

Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Planning: Regional Planning
Body (RPB) Meeting

January 21, 2015

9:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Jacob K. Javits Federal Building

26 Federal Plaza

New York, New York 10278

Laura Cantral: Good morning. How is everybody doing? Ready for a fun-filled action-packed plan for two days? I am Laura Cantral and I will be facilitating this meeting today and tomorrow. You'll note that we have sign language interpretation services available to anyone who needs them either today or tomorrow. So, please avail yourself; or if you know anyone who is going to need those

services. We have two professionals who will be here today to help out.

We're really glad to be here and it is really great to see all of you members and those of you who are joining the RPB for this two day meeting. Thank you to our host in New York and Doug in particular.

We are glad to be here. Thank you so much for making this space available and helping us with the logistics and coordination. This is a great venue for a meeting and obviously it is always great to be in the great city of New York City. So, we have a lot to do over the next couple of days. I will go into some detail about what we plan to accomplish in a moment.

But before I do any of that, let's start this meeting off properly and first off, I'm going to turn to Kelsey Leonard who represents the Shinnecock Indian nation and is the tribal co-lead for the Mid-Atlantic RPB. Kelsey is going to offer a

tribal blessing to get started. Let me say something about logistics of the mics. Please turn them on when you are on and turn it off when you are not talking.

Kelsey Leonard: I hope everyone is comfortable. I'll sit here because at the podium, I don't get to address the public fully. It is important when we are giving a blessing at least in our way.

Hokame; hello everyone. My name is Kelsey Leonard and I serve as the tribal co-lead for the Mid-Atlantic RPB on behalf of the Shinnecock Indian nation. My nation sends it's greetings to the men and women here today. The Shinnecock continue as a sovereign people on the soil we have occupied on the shores of Long Island, Paumanok, since time in Memorial, and we extend friendship to all who recognize our constitutional government and who desire peaceful relations.

Today, we gather in a peaceful way and ask for blessings. We give thanks to the original inhabitants of this land we stand on today- the Lenape. We thank them for their stewardship, for without it we would not be here today. We humbly ask permission from all our relatives, our elders, our families, our children, the winged and the insects, the four-legged, the swimmers and all the plant and animal nations, to speak. Our ocean has cried out to us. It is in need of great healing. We are each called here today to answer those cries. In this way we are all connected. We are all relations.

We are the children of the sea, of the ocean, because life would not be possible without the blessing of the ocean. The ocean does not separate us. It connects us together in our humanity. It is our ocean-and we must care for it. As tribal nations and indigenous people we are not facing the threat of climate change, global warming, ocean acidification, sea level rise, pollution, overfishing and dwindling stocks of fish and a stressed Marine habitat. No, we are living these

dangers already. As indigenous people we are the minors canary. We are the window to what will eventually happen to the rest of the global community if nothing significant is done. So today we gather in peace and we have been given a duty to work for the protection of our ocean. We bring our minds together as one, and we give greeting and thanks to each other as people.

We thank the creator for bringing everyone here today for this public meeting. We ask for productivity for the very best outcomes. And we ask in a humble and a good way for everyone here to have the strength and courage to discuss and accomplish what we need to accomplish. Now our minds are one. We give thanks and prayers for our ocean.

Tabutne.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Kelsey. Those are inspiring words to get started. How is my volume? To further get us started on a good foot for this meeting we would like to hear some remarks from New York, the Department of Environmental Conservation. I'm going to Karen Chytalo who in turn will introduce her colleague will offer some welcoming words and wisdom. Karen I will give it to you.

Karen Chytalo: Thank you very much, I am very pleased to welcome and to have our assistant commissioner for the Department of Environment Conservation and Kathy Mosher to give a little welcome remarks. She is a big supporter of the ocean, and a big supporter of the ocean program. We are very fortunate to have her in our department.

Kathleen Moser: Welcome everyone to New York State. As Karen said, I am Kathy Moser Assistant Commissioner of Natural Resources, Department of

Environmental Conservation. That is slated for fish and wildlife and Marine resources.

I welcome you on behalf of our Commissioner, Joe Martens and the Secretary of State, Caesar Perales . Our original State of the State address by our Governor Cuomo was scheduled for the first week of January. When his father died, the former governor Mario Cuomo, The state of the state address was rescheduled for today. So they send their regrets. I've chose to be down here then be at the state of the state because this is important work. I want to welcome everybody to New York City and I think when most people think of New York City the thick of the belt environment. When I come down to New York City, I look at the coast to look at the oceans. We have a lot of water in our New York City. I'm happy to report that last summer we had over 52 whale sightings off of New York City. We even have

tour groups heading out from New York City. Karen will show you some fabulous pictures from the summer. I think the fact that everybody in this room contributed to that because we are all working for clean water.

We are all trying to balance the needs of the ocean environment for human needs. That's the good news and yet everybody saw; and I'm preaching to the choir. That the Journal of science published a paper on the animal loss in the global ocean. Let me read a conclusion. There's bad news and good news as well. While the populations in the oceans have been badly damaged by human activity, nevertheless, marine fauna generally are in better condition than terrestrial fauna. Fewer marine animal extinctions have occurred. Many geographic ranges have shrunk less. And numerous ocean eco-systems remain more wild than their terrestrial eco-systems. Consequently, meaningful rehabilitations have effected Marine animal populations and remains within reach of managers.

So, I think we still have time for a balance. That is why it is so imperative that we work together. It is important that all the stakeholders come up with this Mid-Atlantic regional ocean plan. We need to ensure the integrity of the ocean ecosystem at the same time at the same time of promoting economic growth human needs. We need to finalize an approach during this meeting and refine our regional ocean assessment so that we can move ahead and develop this important strategy. Now, most of you probably don't know that when you scheduled this meeting today, it really helped the department of state and the Department of Environmental Conservation get our ocean act, the New York Ocean Action Plan draft out for public comment. By having this meeting we really pushed for, with our executive, with the governor's office to review the plans for the deputy secretary for the environment.

I want to recognize Karen Chytalo of DEC and I want to thank Greg Capobianco of the Department of State who really were pushing the plan. We have the draft of the New York Ocean Action Plan out there. This planning encourages a framework for integrated adaptive approach to management and planning. It is an ambitious plan that serves as a starting point and it is a starting point to implement our ecosystem-based management principles into the management existing for the ocean. But the most important part about this plan is that it's not for state government to do alone. Not for the Federal government, not for local municipalities, it has to be in partnership with stakeholders. Not for profits, academia, some of our indigenous groups here in New York State. You will see in our plan, which is on a website and will be in our environmental notice bulletin today, that there is roles for all different stakeholders in the plan. So it is only going to be successful as the involvement of all the groups. So, welcome to New York. Good luck in

the next two days and I look forward to hearing about your success. Thank you very much.

< Applause >

Laura Cantral: Thank you Kathy. As Kathy mentioned the New York draft Ocean Action Plan is out and we're going to hear a little more about that during our time together. We look forward to those details. The next order of business is to do a round of introductions. So that everyone is aware who is here at the table representing the different member entities on the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body. After that I will have a few things to say about the agenda so we know how we are going to spend our time and a few housekeeping details that I need to make sure we are all familiar with. Kelsey, you know we have met you already this morning. Why don't you just say hello again and we will go around this way.

Kelsey Leonard: Hello everyone, my name is Kelsey Leonard and I sit here as your tribal co-lead on behalf of the Shinnecock Nation.

Karen Chytalo: Hello everyone, I am Karen Chytalo, from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Assistant Chief of Marine resources.

Doug Pabst: Good morning, I am Doug Pabst with EPA Region II. I am chief of the Dredging Sediment and Ocean section. I am also joined here by my colleague who represents the southern states of the planning body.

Kevin Kalasz: Kevin Kalasz, Program Manager for Biodiversity for Delaware.

Elizabeth Semple: I'm Elizabeth Semple from New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

Kevin Chu: I am Kevin Chu from the US Department of Commerce of the national oceanic and atmospheric administration. I am joined by alternate John Coryell.

Joe Atangan: I'm Joe Atangan, the US Navy representing joint staff.

Sarah Cooksey: Good morning everyone I am Sarah Cooksey from the state of Delaware and I am also on MARCO, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council for the Ocean

Jeff Flumigan: Good morning everyone. My name is Jeff Flumigan. I'm with the Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation. I am also on Northeast Regional Planning Body.

Catherine McCall: Good morning, Cathy McCall from Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Michael Jones: Good morning I am Michael Jones from the US, Navy representing the Department of Defense.

Laura McKay: Hi, I'm Laura McKay Director of the Virginia, Coastal Zone Management program and a member of MARCO.

Kristie Bailey : Good morning, Kristie Bailey representing US Coast Guard, fifth district.

Michael Luisi: Good morning everyone. My name is Michael Luisi. I'm with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Fishery Service. On this body, I will be serving the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council.

Greg Capobianco: Good morning everybody. My name is Greg Capobianco and I'm with the Department

of State's Office. Planning and development. I'm also the state representative to MARCO.

Selena Elmer: Good morning, I am Selena Elmer, I am with the Program Associate for Meridian.

Ingrid Irigoyen: I'm Ingrid Irigoyen, also with Meridian.

Gwynne Schultz: Good morning, I'm Gwynne Schultz with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources and currently serve as the State Co-lead for the Regional Planning Body and chair the management board of MARCO.

Bob Labelle: Good morning I am Bob Labelle. I'm the senior advisor to the director to the Bureau of Ocean management in the Department of Interior. Serving as Federal co-lead for the RPB. I

just want to acknowledge Maureen, who retired left some large shoes to fill so I want to acknowledge all of her hard work with many of you; and I hope to do the same.

Laura Cantral: Welcome all to this role. We are pleased to have you claim the role. Thanks to everyone. Co-leads, I know in a moment that you will review some progress and status updates. Is there anything else that you want to say? Any preliminaries, or should I just go right into the general review and get that housekeeping out of the way? Okay? So, I think everyone has seen the agenda complete. You have it handy and you have a good sense of how we will proceed over the next couple of days. I want to just describe and hopefully make clear to all of us to remember the overall plot of the story that we're going to tell over the next couple of days. The cornerstone decision for this body to make at this meeting is the approval, a proposed approach for an Ocean Action Plan for the Mid-Atlantic region. And the reason for developing the proposed approach is because this

body at its last public meeting back in May decided that the way you wanted to proceed was to develop the approach that you wanted to take for the plan for an Ocean Action Plan.

So, that has commenced over the summer and the fall with a working group that has led the charge, has identified a range of options, explored those options. There has been a lot of discussion of drafts, a collection of a lot of public input and reaction during a series of public listening sessions that happened in each state over the summer, early fall. And other written input and other public input opportunities. That has all been factored into the proposed approach that is before you today. And our hope is that you will be comfortable approving that approach. And then we will need to proceed to explore some of the important components that make up that Ocean Action Plan. Those components include the regional

ocean assessment. Opportunities and actions to address those opportunities or those issues, if you will; as it relates to interjurisdictional coordination. And of course stakeholder engagement which is a critical aspect of the work that runs through everything; all the activities. So the approval of the Ocean Action Plan I am referring to as the cornerstone decision of this meeting. The discussion of these different components, not to approve. There is no final product parse that needs to be approved. But we want to have good discussion; we want to hear your reactions, your input, your ideas, your guidance going forward. So that there can be a sense of comfort that the way to proceed with you each of these components is something that you're comfortable with and you have had an opportunity to provide your input on.

The other thing that we need to talk about in this meeting is the path forward. How to get work done and the timing associated with getting that work done. As with all public meetings, public comment is an important component

of the meeting and we will have three opportunities over the course of the two days for public comment sessions. This is where anyone or those of you who are interested in joining RPB or providing input will be provided with the opportunity to do so. That is the overall thought for the meeting. Let me just say a little bit about the sequencing of the meeting. I'm not going to belabor this in great detail but just to give you a sense of what we're going to do and the order in which we are going to do it. As I mentioned a moment ago we're going to hear a progress report, here momentarily from the co-leads so you have a good sense of what is going on. Particularly since last public meeting. And then we would go into discussion of the proposed Ocean Action Plan approach. Hear from the work group about that approach, have some discussion, and then we will pause for the first of our public comment sessions.

That will take place at 11:15. If you are interested in providing public comment at that session we ask that you sign up at the table at the entrance to this room by 10:45 AM. A format that this body has developed for public comment is we like to sandwich a public comment session in the middle of an ongoing discussion that is on the table for the RPB. That's what we will be doing for each of the public comment sessions.

We will start the dialogue about the proposed approach for an Ocean Action Plan, pause for public comment and then we will be resuming the topic so that it can be informed by any of the feedback, comments, questions that you in the public have to offer. We will not be engaging in a direct dialogue with any of the public commenter's in real time at the moment. Just so we could stay on track and for efficiency. If there is an opportunity to address particular concerns or questions that may come up during the public comment sessions. That will be true for the

first one that happens this morning. As well as, our practice for each of the public comment sessions that we have over the course of the meeting. So progress report, starting the discussion about the proposed approach for the Ocean Action Plan and the first public comment session, that will take us to lunch. I'm going to say something about the logistics about lunch in a moment. When we come back from lunch we will resume the discussion of the proposed approach and informed by what you've heard from public comment. Then we will put the topic on pause. We will come back to it tomorrow morning.

We will conclude the remainder of today hearing about the New York Ocean planning process and the draft Ocean Action Plan that they just released. We'll have some updates from MARCO about stakeholder engagement activities that they been pursuing and some ideas about what they intend

to do in the future. We will also hear some updates on tribal engagement which of course is very important to this process. We will conclude the subsequent discussions, we will conclude with a presentation from the workgroup that has been developing the regional ocean assessment. That workgroup has developed an outline for that assessment, and a couple of examples sections. It has some questions that they want you to consider and get some direction and feedback from you so that that work can proceed.

We will have the second public comment section at the end of the day. I'm asking those of you who want to sign up and provide public comment, I think that session will start at 4:15. So, if you can sign up at 3:45 that would be helpful. We will wrap up and adjourn today by 5 o'clock. If you are following along on your agenda, you may notice that, that is different from what the agenda says. I will say something about that in a moment as well.

So for tomorrow we will come back and start the day with any further discussion that the RPB needs to have about the proposed approach for the Ocean Action Plan and call a question for approval.

Our intention is that this group will be ready to approve the proposed approach. If there needs to be any fine-tuning that happens as a result of discussion today, we can factor that in. But that is the first thing that is on the docket for tomorrow. We will come back to a discussion about the regional ocean assessment and an opportunity to reflect on any public comment that we heard at the end of today and anything else that needs to be said, so that that work can proceed as outlined and with you all being comfortable. We will then round out the morning tomorrow with a panel; we have three panelists who are going to share information about data and analysis tools that can support ocean planning. This

will be an important component, another component of the Ocean Action Plan that will need some careful thought and consideration about how to proceed and how to incorporate the process.

We will take a lunch break and come back in the afternoon to talk about interjurisdictional coordination. There is material that we will go into some detail about. That outlines a proposed process for identifying opportunities, for interjurisdictional coordination and potential actions that could address those opportunities. And I like to refer to this as the how, the mechanics of implementing an Ocean Action Plan so if the approach is the overall structure and the philosophical approach to planning. Interjurisdictional coordination is the mechanics of the nuts and bolts of how to actually do it. We will have a good discussion about that and we will round out our work for this meeting with a discussion about the "now what". About how to proceed, what is the nature of the work flows and the work groups

that need to be organized around those work flows. The timing and the sequencing of things so that you will have a sense of what is going to be happening and you all have, the public has a sense about what's happening. We will have our final public comment session and wrap up and adjourn by 5:00. That is a lot of work. We've got a lot of work cut out for us, by now all of you are up to the task. Is that all clear about the agenda? Okay.

Bear with me another minute while I mention a few housekeeping matters. With regard to the timing, we will be adjourning at 5:00, both days. Since putting together the agenda and mapping out the timing, we have learned that this facility that we are so happy to be guests at needs us to wrap up by 5 o'clock. So we will be adjusting our time accordingly and adjourning the meeting both days at 5 o'clock. We will shave off some time here and there so if you

see me trying to move things along it's because I'm mindful of us staying on track and it will enable us to adjourn by 5.

The facility also asked that there be no food or drink in his room. There is a lovely little alcove lounge area. We want you to be in here with us during the meeting. We hope you will stay with us but if you need refreshments then that is the place to go. The restrooms are down this corridor, if you go out where you came in to register down the corridor you'll see signs through the lobby area. Or you can come out into the main corridor and there are restrooms near the elevators.

I want to be clear about the Meridian facilitation team and our roles. It's probably clear that I am facilitating the meeting; and that's my role. Selena is here at the table and she's taking notes which is obvious because she is typing away. Ingrid, going in, we know why she is here. You know why she's here. She is used as a resource and help with any

clarifying questions. She is hands-on engaged with the work underway and many of the groups that you all have been organized around. There may be questions that may come up that she can help us navigate through. That's why she was asked Selena to join us at the table.

For lunch, there is a cafeteria that is closed right now so we don't have that as an option for us to all be together over lunch. RPB members, we are going to have a brown bag lunch here. We have sandwiches that will be here and available and you can enter the little lounge area. Or otherwise for lunch. The rest of you can continue off on your own to go out and forage for lunch on your own. You can rejoin us for the afternoon.

I think the only other housekeeping thing that I need to say is a reminder that as you think of things

that you want to say around the table, please do me the favor of your tent up so that I know you have something on your mind. And if you keep your microphone off while you're not talking. It is better if we have just one microphone at a time because it helps with the interference in the audibility.

Audience Member: Laura, it looks like somebody might have dropped a cell phone.

Laura Cantral: That is part of their equipment to make sure that they do not miss a word. Anything else? Thanks for bearing with me for all of that.

Audience member: Since we are doing house-keeping. Is there anything that relates to documents on links online? Is there a Wi-Fi capability for this room? Are we able to get online in any way? Just to use our instruments here to...to read some things.

Laura Cantral: Let us look into that. Okay, so yes, okay, it's GSA guest which is the wireless password. Here we go, this is in large print. Wi-Fi name is GSA guest and password is Th3BIgg@me49. We will make this available. Any other housekeeping? Okay, so that now I will turn to the co-leads to provide some context and updates on the progress. In particular to activities that have happened over the summer and fall since the last RPB meeting in May in Baltimore. And also for other things and purposes of context and orientation.

Kelsey Leonard: Hi everyone. You already know me so I am going to dive right in. The first slide is up there. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body was established in 2013, pursuant to the National Ocean Quality, signed by President Obama in 2010. Our mission is to carry out coordinating efforts to address current challenges and emerging

opportunities with a collaborative process among Federal, State, Tribal and Mid-Atlantic Fishery council representatives. In order to improve our understanding of how the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and its resources are being used, managed and conserved. So for our planning focus within on State, Tribal and Federal Ocean and coastal waters off the state of NY, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and Delaware in order to help guide resource conservation and economic development by facilitating information sharing, fostering collaboration and improving decision making about a growing number of ocean uses. So the argument being with stakeholders, we working together to increase data and information sharing. Improve our understanding of how the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and its resources are being used managed and conserved. And to improve decision-making about a growing number of ocean uses.

Additionally, it's important to note that we are not a regulatory body and we have no independent legal authority. Instead it is our aim to improve the effectiveness of Federal, State and Tribal implementation of responsibilities in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and obviously through this collaborative and cooperative process. So that's a small short introduction to the Mid-Atlantic RPB and our mission. Next with more details is Gwynne Schultz, who will provide you some additional information on this to date.

Gwynne Schultz: Good morning. This is the third in person meeting that we have had as a full Regional Planning Body. The first one was in September 2013 in Long Branch, NJ. The second was in May 2014 in Baltimore Maryland. It was during this May 2014 meeting that the RPB approved the framework. It was called the Mid-Atlantic Regional

Ocean framework. This document articulated our vision, principles, goals, objectives and some sample actions. And clarified our geographic focus. This document has been and continues to serve as our guide as we move forward to develop products, projects and the process. In the period since May 2014, we are working to develop critical elements of the ocean planning process and creating opportunities to engage stakeholders. We've kicked off a number of workgroups that have been exploring and developing different products and ideas in consideration by the full planning body. Five workgroups. The first one has been developing a series of options for the content and structure of our Regional Ocean Action Plan. The second has been developing a strategy for improving interjurisdictional correlation among member entities.

The third workgroup has been developing a plan, an implemented plan to help engage stakeholders. Including developing strategies for coordinating the entities that are

working on Bay estuary and coastal issues. The fourth group has been very busy working on the developing a regional ocean assessment.

Finally, the workgroup has been continuing the development of making sure there are linkages to MARCOS Mid-Atlantic ocean data portal. So that we have the most up-to-date information to inform regional ocean planning. In September 2014, the RPB was formally approved as a charter that describes our purpose, mission, membership and procedures of the regional planning body. If you're interested, the final copy of that is posted on our RPB website.

In October of this year, we hosted a webinar that introduced for the first time to the public some of the development of the products we have been working on to kickoff the sequence of public listening sessions. Those public listening sessions

were developed in November 2014 with the support and sponsorship of Mid-Atlantic regional Council in the ocean or MARCO.

During those public listening sessions we talked about Ocean Action Plan options under consideration. A preliminary outline of the regional ocean assessment and some of our updated thinking with regard to stakeholder engagement. Since getting all of this really good input that we got during the public listening sessions, the workgroups have been refining the products, taking into consideration public input and the products that they are going to be discussing today are a result of that process. So, what I would like to do then is to hand it over to Bob Labelle who will walk us through our updated timeline.

Bob Labelle: Thank you Gwynne. So Gwynne just covered the RPB activities to-date. This line reiterates our accomplishments last year and lays out our next phase of

work. The updated timeline represents the current thinking regarding the RPB's proposed process steps. Now through 2017 and beyond. It lays out the steps of the RPB intends to take as we work towards the milestone of submitting our Ocean Action Plan. You will hear OAP a lot. It has to be submitted to the national Ocean Council in late 2016. As you can see all the slides the RPB will continue to engage stakeholders through all of the steps. We will also continue to focus on collecting, sharing and integrating data. We will continue to refine RPB products and processes. It is an ongoing effort. Since the last meeting, last May, the RPB determined that it needed to identify an option for the OAP before it can develop a formal workplan. So during this meeting as large that it is, the main goal is the RPB will discuss and hopefully approve the OAP approach. Then we will focus on developing and

updating a workplan, workflow to guide the development of the OAP which are already underway and will continue throughout 2015. With some refinements based on discussions that will happen over these two days.

We also plan to hold another in person RPB meeting later this year and in 2016 the RPB installed two more in person meetings. Our goals for 2016 are to release the draft OAP for review and then release a final OAP later that year. For certification by the national Ocean Council. In 2017 the RPB will work on implementation of the plan. It also continue to work to formalize interjurisdictional coordination commitments and monitor the implementation efforts, and make updates to the plan.

Laura Cantral: Thanks to all of the collates with an overview, about what has been done now poised to continue as Bob just mentioned in this updated outline. We will know that we were going to a lot more detail about

different bullets that you saw there in the proposed process steps for 2015 and 2016. There will be a discussion that we will get into as we go along but in particular, later tomorrow as we talk about the path forward and the workflow and the timeline associated with those workflows. I would just ask if there are any brief clarifying questions. Bob has hinted, in particular has had the some things that will probably talk about in detail. I would ask you to save those substantive questions for what is coming up, but anything that you have a clarifying question for? Anything else? Let's just keep moving and we are already shaving some time from our agenda so I'm glad about that. Let's go right on into the presentation of the proposed approach to the Ocean Action Plan and the co-chairs, the work group that has been developing this proposed approach, Karen Chytalo and Bob Labelle will tag team to present the

proposed approach, then we will have some discussion. We'll take a break for public comment and those will be the next couple of sessions.

Karen Chytalo: Good morning again folks and now we will get into some of the meat of the action we have been working on. We have been working as a team now in developing the Ocean Action Plan. We have been meeting on a weekly basis with the working group and we're trying to get the document in place that we could evolve to so that we can have a final discussion so that we can improve it.

First, it is very important that we develop is grounded in the framework goals that were developed, you know, that we developed earlier and approved. It is established well and there and that is our basis. Those two very important goals are equal. We have not put weight on one of them to be more important than the other one of the first goals is the healthy ocean ecosystem which is the goal

to promote ocean ecosystem health, functionality, integrity, conservation, protection, enhancement and restoration.

Our second goal is also the sustainable ocean uses, which is the plan to provide for existing emerging ocean issues in a sustainable manner that minimizes conflicts, which improves effectiveness and regulatory predictability to force economic growth. Without those with two very important tenets of the Ocean Action Plan. We are starting to develop what are the options and how to develop that. Next slide.

What should a Mid-Atlantic regional Ocean Action Plan be? What should it do? Most important, it should be informing decision-making under existing authorities that are in the Mid-Atlantic, not in the regulatory body. We have all of our own

authorities that we have to do we have to work more consistently and more in a fashion to help make better decisions. Another important point is to build on existing partnerships and planning efforts in the Mid-Atlantic. Hey...we got our New York Ocean Action Plan out. That's something that's important and that is something. There is lots of efforts out there that are going on and all the other estuary programs that we need to build. We have to consider the diverse stakeholder interest. There are a lot of different stakeholders in our area. There is not just one group, there are many groups. The Ocean Action Plan was designed and implemented with a robust stakeholder input so we are hoping you folks step up to the mic and give us your thoughts and tell specifically what you want to see too.

One of the things is that the plan should be periodically updated. It is not that we are going to fold the tent up and walk away. We do need to revisit and it needs to be updated over time to reflect some of the information that

comes out and Kevin will be discussing about that and the ocean action or the ocean assessment. All the changing conditions that are going on. We need to address that and keep that moving in this plan. Keep it alive.

Some of the things we also discussed is developing an approach on how we would develop this plan and as I mentioned before we formed an internal workgroup that was formed back in the May meeting. I served as one of the co-chairs and Bob is the other co-chair. We met all the time. Sometimes even twice a week; every now and then. We did have a lot of conference and brainstorming a lot of products going up and we thought we need to get some things out on paper and get things down on paper and understand some of the issues at hand. Back in October, we did have a draft we did bring that up for public review.

We had listening sessions up and down the whole east coast, the Mid-Atlantic. We did get a lot of input. Since the public listening sessions that were held back in November, we did receive numerous written as well as verbal input, we did go back to the drawing board and revise some things that we heard and how to develop a best approach. And one of one of the things that we have been informed to is the National Ocean Council is that the RPB produces Ocean Action Plans by 2016. We want to make sure that we had that date in our heads because we wanted to get this thing done.

We wanted to make sure that we were realistic, so we can achieve the results for the resources that we have and time constraints. Those are the important caveats that we have so we can move forward. It's going to be pretty good and I think we are moving in the right direction.

Now I want to turn it over to Bob. He will tell you about some of the plans and the options we have considered.

Bob LaBelle: Thanks Karen, was it only twice a week? (Laughing). It was great coming into this whole situation where it was this group already. We had some great ideas and getting all of the information and comment we could from the public. It was extremely helpful. I will quickly go through some slides that basically show the group's thinking. The slide depicts the options that the RPB released for public consideration and input back in October. We were trying to cover everything. They range from process oriented type things all the way to geographic, mapped ideas on how to go forward. The RPB received feedback in writing and as Karen mentioned, through a series of public listening sessions. Some of that feedback included support for

very specific elements of the proposed draft options. Development of a hybrid approach that can address both region-wide and geographically-specific opportunities. Also, there was a lot of talk about further analysis of ecological and economic ocean resources of the Mid-Atlantic to inform planning and management.

The RPB also heard concerns from stakeholders regarding the need to ensure RPB actions are appropriate and achievable under existing authorities and are identified and implemented with sufficient stakeholder input and support. Given that feedback, the workgroup combined the preferred ideas for each option into the approach that is proposed in our OAP Approach document that is in your folders.

Next Slide...I've got the clicker? Push the middle?
Why don't you do it? I never give the clicker away at home.

Hybrid of Options: Proposed Approach. I want to

emphasize that the RPB would identify region-wide opportunities and issues. These region-wide opportunities could fall into the category shown on the slide. Identifying research needs, informing and improving management decisions, improving information for environmental and regulatory reviews and leveraging resources. Specific geographic areas would be chosen because they can demonstrate progress on those region-wide opportunities. We will talk a lot about that later. Please note that the RPB will further discuss the details and process of our favorite acronym, IJC which is interjurisdictional coordination. All that means is that agencies work closely together and hopefully better.

We will discuss the details and ideas of the process of IJC and we have someone here to help us do that, that is tomorrow. The approval of the plan is not contingent on fully understanding IJC. We are

asking you to take that leap of faith. IJC is one element of the OAP approach. The document on the proposed approach the OAP says that the RPB would address specific region-wide actions and geographies by clarifying criteria, analyzing compatibility and improving collective understanding. That means that the RPB would document criteria and processes for choosing the initial region-wide interjurisdictional actions and specific geographic areas. For example, consideration should be given to the regional applicability of issues, breadth of RPB member entities affected, potential transferability of lessons to be learned, etc. And the RPB would strive to enhance compatibility among ocean uses and between uses and ecosystem health objectives. This may involve use of one or more types of compatibility assessment to inform decision-making, and the OAP would potentially include commitments to use resulting products to inform decision-making under existing authorities.

The specific types of assessments and how information resulting from them will be used to inform decision making have yet to be determined. And the RPB would also seek a better shared understanding of the Mid-Atlantic Ocean including human uses, natural resources, the ecosystem services the ocean provides, and important and sensitive habitats. We do this by clearly delineating and documenting those in a manner that stakeholders, ocean resource managers and other decision-makers could use to inform decision-making going forward. The specific types of data and analysis and exactly how those would inform decision-making have yet to be determined. We are starting down an interesting road.

This slide includes information found in the RPB document on Potential Data Analyses and Decision Support Tools. Additional analyses could

support the regional ocean planning process and the identification of region-wide opportunities for interjurisdictional coordination and specific geographic areas. The RPB could consider pursuing additional analyses and describe the results of those analyses in the OAP. These kind of additional analyses could help build understanding about the interactions between uses and resources in the region, serve as a bridge between the ROA and OAP and provide the RPB with information it needs to determine meaningful IJC to improve managing ecological resources. Now the Mid Atlantic Ocean portal plays a very important role and it will provide important information about the resources and uses in the region that could support some of these additional resources analyses. Mostly, I need to really stress that these examples are highly dependent on available resources. Again, we have not decided which if any of these analyses to pursue.

Let's go to the next slide, workflows. So the RPB Co-

Leads outlined the work plan development and propose RPB workflows in a memo that we sent to the RPB, these documents are all publicly available.

If you look in that memo, after the RPB decides on the proposed approach to the OAP, we'll then develop a first iteration work plan in early of 2015, that will guide the further development of the plan through 2016. The work plan will provide more details on steps necessary to develop an OAP over the next two years. It will include descriptions of each workflow along with details about the steps and timing for each activities in each workflow. The workflows listed on the slide and their associated activities will evolve, as the RPB begins to develop different sections of the OAP.

Last slide. So the action needed, this is the call to arms here, at this RPB in person meeting. Once we approve an approach to the OAP, hopefully

during this meeting, the workflows detailed in the co-leads memo will constitute the main body of work for the RPB this year. With some potential shifts in the workflow designed over time based on progress. Early next year, additional elements will need to be developed and the outcomes of all workflows brought together in the first draft of the OAP. The OAP will then be refined, finalized and approved by the RPB and sent to the National Ocean Counsel for the certification by the end of 2016. Very, very important- Stakeholder engagement is a key activity at each step in this process. You can go all the way back to the National Ocean Plan to find the root of that statement in the acknowledgment and the importance of that statement.

The process of developing the various components of the OAP will be guided by the evolving work plan that will be revised throughout the year and next year to reflect RPB decisions and workflow progress. So tomorrow I think we talk more about workflow and work plan and we will leave

the meeting with a clear direction of what we need to do next.

Laura Cantral: Thank you for that overview of the, the OAP, Proposed Approach that this workgroup is offering for your consideration and hopefully approval tomorrow. Before we have another discussion, I want to underscore a couple of things. You have heard Bob refer to the colleague memo, that memo circulated to the RPB and posted onto a website, it did not go with a full set of meeting materials, it was an addition. It is publicly available and the RPB has seen it and had some discussion about it. The contingent is to, first of all, help you all, us all, understand the relationship between all of these different documents that are in the binder. What I was referring to a few minutes ago is that it is all part of a package.

The Ocean Action Plan consists of several components; we will break down these components and talk about them. This memo helps outline what that relationship is as well as some suggestions for how to move forward. As Bob and I have said, we will spend quality time talking about all of that tomorrow. A couple of other things I would like to underscore that you have heard from Karen and Bob, for important consideration is for the proposed approach to the Ocean Action Plan, the intention for the Ocean Action Plan is to be executed using existing authorities, as Kelsey reminded us, this body has no regulatory authority, it's purpose is to look for ways to improve the effectiveness of the member entities in carrying out their responsibilities for ocean resource and use management. Its intention is to build on existing partnerships and leverage opportunities to reflect stakeholder interest, to be realistic and doable with the time and capacity available. And that it serves the goals and objectives that are outlined in the framework. As related to

healthy ocean ecosystems and sustainable ocean uses. Those are important considerations in framing and I want to make sure that you keep all of that in mind as we open it up for discussion.

And I am looking at the time and we have a good 45 minutes before we would go to public comment, that we will take if we need to, if we want to and we are a little ahead of schedule, we will turn to you who has signed up for public comment. We will also ask the question at 11:15, since that is when we are scheduled to have public comment, to make sure if anyone who is available for public comment at that time, has an opportunity to do so. That is just a time management thing. Let's open it up for discussion. Questions, comments, reflections?

Karen Chytalo: I want to make a comment, we had five different options and we try to

cherry pick a lot of things basically from things that we heard. I am hoping that, since nobody raised their hand first, that the RPB is supportive of the cherry picking that we did. I want to make sure that people are, there are things that need to be clarified or anything like that. To ask folks about that. Thanks.

Sarah Cooksey: Along that line of thinking, and I think the first slide Bob showed that had the old options, talked about picking the best options, on the far would be my left, your right, issues triggered, I think that's what it says on the bottom, can you talk about, maybe the committee members can talk about, was anything picked from that far side, and if so, why or why not?

Bob LaBelle: I think these options were never meant to be mutually exclusive. So, each one deserves some thought and we did that. We put a lot of thought is that. We

went from process type ideas, doing things differently, all the way to putting things down on a map, and a lot of analysis in between.

The left-hand side refers to, almost like a status quo, an issue comes along and one or more agencies have authority to act on that issue, either regulate or whatever. So, certain things get set into motion and what would improve upon that option a, would be a better coordination information sharing, earlier information about a project is coming, the agencies would get together and try to do things in a group way. That is worth keeping.

Each of these options have aspects that became evident that we tried, as Karen says, cherry picking, keep that idea moving forward. That particular one I just mentioned, improving the process of how things work is expressed through the IJC type effort, for example. I hope that clarifies it a

little bit.

Sarah Cooksey: I think based upon what you just said, an example of that might be a permanent application may be shared amongst all of us that had all of the relevant information about an activity, would that be an example of that?

Bob LaBelle: That would be one of the goals, to have earlier information sharing or a pre-activity workshop. Anything along those lines.

Karen Chytalo: One of the issues too that we wanted to get was that, we didn't want the issue to be running after the issue. We wanted to have information to get to that we had shared beforehand so that we are ready to address the issue. We have the mechanisms in place. So that we are not trying to build the partnerships or the

mechanisms. Everything is set up. That is one of our concerns with the issues triggered one, it was the sense that we had to hurry up and put everything into place. Get all of our pieces into place and be able to address it as a group. Here, now, we will have a lot of that already together, down on paper, we'll have our mechanisms. I know to call Sarah for something that will affect all of us up and down the coast.

Sarah Cooksey: Since no one as the card up, I will keep going. In my defense, Kevin and I have been working on the regional assessment and I haven't had as much time as I would've liked to follow the OAP. So in your example Karen, that would be, may be the research that was listed as a bullet... Okay... I got it. I am done... At least I think I'm done.

Laura McKay: I have feedback. I was thinking about what happened to the issues triggered idea too, because I was, in the beginning part of the workgroup deeply involved and then I was away during the Christmas holiday and came back and was a little confused about what happened. I think the idea is that that comes into play in the number two under the first bullet, when we talk about performing and improvement management decisions. That is where we pull in the idea of particular issues that are region-wide. If that helps clarify a little bit to what is on people's minds. I've had the same reaction when I saw this coming back after New Year's.

Laura Cantral: Just to make sure that everyone is really clear of what we are referring to, in the proposed approach there is that with a label on it. The first three pages of that document is what we are focusing on right now. There's also a part of this document, if you read it you will

see the caveat that there is a draft outline as an appendix. That is an example and we will have it refined over time. What is really up for discussion and approval tomorrow is the proposed approach that is outlined that Karen and Bob have gone over that is found on the first three pages, in particular pages two and three of that document. I want to make sure that everyone has that in front of you so we can refer to that as we are heading this discussion.

Michael Luisi: Thank you, Laura. As far as the discussion that we are having about the issues triggered and cherry picking from the different options that are in front of us as this plan is proposed here. From what Karen is saying it is a proactive versus reactive issue. Are we going to try to be proactive rather than reactive? Although, I think all of us would like to be able to have information before

something happens. I do not think we can be naïve enough to think that we are always going to be in the proactive state, that there are going to be issues that surface that we will need to have a reaction to. I hope that the reactive component is not lost in the current proposed plan. That there is some of that in there to allow for us to engage when necessary. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: Thanks Mike. It strikes me that that is something to bring back when we have IJC opportunities. That will be part of our discussion tomorrow. Kevin?

Kevin Chu: Thank you, first of all I would like to express my support for the proposal that we've got. I like the flexibility it provides; I think it gives us a framework within which we can develop an Ocean Action Plan. I have some concerns about it. One is that flexibility seems at this stage to be broad enough that I'm not sure what it frames

even. It may be more flexible than we need so I am looking for some guidance; I have gotten a little bit today as to the kind of things that will be in it. But I do have a specific question about this; it is a little unclear to me, when we would be able to say we now have an Ocean Action Plan. Looking at page 2 of the proposed approach, we pose a limited number of regional actions that will be part of the plan. Will we say the plan is complete when we have got a final decision on a limited number of interjurisdictional actions? Or are we going to say the plan is complete because we have decided that we will coordinate on a limited number of interjurisdictional items and these are the ones? Is unclear to me to say when we are done with this plan. Can I get some guidance on that?

Karen Chytalo: I will take that. We felt we will mention the little word "unrealistic" in trying to

get things done. We had a lot of discussion about doing some things initially to test the waters. To see how to do things on a region-wide basis and how to do something on a small geographic area and try to test a lot of issues out. You want to test certain things out and then therefore we would start playing that out with the other things. I think the first step is to just to start. Get some of those things out on paper and how we make those agreements, is this very workable? To get back to Mike's point, we have a very important part about this, that is clarifying the criteria. How do we select the issues? As well as the difference in specific areas of something. Which ones will we do, how will we do that, how will we allow flexibility for something new that comes along. It is in the papers now, we have to address it and we cannot ignore it otherwise it won't be relevant.

I think we need to have some of them flexibility and I think we have to start with something. There is always talk about how long we should revise the plan. It will be here are

some starting gates, test them and see how they are working and that we can start adding more pieces in the future. That is something we will have to write it as far as how to do that on a continuing basis. As long as we have the capabilities and resources and not get sick of each other.

Laura Cantral: Did you have your tent up? Do you want to address something else? Okay, alright. There is this sweet spot with flexibility and iterative nature and certainty and clarity about how to proceed and what you're going to focus on that still remains to be worked out and hopefully you're going to make some progress about ideas about that specificity and some of the timing, as Karen has mentioned, the idea from the workgroup is to get started and see how it evolves. Factoring in some of this criteria that we will also talk about in this

meeting. Alright so several tents are starting to show go up.
Let's go to Joe and then Gwynne.

Joe Atangan: So I want to express my support for moving ahead. We have spent a lot of time talking about how to move ahead and I just do not know if we can afford to spend that much more time talking about what we are going to do to keep moving ahead. Let's take the first step, there is a lot of flexibility that has been built into this that will allow us maneuver room if we have got it wrong on the first go around. My suspicion is that there are things that we will stumble upon but we are not going to know unless we take that first step. We have to get to the point where we stop talking about all of these options, I think what we have here is a reasonable approach that gives us a lot of flexibility and moving in the right direction.

To Kevin's point about ultimately what is the end state, to me it is not about the decision, to me it is about the

process by which we arrived to those decisions. I think more important than the decision that is made itself, is the process that gets established along the way. Some of those things will be learned from the things that what we did to react.

I can tell you from some of the experiences that we have. Some of the coordination that is going on for some of the oil and gas, some of the wind and energy areas, some of the processes have already been put in place by BOEM, the states, it's got DOD participation, it is because we were reactive. There are a lot of lessons learned so we can deem so we can have the proactive processes that will get us moving in the right direction. Let's say giddy up, let's get started.

Gwynne Schultz: Ditto that, but with regard to Kevin's question, I like the flexibility of this approach in that depending upon the issues that we

select, some may be more complex than others, some may involve more member entities in the dialogue than others. The degree to which some might be more simple and that we can actually bring some of those to a decision point, have each member and terms of understanding between agencies and have an action plan, that will be a good thing but I too anticipate there will be a number of issues that we are working on that always are going to have is a commitment to work together to continue to try to work on that issue. The approach that we have provides the flexibility to walk down those paths depending upon the complexity of the issue.

Laura Cantral: Kevin.

Kevin Chu: Thank you all for these discussions, it has been helpful. I want to reiterate that I like the flexibility and I agree with Joe, let's just get going. My question has not been elated entirely. It is kind of different in

that I am asking, what is the endpoint of the plan, not necessarily the endpoint of our discussion as a group. At some point or other we are supposed to present to the national Ocean Council a plan. And have it approved by the national Ocean Council.

Are we expecting to try these, a few geographically constricted areas first? And then say this is the conclusion and this is our plan or are we going to say, we want to take up certain area and here's how we will take it up. This is our plan. At what point do we call to plan complete and start moving forward? I am all for trying things out. We have got to do that. Try and fail is fine as long as we are trying. We can plan forever we will not get anything accomplished.

Laura Cantral: So Bob, it looks like you wanted to respond, do that and then we will go to

Laura and Mike.

Bob LaBelle: So I think part of the beauty of the National Ocean Policy is that they have turned to us to say, you tell us what you want to do. And they provided Deerin and others hard work and implementation guidance. If you read that, which is always good to go back, we're all really right in line with most, if not all, the key provisions. Transparency, public and stakeholders. Etc. We pretty much, I think, everyone has their own personal opinion about what our first plan could look like, but as Joe said, I think the process by which we get there is going to be what we write about in the plan. We are going to say we set this up and started with these principles and we performed these analyses or whatever. It would be nice if we also have some on the ground examples of actual projects that are underway or changed or something could happen. But failing that, I think still we could write a good Ocean Action Plan in terms

of the highways we've paved to communicate and to get things done as we go down the road. So I think we will be in good shape in 2016 to write about that and hopefully we should get guidance from them as we go along to say, what are we missing here? What do you think?

Laura McKay: Just try to be specific in answering Kevin's question, I would put out there for discussion that we should find that deadline of when the plan is done for 2016. That we would get so far as to how all of the criteria's set for how we are choosing the issues in geographic areas and that those would be really clear and have some sort of priority rank order of how we are going to start knocking them off. Maybe we would have done an issue or geographic area by 2016, that that would be the start. And then of course, it is an iterative process. I

assume that is what you are asking, Kevin, what would we have exactly done in the plan by 2016? I will just throw that out there, maybe that is what we can specifically agree to, is that we will have all of the criteria done and we will have put the issues in places, in order, and actually begun to address at least a set number, two or three?

Laura Cantral: Thank you Laura, let's hear from Mike and then Karen.

Michael Luisi: Thank you, I am looking across the table at Kevin, thinking the same way maybe because we live in Indianapolis together and share the same ideas. I think what I'm struggling with some of this and I do want to say and put it on record that I am very supportive of what is being proposed, the flexibility and other comments from my colleagues around the table regarding the plan. Where I struggle just a little bit with it all is, knowing success versus

failure. How are we going to judge the plan to determine whether or not it is a successful plan? I come from a fisheries background where there is a population of something that needs to be helped. So we put a plan together and watch the stock grow and that to us is a successful way of achieving the goals of the plan. I struggle with the broadness of this all, how do we determine for it to be successful? How do we know when to make changes? Maybe that will come out through continuing deliberation on this thing. I think that is where I am right now.

Laura Cantral: You are also raising the kinds of questions and considerations that you need to grapple with and further understand and develop the ideas. This is great and the kind of discussion we want to have right now. Hold that thought, I think that we need more refinement of what you're

struggling with. Let's keep going. Karen and Joe.

Karen Chytalo: I wanted to add that some of these things we are doing our sort of like "pilots". We are not using the term "pilots" but it is almost like we are testing some concepts out and seeing how they work and how we can work together to make them happen. I think the point that Mike has raised to you is, how do you know if we are successful or not? We are looking to you Kevin as part of the regional ocean assessment to develop, if anything, ecological indicators to tell us how well the ecosystem is doing. And we have to develop other sources of indicators, even in administrative things, how well things are moving and stuff like that. I think that is some of the things that will help us down the line to know and make some determination, is it working? Is it worth the squeeze to do all of these types of things so that we can collaboratively move forward and get the issues down the table and things that are established- the

whales migrating up and down and agree that okay guys, you whales are not the silver ones that the Navy has but you have a spot here too that can move through this area. If we can do that and do that as a unison group and act as a region, I think that will be very helpful and a strong argument that we can make to be able to move forward.

I think we need to leave some of the flexibility open; we need to be careful of what types of issues we select and types of areas that we are hitting some of the high notes and maybe some of the low notes of issues that are very messy to deal with. We should be able to address it. We should stay away from individual projects, specific areas that we're going to try to solve to show how we can do things through a process and get things established.

Laura Cantral: Joe and then Doug.

Joe Atangan: I understand and share some of your concerns. I try to think strategically with regard to this whole ocean planning process and I think we have to keep our focus on that strategic nature of what we are getting ready to produce. What you have highlighted Mike is an issue of metrics. How do we know that the actions we have taken are effective? Are there corrective actions that need to be implemented subsequently to correct whatever actions that did not work. You have always viewed this and I remember Laura and I used to chuckle about the shampoo approach to ocean planning. Lather, rinse, repeat piece.

I have been fortunate enough to be a part of both the assessments group as well as the action plan options group. What I have always kept in my mind is, because this has to be an iterative process and because the regional ocean assessment really establishes the baseline by which, our baseline map that we will use to embark on this journey, the

plan will be the proposed route. Along the way there, there's going to have to be changes to the plan. We are going to implement these actions and the downstream there has to be another assessment. That is going to contribute to the next iteration of the plan. It has always been- plan, assess, plan, assess. With the approach that is on the table right now I think it gives you the flexibility but I think it's important to bring out what we put out there is the high-level goals but embedded in this thing is the issues that we have to have metrics. We have to have established metrics in there that we can grade ourselves on how well we are executing the plan. That should be the foundation for the next round of assessment for how we proceed.

Doug Pabst: I am kind of channeling
Joe here which is kind of scary but he said pretty

much what I was going to say with the addition that it goes back to the framework which I think we have always envisioned to be the circular approach. If it is not working, clearly, we will not continue. That was the one understanding we have always had. I support moving forward with the understanding that we are going to make changes as we go. We will figure some of this out, we are practical but we really need to get into the issue to figure out if this is the best way to make a decision as a group or to make a recommendation or whatever it will be. I do not think we will know if this is the best approach until we try it. But the flexibility is there to give it a shot.

Laura Cantral: Greg?

Greg Capobianco: Thank you Laura, I would like to express my support for the work as well and thank my colleagues for the efforts that the work that they undertook to put the document together and to think it through. What I am

struggling with a little bit is the two bullets that talk about a limited number of region wide interjurisdictional actions and then the following bullet that talks about the geographic specific areas. I'm just concerned that it sounds like an awful lot of work to get to the geographic piece, and I guess my caution and my hope would be that we start with first bullet and do the region-wide work, and come up with some very meaningful things in that effort, and if we're lucky and if we're productive in a fairly condensed period of time or a couple of years, some geographical things can emerge from that. What I want to avoid is running down let's go find places. I think we have a lot of work to do ahead of that. I will leave with that.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Greg and you are pointing to something I think we will talk a lot

about tomorrow, when we talk about interjurisdictional coordination, opportunities at both of those scales. The challenge for you all to grapple with is that you do not have the luxury of time to be linear and sequential as you might ideally like to be so you'll have to figure out how to address that. The point that you are making is something that you all need to grapple with and have that discussion and it will be part of that IJC discussion and part of the workflow and how to organize workgroups and what those workgroups are focused on, what is doable, realistic and I think that is part of the point you are making. Kevin?

Kevin Chu: Thanks, Greg has raised a really good point but I actually disagree with his proposal with what I think I've heard you say is start with the region-wide thing and see how that works and then take up the more geographically restricted areas. Which makes sense except what I would hope is that we try both of them at the same

time because one approach may work better than the other. If we have one geographic area and one region-wide thing, we may flounder around the region-wide thing but find it was working great in small geographical way. So we could try them both out, as Joe's philosophy, just do something. We might learn a little bit more if we do parallel tracks. We will have to figure that out. I do not think we have to decide that today. I think that will be my preference, to try them both.

Laura Cantral: Workgroup, do you want to respond to that? I think that is what you would imagine would be the approach but it needs more discussion.

Karen Chytalo: We did feel the need to have both pieces in there because at the public

meetings we did get a lot of support for the mapping exercises, key geographic areas and identifying pieces of information. Because one of the geographic area things could be something as simple as, not as simple as, but areas of geological importance could be something that we could identify that would help on a regional basis too. It is something that we would be gathering from our level of activities. If we be helpful for the region, but be specific for a geographical area. We had to place these things out and try them out and see how all of these things work. What is going to make the most sense for us?

Laura Cantral: I think it really depends on what opportunities/issue you identify that you want to focus on, as to what it lends itself to and make some decisions about where to start. I think I will try to wrap this up and move us to public comment session. I don't see any other tents up, before I do that, is there anything else on anyone's mind that

you want to share this point? Again we are not making a decision about approving this approach right now. We will ask that question again tomorrow morning. Having said that, I'm hearing a lot of expressions of support for the approach with some good questions and a need for some further thinking and understanding about how to strike the right balance between flexibility and just getting going and being clear about what the endpoint, what the plan is, and what that actually means because the process is intended to be iterative, it is a lather, rinse, repeat exercise. How do you balance all of those things? One suggestion, I think it was part of the thinking of the work group, if you could imagine developing your list of criteria, how do you want to identify issues or opportunities that you want to take on?

That will be the first thing, identify a list of potential issues, opportunities, that you want to

address that meet those criteria and picking a couple and trying it. That means you also have to be mindful of how you define success, and that this flexibility can accommodate the both proactive and reactive in what this plan can accommodate. Those are a few other good points, and those are a few things that stand out for me. As a process matter we will go to public comments and then we will see where we are on our timing and if we're ready for a lunch break or we want to continue this discussion and get a little bit ahead before we take the lunch break. Let's see how long our public comment section lasts.

We are about five minutes ahead of schedule so I will ask if everyone that is on my list of people who has signed up is in the room and ready to go, and we could get started a little bit earlier, I think that should be okay. I'll list, I'll share the names of the public commenter's in the order that they have signed up in order of the queue Judith Weis, Sarah Chasis, Brent Greenfield, Sarah Winterwhelan, Matt Gove,

Ali Chase, Nikki Rovner, Noah Chesnin, Bonnie Brady. Are you all here and ready to go? So Judith, it looks like you are ready to approach, you can sit at the table or go to the podium, it is up to you. We have a timekeeper who is Ingrid, here at the corner; we ask that you keep your remarks to three minutes.

Judith Weiss: Thank you, good morning. I'm Judith Weiss, I'm a Marine biology professor at Rutgers University. I am also the co-chair of the science and technical advisory committee of the New York New Jersey Harbor estuary program.

I call your attention to a letter that was signed by myself and about 50 other scientists back in November. Focusing attention on the issue we think is of greatest concern which is the one of identifying particular regions of special ecological importance. As we said in this letter, we encourage the regional ocean assessment workgroup to engage the scientific

community in identifying scientific criteria to guide selection of a network of ocean areas which together would represent and adequately connect important habitats, populations, and ecological processes. In order to safeguard their continued functioning and resilience. The methodology for doing this has been established in the scientific literature and has been used. We, the scientists in the region express our interest in working with you and helping to do this. The guiding document for the RPB which was the final recommendations of the interagency ocean policy task force calls for the RPB to investigate, assess, forecast and analyze ecological condition and relative ecological importance or values of areas within the planning area. Therefore, we feel this issue is not one that is optional. It was described earlier this morning as something that you may do. We think it is much more vital to have it as something you will do rather than something that you may do.

Sara Chasis: Good morning and welcome to New York. As a lifelong New Yorker we are delighted to have you here. I want to call out the leadership that the New York State County DEC Department of State have provided on ocean issues and we applaud the recently issued NY Ocean Action Plan and are excited. The importance and timeliness of your preparation of the regional Ocean Action Plan could not have been more underscored and underlined than by the report that came out from In Science last week and underscores the importance of the action that we need to be taking and calls out specifically the type of plan that you are envisioning and we support. In the article it says current trends, coupled with terrestrial declination suggest that marine declination rates, which is the term for extinction of marine species, will rapidly intensify as human use of the ocean industrializes. Then it

specifically talks about solutions that can be employed. It talks about the importance of marine protected areas and of ambitious ecosystem based management plans. Because of the importance of recognizing the need to address broadly the way that oceans are being used not just for limited areas. This really is an important call to action and we urge you to be ambitious and courageous in developing a meaningful plan.

I am concerned about the conversation about the plan only picking one or two issues to focus on. This should be a plan that provides a roadmap for how key issues in the region would be addressed going forward. I think that is something that is very important for you to consider.

We have concerns about the proposed approach that this has articulated here. It does provide a lot of flexibility and the vagueness of it is of concern. I want to particularly reference on page 3 where you talk about analyzing compatibility and it says this may involve use of one or more

types of compatibility assessment. We think it should say you will. In addition, it says the OAP would potentially include commitments to use resulting products with informed decision making. We think it should commit to using those products so it's less vague. We specifically want to see included the identification of a network of important ecological areas and measures for their protection in the plan. That is what we repeatedly hear from scientists and is essential to accomplish a goal and objective of maintaining healthy ocean ecosystems. Finally, I want to call attention to a letter that was recently sent and will be provided to the planning body from several professors at Boston University and Harvard University. Where they talk about the need for what is identified in the appendix, data analyses and decision support tools as optional, to be absolutely essential to the process. And I quote, "We are writing

to comment on the proposed approach but are concerned that the goals and objectives identified in this document will not be attained unless the elements described in the data analyses and decision support tools section are prioritized. Specifically, the following elements should not be considered as optional. Identification of ecological importance, assessment incompatibilities among and between ocean uses and ecosystem health objectives. An assessment of ecosystem assertive trade-offs related to alternative management actions”. This letter will be provided to the planning body but we reiterate and support the need for these is not being optional but essential under tools and planning. Thank you very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you, Brent you are next.

Brent Greenfield: Good morning. My name is Brent Greenfield, and the following comments are made on behalf of the National Ocean Policy Coalition. It may supplement

our comments that were sent to the regional planning body in November.

The Coalition continues to maintain that discussions on whether or how to proceed with an ocean plan should not proceed unless and until a comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy and sufficient engagement mechanisms are in place and a stakeholder-based regional ocean assessment has been completed.

While some have expressed an urgency in finalizing an ocean plan by the end of 2016, it is essential that this process be thoughtful and well-informed and not driven by political considerations or artificial deadlines. To the degree that the RPB nonetheless moves forward in the absence of these critical elements, the Coalition offers the following comments on the proposed approach to the Mid-Atlantic ocean plan.

While the Coalition appreciates the value of planning, enhanced coordination, and informed decision-making, we have significant concerns that the proposed approach will confuse and potentially detract from the existing range of clear, well-understood, and statutorily-authorized planning tools.

Specifically, under the proposed approach, the RPB would identify and address region-wide actions and specific geographic areas deemed to be in need of improved interjurisdictional coordination, an effort that would involve influencing management decisions and environmental and regulatory reviews, among other things, as well as the possible use of compatibility assessments to inform decision-making.

In terms of how this would be accomplished, among other things, the draft outline of the proposed approach includes placeholders for agency commitments to use ocean plan content, and the proposed timeline suggests that efforts

to institutionalize these commitments would take shape through protocols and memorandums of agreement and understanding developed in the second half of 2016.

The Coalition opposes any effort to institutionalize use of an ultimate ocean plan in agency decision-making. Proceeding in such a manner will only serve to heighten regulatory uncertainty by memorializing the application of a non-statutorily authorized product into statutory decision-making activities. Furthermore, by engaging in a targeted effort, RPB activities might only address certain uses, information, or interests and thereby be detrimental to others or unduly burdensome on those targeted.

While the Coalition appreciates the understanding of the many ways in which different ocean uses are compatible, we also do not support

development of compatibility assessments to inform decision-making, including through seeking agency implementation commitments, which would threaten to introduce inappropriate bounds or limits on agency discretion. Compatibility assessments are also redundant with current statutes such as National Environmental Policy Act, and it's entirely unclear how they would be conducted, funded, fully inclusive of stakeholder input, reflective of all relevant data and information, and utilized and applied across various sectors and authorities.

If the RPB moves forward with the selection of an ocean plan approach, rather than seek to commit agencies to using a product that has not been authorized by statute and whose implementation may conflict with processes established through existing laws and regulations, the Coalition urges an approach that closely engages all existing, emerging, and future user groups in an effort to provide non-binding data and information for agencies to voluntarily use

as they see fit based on their own independent judgment and timelines. In addition, rather than a targeted approach, any ocean plan approach must account for all existing and potential future uses, rely on sound science and data, and feature formal and meaningful engagement to ensure consensus-based outcomes.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Sara?

Sara Winter Whelan: Good morning. My name is Sarah Winterwhelan and I work for the American Littoral Society, we are a coastal conservation organization based in New Jersey. I want to direct my comments this morning to the big picture. You guys have done a good job of actually discussing this morning and how that plays into the regional Ocean Action Plan approach that you are

discussing. I think we can agree that the national policy is about better, more integrated coastal and Ocean management and protection efforts. By working together over time, our decision-making becomes better through more robust science and stakeholder engagement. I think the RPB is a reflection of that goal and that your vision and your framework goals are good indicators of how you should be moving forward. I think you guys have had a really good discussion about that this morning. I also appreciate Karen's comments this morning about moving together as a region. And ask that you remember the charge as you work to this meeting and goals. I also asked that you infuse your deliberations with the idea that you are the body we are looking to for a plan on the mid Atlantic Oceans future and not necessarily today, and think about that as you move forward and in order to meet the goals of a healthy ocean ecosystem and sustainable ocean uses for the Mid-Atlantic, we would assert that region-wide identification of important ecological areas is necessary.

Also, a compatibility analysis can be done with help from the regional science community and we look to you to engage those individuals and universities. How can the regional Ocean Action Plan ensure healthy ocean and economy without understanding where our important areas are and where compatible uses could lie. To that end, I urge that the RPB work with our science committee to help ensure healthy oceans and economies and communities and the society looks forward to continuing our engagement as stakeholders in this process that we have been supportive of for many years from now. We look forward to working with you guys in a few years ahead. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you, Matt you are next.

Matt Gove: Matt Gove, from Surfrider Foundation. Nice to see some new faces and I hope to meet everybody over the next two days . There is a lot in all of these documents so I will try to say something that makes sense. I feel that my concern level was up a little bit, I am trying to think into the future, this body and if new uses and projects are coming down the pipeline and I feel like what this body is supposed to be ready for, they are supposed to be ready to say- we can help you do this and we can help you do that. So I think there needs to be a vision because these projects, wind farm or laying a cable or a pipeline or something. They're going to want to know how we should build it and where. I feel like the way we are going really focusing on just the interjurisdictional won't help them that much. We just have almost like a thumb tree, it is not that low level but it seems like, we know who to talk to but as you can see we are in flux because there are new people every time. I think we need something more concrete. The

project comes in a certain place and we say, well we picked these geographic areas to look at. And they are like, well my project is not in that place, so what are we going to do? Or they want to lay a cable and we say well we just looked at wind power, how does that help them?

So, I think I am a little concerned that a lot of the concrete stuff that I think would be really helpful has been stuffed down in the data and needs category. The compatibility analysis, was option B, is now down there and seems like kind of extra stuff, if we have time and money. I know we don't have a lot of time and money but it would be nice to get some sort of estimate of how much time and money does it really take? We have done a ton of work on the portal. Is it that harder to analyze that information in the portal and come up with "these are really good spots, so if you have a project may be you shouldn't

put it there." I am talking about the ecological information. That's one of our main goals. If you don't have a layer and that information, how do we get to that goal, of a healthy ocean ecosystem? So it would be great to hear how much effort and time it really is. Some things seems like it is a big-ticket thing, some things don't seem that hard. A compatibility analysis, I feel like I can do that but I am not offering, but I feel like I could do that. It is not that complicated. What kind of fishing works with shipping, what kind of wind works with fishing? It doesn't seem that hard. I just want to say that we are concerned about that and if we are just going forward with IJC, it doesn't seem far enough help for the future. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: Ali?

Ali Chase: Hi everyone. Ali Chase, RDC, good to see you all. I am going to echo with a number of us this morning has said. I am sure this is no surprise. We think it is absolutely essential to do the data analysis and decision

support tools work that is following towards the end of the document. That really needs to be part of the proposed approach of doing this plan. Because if you don't have that data, that is what is going to give you the direction to be able to achieve your framework goals of a healthy ocean ecosystem and sustainable uses. If you are not building it on some of that analysis that needs to be created and compatibility analysis work and identification of where important places are then, what is the purpose of the interjurisdictional work going forward? And, in terms of the final recommendations, for the interagency Ocean policy work, I think that a lot of effort went into that initial document, there are a lot of steps that are provided there in terms of what can we in a final plan and process can be done? It wasn't just some haphazard thing thrown together. There have been two years of public outreach on this and a lot of

people have committed on this around the country. In terms of what steps were needed. I think that it is absolutely essential for us to take the time to develop a good base layer of where these places are in terms of having importance for our environment. If we don't do that , we will not be able to reach the goals that we want.

I think that another thing that we should really keep in mind is, I did notice in the data analysis section there is one possibility of just identifying really important ecological areas are currently under existing authorities. That is going to tell us what other people have said. It doesn't tell us anything new about an actual analysis of what is out there. We have not taken the time and the effort to pull together all the maps of oceans and look at them and analyze them. And say, here are the places that the scientists are going to tell us we need to protect if we want to see the ocean continue to function. If we want all of those jobs and the food that we rely on and the recreation to continue for the future. I urge

you to take step and think about that and see if that is any way that can get inserted into the approach because I think that is the need of the work and right now is hidden in the quasi-appendix of the work. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Nikki.

Nikki Rovner: Hi I'm Nikki Rovner, I work for the nature Conservancy's Virginia chapter and I'm part of our Mid-Atlantic seascape team. I want to remind you of a couple of the things we've said in our letter and response to the options and give you a little bit of reaction of what we've heard today, in terms of whether those goals that we've outlined are actually being met by this proposed approach. The first thing we've said is that we thought the regional Ocean Action Plan needed to be as

geographically comprehensive and spatially explicit as possible and that there needed to be region-wide data and development analysis and plan development. I'm not sure that we are seeing here. It seems like what's outlined on this slide is first identifying issues on which the plan will focus and then picking geographic areas that you want to focus on. That doesn't sound as comprehensive as what we were asking for. We really think that that is an essential element of a credible regional Ocean Action Plan.

We also thought it was important for the plan to specifically outline commitments being made by the member agencies to use the plan once it's done and I did hear that word commitment this morning and I believe that that is the intent. Of course we know that this plan is not going to charge you with new decisions to make. The agencies will be using their existing authorities to make the same decisions they've made in the past but they will be better informed decisions. So some sort of outline of how the plan will help

you do that is a necessary element. We think that the issues and then made Atlantic need to be comprehensively identified and then we did say that they should be special attention and emphasis to the highest priority issues. I think perhaps that's what you're talking about doing with these IJC's. Identifying the highest priority issues and trying to make some progress on the issues. That makes sense. That needs to be backed up by a more comprehensive approach as to what are the issues in the Atlantic that need to be addressed over time.

We felt like there needed to be a spatially explicit assessment of compatibility between co-occurring human uses and between human uses in the regions and important ecological areas. I think that what we heard this morning is that compatibility assessment may be done in some places for some

issues but it may not be as comprehensive as what we are looking for as it is necessary.

That brings me to this idea of the important ecological areas. That is definitely listed on one of the documents before you. The potential data analyses and decision support tools document. That is something that might be done. We think it's absolutely critical as many other commenter's have said this morning. That it is done. We believe that there is a model out there that you can use as something to follow. The nature Conservancy's several years ago completed the Northwest Atlantic Marine eco-regional Assessment. Sorry. So we believe that is a step so that the data methods used there is something you can start with, in your process. You will not be the first group trying to do something, we really think it is doable and that is my final point. What is really doable here. I feel like a lot of what we have heard this morning is an attempt to be sort of realistic between what you can do now and 2016. I certainly

appreciate the need to be realistic. I have worked in government, so I know what it's like to be given an additional task and no additional resources to do something. However, there are significant resources available to be brought to bear on this. NOAA has 12,000 employees, BOEM has 600, COAST GUARD has 8700 civilians, EPA and DOE each have 16,000 employees. If you include DOD then you get up towards 1 million people and that probably is not fair but there are a lot of people available to you with a lot of expertise. I understand that they have a lot of other things to do but they can help you do this. Some of them can if it is a high enough priority for you all. You are the change we have been waiting for the terms of Regional Ocean Planning. This is what experts are saying is needed for a long time . So I urge you to take that into account as you continue to consider your plans.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Noah.

Noah Jensen: Good morning my name is Noah Jensen and I work for the Wildlife Conservation Society. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. I'm the policy manager for the New York Aquarium. The Wildlife Conservation Society is a global conservation program but we also run four zoos here in the city as well, New York aquarium on the ocean in New York City. One of our goals is to bolster the work that you are trying to do and to build the excitement and awareness and bring people together to appreciate wildlife and ocean uses. And act responsibly manage and conserve the ocean environment around us.

To help support the goals of the meeting today we want to build excitement for this planning body meeting with a variety of other organizations. Three – five productions, NRDC. We held a screening and public format and open

discussion with some of the RPB members. Karen for example and Michael Snyder who will both be generous enough to provide the feedback and comment and answer questions. We had standing room only for this event. We had over 160 RSVPs. 140, 130 people showed up. There was a lot of interest and excitement in the work you are doing. We want to help expand that to reach more people in New York and across the region with our partners. So, thank you and while there might be some people here today there are many people that are interested. In specific terms, my organization has some concerns with the proposed approach that you are debating today. First, as you have heard from others we want to reinforce that it is absolutely critical if you are going to achieve your ocean ecosystem health that you do regional assessment of ecological areas. This is something that is critical to happen as a baseline for all ocean

planning efforts. That compatibility use for those areas as well as other areas is critical to identifying important conflicts and means of moving forward to deconflict those areas and protect the uses and resources used there. Finally, the issue of timing. It is critical to get this done but 2016 but I want to make sure that you consider enough time in the timeline for the National Ocean Council in DC to certify your final plan. I want to make sure there is enough time laid out in your timeline for public comment and drafting to account for time in DC for the national Ocean Council. Thank you very much and on behalf of the 140 people that showed up last night, keep up the good work.

Laura Cantral: Thank you, Bonnie.

Bonnie Brady: Hi, I'm Bonnie Brady, I'm from Long Island commercial fishing Association. I would like to welcome those of you who are not from New York to New York, right across the pond there is Long Island which

represents 99% of all of the seafood that is caught in New York City. It is a \$5 billion industry from boat to restaurant. There are thousands of people on Long Island and in New York also.

I guess my only comment because I do not have a written thing, would be regarding the ecological values, the socioeconomic value and the current and potential use conflict. I understand what you are trying to do. I also made comments for the overall plan but my own personal belief in something that I think is available to all of you so you don't have to reinvent the wheel here. Make use of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. And perhaps the New England Fishery Management Council and the Atlantic States Fishery Management Council. They have a process in place that is not mind numbingly, painful occasionally, fishery Council meeting called the center fish habitat, for habitats of

particular concern, I could go on forever, closures, mesh size depending on the fishery, all kinds of things that are available. On any of these potential is complex, they frankly when it comes to any of the fish that is caught and served in this country, they are the ones that will tell you where the conflicts are, they know where the essential fish habitat is. They know where these areas of ecological sensitivity are because often you're not going to be able to fish on them already. So, I would highly suggest that if it's possible to not only lean on Mike quite a bit there but also perhaps include somebody from the Atlantic Marine fisheries Commission on your overall panel. Because the 0-3 miles is the area that is the most important for the AMFC and they are the ones that regulate. As far as the Mid-Atlantic, they've got a great track record, all of the fish within the mid Atlantic are present and not overfished although fishing is occurring. You do not need to reinvent the wheel, they already have it for you so I highly suggest you utilize that and include a very important

stakeholder balance that is repeated by the state and New York and DC. They work at length to engage the stakeholders that are on the ocean every day. Frankly, when you talk about identifying research needs and leveraging resources, you should probably consider utilizing commercial fisherman in Long Island. Thank you very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So, we have now heard from everyone who signed up for this public comment session. We will have another one at the end of the day, today, this afternoon. We also have one scheduled tomorrow. So we are ahead of schedule. We are about 20 minutes ahead of schedule. We will take a lunch break at noon. My suggestion is that I would offer for your consideration is that we reflect, any other questions or thoughts that come to mind as a result of hearing very good input and some

suggestions and comments about the Ocean Action Plan that you might want to reflect on now, we could talk about it for a few minutes. Then I would ask again, when we come right from lunch if there is anything else that occurred to you, maybe, maybe not. Then we could roll right into the presentation of the New York draft Ocean Action Plan and maybe pick up some time that way. I don't want to rush, I don't mean to suggest that. We need to do these discussions justice for sure but we do have a few minutes so why don't we use it if folks want to.

Gwynne Schultz: I heard with interest a couple of comments that talked about that this should be a roadmap looking at many of the different issues. That while it is important to prioritize key issues that we can address right away, we really also need to be looking at what kind of issues of we want to look to the long run, part of full term continuing process. What I would like to do is see that when we do get into the discussion tomorrow on interjurisdictional

issues, if we could have a bit of a discussion about how comprehensive do we want to be? How many issues for the long run, long-term do we start looking at. Or just pick a couple and work on those that characterize all the issues that might be worked on in the future. So we should use a bit of the discussion tomorrow to look at the roadmap, all of the issues versus the select issues.

Laura Cantral: Yes we will definitely note that as something we should pick up on that discussion. Any other thoughts or reflections on?

Laura McKay: I think along those lines 2, I think it is important that we more squarely address the idea of the RPB conducting an ecological value assessment. Clearly, there's a lot of people who want that. Personally, I will do that. I will talk a little bit

about that on Thursday in terms of what we've done in our state. I know a lot of states in the region have done that sort of thing but I think we do have to have a quick discussion about can we pull that off and make that happen.

Laura Cantral: Yes. Thanks for raising that. As a process point and we probably should have brought everyone's attention to the document that the several commenter's refer to. That in your binder is the document immediately following the ROA proposed approach that outlines some potential data analyses and decision support tools. And as Laura just referenced she will be one of the people on the panel that will provide information about the use of those different kinds of analyses and decision support tools. Reflecting on the experience that is underway in the Northeast and how they have been using some of those tools as well as what's going on in other states such as Virginia. It has been our intention to invoked some thinking about how

to use those tools as we get into the interjurisdictional coordination discussion because it will be relevant to make the connection in that context. So, we do plan to pick that up some more. We should have pointed that out and been a little more explicit. Any other reflections?

Karen Chytalo: Going back to the areas of ecological importance. I'm really on Laura's boat on this for sure that we would like to see more work done on building these essential fish habitats and habitats of particular concern as well as other designations, as well as the newer information that is in the portal and also what other information do we need to develop. That is part of the thing that goes back to research needs and all that kind of stuff. What is the other information that we need together so that we can help support some of those things. Can we get

some of them down? Maybe we will not get all of them. But at least we can try to get some of these things down on paper as something that we all agree. I guess that would be a big step forward. I guess the whole thing in this planning effort is it is going to be evolving. I think we are in this for the long term. I don't think everything is going to get done at once. I think what we need is, show your hands. What do we care about, put your hands on the table". And start looking at some of these pieces together and have that make some sense. I think that will help us in the long-term. We will find more commonalities than we realize.

Joe Atangan: Just to reflect on some of the comments. I'm a little concerned based on what I heard that we are not communicating the fact that we are going to use the best available science and ecosystem-based management principles throughout this process. I think we are so immersed in the process that sometimes this overarching principle, this whole process is going to be science-based. That we lose our ability to

communicate the fact that the science component of this thing is very, very, very important. So what I'm hearing from the audience is, I think we have left the impression that we have left science in the backseat there. That the focus was primarily on regulatory issues and the processes and the policy stuff, at the expense of science. If that is the impression that we've left, and I think, then we have done a poor job in communicating and highlighting the fact that the science piece is very much a key component of this whole process. Which is one of the reasons why we've invested in as much as we have anything in a whole portal concept because that is that will help us visualize the science.

So, I do want to ensure to some of the people in the scientific committee and some of the environmental groups that we hear you loud and clear but we have not been communicating the fact

that the science is a key component in this. The science is what the basis of a lot of decisions that have to be made here. I want to stress that to the rest of the RPB that we need to a little bit better about articulating that in our future documents and how to communicate what we are about to embark on.

Gwynne Schultz: My comment had to do with hearing about engagements and scientific community. Joe, I think you did a nice job of articulating our desire to do that. I think that now we need to do a better job of actually getting down to how and when we will do that. I would encourage us all as we talk about the regional issues assessment or identifying geographic areas in the future that we provide a little bit more clarity about the when and how to engage the scientific community.

Laura Cantral: Anyone else?

Doug Pabst: Thanks and good conversation. I think we have a lot to consider. The messaging to me continues to be a struggle. I think we're doing as best we can. It's another plug for the importance of the stakeholder engagement process. It hasn't been something that has been forgotten it is something we are investing a lot of work into and working with MARCO to make that happen. One of the hard things about this process, we are looked at as decision-makers and in essence we all have a piece of the puzzle but it really is society that will decide some of the larger questions as we move forward. We are trying to set the table for how we might make some of those, take that input from folks, if they want an area protected, we're not necessarily going to be the ones to make that decision there is another avenue and that the stakeholders are a big part of that process. Through their voice, how they make

decisions on elections and other types of things. It's just important to remember that that is a huge part of this process that you will be driving as we move forward. We're trying to do the mechanics based on what it looks like today and where we want to be in the future. I just think that while we can't make the public part of this process for a lot of bureaucratic reasons that have been discussed in the past, the goal is to have you as part of the process to help us as we have to make those decisions as we move forward. I don't think that has come across in the documents that we have produced. I want to continue to remind us that. This is not going to be done and you have lost opportunity to be part of those decisions as we go forward.

Karen Chytalo: I really think that we have to come by tomorrow, finalize and approach to the Ocean Action Plan. Convert more of the maybes to Wells so that will create a strong document the things that we are going to do. That

would help us to better define our workflow and how we're going to see, we'll have clear marching orders. How people will come back to say these are the things that I can support. We really need to get these things done. Maybe some other things were not as strong but have some sort of prioritized list and that might help us to proceed.

Laura Cantral: We have heard comments about how resources are not available. Maybe one of the workflows could be identification of needs as we see it and for research needs as we see it. And decision-making tools, methods that we may or may not yet have identified. Make that available publicly so that we can influence university research agendas to grant research agendas. Moving forward with this information to those tools are available they can be

brought forward to us. So we can further develop and help us evolve as we go forward.

Greg Capobianco: Thank you. My reflection on the comments, what resonated with me anyway and I think Doug is right, we need to message better. The first step in any planning process is inventory analysis. We have to get that together. We need to, you know, as I was listening to some of the comments that I was hearing. I'm feeling, maybe this is where Joe was going on earlier. I would like to start looking at some maps, see those maps generated not just by the data portal folks but with the stakeholders that the subject matter is relative to. I thought the one comment about the Atlantic States Commission is very appropriate. Just as the shipping industry for shipping maps and recreational representation for the recreators in the ocean and start to put down current and future or expected uses and start to look at what we have and I think you will find there is a huge

amount of area and activity in the ocean. And I think there is overlapping activity and incompatibility. I think we have to be careful about wanting to default chase conflict all the time. I guess my observation is let's start looking at some product and put some information together and start to do some head scratching. This gets very complicated when it's all in your head, all of this – what it looks like and I think if you do that region-wide what flows from that will make a lot more sense than I think my earlier comment about chasing places. Thank you

Laura Cantral: Let's go to Laura and then Jeff.

Laura McKay: I want to refresh your memory about the portal and what we do have on it. We don't have a presentation this time about the

portal have had in the past public meetings. There is quite a lot of data on there. Some of it has been vetted with stakeholders who are in that process now for commercial fishing maps and sea maps we've talked about last time. So there is not only a lot of data on there but there is also an assessment of data gaps that is on the portal. Everyone needs to go back and look at that and let us know, us being Marco has an ocean mapping data team which I chair. We have people from the portal team here. So we have a really robust system for collecting all of this data and visualizing it on a regional scale. It really is terrific stuff. My hope is that we may have enough now that we can begin to overlay all of these ecological value layers. And start to do the kind of assessment and synthesis that Greg was talking about. I think that's where we are right now. We really need to start doing that synthesis to understand the big picture. It won't be perfect, yes there are still many data gaps but a whole lot happened during the past few years. I'm really excited about

moving ahead in this direction. And I just want to remind people of what we do have and we have done. It's been quite a lot and it is quite impressive. So shout out and thanks to our portal team.

Laura Cantral: Just a reminder to everyone in the room that the data portal corner is back behinds, you can go back and see what that is about and you can ask questions.

Jeffrey Flumigan: My statement is about process to the extent that we can preserve maximum flexibility that we are planning by and a very judicious approach in converting every May into a shall. In terms of going back and rewriting because we want to make an expeditious decision. We might want to take the time to review the scientific information and get the best to make a decision.

Forcing us to do the same process in every way may not be the best approach

Laura Cantral: okay. So it is about noon. So let's take a break for lunch as I have mentioned. When we come back I will pose a question if you have any other reflections over lunch and you want to share those about the proposed approach, we will do that but we won't plan to spend another 45 minutes on it. I think we need to plan. I will say something about the mechanics about getting back from lunch. Let's plan to start with checking in to see if there is anything else to share about the proposed approach. Then we can go into the presentation. Then we will proceed from there. We are planning to start back at 1 o'clock. Those of you know are with us from the public. That means going out and buying lunch and getting back by 1 o'clock. I know that is a tight timeframe for you because you have to go through

security. I don't have any other answer to that other than it will be a quick break.

(LUNCH BREAK)

Laura Cantral: Alright folks, we are going to get started, if people can find their seats please.

Are you folks ready to get started? Welcome back.

So just to remind folks, there are refreshments in the alcove. Everyone here is welcome to partake, we just ask that you do not bring the food in here. If you are in there having a refreshment, please be quiet. We will have additional afternoon refreshments shortly and I will ask the RPB if you want to take a

break and get a refreshment or if you want to keep going and you get your refreshment as you need to. We will cross that bridge is little later on.

As I have promised right before we took the lunch break, I want to ask the RPB members if there is anything else that you feel that you want to share as you have reflected on the discussion that we've had so far related to the proposed approach for an Ocean Action Plan. If so, let's entertain that for a few minutes and then we will keep moving on with our agenda and hear from New York on their draft Ocean Action Plan.

Kevin Chu: Thanks, I would like to respond to the public comments a little bit. I have listened to them. First I am really grateful for everybody who came and is sitting in the audience listening to us talk. That is hard work. The ideas they have presented are so important for us to hear and so

useful. I'm sitting here thinking, gosh, to accomplish what people are really asking us to accomplish is a huge task, more than we can do in the foreseeable future. That got me thinking - are we wasting our time because we cannot live up to expectations? It helped me to think through that question. My conclusion is, no. I would just like the audience to understand first that we have heard their concerns. Concerns about the confusion that this body could bring to decision-making, confusion about not doing enough for important ecological areas. We have heard those concerns but ask patience because this is hard to get so many agencies that have responsibilities that may overlap, jurisdictional issues and different legal mandates and different chief commanders, it is hard work. What I see, and what the comments have helped me to see today, is that we have a body of people who are willing workers and

trying to figure out how we can all work better together. It is an extremely complicated task. One which is probably hard to imagine how complicated it is if you haven't worked 20 years in a bureaucracy. I ask for patience as we struggle with this. I do think, and I am glad to be part of this group that is wrestling with this difficult question. How can these varied agencies with different mandates and different political agendas, no funding, how can we do a better job of managing this? Is not easy but we are all trying. I guess it's all I wanted to say.

Laura Cantral: Any other post lunch reflections?

We will take this up again tomorrow, it will be the first thing on our agenda. We will have other discussions and points that need to be either made or clarified or both. Then hopefully, you will all be feeling comfortable with and approval of this proposed approach. We'll see how that all proceeds tomorrow morning. For the rest of the day, I won't

repeat all of outline of the agenda, we have several topics we want to take up for the remainder of this afternoon. We are going to turn now to hear from New York about the ocean planning process. Karen Chytalo and Greg Capobianco are going to tag team on this. Karen I think you're up first and then you'll hand it over to Greg is that right?

Karen Chytalo: That is correct. Thank you very much and I appreciate you giving us time to try to get this information out to the folks since it is so brand-new, with this level of effort it is an effort that has been worked out with my agency and the New York State Department of State as well as a lot of other agencies. We are one of the two primary agencies working on that. It has been a labor of love, let's put it that way, and I want you all to look at the new logos we have. If you look at the bottom of the

page, that is the new New York State branding you will see that more and more. We are being branded. It will be on our backs now, too. What I wanted to get to is talk a little bit about the background that went into the development of the plan. It started way back in 2006, it was developed in New York Ocean and Great Lakes Ecosystem Conservation Act, that was passed under Pataki back then. A division to promote this legislation to say we need to do something more about the Ocean and Great Lakes. We do all of these great things in other areas we have to look further than where we are right now. At that time, the act established Ecosystem-Based Management as the foundation to conserve, maintain and restore the health of ocean and coastal ecosystems. The act also created a governmental Council made up of various state agencies as well as SUNY Stony Brook. The councils now on hiatus but we're still looking to move forward. One of the things that developed was a report in 2009, "Our waters, Our Communities, Our

Futures" after gathering information from numerous stakeholder forums. They came up with a laundry list of a lot of activities that needed to be done to do certain things. Part of that action was also called for an action of development on the Regional Ecosystem-Based Management Plan, one for the ocean one for the Great Lakes. Our concept was to build the agendas that were developed for other systems, like the Hudson River Estuary, the Mohawk and Great Lakes.

What we did there was work on some of the things that were critical for looking at the plan. What is critical to New York in a sense, 60% of New York's population lives along the 2,600 mile, coastal miles, that we have. That is a lot of the population, a lot of people. Now we are the fourth most populated state, we lost to Florida because most of New

Yorker's have moved down there. A lot of the population is still involved in seeing the different activities involved there. We have very significant recreational uses, recreational fishers, Surfriders, surfers that utilize the area. Fisheries generate about \$5 billion annually and 42,000 jobs. Shipping generates about \$175 billion and 279,200 jobs. We have never had a plan for this. We never had anything that got to that. The thought was that, to maintain all of this you have to have a healthy ecosystem that it is critical for this economic boom and economic support all the time. We have numerous numbers of fish species that are recreationally and commercially important, as well as endangered and threatened. We have multiple marine habitats, not only within 3 miles within our areas but we know that our resources do not know our state boundaries and go off into the federal waters and up the rivers. We have to maintain all of these different habitats. To make sure all of the life stages are available to them.

Water quality is essential. We have invested a lot to do nitrogen reduction. Ocean health is important to be able to have a good economy. We need to have the two pieces fit together. Alternative energy development is on the horizon, and that will be part of our economic future.

In New York State we have a goal to create renewable energies and significant source of our energy power for the future so we will have to look. We are running out of on land development of solar panels and windmills. We are looking to the ocean to help with renewable energy goals. Part of this thing is that you need to have stakeholder outreach. You need to be engaged with them, to hear what they are thinking. Back a couple of years ago we took some testing ideas out to the public to hear what people were thinking. What do they want? Are they

understanding what we're talking about when we say eco--based management? Here are some outcomes that could potentially be done. So we did a series of these meetings and they were very targeted. We did it with the sister state agencies, so we could explain what we were proposing to do. Federal agencies, Doug was there, here is what we are thinking about doing, and some of the ideas we were coming up with and they said that this is never going to fly, do not do that. But we needed to hear that, the positive and negatives of where we were going to go. The estuary programs, we are blessed with five estuary programs and have been working together for a long time with New Jersey Harbor. Those are important and we wanted to reach them because we wanted to include them as being a part of this. We are looking at the ocean focus but the estuaries are critically important to help save the ocean. We went back to our counties, we went to the Shinnecock Nation Tribe, you guys are good, we were very appreciative and it was very helpful. The New York

Marine Science Consortium which is made up of , I forgot the numbers, 40 or 50 at this point?

Greg Capobianco: About 36.

Karen Chytalo: About 36 of scientific groups, academia groups and groups like that that had gotten together. We give to them a research agenda. Here are some research ideas and build upon the research ideas, that was back in 2009. What do you think? How do we change things or add in? We did targeted meetings with commercial recreational fishers, we went to the east and west along Long Island, just to get an idea of what do you guys want to see happen with this? Here what some of the things that we were thinking of, they wanted to know if they could trust us or not. But we needed to hear their voices and what things were concerning to

them as fishers. They gave us great information, such as the outflow pipes, there are two out there and they're horrible habitats, you need to do something about that and improve that. Things that we were not hearing from others, they were putting it right on the table for us. We also, Nick sit down, I can't see.

We also deal with industries, we had some wind companies come in, some other power companies as consultants. Just to hear their thoughts and concerns. They were wondering, how was this going to affect us? We said tell us what your concerns are. We felt that was a good process to go through, it helped us with how to move ahead and how to explain things and make sure we are getting the message across. I think that is what we are hearing today too, getting the message right. So we went to our not-for-profits and of course they had extremely helpful comments, they read everything and tell you everything on their minds. It was extremely helpful to move the process forward. They

have such an incredible outreach to other people and they bring that to the table. That was a very fortunate group to have as far as our stakeholders.

As far as the action plan, the critical components is a collaborative effort for planning and implementation among the entities, the academia, not-for-profit stakeholders, they all had something to say about what is going on in the ocean. We felt that we needed to hear that and put that down as part of this whole process in the making of this. Basically, the plan we come up with provides a framework for integrated, adaptive approach to management and also to seek to identify the stressors that threaten the system and to make sure that we propose relevant actions, things that make sense that we can do something about. Problem - address problem - research, you need to research and what do you do to address the problem? Here is the geographic scope

that we have selected, it did not include the estuaries but we did go out to the Outer Continental Shelf. Our fishermen are out there, our recreational divers are out there. The fish that are there come into shore. The whales migrating by, coming through. These are all species that we are interested in and concerned with and provide economic information to our areas. Even though we had a near shore focus because we are state people but we also looked outward because we knew that would benefit us in the long run.

Some of the issues affecting the ocean ecosystem, in the New York Bight, there is a large triangular area, it is recreational and commercial fishing, there are activities going on with that. The shipping and transportation, the offshore energy development, the habitat loss and destruction, the water quality issues and we have had a plethora of things that have affected the estuaries. Every now that we have some major blooms that come out to the ocean

we haven't seen them but we hope they come back. The pathogen issues and the toxin issues, the toxins are not going away, some of them are being transported out there. We have seen more and more of the Vibrio type outbreaks in our shellfish and we know that is an issue too. We have seen pathogens that have killed off a lot of the dolphins a couple of years ago that were up and down the coast. They're all connected to one another. Aquatic invasive species, that is more and more important. How is that adjusting things in our Marine systems? How is that affecting the ecology of the system as a whole? And of course climate change, the sea level rises and you learn a lot of stuff through Sandy in 2012. The surge that came through and the damage that was done, it is like we needed to be more resilient for the coastline. The coastline cannot go on as is and stuff like that. We know that there is a lot of other issues. There are

other issues that are we are reflecting too, there are other sorts of things. Mike has seen this slide many times before in presentations. This is work that was done looking at some of the fish stock of summer flounder and the expansion of the stock over the years. As you can see if you look at the red areas, more from Virginia and Maryland, all of a sudden they expanded more and we have a lot more in the New York, New Jersey area. We have seen changes over time, this is a time sequence data that has been done by a company way back. Some other work that shows species shift is looking at the biomass by state. The biomass has changed, you can look at the American lobster and see how over the years and the last few decades how much it has gone past New York. We are weaning, we used to be the kings of lobsters, not anymore, we are at a few percent of our population after they die off in 1999. Now it is way up in Maine, they are overblown, it is almost a nuisance species, it has been for better habitat for the American lobsters. We have found that

under 24°C in bottom waters, you kill the lobster immediately. We have seen that hitting that bottom temperature more and more often in our waters and we know that is a major issue. Things are changing and we are dealing with a very changing system so we have to look at things differently. So the way we structured the document itself, is we came up with four clearly defined goals, which I will talk about later. And we did a timeline of 10 years for the limitations and we will revise it overtime but a 10 year chunk to do very ambitious actions and if we get through a good part of them, that would be fantastic, in that 10 year timeframe. We did come up with 61 prioritize actions and incremental steps for each one of the actions, so that you have steps one through five, here is the action and here is how you are going to get to do that. We had to weigh it out so we know exactly what goes first, second, third. We also feel

very strongly about implementation through partner collaboration, there is no way to say New York has the money to do all of this stuff. We have some money and we have been putting our money where our mouth is but we do need to work with others, especially since these are shared resources. We do seek their assistance as well as guidance on how to do certain things as well as how to implement. Some of the potential partners have been identified within each of the actions right now, some who have said yes, and some we are saying yes for them right now because our assumption is, this is something you care about so we have included folks in our list to do some of these activities.

Just to give you a shorthand of our four goals that we have come up with. First goal is to ensure the ecological integrity of the ocean ecosystem. That is pretty familiar to you for the ocean. Our second goal is to promote economic

growth, coastal development and human use of the ocean in a matter that is sustainable and consistent with maintaining ecosystem integrity. Let's make sure the environment stays healthy. Goal three is to increase resilience of ocean resources to impacts associated with climate changing. We have to be ready for the next storm. You can't go on as usual. New Jersey knows the same thing. You cannot sit idly by. We have to improve what we have. And four is to empower the public to actively participate in the decision-making and the ocean stewardship. We have a lot of action in there, getting more children involved, educating the public, putting out signage for access sites so people know this is the site for fishers where you're allowed to catch, and here is how many. Here's health advisories associated with it. Here's this estuary out there that is great, habitat and wetlands so people know how important the

connection is with the activity, as well as, the habitat that surrounds those areas.

Actions are moving ahead with a lot of the funding that we get through the Ocean Great Lakes portion of the New York State Environmental Protection Fund. There is an allocation that is offered every single year. One of the big things that has been developed is the Geographic Information Gateway. It is almost ready to launch, it's real close. And it is an incredible portal with a lot of information, and stories stuff like that talking about resources in New York ocean area.

Some of the other things that we are going to be coming out with real soon are our request for whale pilot monitoring program. Doing an acoustic monitoring, Aerial monitoring, shipboard monitoring throughout the New York Bight system and also within some of the shipping lanes, we're going to have some areas that will be examined. And

we want to have a pilot program to understand what is happening with the whales that are moving through this area.

We also have, enhancing NOAA's program, we are doing fishery observers because of the by-catch issues. Those are fish that are thrown back dead, basically. They are not targeted for the fishery but thrown back dead. Too many endangered species are winding up in that dead pile. You have to get a better handle on the situation so we can get better fishery management.

One of the things that have occurred through hurricane Sandy is that it broke through three places on the South Shore Barrier Islands, two areas were filled in. One area we had agreement since it was through the Fire Island Natural Area that it could be left open for testing and monitoring to see, is it a good or is it a bad thing? What people are looking at

right now in that breach is are we seeing tidal elevations changing because of having this breach open. So far, we have not seen one centimeter change as a result of having this breach open. But some of this fishery monitoring activities that we have going on right now, we are seeing an increase of species, increase in water clarity, reduction in pathogens. Increase in product vegetation and increase in shellfish populations. It was like, oh, maybe this isn't not such a bad thing after all. That gave people recreational opportunities to go there because they see the seals coming there, they see the fish and they're fishing too, they are not dumb, those seals, they are fishing in that area. We are getting the data and we are fortunate in the sense that back in 2007 we have done a similar survey so we have something to compare it to, we have a baseline to compare it to. This is going to be information for the Breach Contingency Plan, whether or not if we should go ahead and fill or use it as a potential means to improve water quality and other issues in

the area. Sometimes you have to check these things out. It may give you information to make better decisions. One thing we will host this summer is an Ocean Indicators Workshop, it is in June. Some folks will be invited to come to it. We have a group of SUNY Stony Brook, is going to be hosting this, having folks come in. We will have better indicators so that we do understand in all of these actions that we plan, how successful are we in implementing and we will see the room of improvement in resources and things like that. We want to get that worked out so we can help identify that for development of monitoring programs. Those are already funded and ready to move, ready to go. One of the important things that we felt, we are so pleased that you are here in New York as well as the date you've selected is because we were able to push through to get the draft plan out the door, so we can present it to you

because we feel it has a strong relationship to the ongoing activities of the RPB. We will be able to provide more information to the Regional Ocean Assessment because of the stuff that we've gathered, we feel that is an important component just for that alone. It enhances collaborative partnerships for monitoring research. One of the activities we are talking about is research with the IJC, we have a list of our activities and here you go guys, we have things New York is very interested in doing. We have provided guidance for sustainable fisheries and sustainable management of ocean resources. It'll help with the work we are doing here and how to minimize user conflicts. It improves regional policy decision-making. Here is our best attempt at doing what is a draft plan and we are going out for public comments, we will have public meetings starting February 6th, to see if this is working or not. As we have said before, the only way we can implement something like this through partnerships and leveraging some of the funds that we have

and attracting other funding sources. A lot of people here have already provided funds to help implement these activities. If you put something out there, people start saying I have money. It starts to show, here is what we find important and what we value. We want to have others involved and of course you have to see the picture of the humpback whale with the Empire State Building in the background. That is the only way you have to see that. This picture is for real, in this summer as Kathy has said earlier, we had a lot of whales come to the area and moving through, the humpbacks were eating and having a great time out there. Right underneath them were the striped bass and underneath them were the sharks. We had a whole food chain happening this summer. I would like to turn it over to Greg and he can tell you all of the great things going on from the State too.

Greg Capobianco: Thank you so much Karen, I have a few slides and I will try to be pretty brief. I wanted to give you an overview of some of the Ocean Planning work that the Department of State has been doing, it dovetails nicely with the release of the OAP and the ocean planning work that we have been doing at DOS, DEC's been a major part and we have a pretty good click going on with the State agencies of New York. Just quickly the priorities of our offshore planning. We are trying to find ways to wisely site offshore wind to meet energy needs, we want to promote economic development. We are interested in protecting areas that are really important to New York's economy, when we start talking about looking at natural resources and protection activities. Lesson learned from Sandy, Irene and Lee, Irene and Lee more about flooding upstate, we sort of did a head scratch as we looked at our sand resources in New York State. What we do not want is to end up like is Florida, who is now out of sand in their state waters. We are trying to

think through, how can we be smart about where we might borrow sand, how we might borrow sand to minimize effects on fisheries are other habitats. How do we do that, where do we do that is really for in terms of long-term resilience capability given in this entirely new climate we have now. I just wanted to mention that the work that we issued last July in the Atlantic Ocean Study is a great complement to the work that is reflected in the Ocean Action Plan. It is the data backdrop for it and we are going to go into a couple of details about some of our products including them. Some of the things we have been busy with in July 2013, as I've mentioned, we released the Atlantic Ocean Study. You have a disk in front of you. For the people in the audience there is a stack that you are welcome to take with you, we might have enough for everybody I am not sure. Just to follow up, gateway issue, I will send a data link to

show you what we put together, I think you will be impressed. Locating potential offshore wind lease areas, I know other states have been doing this and it is not an easy job it takes a lot of thinking, a lot collaborating and discussing the best available information. We have touched on the sand borrow areas and we are sort of looking inward at the Department of State and trying to reevaluate our coastal management program. I'm not sure what that will look like but it seems appropriate to sort really take a look inward in terms of how our program structure and what our policy set looks like, and how we actually do the work that we do. The Atlantic Ocean Study which focuses on data primarily, it identify some areas that are really important to New York's economy as Karen's mentioned. Our study area goes out to the shelf edge but there are so many things going on in federal waters that are important to New Yorkers and their economy. We have certainly intended and I think the document does a pretty good job of supporting identification

of wind energy areas, possible habitat areas and sand resources, it was a collaborative effort and I was so impressed with the help that we got to do this study. These are a few of our partners. NOAA National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science were amazing. New England aquarium, University of Rhode Island. Riverhead Foundation, Cornell's Cooperative Extension, a host of state agencies and stakeholder interests that we spoke to. I think it has been really reflected in the plan, in the study.

A couple of ongoing partnerships that are good to mention, New York does have a BOEM task force. There is consultation on current perspective leasing activities. That is multiple state, federal and local partners. We have a cooperative agreement with BOEM and we are happy to have that, where we are collaborating between the state and federal agencies

on this issue of sand resources, trying to get a handle on how we can identify locations so we can be responsive and more resilient going forward. This is just a quick sum. Taken together, I think the Study and the Action Plan does address a wide range of things, concerns that New York has in the ocean. It certainly lays a foundation of moving forward.

I think the point I want to make here is that my, and you have heard me say this before, my interpretation of this whole thing we are doing is the President issued his Executive Order and told the federal agencies to listen to the states and regions. The onus on the states and regions are to collaborate and work together and really try to articulate what is important in this region. And tell that to the federal agency so that the federal agencies cannot create new laws or new statues, but within your own respective jurisdictions and within your own resource capacities, figure out how to be regional. How do you address the things that are important to the mid Atlantic as opposed to the Gulf and the

West Coast. I think that is worth saying, that is why I come to these meetings. For more information you are welcome to copy that website address down and I will make sure that we send both a link to that and a link to our information gateway, out all of the email addresses. I'm happy to answer questions and thank you so much for your time.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Greg and Karen for that overview of a lot of really interesting, a lot of hard work and obviously relevant to the regional discussions that we're here about today. We had time to take a few questions or comments for either Karen or Greg.

Mike Luisi: Thank you and congratulations to both you for all of that hard work. I know how difficult it can be to get a product like

that developed and get a prepared and ready to go to the public. The question that I have as I was listening to some of the details of the New York plan are related to, I guess, I forget the number you have said, 60 or 70 different priorities that were identified in the New York plan? And if so, you mentioned there is a list of things that we have heard from our state quarters that we want to accomplish and get done in the ocean. So as this regional planning body continues to develop and potentially priorities are set, how will priorities of the region interact with the priorities of the state level in this Regional Ocean Action Plan it says here that there is a commitment as being a participant in this process. There is a commitment to following the plan at the regional level. It came to my mind as to how the two priorities could merge or do you foresee there being issues on how priorities are established at the region and then translate down to the state?

Mike Luisi: I will take a shot at the answer. I think the short answer is before we can do a regional plan and do a

good regional plan, we have to know what is important in the region. The first way to do that is to know what the states care about, want and need. It is that we put a lot of effort into this, other states are undergoing efforts but from my perspective I hope that the planning work that we have done helps to inform the development of the regional OAP. I think there are some efficiencies to be found, some nuggets in what New York did that are not unique to New York but can be adapted, discussed, lifted and brought into a regional discussion context. I hope that it is a jump starter if you will and it is bit of a New York throw down. This is the "ask" and the beginning of the Ocean Policy, the Executive Order was - what do the states want, these regions? We were talking about what New York wants, and we want to share it with all of you, the state and federal agencies and hope that it enriches the discussion we are having at

this level.

Karen Chytalo: I wanted to say too that this, we don't we expect to go with that. There's something's in there that we want to leverage and work through with the entities that sit around this table. Merrill is doing work on the whale monitoring too, somehow they get from Maryland up through New York, how are they going? New Jersey did a lot of work on that. They had a huge population, there are some things that are happening out there that it starts putting some pieces together and we are hoping that we shed some light, do some things. We have laid out near term and some things are long-term things that may take a lot more time and resources to move forward but we felt like here is a framework. In our framework, you move forward. Some things, you have to work together as a region for New York State too. We have to have the information, when push comes to shove we have to have the best information

available to get that done..

Laura Cantral: I would just add as Bob and Joe both know well from their participation in the Northeast regional planning body, there are two states that have developed state-based ocean plans. And they are finding ways that benefits them in regional context to learn from those experiences to build things that are appropriate as they talk about planning in a regional context, there is an analogy. Sarah?

Sarah Cooksey: Thank you, Laura. I have two questions I would like to ask. I understand there were a lot of partnerships all in working with our colleagues in the scientific community. But could you define the level of effort either in people days or years or dollars or something, what type of effort do

you think this would be?

Mike Luisi: For the Atlantic Ocean study, I'm glad you asked this question, that we released in July 2013, it is a huge thank you to a whole range of federal partners. We did a lot of staff work in setting the communications up and doing the trips, writing, but the federal agencies were remarkable. At the end of the day, it is federal waters for the most part in our planning areas and the federal agency were the keepers and owners of the data. What do you know and what you have to share with us? We calculated that we were seeing in, this is a pretty modest estimate of \$700,000 from our federal partners in terms of data share, advice, counsel and consultation on how to portray and use the data, what the data meant and what the data did not mean. So it was really valuable. That was a great question because this the way to stuff should work that was a really good collaboration and I was pleased at how readily federal agencies sort of came to the table and worked with us on this.

Karen Chytalo: We had one person assigned 100% of the time to work on the writing and stuff like that. That was their job entirely. If you counted all of the other people and their activities, that is priceless. One of the things we have too is some of the work and types of action and some places we spent the money, and we are also using that to leverage our federal grants. We keep leveraging it in so many different ways so that it helps us. You two need a key writing group or a minimum of one person who puts pen to pencil and that is all that they do. They have to get that and they have to be able to wrap it around their heads, as we all know this is hard to wrap around your head.

Sarah Cooksey: a totally different question, in one of your goals you talked about ecosystem integrity. I'm wondering if you defined that and what

that meant. Ecosystem integrity.

Karen Chytalo: That is an issue that will come up as part of the indicator discussion, absolutely. Having the definition in place. It might be in there but I do not remember for sure. We'll check.

Joe Atangan: Not really a question, a general comment. First of all I appreciate New York leading and getting this product out. As we move forward in our own planning process, I look forward to getting your lessons learned as we mulled through the process. In your experience and the rakes that you have stepped on in the process of producing this plan, hopefully we will be able to avoid those same mistakes along the way. To produce a more streamlined product or at least a product that considers all inputs that are already in your plan. I think it is a great document that we can leverage and I do want to stress the fact that we do need the focusing on leveraging efforts like

this rather than duplicating the effort. Really, seriously leveraging that in order to work within the constructs of the resource restraints and the time constraints that we also have.

Catherine McCall: I had a comment. I appreciate hearing what New York has done with their ocean plan and setting the different priorities, collecting the data and I guess part of the way I view my role as a state representative on this body, is putting the burden on myself and others that I work with at this state to be able to help communicate the thoughts on how some of what the RPB is talking about when it comes to what is the socioeconomic impact to particular users in our state and how that connects up with things that our federal partners are doing throughout the region and throughout the nation and making all of us cognizant of this burden,

and how we already start making some solid connections with the stakeholder dialogue that you have through opportunities like this or partnerships with MARCO. I was curious if New York had any thoughts about how or if they thought through how they take things like what you've done on the ocean plan and how you incorporate that into some of your dialogue or thought process with the RPB's moving forward?

Greg Capobianco: Sure, I think that as Karen's mentioned when she started the presentation, we had a window of opportunity to try to get the plan done and released for public comment which was not particularly easy. But it was an important window of opportunity because we wanted to share it with you. I guess sort of answer is we're doing that by having the discussion now and really looking forward to your critical feedback on it. Everything can be improved including the work we have done, no doubt. But I hope that answers your question generally. While I have the

mic, I just wanted to make a quick comment about New York is really extremely fortunate to have an environmental protection fund that is receiving annual appropriations. Small portion of which is allocated for ocean and Great Lakes work. So, it's a big responsibility and a great position to be in to try to spend those state dollars wisely in a way that gets to where Joe was talking about, which is leveraging, I want to understand ways that we can do pilot activities that would then lead to other states or even more so the federal agencies following and completing the work. To me that's what a part of what we are supposed to be doing. So we are lucky we have something to put up. Karen and I have had these discussions a lot but we want to make the best of that opportunity to stretch it and leverage it with the expertise at the table and the staff and resources and the agencies and federal government. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: Karen.

Karen Chytalo: I was going to focus again on the leveraging aspect because as I mentioned before, we thought about how to do something like the Senate side, we have to keep it concrete, we have to keep it focused, and so we are moving ahead with the process but we also have to ensure that, you know, that we do outreach to not only our stakeholders but other stakeholders and entities around this table to help us to achieve our goals as well as the goals for the region. The region wins at the end. If we are all growing in the same direction, things will work out a lot better that way. We have some commonalities of substance. That's why we continue to work with folks and stuff.

Laura Cantral: Anything else before we close this section out?

Kevin Chu: great questions. I'm curious to know if any other the states or environments are something like this and the other question is how, does the New York effort overlap with Marco. I don't understand that aspect either. MARCO is a state planning body and New York has its own plan, do they interact with MARCO in the development?

Greg Capobianco: Not to a huge degree. We certainly let folks know what we were to and the work that we were doing. Again, I guess, I just go back to the same answer which is, MARCO is a group of five states. It is a creature of the state, it's a creature of the governors. MARCO was formed to really work on shared priorities on what was a real value on something that affects all 5 states. And if working together creates an efficiency. If it doesn't

create efficiency that don't do it. I think you can even from the perspective and there is a lot of good work going out in the other states too, believe me and hopefully I will share that and some others will share that, what is happening in the other states. The issue is we had an opportunity to try to lay out an approach and a series of actions and when you get into the OAP you will see that a lot of it is not going to sound unfamiliar because we are asking a lot of the same questions that we are grappling with here. I think there is sort of going back to what Joe was saying earlier, there will be two things that come out of a. One is that we would like to do that to maybe we can expand that and do that in other locations. The other side of the interpretation is "let's see how that works out". That's good. That's fine. I hope that answers.

Karen Chytalo: Yes and another side to is that Marco expressed three priority areas. We didn't want to feel

constrained in the development of the Ocean Action Plan because we felt like it is in the system-based management so we have to get the big picture and try to draw the big picture rather than saying cherry pick those. We want to put the big picture out.

Laura Cantral: Bob.

Bob LaBelle: I just wanted to follow up on something you said Greg. You have the plan. What is New York thinking of in terms of implementation of the plan? Is there a common understanding in the state agencies that is appropriate to follow. Do you have written agreements?

Greg Capobianco: I don't have a written agreement but the primary actors or the spending line that we are so privileged to have DC and DOS. What

agency will take work each year and share our perspective work plans. This is sort of doing it all ahead of time and laying it out. I think there is, I am not, Karen you can correct me if I'm wrong, they are not in priority order, they are not sequential. So, it requires a careful read and the hope is that some subset of those things will resonate with folks here at the table and will find some place to take, in some cases what we're planning to spend money on further and spread into the region. And other places to sit back to see if it makes sense to see if it is going to work and then maybe we can evaluate it.

Laura Cantral: Thank you very much. Congratulations on all of this work. Thanks to Greg and Karen and all the really good discussion and questions on the discussion. Let's segue to our next topic. I'm going to ask the folks that are going to be presenting updates from Marcos, on its stakeholder activities. Chris, Bob and John,

have you three here at the table, this table here?
Gwynne, you're going to stay where you are?

Gwynne Schultz: Yes, I will stay where I
am.

Laura Cantral: I am going to hand it off
to Gwynne to context and kick off a session and then
she'll handed off to Chris and then Chris I assume
you will explain the role of your colleagues here at
the table, right? Okay. Gwynne, I am handing it off to
you.

Gwynne Schultz: I thought we were going to
get a break first. (Laughing.) As I mentioned earlier,
this morning during introductions. In addition to
representing the state of Maryland regional planning
body, I also chair the Marco management board. It is

with that hat, as the chair, we will be kicking today's session and we will hand it over to Kris Ohleth, who is the MARCO executive director. And I will also be bringing it back to closure, with some thoughts about next steps for MARCO stakeholder engagement activities in different regions. We looked at earlier about three activities that Marco has been involved with. We have helped to sponsor the five listening sessions. We get out a lot of information about RPB activities on our website. Newsletters, regular blogs, we put out a poster. If you haven't seen the poster, up on the front table. We brought copies for most people. It is really nicely done and it is an invitation to the public to engage in this ocean planning process. It has been website on it and information. MARCO has really tried to embrace the need and help implement key activities. One of the ways we have done that in having talked to the regional planning body before is through the establishment of stakeholder liaison committee. That is going to be the purpose of today's

session. Another activity that we have engaged in is working to enhance engagement with the tribal community. Kelsey and I will be kicking off a session on tribal engagement after this. With that what I want to do is just have Kris start and walked to the activities of our stakeholder liaison committee.

Kris Ohleth: Great. Thanks, Gwynne and thanks to the planning body for allowing us to this opportunity to debrief you on the stakeholder engagement work we have been involved in. I know that it has been an important priority for this body to be engagement stakeholders. MARCO has been happy to be able to support those efforts. We had the opportunity to brief the stakeholder engagement workgroup previously on some of our efforts. Recognize the importance of keeping the stakeholder liaison committee and Marcos activities coordinated

with the RPB. We really appreciate the opportunity to have this as part of the discussion. I guess tomorrow there will be a full opportunity to discuss stakeholder engagement for the RPB more generally but as Gwynne described now we will discuss the stakeholder liaison committee. Which was formed and I will go over some background. We had our inaugural meeting over one year ago in March 2014. Really was three objectives that were set forth for the stakeholder liaison committee members. The goal was to have them be able to provide direct input on ocean planning with MARCO communicating that information back to the RPB. Marco has done some work and posted some of the feedback we got from stakeholders about ocean planning documents and processes to the body. We hope and the stakeholders have been conduits to the community regarding what's going on in the ocean planning process. In turn, they have also communicated back to us and through Marco to the RPB what is important to their communities and the two members

will talk a little bit more about that today. Also have the SLC members serve as the folks who could increase the dialogue between ocean planning partners and their communities. So we really had an opportunity to build some nice relationships with these folks and as kind of the gate keepers for their communities had a really nice insight into some things that they have been doing in the communities and what is important to them with respect to the oceans. So, I just want to briefly walk you through some of the things we had the opportunity to engage in, in 2014. I don't want to take up much more time because the real interesting piece is the stakeholders. We will get to them in a second. We started with an inaugural meeting back in March where we convened all of the SLC members. We had the opportunity to have a debrief webinar with the SLC members after the May meeting of the RPB because not all of the

SLC members could be at the RPB meeting so without that as an opportunity to catch them about things that have transpired at the meeting and that was a great opportunity to engage something that Gwynne will talk about a little bit later is kind of something we kicked off back in July. We had a sector specific meeting with the submarine cable community, which was a one-on-one dialogue and Bob will share a little bit about that in a moment.

We had another one of those opportunities with a tug and barge community back in September. The members today will regret why those opportunities. We had another webinar back in October when this body released some of your draft documents for the public. We had SLC specific webinar, so they could become more familiar with the documents to pass on to their communities. Just this direct engagement that we continue to have with the SLC members. I wanted to give a little shout out to the other SLC members that are here today. Jeff Deem from the

Recreational Fishing Community. Matt is here from the other non-consumptive recreational uses. Several other members, Nikki, Ali and Sara. Thank you so much for all of your time and energy spent on this important topic.

Now I will turn it over to the two folks who join us here today starting with Bob Wargo who is joining us from the submarine cable community to talk a little bit about the sector specific meeting we had back in July and also just to share some thoughts about what is going on in his community

Bob LaBelle: thank you. I am glad to be here to talk a little bit about undersea cables and why they are important and why you should think about them. If you look at the map up there you will see a representation of essentially all the cables in the world. This is actually a little bit old there are a few

missing that some of us in the industry could actually tell. Why are they important? Greater than 97% of all international telecommunication goes over undersea cables. It is not on satellites in some people probably tell you it is closer to 99%. The United States views them as critical infrastructure on par something with US power grid.

In the Mid-Atlantic region there are currently six landings, three New York and three New Jersey and 19 individual cables at those landings. Cables have been in the ocean since before the Civil War. I have a framed copy of two pages of Harper's Bazaar from 1858. It's a cartoon of submarine cable. It's almost 100 years before I was born. Other than fishing we have been in the ocean longer than anybody else. We use large purposeful vessels to install and maintain the cables. Highly trained crews and specialist techniques and some of those techniques have not changed a lot since those first cables have been installed. We are often overlooked. People do not think about us. In the discussion

we just heard from the folks in New York. Never once was undersea cable mentioned. That happened quite a lot. We've had dredging for sand for beach replenishment cited directly over cables. The cable is broken by directors before. In the recent past there's been a couple of Hydro kinetic projects planned for directly over cable landings. We would like that to stop. I am pleased with the fact that we have been included. We had a really good meeting and I was happy to host it at my office. We had representatives from four or five different cable companies. Cable installers over there. TV subcom. We went through and briefed the MARCO folks and folks from the Army Corps in the state of New Jersey and the state of New York. Essentially, what we do and how we do it and what we think we need. They went through and told us about what they were doing as well. So it was very, very good meeting. We were also at the

first meeting in DC. We're trying to get our cables into the MARCO portal. But we're going about that in a different way because our members are from all of the country. We have cables in Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, down in the Caribbean, West Coast, Alaska, Hawaii, so we're going at this in a different way. We are going through what's called Marine cadastre, which is run by the federal government, just to speak, we've come to an agreement with them. We signed a nondisclosure agreement so they will be getting our cable data and then they will feed that down to every one of the other regional planning bodies that are formed. That is a bit about what's going on at least as far as getting cables there. A couple of other things that you should know, some of the things that you were talking about this morning, the interjurisdictional communication and coordination. That goes along with undersea cable project. We have state involved, we have the Army Corps involved, the Coast Guard involved, we have local governments with

cable lands involved. Input from the Marine fisheries and NOAA. A lot of that already happens and I would hope that whatever comes out of this body and any other original body doesn't make that a harder task than it already is for us. Because it is a planning and installing and getting cables from concept to where it is installed and working. Multiyear project, multijurisdictional, and a lot of coordination. To muddle that and make it a little harder just would not be good for the industry. I think that's it. I'm looking forward to working with MARCO and to continue it. Thank you for the time.

Kris Ohleth: Thanks Bob, I think my favorite quote was, "just don't do anything to make it any harder". I said alright I will take them back to the RPB.

Bob LaBelle: and I think every one of us who works in the ocean would probably say the same thing. Whether it's fishermen, target barge, or oil and gas would say the same thing. We been out there and doing it for a long time. It's not rocket science, just don't make it harder for us.

Kris Ohleth: Thanks, Bob. We are going to turn now to John Harms, who is here on behalf of the navigation community. We met with the tug and barge sector. Our official representative is Eric Johansson who could not be here today. John actually did lead that meeting in September so we were super glad he could be here with us and he is from the American waterways operators. Thanks, John.

John Harms: thanks folks, thanks for having me here today. The first question is has anybody here ever been on a tugboat. That's pretty good. For those of you who have, you know the tugboats that you are on your grandfather's

tugboats. They are not small. They are 150 long they have 6,000 - 10,000 horsepower. They are towing barges that are 700 feet long. Enormous pieces of equipment that can sometimes be towed up to 2000 feet behind the tugboat. I am here on behalf of the American waterways operators. We represent about 85% of the domestic tug boat and barge industry. We operate in every waterway throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. We provide 80% of New England's home heating oil and 60% of America's agricultural exports and we operate in half a dozen ports in the Mid-Atlantic region. I am the Atlantic region manager. My life for the last two years has been all about offshore wind energy and all about preserving roots, working with BOEM, the RPB's and Marcos and NROC. I'm very happy to be here today. I wanted to touch on two things, in particular. First what Kris already mentioned which was the

stakeholder liaison committee. We hope that in Portsmouth Virginia in October. We were able to bring 12 really knowledgeable mariners from all over the Mid-Atlantic region together to talk about how, why, and where tugboats operate off the coast. The number one thing that we all realized from that meeting was that the sea is not an enormous parking lot where you can drive anywhere. These tugboats although they are enormous they have been using the same routes for literally- Mariners have been using the same routes for literally hundreds of years because to go any further offshore subjects you to dangerous wind and dangerous waves. The number one I think that we came away from what the meeting is we need to preserve a coastal route. Whether that is between the coast and any offshore wind farms or any offshore structures. We have to make sure that tugboats and barges are not forced even 15 miles further offshore can seriously jeopardize safety. The other thing I wanted to talk about is AWO American waterways operators

work with the Coast Guard. We have the industry Coast Guard safety partnership of which I am the regional co-chair. We have been putting together a project to finally finish the Atlantic Coast port access route study. ACPARS, I am not sure any of you are familiar with it. Basically, it uses all our AIS data to show where and how our tugboats and barges transit offshore. It's little more complicated than just looking at the AIS dots, as I mentioned these vessels can tow barges up to 2000 feet behind them. If there any kind of went or ways, these barges can be hundreds of feet on either side of the vessel that has the actual AIS beacon. The second point I want to leave you with today is when you look at the AIS data charts, that singular dot is likely not just a singular dot. It could be 2000 feet long and hundreds of feet wide and these vessels really require several miles between each one to ensure safety. In conclusion, I mentioned

your grandfather's tugboat. We don't know what our grandchildren's tugboats will look like. We don't know how big these vessels will become. We do know that they probably will be using the same routes 20, 50, 100 years from now. Without them, this country will lose its most energy efficient, it's safest, it's most economical and its most environmentally friendly way of using agricultural goods and bulk commodities. In conclusion, I would like you to keep in mind the tugboats cannot transit an unlimited amount of distance offshore. Secondly, work with the Coast Guard. Work with the Mariners to get a better understanding of the AIS dot actually means on the map. We are happy here to help you. Thank you so much.

Gwynne Schultz: Thank you and before we open it up for dialogue with Bob, John and Chris, I want to take a minute to look to the future. We have really learned and got valuable insight in working with members of the

stakeholders and the liaison committee. We need to engage in discussion about what are some of the more effective ways for communicating and engaging with the sectors and pursuing more of the dialogue to find out what is the best way to engage each of these sectors in the ocean planning progress. From this dialogue, we have heard three themes here. The first theme is sector specific meetings. Meetings where we sat down with a number of representatives from one sector find out, share information number one, we find out about ocean planning and some of the issues that they have. There was a desire to continue to do those kind of outreach activities. So MARCO is interested in engaging additional sectors in the upcoming year or two. Also have multi-sector meetings. Meaning we get several sectors together at the table at one time to discuss an issue. The third was the idea of webinars. Where you can very easily

without having to do a lot of traveling and provide a way to get online and get some solid presentations and discussions on a particular issue. We are looking to focus on the engagement efforts on those three areas. We are really interested in feedback from the regional planning body and the stakeholder liaison committee going into the future what topics, when, where might be some of the best ways to further our idea of common needs. With that, I like to thank everyone and then open it up for either MARCO colleagues who are interested in sharing perspectives on the stakeholder liaison committee. Also the RPB.

Laura Cantral: First of all, any other MARCO members want to add anything to Gwynne's context or anything about the session, about the activities that you have been engaged in? Why don't we open it up to questions and comments. Joe.

Joe Atangan: just a couple of points. I want to open up with comment from John about coordination already taking place. We recognize that but I think it's the reason why we want to understand what that coordination is so it can be reapplied to other sectors as practical. I think there is a lot of good practices out there that can be applied to various other sectors. That's why it's a point for us to understand what the processes are. Hopefully, it's not to complicate things, hopefully it is to apply the efficiencies to other areas as well. The second part is, I am relieved and really thankful that you are both here to represent some of the industry concerns. We always have a good presence and a lot of great input from the environmental community but we don't always have the time or the representation, other than Brent of course, I don't want to exclude Brent there. I think that's a critical component of the piece. To the RPB

members. I kind of stumbled on the Marco meeting in September. I was one of the RPB reps that got to participate in that. Aside from, being an old sailor looking back to his younger days and dream about being out over the water again, it really was an informative meeting. It helped jog a lot of memories about what things are important for the mariner to consider. I really want to encourage each one of you whether you are MARCO or not. To take the opportunity to participate with the stakeholder sessions because it is a really good opportunity to relearn, sometimes we get so caught up in our jobs and forget some of the things that are really foundational issues. They need to pop up every once in a while. That we need to consider it as key components of overall Ocean Planning. I would encourage, if one comes by to you, to an office near you, too take the time and participate. It really was a lot of great information exchange and really quite fun to interact with the industry folks. The last thing I want to mention is this is great that

you are providing feedback to us now as a group. This is just the tip of the iceberg with the information from the stakeholder. I think the RPB as a whole can benefit. Even if it is just targeted phone calls to get feedback of the information that is gathered from the stakeholder meetings. I would encourage you to factor that into the overall meeting, this is great but again it's just a thumbnail of the important information that comes out of the stakeholder meetings.

Laura Cantral: Several folks had their tents up and I apologize because I do not know what order. So I will suggest that we go around the table this way.

Greg Capobianco: Thank you. I was going to say, I think tax right onto what we just heard from Joe. First of all, thank you so much Bob and John for

coming back and sharing the report out on the stakeholder work you have done so far. We appreciate it. I guess when I see is the tip of the iceberg. To me, the next step is if we really are going to do a good regional ocean assessment, and we're going to use data, the best data that we have, and if this is the way we're going and I certainly hope it is, that we're going to look at product and look at some things. The things that we look at Mike sectors or usage or resources, I would advocate to Bob and John and others that own that **subject** area, are at the table with the portal folks generating the maps. So that when the maps come to us and we start to look at regional ocean assessment data. We're not looking at it and in saying, what do you guys think? I want the stakeholders to own data and information so that we have the best available stuff and we can ask them questions directly when we're looking at information. To me I hope that is the progression that we are making and that we're taking. I think that would be equally valuable and we would create a ton of

efficiencies. So we do not have to look back three times and maybe we just have to look back once if we do it smart and get the actual owners of the information and work with the portal folks and generate information to look at things to make sure what we are really looking at is both current and supported by the folks that it's affecting and the folks that own that data, and then have them present to explain it to us. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: So Bob I'm going back to you because I know that you wanted to respond. Then
Laura.

Bob LaBelle: I want to respond to all three points. Trying to draw parallels between possible new uses and the permanent regime that we go through. FURC and BOEM are both different from

what we go through. There may not be those parallels but there certainly will be input from our agencies and litigations and everything else that goes into it. I don't know how much. The second point is I always think he has a lot of good things to say and I agree with most of them. Finally, the tip of the iceberg thing is I tend to describe the cable industry as highly inbred. We all know each other and we have all worked with each other and if we don't know the answer to a question, we know somebody who does know the answer to the questions. So if you have any questions, please feel free to call me or email me. If I don't know the answer, I know somebody who knows the person.

Kris Ohleth: And we've generated meeting summaries that we've distributed as well.

Bob LaBelle: So we have another person for the cable industry today, Ron and he's been around as long as I have. If you have questions just ask.

Laura Cantral: We will continue with questions and comments around the table. But any of you panelists if you want to interject wave me down and let me know that you want to jump in. Laura, I think you wanted to respond to something.

Laura McKay: just so you know that the team was with us at both of the stakeholder meetings. As Bob was mentioning we are working on that agreement and that is related to the MARCO portal to, they're all working to get the data. It is data that is vetted by the stakeholders, the users themselves. And same with John, we had great discussions. W it was fascinating to me about the tugs and barges and how that works. Even the nuances, the tug and barge guys need this wide girth and you start thinking about what could we designate a navigational quarter because

that's what the harbor pilots were telling us that at another stakeholder meeting. They have a particular channel that they wanted protected. But that was just from that very specific sector viewpoint, that they wanted a much narrower channel designated. But when we talk to the tug and barge guys, that doesn't do it because they need so much width. It is so important and so critical for us to hear directly from the stakeholders what these different views are. We might call one sector , there's a lot of different needs and nuances. Again, we appreciate everything you do to guide us and appreciate the portal team always being there, hearing this input from you and incorporating that into the maps to be put on the portal. Thanks.

John Harms: to your discussion of fairways. It would be great to just quarter off a section of the ocean but like you mentioned depending on the wind and the weather and which way the weather is coming from, these guys need the ability

to move inshore or offshore and at the end of the day it's not just an enormous ocean where you could go anywhere. It is very complicated. I would love to talk to any of you about the meeting summary that we generated and happy to help interpret the data on MARCO's data portal which has been pretty well done but can be misinterpreted, so please us as a resource.

Michael Jonas: So the comments that were made struck me in terms of what I represent and why am sitting here. I am representative of the Navy. Specifically the infrastructure of the Navy where the short meets the ocean. You think of the Navy and you think of flying airplanes and bombing things and whatever. But I think of it in terms as the ability of the infrastructure that we need to support all that stuff. So Bob, when you talk about cables and what

not, we're actually doing a cable project now, when you made a comment to the process of coordinating with the states and the other federal agencies already, those are the same types of things that my agency is doing now. It's through the needle process. I'm sure you're somewhat familiar with that because of the federal monies that you have to obtain to do your project. The way I see this is, the project I'm talking about specifically, we did studies where we coordinate with our tribal folks and we invested a lot of money and time and effort and energy and different types of data that we were producing. The type of data is not unique or specific. It's something that we can keep our arms around that we could not share.

What I see as a benefit to the federal projects and being a federal partner is to feed that into the portal is that it can be used by all. And in the long so that when you go to do these processes that aren't going away, it actually makes it easier if you could check with your federal partners and your

travel folks and states and whatnot, rather than make it harder. I 100% agree with you. That is why sit at this table. We do not want to make things any harder on ourselves that we have to, so it's more or less echoing Joe's point. But to your point, sorry.

Jeff Flumigan: my question is for John. My name is Jeff, I'm from the maritime administration and the Coast Guard has been leading an effort and I wanted to get your impression about what you thought based on what your agency thinks or your organization thinks about what the outcome of the process will be and what is going to look like because that is ocean planning.

John Harms: ACPARS from the start has been a bit of a boondoggle from the start.

Jeff Flumigan: Really, okay. Explain that please.

John Harms: it was supposed to be a part of the Smart from the start program that would allow BOEM and other federal agencies to see exactly where tug and barge operators, fishing vessels and other maritime operators worked offshore. Then we could plan these wind energy areas around them. There has been some contracting issues on the actual analysis portion of ACPARS, the technical analysis portion. That's led to a stalling of the AC PARS project. You have asked how we are involved in it.

Jeff Flumigan: no, I asked what are your thoughts about it and how it should end up

John Harms: I think that the contracting process should be redone. This was the Coast Guard's opinion of the

contracting process. It did not produce a workable product. I think the contracting process should be redone and the contractors should be made to deliver a workable product that can then be used to finalize ACPARS.

Jeff Flumigan: my question to you is should there be routing mechanisms? \

John Harms: I think they should be if it is done correctly. The last thing I would want to see is a better way that looks like a federal channel that is only a few hundred feet wide. Stretching from New York harbor down to Norfolk, our carriers need a lot more space. And working with the Navy, they need a lot more space as well. I think it is feasible. At the end of the day it might be the best option but it has to be done correctly.

Jeff Flumigan: my next question is how many cable operation events typically go on in the Northeast on an annual basis?

Bob LaBelle: we have not laid a new cable in quite a long time, it's been about 8 to 12 years since we've laid cable in the Northeast. Most of the increase in capacity in the cables, in the North East have been achieved through terminal station increases. So we can increase the amount of data pump through the cable. There are occasional repairs. I don't remember when the last one was, at least from my company's perspective. Maybe one or two a year at most.

Jeff Flumigan: the reason I am asking because my perspective goes back to Greg's comments. I was looking at the MARCO website of the Northeast portal and my perspective, seeing the diagrams of the locations of things

visually is great but it doesn't help me understand how many cruise ships are coming and going from the East Coast in the United States. How many took passages there are on a weekly basis. How many container ships are going to Baltimore, New York etc. I can go figure it out but perhaps it is a useful tool for organizations like this to have some sort of tabulating table. Some sort of catalog where I can say, okay a container ship- about 6000 in New York in a 10 year period. How many single whole tankers or tug and barge ATVs, that's the kind of aggregate data that sometimes presents a different picture than looking at this diagram and seeing the blue and the red at this particular spot in the ocean. Tugboats, it changes week after week and week. Conditions are ice, wind, nor'easter, that will determine where those vessels are transiting and how they are transiting. Organizations like ours here don't have a grasp of

that. That's why am trying to drive this form because maybe we need to look at data differently than just a graphic way that the form presents.

Laura Cantral: All right, thank you. So many people have been waiting with comments and we will try to get to all of you and then close the session out. Give you a little break and stay on time to take care of the other things that we need to do. Joe, I see you but I'm going to skip you. I'm going to go to Doug and Gwynne and Mike and then will pick up Joe and Karen.

Doug Pabst: Thanks I wanted to follow-up on the header of not to make it harder for you especially with the concept of outreach and communication. That is an integral part of the success of whatever we do here whatever machine we build. It's not a static situation and things will change. My question to you would be, you don't have to answer it now

but what is the best way to communicate with you and your members to get feedback from them and not go through the normal process where we have to go out for 30 days... I mean, we want to get information fast and somewhat coordinated is what we are struggling with and I'll think we do it well as a government in general, but I am impressed with all of the other organizations that do it better than we do. We want to be able to tap into that for efficiency purposes and we do not have the ability to build any new infrastructure for it. Your thoughts on how you communicate with your members on a real-time fashion.

Bob LaBelle: how I communicate with others? I sent an email. We all have day jobs in the undersea cable industry. We are spread all around the world. There are members in Australia, the UK, so to

get everybody on the phone at the same time is a challenge but we have done it. We typically try to meet face-to-face once per year. We don't always get the chance. We get maybe 50% in the room and the other people are on the phone calling from somewhere else in the world. The way the undersea cable industry works is there's always something going on. As far as you getting input from us. Just ask. I'm not sure how this works in relation to that but like I said if I do not know the answer and I don't know somebody who knows the answer, I know somebody who know somebody who knows the answer. So if you have questions or concerns or need information, just ask. I mean we are nice guys.

Doug Pabst: no doubt

John Harms: we meet with our members four times a year, we have regional and national meetings. All of our

company safety directors are meeting in Houston this week to discuss best practices in the safety route. We have a safety partnership with the Coast Guard and all sorts of ways that interact with the federal government. We can make our members available at your convenience essentially. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne, I know you have a thought that you want to share and I would like to ask you to make your comment just based on some of the questions that have come up relative, it might be helpful to put into context to remind people about the creation of this committee the stakeholders committee that our panelists have been participating in and the role that you are playing in providing input that is hosted by MARCO, managed by MARCO but the intent is to be available to provide the kind of input to the planning process. Some of the questions

that some of you are asking about, there is a thirst to reach you and not just you two individuals, but the other people who are part of the committee and are in the room today. So, Gwynne, it seems like you're in the best position to provide that reminder.

Gwynne Schultz: Chris, you are welcome to become a contact on that. I wanted to make two quick comments and then ask a question. Number one was to remind you all that we had really good summaries of the two sector-based meetings that we had to date both on our MARCO website it was submitted to the RPB and posted on the RPB public website. The other is response to Jeff's question about I just do not see it fully, graphically but I also want a bunch of data and I am hoping that we will talk about a regional ocean assessment, see may talk about how you are trying to link all of the data and information that you are getting with all of the work that is already on the portal,

connecting the text with the data. The question for our speaker, and it has to do with Bob's comment about do no harm. Either now or in the future, I guess it would go for both of you, what can we do as an RPB to make all of that coordination that you need to do easier, better, faster? In either ways that this process can result in a positive change instead of making it harder.

John Harms: It was a great opportunity to host Chris and MARCO and since then we've held a similar stakeholder liaison committee with NROC in the Northeast. How can we make sure that the summaries that were generated out of those meetings that really are the best synopsis of how our industry operates? How do we make sure that those are well explained to you folks and that we follow up with questions, how can we do that because to us, those

meetings were the vessel that we were using to communicate and I just want to make sure that there aren't any other stones that are not being turned.

Bob LaBelle: I think I probably echo that, not to sound like I am just parroting what he said but the meeting we had between MARCO and undersea cable community was more of a discussion. I have prepared a bunch of PowerPoint slides and the first one, somebody asked the question on in the next with somebody asked a question on and it was just a back-and-forth. And it was an explanation of how we do our business, the history of our business and the techniques we use at all about what we do. So, if you need that explained, we can help with that. If you need a similar kind of tutorial, we can help with that as well.

John Harms: In terms of making our lives easier, the port of New York New Jersey is the largest port on the east

coast, there is more maritime time traffic here and it sounds like there are a lot of cables in this region two. I urge you folks to work really closely with the Northeast RPB. To make sure that the jurisdictional lines are not too firm.

Laura Cantral: That is really helpful and just as a reminder, the summaries from both of those meetings are made available and circulated to the RPB members. It strikes me that the action we can take on is to explore your question about whether there is some further understanding about what is in those summaries that RPB members have some questions about and to figure out how we can get that explanation and information from you. All right Mike, we're going to have you close this out.

Mike Luisi: I will be brief I just need to make a point. We're listening to all of this and these two different industries and the information that they are providing through these meetings. I'm thinking about the constituents that I represent and that you cannot have a meeting hundreds of thousands of recreational and commercial fishermen along the East Coast. So there are some challenges with getting the right information from commercial and recreational fishermen. Even in nongovernmental organizations who want to provide thoughts about areas in the ecosystem and the importance and we could go on forever. So the challenges there we have sitting in front of us are folks who are either directors or in charge of some greater region. They are a point of contact. It's easy enough to have information about cables tomorrow. You can't have that with recreation and commercial fishermen. It's impossible for it to happen. We have folks who advocate for it in different sectors, Jeff Deem, here in the audience, is one of the liaisons to the

recreational community. That is one challenge that we're going to face moving forward is trying to map these activities. The second challenge has to do with the spatial dynamic. As we heard from Karen, I have to say that there are still fish south of New Jersey. There are still flounder down there. We have sea bass, they did not all move away. We each have to go to work every day to protect those areas and manage the species. Things move and you can't say that one day fishing activity by recreational anglers will be in this place and this place only. It will move with fish, they are not buried in the ground. They are moving around continuously all the time. I just wanted make sure I would mention that when we consider these interactions that we have. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: you are absolutely right to point out these challenges.

Joe Atangan: I am going to take off my policy hat and put on my scientist head. And try to address some of the data and analysis piece and I'm concerned because all of the focus seems to be on the data and understanding the data. We need to go back to the premise that data is part of the three-legged stool that we have to use here. There is the data, the process or analysis that has to take place to make that data useful. Then there is the conclusion that has to be reached based on that analysis. Okay? What you are asking for is an understanding of not just the data but the analysis that took place to reach that conclusion. All those three things have to be considered so with regard to the ACPAR study, I agree they probably didn't think this all the way through but I wouldn't consider that effort as all lost because it was very useful data-gathering evolution that produced a lot of material. What's missing is, you are right, the analysis piece still has to take place but that data is not going away.

Now it's just a matter of us analyzing the thing and using the engagement that has taken place with the tugs and boats to make sure we are asking the right questions and applying the right things in the analysis of the data to reach the kind of conclusion that we need to reach for the ocean planning process. So I think we really need to stop just looking at what's data. There is tons of data out there. How you massage that data and interpret that data is very important. I'm a weather guy by trade so I always remind folks of what's the average temperature in the desert. Well 70° might sound comfortable. But it's 100 and the daytime goes down to the 40s in the nighttime. So how do you massage the data and how you use that data and what conclusions you form out of that analysis is every bit as important. So the engagement with you is helping us form the questions that will help us with the analysis.

Laura Cantral: Karen, bring us on home.

Karen Chytalo: all right, real quick. I appreciate hearing all of those things and it is so great that you guys spent the time to talk to people and get the information and bring those issues to the table. One of the things we are looking is conflict and also looking at compatibilities, and doing compatibility analyses. I would love to be able to work with the stakeholders what are the compatible uses with your activities. We talk about pipeline and cables and we are looking at not only the installation but the post you know, those are two different stories that you have to work on. What kind of things can we build upon that would be compatible uses within those types of areas and can we start to build that up to that level of information and start to get that, so that we can have fishers working in those areas. And

whenever we have application for cable lines and stuff like that, first thing we tell them is talk to the fishermen. We don't want them pulling up cable. We can look to see how we can help make compatibilities or whatever and help identify things a little bit better on a spatial scale. I think it would be great if we do more along those lines rather than just about where we are going to find the conflict. Sorry.

Jeffrey Flumigan: my comment is this for all of the conference calls that we have, all of the meetings that we have, it would be helpful if we could set aside 15 minutes to get an industry brief where they explain to us what they do, how they do it, maybe some decision making processes. That would be tremendously helpful to hear about cable operations on the East Coast. Or about the tug and barge industries. That is great engagement.

John Harms: We would love to do that, you just need to let us know when and where and we will be there.

Laura Cantral: Let's try to figure out if we can make something like that happen. Bob did you want to say something?

Bob LaBelle: I would be glad to work with you on anything you want to work on and we can do that too but I think it will take a lot more than 15 minutes. I'm thinking back about the meeting with SLC and Marco. We planned for about an hour to tell people about the undersea cable industry. It probably lasted at least two hours.

Laura Cantral: multiply that by how many people you have on the committee to represent communities, there is a lot to understand a lot to learn and the challenge and opportunity is to figure out how to engage, not only you and your community but other associate members who are here and those who are not with us today which I think is the intent of organizing the stakeholder liaison committee and the work that MARCO's has been spearheading to provide a vehicle. It's on all of us to figure out how to fully take advantage of that vehicle and the opportunity for the dialogue. We're going to wrap up dialogue for the moment and take a break. Thanks to all of you for leading this discussion really helpful and valuable. I would like to ask if we could just take a quick break and come back in 10 minutes, we need to catch up on some time now. It is 3 PM now and come back at 10 after and we will keep going.

Laura Cantral: Okay folks, let's get started. Please take your seats. Let's get started, okay? Folks in the break, if you can join us. We have several colleagues that are on the way and joining us but we want to have some time to take up our next two topics for this afternoon before we have another public comment session at 4:15 PM, about an hour from now. I will turn it right over to Kelsey and Gwynne who are going to give us an update on tribal engagement efforts that Kelsey has been engaged with working with MARCO on. Who is going first? Gwynne, okay, here you go.

Gwynne Schultz: Good afternoon. MARCO and the Shinnecock Indian Nation are collaborating to expand and enhance tribal engagement in the Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Planning process. To date, the Shinnecock Indian Nation has been the only tribe in the Mid-Atlantic that has

been engaging in our ocean planning process. And in just a second Kelsey will describe, and explain how there are other tribes in the region and that all of them have made important contributions to this process. We have not had a whole lot of participation of other tribes in the region, I believe that one of the public listening sessions in Delaware, there was a state tribal engagement but this is an effort to expand and enhance that. And also in Virginia. Through a very generous support of the Moore Foundation, they provided funds to MARCO and through those funds we have had hired two consulting firms to help facilitate this new engagement initiative. One of the firms have expertise in tribal engagement and the other firm has expertise in the whole logistics of engaging folks. Kelsey will go over the framework and the next steps. What I would like to do is encourage the RPB members to stay not only just

informed in this process but especially as we start reaching out to tribes in your region that have a particular interest in your area of expertise or your agency's expertise, stay engaged with this whole process. I will hand it over to Kelsey.

Kelsey Leonard: Thank you, Gwynne. So our consultants are undertaking in early stage of outreach to the individual tribes within the region. Those tribes that are federally recognized, state recognized and as well as leadership that serves on State Tribal leadership boards or consortiums and commissions. We are hoping that through this early outreach our consultants will be able to determine how each tribe would like to be engaged and what setting would be most beneficial for their participation in this process. The anticipated framework for engagement is structure with two main components, the first component being listening sessions and the second being data

workshops. So looking specifically at the listening sessions, our consultants are going to conduct outreach to each of the tribes in a collaborative process through a series of Tribal focus listening sessions. These listening sessions are coordinated and organized by the consultants and will be geared toward informing the tribes in the region about current regional ocean planning activities and creating opportunities for tribal engagement in the process. Starting at a basic introductory stage to allow for tribes in the region to become oriented to not only with the work of MARCO but Mid-Atlantic RPB. That will then be followed in sequence with the participatory GIS workshops, data workshops that we hope will create opportunities to work with federal and state tribes in the region to identify and collect existing tribal data for inclusion in the MARCO portal. The information and collection efforts are

going to be informed by the listening sessions, so how those will be conducted, the proper consultation practices will be informed by the previous listening sessions as described above. Additionally, these listening sessions, through these listening sessions MARCO hopes to explore potential tribal specific data needs and traditional ecological knowledge considerations in the ocean planning process. For example, specifically cultural, archaeological, historical and natural resources. And we also hope to identify a process to collect that information. We have seen a gap in the data and we're trying to fill it, essentially. So the timeline for this process is, which we are currently in, is conducting a survey in the region, making sure that we have all that baseline data to be able to properly engage with tribes in the region who choose to participate and then initializing and implementing that engagement in the Spring of 2015. The execution of the listening sessions and participatory GIS workshops as mentioned will hopefully take place this summer and fall of

2015. We hope to have all of that information from the listening sessions and GIS workshops gathered to report back to the RPB in the winter of 2015. Ultimately with our findings being gathered and put together for the end of the grand fund, which I believe is February 2016, please correct me if I made a mistake in saying that. That is where we are in terms of our tribal engagement scope of work and timeline. We would love to and encourage any questions or comments regarding tribal engagement. Thank you

Laura Cantral: Thank you for that overview with Kelsey.

Sarah Cooksey: What is the scope of breadth of tribal nations that you hope to engage?

Kelsey Leonard: Between state and federally recognized tribes we have 29 in the region, that does not include the tribes that have historical ties to the region. Those tribes that historically were removed for various reasons no longer are physically located within the Mid-Atlantic region had to be defined but have historical ties.

Laura Cantral: Other questions or comments about this?

Laura Cooksey: How much reaction are you getting, I am curious about our Virginia Tribes, we have a lot of them. What kind of response are you getting?

Kelsey Leonard: We are still in the initial stages where our consultants are gathering all of that initial information on the 29 tribes that we have identified, and they have identified in collaboration with us. At this time we have

not actually gone through the initial communication engagement to then get a response back. That hopefully will be in the next few months. They had a kickoff meeting at the beginning of January with consultants, so they are getting started.

Laura Cantral: Other questions?

Gwynne Schultz: We will keep you apprised of the activities, during our work group calls, we encourage you, if you are in an area where a particular tribe is, to work with us and stay engaged.

Karen Chytalo: I was going to ask you that as well, a lot of this information will be important for the regional ocean assessment. Is there a coordination going on so that we can have access to it real quick or be involved in some way? I don't know but it is an

important point.

Kelsey Leonard: I am your coordination.

Karen Chytalo: You do everything

Kelsey Leonard: I think they will be coordination as we segue into discussing the ROA, it has been discussed to be a living document. As this data is collected and these practices are informed by the tribes, hopefully that is incorporated at some point if not in the initial draft. I thought in response to the question Laura asked, this is the first time that we have to outreach to state recognized tribes in the region so we are very hopeful that we will have a stronger response this time around because it is our first time around really for a lot of these tribes. We owe a lot of that to MARCO to the states that are involved, recognizing that there are indigenous communities aside from fairly

recognized tribes that they have a responsibility and duty to consult with.

Laura Cantral: All right, anything else?

Bob LaBelle: Thank you on behalf of the other co-leads, Gwynne and I would be happy to help in any way.

Kelsey Leonard: I will definitely take you up on that. Chris, did you take that note?

Laura Cantral: Okay, well I think the take away for now is its early on, the process is launching, so stay tuned for more information as the consultants, Kelsey and MARCO and the team really get in gear and provide updates as the work continues. I think it will be helpful to have from you all a sense of how

RPB members can engage as you start to get a sense of what you are hearing as you have these discussions with the state-based tribes. We are really pleased that this work is coming together because it is a critical component in process.

Okay I think that we will make a transition now, I just want to do a time check. We are scheduled to have a public comment session at 4:15 PM. As of now we have two people who are signed up for that comment session. Maybe there will be many more than rush to sign up in the next 10 minutes but for now we have two people. So I'm wondering if you two people are willing to indulge us to have a little extra time to get through the next presentation because it may be something that you want to hear before you offer your comments. I do not know who those people are.

Thank you for your patience on that. It gives us a little more time, we don't have to rush to get through the next

presentation which is next from the ROA workgroup. They want to get a status update of that work. And we have some questions to pose for our RPB members.

Kevin Chu: . Thank you very much. Before I jump into what I think is a brief presentation. There are a couple of points I want to make sure that I make so I will make them right away. I have the attention of a four-year-old. If I do not make them right away I will forget. I have always had the attention of a four year old, it has taken me 60 years to figure that out. One, is that it is important to acknowledge the working group members because it has been a great group to work with and is a very complicated process and we have had terrific support from the working group members. It is a large group of members so I want people to be aware of who they are and to

acknowledge the large amount of work they have put into it. I want to start with acknowledging my co-chair Sarah Cooksey who is a spectacular person to be working with. She is just terrific. We have the honor of having Kelsey with the working group and you can imagine since she is co-chair there is a lot riding on her shoulders and it is interesting in your efforts to help us out. I look forward to coordinating with you. We have also our local host Doug Pabst, who is on the working group and we have Kim Barber of Maryland, and Taura Huxley of Nelson of the Department of Defense, Megan Tremal from NOAA, Michelle Morin from BOEM, Lori Fenstermacher from NOAA, Kevin Hassell from New Jersey, Karen Chytalo from New York. She is also the Chair of the Ocean Action Plan and she is really steeped in all of this stuff, amazing. Kristie Bailey from the Coast Guard, Jeff Herter from the Department of State from New York. Phil Stafford from Maryland, Joe Antangan from the Department of Defense, Tony MacDonald from the MARCO Portal,

Debbie Abercrombie from New York... Angel McCoy from BOEM, Darlene Finch from NOAA, Mary Boatman from BOEM, Jay Odell from the MARCO Portal, René Searfoss from EPA, and Lorraine Wakeman from the MARAD. Really a great group working on this project. I also want to acknowledge we are so grateful for the support of Michelle Lennix from MARCO without whom we would never know what we talked about.

As you can see, it is a large group of people, it is a complicated process and a little tricky to get everything going but it is a wonderful working relationship. The second point I want to make, is Gwynne asked the link between the Ocean Assessment and the MARCO Data Portal. I want to make sure it is clear that everyone of the examples that we have prepared, there is a link to a layer of the

MARCO Data Portal. So those things are going on and is an important to keep the links, there's a very close relationship with the data portal and ocean assessment. Third, because I know it's going to come up, we heard in the last public comment that we needed more contact with the scientists. I want to acknowledge that right away. We understand that what we are preparing is primarily because this is the resources that we've got to draw from, the federal and state biologist are by no means the full suite of scientific expertise available to us. The reason we have not reached out yet to the scientific community is because we only have three sections and it seems like a little thing to ask the scientific community to weigh in on those. What we propose is to work and develop a much more complete ocean assessment using expertise that is available to us within the state and federal governments and then go to the scientific communities asking what do you think, what did we miss, and how to make it better. Those of the points I want to

make.

So I want to start with reminding everyone of the purpose of the regional ocean assessment. What we are compiling is a document that brings together data that are available to us to make decisions upon and highlights the uses of oceans and services, it does include maps and sources of information and includes government peer-reviewed document and a section in each topic where informal sources of knowledge can be added to the assessment.

So we are trying to make sure there is a way in which we can bring information, not only from tribes, recreational fishermen and other sources that we need to acknowledge and draw from. The whole point of this is to provide information to the regional planning body for its decision-making process. I want

to acknowledge that there is a little bit of chicken and egg between the ocean assessment and the Ocean Action Plan because the assessment is there to provide information upon which to base the Ocean Action Plan but we are having some trouble because we do not know what the action plan is that we do not know what information to provide. It has been a bit of a challenge but what we have done is we have chosen to draft a document that basically reflexive framework that was adopted in May. You will see two main sections, assuming we stay on this particular track. One reflects the first goal of the value of ocean ecosystems and the second reflects the goal of sustainable ocean uses. I will say that in the process of developing these three sample sections in our handouts, it has been very useful, at least for me and probably should have known more about the Panama Canal and did not even know that it was being widened. It has been very helpful to have this exchange of information and I hope that all of you can take advantage of our work and brought in

perspective through this document. I'm going to step really quickly through the outline that is in the documents that we have to. We want to remind people that what we're doing is providing basically short summaries of topics and providing what we hope are fairly extensive links to more information and more accurate information, maps on the portal, various other kinds of information that some of you who need more information, we are able to find.

We are going to have general back end information. Let me talk about the first section which will provide information of the ocean ecosystem. In that section we are going to compile information about the biology and physical and chemical nature of the ocean and it's links to its atmosphere. There will be a fairly comprehensive information about animals that live in the ocean, the plants that live in the ocean the physical processes in the ocean, and the

ocean environment, the coastal processes and we have decided to include a section called emerging issues. In which we will identify various and sort of more controversial topics such as coastal inundation, and sort of policy type topics.

In the second part, in addressing the sustainable ocean uses we will have a section for each of the nine goals that are identified in the framework. These will be somewhat more issues oriented but we still intend to have short summaries and links to maps or maps in the document and references for further information.

So with regard to the outline that we have presented, there are two decisions that we are looking for. At least two pieces of sage advice from the argument. One is, is this version of the outline sufficient for the ROA working group to continue drafting the assessment? I say sufficient because we are not looking for approval of this outline as the final outline that we will be using. The reason for that is because of this, we do not know the RPB may ask to see in the ocean

assessment as it goes further on. We will expect that there will be issues identified that are not included, we will address those when requested by the RPB. But we would like to move forward and we would like to start filling out more of these topics, this is good enough to move forward with. We would like to do that. Especially if it is not, for people who have concerns about the way this is structured, we would love to hear from them.

It would really help us to get ideas of which specific topics in the outline the RPB would like us to work on. We could start anywhere. It took us, longer than expected to get these three example sections done. So we could take up any other three or six but if there are specific ones people would like us to develop more, in-depth text on, we will start it.

I will describe in detail the example sections, there are three but they are chosen because they are

representative of the kinds of topics you might dig up. One is on deep-sea corals. One is on offshore wind energy, ones on the Panama Canal expansion.

The questions we have with regard to these three topics, one is, is the level of information appropriate? As you read it you are bogged down with the second paragraph saying I cannot read more of this. Why did they throw in all of this other stuff. Or after they read it do they say I would love to have more information on the corals you find here. Is the level of information appropriate for the RPB? I'm interested to hear from the public what level of information is appropriate. The main question is, will this be useful to the regional planning and can you get the contact information you want out of these topics in the draft at this level? And then, is the scope of the information sufficient? Are there topics we should include that you do not see? Would you like more information about the management actions each agency is taking, or would you like less? Would you like

more background information or general topics?

So that concludes my presentation, I want to go back to the first set of questions about the outline, we are asking four decision points from the RPB. Is the outline sufficient for us to move forward and draft more sections? Second, are there particular topics that you would like to see us to work on so that when we get together again we can have more information to talk about? And then is the level in each section appropriate and are there topics you would like to see? Sarah, anything else to add?

Sarah Cooksey: Just a shout out to you, Kevin, for doing more than the last meeting. We were at one point equally sharing duties and Kevin has really been doing a lot lately, I have been doing less lately, so shout out to you. Just a reminder that back to what Kevin started out with, I think the workgroup

has done a tremendous job and what Greg said about products, we have three chapters, so we have some products ready for review. But we have been challenged by where does the ROA start and the Ocean Action Plan begin? We have stepped into the water and perhaps talking about challenges or issues or whatever you want to call them and then we have come back to just started sticking with the facts. We have a lot of really smart people with a lot of experience and resource management on the committee so I think we are ready to do more work.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Kevin and Sarah and the entire workgroup for getting this ready and presenting it for discussion. As you have heard from Kevin, the work is posing four questions, two related to the outline. Two related to the sample sections. There is connectivity across the questions obviously but I think that the workgroup would appreciate your feedback in the way Kevin has described, I

will not try to repeat that but let's open it up for discussion. Take those questions sequentially and that might be helpful way to proceed.

Laura McKay: So I think this brings us to where is the appropriate place in the plan or assessment for two of the things we have talked about today which is the idea of a synthesis of the data, because this outline seems to take things one item at a time, one topic at a time and we are still creating a synthesis by putting all of the biological ecology layers together to tell us where are the high ecological areas. So do we do that as part of this assessment? Also, the other piece we keep grappling with is with compatibility assessment. Is that compatibility assessment something that should be reflected in the outline with the ROA or to belong in the Ocean Action Plan? Personally, it does not matter to me as long as we do it. But at the moment, I guess

we have alluded to in the action plan, but it is a fine distinction on whether that kind of information that is a synthesis or assessment of some sort, where it really belongs. So I'm just curious to hear others' thoughts on where we should put it. And where we decide to put it, hopefully we can make it a little more clear so it can pop out of these documents. And have a better understanding of what we are trying to do.

Laura Cantral: Any thoughts about that?
Gwynne?

Gwynne Schultz: The section we have on the structure of the Ocean Action Plan, there is that appendix, a draft outline, and what we have found in that is, there is a chapter on the assessment and there is a chapter on the different data and tools. It is almost it's own separate part of the Regional Ocean Action Plan.

Laura Cooksey: Right, and that is what is making me wonder, is that clear enough? Do we need to tie that a little bit tighter rather than having a separate data and tools idea. Should these ideas and assessment be directly integrated into the plan?

Gwynne Schultz: I think that is a good question and I think that is one reason why as part of the decision tomorrow, we want to approve the approach to the Ocean Action Plan, not yet that outline because as this involves we want the flexibility to figure out what is the best mix of the Ocean Action Plan and how should that be structure? I think that is still up for discussion.

Laura Cantral: I think that is right. I also

think it would be great if other people have thoughts to Laura's question, what do you think about that? Where it should go and how to make it clearer? All of this, begging the question about what kind of data analysis and tools you are going to use because you have not made a decision yet. That will be more discussion as well. Karen, do you want to offer some things on this point?

Karen Chytalo: I agree with Laura's comment about synthesis. We need to have preventive organisms and algae, and what does it all mean? What is the storyline, what is it telling us? Is the system okay, resilient? Do we have sufficient quantities of stuff out there?

What we want to know is, are any of these habitats or systems in distress? I think we have to make sure that if there is an important storyline in the Atlantic that it comes out. It is clearly identified as write-ups in sections so that we do know, whatever, I don't know but we need to have a better

Elizabeth Semple: It seems to me if you think about the plan of the management process and the assessment as the science, and potentially the assessment as something to update. We may want to think about what we put in each based on that process, we may not want to change until we complete overall or input, where the science could continue to be informed as science is documented. You may want to think about those, to answering those questions on how we want to update. We may want to create some linkages in the outline in the organization so if you need criteria or designating something as a certain thing, in the decision-making process so that you have that information that you need to have that decision-making in the criteria where it is easily identifiable in the assessment. And I'm not sure if we have made that clear. Plus the indicators, it looks like you have a section that talks about indicators but they are not necessarily listed yet. So maybe that can be an area where we start to list the indicator so we

can look, then back from the management plan at the indicators so we could say whether we are having success in each of the different areas. I'm just thinking about the interrelationship between the two documents and how one can inform the other end use of each.

Kevin Chu: The RPB would like the work group to answer the question of what does it mean, or to provide our advice on which habitats are particularly sensitive. Which activities are compatible with other activities? We can do that. But I do not know if the working group is the right forum or the right mix of people. What we have in the workgroup are primarily people who are knowledgeable about their areas. I think it will take something like the RPB, a higher level to say, this is what we are concerned about. These are areas where we really

need to take extra action on. I think it is probably not the right task for this particular working group, but as I said, I think we enjoy the challenge and we would be glad to comply if that is the instructions. That is my main point, we can do it but it may not be the right body to do that.

The other point was it would also take a lot longer. The reason is because I would not feel comfortable in providing advice on what are the important ecological areas without a lot of info from the academic community and a lot more people, and you know I read a lot of names but they are not experts on this. If that is part of what this working group is doing we will need more of the year and more plan to get that done. In any case, I think, this coming year should be focused on collecting what do we know, which is what this outline is. It is probably a good starting point for what we want to know, what do we think about what we want.

Laura Cantral: Joe, Sarah?

Sarah Cooksey: I forgot to say something. I'm going in a think we have decided this, we were supposed to be totally virtual and have everything online. As you can see, we are moving to having a minimum, small document. I want people to know that.

Laura Cantral: Okay, that is a whole other issue. Joe?

Joe Atangan: So we are somewhat in an unfortunate position of having a parallel effort that should be happening in my mind somewhat sequential. In an ideal world, you would have an assessment conducted, and based on that assessment, you would develop a plan that would have the metrics by which you can evaluate change the from

that assessment. So I am a little bit concerned that what we have produced so far, it is an assessment and there has to be some sort of value judgment in there someplace. If you absent that value judgment and you just put in the facts, it is nothing more than a regional ocean description, I do not think that is what we are after at this point. If you think long-term and you think of it as an iterative process, then to me, it makes sense to do the assessment that includes a description of the ocean as it is right now. If done properly, will take a long time, but also an assessment on what are the key areas to tackle? What are the priorities areas? We will need the help of outside forces to help but I do not see any other way around it. The ocean assessment is the foundation for the regional Ocean Action Plan. It's your starting point. Without that assessment, your plan, how do you measure the success of your plan if you do not have that baseline to compare it with? I know it is a difficult task, I know that we are proceeding on divergent paths and how they go on

concurrently but I think we need to own up to the fact that the assessment is the foundation document and we have to do all of the things we can, any effort we can to make sure that assessment is correct as we can with the concerns that we have so that we can logically feed the Ocean Action Plan.

Bob LaBelle: Building on that, first of all thank you to the group. This is a lot of work it is very useful that you have a lot of the same topic sections to keep some sort of parallel processing going. I do not think it is fair or makes good sense to ask this group to do the full work of the RPB and the scientific community and the industry and fishing communities. I think this is an assessment of, if you look at who writes it, it is people who are knowledgeable, mostly in federal government, state government, and tribes. It is their assessment of

initial conditions that are out there right now. Right now it is written pretty closely to being neutral. So that is helpful. When this goes out for scientific and industry review, we will get a lot of good information and a lot more references so I'm trying to say that this draft will be useful to us over the next two years and we should use it to help set our criteria on what we're going to do and what we are going to look at maybe fulfill some of our criteria. We can go to the document and our discussions about what should be in the Ocean Action Plan. But the version of this that goes out with the OAP in 2016 should be sort of like a summary of what we heard from the science and other communities. And in that last version, we may be able to put value judgments on the state of this or that in the ocean. From our perspective we would have to qualify this. In RPB opinion we feel this best represents the state of this resource or something like that. But I think it is valuable as the draft and as it grows over the years we should be using it to help inform our decision.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne.

Gwynne Schultz: First two comments. I wanted to remind everybody that we do have time on the agenda tomorrow when we're talking about kind of the workplan and next steps. We have a discussion about the different work groups and how some of them may need to morph a little bit, change membership to address some different topics. I encourage you to think about this issue of not just having the data and information but having the next step of analysis. Now in the co-lead memo, we're recommending perhaps that the exploration of the data analysis would be revised with the OAP workgroup. That is the topic for tomorrow so give that some thought so we can regroup to say who is the best entity. I would like to comment on your question number two. About which topics the RPB

should prioritized. If we really do want to conduct and identify areas of ecological importance, I'd be interested in what data layers and what information do we need to do that and perhaps say let's start those first. I guess in my mind I'm thinking let's get those areas of ecological importance identified. It might be subsequent or at the same time I'm sure, you then need to be looking at what might impact those areas of ecological importance. That might be when you start to spend a little bit more time on the human uses. Maybe not but at least let's kick off the data layers that are needed for the ecological importance. I don't know what they are but...

Karen Chytalo: I'm trying to think of a process that we can do to get to that impact analysis and make better use of the scientific community and the stakeholders and others. In a sense of we have three segments, there is three things written out. It has a little base. Here is the base guys. Start growing other information to build up the body of

evidence as to what do we know about some of the impacts that we can document or something like that. There's this or that or whatever. Do that as an iterative thing, and get these things written at the base level and get them out and hear back from the public and the stakeholders and other users for information that could be applied into there. Back-and-forth and building the document up. Therefore, you are drawing in a lot more of the public to in helping to support this. It is providing information that is something which is playing into the Ocean Action Plan. I am trying to think of a tool that will help to develop that. Having our valued judgment but on some of these things. Let's start entertaining it and opening it up to a pool of people to look at it and start taking more comments or something like that. Keep pumping out these documents or something like that, that are identified in the outline. Some of these things

we cannot get very quickly. There was a lot of information on fish. I'm sure we can knock some of those things out but keep it revved up and feeding the machine out there. I don't know I'm thinking of a way that we can get some of the other hands together too.

Kevin Chu: I can't resist responding to knocking some of these things out quickly. I thought we'd be done but we've got three measly sections but anyway Joe brought up an essential topic. Are we compiling a description of the Mid-Atlantic region or are we compiling an assessment of the status. The text that you see before you are very much as Joe pointed out our very much more descriptive or a description. That is deliberate. It is based on the RPB conversations that we had reviewing earlier drafts where there were at various stages more issues being called out. More discussion of different viewpoints. It was decided that this should be as neutral as possible. Because what the

RPB really wanted or that's what the working group heard, was a factual description leaving to the RPB to make those value gestures. I see the wisdom of that and I strongly suspect that even though you would like in this document you have, or in the final version, you are going to want the value judgments that Joe has brought forth. I think where we should start is with description. Even though we all want to have value judgments. We want to start now to say these are the areas that are of importance to us. Again, I think this group is not the right one to make those judgment calls. As shown by our conversations with the RPB.

Laura Cantral: Sarah.

Sarah Cooksey: First of all I want to thank Gwynne, for answering our questions and if anybody

else wants to answer our questions that would be great. (Laughing.) Perhaps, I'm sure not everybody in the room knows this but we have told RPB a couple of times, thanks to Marco we have some money to engage the scientific community. We have a workgroup that Michelle is leading with our colleagues from the portal. We have a small amount of money to do that but not as much as we would like. Then I guess if I was in charge, this is what I would do, I agree with Kevin in that perhaps the people of the working group are not the, um, perhaps some of them are not the most qualified to do any new compatibility assessments. But there certainly are enough people within workgroup that in their particular field know enough today about particular issues and that's the first one to pop into my mind. We know that there are whale strikes. I see no reason why we couldn't in an appropriate manner, talk about existing issues that we know of today and that are being managed. Then the RPB could focus on those issues that have not been deliberated on and

could help Gwynne with the question that she forward and she chose the ecological important areas. So I think we do have the brainpower to put pen and paper on the things that we do know. The assessment that we do know. And that would move us forward some.

Mike Luisi: Thank you, I think between Joe and Kevin, the idea of assessment versus description hit the nail right on the head. And starting what Joe had mentioned in the beginning, where I see this process taking us is a document that provides description for the use, as a whole document to assess what is needed next instead of assessing and providing what I have cautioned and I continued to caution, words like judgment, opinion thrown into the description document. Those are things that I think we can get an awful lot of trouble when we start to

provide our own opinions even if they are our agencies. Opinion should be left alone at this point. What the entities that are in charge of management engage with those opinions on whether they would go forward on their policy decision. This last half hour has been enlightening. I think where we are now, and my opinion would be to move forward to provide prescriptive or descriptive documents. So the question one, the answer is yes. The answer to question two, is I think we should start to fill this up with information we already have. There is an enormous amount of information in the Mid-Atlantic Council and Atlantic states Marine fisheries commission, those are simple links to websites that are up to date, as up to date as staff keeps them, which is real-time. Let's start to fill up some of this with things that are already done so that we can assess it once we have the descriptions. We can now access the full document and determine where we go next. Thank you

Laura Cantral: Laura.

Laura McKay: Just again I was using the word synthesis rather than value or judgment. I think there is a step in between the description of value judgment assessment and that is the synthesis of the objective data that we already have in hand. I feel like that's very doable. I am anxious for us to do that as soon as we can. We got a lot of great data layers out there out there but we still have not combined them or synthesize them into something that adds them all up and shows you, when we look at all those together, what the map looks like. That's what I'm talking about again tomorrow. I feel like that's a really clear step that we can take and that's not that difficult to do. It's been done many times in many places. All kinds of methodologies already developed out there that we can use. It's that synthesis, that is a

necessary step on our road that I would like to see us focus on now.

John Harms: I think I could stop by I'm hearing a lot of numbers mentioned about resources that are available through different agencies and entities that you are affiliated with. I would follow up with what Laura and Gwynne mentioned earlier. Tomorrow when we look at the workflow and we are reorganizing these workgroups to consider if you would be able to add yourself there were consider adding someone. As you can see, a lot of the sections need to be filled and we are often missing someone who has the dedicated time to fill them. That is just something to keep in the back of your mind that we want to reiterate. I think we can also see some discussion today and the discussions we've had as colleagues, the value aspect of this can delay us in actually producing a work product that we can move forward with that. To get maybe to a value discussion. I think what

Kevin was getting at is that we start at the description level. We start with the outline and we start with getting that content and then we can build and as a whole we can move on. We start doing more value assessments or lead to a discussion like we are having today. If we had that in our work group and we have had that discussion and our group, we would not be moving forward. I think that's what we really need to be doing, moving forward.

Liz: Is there an overall outline of all of the different pieces of everything that we need to complete the Ocean Action Plan, the assessment and the Marco portal. Even if we just do the descriptions now and the assessment. If we expect ultimately for the evaluation or the overlay to be there, we can just leap forward to that or we can make sure that it is being done at the portal. As long as we have the

overall outline and we have the areas identified where those gaps will be filled, I think we can move forward with the rest but we just need to make sure we have this taken care of and our workforce.

Laura Cantral: Doug and then Karen and then Joe.

Doug Pabst: thanks, I think the complexity of this has become obvious during this conversation. And you find yourself flipping back and forth between the factual and the assessment part of this. Some of these topics are pretty straightforward. I think we made some of these changes to separate out those things that went themselves to more factual and some things that required an analytical or interpretive description. A lot of the same things in the interjurisdictional part of the document transformed into this part of the document. Because we all have a part of the

science puzzle or a part of the assets as far as the government goes. We'll say the same things a little bit differently. So we are finding that we have to come up with the government line on a lot of these items. While there may be a ton of information that doesn't necessarily mean we still have to call through that to come up with that line, for lack of a better word. That's the challenge we've had. If you look at the examples we've provided, were starting to get a little bit. Here's what a discussion of a topic we use might look at. We could go further and we could start making those value decisions as a group but I want to not lose sight of some of the other issues that we have, the emerging issues like climate change, water quality, invasive species. They are not factual in the context of the extent of the problem and we might have to come up with a solution for. So, there is just parts of this that we are going to have to say

something assessment wise about so it has to have both of those. There is no way you can talk about climate change without doing something about assessment. You also cover a lot of territory around here. We'll talk but the salinity patterns going from the Long Island sound to Virginia? That is probably not going to be very exciting for people but we want to talk about trends and warming. These are the kind of questions that we talk about on the work group force. It is not just finding links and documents. It's also a depth issue. An elevation issue.

Karen Chytalo: Doug hit on the trends issue and I think there's something it's very important that pass to be thoroughly articulated in here because that helps to get you to the assessment. Because, I don't know, we have written a lot of management plans and worked on a lot of different types of documents and when we bring these things up to our Commissioner, first thing they always ask is, why? Why are

you taking action? When we first went to them about doing nitrogen reduction. Our Commissioner said you want me to go to the mayor of New York City and tell them to spend billions of dollars on nitrogen reduction meanwhile he's got people sleeping on the street. You better give me a good reason why I have to do that. And so I went and did all of that and he was like, okay. So to convince people that there are issues out there that need to be addressed, we have to give them the why. We get the synthesis down and we need that. We have to have a rationale as to why a compatibility analysis. If it's just for a descriptive, I don't think you are going to get enough as to "why should I care about this". "Big deal, who cares, a bunch of worms". He's happy because he sees a whale every now and then. He goes out with his kids and he sees a whale. We have to be able to get the why out. I think that's the thing that really helps. I get

nervous if we get to neutral. I think that is just laying out "okay, yes, there is fish out there". What makes this area so special? Especially since we have so many people out here and so many activities on out here. Why do we care about the resources and why do we care about the way things are moving? Why is climate changing affecting all of those types of changes? How do we deal with the changing landscape. Unless we document that in some way, it's not going to give us the information. That is something I get concerned with.

Joe Atangan: To get back to Sarah's objectives here. I support one and two. I think it is sufficient. I think the prioritizing is good initial start. I do want to go back to a descriptive verses assessment part. I don't want to leave the public with the impression that it is going to be a description and we don't want to do an assessment. We are going to do an assessment. Just a matter of when and at what point of the assessment process are we going to have an++ assessment?

What that speaks to is, I had a boss who was rather difficult and he was always asking they so what factor. So what, why should I care. I think that assessment piece that leads us down the road of "why do I care". So I go back and toss it back to Laura because she started all this stuff. How do you bridge the two documents? What is the bridge that allows us to connect the regional ocean assessment with the Ocean Action Plan? And all the synthesis that takes place in between? To me it still comes down to, I don't want to lose sight of that assessment. It's a critical piece for laying the foundation for what we are about to embark on. I am concerned that it is descriptive and it is neutral and we are kind of shying away from a direct confrontation of issues that need to be addressed. Again, I am on board with the online and I'm on board with the topics that I think it is a great start. I do want to keep putting forward this idea

that this cannot be just a general description piece and that whether we like it or not, we have to conduct some sort of analysis in there that leads us to an assessment of something. It gives us that so what factor that will keep people interested. It will be the foundational objective for what we are trying to get to.

Laura Cantral: Bob.

Bob LaBelle: It just strikes me that we are just going about this really long, hard way. This is just my personal opinion. I counted 47 sections here that have to be written. I might be wrong but that's a lot of work to ask people to do. It's a lot of work to just chase after 47 different authors. Other than a nice coffee table book that would come out, by the time it comes out it would be two years old and so it would go on the coffee table. I'm in total agreement that we need to use this information. However, I believe the

descriptive information is the first thing that you need to do the kind of synthesis and analysis that folks really want to do.

Joe Atangan: I agree.

Bob LaBelle: So maybe what we can do, and it's just a suggestion, is maybe we don't need to have every one of those things if we could look ahead and see what the RPB, you know, once we do our criteria and analysis, where we are going to focus. If we knew that we can come back and do a much more thorough job on whatever it takes to get to that decision.

Joe Atangan: So this is the balance between huge book and the executive summary. To me, I am interested in the executive summary but I am also

interested in what is the real meat that supports the executive summary. Whether that be scientific literature, the New York State Ocean Action Plan, the general climate assessment, there are other publications out there that you can draw from then I'm on board with that. I agree with you. We don't want another 800 or 900 page document that will sit and gather dust on our shelf. We set that as goal at the very start of this thing. As we immerse ourselves into this process, there are a lot of issues that pop up and it comes down who is going to make the value judgment on what issues to address? How do we prioritize? Because we clearly cannot tackle it all so it still comes down to this RPB rolling up its sleeves and giving the assessment groups some guidance on "here are the issues that I want you to put most of your effort on", to spit out a product that can be used to develop an Ocean Action Plan.

Laura Cantral: I want to ask Kevin and Sarah, you posed four questions and you've asked at least two or three times for reactions and feedback on those questions. I've heard some people giving you an indication that they are comfortable with number one as the revised version that outlines sufficient continue drafting. Some people said they were okay with that. I've also heard some expressions of comfort with a level of information that is in the examples. So your questions three and four. I want to ask the two of you, in the time that we have before we wrap this up and we're going to sleep on this and we're going to hear from the public. We will go to this discussion tomorrow and hopefully has some very clear direction for how this workflow needs to move forward in the current composition with some modification that we may make. What else can we get out of this session right now, that we need to

focus on these four questions. Or is there something else that you feel like, in the next few minutes would be useful to hear members so we can move forward.

Sarah Cooksey: How much time do we have before the break?

Laura Cantral: I think we need to shift gears in about 10 minutes.

Sarah Cooksey: Based upon this discussion I would add another question. I have not heard people say that they are uncomfortable or I don't like the descriptive ROA, but I have heard people say the descriptive document is not an ROA. We are very aware it is 47 chapters. Maybe a different way to approach it, this would be something that I would not an answer now but maybe tomorrow. What if we approached it completely differently and we looked at the

uses and maybe the RPB would be more interested in focusing on some uses that they would like information on that might help with an assessment. So I am just trying to find another way to skin a cat here. Because how can we do an Ocean Action Plan without the ROA. I don't get it so I'll just say it. I don't get it.

Kevin Chu: To add to what Sarah is proposing, as always I like to hear this suggestion. What we might think about in the proposal is within the next three or four months , we try to fill out at least one topic under each one of section 2 topics. Something on national security, something on ocean energy, we do have one maybe we can do the other? Something on fishing and something on ocean agriculture. So have a topic to discuss on each of the subtotals of the sustainable usages. I do think in

reference to Gwynne's suggestion, we can take up a few topics under the ocean ecosystems that are particularly focused on habitats. Letting go of some things like the marine worms. I hate to propose that. But to start working on the more fundamental aspects of the ecology. The bigger picture of the parts of the ecology as well as something on each of the uses. Then when we get back together perhaps we can merge the uses and the ecology and start to about other topics. Trying to do the synthesis.

Laura Cantral: Greg .

Greg Capobianco: I was sort of having the same thought, maybe slightly different words, but I guess I'm trying to figure how to write this down and figure out carefully. I guess there would be some key uses and key resources. And the uses to my way of thinking would be shipping, fishing, recreation, and perhaps an infrastructure

that we address cables and pipelines and other infrastructure aspects of what is in the ocean. That the resources would be fisheries and habitats, similar to what Kevin was saying, and then can we put some numbers? I am struggling with how to convey, what about the descriptions? Can we use numbers? Do we have enough trend data, enough historical data and current data to project the trends to suggest, is that what leads to the gaps? Are the gaps identified in the OAP, as the prior research that we need to undertake? That is the train of thought that makes sense to me. But there is the uses and the resources and then you have to figure out how to put them together and look at them together and make incremental steps. I agree, the number 40 or whatever the number is, is overwhelming. I'm not sure how useful it would be. Those are my thoughts.

Jeffrey Flumigan: I am thinking about this in a different way, maybe there is a way of doing it just in time assessment. Where an issue that has brought to the table for decision that has been for review, to do the assessment on that particular issue covering all of the different topics so that we are not creating a 900 page book but we are focusing our efforts on the issue at hand. The assessment can be done on those particular issues on covering everything from New York to, I am not a biologist or scientist but it seems to me that a just in time assessment as opposed to an assessment of the entire regional ocean is perhaps more forgiving, then trying to figure out the whole ocean.

Catherine McCall: A lot of folks have talked about descriptions versus assessment. We have a couple of products that have come together whether it is from the barge, undersea cables or canyons, whether there may be more meat that gets us towards the assessment that we can

use those topics to delve into this issue more and see what those products are helping form. And then I'll know, from the current discussion with OAP group whether that is irrational thinking or not. At least we'll have more information that get us towards that, that has also been informed by the feedback that we've heard from the different communities.

Joe Atangan: So, anybody familiar with military knows that we like acronyms. When we do briefs, some of our bosses like this thing called "BLUF", bottom line up front. It occurred to me what we are talking about here, there are plenty of descriptive stuff out there already. There are textbooks on descriptive stuff. What do we really care about? The bottom line up front. What are the issues, what are the concerns? Maybe we should highlight the issues and concerns. Do we hear from the fishers, the biologists, this group we are talking

about and use as the lead in our ocean assessment. If we do that we may whittle down some of the topic areas and some of the volume associated with it. I appreciate the descriptive stuff, it is very valuable in framing the things that maybe recognize what the issues are. But as everybody here recognizes, this is a very compressed and yet we have to be thorough. So to me it is less about the description as it is about the issues and concerns that will feed the ocean assessment that is important to this process.

Laura McKay: I think it ties back to what we had in the Ocean Action Plan. We talked about identifying those region wide issues of the criteria for prioritizing those, then we have the list of those. The other piece of it is to look at specific geographic areas, which is where we can take the data we have in the portal, those layers that apply to biological resources, geological resources of habitats and we synthesize those into a layer of environmental, ecological

importance. That becomes one layer. We see on one map- here are all of the important ecological areas. Then parallel to that, we have our list of prioritized region-wide issues. Then we start picking those off then we start to deal with those issues based on the knowledge we now have. Where are the more important ecological areas are so that we are dealing with those issues on a interjurisdictional basis with respect to protecting ocean ecosystem but also doing that work to figure out when we identify the issue, what are the compatibilities or incompatibilities around that issue, given their location? With respect to the ecological value areas. I think we are all saying the same thing from different perspectives but I hope that we are all getting to the same point. It feels like it to me but maybe I am being overly optimistic.

Kevin Chu: I want to follow up on Joe's

BLUFF, which I love that acronym, when I watch people in the room I saw people nodding, yes, that is what it should be. Can I take that the RPB would like in the assessment, at least, very upfront a short summary of the key issues that we should be thinking about, as decision-makers. We will go through the introduction section to make sure that those are called out at least. Or each topic perhaps you may only need to read the first paragraph, should we try in the very first paragraph to just give a very high level summary of the topic?

Gwynne Schultz: I am not sure at this stage what the best place is in the assessment. I think that as you go through to write up the different information, that you are harvesting those issues. I am hoping that you are capturing and documenting these issues but I'm not sure that is part of this regional ocean assessment document. Because I think that all of the issues you are finding will be of value for a lot

of the different analysis but I hope you capture it but I guess I'm not ready to say yes make it a part of the assessment.

Michael Jones: It is almost as if it is missing a section. It's almost as if we have our baseline with the biological information that is descriptive and then we have our uses, our action of what is going on but we are missing the big picture section of what we have been talking about. Section number three. The analysis, how do these uses affect these baseline conditions? It is a thought that occurred to me.

Laura Cantral: A really rich discussion, there is a sense that there is some ideas and directions that perhaps will be helpful to the working group but we will not summarize that now because we are going to hear from the public and revisit this at our

morning session. I encourage you all to think about this more and what we hear here in a few moments and we will take this up again and I think it will be particularly helpful to everyone to think about discussion what you want this product to be in the context of the OAP. If it is true that the OAP is composed of several elements and the regional ocean assessment, whether it is descriptive or truly assessing or starts as a description and leads to assessing, that is something you have to work out but it's to inform how you are going to ultimately implement what is in the plan being informed by what is important to this region and what you know about it. So thank you for really good comments, good input, co-chairs of the workgroup, I encourage you to think about what else you want to get from your colleagues when you revisit this tomorrow. Let's hear from the public now. We have poor people who have signed up with the comments. We have Matt Gove, Brent Greenfield, Karen Meyer, Bonnie Brady. Matt, we will turn to you first.

Matt Cove: Okay, that was interesting. I think you guys came back around and I think there were some red herrings in there they were chased. I think you figured it out, the whole judgment, value, I agree that should not be in the ROA. I think we are confusing what is what. I think of the value of the judgment as this area is for wind only or this area is not allowed to trall. And that is a valued opinion. But asking a scientist or even us to say, to get to the goal of a healthy ocean ecosystem, what areas of the ocean are the highest areas, that is science, that is not a value judgment. If I take you out to the suburbs here and give you a map of the residential area, a shopping mall and a forest. And said, if we want to get to a healthy forest. Which area is the best area? It's obvious. It would be the forest. If our goal is a healthy ocean ecosystem, there is science that can tell us what areas are the best areas. It's not a value

judgment. It's part of the ROA. I hope I made that clear. Also, the compatibility assessment. I would also put in that category of science. We know doing certain things in the ocean effects other things, we know that. Those are facts. It's not a value judgment. So I think that can be a part of the ROA. Obviously, there is a part where you go over the top and now you're making a judgment. But I agree with Joe that we really need this ROA piece and this stuff has to be part of it. Because as people have said, a description is helpful but I am not sure that keeps people coming here and gives you value for the future of what to do. Are we talking about stakeholder stuff tomorrow or is this stakeholder.

Laura Cantral: We will talk about that tomorrow.

Matt Gove: I'm doing a lot of it stakeholder stuff so I will talk about that tomorrow, so I will just keep it at that. Oh. A description document is not an ROA.

Sarah Cooksey: don't point at me.

Laura Cantral: We have one more person who has signed up, we would like to get all of you in by the time we have to leave at 5 o'clock so just try to bear with us, Brent you are next, Ali you are after Bonnie and we do want to try to get out of here by five so that our host will let us come back tomorrow.

Brent Greenfield: My name is Brent Greenfield, and the following comments are made on behalf of the National Ocean Policy Coalition.

Rather than prioritize certain topics for development during Spring 2015 as proposed in the assessment outline, the Coalition reiterates its previous comments underscoring the necessity of

collecting data and information on environmental and economic uses and resources simultaneously in a manner that will help ensure a comprehensive and well-informed assessment that assesses all existing and potential future uses and resources in a non-discriminatory manner.

Thus, while the assessment outline includes draft sections addressing deep sea corals, renewable energy, and the Panama Canal expansion, consideration of all uses and resources is necessary as individual uses and activities do not occur in a vacuum, and any use of the assessment to influence decisions as to one use or resource or a limited set of uses or resources will invariably impact others.

Given the intended use of the assessment to support development of the Ocean Action Plan, the Coalition reiterates the importance of completing a stakeholder-based regional ocean assessment before proceeding forward with

discussions on whether or how to proceed with an ocean plan.

In addition, in drafting the assessment, great caution must be taken to avoid the appearance or reality of subjective conclusions or statements about resource conditions or human uses or human use impacts. For example, without providing citations to any external sources for its conclusion, the deep sea coral example included in the outline notes special vulnerability to certain ocean activities.

Thus, assessment content should be limited to scientific data and information and not include conclusory statements unsupported by or unsourced to authoritative sources. In that regard, data and information included in the report should be based on extensive research that reflects the current state of

knowledge about the applicable use or resource, including but not limited to data and information on successful use coexistence and resource resilience. In addition, the RPB must provide clear guidance and protocols that apply to the collection, inclusion, and reference to all assessment data and information, including minimum requirements that ensure assessment content complies with relevant federal and state data and information quality laws, standards, and protocols, and continuous opportunities to update the assessment with new data and information.

As to maps included in the assessment, the RPB should also clearly and comprehensively communicate the purpose for which they were originally developed and the reason for its inclusion in the assessment and its potential application in the RPB ocean planning process.

While the assessment outline notes the recommendation to seek input from the scientific community after additional assessment sections have been drafted, the RPB should clarify that it will also seek such input from existing and potential future user group communities. It is vital that stakeholders including the commercial and recreational user group communities be closely engaged with and given ample opportunity to review and provide feedback on all draft assessment content.

The last comment that I just wanted to make, I know that there were certain comments this morning about the desire by some to have important ecological areas identified and engaging compatibility assessments as part of being potential data and analysis, decision support tools, that will be discussed tomorrow. I just want to note the language included in the memo that was put on the website last

week that the RPB, while provided a general sense of direction and input about potential analysis will not make a formal decision about this document at this meeting. I would just respectfully urge that you all, before doing so, provide an adequate opportunity for public review and comment on any proposed options that you consider in that regard. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Karen

Karen: thanks. I am Karen Meyer I am the Executive Director of Empire productions. So I am executive director of Green Fire Productions. We are a nonprofit communications organization and for the last 25 years we have been producing links to conservation and sustainability topics. As well as most of you know, outreach campaigns around the films to both the issues forward. So I want to first and foremost, thank you for your work on the Mid-Atlantic

RPB. It is a challenge. Anytime you are on the cutting edge, it is a challenge. Certainly moving forward with new way of ocean management. We are right there so thank you very much.

Since 2010, I have been documenting pioneering efforts in ocean planning and green fire has produced two films in our ocean front series. In the last three years we've screened these films nationwide with 875 partners and a thousand events, 35 states and get this, in 30 countries around the world.

There is a lot of interest in all the work that we're doing here in the United States. New York City is no different. As Noah Chesnin has mentioned earlier, we had our New York City premiere last night. Packed house 140+ people. They are very interested in the work that you are doing and very excited to know that it is happening. So, I wanted to

be sure and share that with you. It is nice to know that the rest of the folks, once they hear about this and learn about it, it makes sense to them. They want to see this happen. They want to know what they can do to help support it.

So I want to also mainly mention to you that we've received some additional funding for 2015 to host a series of screenings throughout the Mid-Atlantic. So I will be getting in touch with many of you to get your input and to ask you to sit on a panel like Karen and Mike did last night. Thank you very much as well as Matt Gove. Green Fire will be working with Surfrider and others to develop these screenings and so I would love to pick your brains about, get your input about important places to be, people to bring into the panel, agencies to reach out to, etc. As well as the films are made available for free. We have provided them free to Marco. I know there are new members so if anybody would like copies of the film, I am here tomorrow and we have copies with us. You can also get them on my website.

We encourage a lot of these screenings have been brownbag lunches so that folks have posted for their colleagues and their agencies where they were, so that you can share more about the work that you are doing and help people that you work with the understand the concept of ocean planning and how it's moving forward here in the Mid-Atlantic and as well as around the country. It's a very effective outreach tool. We've surveyed folks and 80% of the people come away with a better understanding of ocean planning. 95% of the people want to get involved. I encourage you and the rest of the audience to use this important communication tool in your work as we move forward. So thanks very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Bonnie.

Bonnie Brady: Hi, thank you. I will try to be super quick because I know that we have seconds. Regarding the Ocean Action Plan and the ocean assessment. I feel like from a stakeholders perspective I feel like the biggest decisions of that process should be what are the economic drivers and the ecologically important areas that exist presently. That is all kind of stakeholders that are presently in these waters. Regarding the science, I believe it should come from fishery management councils. They are the ones who reassess every 3 years, and national fisheries pull their hair out regularly but it is the most up-to-date assessment process presently. I think also that there needs to be, you need to decide what you hope to create ecologically and economically throughout for the future. I think you need to decide the present impediments to that progress forward both economically and ecologically. Right now we have stakeholders who utilize the ocean and I do not feel the process will if you worked with fishery management councils and they tell us they cannot go for

whatever the reason. I feel that the industry as it exists presently, by the way, Karen you know I love you. The oceans are not overfished regionally. We're good to go gang, I can give you the links. The New York OAP specifically said that in an executive summary. When I saw, I know how hard we worked as an industry to be able to save this industry grow this industry. Lastly, I promise I will be quick. Also, the last thing I think is important, is how do we ameliorate or improve those barriers to future progress along both tracks, both economically and environmentally. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Ali.

Ali Chase: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm Ali Chase. I know I mentioned this morning but I do think it bears repeating. The portal

and a lot of the information we've collected so far has base layers on different uses like shipping and went but there isn't a base layer that pulls together all of the national resource data that exist and conveys where some of these important places are for functioning. Some of the synthesis that Laura is talking about I think it's really important. What I think the regional assessment should be is, what are the critical areas and the key species for the ecosystem to function and be resilient? Where are the areas of spawning and breeding and feeding? What areas contain rare or vulnerable marine resources. These are the questions I think we need to answer in order to actually address the frameworks number one goal in figuring out how to create a healthier ecosystem. I feel that this work should be part of the regional assessment is that is what was envisioned and I think if this workgroup feels that it is unable to do this then a new task force of some short should be created immediately to get this effort underway. Some of the description work needs to continue,

that's fine but I think that this is definitely a process that can be done. And as others have mentioned, there are examples, there are other places that have done this before, we can do this work. But it is going to take some time. And we need to get started on this as soon as possible. The way it is currently structured I fear that the regional ocean assessment is not going to actually advance our understanding for the regions ecological health or what uses are compatible with each other. I think we need to have an additional piece brought in so that the RPB can design a plan that meets the frameworks goals. I would recommend that we immediately start working with the scientific community to develop a compatibility analysis to identify areas of ecological importance throughout the entire region. To develop an ocean health index so we can monitor our progress. Again, this is something that a new workgroup needs to be added

for, then we need to do that. The work needs to start so we can start making these calls and hear what we are going to do with it. Thanks

Laura Cantral: Thanks to all of you for your comments and patience as we are running out of time. Starting late and then rushing you a little bit. We appreciate that. We will have another public session tomorrow and I will dispense with any kind of wrap up for other formalities and just say we are adjourned for today and will start again tomorrow morning at 9 AM. We have registration which is open for business at 8:30 and we will get started at nine.