to him if either north of Reedsport or south of Bandon was to be included. He went on to say that the attorney for OPAC who is a State attorney said that we are to consider Cape Arago to Seven Devils as of last week's meeting. Jim said he has tried to get clarification on this issue and this is what keeps coming back. Jim said he doesn't agree with him because we represent this community and doesn't agree with the group to the south claiming the territory that they claim but his is just one vote. Jan Hodder then asked for a bit more clarification on the Ed Bowles letter. Jim said no, that it was in HB 3013 that authorizes us to look at this area which says "at Cape Arago Seven Devils". Jan asked if we are looking at the point at Cape Arago. Cristen said she thought it meant the extent of the combined areas. Jan asked if the Our Ocean's proposal went as far as Bandon and Jim replied yes. Jim asked the group for consensus on moving forward with the proposals and that we would work on clarification some more.

Gus Gates, representing Surfrider, was next to present his proposal. Gus had two proposed areas which he identified on the map. Copies of those two maps are included with these minutes. Gus talked about Siltcoos Lake having one of the healthiest Coho salmon runs in the entire State of Oregon. He said that he had been speaking with Steve Shimotakahara about the concept of having a Marine Protected Area and evaluating the effects of having alternative energy. Gus said one of his proposed areas which he identified on the map as Siltcoos River and Tahkenitch Creek as a Marine Protected Area. Gus said recognizing the discussion tonight he is willing to set this aside and bring forward one proposal. Jim recommended that Gus go forward with both proposals. Gus

then drew lines on the map with the idea that the area would run along the line of the shipping lane coming from the south jetty encompassing Yockum Point, Gregory Point, coming just around the corner leaving Baltimore Rock out. This would potentially be a Marine Reserve. Then following that same line go out to the Territorial Sea boundary and on down would be a Marine Protected Area. Gus wanted to clarify the things in his mind that he felt would be essential to include in a Marine Protected Area. One would be recreational ground fishing, second would be salmon trolling and third would be crabbing allowing nets. Gus felt that in his mind that industrial development shouldn't be allowed as he felt the entire area was a special place. He felt there should be some level of protection. Whether that is wave energy or off shore aquaculture and not knowing what would be coming down the line in the future. Gus said bottom trolling would not be allowed in that area. Other uses that would be allowed are kayak fishing, shore base angling and scientific research. Gus said he would draw lines on the map for the Siltcoos and Tahkenitch areas that would be an MPA. He identified the Gardiner wave energy area on the map as well which he felt would make a good reference area. Gus said that bottom trolling would not be allowed in that area. He wished that Steve Bodner had been there as he wasn't sure of the amount of activity in this area so it would be an item for further discussion. Don Peabody asked what the reason for extending the Marine Reserve so far south past Gregory Point was. Gus responded with Steve helped put this together because he had been gone and again pointed to an area on the map. He said the species of interest for him is the range of invertebrate species that had previously been talked about. It would include marine mammals, sea birds and the suite of near shore ground fish especially those that have not had stock assessments done. Gus felt with its close proximity to the Port the area would make this an interesting area for further collaborative research. Someone referred to the intersected areas in Gus' proposals and asked if Florence had developed a near shore committee fairly similar to what we have? Gus responded there is one in that area. Theirs is the Heceta Head Cape Perpetua Marine Reserve so they are looking in the area that was proposed from Heceta Head to Yachats. Florence did have this loosely organized committee remaining under the Port but they essentially haven't been meeting. A comment indicated that under the guidance we got from Ed Bowles we would be out of our realm to even look or consider a Marine Protected Area. Gus replied that yes, I recognize this is outside of the Cape Arago Seven Devils region. Cristen commented that Ed Bowles said if this community team ends up pointing toward another area you are welcome to recommend that but that a new community team would have to be developed in order to go through a more local community. Gus said that to clarify there are representatives from Reedsport and the Coos Bay community. He also said that he is not drawing hard lines on the map saying that this should be implemented as a Marine Reserve or a Marine Protected Area in a year or two. This is an area potentially for further evaluation and discussion. Don Peabody asked Gus if he was proposing that area or raising that issue in the community meetings up north. Cristen said the area is not part of the area that the community is charged with. Gus said he would be happy to communicate with other constituents and representatives that are on that committee. Reg Pullen asked what the difference was between the proposal Gus came up with compared to what he presented at Black Rock Point? Gus responded that they are both outside the area. Cristen said there is a difference though because the community team already vetted Black Rock Point. Reg then asked how

could they carve out an area of Coos County and say that is their area of influence. Kathy responded that she had a pdf of that stewardship area if the committee wanted to see it. Jim responded no and suggested the committee move on.

Crystal said there were two written proposals submitted and wanted to know if anyone on the committee was asked to present them on behalf of the authors. Copies of both proposals were sent out and Kathy had copies to distribute. Jim said that Don would read John Griffith's proposal. A copy of John's proposal is included with these meeting minutes. Mike Graybill objected to the reading but Jim said since the committee was hearing everyone else's John's should be read. The document was read without the attachments. John's proposal was for no marine reserves.

The written proposal from Dr. Steve Shimotakahara had previously been circulated by email. Kathy explained that Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal was combining an MPA with a wave energy park so we could not put geographic boundaries on a map because that was not clearly defined in the wave energy process and that we would need to be a little bit fluid through the discussion so think of it as a general area without specific boundaries right now. Mike Helfrich asked if this was going to be in the general area of the outfall and Kathy responded yes. Jim felt it would be fair to handle this proposal as we had everyone else by reading it into the record. Jan Hodder asked for clarification of the outfall area. Mike responded that it was the Weyerhaeuser outfall and not the Gardiner outfall. Mike Helfrich asked if anyone had an answer to the comment that Steve made regarding the State of Oregon being committed to a comprehensive study of the ocean through the Marine Reserve system and has committed funds for this purpose. Mike asked how much funding had been provided by the State. Cristen responded that this year there was \$1,000,000 in addition to several grants. The requested budget for the next biennium is \$1,000,000 with the ability to go out and apply for other grants including both federal and private. Mike asked if that was for all of the reserves and Cristen replied yes. Mike Graybill followed Cristen's comments stating he felt she was only talking about a portion of the funding that has been committed to support this process because they had spent between \$8 - \$10 million on sea floor mapping. Cristen clarified the total for mapping was \$6 million with \$5 million coming from Federal and \$1 million from State funds. Mike said those funds plus \$2 million of New Carissa funds also went into that. Cristen again clarified that it was \$1.3 million. Mike said there were multiple millions of dollars going into the mapping effort and the directions to the people at Oregon State University and to the Federal agencies have been to prioritize mapping in areas under consideration for a Marine Reserve. So that represents a substantial investment on top of the investment that Cristen outlined. Cristen stated that the mapping goes toward much more than just Marine Reserves. She also said that OSU had just completed mapping the Cape Arago area. Mike Boehme asked for a point of clarification on the proposals and if they would be provided in written draft form for the committee. Crystal asked the committee if that is something they would like to have. Mike Boehme felt it would be nice to have the proposals in some sort of format to look at. Crystal asked if he could wait until after the discussion and then decide if the committee wanted written drafts on all of them or just some of them. Mike Boehme was fine with that suggestion.

Crystal began reviewing the proposals and stated that she had put alphabetical letters on them so that the committee could decide which proposal to start talking about.

Crystal began reviewing the various proposals beginning with Steve Rumrill's (A) Simpson Reef Great Kelp Study Area, (B) Gregory Point/Sunset Rocks Study Area, (C) South Cove Study Area (D) Cape Arago Cluster Study Area; Dave Lacey's is (E) which is somewhat open ended at this point but could be more defined by the group or by Dave; (F) Gus Gates Siltcoos Tahkenitch area which is somewhat in the same category as what Reg proposed last month; (G) Gus Gates Gregory Point Study Area; (H) John Griffith's No Marine/MPA; and then (I) Dr. Steve Shimotakahara Floating Wave Energy.

Crystal asked the committee to talk about the same proposal at the same time. Jim asked Reg Pullen if he wanted to make a proposal to the group which he replied he would be happy to do but that he had already made the proposal and showed the boundaries for the record. Kathy said she had a copy that she could pass around. A copy of Reg's proposal (J) that was presented at the June 16th meeting is part of these meeting minutes. Crystal stated that she was putting question marks by two of the proposals as they were outside of the area for consideration.

Mike Graybill commented that he felt Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal had been discussed previously, that his proposal was very thoughtful and very helpful but that it failed to meet any underlying scientific rationale for why you would create a Marine Protected Area or a Marine Reserve. Mike felt he was trying to achieve something with his proposal but that he would be unsuccessful in achieving what he was hoping to achieve with the proposal he has developed. Mike felt his proposal could be modified to achieve what he was trying to do but that the burden of responsibility to do that is already born by the people who are in the wave energy business. He felt that the people who are in the wave energy business have already picked the reference areas which are actually missing from Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal. So in order for his proposal to go forward to answer the question he is proposing you would need a control area where no wave energy is going on that would be a Marine Protected Area. His proposal lacks that and therefore Mike Graybill believes it lacks any sort of scientific rigor that would be necessary to address the questions he is suggesting that his Marine Protected Area would address.

Mike Lane felt Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal had a certain amount of merit, maybe not the answer to a Marine Reserve or Marine Protected area in answer to our need to address a proposal here, but it is possible that if and when a wave energy park is put in place that some ideas might be presented to that group to enhance the wave energy park so that it is more resource friendly and one of those possibilities is the anchors that are put in there rather than having smooth side anchors there might be a proposal to make those anchors pocketed so that small fish could create an artificial reef. Mike felt this proposal might be better addressed in another venue and also it is still in question whether the Marine Reserve process or the Marine Reserve placement of a full build out will be able to be done within a wave energy park will happen within a Territorial Sea given some of the protections the State has for economic impact.

Jan Hodder commented that there is a seminar series at the marine lab every Wednesday and next Wednesday Sarah Henkle who is a new faculty member at the Hatfield Marine Science Center will speak. She has been specifically hired to study the ecological effect of wave energy and that is what she is going to be talking about at 4:00 p.m. next Wednesday. Jan said if anyone is interested in coming they are more than welcome to attend the seminar and hear what Sarah has to say. Crystal asked Jan to send out an email with the information on the seminar.

Bill Poppe didn't feel that Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal fell within the committee's mandate but he did like the idea of combining a research effort like Mike said. They could do some studies on different types of anchors. It may not fall within an MPA or MR range at all but he felt that someone ought to kick start the idea somewhere along the line.

Don Peabody asked if, as a committee, could we reach out to Sarah Henkel and ask her if an MPA would be helpful in a wave energy park. Jan Hodder said that she would ask Sarah on behalf of the committee.

Jim said that the committee needs to decide if all of the proposals needed to be put forward or just some of them. He felt that the committee needed to be realistic in their presentations to the public and how many proposals the committee wants to make. The other thing the committee needed to do is make a recommendation to the Port which could be multi-faceted, it doesn't have to be we recommend this proposal. We the committee could throw in something about a problem with wave energy exists. Crystal asked Jim for clarification on whether he was suggesting that the committee should or should not talk about all of the proposals. Jim said he was asking for the committee's input and what they thought. Crystal felt it was good to just keep going through the proposals and that we may already have all of the comments on Dr. Shimotakahara's.

Wayne Butler had one additional comment regarding Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal and in the context of the marine reserves with the process moving forward he felt, to his knowledge, more baseline study had been done on this than any other proposal. There have been crab studies, with crabs being tagged and released. There has been trolling with small nets on the bottom to see what kind of species live there. These things are already being done in this process so it does kind of fit into a Marine Reserve category.

Jamie Doyle asked for clarification on Bill's comment about being concerned that it was not within our mandate as a committee and it could be something that people are hesitant because they feel it is not within our boundaries to address. If the group decides to put something forward that says while we recognize this might not be within our mandate we consider this or something like that.

Crystal asked before this proposal was put to rest for tonight was there other information that people wanted about Dr. Shimotakahara's proposal besides what Jan will be coming back with after she talks with Sarah Henkel. Gus felt it would be helpful to know where

specifically the reference areas were established for that wave energy site. Supposedly the wave energy company has identified areas that they are going to be preparing. Mike Lane responded they have got to do a two year study with a nine buoy array which will probably be three years out before there is any information back on that. The phase 3 which is a commercial build out past that buoy array has not been accepted by the State or by OWET. So we and they don't even know whether they want to go forward if they don't feel that the State is going to give them that piece of ground. Right now our mapping has shown that the economic value is very high and in the State has backed off and has said we will let you do the study in the area with the nine buoys but beyond that we are not going to move until they see some other proposals. Gus thanked Mike for the clarification because he had heard others say that there has already been reference areas established which he knew there had been for the Gardiner project. Mike confirmed they had outlined areas but that it was all based on its locality near outfalls that exist because of the economics of trying to put their package together.

Alan Shanks commented that basically at this stage of the wave energy development they don't even know if they will be building it. Mike responded that they don't even know whether they will be able to get the ground that they want. They might be told to go out 3 miles. Alan said so what we are doing here essentially is a pie in the sky plan and that it seemed foolish. Basically what we would say is if some time in the future they ever get around to building a wave energy park we think we should have an MPA associated with it. We have no idea when, where, how big, we don't know anything about it.

Crystal asked for comments on the other proposals. Wayne asked a question of Dr. Rumrill and Jan about the Cape Arago proposals. Previously you made a proposal down off of Seven Devils because you wanted to avoid that area because of the impact it might have on your research area. Alan responded that, the difference here is we said from the low tide line out 50 feet out beyond that. That means almost all of our research is intertidal which is useful. It also means that numerous people would be able to fish off the rocks thinking 50 feet would be as far as anyone could cast but if 75 – 100 feet is better, then that is our distance.

Mike Helfrich felt this proposal is better than just north of the Cape Arago Lighthouse, proposal (B) where you will run into a tremendous amount of resistance from sport fishermen. Crystal clarified that Mike was talking about proposals (B) and (G). Alan commented that the Sunset Bay proposal under estimates the number of small boat fishermen. Mike said there would be great public outcry because the economic benefit to the people that fish there is much greater than a reserve would be.

Alan added that maybe for that one that includes Sunset Bay maybe we should push it over to within a Marine Reserve to Gregory Point. Mike Graybill asked that the maps be put up for better reference of slide number 7. Alan talked about small boats and kayaks coming out of Sunset Bay which suggests economic impact to that area so he suggested that area should be removed from the proposal. Mike referenced a 10 fathom line at the edge of the gray area where there is a lot of commercial crabbing taking place. [At this

point there were several side conversations taking place making it difficult to hear what was being said]. Crystal corrected that.

Jim commented that this area was being considered as a potential MR so we have already said that in some of the proposals we were going to allow crabbing and salmon fishing. And suppose we allowed recreational ground fishing it would basically turn this into an MPA. How does that fit? Mike Helfrich said he felt the answer to that would be sport fishermen are going to ask okay so if you are going to set it aside as an MPA what is the likelihood at some future point it would become a Marine Reserve now that you have something defined. Alan commented the problem he saw allowing sport fishing here is that basically it's like saying okay we are going to have Yellowstone National Park and we are going to say we will allow you to have wolves and grizzly bears in the Park and basically what we are doing is hunting carnivores. And it doesn't take a long time hunting carnivores before you really change the food chain. So we need to make that decision. If you allow sport fishing in here you are going to remove the carnivores and you are going to change their community structure. Mike Boehme asked if that was already happening there now. Alan responded definitely, of course. Jim asked is there anything wrong with that? Alan responded yes and no, it's a decision we make. We are being asked to make a decision should this be a Marine Reserve or not. If it is a Marine Reserve it's going to be something like we aren't going to allow anything and it becomes a more natural environment. If we say this is going to be an MPA there are certain ways you can't commercially fish but you can recreationally fish. That amount of pressure will in fact alter the community relative to a Marine Reserve relative to what is happening right now no, because right now almost all of the fishing here is recreational. There is not much commercial fishing this close to shore. Valerie commented there were a couple of areas that bothered her, one on the north side of Gregory Point she sees a lot of crabbing and smaller 12 – 16 foot boats. Many of these boats are not local boats but tourists who have come to the area. Valerie felt the way the lines are going to be, two things may happen. Once they hear there is a Marine Reserve they are going to say they don't understand it so they are not going to come there this summer. The second thing is they don't have GPS on their boats so they can't sit there and try to figure out how far out from Gregory Point they can't go or where the area is. Logistically for a small boat they don't have the equipment to do that and it is also a safety issue coming out of the Point because they can run into the Point very quickly when the north winds kick up because they don't have far to go. The other issue is that around the bay, (Alan pointed to the area on the map) that is a recreational fishing area; especially when the north winds kick up the people will go in there and again it is normally the smaller recreational boats. Alan identified two areas on the map to be removed which Valerie and Mike Helfrich agreed were too heavily used. Jim asked if there were consensus on that. One person commented no.

Matt LeDoux addressed the economic impact on the area. He said there are a lot of tourists this time of year and that area is highly used. Being out in Charleston Matt points people to the Cape Arago highway area all the time for recreational activities. Sunset Bay is a well enough known area that has trails and is also a highlighted dive area with spear fishing. Alan pointed to an area on the map and asked if people went all around

that particular area. Matt responded yes because it is a safe area to dive. Forcing people to go further around Simpson Reef to do their recreational fishing for the not so skilled seaman it tends to be definitely unsafe. Today alone there were 3 Coast Guard calls for overturned vessels. This time of year especially the public is out there and they are unaware of the dangers of going out on the ocean. Matt felt if you force people to go farther out you are going to see a higher accident rate. Matt reiterated that this area was highly used by tourists, camping at Sunset Bay, kayak fishing all around the Sunset Bay point and around the small island and fishing off the Lighthouse area. Matt felt it would kill a large portion of tourism where people come out to Sunset and Basendorf to camp. Matt felt the whole area was a bad placement. He felt a Marine Reserve in the Sunset Bay area would be a negative connotation for tourists which would keep them from coming to the area. Don Peabody said through that area it is safe for kayaks and scuba divers to get into and around the point at Sunset Bay.

Mike Graybill wanted to clarify that it was Lighthouse Beach and not Basendorf Beach. He said he lived on Lighthouse Beach for 10 years and that the area is facing north. He felt it was one of the most hostile areas you can go. In the summer time when it is protected and there is a lee shores. Typically when we have southerly winds the bar is too rough to cross. Mike went on to say when fishing happens in there it's either going to be troll or bottom fishing on very isolated rock pinnacles if any. At this point he pointed out there is a difference of opinion on the intensity of recreational use and we have no data to support the level or the possible economic consequences of recreational uses in those areas. We have identified that recreational use exists. If we are going to weigh these things it is likely to be an emotional issue but there may not be a rational basis.

Alan commented that he could see where Mike Graybill was coming from but the arguments that tourists arriving here and knowing that there is a Marine Reserve this close to the harbor but they are not quiet sure where it is. Mike interjected it is point to point, it's at the end of Yockum Point and you don't need navigational equipment, you can look at a straight line. Dave Lacey wanted to point out that most of the kayak users are not there to fish and most of the boats he sees are not kayak fishermen and they are just there to look at the natural beauty of the area so its not like we are going to wipe out all of the tourism because people are going to go there just to enjoy the nature of it. It is not a complete economic loss. Alan agreed that it is not a complete economic loss but there are people who fish there in small boats.

Mike Helfrich commented that he did not have any scientific numbers for support but in that triangle he spends eighty days a year in between the north end of Simpson up to the point of the Lighthouse. At almost any time you can cross the bar and there are boats fishing in that area. There might be 5 or 10 or even 30, but even in the winter time north where you are saying that it's not protected in the winter time it's a great place to fish. Mike Graybill commented that the area is highly protected in the winter time.

Bill Poppee said when he was out there this morning there were five boats inside that area. Alan pointed to two areas on the map and Bill confirmed there were boats in both areas.

Crystal said the group had been talking about this proposal for quite awhile and there really hadn't been anyone fighting for this area. She said there has been a lot of negatives so she asked if the group wanted to move on or if someone wanted to propose consensus or did Alan want to propose a consensus. Alan said at this point it sounds like this area is a dead deal, and if it is, this is not where we should do it. Crystal asked if there was consensus on this not being an area the group wanted to propose as one of the alternatives. That way the group could move on to something else but could come back and decide differently. Alan asked if anyone disagreed with that. He said what he was hearing is that this area is too heavily used and that the economic impact would be too great and that we shouldn't do it there. Alan again asked if anyone disagreed.

Mike Graybill said he didn't disagree with that but he felt the group should give it some thought because if the use level in that area is above the threshold, then it was going to be a really interesting standard to apply to anything else. Crystal commented we wouldn't be dropping it but would be going on to some other proposals. She asked if anyone wanted additional information about this proposal.

Jim commented that Mike Graybill said he didn't disagree so on his initial question about moving forward with this proposal or abandoning the proposal, did we have consensus. Does everyone agree to abandon this particular proposal? Is there anyone who is opposed? Mike Graybill said he would oppose a Marine Reserve for consideration of that area. Dave Lacey said he did not want to oppose it. Jim said we are only talking about this one proposal. Mike Graybill asked Marine Reserve, not that same area as an MPA. Jim said what is on the wall is proposal (B). Mike Graybill asked does that mean we will never come back to discuss it, we are rejecting it? Alan said if you say no, I think we should discuss it again, then we keep it on. Alan said two people said there is not consensus. If there is not a consensus then it stays. Jim said to Mike Graybill it is not this proposal it is just this area. Mike Graybill said he did not contest the consensus so long as this area is not removed for consideration for some other configuration of some MPA or something else. Jim identified Gus and Dave who raised their hands who didn't agree. Jim asked if we needed to move to a vote on this proposal? Crystal asked or do we want to wait until we do them all? Gus said he wanted to clarify that he was fine with moving on and talking about different areas but he felt this area potentially should get broader feedback. Crystal asked the group if there should be further information at the next meeting about this area. Is there any information that would help anybody or anything that anyone wants to bring to present? Alan said what we really need, but what we aren't going to get, is how much recreational fishing there is in this area.

Don Peabody said he would be interested in proposing coming back at the next meeting with specific rationale as to why this particular area is so important not just the list of there are invertebrates; why this area versus another area down south. Alan reviewed the rationale for Ecological Features and Existing Human Uses on the Gregory Point/Sunset Rocks Study Area slides. He pointed to areas on the slide including a research reserve for sea urchins which is also a complex subtidal habitat. He said Don was right in that there are complex subtidal habitats all over. That doesn't make this area unique, it is

representative. Don said so in looking at this in overall terms we can say the red urchins are already protected in that area because there is a reserve. So in terms of using that study area in common with the other ones we can say we don't necessarily need to go forward with this particular proposal because the urchins are already protected and we didn't see the same protection in any of the other areas that have been proposed or other commonality.

Dean Warner asked what the potential benefit to the public would be to make this a Marine Reserve. Alan responded if we were to make this a Marine Reserve like all of the other well studied Marine Reserves in the world, then what you would see in here is significant build up in population size of fish and the size of fish. The benefit to the public from a fisheries perspective is that with more fish and larger fish that would be reproducing they would be producing more offspring which would be a benefit to the fishery as many fisheries are limited in being able to support populations consistently. In other parts of the world where there is scuba diving associated with a Marine Reserve the scuba diving actually picks up because of the size and quantities of fish making it a tourist attraction. It is conceivable that is what you would see here.

Gus added that given the Institute of Marine Biology is directly adjacent to this area it gives opportunities for public education as well through summer camps, educating young students who are interested in a degree in marine biology or oceanography, or fisheries biology. This could potentially become a living laboratory.

Matt referenced a letter from Governor Kulongoski that the committee received dated November 1, 2007. On the last bullet he says "I am committed to working closely with coastal communities as we move forward with preserves and wave energy. As part of this commitment I will be dispatching my Chief of Staff to the coast with conversations with these communities." "The new ocean uses must benefit not disrupt existing economic and recreational uses of our ocean." So we are already saying that is a highly used recreational area so I think that disrupts that. Alan commented that is exactly why we are having these discussions. Matt said he just wanted to point out the language that Kulongoski used.

Crystal gave Don Peabody the floor and said if possible she wanted to move on to another proposal tonight. Don Peabody said given what we know about the reproductive process of the rock fish in that area and since it is a protected area already, are the larvae that are released there settling there or will they settle down from the Marine Reserve, will they move outside and seek other areas. Alan responded the sea urchins go a long way. Abalone have a very short wash period and they hardly ever self seed right there. Rock fish have two to four month larvae period and they go great distances. Crystal asked the group to move on to another proposal.

Jim asked the group to think in the terms of proposal numbers/letters and not areas. We need to have some sort of process here. So later on we are looking at these as proposals and not necessarily areas. Crystal felt the group got a pretty good reading on different

benefits and drawbacks to that particular area. At some point you are going to have to be prioritizing anyway as individuals or not.

Gus commented that he has heard a lot of concerns and negative feelings about certain areas but he wanted to know from committee members what they were interested in. What do you see as a potential near shore science research area. What do folks like about some of these areas? Jim asked Gus if we could take those comments as we go through the proposals and Gus responded sure.

Crystal commented that she thought people did say there were things they liked about proposal (A). Steve commented that North Cove is a very important marine mammal area and that there were experts in Jan and Mike that could talk about this area. Steve asked Jan to describe the existing situation there in terms of public access and public use. Alan pointed out areas on the slide including North Cove, Simpson Outlook and Shell Island where seals hang out. Seasonally there are harbor seal pups and all year long there are adult harbor seals. Seasonally there are elephant seals in another referenced area and sea lions. This is a very busy area for marine mammals. Alan pointed to another area which is off limits to human navigation to avoid changing the mammal behavior. Seasonally the beach is closed. Don Peabody asked if there was a reason that the north rocks were not included in their proposal. Jan responded that they are above the water line at high tide. Alan showed on the slide when the tide goes out there is a reef which is also closed to the public. Mike Boehme asked for clarification on the low tides. Alan explained he was referring to the lowest tides. Jim asked about the benefits of this area. Alan referenced the slide for the Simpson Reef Great Kelp Study Area where he pointed to a substantial urchin population in one area. Alan said it was a fairly unique habitat due to the stretch of rock and a barrier reef. Inside the barrier reef you end up with silt sediment because it is protected. There are also lots of invertebrates which are unique. Alan also said the area hadn't been well studied. Jim asked how would the southern boundaries be marked so that people wouldn't go in there? Mike Graybill asked that Alan move to the map at which time Alan showed the boundary. Alan explained it was a dangerous area because of the wash rocks. Don asked what if you came out at the end of the reef and south toward Cape Arago in exchange for losing Middle Cove which has a fair amount of fishing up to the far north tip. Alan again identified the area on the map that Don asked about. Don then identified an area between the shoreline to the point and into North Cove because no one can fish there anyway. He felt there would be a gain in more square footage and shoreline. Don pointed to an edge and also wash rocks in the area. He further described the area as having a depth of 60 feet graduating to a 20 foot depth. Don felt a depth definition could be used for that area. Don liked the proposal because he felt it was well defined and it is not an easy proposal to enlarge in the future because of the very sharp definition. Mike Helfrich added the northern boundary could be the parking lot.

Matt asked the science community how hard it would be to access this area for research. Jan responded that it would be easy to get to. Don said it would be easy access from both the shoreline and by boat.

Mike Helfrich suggested the overlook from the parking lot, not the viewing area up the coast, out to the point. Mike wasn't sure how scientifically you would learn about the fish in the area when it is heavily populated with seals and sea lions. Alan said that the sea lions are fishing more off shore. Jan said even the harbor seals don't fish much in that area. Jim raised the question on the northern boundary because of the kelp making it very difficult to get into the area for fishing. Further discussion was taking place with many committee members talking among themselves about defining the boundaries. Alan then indicated an area on the map defined by a straight line. Cristen asked if people were using the North Cove, could you hug the intertidal areas. Alan said at low tide North Cove is out of the water so to keep this as part of the boundary then North Cove is mostly not going to be in there. Jim commented to Alan to keep in mind that we are defining what we are going to call this. If we called it instead of an MR an MPA and allowed for your tidal research then we could come right across.

Matt commented that he was hearing this was a natural Marine Reserve. It goes back to do you actually have to tag it off and call it something to research it if it is already a natural Marine Reserve. Cristen commented that you get money for it. Alan said it is not a defacto Marine Reserve. That people actually do go in there and fish. People actually commercially fish urchins in there. There is also rock fishing in the area. So it could be protected. Mike Helfrich asked if there were criteria on how large the reserve needed to be in order to be effective because he didn't feel it was a very large area. Alan responded there are criteria. They are not extremely well defined. The definition is bigger than what we are talking about. Alan didn't feel that was the route the committee should take because the cut off is so sharp on whether it is going to be an economic impact or not. Alan felt that was what defines the size. Don Peabody asked for clarification on the size not being big enough so the scientist would be pushing for a larger one. Alan said the area is not large enough and he would be asking for a larger area. Crystal asked if anyone wanted more information other than redrawing the area. Alan said if we do this and we study it carefully, we will demonstrate that it works great. People would then say it works great and we need to do more like this. Crystal asked again if anyone wanted more information or for the area to be redrawn. Mike Boehme asked to have the area redrawn and write a proposal for it.

Crystal said there wasn't enough time to go over another proposal and at the next meeting we would continue with the proposals. Mike Lane commented that he felt we are at a disadvantage at this point in time because it can be quite possible that we could be having this conversation five to six years from now after we have had feedback on two pilot Marine Reserve projects that are in place. And having some benefit finding out what the effects of those Marine Reserves are having on their local areas. We might be having a completely different conversation here. Until that time, many of us are reluctant to take a leap of faith in trying to create larger Marine Reserve areas given the management program that is in place in Oregon today. Unfortunately we are under a timeframe. It could very well be that we are not going to come up with a perfect size, a perfect reserve area here. But it is also possible that five to six years down the road when we do have more information about how they work we might want to come back to the table and rethink all this and to discuss further if the benefits are found to be positive.

Gus added if there is a decision of this area that it wouldn't be for a couple years out anyway so what does it hurt to establish a better base line at this area and focus some research so we have a better grasp on this area. This area is pretty darn unique when you look at it with great kelp being the only place where it is found. There are a number of things that are just incredible, different from Otter Rock and Red Fish Rock that warrant some closer look at this area over the next couple of years that could form decision making for this area. Jim said to Gus it would appear what you like is that instead of defining an MR or an MPA that this is an area for study like Red Fish Rock and make that kind of a proposal for this group. We want you to consider this as a study site. Gus agreed and said that is what it says right there "study area."

Mike Graybill said he thought the thing that we were studying is the impact of the Marine Reserve so you've got to have a Marine Reserve if you are going to study its impact. I don't know how you can demonstrate the effectiveness of a Marine Reserve unless you have one.

Mike Lane said in response to Mike Graybill's comments we have in place two pilot projects that are going to be study areas for Marine Reserves and so I guess the question for many of us is do we need to have nine study areas or can we look at these two areas as pilot projects and consolidate effort and study them more in-depth instead of trying to spread it over a whole coastline. Mike Lane said he wasn't sure as an extractive user of our resources that he's yet completely sold on the benefits of Marine Reserves in Oregon under the current management plan. He does believe that they have real benefits in areas around the world that have had problems and they have shown to improve things quite a bit, but he's not sure it is necessary to create a whole network of Reserves in an area that already seems to be rebuilding stocks of concern under the current management plans. Until he has a chance to see some results from the existing ones he's probably going to reserve support for them 100% and thinks a lot of people in the room feel the same way.

Jan commented as another piece of information in the last 3 – 4 years they have been writing a grant to the National Science Foundation to try to see if they can get an ROV that would allow some subtidal work. In the last month they have been successful so OMB will be getting the ROV that will be used for research. Research will be coordinated with ODF&W.

Alan commented to answer the question, are two Marine Reserves enough for scientific research and the answer is no. From a scientific perspective there are not enough statistics for comparison. You need replication; you need a minimum of three of each as a bare minimum. Alan personally felt you need five MRs for comparison. Once the preliminary data has been collected you can tell precisely how many you ought to have in order to statistically answer your question. Dave Lacey commented at a size and spacing workshop it addressed this exact issue. It depends on how big your reserve is as to how many you need. If you have a bunch of little babies like Otter Rock, you are going to need more of them to get that network benefit. It does depend how big they are.

Kathy said for the August meeting we will be back to the regular third Wednesday which is August 18 at 5:30 p.m. at the same location.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.