

**Oregon International Port of Coos Bay
Marine Reserves Recommendation Committee
November 17, 2010; 5:30pm**

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

MINUTES

Attendance: Wayne Butler; Gus Gates; Rick Goché; Mike Graybill; John Griffith; Mike Helfrich; Dr. Jan Hodder; Don Ivy; Dave Lacey; Mike Lane; Matt LeDoux; James Moore; Jim Pex Sr.; Bill Poppe; Dr. Steve Rumrill; John Schaefer; Dr. Alan Shanks; Dr. Steve Shimotakahara; Margie Whitmer;

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

Guests: Gail Elber, The World; Thersa Wisner, Aquamarine Power

Opening: The meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Crystal Shoji.

Opening Remarks & Updates

There were no opening remarks by Chairman Pex.

Approval of Minutes of October 20, 2010

Ms. Shoji asked for comments on the minutes. Dr. Shimotakahara asked to be added to the attendance at the October 20th meeting. Hearing no other corrections or comments Ms. Shoji asked for a motion for approval of the October 20, 2010 minutes.

Upon a motion by Mr. Helfrich (seconded by Mr. Ivy) the Marine Reserves Recommendation Committee members voted unanimously to approve the minutes of October 20, 2010.

Facilitated Discussion with Crystal Shoji, Facilitator

Ms. Wall thanked the steering committee for their help with planning the meetings and locations which include Wednesday, December 8 at Bandon High School cafeteria, Thursday, December 9 at OIMB's dining hall and Monday, December 13 at Reedsport High School cafeteria. The meetings will run from 6:30 – 9:00 p.m. The room layout diagram was discussed which included a projector for an introductory PowerPoint presentation, tables with the four proposals for public comment, a general comment table, and a table for the proposals not moving forward along with additional maps. The meeting materials included the written comment form which will be two-sided where all comments on the four proposals will be on one sheet and the public comment meeting brochure.

Mr. Goché asked why the proposals were labeled A, C, G and H instead of A, B, C and D. Ms. Wall explained those were the original proposal letters that the committee decided to move forward for public comment. She said on Proposal B the committee had

reached consensus not to move it forward for public comment but that it will be at the meeting at the table for proposals not moving forward. Mr. Helfrich felt that by keeping the original proposal letters it would indicate to the public that there were other proposals considered in addition to these four.

Ms. Wall said the steering committee had a lot of discussion on the brochure and will be using one map with all of the proposals identified on it so the proposal descriptions can be on full pages for better font size and readability. She was looking to the committee for their input on any errors in the handout but would like to avoid language discussion since that had already occurred at several other meetings.

Ms. Wall asked Mr. Gates for input on his proposal description since it was not clear taking information from the meeting minutes. Mr. Gates felt overall the information captured his proposal but he asked that the wording change to indicate no bottom trawling would be allowed in the area. Ms. Wall said she didn't think bottom trawl had been nailed down very well because the committee was waiting for information from Mr. Bodner as to whether or not bottom trawl was occurring in this area and if it needed to be specifically addressed. She said as of now the question hadn't been answered and she agreed with Mr. Gates that it was appropriate to include the exclusion in his description. Mr. Gates said the last committee discussion point on Sunset Bay resulting in loss of major tourism was no longer applicable since the Marine Reserve portion of his proposal had been dropped. Accordingly, he asked that the comment be removed. In addition, he asked that the original Marine Reserve dividing line on the map be removed and extend the MPA boundary out to the Territorial Sea Boundary. Ms. Wall said since Mr. Gates changed his proposal to an MPA only, allowing existing uses, then the comment regarding Sunset Bay was no longer an accurate statement. Mr. Butler said if the comment was a sampling of committee discussion points then why would it be removed. Ms. Wall explained changing it from a Marine Reserve to a Marine Protected Area allowing existing uses, the comment now becomes irrelevant. She said not all comments were included on every proposal in the handout and she didn't have a problem removing that one comment if the committee could agree. Dr. Shimotakahara asked if all existing activities would be allowed, specifically shore-based angling, and would that require standing on the shore for angling or could you be angling from a boat launching it from the shore. Mr. Gates said the statement would allow for existing uses except for bottom trawling within the area including shore angling, angling from a boat, crabbing from a boat, scuba diving, snorkeling and kayaking. Dr. Shimotakahara also questioned under current uses/socio economic importance it states this is a "prime sport and charter area" and then in the sampling of committee discussion points the first bullet reads "there will be much resistance from sport fishermen," so if all existing activities, including charter fishing are to be allowed, these comments are conflicting. Mr. Gates said the comment about much resistance from sport fishermen occurred when the area included a Marine Reserve so an argument could be made to remove this comment as well. Mr. Pex said he felt the main concern in this proposal was mission creep and the fear that someone might change it. Mr. Goché suggested adding a comment that there is fear due to mission creep. Ms. Wall said she wouldn't mind making that change. Dr. Shimotakahara added "due to the expansions of the restrictions on fishing." Mr. Goché said he felt those attending the meetings would understand what mission creep referred to and would understand the committee members concerns. Ms. Wall said she would be willing to

make the comment as either mission creep or due to concerns for expansion of area or restrictions. Mr. Helfrich commented “or the threat of further restrictions.” Ms. Wall repeated “due to the threat for expansion of the area or further restrictions.”

Ms. Wall said she was happy to give the committee time to look over the remainder of the committee discussion points after looking over the rest of the documents. She then went on to talk about maps for display and not wanting to make them too large in order to keep costs down. The maps for the four proposals receiving comment would be reproduced as 2x3 feet and mounted on foam board. She said she was struggling with the size of the maps for the proposals not moving forward and asked for suggestions from the committee. She showed an example of an 11 x 17 that included the map and text reproduced in a vertical or horizontal format where the map would be on the left and the text to the right. Ms. Wall suggested two 2 x 3 maps depicting the four proposals moving forward with one on each side of the room.

Mr. Graybill suggested the map on one sheet of 11 x 17 with the text on an 8 ½ by 11 colored sheet with a header saying the proposal was not moving forward. Ms. Doyle recommended that the six proposals where comment would not be taken be smaller than the maps for the four comment proposals. Dr. Hodder asked if the Port would provide easels for the maps and Ms. Wall responded yes.

Mr. Griffith said on proposal H he made it clear through the process that it was for no new marine reserves and no new marine protected areas since there are already five existing protected designations. Ms. Wall said the group got caught up in determining what is new and used the examples of Red Fish Rocks and Depoe Bay, and is saying “no new Marine Reserve” a good way to say it or is there a better way to differentiate them. Mr. Griffith recommended saying “no new Marine Reserve and no new Marine Protected Area in the Cape Arago area. Mr. Griffith also felt the last two bullet points were speculative and intimidating, not based on fact but opinions. He felt it would intimidate people away from a position by saying if you don’t do something, something will be done to you. Mr. Graybill commented that is what the committee talked about. Mr. Griffith responded that the committee talked about a lot of things but that didn’t mean it needed to be in the brochure. He said he wasn’t asking the committee to get rid of any other comments, only the intimidating ones. Mr. Butler agreed that they were intimidating and threatening comments. Mr. Lacey said he felt there were more comments than just these two that were opinions and that is why he had suggested not including committee discussion points in any of the proposals. Ms. Wall said the steering committee had discussed at length including or not including the discussion points and felt that they needed to remain.

Mr. Poppe said under the “Current Uses/Socio Economic Importance” there should be a statement that this area is heavily used by a variety of fisheries and it is of major economic importance to Charleston and the entire south coast. He said as it reads now it sounds as if there is no current socio economic importance which is not true at all. Mr. Poppe felt the committee should state the Cape Arago area is heavily used and is of major economic importance to the south coast area. Other committee members agreed with Mr. Poppe. Ms. Wall asked the committee to provide some language. Mr. Poppe and Mr. LeDoux repeated “the Cape Arago area is heavily used by a variety of fisheries, both

commercial and sport, including but not limited to, recreational or commercial fishing or harvesting.”

Dr. Hodder said there had been discussion by the committee at the last meeting, that for a no Marine Reserve, this kind of statement should not be included and suggested a broader statement about the Cape Arago area in terms of resources and not just fisheries including, research, tourism, state parks, diving, surfing, wild life viewing, kayaking, non-consumptive recreation, fishing, harvesting, aesthetic appreciation, and whale watching. And these uses currently provide so many dollars to the local economy. She felt there should be a preamble to the map in the form of a broader statement about the area.

Ms. Wall suggested the committee talk about how to use these items in current uses including recreation, research, fishing, harvesting, boating, tourism, bird watching, surfing, etc.

Mr. Lacey asked if this was going to be used for the current uses on all of the proposals. Mr. Pex responded no, that it was being crafted to use as a general statement about the Cape Arago area. Ms. Wall said she created the previous statement for current uses on Proposal H to trade it with the existing statement but the committee never focused in on it. Mr. Poppe felt that an additional statement could be “current uses easily provide millions of dollars worth of benefit to the local economy.” Ms. Wall said she didn’t mind keeping the current statement. Dr. Hodder said she could include the \$7 million she brought in for research. Ms. Wall asked if the committee would trust her to come up with a current uses statement. Mr. Griffith said he wanted to know the fate of the last two bullet points he referenced earlier. Ms. Wall told him she would come back to that after wrapping up the current uses. She asked the committee again if they were going to let her come up with a current uses statement. Dr. Hodder asked if the statement was going under Proposal H or as a preamble to the entire area. Both Ms. Wall and Mr. Pex responded for Proposal H. Ms. Wall said if people want to talk about current uses there would be a place in the handout they could be referred to. Mr. Ivy said he disagreed with applying the new statement to just Proposal H. He also felt it should be a preamble to the discussion of Cape Arago so that it would be applicable to all of the proposals. It should describe the current conditions and uses of the place so that all of the things described are going to happen somewhere in that place but they all have some implications to the current conditions of the place. Ms. Wall said it had been suggested that the committee take the opportunity to go to the back of the handout where some of the committee definitions have been added and put the uses as a definition of Cape Arago. Mr. Helfrich said it already appeared in the preamble on page two, number two, the first bullet where it reads “recognizing that the Territorial Sea between Reedsport and Bandon has high economic value to the communities” and not specifically saying its sport fishing.

Dr. Hodder suggested adding page numbers to the handout. Ms. Wall said in talking about current uses/socio economic importance on Proposal H, should the economic value be left in the process document versus adding a committee definition rather than saying there are no current uses to describe. Mr. Goché suggested added “not applicable” under current uses since this proposal doesn’t carry a specific area like the others do. The other

option he suggested was to remove the current uses so people would need to look elsewhere for them.

Mr. Pex said if the committee follows the pattern of the other proposals which have statements in them, and referenced Proposal G on the previous page he felt there should be a positive statement within Proposal H which describes the area from Reedsport to Bandon. He felt it could be a generalization of a sentence or two. He felt it would not carry the weight of the world on it and secondly, trying to describe all of the benefits associated with Cape Arago the proposal document wasn't big enough. Mr. Pex recommended getting a commercial document from someone like BLM for the language. He felt everyone coming to the meetings will already know the value of the Cape Arago area. Mr. Pex suggested sticking with the proposals and that Ms. Wall was fully capable of adding a sentence or two that would be obvious to everyone. Ms. Wall asked Mr. Griffith if he had any comments about the current uses statement. Mr. Griffith suggested using the sentences that Mr. LeDoux and Mr. Poppe stated saying there were pieces of them in the other proposals. He felt there were people who weren't familiar with Cape Arago and suggested Ms. Wall do an overview. He also felt there were only two or three of the OPAC definitions that the public really needed which would free up space in the brochure. Ms. Shoji said the definition discussion would occur later in the meeting.

Mr. Pex asked the committee to move the discussion back to Proposal H, current uses/socio economic importance, and asked if the committee could agree that Ms. Wall put together a couple of sentences that would be obvious to everyone and move on to the issue of the sampling of committee discussion points. No one was opposed so Mr. Pex said the committee had consensus to have Ms. Wall come up with a sentence or two. Mr. Lane said he agreed with Mr. Pex because he felt there might be people who aren't familiar with the local area and don't know what the actual uses of the area are. Mr. Pex asked him if he were suggesting a poster for the wall that would list the uses. Mr. Griffith thought that was a great idea. Ms. Wall said non-consumptive use covers a lot of things. She asked Ms. Don for her input. Ms. Don said she was worried that the committee would not get the feedback they were looking for from the town hall meetings because the information being presented would be overwhelming for someone to digest in a short duration. She said she liked the idea of having a general description of the whole area and then ask people specifically what they know about the biological characteristics or the current uses and socio economic importance of the proposal from their perspective instead of being influenced by what this community team has already heard. Ms. Wall said the steering committee had spent a lot of time getting to the headings and working through a lot of the brochure information and she was comfortable keeping the categories but coming up with a general description. Ms. Don commented she felt the committee was not coming to agreement, that people have different interpretations on how things are worded. She was concerned that the team was quibbling about the information and wanted them to be comfortable with what was being presented to the public and felt the information should be more simplified using Mr. Lane's idea of more general information about the entire area. Mr. Pex suggested a map overview of the area that listed the activities. Ms. Don felt people could spend a lot of time debating what was already here instead of giving critical and constructive feedback on the actual proposal from their personal perspective. Ms. Don felt the simpler the information was the better it would be for the public. Mr. Lane said he wanted to make

sure that everyone who came to the meetings understood how important the area was. He said it might seem obvious to the committee members because they are so close to the area but felt it might not be as obvious to others.

Ms. Wall asked the committee to talk about a generic statement and move on to the two bullet points that Mr. Griffith wanted removed from his proposal. She felt Proposal H needed a better definition under “current uses” other than saying “there are no current uses.” Ms. Doyle said if there was a generic description on another page it could read “for current uses see the description on page” as an idea. Ms. Wall said that she wanted something acceptable as a short description. Dr. Shimotakahara asked if there would be a verbal preamble at the start of the meetings that would describe the uses. Ms. Wall responded yes but felt this proposal still needed some sort of a statement. Mr. Griffith reminded the committee that there has already been consensus to let Ms. Wall write something up for Proposal H under “current uses/socio economic importance.”

Mr. Griffith asked to move on to the last two bullets in his proposal. Mr. Pex asked if there was agreement on the rest of the bullet points before moving on to the last two. Dr. Hodder commented if there was going to be discussion on these two bullet points then there should be discussion on all of the bullet points in all of the proposals. She said there were some bullet points in some of the other proposals that she didn’t agree with and thought there were other committee members that felt the same way. She said she thought there had been a decision made at the last meeting that the committee was not going to go through the bullet points. Mr. Pex suggested starting with the very first bullet point. Dr. Hodder said if he was going to do that then she felt the committee should start with Proposal A.

Ms. Wall reminded the committee that this meeting was for errors in the brochure. Mr. Griffith commented that he thought the last two bullet points in his proposal were already eliminated.

Mr. Gates suggested making a change in the wording from “will likely” to “could potentially lead to.” He said the committee had discussed this comment at length and felt it was a relevant comment to potentially leave it in the proposal but change the wording so it was not as threatening. Mr. Lacey said he brought up the last bullet point and he was willing to remove it and felt if some bullet points were going to be removed that all of the bullet points should be looked at in all of the proposals. Ms. Wall said she did not have a problem with changing “will likely” to “could potentially” because the committee did talk about this and the bullet points were a sampling of the discussion. Mr. Griffith made the comparison to falling leaves and that eight leaves were picked up and used with two of them intimidating and the other hundred weren’t. Mr. Griffith said to go ahead and leave them in but he didn’t feel the committee would be happy with the result. Mr. Griffith did not agree with Mr. Gates solution of changing the two words.

Mr. Pex asked Mr. Griffith on his Proposal H did he want to drop the last two bullet points. Mr. Griffith responded yes. Mr. Pex asked if there was consensus to remove them. Mr. Graybill said he didn’t feel this was a good way to handle the situation because it opened it up to someone else who had a proposal to say what they wanted to drop bullet points from them. Mr. Pex said it was Mr. Griffith’s proposal. Mr. Graybill

said there were others who would like to do the same but they have tolerated having comments in their proposals that were selected by the committee. Mr. Pex repeated at this time in the process the committee was talking about Proposal H and if someone wanted to propose another topic the committee could move forward on other proposals if they desired but at this point the discussion was focusing on Proposal H, sampling of committee discussion points. Mr. Pex again asked Mr. Griffith if he was suggesting removing the last two bullet points. Mr. Griffith responded that was correct. Mr. Pex then asked if it was the position of the group and if they agreed. Some committee members responded no. Dr. Shimotakahara suggested splitting up the comments if there was going to be a vote so there would be a separate vote on each bullet point. Ms. Shoji suggested taking the bullet points one at a time starting with “if this community opts out” and asked for comments.

Dr. Hodder said she supported Mr. Gates recommendation for changing the wording from “will likely” to “could potentially.” Dr. Hodder then suggested taking this bullet point out of Proposal H and adding it to either Proposal A, C or G because it had been discussed for all of the proposals. She said she voted for taking it out of Mr. Griffith’s and putting it in someone else’s proposal. Mr. Griffith asked Dr. Hodder if she had a proposal to which she responded she was part of Proposal A. She said Proposal A only had four bullet points and she would like to add a lot more but that the committee had already decided not to go there, that the bullet points were not going to be changed. Mr. Griffith asked Dr. Hodder if she was willing to swap the bullet point to Proposal A and she agreed she would add it to A, C or G.

Mr. Pex asked the committee to stick with discussion on Proposal H, specifically the last two bullet points before moving on. Ms. Shoji repeated the suggestion for sentence restructure to remove “will likely” and change it to “could potentially.” Mr. Griffith said he had a problem with it. Mr. Lane suggested rewording the first part of the sentence with “there is a concern that if this community opts out.” Ms. Wall said that would work for her. Mr. Griffith said he liked Dr. Hodder’s solution of moving the bullet point to another proposal. Mr. Lane said in the beginning of the brochure on the first page under “recognizing” where there are bullet points, would the committee want to add this sentence there. Ms. Wall said no because that document was the agreed upon process created by consensus. Mr. Graybill said under the third bullet on page two, it reads “the issue of the MR/MPA designation is socio-economic and political, but this does not make the issue any less important, and that no marine reserve or marine protected area is an option.” He suggested that comment could be followed by inserting the bullet there. Ms. Wall repeated this document was created by consensus and she was not going to change the language.

Dr. Shimotakahara said the petitioners for Proposals A and H agreed that they would swap the bullet point in their proposals and asked why that couldn’t be done. Mr. Graybill commented the bullet point did not have anything to do with a specific proposal but had to do with no proposal, and that it was not a proper location for it and it would not read right. He said Proposal A was written about a specific site and the bullet point addressed the consequence of not having a site. Mr. Pex reminded the committee to stick with Proposal H. Mr. Graybill said people were talking about using Dr. Hodder’s

proposal as an alternative and that moving this bullet point to a specific site was a non-start.

Mr. Lacey said this was a perfect example of why people were becoming confused and why he proposed getting rid of all of the discussion points in all of the proposals. Mr. Pex said the steering committee agreed to leave the points in and they are going to stay in. He said if there were certain points that the committee as a group felt would cause too much concern for the public then they should be modified. He recommended taking these two bullet points one at a time and suggested seeking to resolve, and not seek to be combative with each other, by going back to the second to the last bullet point. He asked if there were some change in terminology that the committee could live with and should it be taken to a vote as the next step.

Ms. Wall reminded the committee the suggestion was to start the last bullet point off with “there is a concern that if this committee” and change “will likely” to “could potentially.” Mr. Butler asked did he understand that the committee did not have consensus on making this change so the next step would be to take it to a vote. Mr. Pex responded that was correct. Mr. Griffith moved to delete the second to the last bullet point in proposal H. Mr. Pex said there had to be a second to the motion to go forward. Mr. Butler seconded the motion for the vote. Mr. Pex repeated the motion and asked that all in favor raise their hands. Five committee members voted to remove it, everyone else was opposed. Mr. Gates made the motion to change the start of the sentence language to “there is a concern that” and change “will likely” to could potentially.” Mr. Pex asked if everyone understood the changes. Mr. Poppe commented this concern was brought up at the Charleston Community Enhancement Group and said they strongly reacted to the possibility of a threat about interference of outside activity. He said the language would cause concern no matter where it appeared. Mr. Pex asked for all in favor of the language change in the second to the last bullet point to raise their hands. The motion carried.

Mr. Pex asked the committee to move on to the last bullet point in Proposal H. Mr. Griffith read the bullet point and said it was speculative and like suggesting the history of success of ODF&W is completely jeopardized by not having more Marine Reserves or more Marine Protected Areas in this area which he felt in his opinion was ridiculous. Dr. Shimotakahara said it contradicts the second bullet point in the combined outline and read “recognizing that we are not aware of biological problems of the Territorial Sea between Reedsport and Bandon that necessitates Marine Reserve protection sufficient to cause economic harm.” Mr. Lacey said the committee discussion points were things that the committee talked about and were opinions. Mr. Pex asked did the committee want to change or leave this bullet point. Dr. Hodder said all of the bullet points were opinions and this bullet point was a counter to the seventh bullet point that a Marine Reserve may cause over fishing of fishery stocks and that both bullet points should be considered together. Ms. Wall felt it was a good sampling of committee discussion points. Dr. Hodder repeated it was said at the last meeting that the committee was not going to review the discussion points again and why was the committee going through this process now when they had already decided to leave the decision up to the steering committee. Ms. Doyle suggested an explanation in the pamphlet introduction that the various samplings of committee discussion points were the thoughts and opinions that people

brought up from their backgrounds, expertise and concerns so as the public is reading the information they understand why some of the points were contradictory. Mr. Pex said he was in favor of removing this bullet point because it was an opinion statement that has no basis in fact.

Ms. Wall suggested going back to Ms. Doyle's comment saying she didn't mind footnoting Ms. Doyle's statement on every page for every proposal so that each one had a like statement. Mr. Gates made a motion to add Ms. Doyle's footnote to read the same in all of the proposals and leave the last bullet point in Proposal H as it was written. Mr. Graybill seconded the motion. Mr. Pex said as a discussion point by having no Marine Reserves or No Marine Protected Area in this area there may or may not be fisheries depletions in the future. Dr. Hodder commented the committee should not start changing the bullet points again. Mr. Pex said he was only talking about this particular bullet point. He said it was the same as changing "will likely" to "could potentially" because we all know there may or may not be. Mr. Graybill commented there was a motion on the floor. Mr. Pex said he would like to amend the motion. He asked if there had been a second. Dr. Hodder responded that it had been on the original motion. Mr. Helfrich commented "call for the question." Ms. Shoji asked if there was discussion on that motion. Mr. Graybill repeated "call for the question, it's time to vote". Mr. Pex said he would call for the question and asked all in favor of this particular motion to raise their hand. Some committee members asked for clarification and if the vote was on the footnote suggested by Ms. Doyle. Mr. Pex responded yes, to add the footnote in each proposal as stated. Mr. Pex repeated all in favor to raise their hand. Motion passed. Mr. Pex said at this time there can be no change in the wording in the motion because presumably there may or may not be fisheries depletions in the future. Mr. Pex said he would like to see a change to that affect. Mr. Gates said he personally did not care and that he was attempting to get the committee to move on.

Ms. Wall said Mr. Schaefer had been waiting patiently to make a comment so she gave him the floor. Mr. Schaefer said he felt that Dr. Hodder had a good point in stating bullet point number seven was the counterpoint of the last bullet and recommended changing the order having them appear sequentially so that a person would get both sides quickly and it would make more sense.

Mr. Gates suggested a change to the first bullet point in the Sampling of Committee Discussion Points in Proposal C by separating "hook and line" from the word "trawl" by inserting either a comma or the word "or."

Mr. Lane asked if in the Combined Outline document if letter "d" did not negate the concern in the Sampling of Committee Discussion Points because it reads basically any proposal the Committee makes will allow for crabbing and salmon harvest. Ms. Wall asked if he was referring to Mr. Gates' comment in Proposal C. She repeated that Mr. Gates was referring to adding the word "and" between hook-and-line and trawl.

Mr. Helfrich asked what the two web site addresses were on the brochure front cover. Ms. Don responded that the second address was the ODF&W special email address so that comments would not overwhelm Ms. Wall's mailbox. Ms. Wall commented that ODF&W had offered assistance in collecting email traffic which she graciously accepted.

Dr. Hodder said she was looking at the brochure from the perspective of someone who wasn't familiar with the process and in opening it the first thing a person will see is the "Combined Outline" document where it reads "we will proceed in the following manner" which she felt was confusing. Ms. Wall said she would include a box on the document that states it is a Committee document for further clarification. Dr. Hodder then asked what the reference to "year-round" on the map referred to. Mr. Gates suggested adding the words "shipping lane" after the words to make the phrase more understandable. Dr. Hodder then asked if the border for the Gregory Point Subtidal Research Reserve could be made a color other than blue so that it didn't look like it was part of Proposal C. Ms. Wall said she would look into it. Mr. Graybill commented the area should be flagged as pre-existing so it didn't appear to be part of the proposals the Committee was considering. Dr. Hodder then suggested to include in the definitions what a sub-tidal research reserve was. Ms. Wall explained there was an additional sheet that included additional definitions from ODF&W printed materials which would be added to the brochure.

Dr. Rumrill asked on Proposal A to change the word "giant" to "great" because giant kelp is a different species.

There was a break at 6:55 pm.

Ms. Shoji reviewed the rest of the meeting format including volunteers for each of the three public comment meetings, the written comment forms, committee member roles and responsibilities at the meetings, and any missing definitions. Ms. Doyle asked if the proposal authors could be at each of the meetings at their respective proposal table to answer any questions that might come up.

Ms. Shoji asked for feedback on the written comment sheets including the proposal strengths, proposal weaknesses and additional opportunities or suggestions in order to solicit public input. Mr. Helfrich suggested blank sheets at the tables for people to use for additional general comments. Mr. Goché suggested on Proposal H eliminating the phrase "as assigned to this committee for consideration" on the comment sheet. Ms. Wall said she would add no "new" Marine Reserve and no "new" Marine Protected Area.

Ms. Don suggested rewording the first paragraph on page one of the comment sheet to include asking for comments on the biological resources from an individual's personal knowledge. Dr. Hodder asked if it was necessary to qualify and could it not read "please comment on any or all proposals and add any further information you have about these areas." Mr. Griffith suggested adding "or use a page for general comments" or "use general comment area on the back of this form" because someone might have an idea or thoughts that don't go well with any of the proposals.

Ms. Shoji asked the Committee to think about when they were staffing the various tables, what is going to be expected of them. As an example, Ms. Shoji used the table for "proposals not moving forward" and asked the Committee what they would want people to do at that table. Mr. Graybill responded thank them for coming and ask them if they have any questions. He felt the Committee members should be there to clarify if

someone needed additional information about an area or proposal. Dr. Shimotakahara suggested take names and invite the public to make comments.

Dr. Rumrill suggested a one-page handout that would give an overview of the proposals so the public would understand the breadth of what the Committee had discussed and remind them there is an opportunity for verbal comment on the proposals as well.

Dr. Hodder said the Committee should be there to help facilitate and help clarify information and encourage them to provide some comments. Mr. Graybill suggested explaining how the comment form was structured. Ms. Wall suggested reminding people that there was the opportunity for verbal comment as well.

Mr. Helfrich asked how the Committee would solicit verbal comment and would there be sign-up cards. Ms. Shoji suggested a sign-up sheet at each table.

Dr. Hodder asked for an explanation of how the meeting was going to work and would Committee members be giving verbal descriptions. Mr. Gates felt it might be helpful to the entire Committee to walk through how the meeting would be structured.

Ms. Shoji explained that the meetings would start at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Wall will begin the meeting with a PowerPoint presentation and an overview of how the Committee came together. The Committee Chairman will also have an opportunity for brief comments. The public would then be dispersed to the various stations around the room to provide written comment. From there (specific time to be determined) the public will come back to give video recorded verbal comment if they so chose. Ms. Doyle commented that the steering committee had determined 20 minutes for the overview by Ms. Wall, with 45 minutes at the various stations with an hour maximum allotted for public comment. Ms. Wall had not yet decided how much time would be allotted to those wishing to give oral comment but said time would be limited. Mr. Pex recommended that the public be told if they gave verbal comment at the first public meeting that they are asked not to sign up to speak at any subsequent meeting. Mr. Helfrich said he thought the public should also be told what the Committee was going to do with the comments they received and the fact that a recommendation would go to the Port Commission who would then have a public hearing. Ms. Wall said she would include that information in her overview comments at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Pex said it had also been discussed if the public finished the stations early the times would be moved up to finish earlier. Ms. Wall said part of her presentation would include directing the public to the two web sites where they could also give written email comment.

Mr. Poppe asked if the proposals would be listed with the number of Committee member supporters when they had been originally ranked by the Committee. Ms. Wall responded no, that the ranking would not be discussed.

Mr. Ivy reviewed the sequence of events at the public meetings starting with the call to order, introduction by Ms. Wall, Chairman remarks that would explain the nuances of the process that might not have been explained earlier, an explanation of the chronology of the events of the evening including what the tables were for, what could be done at each of the tables, and that the gathering would be closed with recording verbal comments. He

said the four proposal tables would be complimented by the general comment station for people who may not be interested in the four Committee proposals. He felt the idea was to close the meetings by approximately 8:15 p.m. instead of 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Gates said he imagined most of the people attending the meetings would have an understanding of a Marine Reserve or a Marine Protected Area but he wondered if it would be beneficial to have a brief overview by ODF&W since they are the lead agency as to why the Committee is discussing Marine Reserves and Marine Protected Areas in Oregon. Ms. Don said that Ms. Wall would do the overview of the Committee and how it was formed including the definition of a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area. Mr. Gates said he felt there should be some core foundation information given to the public. Mr. Lacey felt ODF&W should explain the process.

Mr. Goché asked where at the meetings would the public go to sign up for verbal comment. Ms. Wall responded the verbal comment sign up sheet would be at the general comment table. Mr. Goché suggested a sheet be left at all of the tables. Ms. Wall felt that by having one sheet there would be some order to the sign up whereas with more than one sheet it might create some mix-up. Mr. Helfrich said at most public meetings there is one sign-up sheet that people are directed to. Ms. Doyle suggested leaving it at the entrance which would then serve as the general comment table as well.

Mr. Griffith proposed that the public be made aware this was not an election and not based on the number of comments but on the quality of them. He said he would prefer not to have ODF&W speak because this Committee's process was different than the other community teams on the coast.

Mr. Helfrich suggested adding a mailing address for written testimony on the brochure front cover.

Mr. Ivy said he agreed with Mr. Griffith that ODF&W not be included in making comments but asked to reinforce with the public if there was anything the Committee missed, if there was something that had been mischaracterized that could be said better. In terms of getting information to people before hand, one of the things that had been discussed was a series of PSA's and other media announcements including links to web sites where the public could find information. Ms. Wall confirmed there would be press releases which have yet to be scheduled. She also confirmed the brochure would be included on the web sites. She asked the committee about links to the information and should the Port's web site be linked to the ODF&W Marine Reserve web site and would that be sufficient for this Committee. Mr. Griffith suggested distributing the brochures to the different cities including Bandon and Reedsport and tackle shops. Ms. Wall said she would be happy to take out newspaper ads in the cities of Bandon, Reedsport and Coos Bay in addition to the press releases. Mr. Ivy said if the brochure was sent to him he would be happy to make copies of it for distribution at his office. Mr. Gates asked to have a notice sent to the Committee members once the information had been posted to the web sites so it could be shared with their constituents. Ms. Don offered to send an email message to the ODF&W Marine Reserve Distribution List which is approximately 500+ people to help spread the word about the public meetings.

Mr. Graybill said he wanted to point out the value of the brochure and how it would be used as a stand-alone document. He said if it was going to be left at tackle shops it could be taken out of context since if it did not include a preamble. He felt there would be value in the brochure because of how it would be used and that it should have an overview statement about the richness of the Cape Arago region including the assignment that had been given to the Committee. He felt this information would be more important than definitions, and that the definitions could be available on the web site which would allow for a more narrative brochure.

Mr. LeDoux asked about the public notice and could Committee members send out their own email information. Ms. Wall responded yes.

Ms. Doyle agreed with Mr. Graybill and suggested listing the three meeting dates and times on the cover.

Mr. Griffith felt the brochure should be distributed prior to the meeting if at all possible so that the public didn't feel something has been sprung on them. Mr. Ivy agreed that the brochure should be made available ahead of time so that no one is confused and the public has more time to review what has been offered.

Ms. Whitmer asked if she could put a flyer at her business. She also recommended the sign-up sheets be emailed to committee members so those not at the meeting could sign up to help.

Mr. Griffith suggested on the combined outline, eliminating the things that have already been done, include pictures of the Cape Arago area on the cover, describe the Cape Arago area, and use only the consensus description information.

Mr. Ledoux suggested including Ms. Wall's opening comments or opening letter in the brochure on the inside cover, move the combined outline to the third page, and explain the committee structure.

Mr. Ivy said the brochure is for posterity, represents eighteen months of meetings and felt that it should contain a narrative that the committee could defend. Ms. Wall asked if the Committee could agree to let her make adjustments to the brochure with the help of the steering committee.

Mr. Griffith suggested keeping the information in the brochure short, place the Port logo at the bottom of the cover, and include a picture on the front cover.

Mr. Gates suggested adding a phone number to the front cover as well in case people had questions.

Mr. Ivy suggested having at the meetings the ODF&W map from page 99 of the 2010 Fishing Regulations which showed the areas that were already restricted and asked the Committee if there were other items that should be available at the meetings that might be useful for discussion or to answer questions. Mr. Griffith recommended the SOORC map be at the meetings.

Dr. Hodder asked for the rationale of including three pages of definitions from OPAC in the brochure and gave examples of some of the definitions she felt were not necessary because they were not part of this Committee's process and that they were confusing. Mr. Pex felt it was important to include the descriptions of a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area. Dr. Hodder felt that the definitions of anything included on the map would also be important such as a Subtidal Research Reserve. Mr. Griffith commented he was thinking the same thing but felt if there was a definition of a term used in describing a Marine Reserve or a Marine Protected Area that it should be left in the brochure. He felt the first six OPAC definitions should be included but suggested eliminating everything else. He also suggested including the definitions on hook and line, trolling and trawling as there were people who did not understand them.

Mr. Graybill said a definition of crab fishing should be included since the committee had made that a specific exemption including the use of fixed traps which did not create a lot of bottom disturbance. He also felt the definition of troll and trawl was important since they helped differentiate what would be allowed in a Marine Reserve and a Marine Protected Area.

Ms. Doyle recommended changing the title of the definitions used by the Committee to avoid confusion.

Ms. Wall asked the committee about the definition of hook and line since the process document specifically talked about salmon fishing and recommended adding the word "salmon" in front of it. Ms. Don gave the Oregon Administrative Rules definition of hook and line as "one or more hooks attached to one or more lines."

Mr. Lane asked for clarification in proposal C on the Sampling of Committee Discussion Points "commercial crabbing, especially in the proposed Marine Protected Area where winter storms push gear into the proposed Marine Reserve area (would have to empty pots retrieved in Marine Reserve pursuant to rules); creates large economic loss." He said in the Combined Outline on page two of the brochure it stated "any recommendations we produce allow for crabbing and salmon harvest," and asked if that was a true comment because he felt it would create confusion. He wanted to make sure there was clarification and that misinformation was not going out to the public, and if the statement was not true he felt it should be removed. Mr. Lane asked which statement took precedence. Mr. LeDoux recommended eliminating letter "d" from the Combined Outline document. Mr. Graybill asked Mr. Lane if that was what he was talking about. Mr. Lane said he was talking about the bullet point in Proposal C and should it be eliminated or left in. Ms. Wall clarified that the Committee talked about Proposal C as a combination Marine Reserve/Marine Protected Area and that it contradicted the Committee's process document. She felt the Combined Outline needed a footnote explanation on letter "d" since it was contradictory for both Proposals A and C. Mr. Pex added that he was not willing to change the Committee's process document and Ms. Wall agreed.

Mr. Gates asked Ms. Don to clarify the regulation for Mr. Lane and then asked Mr. Lane how much crabbing actually went on in this specific area. Ms. Don explained that a person would need to call OSP to get permission to retrieve crab pots that might have

drifted into the Marine Reserve but any catch in the pots would have to be released. Mr. Lane commented then that would take priority over this Committee's definition for any proposal. Ms. Don said a Marine Reserve does not allow salmon fishing or crabbing. Mr. Lane said he still wasn't clear when people come up to him and comment "you say we can crab anywhere we want to but here it says we cannot crab in a Marine Reserve." Ms. Shoji asked if the Committee was comfortable adding a footnote that explained it. Mr. Lane commented again he still wasn't sure which statement was correct. Ms. Don explained it would not be allowed in a Marine Reserve and that Ms. Wall would add a footnote on letter "d" that Proposals A & C knowingly contradict the committees process statement for allowing crabbing and salmon fishing. Mr. Lane commented because it places priority on the Marine Reserve as being a no take zone. Ms. Shoji asked Mr. Lane if he was okay with adding the footnote and he responded as long as the Committee realized the reality that there would not be any crabbing or trolling in that area. He said the Committee was basically pretending that these things would be allowed in a Marine Reserve. Mr. Helfrich commented that the Committee may not select Proposal A or C because of this contradiction. Mr. Lane said he would be curious what the fathom depth was in this area because this proposal somehow got past him. Mr. Pex suggested that something be put together in an email to answer Mr. Lane's question.

Mr. Lacey asked if the definitions of both habitat, biodiversity and rocky intertidal could be left in the brochure since these terms are included in the OPAC description of a Marine Reserve. He also asked that the "key types of marine habitat" be included. Ms. Wall said she did not see a definition of biodiversity in the OPAC definitions. Mr. Lacey suggested looking it up in the dictionary and including it. Dr. Hodder suggested using the definition found in Wikipedia and said the word is neither complicated nor a controversial definition.

Mr. Griffith said he wasn't sure the footnote had been completely resolved and suggested wording it as "except in proposals A & C no fishing is allowed" knowing it is a contradictory statement and a little ambiguous.

Jim Pex asked for closing remarks. Hearing none the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.