

**Oregon International Port of Coos Bay
Marine Reserves Recommendation Committee
October 20, 2010; 5:30pm**

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

MINUTES

Attendance: Steve Bodner; Rodger Craddock; Gus Gates; Rick Goché; Mike Graybill; John Griffith; Mike Helfrich; Devin Hockema; Dr. Jan Hodder; Don Ivy; Dave Lacey; Mike Lane; Matt LeDoux; James Moore; Don Peabody; Valerie Peña; Jim Pex Sr.; Bill Poppe; Reg Pullen; Dr.; John Schaefer; Dr. Alan Shanks; Dr. Steve Shimotakahara; Bart Stein; Keith Tymchuk; Dean Warner; Margie Whitmer;

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

Guests: Anna Pakenham, ODF&W; Susan Allen, Our Ocean; Ben Enticknap, Oceana

Opening: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Mr. Pex.

Opening Remarks & Updates

Mr. Pex asked for self-introductions around the room including the guests.

Approval of Minutes of September 8, 2010

Mr. Pex asked for comments on the minutes. Hearing none he asked for a motion for approval of the September 8, 2010 minutes.

Upon a motion by Mike Helfrich (seconded by Don Ivy) the Marine Reserves Recommendation Committee members voted unanimously to approve the minutes of September 8, 2010.

Mr. Pex explained the process for tonight's meeting. Ms. Wall will talk about how the proposals were created, an email was sent out asking committee members to prioritize their top proposal choices for the public meetings, there will be clarification and discussion on those proposals, committee members will have an opportunity to change their selections or make selections for the first time if they haven't already done so and finally a tally of those choices will be done. Discussion tonight will also include the process for public meetings.

Facilitated Discussion with Crystal Shoji, Facilitator

Ms. Wall explained how the proposals were designed using comments from the previous meeting minutes and ranking which proposals committee members felt should go forward for public comment. There was also discussion on providing information on all proposals to demonstrate the committees work including bullet points as to why certain proposals were not considered for moving forward for public comment. Ms. Wall explained she used the PowerPoint presentation the committee had been working from and the bullet

points that were put together including suggestions on how to categorize them. Dr. Rumrill redefined some maps based on committee discussion. She also explained that some of the pages in the pamphlet had new maps. The proposals included information on the biological and ecological characteristics of each area, current uses, socio economic impacts and general committee discussion. She said Mr. Gates had pointed out his proposal was not presented accurately as he had agreed to remove the Marine Reserve portion of his proposal changing it to a Marine Protected Area only. She asked that the committee have discussion on what is the most accurate description of the new area. Ms. Wall also said there would be input from people who choose not to supply a ranking by email.

Mr. Graybill said he was grateful for the development of the brochures and felt they would be helpful. He commented that some of the proposals had a notation that they were not recommended for consideration in a banner across the map whereas others have the same information included in the discussion points. Ms. Wall explained that anything included in the narrative is not in the record as reaching consensus and the ones that have the banner included in the map the committee at a previous meeting came to consensus on not moving those proposals forward for the public meetings. Mr. Graybill commented that on Proposal J he thought there was consensus to not move it forward. He said it is explained in the committee discussion that it shouldn't be recommended but it does not include that it shouldn't be considered by someone else just as in Mr. Gates proposal. Mr. Graybill felt it was just a formatting issue. Ms. Wall explained that Mr. Gates had two proposals with one where consensus was reached for not moving it forward for public input. She said if Mr. Graybill was interpreting the bullet points as deciding not to go forward for public comment that was what was included in the discussion. Mr. Graybill said he felt there was consensus and Ms. Wall responded that technically there was no consensus. Ms. Wall asked if Proposal J should be presented in public meetings in its current format or should it be changed including those proposal where comments would not be solicited. She also explained to the committee that unlimited resources were not available to do exhibits. Mr. Pullen said he created his proposal as an idea.

Mr. Goché asked for clarification on the brochure that was going to be created for public comment and would it include all of the proposals including those that the committee would not be selecting. Ms. Wall said a decision had not been made, but her observation was, in going to a public meeting there is worth in showing them all the work that the committee has done, not just the proposals that are being presented for public comment. She felt it would explain to the public what the background was on all of the proposals and why some were considered and others were not. Ms. Wall said she was proposing taking some kind of an exhibit on all of the proposals focusing on those selected by the committee for more public input.

Mr. Helfrich commented in regard to Proposal J he felt many of the committee members thought it was a good area to look at primarily because it didn't have a large economic impact on sport or commercial fishermen. He said the committee did agree this area was outside of this committee's jurisdiction much like the Siltcoos Study Area. Mr. Helfrich said this area was important to him and hoped it could be conveyed to the Port Commission in a letter how the committee did not select this area but it might be an area to look at. He then mentioned how the Port Orford committee selected Red Fish Rock

but he felt that this location might be the next best site in Oregon, and even though the other committee selected another location, it might be worth having the State look at this site for consideration. Ms. Wall suggested then as part of the public process the committee states that this area was considered but by consensus was not being recommended to the Port Commission.

Mr. Bodnar asked if committee member proposal selections could be amended. Ms. Wall responded yes, the rankings could be changed. Mr. Lacey said he thought for presentation purposes in the selected proposals all the maps should be the same. Ms. Wall said she had spoken to Anna Pakenham and Ms. Don from ODF&W prior to the meeting and they have agreed to create new maps that would be like scaled to provide comparisons between the areas.

Dr. Shanks felt there should be discussion as to what was going to be taken forward to the public meetings. He felt there had been agreement to take all of the proposals forward which would create very long meetings, they would be confusing and there would not be enough time to collect information on the proposals the committee was interested in carrying forward. Ms. Wall asked Mr. Shanks if he was suggesting the proposals where consensus was reached not to move them forward would not be presented at all and he responded yes. Ms. Wall said that would be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Helfrich asked in the informal polling that took place was there a majority to the selections or were they all over the landscape. He suggested if the selections were fairly centralized maybe the committee would want to present the centralized ones and let the public know there had also been discussion on the other proposals.

Mr. Peabody asked if a committee member amended their selection were they able to rank a single choice and not rank any of the other proposals. Ms. Wall responded there were some committee members who selected only one proposal in ranking their choices. Mr. Pex asked the committee how they wanted to cover the selection of the proposals. Ms. Wall responded that she had forms for the committee to use and that they needed to include their names if they were changing their previous selections.

Mr. Poppe said he did not have time to look at the information because he was out of town and did not have time to communicate with the constituents he represented so he would be guessing as to the selections they might make or the order. Ms. Wall explained that the proposals were not ranked in order that it was just a tally for the public meetings. Dr. Hodder asked for clarification on the process. Mr. Ivy asked for those who have cast their choices electronically, was there a tally of those votes for assurance they have been received. Ms. Wall responded yes. Ms. Shoji explained that the choices would be tallied this evening during a break.

Dr. Shanks asked for clarification on proposal G as it was being presented with both a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area, the Marine Reserve portion has now been removed so committee members would be voting for a Marine Protected Area only. Ms. Shoji said the proposals would be reviewed one more time so that everyone would know what they were selecting.

Mr. Lane asked if a person had less than three choices is there a rule that you can vote for any proposal one time only. Ms. Wall explained if a committee member only had one choice that would become their number one selection. Mr. Helfrich asked whether the votes would be weighted or tallied. Ms. Wall responded the choices would be tallied.

Mr. Graybill asked about Proposal H which is a no Marine Reserve, No Marine Protected Area option. He felt if option H appeared on the list of proposals it should be one that any committee considered. He went on to say if the committee is soliciting public input he felt there were not a lot of input options available. Ms. Wall felt that public input could be collected on Proposal H because what the committee would be looking at is what impacts a particular site has, and what additional information does a person providing input have to share. She said if someone wanted to say they supported a no Marine Reserve proposal and listed the impacts it would have on them, the committee should be willing to hear that input. Mr. Graybill responded that he wasn't saying he didn't feel Proposal H should be an option, but he would like to see three actual places a no Marine Reserve might be located. Ms. Wall asked the committee to keep in mind that no Marine Reserve is an option through the process.

Ms. Shoji asked for comments on the pamphlet that was sent out by email and wanted to know if committee members felt there was anything missing from them. She reminded the committee she was not looking for new information on the proposals, only information they felt might be missing. Mr. Gates asked how the decision was made to move forward with only three proposals. Ms. Shoji responded that there wasn't a decision to move forward with only three but to see which proposals rose to the top. Ms. Don commented that this was the committee's opportunity to address any information they felt needed to be clarified.

Dr. Shanks wanted to begin with Proposal G. Mr. Pex asked that the committee start with proposal A and go through them in order. Ms. Shoji asked for comments on Proposal A.

Comments on Proposal A – Mr. Graybill said there was a discussion and suggestion when this proposal was advanced about moving the northerly line into the shoreline. Ms. Wall explained that the map in the pamphlet was the revised map with the new boundaries after the discussion. Mr. Graybill commented that he noticed the southerly line had been adjusted to the north in response to comments that Mr. Peabody had made, but he felt he recalled that Mr. Helfrich suggested striking a straight line that ran across the tip of the reef into a distinct shore point. He wasn't sure that had been done. Ms. Wall confirmed that the northerly line had been moved. Ms. Doyle responded that it was moved partially because of the intertidal area and the fact that this area would not be under water at low tide. Mr. Graybill commented that if the line was projected into the shore there would be a substantial portion of subtidal that would be included which is currently not represented. Ms. Wall responded that this was an updated map from Dr. Rumrill so she would need to defer comments to him. Mr. Graybill asked if he were correct in remembering the discussion. Mr. Peabody responded yes and that the rocky intertidal is part of a Marine Reserve. Dr. Hodder clarified the boundary for Proposal A is 50 feet below the low tide to allow for bank fishermen. She said because there are no good maps available right now this is the best estimate for where 50 feet off low tide

would occur. She commented that they have been working toward getting better maps and didn't feel the line would be much different than what is shown now but it would allow them to show where the lowest tide is. Mr. Hockema said he felt the low water line was depicted pretty accurately. Mr. Peabody said his recollection of what Dr. Hodder said was the boundary was moved into the shoreline eliminating the 50 foot exclusion zone. Dr. Shanks responded they were trying not to cut off shore fishermen so with the 50 foot exclusion zone they would still be able to fish from shore. Mr. Graybill said if the committee was going to create a brochure for public comment he felt it was important to be careful when using terms like *Macrocystis integrifolia* because it wouldn't offer a whole lot of information to the public. He felt it would be better to use the term Great Kelp or seaweed or something with broader public understanding than some of the technical terminology that now exists in the narrative. Mr. Warner felt removing the Latin name of the Great Kelp wasn't necessary because the public was more intelligent than what they were being given credit for.

Comments on Proposal B – Ms. Shoji commented that there was already consensus for not moving this proposal forward.

Comments on Proposal C – Mr. Gates commented that he liked the fact that the shoreline miles were listed and felt a scale should be included in all of the proposals so the public would be able to judge the size of the areas. Ms. Wall responded that it would be on the ODF&W maps. Mr. Gates then commented on the first bullet and suggested the first discussion point be separated with commas to read “restricts commercial hook and line, and trawl. Mr. Helfrich said it should show it restricts sport fishing which was part of the original discussion. Dr. Hodder asked if the committee was adding new items to the discussion points. Ms. Shoji answered they would not be added unless it was something that had been missed and had already been included in previous discussion. Ms. Wall responded that she didn't feel it was necessary to capture every comment to be taken to the public as long as the important ones were listed that would help the committee reach their decision. Ms. Hodder said in comparing the comments in the different proposals, some of them were very lengthy and others were not and they didn't cover very many topics. She felt the comments should be reorganized and more specific. Ms. Wall suggested once the proposals are ranked then go back and add comments. She said what she was currently looking for were inaccuracies, such as in Mr. Gates proposal which still showed a Marine Reserve, and not small bullet points. Mr. Graybill said this is the first proposal that presents to the public a Marine Reserve with a Marine Protected Area and in looking at the narrative it doesn't really distinguish or differentiate what would take place in those areas. He felt the public should be made aware of the difference between a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area and if it wasn't included in the pamphlet then it should be made a part of the public presentation so when they look at the map they can see the differences. He felt the comments in the pamphlet should be associated with either the Marine Reserve or the Marine Protected Area portions of the discussion points. Mr. Tymchuk suggested that as part of the introductory comment of each proposal the difference be explained in detail. Ms. Don said the committee was bouncing back and forth in their discussion and that the focus of the current discussion was on any mistakes in the pamphlet that needed to be addressed prior to the rankings. The information that was going to be presented at the public meetings would be included in the second half of this meeting.

Comments on Proposal D – Ms. Wall asked the committee to keep in mind a cluster or combination can be made using the other proposals which leaves the ability to cluster even though Proposal B has been eliminated. Mr. Helfrich said Gregory Point and South Cove are already highly unacceptable and there is redundancy so basically what is left is Simpson Reef which is already a proposal. Dr. Shanks said it is not South Cove and that South Cove was purposely excluded because it is an area that is heavily used. He said Proposal C did not include South Cove at all. He said ideally there would be a cluster of Marine Reserves close together comprised of Proposals A, B & C. He commented that the committee did not like Proposal B, the Cape Arago Study Area, so it shouldn't be included in Proposal D creating a cluster of two and not three. Dr. Shanks felt that Proposal D should be moved forward but only as Simpson Reef Giant Kelp and South Cove Study Area which doesn't include south of South Cove at all, and remove what is currently called Cape Arago Study Area. Mr. Peabody said he would like to see all three included because it creates unity as a committee. As a committee it would be interesting to see the community reaction to a series of three small proposals. A series of two small proposals he felt would not give as much as a series of three, four or five proposals clustered together. He felt the community might like the cluster approach versus one large Marine Reserve.

Ms. Shoji commented that she didn't feel anyone had ever said that this cluster of proposals should be separated in any of the other meetings so she suggested moving on with the discussion. Mr. Graybill said the committee has never had a chance to discuss this idea because at the other meetings the first option was ruled out by consensus. He said he recalled that these proposals were presented by the presenters as some for instances and this was presented as a for instance. He felt the committee could be reflective and it is achieving that discussion and as Dr. Shanks has just pointed out the discussion has carried forward to a point where the committee knows more about it and the committee can speak more specifically about a cluster concept. He said the for instance example is failing in that regard because one location has been ruled out. Ms. Shoji replied "so there it sits" and asked if that was a problem. Mr. Graybill responded if it was being presented to the public it wasn't any part of that discussion. Ms. Shoji replied that we are currently discussing what the committee members wanted to move forward for public comment and if this proposal is one that moves forward there will be a chance for further clarification. Mr. Pex said the purpose of this discussion is to run through the proposals to see if there are any technical errors that need to be corrected. He said if the committee was going to make a landmark change to a proposal it needed to be done either by consensus or by vote. This would be a landmark change by excluding an entire area so the committee either moves the proposal forward as it is or the changes need to be made through a process. Dr. Shanks said he was under the impression two months ago because no one liked the Gregory Point and Sunset Rock area that it had already been removed from this proposal. Mr. Goeché said he was confused because now things that were voted on were being changed. Ms. Wall said the purpose of this review was to see if there were errors in the proposals and asked if on proposal B there was anything glaring that would change or influence a persons ranking of this proposal. Ms. Wall said there was no previous consensus to remove this area from the proposal. Mr. Lacey asked for consensus to remove Gregory Point from the cluster. Mr. Pex asked if Mr. Lacey was making a motion and he responded yes. There was one opposition to

removing Gregory Point from this proposal. Mr. Pex said the committee will then need to go through a vote. Mr. Lacey then proposed removing the area as a vote which was seconded by Dr. Shanks. Mr. Peabody commented that he would like to see agreement among the committee that if there is a vote for dropping the area then the committee will not entertain any future motions to revote for people not attending tonight's meeting. For clarification he said for those who were not at the meeting tonight who had already made their selections that they could not come back and say since you dropped this area I want to change my vote. Mr. Pex asked for all in favor of dropping this on geographic area from this proposal raise their hand. A count of those raising their hands showed nine in favor and six were opposed so the motion carried. Six committee members abstained from voting.

Comments on E – Mr. Poppe commented the word miles should be used in the first sentence instead of kilometers.

Comments on F – Consensus was not to move this proposal forward.

Comments on G – Ms. Wall asked Mr. Gates to explain the error in his proposal. Mr. Gates said as a committee there were concerns expressed that this proposal was very similar to the Gregory Point Sunset Rocks proposal so he said at the last meeting he was willing to drop the Marine Reserve component from this proposal but felt it was important to still have the concept of a Marine Protected Area so in essence his proposal would be for a Marine Protected Area. Ms. Wall then asked him to clarify the boundaries. Mr. Gates said he would make the whole area a Marine Protected Area. Mr. Hockema said under current uses it should state that this area is heavily crabbed. Ms. Wall said she would check the record for comments made for current uses of this area. Mr. Pex commented that it had already been decided that areas used for current salmon fishing and crabbing would still be allowed in anything the committee proposed. Mr. Gates wanted to clarify the current uses in this area such as crabbing, salmon trolling, bottom fishing, hook and line would still be allowed. He felt as a Marine Protected Area a lot of the current discussion points shown were invalid. He said the intent of his proposal would be to prevent future offshore industrial development. Ms. Wall said the record would be checked for previous comments and better definition of the Marine Protected Area Mr. Gates was proposing. Ms. Whitmer felt it would be good to list the number of miles this proposal would encompass. Ms. Wall responded that this would be included in the maps that ODF&W would be providing.

Mr. Tymchuk asked if this Marine Protected Area proposal was inside or within the waters that Ocean Power Technologies has indicated they filed for. Mr. Gates responded no that the area he is proposing is south of that area. The boundaries are from the south jetty south and stops just past Cape Arago. Ms. Peña said she had concerns telling the public current uses would be allowed and what guarantee does the committee have that once the recommendation goes to OPAC and then on to the legislature that they completely change it to the definition that OPAC used in the original MPA designation. Mr. Pex responded the committee is going to vote on it and the committee cannot control any changes. Mr. Pex explained the purpose of the public meetings was to receive input from the public and to make clarification at the meetings. Mr. Poppe asked what the size of the proposed area was. Mr. Gates said the proposal goes to the Territorial Sea

Boundary which is the offshore rocks and over approximately 3.5 miles. Mr. Graybill commented this Marine Protected Area encompasses the area of Proposal A and by removing the Marine Reserve from this proposal fails to meet the OPAC criteria because the committee has been charged with identifying Marine Reserves. He said you cannot have a stand alone Marine Protected Area, that a Marine Protected Area can only accompany a Marine Reserve. Mr. Graybill said he supported the proposal modification but by pulling out the Marine Reserve component it may drop it below what OPAC would consider as a proposal. He suggested if Proposal A is still considered a viable proposal as a Marine Reserve and it could be encompassed by this Marine Protected Area. Ms. Wall reminded the committee that these were two separate proposals and asked that tonight they focus on any errors that might be in the pamphlet. Mr. Graybill commented that this proposal contained inaccuracies. Ms. Shoji reminded the committee they will have an opportunity to suggest their recommendations later. Mr. LeDoux asked if it had been discussed at an earlier meeting that permits to enter this area be required as he wasn't sure it had moved forward. Mr. Gates responded that it had been discussed but that it was never concluded.

Comments on H – Mr. Graybill felt the map was very confusing and asked why it was even needed. Mr. Gates said he agreed. Mr. Pex responded the map was necessary to show the limits of the committee's venue. Mr. Graybill commented that he didn't feel this map did that. Mr. Pullen commented with no hypothesis he didn't understand why it was bad. A suggestion was made to leave the map but just include the word "no" eliminating everything else. Ms. Doyle asked if an overview map showing the committee's area for consideration could be used where all the proposed sites that were moving forward would be on one map. Ms. Pakenham said that could be done.

Comments on I – Ms. Wall said that this proposal would probably have the same map comment as H because she used the FERC map. Mr. Tymchuk asked if this proposal had been put forward following discussion with the developer. Ms. Wall responded that there had not been discussion with the developers of any wave buoy parks because the proposal is not developer driven. The proposal was project site specific driven. Dr. Hodder commented she felt maps for this proposal was a very bad idea and that this proposal should not have maps because there is not a site associated with it. She felt by including a map it was saying here are the sites for this proposal. Ms. Wall agreed to drop the maps for Proposal I.

Comments on J - No consensus for moving forward.

Mr. Lane asked for clarification on proposal C's boundaries where it indicated the inshore boundary as high tide and the Marine Reserve boundary as 3.6 miles along the shore. He said the area shown in the map is no where near 3.6 miles but closer to 1 – 1.5 miles to Sacchi Beach up to the south of Cape Arago. He felt someone should look at the map for clarification. Dr. Hodder said she actually measured the distance and it is 1.33 miles long and said she should have previously caught that to make the change.

Mr. Pex asked the committee if they were at a point where they could rank their proposal selections. Ms. Wall commented if someone wanted to change their email selections to indicate that when making their choices.

Dr. Hodder asked for clarification on the selections and in choosing 1, 2 and 3, is 1 better than 2 better than 3. Ms. Wall responded it would be the three proposals a committee member felt were most worthy of taking public comment on and that the selection was not weighted. Dr. Hodder then asked, the committee had already voted on the consensus proposals correct, so they are no longer an issue and the committee would not be moving those forward? Ms. Wall responded if the choice was to select a consensus proposal the committee was welcome to do that but by consensus that proposal would not be put forward for public comment. Ms. Wall explained that some people wanted Proposal J as their choice which won't influence taking comment on it because there was already consensus that this proposal was not moving forward for public comment. Ms. Shoji asked the committee members to please send forward their selections so that they could be tallied during the 15 minute break.

At 6:45 p.m. Mr. Pex called for a break.

At the end of the break the proposal selections had been tallied with the following committee selection outcome:

Proposal A = 24, Proposal B = 2, Proposal C = 10, Proposal D = 1, Proposal E = 1, Proposal F = 0, Proposal G = 10, Proposal H = 20, Proposal I = 6 and Proposal J = 3.

Ms. Shoji asked for discussion on taking the most popular proposals forward. Dr. Shanks proposed that the committee put forward four proposals instead of three which are Proposals A, C, G and H. Mr. Tymchuk said he agreed with Dr. Shanks by explaining that one proposal was a pure Marine Reserve, one a pure Marine Protected Area, one a no Marine Reserve/no Marine Protected Area, and one that is a combination of a Marine Reserve and Marine Protected Area. Mr. Stein commented he felt some committee members were at a disadvantage because the proposal packets were not out in time for them to be presented to the constituents represented by them. He said he would like to see the committee make a commitment to give a month's lead time whenever a decision needed to be made so that those representing constituents had enough time to get their input prior to a decision or vote. Mr. Stein said he abstained from choosing proposals because he hadn't had a chance to take the information to his group. Mr. Bodnar said he agreed with Mr. Stein. He said he had submitted his selections by email and that he had a minimal amount of time to get feedback from his constituents. Although he wasn't able to get input from everyone he did amend his selection tonight based on input from those who had contacted him.

Mr. Tymchuk said even though Proposal J is outside of this committee's area for consideration he wondered if it was worth mentioning at a public forum that it was given some support. Mr. Pex asked the committee to keep in mind that this discussion was based on which proposals to take forward for public comment and that all of the proposals would be at the public meetings. That the four proposals identified would be looked at more carefully and out of this smaller group the committee would most likely select one proposal. Mr. Pex also said the times for the town hall meetings had not yet been determined and that there would be time for committee members to go to their constituents inviting them to attend the town hall meetings and provide input. Future

discussion will include how the input will be taken. All committee members are invited to attend and Mr. Pex would like to see them identified with name badges. Mr. Pex asked if there were any additional discussion on the four proposals that would be moving forward for public comment or was there consensus. Mr. Goché said he would like to move forward with consensus on the four proposals but asked if a decision was necessary about any particular proposal or just whether or not the committee was going to move forward with these four. Mr. Helfrich responded that all of the proposals would be available for the public to see but that the committee has narrowed it down to these four. Mr. Lacey asked if the committee was going to ask for comments on the other proposals that were not moving forward. Mr. Pex said further discussion would take place.

Mr. Peabody recommended a definite separation of the proposals and suggested a table with the ones not going forward letting the public know they were considered but were not moving forward for public comment. He agreed the four proposals going forward were a good representation and that receiving public comments on them will give direction as to where the committee should go with them.

Dr. Shimotakahara apologized for missing the first part of the meeting and said there was a consensus put forward that the wave energy issue should be re-examined if a park is sited in the future and felt it should be brought to the public's attention. He also wanted to take issue with the points identified as committee discussion points including "does not meet the standard set for a Marine Reserve or Marine Protected Area and does not meet the scientific rationale for an MR/MPA." He felt these issues were put to rest when Ed Bowles came to the meeting and stated that the whole issue was wide open and that there were no complications with regard to a Marine Protected Area or Marine Reserve. Dr. Shimotakahara felt the comments had an effect on how committee members made their selections. He felt the discussion points were not representative of the actual discussion and this idea is one that should be looked at in the future. He repeated there was consensus on this. Mr. Pex suggested that Dr. Shimotakahara meet privately with Ms. Wall to address his concerns since unfortunately the committee had already discussed his proposal in his absence. Mr. Pex said he wanted to move forward with the four proposal concepts and that the committee could detail his suggestions into his proposal prior to the town hall meetings. Dr. Shimotakahara agreed to move on.

Mr. Pex said he was looking for two things and did the committee have consensus to move forward with the four proposals A, C, G and H and secondly, discussion on how and when the meetings would occur. He then asked the committee if there was consensus on taking Proposals A, C, G and H forward. No one responded "no" to moving these four proposals forward, there was one abstention, so Mr. Pex said there was consensus.

Mr. Pex then asked for discussion on how to present the proposals. Mr. Warner felt the initial remarks at the public meetings should clearly point out that this committee was brought together to review and make recommendations and that a "no recommendation" is part of the procedure so that the public is clear that they are not being forced into making a decision to have a Marine Reserve or a Marine Protected Area.

Mr. Graybill said he supported Mr. Peabody's suggestion that once it is time to receive public comment it would be good to cluster the proposals considered but not moving forward. Mr. Graybill thought it had been very helpful to have members of the committee walk through and describe each and every proposal and suggested that as part of the introduction it be related to the public that the committee was here to receive public comment on specific proposals but would like to present the range of options considered by the committee by walking through all of the proposals and for more information on the other options please visit the tables where they are described in further detail. Who ever presents the four selected proposals the committee is interested in receiving comment on would focus the public on those. Mr. Graybill said he also supported Mr. Warner's comments and that the committee as a group is advancing a recommendation to the Port Commission. We are soliciting comments from the public to influence how the committee makes their recommendation.

Mr. Goché said he keeps hearing committee members say how the public comment was supposed to influence what is recommended to the Port. He said the group he represents already knows what they want. He asked the committee if they or the group they represent were going to change their minds about how they felt and if the public comment would contribute to that. Mr. Pex responded the public deserves to make comment on the committee's work and this is an opportunity for the public to provide input but the committee decides the final proposals.

Mr. Poppe said he recommended that the World newspaper put the four proposals forward with an explanatory statement and request that they not edit the comments just so the information gets out to the larger public. Mr. Helfrich said the public meetings cover this group in case something was missed and gives the public an opportunity to provide input. He said the public will have two opportunities to provide input by attending the public meetings or the Port Commission meeting when the recommendation is made to them. Mr. Helfrich suggested moving forward as soon as possible using a time table of what is required for public notice, have the meetings at a public place on a weekday evening, and select three locations such as Reedsport, Bandon, and the Bay Area or Charleston. Ms. Wall asked the committee if there was an opinion for time of day. Mr. Helfrich responded evening after dinner around 7:00 p.m. with a specific end time. Dr. Hodder suggested the meeting could be held in the OIMB dining hall.

Ms. Don suggested not presenting the proposals as options for a yes or no response but as a scenario for actual input. She felt the committee might learn more from public input and might want to make some adjustments in the proposals that would result in a proposal that may work better than one of the ones that was put forward. Ms. Don's second recommendation was to produce an information packet that would not include the committee discussion points since the committee was looking for input from the public but suggested leaving the committee discussion points on the proposals that did not move forward.

Mr. Gates suggested providing a quick overview by either Mr. Pex or Ms. Wall on how the committee was established and what the committee's charge is. And second, a quick overview by ODF&W on why the committee is discussing Marine Reserves in Oregon's Territorial Sea. Mr. Gates liked the representation at different areas and the evening

meetings. He also suggested having the various proposals on a small table where the public could look at a map for more interaction instead of a lecture style format. His last suggestion was for those who couldn't attend a public meeting they could provide written comments via email.

Mr. LeDoux wanted to touch on the timeline where at the very beginning of the meetings a goal was set and the committee has currently been meeting for 18 months. He felt the committee was spending a lot of time on these discussions and there was need to keep a timeline and focus because the committee is overdue and should have been done by today. Mr. Pex replied that Ms. Wall has indicated once these meetings are complete it will take 30 days to put the notices out and put the information together. Ms. Wall said it was going to take time but she was keyed in on the timeline and needed time to work on the venue and staffing options working toward sooner rather than later.

Mr. Peabody said the original charge did not have a timeline so the committee will be here as long as it takes. He repeated that the committee is not working under a strict deadline like the other community teams. He said the committee is working under a financial and common sense deadline but it's not a strict deadline.

Mr. Bodner commented that all of the proposals should have the size specifications including the distance from shore and the square miles they encompass. He suggested that all uses be specified more clearly using "little commercial fishing" as an example by explaining what that represented and what it would be if the area was approved for a Marine Reserve and what it would restrict so it is clear to the public.

Mr. Lacey said he would like to see not only written comments at the meetings but also email comments as options.

Mr. Ivy commented he was hoping the committee could take a good look at the minutes capturing all of the suggestions on how to present the information, clear definitions of terminology used for a Marine Reserve or Marine Protected Area, ground fishing, hook and line, trolling, and post the terms on the wall as a glossary to avoid spending a lot of time explaining this information to the public. He said he hoped there is agreement to an end of this committee process recognizing that with the upcoming holiday season it may not be November or December but that the committee comes out of the holiday season with an end. He questioned whether or not public meetings could be arranged by the end of this year. Mr. Ivy said to answer the question that was asked earlier whether or not he expected his mind to be changed by the public input process and what the committee came up with as alternatives he didn't feel that every perspective had been represented during this process and the committee will be confronted with different constituent groups that haven't been able to participate with input. As a member of the public and the public he represented, Mr. Ivy was interested in hearing the public's views, did they have an interest and can they persuade other members of the public.

Mr. Warner said he agreed with a lot of what Mr. Ivy said but that he represents a specific group, he knows how they feel and that reflects in his vote. Mr. Warner felt that the committee needed to recognize that these waters and lands are public and they have a right to have an impact on what this committee decides. He said if a committee member

is voting a personal preference, and is representing a public at large, he didn't know how public comment could be ignored and may be apt to change that individual's vote.

Ms. Peña suggested that public meetings not be held until after the December holidays as the public will be occupied with family and holiday parties, and this committee owed the public time to attend the public meetings. She felt a lot of people would be eliminated from attendance during the holidays for various reasons.

Ms. Doyle said a few committee members had raised concerns as to what was in the bullet points and explained that they were not exhaustive but the comments that people had raised as the proposals were being discussed so they can be added to. Secondly, Ms. Doyle felt sending something to the World newspaper was a good idea and maybe whatever the official packet that would be presented to the public could be a PDF file on the Port web site so that people could be directed there so if they were going to give public comment by email that is where they would find the information.

Mr. Tymchuk felt for the public meetings the proposals should be referred to as draft proposals and not "our" proposals. He also recommended eliminating the committee discussion bullet points on the four proposals going forward so the public would not be influenced by them and would be giving their input. Mr. Tymchuk liked the overview suggestion of what the Port of Coos Bay has tasked this committee with along with ODF&W. The overview would be for 3 – 5 minutes. Written comments need to be made available. The proposals should contain identical maps with identical scales, colors and design. He suggested clustering the four proposals moving forward with the other six options at the back representing committee discussion and consideration of other options. Mr. Tymchuk said he was leery of the idea of publishing the document that was going to be presented in the newspaper due to the public potentially receiving misinformation. He did like the idea of doing a story and if the public was interested in seeing the proposals they could be referred to a web site that would have them with a narrative.

Mr. Craddock said he had heard input on public discussion, public comment and public input but felt the committee did not want to get into a situation with a question and answer period, only a public comment opportunity. He felt there should be ground rules on receiving public comment including a timeline for the speaker so that as many people as possible could give their comments. He said if a timeline was not established that someone would end up taking all the available time. Mr. Craddock suggested setting the guidelines for giving public comment ahead of time including that this was not an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Helfrich said he would like to see the committee discussion points left in all proposals for two reasons. One was so that the public could see what the committee had already looked at, and two, that it would avoid redundancy on what had already been considered. He felt leaving the comments in the proposals might also help bring up ideas within the public's mind and solicit new testimony.

Mr. Griffith said he had a conflict the night he would have presented his Proposal H for no Marine Reserve and no Marine Protected Area so he felt he had taken a step backward

and that his proposal might be viewed as eradicating the five that already exist. He said his proposal was for no “new” Marine Reserves and no “new” Marine Protected Area.

Mr. Lacey said he disagreed with leaving the committee discussion points in the proposals because some were chosen to be included and some of them had been left out so he felt it wasn't fair. He felt it would also sidetrack the discussion and felt there should be a committee vote on leaving them in or not. Mr. Pex asked him to clarify his comments. Mr. Lacey said it was unfair to include just some comments instead of all of the comments. He felt there were a lot of discussion points missing from some of the proposals in the pamphlet so he felt they should all be taken out. Mr. Pex felt the decision had already been made to not include them. Ms. Wall said it hadn't been decided because Mr. Helfrich commented he felt they should be left in. A comment was made that he heard in the discussion they would be taken out of the four proposals moving forward but left in the others.

Dr. Hodder asked what the four proposals were going to look like and how will information be gathered. She felt the other six were fine as they were. She said the committee has already decided that the SOORC maps were not the place to get information. How will the committee accurately reflect what the fishing activity is in these areas? Mr. Bodner responded he felt that ODF&W had fish data and log books. He said they would know what fish were caught commercially. He said when saying minimal commercial fishing there are several different kinds of commercial fishing including trawlers and ODF&W would have information on them. He said commercial fishing could include hook and line, open access, salmon fishing and crabbing and ODF&W has information on these types of commercial fishing. Mr. Bodner would like to see listed what is currently allowed in an area and what would be restricted. He said currently most anything is allowed but what is going to be restricted later. He suggested having the information available in the glossary. Ms. Wall said she tried to eliminate qualifying words like “minimally” from the bullet points. She said in response to Dr. Hodder's comment she felt the committee needed to be careful with the information being taken forward for the presentations to reflect committee discussion and not new information. She asked the committee members to keep this in mind while talking through the meetings and the proposals.

Dr. Hodder said if some new information is not included she didn't feel the proposals would be reflected accurately. The example she used was Mr. Gates Proposal G which needs to be rewritten because the comments reflect it as a Marine Reserve with a Marine Protected Area which has now been changed with the elimination of the Marine Reserve so the discussion points are no longer reflective of the area. Ms. Wall said the committee has agreed to correct Mr. Gates proposal based on the information in the record.

Dr. Hodder said in Proposal C where there is a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area, she felt information should be included within those proposals so it is obvious what is being talked about.

Dr. Hodder asked if it wouldn't be prudent to have the four proposals moving forward produced and then have the committee look at them prior to going to a public meeting so if better definition is needed it can be discussed. Mr. Pex asked if she was talking about

the minor changes that were being discussed tonight by sending them out so everyone can see them prior to the public meetings. Dr. Hodder responded yes.

Mr. Peabody commented with respect to the no Marine Reserve proposal he felt if a map was not included that this proposal would be at a disadvantage in front of the public. He also commented since there is a rationale for that, which is the public SOORC map, he felt it could overlay a comment map which has the orange on it and then identify on that map the current areas that are already there and then size the map the same as the other maps which would be a map representation for the no Marine Reserve. Ms. Wall said the committee was going to get new like maps provided by ODF&W instead of the SOORC map which doesn't fit into the discussion. Mr. Peabody asked couldn't the SOORC map be gotten from someone else in the same scale. Ms. Wall responded that the SOORC map is proprietary information and cannot be used and to attempt to rescale it to fit the size of the ODF&W maps would be an expense. Mr. Goché said he could call Ecotrust to see if they would charge something to match the same scale as the ODF&W maps. He said if it was going to be an expense then the answer would be no. He felt if they could do it for free then he didn't see a problem with it since the data wouldn't be changed. Mr. Peabody said in the event that it does happen he proposed submitting the first map as is just so there is a map with the no Marine Reserve proposal.

Mr. Peabody said he felt the conversation was scattered and that he was hearing talk about verbal public comment, written public comment, email public comment, and video taped public comment and presentations. He felt the committee needed to go through a process to decide how the meetings would be formatted including, would they be held in an open room or an auditorium, the structure of the meetings and the structure of the presentations.

Ms. Shoji asked if the committee wanted to design the public meeting or if they felt it was okay for the steering committee to go back and design the public meetings that takes into consideration all of the comments that have been made instead of having 35 people trying to design them. Mr. Stein moved for consensus on having the steering committee design the structure of the public meetings. Mr. Gates seconded the motion for consensus. Mr. Gates said there had been healthy suggestions tonight and felt a foundation had been laid. He recommended the expertise of Sea Grant and ODF&W be included with the steering committee. Mr. Pex said there had been a motion and a second for consensus on having a steering committee put together the structure of the public meetings. There was no opposition so Mr. Pex said there was consensus for design by the steering committee. Ms. Wall asked for volunteers for the steering committee. The volunteers were Mr. Ivy, Ms. Doyle, Mr. Pex, Mr. Peabody, Ms. Don and Mr. Helfrich.

Mr. Graybill said he would be happy to offer his suggestions at this meeting and wanted to continue collecting ideas. He said he had helped the Port of Coos Bay a couple of years ago collect public input on a contentious ship breaking issue. He agreed that the committee should be very clear about how public input is collected and strongly discouraged a grandstanding format that would allow a single person taking the floor and dominating it. He said there were a series of very active discussions for the ship breaking meetings. One idea would be to have a moderator panel at a head table and then have them consolidate the comments. BLM has used a lecture style presentation where the

topic is introduced and the proposals are reviewed before breaking into an open house format where there are separate tables for each proposal with people at the tables receiving comments. He said it is a come and go as you choose environment where the audience is not trapped in an auditorium while someone is making a comment that no one else is interested in. This format is a way to gather multiple comments at the same time. Mr. Graybill suggested using an “open house” format with different stations after introducing the information to the public as a group. He said he would strongly discourage asking the public as a group what their thoughts were because he didn’t feel the committee would get the comments they were looking for.

Mr. Graybill commented on the presentation of the brochures stating the conversations about the topics emerged as the topics evolved. He felt relying exclusively on the minutes of the discussion of the different topics meant the committee would end up with an inconsistent presentation of the concepts. Mr. Graybill wanted to give the group working on the brochures editorial license to create them in a consistent format and if there was a need to fill in with information to achieve consistency he was comfortable with it.

Mr. Lane asked if Mr. Graybill was suggesting not having an open forum where people get up and present their three minutes reason why they disapprove of a proposal. Mr. Graybill responded that he strongly advised against doing that. Mr. Lane said then all the different proposals would be presented to the public and then open it up to the different stations where people would be able to make written comment for each one of the proposals so more than one person could be actively participating. Mr. Graybill suggested having representatives there to interact with people who have issues, answer questions, and have a stack of comment cards where ten people could be giving comments at the same time.

Mr. Griffith suggested using the consensus statement that was designed prior to designing the proposals as a starting point. Mr. Pex commented, using it as a foundation. Mr. Griffith asked Ms. Shoji if she would be at the meetings, to which she replied she felt she would be at some of them, because he said there was a legal obligation to keep people on point at the meetings. Mr. Griffith said it was necessary to be sensitive to people and to let them make their comments. Ms. Shoji clarified that there needed to be a place where people could make general comments and Mr. Griffith responded yes, and it would be necessary to allow some people to just be themselves. Mr. Griffith said it is really optimistic to think that the public is going to keep their comments just to the four proposals that were being presented. Mr. Pex said that is going to be something for the steering committee to work on as far as keeping people on point.

Mr. Warner asked to make a couple of comments for the steering committee starting with Proposal J which he said wasn’t a very popular proposal but there were a couple of sentences he felt were important to point out. Under the “proposal description” it reads “the MPA would still allow for crabbing and recreational fishing” and the next sentence “the MPA restricted activities have not yet been determined” which leaves an open door which he felt shouldn’t be left open as it would allow the State to move into that area. He also commented this was a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area and that the Snowy Plover comment should not be included in this proposal.

Dr. Shimotakahara wanted to make a comment for the steering committee because he said everyone is talking about the four proposals for public comment. He said the committee had already made a consensus decision about joining the wave energy park to a Marine Protected Area and it is something that should be looked at in the future should a wave energy park be sited. He felt it should be part of the public comment and that it was a decision the committee had already made. Dr. Shanks and Dr. Hodder said there had not been consensus on this idea. Mr. Pex told Dr. Shimotakahara he raised the issue mostly to get agreement from him to see if he would accept the concept that should a wave energy park ever be formed, this committee would reconvene and address the issue of combining the concept of a Marine Reserve with that wave energy park. Mr. Pex said he felt Dr. Shimotakahara had agreed but the committee had not had consensus on the concept. Dr. Shimotakahara said he disagreed. Mr. Pex said the minutes could be checked but that it was not something that was going to affect this meeting but it is something that could come about in the future.

Mr. Tymchuk said although he was sensitive to the holiday timeline, he was suggesting the first week of December for the public meetings if it can be arranged. He also suggested consistency in the way the information is presented at all of the meetings using the same people presenting the same information in Charleston, Bandon and Reedsport so that the information is consistent and everyone is hearing the same information from all who will be presenting. He asked if money could be made available to reimburse the proposal presenters since it was going to be three evenings. Mr. Tymchuk asked for committee members to volunteer to be at the meetings with some being representatives in their own communities such as Ms. Whitmer in Charleston and himself in Reedsport so that the public is commenting to people from their own community.

Mr. Peabody said with respect to the comments he would like to see rules for receiving comment recognizing that the ocean belongs to all Oregonians but this is also a community issue recognized by the Governor's Office and OPAC that convened a community committee dealing with this issue. He said he would like to see limits and rules on the comments. He said he didn't want someone from Seattle commenting necessarily effecting what is done in Oregon and that a comment from Ontario, Oregon may or may not be valid. Although Mr. Peabody recognizes the need to take public comment he felt there should be rules, especially on electronic comment because of the ability to inundate with comments.

Mr. Griffith would like to see some sound recording of testimony making it available on public access TV.

Mr. Lane asked if it were possible to have those making public comment give at least their zip code or area they are in to get an idea of how many public comments are coming from the local area. Mr. Goché commented maybe just their name and their city.

Mr. Goché said he again heard Mr. Peabody suggest that public comment is going to influence the outcome of this committee's decision making process. He agreed it is public domain and that the public needed to be heard but wanted to be absolutely certain that there wasn't going to be some sort of tally of public comment that some committee

members think is going to be part of the voting process. Mr. Goche said he wanted to be absolutely certain that there wasn't going to be some sort of tally with one side or the other attempting to stack the room full of their commenter's. Mr. Peabody said as a representative of the public at large it absolutely has to affect his vote. He said if the vote is ten to one for a Marine Reserve in good conscience and as much as he would hate to do it he would vote that way or he would be violating a personal responsibility to the community. He said from another standpoint there is a City of Reedsport representative and a City of Bandon representative and if the public outpouring in the City of Reedsport is ten to one for a Marine Reserve the representative's vote could absolutely be changed. The people who appointed the representative to this committee are looking at public support for a process. Mr. Peabody felt there was potential for inundation by a coordinated effort that is well financed to drive the public comment process the direction they want it to go which is why comment rules need to be established. He said if 1000 comments with the same view were received from Reedsport, Bandon and Coos Bay he would take it differently than if there were 1000 comments received from New York or Seattle. Mr. Peabody said there are several members in this community that are enough to swing a vote one way or the other whose vote could be changed.

Ms. Shoji said there seemed to be some hesitancy about requiring people to give their name and address which she felt was common practice for those giving public comment into the process.

Mr. Pex commented he would be more than happy to lead the charge on providing the introduction at the meetings. In the introduction he felt it was important to begin with HB 3013, the governor's letter to the committee, mention of the socio economic impacts, and some type of SOORC map that defines the socially important areas. Those are the external influences and then there are the internal influences. There are certain ground rules that have been put into the committee discussions such as the committee is not going to influence crabbing and salmon fishing. Mr. Pex said he would explain the processes the committee has gone through which brought the committee to the point of receiving public comment and then define the purpose of public comment and how the committee would use it in making the committee decision for a final recommendation to the Port.

Mr. Tymchuk commented the public that each committee member represents is quite different. For example, Mr. Gates represents a much smaller public in a sense in a specific group than Mr. Peabody does and that specific group is going to have a much greater impact on Mr. Gates and may have very little impact on Mr. Peabody. Mr. Tymchuk said everyone is going to have to trust each other and represent their public to the best of their ability.

Mr. Ivy said he was fascinated that in going through the meetings the committee is always trying to recall what was said and what the committee did. And yet the committee just passed the minutes and agreed that the minutes of the previous meeting were okay and then the committee never refers to them again. He said he thought he recalled at one of the previous meetings the reason the committee decided to go to the public is because the committee realized that it would not get to one choice and that the public could help the committee decide instead of having someone else decide for the committee. Mr. Ivy said he was all for the public comment. He said his expectation was

that the recommendation the committee made at the end as a result of the public comment will not look like any one of the four but will be something that represents all of what the public hopes for and the committee's expertise in guiding in what has been done so far will help the public be for a better defined proposal not what the original four looked like. Out of this there will be reception to establishing a Marine Reserve. He felt out of this there will be an alternative that is acceptable to the public, and that the committee will reconcile amongst themselves, and find something acceptable to advance as a recommendation. Mr. Ivy said he didn't feel the committee wanted to put two, three or four recommendations out there for someone else to pick and choose for the committee.

Mr. Pex said when the public process has been completed that was outlined in the overall process, the committee will come back with the information that has been collected, everyone will evaluate the information taking it under advisement, and when the committee decides to take a vote it is going to be up to the committee to decide how to proceed.

Mr. Lacey said he felt having names and addresses is great but asked that they not be released to everyone in the world due to a potential for harassment. Ms. Don said that ODF&W withholds the actual address from the newspaper and web site as there have been some instances of harassment.

Mr. Griffith felt the names and addresses would be public record but if the committee is putting out comments they do not need to be included with the comments.

Mr. Ivy said it was reasonable to expect that if a person is going to give testimony in a public setting then it is going to be recorded but in terms of publishing information the name could be disassociated from the person making the comments.

Mr. Warner said he felt it was essential to collect the names and addresses. He felt the committee members who are at the meetings would know pretty well who was there and where they had come from. He used the example of an organization such as Greenpeace who had recruited a bunch of people to overload a public meeting and could not analyze where they were coming from then that could influence, in an improper way, the script. Mr. Warner felt it was up to the committee members in attendance at the meetings to analyze who was at the meetings and to know the constituents.

Ms. Shoji asked if everyone was satisfied with the steering committee who would be putting the brochure together or if there were any other volunteers. Mr. Pex said Ms. Wall could send out an email with those names.

Mr. Stein asked for lead time to take actions back to his constituents before votes or selections are made.

Mr. Tymchuk clarified that prior to a pivotal vote there be a month lead time to take the information back to his constituents. Mr. Peabody asked if it could be amended to two weeks. Mr. Tymchuk said no because not everyone meets every two weeks and that the regularly scheduled meetings of a chamber of commerce is monthly. Mr. Helfrich asked if the committee wasn't at that point now so that committee members could say one of four things was going to happen subject to public comment.

Mr. Graybill said he supports what Mr. Ivy has said and that these concepts should be allowed to morph but when he heard Mr. Pex give a presentation and Mr. Helfrich make his comments that these four proposals will largely remain unchanged as a result of public comment he wanted to make sure that the committee's process allowed for an opportunity to modify the proposals in response to public comment. Mr. Pex responded that he did not say that. Mr. Graybill said he just wanted to be sure that the committee would have discussion and be allowed to change the four proposals to reflect input from public comment. Mr. Pex clarified that Ms. Wall will make modifications to the four proposals and email them out for the committee to have a chance to come back with input. Mr. Graybill said he was referring to after public comment. Mr. Pex said the proposals would be going out for public comment after which the committee will reconvene to make modifications within this group.

Mr. Ivy said he agreed with trying to get one or more meetings done by the first week of December and felt there would be enough time to do that. He wanted to know who was going to be working on getting the meeting locations lined up and the proposal information together. Ms. Wall responded that she had the following volunteers: ODF&W, Seagrant, Mr. Ivy, Mr. Helfrich, Mr. Pex and Mr. Peabody and herself. She said ODF&W staff will help Port staff. Mr. Stein said he would help facilitate a Bandon location and Mr. Tymchuk said he would help facilitate a location in Reedsport.

Mr. Ivy asked if there was going to be a November meeting and Ms. Wall said that still needed to be decided. She said it was suggested not to meet in November and that the steering committee has work to do so the committee needed to talk about how the information would go out to them.

Mr. Ivy asked if there was consensus for having any meetings the first week in December. Mr. Pex recommended giving the steering committee a chance to work on the proposals and meeting locations. Mr. Tymchuk asked if there was going to be a meeting in November and said the answer is no. He then commented that he had missed a lot of meetings but felt that the committee had taken a tremendously difficult task and had received a tremendous amount of input and a variety of information and nearly achieved what its mission was. He congratulated the committee for getting to this point.

There were no closing remarks.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.