

This transcript of the September 24-25, 2013 Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body meeting was developed by a third party court reporter. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body and Meridian Institute cannot verify the accuracy of its content.

1

-----x  
MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL OCEAN PLANNING,

Inaugural Regional Planning Body (RPB) Meeting  
-----x

September 24, 2013  
10:30 a.m.

Held at: Wilson Hall Auditorium  
Monmouth University  
400 Cedar Avenue  
West Long Branch, New Jersey 07764

JOSEPH ALBANESE & ASSOCIATES  
Certified Shorthand Reporters  
250 Washington Street, Suite A  
Toms River, New Jersey 08754  
(732) 244-6100  
reporter@albaneseassoc.com

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 FACILITATOR: LAURA CANTRAL, Meridian Institute

4 CO-LEADS:

5

GWYNNE SCHULTZ,

6

Maryland, MARCO

7

MAUREEN BORNHOLDT

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

8

GERROD SMITH,

9

C.F.O. Shinnecock Indian Nation

10

11 PANEL MEMBERS:

12

SARAH COOKSEY, Delaware, MARCO

13

MARTY ROSEN, New Jersey, MARCO

14

JOSE ATANGAN, Joint Chiefs of Staff

15

GREG CAPOBIANCO, New York, MARCO

16

JOHN WALTERS, U.S. Coast Guard

17

PEDRO RAMOS, Acting State Conservationists, USDA

18

ANDY ZEMBA, Pennsylvania

19

L. FRANK MACH, U.S. Department of Transportation

Maritime Administration

20

21

DOUGLAS PABST, E.P.A.

22

TOM BIGFORD, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

23

LAURA MCKAY, Virginia, MARCO

24

25

NOTE TAKER: INGRID IRIGOYEN, Meridian Institute

## 1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

## 3 PANEL MEMBERS:

4 KAREN CHYTALO, Assistant Bureau Chief Maritime  
 Resources, New York State  
 5 Department of Environmental  
 Conservation

6 DAVID NOBLE, Department of the Navy  
 7

8

## 9 PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

## PAGES

-----  
 -----

10	MORGAN GOPNIK	144 234
11	ALI CHASE	148 236
12		
13	BRENT GREENFEIELD	151 238
14	ARLO HEMPHILL	155
15	MATT GOVE	158 242
16		
17	CINDY ZIPF	160 244
18	GREG DiDOMENICO	165 253
19		
20	DOUG PHEISTER	168
21	NICK NAPOLI	205
22	RON RAPP	248
23	JOHN WILLIAMSON	251
24	MARGO PELLIGRINO	255
25		

1 MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Are we ready  
2 to get the party started?

3 Welcome everyone, members of the  
4 Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Planning  
5 body, and those of you joining for the  
6 first in-person meeting, a business  
7 meeting to be happening over the course  
8 of today and tomorrow. I'll tell you a  
9 lot more about our plans together in a  
10 moment, but on behalf of the RPB, we'll  
11 welcome you all in joining us for this  
12 kickoff discussion.

13 The RPB has been having working  
14 sessions via conference calls and has  
15 conducted a webinar to provide status  
16 updates to those of you with us and  
17 others who are interested in its  
18 progress, but this really is the  
19 jumping-off point where there is an  
20 opportunity to be around the table  
21 together and deliberating and making some  
22 decisions about how to proceed.

23 I'm Laura Cantral with Meridian  
24 Institute and will be instituting the  
25 dialogue over the course of today and

1 tomorrow, and also we would very much  
2 like to thank our friends at Monmouth  
3 University for their hospitality and  
4 hosting us here for this meeting in this  
5 beautiful and inspiring space.

6 So, I'll have a few things to say  
7 about the agenda in a moment, but before  
8 doing that, I would like to ask Gerrod  
9 Smith with the Shinnecock Indian Nation  
10 to honor our proceedings by starting us  
11 off with a tribal blessing.

12 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

13 Let us thank the creator, whomever  
14 you believe this one to be, for bringing  
15 us all here together for common cause to  
16 help manage our oceans in a better way,  
17 and there are many stakeholders here with  
18 many interests and many concerns and let  
19 us continue to create dialogue and offer  
20 suggestions as to how to manage our  
21 oceans better to bring back that balance.  
22 By coming together and working  
23 collectively we can achieve this goal.

24 My elders once told me that  
25 sometimes it is good to close your eyes

1           and close your mouth and just listen.  
2           You can learn lots. So, as we discuss  
3           and listen and move forward together, we  
4           say "Ma-Ma." Let's move together. Let's  
5           move forward together and let us keep in  
6           mind that this is for many generations.  
7           As one of the presidents once said, we do  
8           these things not because they are easy,  
9           but because they are hard, and so we have  
10          lots of work ahead of us, but we are off  
11          to a good start. "Tap-Bu-Mat." Thank  
12          you.

13                   MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. Inspiring  
14                   wisdom.

15                   We were talking over breakfast  
16                   about Roddy's heritage and understanding  
17                   a lot about the past and how interesting  
18                   to learn and how important it is to know  
19                   that and we also reflected that those of  
20                   you -- part of this process are taking  
21                   that into the future and that is  
22                   reflected in your blessing and in your  
23                   opening remarks. So, thank you very  
24                   much.

25                   So, let me say a few things about

1           the agenda, and those of you who are with  
2           the RPB, should have gotten an agenda  
3           posted on the website, so you -- maybe  
4           you took a look, and we also have some  
5           copies here at the front desk, and for  
6           RPB members. You should have your agenda  
7           in front of you at tab one. And I don't  
8           want to bore you all with too much detail  
9           about the agenda, but I want to point out  
10          some things I think are important for us  
11          to all keep in mind.

12                 First of all, to start by pointing  
13           you to the objectives and what we hope to  
14           accomplish over the course of this  
15           meeting. We would like to determine a  
16           general five-years' timeline for the  
17           regional ocean planning process and  
18           associated products that will be part of  
19           that timeline. We'll present a proposal  
20           and have some discussion and see what  
21           you're thinking is how to further develop  
22           that or what you want to do in terms of  
23           setting some expectations for timing in  
24           place.

25                 We also want to have a good

1 discussion around the approach process,  
2 again timeline-wise to engage the public  
3 around the development of ocean planning  
4 goals, associated objectives and  
5 geographic scope of work for the  
6 geographic focus for the planning work.

7 We'll be discussing and presenting  
8 some preliminary thinking that's been  
9 done by a number of folks on the RPB, and  
10 the notion for this meeting is to have  
11 some good discussion around that. This  
12 is not about making decisions about  
13 goals, this is about starting the process  
14 of balancing the goals and, most  
15 importantly, starting the process of  
16 engaging all of you who are here today in  
17 the process of further developing those  
18 goals and related objectives.

19 Very much related to what I just  
20 said is the mechanics for engaging  
21 stakeholders, this RPB is very committed  
22 to finding as many mechanisms for  
23 engaging the members of the public in  
24 this region and all of the sectors and  
25 interests people who live here and work



1 here and care about these resources, and  
2 we'll be talking about some ideas how  
3 we'd do that as the process moves forward  
4 from the first meeting, and we've got to  
5 do some business and talk about a charter  
6 for the regional planning body.

7 There is a draft charter that is  
8 under development. There is still some  
9 outstanding details you all need to  
10 discuss and figure out as we walk away  
11 from this meeting what is going to be the  
12 timeline for finalizing that charter  
13 having all of you view as members prepare  
14 to sign the charter and formalize that.  
15 There are related operational and  
16 administrative considerations that we'll  
17 need to discuss that will be part of our  
18 day, too, to take up some of those  
19 matters.

20 We'll also be spending time talking  
21 about the use of the MARCO, Mid-Atlantic  
22 Regional Council on the Ocean. It's an  
23 important tool to support data and  
24 information needs for regional planning  
25 and also how to move forward and design

1           the next steps related to conducting a  
2           regional ocean assessment, which is an  
3           important early step in any planning  
4           process as you've got to assess what  
5           you've got before you can plan for where  
6           you want to go.

7                     So, in outlining those objectives,  
8           you'll hear me say this more than once,  
9           but to start now, an important  
10          perspective or context to add about this  
11          meeting, as the first meeting that all of  
12          you as RPB members have to be together,  
13          have discussions to present the early  
14          thinking that has happened over the  
15          course of the summer, have good dialogue  
16          around the -- identify some next steps,  
17          note some good ideas and make some  
18          decisions about how to take the next set  
19          of steps. So, just to keep that in mind  
20          and in perspective -- as we go into our  
21          different perspectives is important to  
22          keep in mind.

23                     We are going to be spending the  
24          morning with welcoming remarks, some  
25          introductions to make sure you all know

1           who is here at the table and who they  
2           represent, and then we are going to have  
3           some discussion around, first of all,  
4           overview of the activities to date. Over  
5           the course of the summer, some of these  
6           things already have been referred to and  
7           in particular have some RPB discussion  
8           around two topics that are going to be  
9           fundamental and foundational to the work,  
10          and one of those is this timeline, and I  
11          already referred to the five-years'  
12          timeline and why it's important to talk  
13          about that. Also, to discuss the  
14          relationship between MARCO and the RPB as  
15          the process moves forward, and MARCO has  
16          some ideas to present to the RPB about  
17          that.

18                 At that point, we'll break for  
19          lunch, and when we come back in the  
20          afternoon, we'll spend the remainder of  
21          the day talking about two important  
22          topics, the process for setting goals and  
23          objectives. Again, I just referred to  
24          that as one of our meeting objectives and  
25          also ideas for engaging stakeholders.

1           I think at this point what I would  
2           like to do is point out that the RPB  
3           decided to structure this agenda and  
4           sequence it in a way to enable those of  
5           you that may have ideas they are going to  
6           be discussing, to have an opportunity to  
7           speak to the RPB about those ideas.

8           So, I just want to point you to the  
9           agenda and make reference to the sequence  
10          that we've designed here. So, for  
11          example, starting at one o'clock, after  
12          lunch when we resume discussion about  
13          regional planning goals and the related  
14          topic of geographic focus for ocean  
15          planning, we are going to present some  
16          information, we'll have some initial  
17          dialogue among RPB members, and then  
18          we'll pause for public comment.

19          I'm going to talk about the  
20          mechanics of signing up for public  
21          comment, and if you want to cover public  
22          comment, if you choose to do so, the  
23          point is there will be some discussion  
24          about a topic, we'll pause for public  
25          comment, and resume the discussion, and

1           that gives an opportunity for anything  
2           that members have heard from the public  
3           related to the discussion, to roll that  
4           back into the discussion. We'll wrap it  
5           up and move to the next topic. That's  
6           the pattern of how the agenda is designed  
7           starting in the afternoon, topic A,  
8           pause, public comment, resume topic A, B  
9           and so on.

10                         With regard to those public comment  
11           sessions, we are hopeful that you -- if  
12           you have a thought that you want to share  
13           with the RPB, you'll tailor when you  
14           offer that thought to the topic that is  
15           under discussion. But it's -- there is  
16           no rule about that, so you are free to  
17           offer any question or comment on your  
18           mind you want to share with the RPB in  
19           any of these sessions, but we are hoping  
20           that this kind of lather, rinse, repeat  
21           works for you as well as for the RPB.

22                         So, bear with me. I know this is a  
23           lot of information, I'm almost done. I  
24           promise.

25                         We'll go to about 6 p.m. this

1 evening, and upon adjourning the formal  
2 part of the session, the RPB is inviting  
3 you to join them for an informal  
4 opportunity for dialogue in a more  
5 interactive fashion than we can  
6 accommodate during this part of the  
7 meeting.

8 So upstairs and down the hall there  
9 will be signs that will point you to the  
10 location. That will be an hour, from  
11 6:30 to 7:30, with some refreshments and  
12 discussion with members of the RPB. It's  
13 really intended to be an informal  
14 opportunity. There will be a little bit  
15 of structure to help focus around some  
16 particular questions or topics related to  
17 the ocean planning process, but it will  
18 be an opportunity for exchange.

19 We will resume tomorrow morning at  
20 9:30, come back to the discussion about  
21 stakeholder engagement, and as I said,  
22 take up the matters related to data and  
23 information and operational  
24 considerations, including the chart.

25 So, with regard to public comment,

1           if you would like to offer a public  
2           comment during any of the sessions that  
3           we have designated on the agenda, you can  
4           sign up. There will be instructions  
5           provided to you outside at the  
6           registration table depending how many  
7           people sign up for any given session.  
8           We'll do the math and figure out how much  
9           time you have. It will be between two  
10          and three minutes each, and I think I've  
11          said everything I need to say about  
12          public comment, as well as the informal  
13          session that's going to happen later this  
14          evening.

15                 So, just a couple of other sort of  
16                 housekeeping things that I want to point  
17                 out. We hope that you are aware that the  
18                 meeting materials were posted on the  
19                 RPB's website in advance. This was to  
20                 give you all an opportunity to see the  
21                 materials, you were invited to comment on  
22                 the draft documents that were posted as  
23                 part of the reading materials. We did  
24                 get some comments that we are -- we had  
25                 in mind has been brought to the attention

1 of all of the RPB members, and we can  
2 invoke as the discussion about different  
3 aspects of our agenda moves forward.

4 Furthermore, after this meeting, a  
5 full meeting transcript will be posted on  
6 the website, along with all of the  
7 meeting materials, the slides we'll be  
8 referring to today, and we also intend to  
9 post a participant listing, including all  
10 of the public participants who are  
11 attending this meeting.

12 If you have concerns and for some  
13 reason do not want your name to be part  
14 of that list, we ask you just let us know  
15 at the front desk so your name won't  
16 appear, and as we move forward with the  
17 web interface and aspects of the RPB's  
18 work and our dialogue and engagement  
19 through that platform, we've got some  
20 things we still have to iron out  
21 regarding postings, things that may be  
22 submitted to us -- submitted to us that  
23 have name and contact information and  
24 personal information. We'll have to work  
25 that out, but the idea you'll hear more



1           about is that the RPB wants to look for  
2           as many opportunities to engage you and  
3           be able to identify you and follow up  
4           with you as possible. I hope you'll take  
5           that in the spirit it's intended.

6                     Okay. So guess what? I think  
7           that's it for now for me.

8                     Actually, one -- a couple other  
9           mechanics. So those of you at the table,  
10          microphones, you press the little mute  
11          button when you want to turn it on. The  
12          red light is on, that means I'm on.  
13          If -- you can stay on when you don't have  
14          something to say, just to keep that noise  
15          at a minimum. If a lot of you start  
16          turning the microphone on, I can turn you  
17          all off. Be aware.

18                    Also, let's institute protocol.  
19          Once we open up for discussion, you want  
20          to get in the queue, you have something  
21          to say, put your name tent up, I'll track  
22          and call on you in the order I see the  
23          tents going up. If you have something  
24          you are dying to say, let me know, I'll  
25          let you bump in the queue, but that's the

1 way we'll manage the discussion, and we  
2 want this to be organic engaging and for  
3 you all to be contributing and  
4 participating in the discussion.

5 All right. So, at this point I  
6 would like to introduce Tony McDonald,  
7 our host -- one of our hosts here at  
8 Monmouth, director of the Urban Coast  
9 Institute at Monmouth University known to  
10 many of us. Tony, say a few words.

11 MR. McDONALD: Thank you, Laura,  
12 and everybody for coming today. This  
13 is -- I'm director of the Urban Coast  
14 Institute at Monmouth University, and  
15 many of you in the room know I have a  
16 checkered history with these issues  
17 working on them for many years. It's  
18 exciting for me to get to that point. I  
19 really welcome you on behalf of  
20 Monmouth -- from N.J. DEP who could not  
21 be here and wanted to express her welcome  
22 to New Jersey.

23 We are excited. We did all of the  
24 murals in a nautical theme. If you knew  
25 how much we care about the issues, it's

1 important to us, and this room is kind of  
2 your early -- that was a private home,  
3 this was actually an early day media  
4 room. They rent puppet shows behind  
5 curtain. They rent puppet shows before  
6 the iPads and iPhones. So, thank you,  
7 and we are happy we can share it with  
8 you.

9 I want to thank the RPB colleagues  
10 for all of the work I know that have gone  
11 into planning the meeting. I know it's  
12 hard and there is a lot of work into  
13 making this happen, as Laura was  
14 explaining, but for all of the work you  
15 are permitted to lying ahead we are  
16 excited about the level of commitment  
17 coming to Monmouth and contributing your  
18 time to this effort.

19 Now, at this time it's particularly  
20 difficult time to commit that who the  
21 heck knows what's going on in Congress  
22 right now. Hopefully you'll be able to  
23 get home after this. It's fitting and  
24 everybody in the audience knows you are  
25 coming to New Jersey and focusing on the

1 Mid-Atlantic, we are three-quarters of a  
2 mile and make sure you take that way,  
3 it's a fantastic spot to have a meeting  
4 like this. In fact, if you come to  
5 Monmouth, we opened a dorm on the  
6 waterfront, you may want to consider  
7 coming back to school if you like. So  
8 that's pretty exciting.

9 But for me as the director of UCI,  
10 it was formed in 2005 largely on the U.S.  
11 economic on policies. I came up from  
12 D.C. as the first founding director. We  
13 were permitted to bring these issues to  
14 the local and state level and coming to  
15 see this to fruition after these years.  
16 It's particularly a fortunate time in the  
17 Mid-Atlantic for everybody to pull  
18 together. That's clearly something we've  
19 learned from recent events that may be  
20 focused on different issues. The  
21 Mid-Atlantic coming together has never  
22 been clearer.

23 If you've been around, we've  
24 rebuilt some boardwalks, but there is a  
25 lot of hidden hurt and a lot of problems

1           needed to get solved recovering from  
2           Sandy, but you will be talking about the  
3           ecological resources and understand  
4           what's going on in the ocean so we can  
5           make sure we are addressing the  
6           fundamental problems for our ocean and  
7           coastal areas. The storm reminds us how  
8           precious the people and places are.

9           I know this will be a lot of  
10          process talked about today that's  
11          necessary. The people in the audience  
12          are hopefully patient with that. It's  
13          really important we get through that  
14          because reminding us of the people and  
15          places and not only the economic benefits  
16          of travel, tourism, ports, fisheries, but  
17          the rich fabric of fishers, retirees, the  
18          multi-generations of people that depend  
19          on the ocean and live on the ocean, as  
20          well as families and immigrants. It's  
21          important how the ocean is. We get  
22          removed from -- we need to remember this  
23          is good about the people and places as we  
24          work through all of the difficult work  
25          you have and the process you are

1           discussing the next two days.

2                     And the other thing about the RPB  
3           which is exciting to me and I really  
4           challenge you, we are not looking to the  
5           past, but the future. That's the other  
6           thing in my mind which is very much part  
7           of the charters and your commitment  
8           toward the future and look toward those  
9           challenging issues, ecological issues,  
10          alternative energy growth, and  
11          international trade, securities, these  
12          are issues for tomorrow and we are  
13          prepared for you to do that.

14                    And finally, I'll conclude, you are  
15          not in it alone. There is -- really is a  
16          lot of folks, some are here, but I know  
17          there are many in the region who are  
18          certainly committed to work with you. I  
19          am looking at the familiar faces and not  
20          familiar faces in the audience. You are  
21          not alone. There are people to help you  
22          advance that call. So if there is  
23          anything we can do as you work through  
24          your agenda, let us know, I'm sure  
25          everybody in the audience is more

1 committed than I to move the agenda  
2 forward.

3 Welcome to Monmouth. Here is to a  
4 great meeting and looking forward to it.

5 MS. CANTRAL: Did you say there was  
6 going to be a puppet show later?

7 MR. McDONALD: We can arrange that.

8 MS. CANTRAL: Good. Thank you for  
9 those remarks and your hospitality, and  
10 as Tony mentioned, there are a couple of  
11 RPB members who couldn't be with us. I  
12 did want to point out in particular a  
13 vision to Tony's note, Jack, who is our  
14 representative from Virginia, but also a  
15 fishing representative, as a member of  
16 the Fisheries Management Council had a  
17 conflict today. He chairs a standing  
18 meeting. He could not -- he has to be  
19 participating in and attending. He is  
20 really disappointed he is not here with  
21 us today and sends his regrets, but we  
22 have a lot of people here with us today,  
23 so I would like to invite all of you RPB  
24 members to introduce yourselves as we go  
25 around the room.

1           We'll start with Sarah. We ask you  
2           to give us your name, title and  
3           affiliation and then also answer the  
4           question -- just brief comment on the  
5           question in your view why is regional  
6           ocean planning important for the  
7           Mid-Atlantic and what is your No. 1 hope  
8           or desired outcome as a result of the  
9           process?

10           MS. COOKSEY: Thank you, Laura.

11           Good morning. I'm Sarah Cooksey  
12           from the State of Delaware and board  
13           member of the MARCO administrative board.  
14           I run our coastal resource and research  
15           along with those other duties assigned as  
16           the Department of Natural Resources and  
17           Environmental Control.

18           Quickly, what I'm looking to get  
19           out of it is the ability to make better  
20           decisions for ocean health and human  
21           beings through some sort of streamline  
22           process. And then when Tony mentions  
23           puppeteers and puppets, I thought another  
24           goal would be to reduce the number of  
25           puppeteers. Thank you.



1                   MR. ROSEN: Good morning. I'm  
2                   Marty Rosen with the Department of  
3                   Environmental Protection Coastal  
4                   Management. I'm serving to -- our  
5                   commissioner couldn't be here and like  
6                   Sarah, a member of the MARCO board,  
7                   New Jersey representative.

8                   What value today's session I think  
9                   should be fairly self-evident. Any time  
10                  you have a range of interests, desire to  
11                  utilize the common resource, it's better  
12                  to have a collaborative systematic data  
13                  driven approach to managing that and --  
14                  (inaudible) approach. I think planning  
15                  in any kind of reasonable way makes sense  
16                  this is a natural progression for  
17                  managing the ocean.

18                  What I want to see out of this?  
19                  You know, certainly in the wake of Sandy  
20                  and the impacts on the state, I would  
21                  like to see how ocean planning -- special  
22                  planning can be a positive force for  
23                  recreating a more resilient coast in the  
24                  coastal communities to address the  
25                  hazards less exclusive part of the

1 process and potential benefits. I want  
2 to see how this process pays tribute to  
3 that. Thank you.

4 MR. ATANGAN: I'm Joe Atangan. I  
5 represent the Joint Staff. I'm home  
6 based out of Norfolk, Virginia and work  
7 for the commander of the U.S. Fleet  
8 Forces Command.

9 For those not in the military,  
10 that's -- to put simply, is the home of  
11 the Atlantic fleet. As part of the  
12 Atlantic fleet, our priorities are  
13 reserving our military training ranges  
14 just off the coast here in the U.S. The  
15 Mid-Atlantic is a key component of that  
16 in that a majority of our training areas  
17 are right here just off the coast of the  
18 Mid-Atlantic regions.

19 Our goal for this process is to,  
20 one, streamline the dialogue that has to  
21 take place in order to preserve our uses  
22 for those training ranges. In the past  
23 we've had free range there. We went to  
24 those open oceans because that's where  
25 people weren't, but as industry starts

1 building and as more and more folks are  
2 gaining access to the areas that have  
3 traditionally been open, it becomes  
4 incumbent upon us to work with those  
5 folks to share the use of that area.

6 I believe this process right here,  
7 just the fact you are bringing in all of  
8 these states, all of the industry, all of  
9 the federal regulators, all these folks  
10 who have mutual interest in the ocean,  
11 that you bring them here together to  
12 start this dialogue, I think that's the  
13 key part of this piece, starting the  
14 dialogue to make sure that we prevent  
15 conflicts.

16 MR. CAPOBIANCO: Good morning. I'm  
17 Greg Capobianco and I'm here as an  
18 alternate on behalf of our New York  
19 State. I'm very pleased to be here  
20 today. I work for the New York State  
21 Coastal Management Program, which is  
22 housed now in the newly renamed Office of  
23 Planning and Development in the  
24 Department of State. I am the program  
25 lead for the Ocean and Great Lakes

1 Program and we have engaged in some  
2 state-based ocean planning for quite some  
3 time.

4 I guess what -- I'm very excited to  
5 be here -- I would like to see out of  
6 this process is some results from a wide  
7 conversation that is going to generate  
8 some better understanding about our  
9 unique needs and how our federal agency  
10 friends can really help the states and  
11 local government meet those needs. I'm  
12 looking forward to productive dialogue.  
13 Joe is right, this is the start of the  
14 conversation, but I'm very glad to be  
15 here for the start and look forward to  
16 working with you all.

17 MR. WALTERS: Good morning, John  
18 Walters, representing United States Coast  
19 Guard. What's important, multiple user  
20 potential conflicts all exist offshore.  
21 Coast guard interest here is ensuring the  
22 system functions and functions well to  
23 ensure the competitiveness of the  
24 United States, continues and our reach to  
25 the world continues to exist not

1 unfettered, but impeded so with everybody  
2 enjoys the benefits of marine  
3 transportation, international commerce  
4 and we continue to work with our partners  
5 in the Navy and states to ensure we are  
6 all healthy.

7           It's great to have these  
8 multi-jurisdictional entities all  
9 represented at the table here and the  
10 conversations since this organization or  
11 this body formed has just been  
12 outstanding. So much more education has  
13 been embedded with me as to who and  
14 what -- who is playing offshore and what  
15 is the impact to each other. We just  
16 hope for everything to continue and  
17 improve in the future.

18           MR. RAMOS: Good morning, I'm David  
19 Ramos with the U.S. Department of  
20 Commercial Natural Resources. Our  
21 interest here is really, first of all,  
22 recognizing that oceans provide a  
23 significant food source for a large  
24 population. We mostly do work on upland  
25 areas, private land owners, most of the



1 of balance. We call it things becoming  
2 out of balance. If we continue in this  
3 way it is just not a good thing with all  
4 of us here to learn how to manage in a  
5 better way and bring that balance back.

6 MS. SCHULTZ: Good morning. I'm  
7 Gwynne Schultz and I'm representing the  
8 State of Maryland. I'm the senior  
9 coastal ocean policy within the  
10 natural -- Department of Natural  
11 Resources and current the share of the  
12 mark co-management board.

13 With regard to why we do ocean  
14 planning, its importance, I really see  
15 this as an opportunity for us to be  
16 proactive, to get in front of a number of  
17 issues before they really do become a  
18 problem, and as I look out three years,  
19 five years, personally what I would like  
20 to see instead of us -- and by us, I mean  
21 government agencies, industry, NGOs,  
22 recreational groups, I would like to see  
23 us not spending as much time as  
24 protecting your own turf or promoting the  
25 self-interest by ourselves, but instead

1 working as a group promoting ourself,  
2 interests in collaboration and  
3 coordination with all of our other  
4 partners to achieve some common  
5 objective. It's about that process, in  
6 bringing that process together.

7 MS. BORNHOLDT: Good morning. I'm  
8 Maureen Bornholdt. Please don't call me  
9 Maureen. It's short and sweet to the  
10 point I'm hopefully all those things as  
11 well. I'm presently the program manager  
12 for the Offshore Renewal Program. It's a  
13 small bureau within the Department of the  
14 Interior, the co-lead -- and co-leader of  
15 this body.

16 My reason why thinking ocean  
17 planning in the Mid-Atlantic we are  
18 involved in a changing world. You heard  
19 from John talking about sustaining --  
20 sustaining maritime commerce. You heard  
21 from Gwynne it's no longer us, it's the  
22 we, that's the we and that's important  
23 about this effort. We are a changing  
24 community and the changing resources in  
25 credible demand.



1           My kind of end point is like what  
2           Gwynne mentioned and Sarah mentioned and  
3           the others before me, to cost cut across  
4           the stove pipes and have the dialogue and  
5           we can end up to work together, manage  
6           the resources and create an environment  
7           of discussion and instead of conflict and  
8           have the working relationship I can reach  
9           to Doug, talk to Sarah, talk to the folks  
10          that work with Sarah, so I know who to  
11          approach, where can I get information,  
12          science, traditional knowledge to help  
13          make our decision-making more efficient  
14          and informed.

15                 MR. ZEMBA: I'm Andy Zemba. I work  
16                 at the Department of Environmental  
17                 Protection in Pennsylvania, the director  
18                 of our Interstate Waters' Office.

19                 Although Pennsylvania does not have  
20                 any ocean front property, we feel it's  
21                 important for us to be here and part of  
22                 the discussion. You know we are part of  
23                 a number of interstate organizations,  
24                 whether it's Delaware River basic  
25                 economic, Chesapeake Bay program,

1 different organizations like that.

2 We need to protect the estuaries  
3 linked to the ocean. This is about what  
4 is our role in this really, what we are  
5 looking for to come out of this. You  
6 know, obviously things we do much like  
7 NRCS, we try to protect water quality.  
8 It's important to think about the  
9 economics in addition to the  
10 environmental resources. We've got ports  
11 in Delaware estuary. We have to be  
12 thinking about bottom line. We want to  
13 be part of this discussion as we move  
14 forward and develop a plan and  
15 appropriate how to deal with the  
16 different uses and balance the different  
17 issues.

18 MR. MACH: I'm Frank Mach with the  
19 Maritime Administration representative  
20 for the U.S. Department of  
21 Transportation. Maritime Administration  
22 essentially is on the books for carrying  
23 out the Merchant Marine starting with the  
24 1903 Act and going through the various  
25 other acts as they are updated

1 continuously. Those acts are basically  
2 set up to have us as advocates for the  
3 maritime free and marine transportation  
4 system and all of the things that support  
5 the marine transportation system, as John  
6 suggested, starting with shipyards,  
7 building shipyards and unions that work  
8 those yards, the ports and numerous other  
9 aspects of the industry that have  
10 commercial as advocacy needs, and my  
11 hopes here are we can take this body, as  
12 has been mentioned a number of times, and  
13 compact and streamline and various  
14 regulations in place and hopefully still  
15 maintain the environmental qualities  
16 already in place. Thank you.

17 MR. PABST: Doug Pabst, EPA. Call  
18 me Doug. My mom calls me Douglas. I  
19 have the pleasure being here representing  
20 the EPA Region II. I'm the chief of the  
21 dredging -- sediment dredging and have a  
22 history in the oceans and see a lot of  
23 familiar faces and look forward to  
24 working with everyone to do good. The  
25 Mid-Atlantic ocean does not recognize

1 political or other created boundaries.  
2 Potentially competing uses over the  
3 Mid-Atlantic across the boundaries  
4 necessitates our working together to  
5 clearly understand the resources. My  
6 hope through what everybody else wants,  
7 that we work together to establish a  
8 scientifically based approach that  
9 balances economic development with  
10 economic protection and we work together  
11 to protect the environment for future  
12 generations, and game on.

13 MR. BIGFORD: I'm Tom Bigford, I  
14 represent the Department of Commerce, and  
15 I specifically am from the National  
16 Ocean -- I work on habitat issues. My  
17 view here is very much related to my  
18 hope, I really look forward to us working  
19 together to improve the existing  
20 processes, to apply them to the new  
21 challenges out there in the ocean and  
22 make some quality decisions on difficult  
23 challenges, be much more efficient about  
24 that. Many people around the table and  
25 their agencies I work would've been at

1           that 35, 35 years in meeting new -- new  
2           people.  Hey we have to work together and  
3           develop relationships beyond where we've  
4           already been closely associated.  We all  
5           engage and commit to the process that we  
6           are all in like you say --

7                     MR. PABST:  Game on.

8                     MR. BIGFORD:  That's sounds good  
9           for me, too.  My hope, I get a chance to  
10          sign the charter before I retire in  
11          January.  So, that's a challenge to me  
12          and everybody else, but I would like to  
13          also like to change the other thank the  
14          other Department of Commerce and know  
15          people past and present who are in the  
16          audience know is deeply committed to this  
17          and nice to see a handful of people in  
18          the audience.

19                    MS. MCKAY:  Good morning.  I'm  
20          Laura McKay with the Virginia Coastal  
21          Zone Management Program.  I'm  
22          representing my boss, Rex Weeks, who is  
23          the chief deputy at the Virginia  
24          Department of Environmental Quality, and  
25          he sends his regrets he couldn't be here.

1           It's always hard being almost last.  
2           David has it the worst being the last.  
3           Tom could come up with something new and  
4           different, basically I think ocean  
5           planning is important. It's the wet  
6           equivalent what we've gone on the land  
7           with comprehensive planning and it's kind  
8           of shocking that it's taken this country  
9           so long to look at the ocean in that way.  
10          So I'm very grateful we have a National  
11          Ocean Policy. It's even an incredible  
12          opportunity for all of us to make a  
13          really historic difference in the way we  
14          deal with the ocean.

15                 So that's why it's important to  
16          look at it comprehensively so that all  
17          things are considered using the best  
18          available knowledge and understanding,  
19          and as Roddy say, looking ahead to many  
20          generations. It's definitely time we get  
21          started with that.

22                 One of my big hopes for this is  
23          that this forum that we've now created as  
24          a regional planning body is really  
25          institutionalized, we have a window of

1 time here to get this done. We hopefully  
2 have some funding for the next few years  
3 to keep this process going. I just think  
4 it's a huge responsibility on all of us  
5 to stick together and make this the way  
6 we do business in this country forever  
7 more. Thanks.

8 MR. NOBLE: Good morning,  
9 David Noble with the Department of Navy,  
10 Director of Environmental Planning and  
11 Conservation for the Navy's Mid-Atlantic  
12 region. I represent the Department of  
13 Defense, not only the Navy, Marine, Army  
14 Corps. of Engineers and Air Force in this  
15 process.

16 As many people said, this is long,  
17 long overdue. It's hard to believe this  
18 has not happened 10 or 15 years ago.  
19 Obviously, there were big pushes for land  
20 use planning on the upland and wetlands  
21 area and that sort of thing and  
22 staggering to think we've ignored the  
23 ocean for this long is certainly  
24 shrinking in a lot of ways. Even though  
25 sea level rising, might be expanding the

1 ocean in some ways, it's shrinking in  
2 terms of the uses. I'm interested in  
3 moving forward with working with  
4 different stakeholders and coming with --  
5 up with a balanced approach on allowing  
6 certain -- to accomplish its commission  
7 in an environmental competent manner.

8 MS. CANTRAL: All right. Thank  
9 you.

10 Thanks to all of you for sharing  
11 the reflections, and as we went around  
12 the table, the recurring themes of a  
13 changing world necessitates a change in  
14 the way we do the business of managing  
15 our oceans and relationships, building a  
16 relationship that you are starting to  
17 build as a group, and also working with  
18 the people who are of this region and all  
19 of the improved information that comes  
20 with those that development of those  
21 relationships can lead to better  
22 decisions and the collaboration and  
23 coordination that goes along with that.

24 As Tony pointed out, there is a lot  
25 of process that goes along with that, a



1 lot of what you are going to have to  
2 discuss today at your first meeting is  
3 going to be about a lot of process.  
4 Because we have -- we have to understand  
5 those things and make some decisions  
6 about how to function.

7 But I'm competent in working with  
8 this group that everyone really  
9 understands and is committed to the fact  
10 that it's fundamentally about the people  
11 and about the future as many of you said.

12 So, thank you for that, a great way  
13 to get started into our discussions, and  
14 at that point I think we'll turn to the  
15 next session on our agenda which will be  
16 a tag team effort among the three  
17 co-leads, and I think we made it clear in  
18 a random introductions Mo Bornholdt serve  
19 as the federal co-lead, Gwynne Schultz is  
20 the state co-lead, and Roddy Smith is the  
21 tribal co-lead. It's a triumphant that  
22 represent the three governmental sectors  
23 that sit on that body and that co-lead  
24 responsibility is anticipated by the  
25 charter and other procedures that those

1           responsibilities will rotate, but right  
2           now these are the three individuals who  
3           have that role and responsibilities and  
4           they are going to provide an overview of  
5           some of the activities to date. Since  
6           the RPB was formally established in  
7           April, and to present some thinking  
8           about -- some initial thinking about  
9           timeline for RPB activities over the next  
10          few years.

11                        So, I think Roddy will kick this  
12           off and bounce it among the three of us.

13                        MR. SMITH: Thank you again.  
14           Opportunities and challenges.

15                        Good morning, fellow RPB members,  
16           and thank you for those interested  
17           stakeholders for joining us today.

18                        We consider our progress and chart  
19           the next steps for the RPB, we are  
20           gathered here together today because of  
21           our personal and professional connection  
22           to the ocean, our roles in its  
23           stewardship. So these common connections  
24           stem from our appreciation of the fish  
25           and wildlife and other natural resources

1 the ocean supports, the cultural  
2 treasures that are important to  
3 understand our past and guide our future,  
4 and many of other livelihoods depends on  
5 the resources in the Atlantic Ocean. I'm  
6 confident you are participating in this  
7 meeting. There are better ways to manage  
8 the ocean, obtain and share better data,  
9 create efficient government  
10 decision-making.

11 I'm competent you share your  
12 interest in sharing myth Mid-Atlantic  
13 planning adds value, entities  
14 constituents, commercial and natural  
15 resources across of Mid-Atlantic region  
16 that depend on the ocean.

17 Our ocean and our uses of the ocean  
18 are dynamic. There are many  
19 opportunities and challenges on the  
20 horizon. To give you a few examples,  
21 offshore wind energy, expansion of  
22 commercial fishing when the Panama Canal  
23 project is completed, and operation of  
24 military bases, stewardship of our marine  
25 resources.

1           The Atlantic Ocean is a business,  
2           is place and demand for ocean area and  
3           resources are increasing our charge as  
4           Mid-Atlantic RPB to provide a forum for  
5           coordination and sharing all of the  
6           levels of government for agreed-upon  
7           goals and objectives. Using a process  
8           that is informed by the public and  
9           interested stakeholders, ocean users. So  
10          we must make the most of our opportunity  
11          to talk for the two days about these  
12          important opportunities and challenges,  
13          and on that note I turn it over to Gwynne.

14                 MS. SCHULTZ: Well, as members of  
15                 the RPB, we all engage in continuing to  
16                 ocean planning process and help the  
17                 region embrace future opportunities and  
18                 work through the challenges. Our purpose  
19                 is to coordinate federal, state and  
20                 tribal representatives to prepare to be  
21                 proactive and prepare for expanded uses  
22                 so we can ensure stronger coastal  
23                 communities and economies, as well as a  
24                 healthier ocean and ecco system, also  
25                 work to make sure -- make better and more

1 informed decisions about the use of ocean  
2 space and also make smarter use of our  
3 public resources.

4 Through that process, we are  
5 committing to work with stakeholders and  
6 the public to achieve our shared goals in  
7 this to occur throughout the entire  
8 planning process as we identify goals,  
9 objectives and work through our projects.  
10 As we take this charge, there is a number  
11 of important considerations for us to  
12 consider. First is really the key about  
13 the stakeholder engagement and that to me  
14 means coordinated stakeholders,  
15 scientific technical experts and members  
16 of the public to address all of our ocean  
17 and coastal issues.

18 Through this effort we are  
19 supporting the National Ocean Policy  
20 which calls for existing executive and  
21 legislative authority to strengthen  
22 coordination more effectively, to  
23 strengthen our marine stewardship as a  
24 collective of federal, state, tribal and  
25 fishery management. It's important that

1 each of our entities take action within  
2 our existing legal authorities and that  
3 the Mid-Atlantic RPB is not using any  
4 independent authority. We want to use it  
5 as a forum to provide for collective  
6 discussions.

7 And just as a reminder, we will be  
8 discussing, as we go on, each of the  
9 participating agencies are responsible to  
10 provide resources to support their own  
11 participation in this regional planning  
12 process. We need to think of the RPB as  
13 a forum to assist agencies in carrying  
14 out the existing core admissions and  
15 improved coordination with all of our  
16 counterparts. The bottom line is the RPB  
17 is going to provide for better, more  
18 coordinated an efficient collaborative  
19 process in an approach from many of the  
20 different federal law agencies and  
21 programs that are already in place. So,  
22 Mo?

23 MS. BORNHOLDT: Thank you.

24 Kind of picking up there, where  
25 have we been? Some of you were in the

1 audience in April when we established as  
2 an RPB and it was kind of fun to  
3 initially have that face to face and meet  
4 our cohorts around the table. So we got  
5 kind of the lift with regard to initial  
6 public input at that April workshop.

7 Since April what we decided to do  
8 is -- was identify different areas we  
9 needed to take our first leap to base our  
10 foundational materials. We did that  
11 through the work groups. I wanted to  
12 call out the co-champions. We had our  
13 stakeholder engagement with Tom and  
14 Sarah, kind of leading the charge there  
15 to collect some concepts and philosophy  
16 we can use in the dialogue today and use  
17 in the planning processes, as well as the  
18 regional ocean planning goals and  
19 geographic focus. We had Greg and Doug  
20 take on that important issue to kind of  
21 bring to the RPB table some initial  
22 concepts, provocative discussion groups  
23 to carry out the work with regard to  
24 operational administrative procedures.  
25 Joe, we tapped on Joe and begin to be

1           able to help us frame up with is a  
2           charter, how to make sure how our  
3           business is framed up so to see what our  
4           roles and responsibilities, et cetera.  
5           And cannot forget Dave and Laura McKay  
6           and John Walters from the Coast Guard.  
7           We use the informal groups to kind of be  
8           our brains to feed the dialogue we'll  
9           have today.

10                    The dialogue we had today with the  
11           August 1st webinar which was really,  
12           really successful participation on part  
13           of the RPB and input we received from the  
14           public all forming how we are thinking,  
15           how we are going to approach ocean  
16           planning.

17                    As Laura mentioned earlier, we have  
18           posted our materials on our website and  
19           encourage all of us to use around the RPB  
20           table, as well as those joining us today  
21           the website hosted on the OBY. If you  
22           look on the left there is a Mid-Atlantic  
23           employees use that our hope is folks  
24           around the table as well as people  
25           joining to us today, take a look at those



1 materials to foster really robust  
2 discussion and informed discussion on  
3 some of the challenges we have before us.

4 We also have another tool, we have  
5 an email address, and that's the  
6 Mid-Atlantic RPBAOEM.gov. We have --  
7 some are using that particular tool and  
8 our members use some of the  
9 correspondence and inquiry. We have data  
10 from our email website.

11 So, as Laura mentioned, we've  
12 intentionally structured this meeting  
13 today that we have the conversation  
14 around the table, take a pause, have  
15 public input and consider that, you know,  
16 as we move forward through our days and  
17 planning ahead for the next generation  
18 and tackling some of these administrative  
19 objectives and goals and other targets,  
20 how to deal with them and integrate them.  
21 This will inform our decision-making  
22 today as well as setting up a plan how to  
23 move forward in the next six months and  
24 the next five years begin you'll walk us  
25 through the outline today in our thinking

1 in that kind of thing.

2 MS. SCHULTZ: First, I would like to  
3 ask the members, I think if you turn to  
4 tab three, you'll see a copy of the  
5 timeline. For those of you in the  
6 audience, I know we provided a copy of  
7 the timeline on line and if you didn't  
8 print out a copy, there is also some  
9 posters around that show the timeline I'm  
10 going to be walking through.

11 What was established is through the  
12 draft timeline that brings us to a  
13 five-year period, and I'll start saying  
14 this is a draft, it's for discussion  
15 purposes, it's not cast in stone. I  
16 anticipate some modifications to this as  
17 we go over -- go through today's and  
18 tomorrow's discussion, and what we would  
19 like to do is walk through each of the  
20 bulleted items in the columns and first  
21 draw your attention to the very bottom of  
22 the page where you see that big bold  
23 arrow. That bold arrow calls out three  
24 things, says we are going to have  
25 continuous stakeholder engagement

1 throughout the process and ongoing data  
2 collection, sharing and integration, and  
3 we are also going to be seeing a lot of  
4 continuous adaptation of the products as  
5 we learn some lessons.

6 So taking a look at the column on  
7 our left, that is for covering the period  
8 from the rest of 2013 and going into  
9 2014. I call that Phase I. That's where  
10 we'll be organizing and identifying our  
11 goals and products.

12 First bullet talks about we are  
13 going to be organizing our operations.  
14 Things such as charter, which is a  
15 document that ensures that we have a  
16 clear understanding of our roles and  
17 responsibilities and --

18 MR. SMITH: To the RPB members,  
19 we'll be discussing that in more detail  
20 during Joe's presentation tomorrow. We  
21 are in the process of trying to discuss  
22 staff and what is our current capacity  
23 and current capacity needs. We'll be  
24 spending some time looking at work groups  
25 and what would be the best structure in

1 the work group, and also, especially as  
2 part of our stakeholder engagement  
3 activity, we'll be looking at the  
4 creation and how to create different  
5 advisory bodies. That does get into the  
6 second bullet, we'll be extending a lot  
7 of time and talking about during the next  
8 day or two identifying and instituting  
9 the mechanisms.

10 Third bullet really is very  
11 aggressive in that it's saying by the end  
12 of 2014, we will have vision on goals,  
13 objectives, specific actions, principles  
14 and geographic focus established. This  
15 is an ambiguous timeline. I anticipate  
16 we'll be revisiting this over the next  
17 couple days to say is it feasible, and  
18 how to approach it, can we meet the  
19 deadlines?

20 Down to the fourth bullet, we  
21 anticipate working on the first iteration  
22 of the work plan during this first phase.  
23 A work plan outlines activities and  
24 milestones for the RPBs and should  
25 describe what is the overall planning

1 process, what are the key milestones and  
2 products available and required  
3 resources, as well as describing how the  
4 RPB will engage stakeholders in the  
5 public planning process.

6 So, finally during this 2013 and  
7 '14 time frame, we anticipate in the  
8 beginning and/or continuing development  
9 of the suite of products, the first one  
10 being a regional assessment. This is  
11 where we analyze relevant information  
12 about the marine environment and the  
13 human activities in the region. Some of  
14 the elements that may be included in  
15 assessment would include biological and  
16 geophysical conditions, human uses and  
17 economies and future needs of proposed  
18 uses.

19 The next product is -- we call it  
20 capacity assessment, and that's a process  
21 where we identify existing resource as  
22 Initiatives at the regional, state,  
23 tribal and global levels that may help  
24 support marine planning. We look at  
25 those products and tools and data

1 expertise and any of the things that help  
2 to contribute to advancing our regional  
3 goals and objectives.

4 One of the tools we'll be  
5 discussing during that meeting is the  
6 MARCO portal, the Mid-Atlantic portal.  
7 It's important to meet some of our data  
8 and information needs.

9 Shifting to the middle column up,  
10 during 2015 and '16, we would work to  
11 implement the work plan, and then also  
12 refine it as we learn lessons, and so we  
13 are also going to be completing our first  
14 iteration of a number of products.  
15 That's where we hope to meet the regional  
16 assessment and capacity assessment.

17 As we work through the planning  
18 process and we monitor and evaluate our  
19 activities, we'll see the need  
20 potentially for certain additional  
21 products and information to pull in  
22 additional expert analysis and data and  
23 information. One of the possible  
24 products would be an ocean plan, and at  
25 this stage the RPB is not really

1 determining the exact nature of what is  
2 meant by ocean planning.

3 So what we are thinking is for now  
4 we are going to set that question aside  
5 and focus more on undertaking and  
6 completing our initial products and we  
7 would revisit this concept of an ocean  
8 plan during the second phase.

9 During this time frame, 2015 and  
10 going beyond that, we really anticipate  
11 that the region is going to be beginning  
12 to experience really some of the benefits  
13 of our work, and you'll see on the  
14 timeline just a couple of those bullets:  
15 Increased collaboration, heightened  
16 awareness, increased leveraging, greater  
17 predictability. And so we need to --  
18 we'll start seeing some of it in the  
19 outcoming of our work.

20 Finally, during the last phase from  
21 2017 and '18 is where some of our  
22 products we've produced will be refined  
23 based on lessons learned, some products  
24 finalized and hopefully we are well  
25 underway with implementation.

1           So just as a reminder, before I  
2           hand it back to Laura, this is a draft  
3           for discussion, and we look forward to  
4           everybody's input. Thank you.

5           MS. CANTRAL: All right. Great.

6           So, now we've got some time to have  
7           some discussion about anything that was  
8           shared by the co-leads, in particular  
9           with regard to the draft outline that  
10          Gwynne just walked through with all of the  
11          caveats that she included, and I would  
12          also like to point out that some of the  
13          questions and impressions for this time  
14          range may become clearer over the course  
15          of our discussion later today and  
16          tomorrow.

17          So we've intentionally built time  
18          into our agenda later tomorrow to revisit  
19          this because some things may become clear  
20          and occur to you as we go through some of  
21          the subsequent discussions.

22          With that said, we would like to  
23          invite your questions, comments and  
24          reactions, thoughts about what Gwynne has  
25          presented, the three phases. She went



1           into a lot of detail about the first  
2           phase, but obviously that's where you are  
3           right now and projecting out what that  
4           might suggest, the farther out into the  
5           other years and any other phases. So any  
6           thoughts?

7           MR. ROSEN: Typically, planning  
8           processes, common aspect of it is to have  
9           measures of success for progress. I  
10          didn't hear that mentioned this morning.  
11          So I know we are in the early stages.

12          Do you anticipate that will be a  
13          component of the planning process? And  
14          we should be thinking about that now or  
15          part of the work plan process?

16          MS. SCHULTZ: I would anticipate it  
17          as part of the work plan. We would  
18          identify mechanisms and monitor and  
19          evaluate our progress in a more -- that's  
20          up for discussion, but in a little bit  
21          more of a structured mechanisms versus  
22          kind of ad hoc lessons learned.

23          MS. CANTRAL: Sarah?

24          MS. COOKSEY: This is just a  
25          comment at this point, and I'm not

1           addressing it to just the co-chairs but  
2           everybody in this room for us to banter  
3           about.

4                     It's unclear to me how we can pull  
5           all of this together without having what  
6           we are saying we might not do the ocean  
7           plan. So I still don't have figured out  
8           in my head, especially when I see already  
9           we've had some turnover in our board so  
10          what will be left at the end of the day  
11          other than an ocean plan. So that's just  
12          if someone has an answer I would -- would  
13          love to know what that is, but it's food  
14          for thought at this point.

15                    MS. CANTRAL: So this notion of  
16          what it is you are actually creating is a  
17          plan or an ocean plan. This has been  
18          coming up in some of your communications.

19                    Does anyone want to offer a thought  
20          about Sarah's comment?

21                    MS. COOKSEY: We've been through  
22          the idea of a process as well.

23                    MS. MCKAY: I think that is a  
24          really key concept. Are we creating a  
25          plan or are we creating a forum and

1 process, a place to solve problems? I  
2 don't quite know the answer, but I do  
3 know that plans have a tendency to be  
4 static and sit on a shelf and I assume  
5 none of us want that.

6 So what we call this may be a  
7 little bit problematic to me. Process  
8 makes a little more sense. We've created  
9 this for the RPB. We have the data and  
10 tools being developed and more and more  
11 data being collected. That will be done  
12 as well into the future. And so trying  
13 to define what a plan would look like is  
14 really difficult and I'm not sure how to  
15 go about it. I feel more comfortable  
16 talking about a process and a baseline of  
17 current resources and using and working  
18 together to determine how we want those  
19 resources and uses to shift over time.  
20 So I am sorry, not an answer, but just  
21 the way it feels in my head.

22 MS. CANTRAL: Yes. This is the  
23 kind of reflection and dialogue we want  
24 and Sarah was inviting with the document.  
25 We have Doug and Joe.

1           MR. PABST: This is the essence of  
2           the conversation we've been having,  
3           talking about the goals you get involved  
4           in, what do you want it to look like  
5           versus what are you trying to do, and we  
6           really haven't defined whether it's a  
7           widget, a machine or process. That has  
8           not been defined. We've had good  
9           conversations about what we would like to  
10          do and what I think it's going to be an  
11          evolving process a little circular in  
12          some of the conversation I think evident  
13          during my talk, whether it's a car or a  
14          train, I think it's going to be some form  
15          of transportation that gets us somewhere,  
16          and hopefully gets everybody to the same  
17          place. That's what we've been trying to  
18          focus on, just getting all of us to speak  
19          the same language and look at the same --  
20          through the same lens, and the data  
21          portal has been helpful in that, you  
22          know, and language has been an issue for  
23          a lot of us in government at this state  
24          and federal level, what we mean when we  
25          say a lot of things.

1           I don't think we have a specific  
2           answer, but I lean towards something  
3           living, not just another plan that gets  
4           put on a shelf. I like the way you said  
5           that. I think it's widgets at that point  
6           that does a lot of good things that we  
7           are trying to figure out right now.

8           MR. ATANGAN: The military has a  
9           lot of plans, we develop a lot of complex  
10          plans, and I think it was Grant who said  
11          the beauty of plans -- well, in the some  
12          of the beauty of plans it's the war plans  
13          are only good until you make sure you  
14          first contact with the enemy. So I think  
15          that we really don't need so much to --  
16          it does not have to be one or the other.  
17          It does not have to be a process or a  
18          plan. I think it's a combination of  
19          both. You have to look at the developing  
20          a plan in order to develop that process  
21          and it's that -- it's that working  
22          towards that plan that will help you  
23          identify the processes that you are going  
24          to need to employ in order to achieve  
25          what's in that plan, in order to identify

1           were you going to diverge from that plan  
2           when you realize that we've got this  
3           great plan that will sit on a shelf and  
4           it's a few years old now and does not fit  
5           the bill anymore, how are we going to  
6           change it? How are we going to modify  
7           this thing? So it can be implemented  
8           based on the most recent information we  
9           have.

10                         So, I guess what I would like the  
11           body to do is let's stop what is it going  
12           to be, a plan or process? Let's set a  
13           mark, proceed and develop that process  
14           towards that mark and we'll figure it out  
15           once we get there. But I think if we sit  
16           here and discuss, well, is it going to be  
17           a process or plan, we'll be here next  
18           year talking about the same thing.

19                         Let's move.

20                         MS. CANTRAL: Let's take a couple  
21           other thoughts on this as I see Tom and  
22           Frank.

23                         MR. BIGFORD: Well said. Joe, I  
24           agree there and there is another way to  
25           slice this. It might be different to the

1 regional planning body and public. I  
2 think the public also will benefit from a  
3 process or plan and will help them  
4 develop business plans to respect where  
5 we are in a couple years whether it's  
6 wind power, offshore agriculture or  
7 different tanker separation we are not  
8 aware of, another endangered species I  
9 don't know.

10 It's going to be different to the  
11 people in the audience and the sectors  
12 they represent and those may be involved  
13 more in the official planning regulatory  
14 roles. So that's another angle to this  
15 which is really important -- we are using  
16 but so are the people in the audience.

17 MR. MACH: I have a question. The  
18 National Ocean Council has established a  
19 handle for the regional planning values.  
20 I'm not an expert, but there is probably  
21 some guidelines in the handbook to push  
22 us in the right direction. It's obvious  
23 Mid-Atlantic has certain areas that are  
24 specific to the area and has to be  
25 modified to reflect those specifics. But

1           there should be some overall guidance  
2           that would help us out.

3           MS. CANTRAL: You are right, and I  
4           think that's a good point. There is a  
5           lot of helpful guidance and advice and  
6           suggestions in the handbook, and also  
7           part of that handbook, those of you who  
8           are familiar with it, is the motion of  
9           flexibility. So that regions can design  
10          their processes and what you call the  
11          things, widget or train that you are  
12          designing in a way that makes sense for  
13          your region, your stakeholders, your  
14          needs and your goals.

15          MR. MACH: The charter which Joe  
16          has been working on for the northeast  
17          group is probably a template for us and  
18          hopefully a template for the other RPBs  
19          as they are established around the  
20          country.

21          MS. CANTRAL: Absolutely.

22          MR. MACH: Another common goal  
23          would help us in working with our  
24          organizations or RPBs around the country.

25          MS. CANTRAL: Yes.



1           So what I'm hearing out of this --  
2           what I'm hearing out of this dialogue,  
3           you are comfortable with the notion of  
4           what it is you are doing you don't want  
5           it to be static, you want it to be an  
6           ongoing living process, a forum and  
7           process, an opportunity for articulating  
8           goals and developing strategies for  
9           coordinating activities and carrying  
10          those out within existing authorities in  
11          order to reach those goals, and that you  
12          are thinking -- you're thinking about  
13          this is going to be evolving. We are  
14          here today to start that evolution, to  
15          have some good discussion about what do  
16          we think about the goals we want to  
17          identify, and if we are landing on the  
18          right set of goals, how do we carry those  
19          out and achieve them and what are the  
20          strategies, what is the work plan so we  
21          can measure our success as we endeavor  
22          and what is the overall timeline for key  
23          markers along the way.

24                 Anything else on the timeline or  
25          any of the other comments from the --

1 before we shift into our next discussion?

2 So, then, Gwynne, I'll turn it back  
3 to you. Gwynne is going to present some  
4 ideas that had been developed by MARCO  
5 about the relationship between that  
6 entity which is represented, obviously  
7 many people sitting here around the  
8 table, and the RPB, so what does that  
9 look like and what are some ideas for  
10 some synergy and taking advantage of some  
11 good work that's being done in the  
12 context of MARCO? Gwynne.

13 MS. SCHULTZ: Thank you.

14 Before I start the presentation,  
15 what I would like to do is just briefly  
16 define MARCO. For those of you that may  
17 not be living and breathing it, like some  
18 of us are, MARCO, which stands for  
19 Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the  
20 Ocean, was established in 2009 by the  
21 governors of New York, New Jersey,  
22 Delaware, Maryland and Virginia to work  
23 on shared regional ocean issues that we  
24 believe would benefit from interstate  
25 collaboration and coordinated problem

1 solving.

2 It's a partnership that we believe  
3 provides early valuable forum in order to  
4 meet our mutual goals. By the  
5 Mid-Atlantic states, the MARCO board  
6 members who are here, Sarah Cooksey  
7 represents the State of Delaware, Marty  
8 Rosen represents New Jersey, Greg  
9 Capobianco represents New York, I  
10 represent Maryland and Laura McKay  
11 represents the State of Virginia on the  
12 MARCO management board.

13 So, we coordinate frequently in  
14 working through some of our management  
15 challenges and opportunities.

16 So, we think that by MARCO and the  
17 Mid-Atlantic RPB working together we  
18 promote greater and more effective  
19 governmental and private investment and  
20 also generate more attention on the  
21 priority of Mid-Atlantic issues to  
22 accomplish its objective. MARCO is  
23 offering a number of products and  
24 services to the Mid-Atlantic RPB for the  
25 ocean plan. I'll walk through the first

1           one being Mid-Atlantic, ocean portal  
2           stakeholder engagement and the third, a  
3           preliminary regional ocean assessment.

4           So, the first service that we have  
5           and product is our Mid-Atlantic Ocean  
6           data portal. What the Mid-Atlantic RPB  
7           is actually going to need relevant and  
8           credible data and undertaking to ocean  
9           planning an accomplish that MARCO is  
10          offering the portal for its use, and  
11          during the presentation tomorrow, when we  
12          get into the portal, Laura is going to  
13          spend more time in walking through what  
14          the portal is, what it can provide as a  
15          service, and there will be an opportunity  
16          for the RPB to engage in discussions and  
17          see how much -- to what degree one  
18          engages as a viable tool for the ocean  
19          planning.

20          If we do move down that direction,  
21          MARCO will work to ensure that data  
22          quality criteria are developed and  
23          adhered to and connect to adding  
24          additional data relevant for ocean  
25          planning and also make the portal and

1 associated visual tools available for  
2 stakeholders.

3 The portal is a collaborative  
4 effort not only among our states, but we  
5 have a very strong team in the Monmouth  
6 team, that even includes a number of  
7 different organizations and entities, and  
8 Laura will be getting into more of that  
9 tomorrow.

10 The next service that we would like  
11 to provide to the RPB is one of  
12 stakeholder engagement as MARCO is  
13 composed a lot of, you know, from the  
14 states we have close connections to a lot  
15 of our constituents with our local  
16 governments and also with the businesses  
17 and different communities along the  
18 coast.

19 So, what we would like to do is  
20 engage stakeholders been we've been  
21 engaged in stakeholder to inform them of  
22 our activities, but we see that doing  
23 some of this on behalf of the RPB can  
24 really help move our efforts forward, and  
25 that any of the insights that we gain and

1 information we gain will be shared with  
2 the Mid-Atlantic RPB on a regular basis.

3 And finally, the authorized item we  
4 will get into a little bit more after  
5 discussion, Tom will help out with the  
6 regional OSHA assessment as a reminder  
7 assessment used as maps and information  
8 to describe the ocean environment and  
9 human activities we believe that it  
10 should leverage work by states, federal  
11 agencies around then that it should be  
12 coordinated with and use the data  
13 contained in the portal.

14 Right now we've got a team of  
15 regional partners going to have some  
16 limited funding and want to work together  
17 to initiate work on this kind of  
18 preliminary ocean assessment in order to  
19 kind of use components of one of those.

20 That's a brief overview, and the  
21 rest of today and tomorrow we'll be  
22 revisiting this issue about the various  
23 issues or services that MARCO can provide  
24 and hoping at the end of tomorrow we have  
25 a better sense of future direction.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. CANTRAL: All right. So we  
3 have a few minutes and we would like to  
4 invite some discussion around what you  
5 just heard from Gwynne's three categories  
6 of products and services that MARCO can  
7 contribute to the RPB effort, the ocean  
8 data, part stakeholder engagement and  
9 helping get started on the regional ocean  
10 assessment. As Gwynne said, the details  
11 how this relationship is these  
12 contributions will play out in practice I  
13 think will make more sense and get into  
14 as our discussion moves forward this  
15 afternoon and tomorrow. But for now, it  
16 would be helpful to hear any reflections,  
17 any questions for clarification, any  
18 contribution to management. MARCO  
19 management board members want to make to  
20 what I just summarized? We just want to  
21 hear kind of a general gut check, comfort  
22 level, the nature of this relationship  
23 and in what Gwynne has described.  
24 Thoughts?

25 MR. WALTERS: It makes sense for

1           the RPB to work closely with MARCO on the  
2           portal. It does not make any sense to me  
3           to develop -- develop another portal or  
4           access point for all of the ocean data.  
5           How we access or for that cooperative  
6           agreement if one is to be established how  
7           do we interact with the MARCO board if  
8           the portal does not meet all needs of the  
9           federal aspects. There is an exchange of  
10          funds that would have to occur, but this  
11          is a stumbling block on all of our  
12          agencies. So, funding is provided by  
13          NOAA for a certain amount of work to be  
14          performed by the Monmouth team to keep  
15          the portal active. How do we -- if we  
16          see there is an avenue or aspect of the  
17          portal that's not meeting our needs, how  
18          do we get those needs met? Is there  
19          because there is a task order to the team  
20          to develop certain functions? How do we  
21          go about having that expanded to  
22          incorporate more of what's needed?

23                   And the discussion yesterday at the  
24                   developmental team meeting, it was  
25                   explained that the portal is more of a



1           30,000 foot strategic view of the world  
2           at large in the ocean. And yet we are  
3           going to tackle individual projects,  
4           issues, problems, planning on the ocean  
5           the refinement is not there. We can't  
6           delve down so far. We have enough finite  
7           or information what we are dealing with.

8                        So I would like to propose or what  
9           I'm thinking is maybe identify what we  
10          really need to help the portal meet all  
11          of our needs, maybe not 30,000 foot, but  
12          500 foot level to tackle some of the  
13          things come up. There needs to be some  
14          issues addressed offshore and more feed  
15          is needed to use the tool effectively.

16                      MS. CANTRAL: So, in listening to  
17          your remarks, it sounds like you are  
18          flagging two good examples which we'll  
19          get into more details.

20                      With regard to the data portal, and  
21          we'll be having discussion about that  
22          tomorrow afternoon, some of the questions  
23          that you just posed, I think will need to  
24          be part of that discussion, and then some  
25          discussion about the nature of the

1 relationship and how we document that  
2 relationship and there is -- so that I  
3 think is going to be part of the charter  
4 discussion and some ideas met. So, thank  
5 you for providing evidence of the fact  
6 that we are going to need to get, now,  
7 further into these discussions as we take  
8 up the additional topics.

9 MR. MACH: Just a question, John.  
10 The Coast Guard has a number of studies  
11 going on right now considering offshore  
12 commercial, is any of the data from those  
13 studies being inputted to this portal?

14 MR. WALTERS: Not yet. We are  
15 working on it. We have a team working  
16 with Gwen Kraton and Nature Conservancy.  
17 There is a meeting coming up next week in  
18 Baltimore and Hamilton on the 2nd where  
19 MARCO is meeting with the port interest  
20 and Coast Guard's studies is also  
21 participating in those meetings, and the  
22 goal, I believe, is to incorporate or use  
23 this tool to come up with a findings and  
24 results of the port access route study.  
25 This tool we are looking at is very

1 important to determine where marine  
2 transportation is headed and to identify  
3 those impediments or additions to the  
4 ocean environment for marine  
5 transportation needs to consider all  
6 those various aspects of what's happening  
7 in the ocean. We look at this as a tool  
8 to help that, and right now -- that's why  
9 we are having these meetings, to identify  
10 where the shortcomings are, to identify a  
11 good -- really, really good deal.

12 MR. MACH: Those studies are being  
13 conducted off not only the Atlantic but  
14 Pacific and Gulf.

15 MR. WALTERS: I'm not --

16 MR. MACH: Correct me if I'm wrong.

17 MR. WALTERS: I think there is one  
18 on the west coast, but not yet off the  
19 ground.

20 MR. MACH: The results of -- to get  
21 the results inputted to this study  
22 hopefully.

23 MR. WALTERS: I'm not sure that's  
24 spelled out yet.

25 MR. MACH: Maybe that's something

1 to explore.

2 MS. CANTRAL: All work in progress.

3 MS. BORNHOLDT: That brings a good  
4 point, not only for Coast Guard and the  
5 types of studies you do, but the rest of  
6 us around the timetable to have  
7 environmental studies and regulatory  
8 responsibilities that gather that type of  
9 data, but let me take a step up in  
10 altitude, and again -- and the rest of  
11 the MARCO board present around the time  
12 this is the kind of porte cochere. I sit  
13 in Herndon, not near the coast and to be  
14 able to have that ability to reach out  
15 and benefit from the work the coastal  
16 states have done in understanding the  
17 issues on the landscape from the  
18 perspective from the residents and users  
19 is unique and important for to us embrace  
20 that we don't have the resources to go  
21 out and reinvent the wheel. This kind of  
22 leveraging is at the hub of the  
23 philosophy.

24 Thank you MARCO board for making  
25 this offer for as tool as we move

1 forward. I appreciate that.

2 MS. CANTRAL: I see I'm thinking  
3 we'll go around the table in order and  
4 see where we are. Once you've all had a  
5 chance to speak. Sarah, Joe, Greg and  
6 Laura.

7 MS. COOKSEY: I'm going to be kind  
8 of obvious here. We haven't had any  
9 other options presented to us other than  
10 MARCO stepping forward. So that would  
11 have been nice, but we don't have that.  
12 I think it's wise for us to act on the  
13 options we were given, and again, it goes  
14 without saying, I just want to make sure  
15 everyone in this room, especially the  
16 public, understands that MARCO is  
17 primarily supported by federal funds  
18 through the Coastal Zone Management Act,  
19 of which have been declining, and now  
20 regional ocean management and  
21 partnerships have been added to our  
22 portfolio of work, and we've been very  
23 grateful for the small amount of money we  
24 have gotten that has allowed us to do the  
25 great work with -- trust and TNA,

1 et cetera to help us in the portal and  
2 other scientific information.

3 So, just to keep expectations sort  
4 of understood, I think the ability for us  
5 to move forward will be directly related  
6 to our finances.

7 MR. ATANGAN: Actually, I stole  
8 some of the thunder, I was a federal  
9 agency guide who didn't know how to spell  
10 MARCO a couple years ago. I want to  
11 thank what MARCO has done in advancing  
12 this cause. I do believe we are -- even  
13 though it seems like we are not far  
14 along, we are farther along than where we  
15 would be because of the efforts that have  
16 been taking place with -- you know, with  
17 MARCO's effort.

18 So, as a federal, I want to thank  
19 all of the states participating in MARCO  
20 and believe they are a critical partner  
21 in moving this effort along. I  
22 appreciate the resources piece. And  
23 certainly, you know, we are all hurting  
24 with resources, but if there is anything  
25 we can do on the federal side to push

1           this along, we'll most certainly try to  
2           do that. I couldn't go without saying  
3           thank you to the MARCO folks for  
4           advancing this cause.

5                     MS. CANTRAL: Greg?

6                     MR. CAPOBIANCO: Thanks again for  
7           the overview.

8                     The key thing that I'm thinking  
9           about, and I know I'll have more  
10          discussing it, but to queue it up for  
11          food for thought today, what is the best  
12          way to have enduring meaningful  
13          stakeholder contributions to the work we  
14          are about to undertake and it's  
15          complimented. You know, there is -- I  
16          think the states are in a good position  
17          to reach out to their constituents, and  
18          MARCO is comprised of the five states.  
19          We've done a lot of that already, but the  
20          question is -- I guess one of big  
21          questions is, what is the structure? Are  
22          we going to have committees? How are we  
23          going to do this? What is the feedback  
24          loop? How do we, as government so often  
25          does, how do we avoid letting down the

1 stakeholders with what office and lack of  
2 follow through and you know how do we  
3 really, I think, boil down what are the  
4 questions we are going to be asking and  
5 what are we seeking input on?

6 I think there is -- you know, to me  
7 that's a real pivotal turning point for  
8 us to be productive and it does take the  
9 resources, and it's a huge issue, and I  
10 think if the MARCO portal is a traffic  
11 tool, there is a lot of regional data and  
12 one of the things we can start to talk  
13 about is how could we start to focus down  
14 and bring more state-based data onto that  
15 portal. That's a big lift but something  
16 we should start thinking about that  
17 requires a lot of issues regarding  
18 compatibility and scale and so forth, but  
19 there is work happening with the  
20 stakeholders that are not being captured.  
21 How do we do that? I'll stop there, but  
22 those are key issues that are rolling  
23 around in my mind.

24 MS. CANTRAL: Mark? Laura. Mark?

25 MS. MCKAY: I want to remind



1 everyone and RPB members and public on  
2 the portal there is a nice location that  
3 needs priorities and a feedback button on  
4 that page. There is a built-in mechanism  
5 and I hope people will use that to say  
6 when you identify a data layer you were  
7 on the portal going to that data, needs  
8 data priority section, hit that feedback  
9 button and type it in what it is you are  
10 looking for and like to see.

11 That's a way starting to collect in  
12 one place what those needs are, what are  
13 those issues, whether it's, you know,  
14 more fine scale shipping information or  
15 if it's a state beta layer you have that  
16 would be suitable for the portal we have  
17 that built in to collect those ideas.

18 So I think that's a good start for  
19 this, and then once we have those in  
20 there in an organized fashion, I think  
21 MARCO can work with the RPB and negotiate  
22 how are we going to get those data  
23 layers, where will we find the funding to  
24 get that data done. I wanted to make  
25 that reminder.

1 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you for that.

2 So, I think we are at a point if  
3 someone else has something, those of you  
4 have your cards up have already spoken.  
5 So I think we'll adjourn for lunch, and I  
6 think what I heard in the last round of  
7 comments about Gwynne's presentation and  
8 offer from MARCO is that the synergies  
9 between the two MARCO and the RPB are  
10 going to be essential for a number of  
11 reasons, the fact that this work is  
12 underway, the kind of institutional and  
13 relationship that MARCO already possesses  
14 and the fact that resources and  
15 leveraging resources is always going to  
16 be essential in times of limited budget.

17 So, I'm hearing that the offer from  
18 MARCO is very much appreciated, the  
19 nature of that relationship is going to  
20 continue to evolve, and you are right,  
21 Greg, some of the things related to  
22 stakeholder engagement. We'll get into  
23 even this afternoon to talk about some  
24 ideas regarding what could structure look  
25 like, and I think for now we should all

1 take a break and go have some lunch and  
2 come back and resume those discussions at  
3 1:00 o'clock.

4 For those of you in the public  
5 joining us, lunch opportunities I'm told,  
6 the best -- your best option is at the  
7 MaGill Commons building which is just  
8 across the way. And there is a map if  
9 you don't know where to go. Stop at the  
10 front desk and get a map and go enjoy  
11 some lunch and join us again for more  
12 good discussion starting at 1:00 p.m.

13 (Whereupon, a luncheon recess  
14 was taken at 12:00 p.m.)

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1                   (Whereupon, the meeting  
2 resumes at 1:10 p.m.)

3                   MS. CANTRAL: I think we are ready  
4 to get started. Welcome to those of you  
5 that were with us this morning and those  
6 of you with us now this afternoon.

7                   We have been joined by an  
8 additional person, by the regional  
9 planning party, and when you were  
10 introducing yourself -- I would like to  
11 call on Karen Chytalo to introduce  
12 herself and get back right into our a  
13 general.

14                   MS. CHYTALO: I'm Karen Chytalo  
15 with the New York State Department of  
16 Conservation, the Bureau of Marine  
17 Research Services working out of Eastern  
18 Long Island, Eastern Setauket. I'm the  
19 assistant chief of marine resources. I  
20 appreciate being here today, and we do  
21 have a nice crowd and hope we have a nice  
22 diverse crowd of different stakeholders  
23 to join us on this day.

24                   One of the questions we were asked  
25 originally to look at had to do with what

1           we want for from ocean planning and I  
2           think it's high time that we do plan.  
3           It's makes a whole lot of sense. It's  
4           practical. There is a lot of activities  
5           going on and a lot of users and people  
6           who just want to appreciate the sound,  
7           ocean. The ocean can't take all of the  
8           activity you have -- we have to work  
9           together to see what is going to be our  
10          vision. I hope one of the outcomes of  
11          this meeting is we do have a nice and  
12          good shared vision amongst all of the  
13          stakeholders, as well as the regional  
14          planning body and that will be good. We  
15          have firm goals and know what we are  
16          driving towards and can really get our  
17          feet on the ground and do something, we  
18          do come up with a regional plan for the  
19          Mid-Atlantic. It's an important body of  
20          water and important for our stakeholders  
21          and resource holders and our resources we  
22          need to have a good body of water out  
23          there. Thank you very much.

24                   MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. And  
25          you -- first of all, your comments have

1           been shared by many of the colleagues  
2           that said similar things this morning,  
3           and second of all, you set me up well to  
4           introduce the next session, which I would  
5           like to do now and turn to a discussion  
6           of the initial draft, regional ocean  
7           planning goals that have been under  
8           development.

9                     You are aware from Mo described  
10           this morning that the RPB has broken  
11           itself up into several working groups to  
12           jump start the thinking and to have some  
13           ideas to present in this forum for full  
14           brief discussion, and those groups have  
15           focused on different aspects of the work  
16           before you, and among them is the  
17           development of goals for regional ocean  
18           planning and objectives, whether or not  
19           you need to have a statement, a vision  
20           that goes along with that and other  
21           aspects that Doug Pabst, as one of the  
22           co-champions, along with Greg Capobianco  
23           will describe for you.

24                     So, let me outline -- this is going  
25           to be the part of the agenda where we see

1           how the environment works starting a  
2           discussion, getting into that discussion,  
3           taking a break, hearing public comment  
4           and coming back to the discussion.

5           So, it's going to require some  
6           careful navigation and some of the  
7           attention by all of us to track the many  
8           lines of discussion and questions that we  
9           want to put on the table and have some  
10          good dialogue, and part of that is to  
11          keep -- my job to keep us all organized,  
12          and before I turn it over to Doug, let me  
13          point out a couple things regarding  
14          timing.

15          We are starting a little bit late,  
16          that's fine. We've got a good amount of  
17          time to get through this afternoon. But  
18          at 2:00 o'clock, wherever we are, we are  
19          going to stop for our public comment  
20          section. That's what we advertised we  
21          will do and pick back up where we left  
22          off and keep going.

23          Doug, you'll get your ten minutes,  
24          I promise.

25          MR. PABST: I need 15. (Laughter.)

1 MS. CANTRAL: It's important to  
2 underscore the discussion the RPB is  
3 having about a few things related to  
4 goals, development and geographic goals,  
5 the framework for developing its regional  
6 ocean planning goals, including what kind  
7 of stakeholder engagement the RPB wants  
8 to have in finalizing those goals and  
9 further shaking the details.

10 So framework in the process is one  
11 thing, a discussion, a focus on the  
12 substantial of the initial goals that  
13 have been identified and there is a  
14 heritage of where that all came from that  
15 we can talk about, but to reflect on that  
16 and identify a process for finalizing.

17 Then we'll move to a discussion  
18 about the geographic focus. As I said,  
19 pause for public comment, whenever  
20 2:00 o'clock arrives, and we resume the  
21 discussion and wrap up before we move to  
22 our next topics which is stakeholder  
23 engagement.

24 Does that make sense?

25 So, Doug, off to you.



1           MR. PABST: Thank you. I'm still  
2           Doug Pabst from EPA, and welcome back  
3           from lunch. I seem to go after lunch.  
4           I'm not sure how that works. I want to  
5           thank the co-leads for that leadership  
6           and acknowledge my colleagues and the RPB  
7           in general in making this happen, that --  
8           give a shout out to Greg, New York State  
9           rocks and Meridian for helping to make  
10          stuff happen.

11          We have limited resources, we need  
12          to be strategic as possible. We can't do  
13          everything. We need to figure out what  
14          we can do and what are the most important  
15          areas to focus on. You are going to see  
16          in the presentations some of the thinking  
17          to get the RPB's input and public's  
18          input, whether or not it wants to develop  
19          a vision, which Karen set up for that  
20          lovely segue, and a robust discussion  
21          about goals and priorities that can be  
22          approved and implemented in the future,  
23          and this can serve as a foundation for  
24          the work plan we talked about earlier on  
25          in the different boxes in the chart

1           that's outside as well.

2                     Just to get even more boring, let's  
3           talk about terminology. That's obviously  
4           something we all found that people mean  
5           different things when they say different  
6           things. What we have up here is what we  
7           consider the definitions of these items  
8           to be and my apologies to Merriam  
9           Webster. They are not perfect, but to  
10          give us a common understanding.

11                    Vision is a desired future state  
12          and the goal is a statement of general  
13          direction or intent. Again higher-level  
14          principal, little lower level, but a  
15          quality or element determining the  
16          intrinsic nature of characteristic  
17          behavior of ocean planning. And  
18          objective is a statement of a desired  
19          outcome or observable behavioral change  
20          that represents the achievement after  
21          goal.

22                    Somebody mentioned metrics before,  
23          that is a step towards that particular  
24          item as well.

25                    Now, possible next steps, and this

1 is sort of getting into the what we  
2 discussed earlier we can do would be does  
3 the RPB want to develop a vision? Do we  
4 want to develop a some of the principles  
5 for achieving growth and government  
6 coordination and efficiency and the full  
7 range of interest to account using the  
8 best data and information available and  
9 after we develop goals and principles, we  
10 can start drilling down to objective and  
11 actions to achieve those goals and  
12 principals.

13 Laura mentioned that we've got some  
14 questions that have -- are going to be  
15 layered in and this talks about questions  
16 for the RPB and for the public.

17 Does the RPB wish to articulate a  
18 high-level vision for the route they are  
19 hoping a achieve through regional ocean  
20 planning, if so will we craft a vision  
21 statement as next step? We'll come back  
22 to that as Laura mentioned.

23 Now, thoughts about goals. I want  
24 to know how the group decided to take  
25 this date. This has been in discussion

1 form for years and maybe years before  
2 that, but really everything is sort of  
3 coming together now. The criteria we had  
4 in mind, including things like what  
5 aspects we heard about regional ocean  
6 planning in the past, what desired  
7 outcomes have we heard that rise to the  
8 level of a vision or would be more  
9 appropriate as principles or even  
10 objectives. That was a filter we  
11 applied. We want to identify ideas about  
12 goals that would benefit everybody, not  
13 just specific interests or localized  
14 parochial areas for example. And we  
15 wanted to achieve balance.

16 I think we've heard that word a lot  
17 about boosting economic growth and  
18 natural commercial and protecting and  
19 restoring ecosystem health which we view  
20 as interlinked and the examination uses a  
21 new proposed use of the ocean. We want  
22 to identify areas that we think are  
23 achievable and we don't want to set  
24 ourselves up for failure and we want to  
25 maximum compatibility.

1           And I appreciate the input I got  
2           from -- input I got from stakeholder  
3           prior to that and we've had many  
4           opportunities, and again, all of us have  
5           been at this for years and heard a lot of  
6           input over the years.

7           I wanted to touch base on what was  
8           business based on the 2013 MARCO work.  
9           We want to improve government efficiency  
10          and function improving stakeholder  
11          engagement, a lot of similar themes  
12          throughout a lot of this, maintain access  
13          for fisherman and recreational users,  
14          protect ecosystem health, resolve ocean  
15          space use, improving shipping efficiency  
16          and navigation facilitating offshore  
17          entity and military readiness, adapting  
18          to changing conditions, having scientific  
19          basis for ocean planning and establishing  
20          metrics of success. A lot of  
21          commonalities among the stakeholder group  
22          on these areas.

23          And this is what the ocean policy  
24          had said. You can see a lot of  
25          similarities. I'm not going to read

1 through all of these, very similar,  
2 everybody wants to do similar things  
3 which is really good.

4 Now, here is our first shot. It's  
5 in draft, Mid-Atlantic RPB goals.  
6 Hopefully we'll have robust conversations  
7 or unanimous consent and a lot of  
8 yielding that goes along with it. We put  
9 the definition on the bottom in case you  
10 forgot what we mean by goal. I know I  
11 have.

12 We wanted to start with  
13 facilitating responsible renewable energy  
14 protecting habitats and ecosystem  
15 functionality, ensuring existing  
16 traditional uses, ensuring sufficient  
17 access to ports and retaining areas for  
18 military testing, training and  
19 operations. We need to keep in mind that  
20 to achieve meaningful benefits within a  
21 reasonable time frame in the context of  
22 constrained resources, that's a mouthful,  
23 meaning, we are not going to get any more  
24 money and hold onto what we have, and we  
25 need to do this in a time frame that

1 people will believe and stay committed to  
2 the cause.

3 These are consistent with the  
4 National Ocean Policy keeping our  
5 resources in trust for all Americans.

6 Again, some other questions to  
7 discuss, looking at the definitions we've  
8 offered for planning and terminology and  
9 list of initial draft goals. Is the RPB  
10 comfortable with regional ocean planning  
11 goals at this scale and level of detail?  
12 Do any of the initial draft goals need to  
13 be modified? If so, how?

14 Again, if there is other questions  
15 that pop up, we are trying to get the  
16 ball rolling here. We also talk about  
17 hazard resilience. I think we hear the  
18 word resiliency quite a bit and seems to  
19 be a term everybody is throwing around.  
20 Climate change is getting a lot of  
21 attention. It's good to see it's here  
22 and needs to be part of this  
23 conversation, and Tony eloquently laid  
24 out this morning this is a region still  
25 hurting, hidden hurt and recovery going

1 on. We need to adapt to that an changing  
2 climate and figure out how to deal with  
3 the future hazards and threats and  
4 whatever term you like to use. We need  
5 to weave that into everything we are  
6 doing and need to have discussion about  
7 exactly what that means.

8 Based on everything we heard to  
9 date, this is what we've come up, and  
10 again I've got the definition on the  
11 bottom so people can remember in the  
12 context of our discussions. We want to  
13 increase government coordination and  
14 efficiency. If we can do that, we would  
15 be happy. Improve stakeholder engagement  
16 and everyone feels confident we need to  
17 do that, and it's important. I'm happy  
18 to hear that. Provide for current and  
19 future ocean uses probably going to have  
20 some conversations about that.

21 Use the best existing and new ocean  
22 data to provide a shared scientific  
23 foundation for ocean planning and  
24 improving decision-making.

25 Again, principles are defined -- we



1           can go back if we need to, and the  
2           question is for us to consider, again, do  
3           any of these draft principles need to be  
4           modified? If so, how? And I think  
5           that's transition point.

6                     I'll turn it over to Laura.

7           MS. CANTRAL: All right. Thank  
8           you, Doug, and thank you to the work  
9           group that put together the thinking on  
10          this, and what I would like to do is try  
11          to bring attention back to some of the  
12          questions that Doug posed, not that these  
13          are the only questions, but to get us  
14          started in the dialogue and try to track  
15          it sort of in the sequence of the way  
16          that information was presented, which, as  
17          you'll recall, the -- he started with an  
18          overview of the planning terminology, and  
19          many of you are planners in this room and  
20          you know there are all kinds of  
21          definitions for these terms in a planning  
22          process. You can spend a lot of time  
23          arguing about definitions and putting  
24          together different kinds of frameworks,  
25          but this is one and it acknowledges there

1           are elements of a planning process that  
2           should be accounted for and this work  
3           group took some time to parse out what  
4           you all have been hearing in the  
5           stakeholder workshop in April and MARCO  
6           meetings and federal agency meetings that  
7           took place before that and going back to  
8           2009 when there was a regional workshop  
9           here to talk about the kinds of issues  
10          that we are still talking about today.

11                 So, you know what? I said we may  
12          not need to go back to the slides, but it  
13          would be helpful to go back to your  
14          definitions. Not that we need to have a  
15          conversation about all of these  
16          definitions, but just since one of the  
17          questions that Doug and the work group  
18          have put on together and are asking of  
19          you is and I think we know what Karen  
20          thinks about this question about a  
21          vision.

22                 Do you want to articulate a  
23          high-level vision for the future that the  
24          RPB is hoping to achieve through this  
25          process, something that is achievable

1           that ocean planning contribute to, is  
2           that something you would like to commit  
3           to doing, and if so, then let's have some  
4           discussion about how you would go about  
5           doing. I'm opening for some comments on  
6           that point, Joe?

7           MR. ATANGAN: I guess the first  
8           thing that comes to mind is isn't there a  
9           vision statement already articulated in  
10          the National Ocean Policy? And the  
11          question would be why do we need a  
12          separate vision? Shouldn't that be the  
13          overarching one and the goals and  
14          principles and objectives would be in  
15          support of that vision or articulated?

16          MS. CANTRAL: So --

17          MR. ATANGAN: That's --

18          MS. CANTRAL: -- a reasonable  
19          approach, again, to back to a comment and  
20          exchange we had earlier to a question  
21          about the handbook. There is -- that  
22          stuff exists as part of the National  
23          Ocean Policy, and the National Ocean  
24          Policy with regard to regional ocean  
25          planning provides for applicability.

1           The question might be do you want  
2           to look at that decide that that even  
3           captures it for you or do you want in  
4           some way to simplify that or add to it?  
5           I think that my hunch, working with you  
6           folks is that you don't want -- you are  
7           not going to have much aptitude for a  
8           long envisioning process. Those things  
9           can be time consuming and take a lot of  
10          energy, and there is probably a better  
11          way, and maybe Joe's approach is  
12          something that could be a reasonable way  
13          to have that included as part of this  
14          framework. Doug?

15                 MR. PABST: Yes. Thanks.

16                 Clearly, we would start there given  
17          the discussions that have happened over  
18          the course of getting to this point. I  
19          think we probably would want to put some  
20          qualifiers in that statement and focus  
21          more, but I don't think it's going to  
22          require months of work to look at that,  
23          at least I hope it doesn't. That is  
24          something for the RPB to decide if they  
25          wanted to accept the national statement

1           or they wanted to drill down a little  
2           bit, which I think there was an interest  
3           in many of our calls to do that, but we  
4           would start with the national vision at a  
5           minimum.

6                     MS. CANTRAL: Right. Other  
7           thoughts? Frank?

8                     MR. MACH: I would also say I think  
9           the vision is very well-outlined for us,  
10          but jumping maybe ahead of myself, I  
11          think the goals are -- am I ahead of  
12          myself?

13                    MS. CANTRAL: You are.

14                    MR. MACH: In advance of goals we  
15          have in mind have been discussed in  
16          numerous times over the various meetings  
17          and I think they are brought enough in  
18          a -- with, you know, as we --

19                    MS. CANTRAL: Right.

20                    MR. MACH: I can skip my time.

21                    MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Duly noted.

22          (Laughter)

23                    We want to get to that soon. I  
24          want to hear and need some sense of a  
25          group that you are comfortable with.

1 This idea of simplified approach to  
2 including a vision, articulating a vision  
3 as part of this framework and if so, next  
4 step for how to do that.

5 You were about to comment?

6 MS. SCHULTZ: Starting out with the  
7 vision to make sure we spend some time to  
8 make sure it's relevant, all of it is  
9 relevant to our region, and that I do  
10 like the idea of shorter process, simple  
11 one-page vision, not anything really,  
12 really going to take a long time, and  
13 then going to put that out for some  
14 public input, but keeping it short,  
15 concise and relevant.

16 MS. CANTRAL: Okay. I'm seeing  
17 some nodding. Let me try this: What I'm  
18 hearing is that you like this general  
19 approach, so perhaps the next step would  
20 be for the work group and the staff team.  
21 I'm saying this with -- my caveat here is  
22 we are going to have more discussion  
23 about the composites of work groups and  
24 functionality of the work groups, exactly  
25 who takes this next step would be an open

1 question for the moment, but putting that  
2 aside, the next step would be to  
3 develop -- develop a first draft,  
4 circulate that among all of you for some  
5 review and comment, and then take it out  
6 to some public review or comment and that  
7 we would be folding the idea would be to  
8 fold this into the package of goals and  
9 later on objectives, actions and other  
10 things that would be developed as this  
11 matures. Folks okay with that?

12 (Chorus of ayes.)

13 MS. CANTRAL: All right. Good.

14 So, with regard to -- I think we  
15 are now ready to turn to where you want  
16 to go, Frank --

17 MR. MACH: Yes.

18 MS. CANTRAL: -- with regard to the  
19 initial draft goals.

20 Is there anything else before we  
21 talk about the substance of the goals?  
22 Is there anything else that people have  
23 on their minds regarding this framework  
24 of how the work group is defining what  
25 the goals are that are fairly

1 substantive? Things that are more  
2 process-oriented kind of goals you could  
3 call them goals. Those are reflected as  
4 principles in their construct and  
5 objectives and things you are acting  
6 going to do that are appreciable,  
7 achievable timely, et cetera, that are  
8 going to be how you operationalize the  
9 goal.

10 Is everyone comfortable with that  
11 framework?

12 (Chorus of ayes.)

13 MS. CANTRAL: So, let's turn to the  
14 work group's substance of ideas about the  
15 goals, and I think it's important to keep  
16 in mind that an objective of this  
17 discussion is to refine these initially  
18 as you see fit so that you all are  
19 comfortable with taking these ideas out  
20 for some stakeholder input, and that may  
21 mean you want to include as part of your  
22 discussions some ideas or examples of  
23 what those objectives might be just so  
24 people know how are we actually doing  
25 this kind of thing now that you made a



1 decision about it, but to give people  
2 enough to react to and have some good  
3 discussions.

4 I think part of what we are going  
5 to talk about later that afternoon when  
6 we really get into stakeholder  
7 engagement, how to engage the  
8 stakeholders around the development of  
9 goals and objectives.

10 Frank started us off with one  
11 reflection on the goals as they are  
12 articulated here, but I would like to  
13 hear other thoughts about what you see  
14 here and what the work is presented.

15 John?

16 MR. WALTERS: The first goal  
17 facilitates responsible renewable energy  
18 development, may be too limiting as the  
19 pro stated all of the above and though we  
20 are focused on renewable energy with  
21 offshore wind development, apparently  
22 New York, New Jersey are entertaining an  
23 import or export of L and G. There is  
24 potential of fossil fuel development  
25 offshore and other renewable -- nuclear

1 is also on line in the State of New  
2 Jersey as a couple nuclear reactors went  
3 on the coastline, I believe. Are we  
4 being too limited by saying renewable  
5 energy development and not including all  
6 other --

7 MS. BORNHOLDT: We may be too  
8 limiting not coming from the point of  
9 energy development. We had Super Storm  
10 Sandy. I know there is incredible  
11 effort. Many of us around the table are  
12 being involved with being able to use  
13 sand resources and offshore resources in  
14 coast restoration should it be ocean  
15 energy and not so it's just food for  
16 thought.

17 MS. MCKAY: It's not my personal  
18 view but I have to say, but in  
19 representing the Commonwealth of  
20 Virginia, our governor wishes to proceed  
21 with offshore oil development and a  
22 couple months left in his administration  
23 and there will be an election in  
24 November. So I'm not sure where that  
25 will head. I have to make that comment

1 for Virginia.

2 MR. ROSEN: Not all states share  
3 that opinion.

4 MR. PABST: That is when you put a  
5 bullet on a page. There should be a page  
6 that accompanies the bullet. Some of  
7 these things might be better phrased, but  
8 clearly for existing uses and regulatory  
9 authorities that is sort of part of the  
10 ensuring access and we continue to do  
11 that the hazard resilience effects  
12 looking at existing structure, but to  
13 facilitate responsible renewable energy  
14 was -- development was part of the newer  
15 challenges to avoid figuring out some of  
16 the conflicts that seem to be arising.  
17 All of this was discussed during the work  
18 group deliberations.

19 This may not be the best language  
20 to discuss those things is my point. You  
21 are not trying to take a stand before any  
22 particular action. We were trying to lay  
23 out themes that we had heard through the  
24 president's plan or stakeholders and  
25 things.

1 MS. CANTRAL: All right. We've got  
2 several people who want to chime in.  
3 I've have Joe, Tom, Karen, Greg. Take it  
4 in that order. Joe?

5 MR. ATANGAN: I certainly  
6 appreciate the political winds that you  
7 know might prompt some of these --  
8 achieving some of these goals. As we  
9 proceed down this process, we need to put  
10 those things aside a little bit and look  
11 at it from a non-political perspective.

12 So, yes, alternative energy is  
13 right now and fossil fuels are not, but  
14 we may -- that may not always be the  
15 case. We need to be somewhat flexible in  
16 how we articulate, you know, what our  
17 goal statements are. Even though it's  
18 unpopular right now and governors will  
19 disagree, what is the prudent thing to do  
20 we need to set that aside and look at it  
21 as we are doing this.

22 This is not a political process.  
23 We have to base it on what the scientific  
24 now what -- it's got to be science based  
25 and what, you know, planning for future

1 uses. What's not popular now may be  
2 popular later on and we may be adaptive  
3 to that. So certainly I agree with Mo in  
4 that maybe it should be limited to just  
5 energy use. It could be total ocean  
6 development for, you know, as the phrase  
7 in there, to allow us to -- remember,  
8 these are high-level goals which they are  
9 subsets and objectives that we are going  
10 to have to plan for.

11 MS. CANTRAL: Tom?

12 MR. BIGFORD: To me the key word is  
13 responsible and like Joe I'm thinking  
14 beyond that. You can fill in the blank  
15 afterwards. What's new about -- what's  
16 so tantalizing about renewable energy it  
17 is rare. There is a new sector that  
18 develops. It's rare. We have an  
19 opportunity to do something responsible  
20 from the beginning, more responsible than  
21 we've done in the past. In the past we  
22 have been responsible according to the  
23 metrics of that time, but now we have  
24 higher expectations for us and the  
25 sector. So whether it's floating

1 airports, floating nuclear energy plants  
2 or whatever exists elsewhere in the  
3 world, we want to be more responsible  
4 about it now than we would have been in  
5 the past. That's our challenge and  
6 that's with we have to do.

7 So for me, the way it's worded is  
8 good, but I like Joe's approach. We want  
9 to be more responsible for anything that  
10 happens in the Mid-Atlantic, but  
11 renewables is our first opportunity to  
12 show that, wind power especially.

13 MS. CANTRAL: Right. Karen?

14 MS. CHYTALO: I agree with you,  
15 Tom. This will be the first time we are  
16 showing that we are pro or we want to  
17 help make this new type of energy occur.  
18 There have been other supporters of the  
19 other type of energy and there is a  
20 moratorium for no oil and gas exploration  
21 out in the Mid-Atlantic. That would be a  
22 major change in policy if we promote  
23 anything along that line. I like to say  
24 responsible in development.

25 I like what Maureen said, minerals

1 management, too. That's another avenue  
2 that we have to examine to make sure we  
3 are using those precious resources out  
4 there near shore and offshore and in the  
5 oceanic sand resources out there and that  
6 would be a responsible use, too, or  
7 materials management development.

8 MS. CANTRAL: Do you want to  
9 respond just to that point?

10 MR. BIGFORD: Just make the  
11 comment, sand resources is a euphemism  
12 for habitat and protecting habitat means  
13 protecting the sand that might be mined.  
14 It's just not a resource that would be  
15 harvested, it's habitat that would be  
16 taken.

17 MS. CHYTALO: That's why we would  
18 have to have ensuring that we are  
19 protected to be responsible in how it's  
20 used. No. 1, we have to be good stewards  
21 of the ocean. That's something we have  
22 to demonstrate, good stewards, and taking  
23 care of the ocean and we are protecting  
24 the habitats and ecosystems and making  
25 sure they function and resources can

1 migrate up and down the coast without  
2 getting stuck in the way or -- and we  
3 have to ensure those migratory corridors  
4 are open and clear. That comes first.  
5 And see how we fit into some of these  
6 other resources minimize the conflict  
7 between those type of things.

8 That's why I think it's important  
9 to keep that word responsible in there to  
10 ensure, you know, but also we are looking  
11 for -- we have to think of about the  
12 future of other resources. Do we need to  
13 have those oceanic drawer areas? That is  
14 a possibility. Rather than nearshore  
15 area that's where we are in.

16 MR. BIGFORD: Sand harvest.

17 MS. CHYTALO: We have a lot of --  
18 that have not been perfect. Now, there  
19 are issues that's -- let's put it that  
20 way. We have to explore beyond that and  
21 start looking at some other types of  
22 things, but at the same time ensuring  
23 those habitats. I don't think these  
24 things stand alone. These goals have to  
25 work together.



1 MS. CANTRAL: That's right. I was  
2 going to point that out, but thank you  
3 for making that comment.

4 MR. CAPOBIANCO: This is getting  
5 fun already, getting fun already. I will  
6 just be frank because that's how I am.  
7 Actually I'm Greg because -- (Laughter)  
8 I guess this body, we all have our own  
9 jobs and responsibilities. I represent  
10 the State of New York. State of New York  
11 does have a moratorium on offshore gas.  
12 We are not interested in wasting or  
13 spending time with offshore oil and gas  
14 in this forum. This is for shared ocean  
15 issues. There are plenty of shared good  
16 ocean issues we can work on in regards to  
17 language the faux pas we made, was not to  
18 put up offshore wind. That's the  
19 challenge of the day and exciting  
20 challenge in the wind. All five states  
21 are engaged and working towards it. This  
22 body can help make it move forward.

23 That's really a very important  
24 thing. Meaning, you know, at the end of  
25 the day, we have to -- may have a mine

1 field of goals between what the federal  
2 agency partners want, what the states are  
3 bringing to the table and what the  
4 stakeholders are asking and the  
5 constituents are asking.

6 I made some notes. I'll put them  
7 out here at the risk of being  
8 provocative. At the end of the day,  
9 New York -- we are looking to get  
10 something out of this process. Starts  
11 with the development of goals. We want  
12 to work cooperatively and productively  
13 towards achieving the goals. The first  
14 goal is about jobs and clean energy. And  
15 I think what we know has is contemplating  
16 is seeking some kind of relief or way to  
17 reduce timeframes and costs of permitting  
18 to move offshore and renewable wind  
19 forward, and it's no fault of anybody's  
20 that the previous mess has taken  
21 regulations that were designed for oil  
22 and gas drilling in the Gulf of Mexico  
23 and operating under that same rubric for  
24 offshore wind. Maybe we can do this a  
25 little bit smoother and faster and

1 generate a regional industry.

2 On the offshore habitat, sides  
3 extremely committed to fisheries. We  
4 need to start with the canyons because it  
5 makes a lot of sense to me. That's the  
6 place where there is structure and a lot  
7 of diversity and place we are having a  
8 lot of ocean discovery right now. And  
9 that's another way of protecting and  
10 maintaining jobs that are important to  
11 New York.

12 The third piece, these are -- what  
13 I'm trying to do is demonstrate the  
14 consistency or connection of a particular  
15 state's goals are compared to what's up  
16 and the federal half said and stakeholder  
17 have said and third is commerce. It's  
18 job, navigation safety and maritime  
19 industry growth. We have a Panama Canal  
20 being widened, things are going to  
21 change, not just large ports, but short  
22 sea shipping and a whole range of  
23 maritime-related industry job growth,  
24 opportunities we should be thinking about  
25 in trying to figure out how to grow that

1           and facilitate ramping that up and moving  
2           that for the last piece which we touched  
3           on, the sand. The idea Doug touched on,  
4           resiliency, touching everything New York  
5           and New Jersey in particular, but, you  
6           know, resiliency is not something new to  
7           the Mid-Atlantic states.

8                     One of the -- to me, one of the key  
9           things is I understand the sand habitats,  
10          but there is a great need in New York for  
11          sand. A lot of smart discussions already  
12          have taken place right now thinking about  
13          what makes the most sense where would we  
14          take sand? What are the latest  
15          technologies we need to take sand? How  
16          can we do that in a way to protect to the  
17          best of our ability offshore habitats and  
18          enhances and protects current natural  
19          properties. See, for example, moving  
20          offshore, as Karen suggested and taking  
21          the sand deeper off, further off the  
22          coast you might be allowing some of those  
23          articles sand repels slowly and naturally  
24          replenish beaches.

25                    I don't want to be long winded, but

1           there is a lot of things on the table and  
2           a lot of things New York is interested in  
3           getting on the table, and the goals are a  
4           good start.

5                     I'm anxious to try to craft a  
6           language we agree on and I'm really  
7           interested in hearing stakeholders today  
8           and as we go forward what the people have  
9           to say. We have to get the goals right  
10          now before we start doing anything else  
11          productive. I'll stop there, but thank  
12          you for the time.

13                    MS. CANTRAL: Thank you, Frank.

14                    MR. MACH: It sounds like the way  
15          it's written or focused on renewable  
16          energy, dropping renewable you can cover  
17          all of the energy possibilities that  
18          might come along for us to consider we  
19          become more general.

20                    MR. CAPOBIANCO: Yes.

21                    MS. COOKSEY: I was going to move  
22          us on, but Greg had done a good job, but  
23          specifically No. 2, I don't think it's  
24          enough to protect habitats and ecosystem  
25          functionality. I think the ecosystem is

1 beginning to break or is already broken  
2 and I think we should have words such as  
3 improve or restore as well as protect.

4 MS. CANTRAL: Okay.

5 MS. CHYTALO: Well, yes. I want to  
6 agree with Sarah, some habitats have been  
7 affected out in the ocean and what can we  
8 do to protect them more or do things to  
9 bring them into some sort of restoration.

10 We have restoration of the historic  
11 site, dredged material site out in the  
12 ocean right now and that's been restored  
13 in a sense changing the quality of the  
14 sand and contaminants. There are things  
15 we can do with a lot of our projects and  
16 protect and improve and restore. They  
17 are very important words we should be  
18 putting out there.

19 I have one question with that goal  
20 when we talk about ecosystem  
21 functionality we are talking about -- I  
22 mentioned earlier the corridors,  
23 migration corridors, moving up and down  
24 the coast that are very important to our  
25 states that you know we utilize in and's

1 resource fisherman are using those  
2 resources. How can we assure they have  
3 that access to is that clearly  
4 articulated in that goal the way it is  
5 stated right now. I'm just not sure we  
6 can what words we put in there to enhance  
7 that.

8 MS. CANTRAL: Sarah, just a  
9 clarification to your point. When you  
10 said that you -- it's your view that  
11 habitats doesn't capture it all, it's  
12 broader than that. Can you talk a little  
13 bit more?

14 MS. COOKSEY: The word -- my issue  
15 was protect. Fishing is down, we know  
16 there is contamination and there is a lot  
17 that we don't know.

18 Also, since I have the floor, on  
19 the second bullet, I don't think we  
20 should leave the words fishing and  
21 recreation to just -- to just the EG.  
22 It's important to -- more important  
23 enough to not have them in the  
24 parentheses and somehow back to the  
25 vision. We need to capture what is

1 unique about our region, the people, the  
2 fishing and military.

3 MS. CANTRAL: That may be the  
4 detail you can add looking at the  
5 national statement and customize it to be  
6 presenting what is unique and important  
7 about your region so then it's not that's  
8 one opportunity.

9 And your point, what kind of words  
10 we need to think about to capture your  
11 idea. So keep in mind what you are  
12 talking about right now are some broad  
13 goals, statements, a definition for that  
14 that's reflective of this broadness, and  
15 part of what we want to get out of our  
16 discussion today is are you comfortable  
17 enough with this set given that you got  
18 some ideas for some refinement and you --  
19 there is some discussion about your  
20 references for the way they are written  
21 right now, but are they generally  
22 capturing what you want to take out to  
23 have some public engagement about and  
24 hear more about the ideas both at the  
25 ideas you are referring with each other



1 and ideas that are going to be offered to  
2 you that I may haven't even considered  
3 yet.

4 The notion that one of you is, I  
5 think, more than 16 you have articulated  
6 this is -- that this set of goals and  
7 this process overall is about identifying  
8 what this group and this process can do  
9 to address some common needs and  
10 opportunities that all of the  
11 Mid-Atlantic states share, and they are  
12 not going to be all of the needs and  
13 opportunities every region -- it's making  
14 a decision where you can start and add  
15 value to seizing the opportunities,  
16 whether it's wind -- wind or other things  
17 and addressing things and some critical  
18 problems like habitats. So, who is --  
19 Marty?

20 MR. CAPOBIANCO: Yes, I think you  
21 captured it, the last bit of your  
22 remarks. I wanted to remind people,  
23 again, there is a thing -- saying in my  
24 office called one is the boil down and  
25 what are we going to do? And, you know,



1 all of our handling habitat or geared  
2 towards future threats and resiliency.  
3 That is something the group should talk  
4 about. If we need a specific resilience  
5 towards the climate goal we can do that.  
6 It was all ingrained in our planning. We  
7 needed to make that an overarching part  
8 of our thought process.

9 MS. CANTRAL: All right. John, you  
10 are up.

11 MR. WALTERS: Regarding marine  
12 transportation, I believe the word was  
13 sufficient access? I would suggest we  
14 place that -- efficient and safe. It  
15 means -- efficient means you can go  
16 hundreds of miles but it's not efficient  
17 and very safe.

18 MS. SCHULTZ: I just encourage us  
19 and we get into the discussion of the  
20 goals that we have now is that we  
21 continually look back at one of the  
22 slides that Doug put forth about the  
23 thoughts of the goals and use that as  
24 some of our own criteria, and those were  
25 goals that benefit the entire region, not

1           just the specific geographic area or  
2           sector to consider the values of existing  
3           and proposed uses a potentially  
4           achievable and maximize capability and  
5           making sure we are comfortable with those  
6           and quote/unquote criteria and modify  
7           those and always keep them right in front  
8           of us as we engage in this dialogue.

9           MS. CANTRAL: Marty?

10          MR. ROSEN: Just to complete the  
11          thought on resilience, even though -- it  
12          has resilience, should be an overarching  
13          goal to influence decision-making unless  
14          it's not a goal it -- it's not going to  
15          be. I think history of the region what's  
16          happening, I think it -- I think it's--  
17          means obvious omission not to have some  
18          goal coastal hazards.

19          MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. So, Doug,  
20          my suggestion at this point we move into  
21          the next part of this discussion, which  
22          is the geographic focus for the planning  
23          effort, and then see where we are with  
24          timing. We may then take a pause to go  
25          to public comment. See where we are with

1           this entire discussion and what we need  
2           to do next.

3                     Does that make sense?

4                     MR. PABST:    Sure.

5                     Let's talk about the where.

6                     MR. NOBLE:  It's always about the  
7           where, the location.  I would like to  
8           think we have agreement we clearly have  
9           the best regional planning body out of  
10          all of them.  (Laughter)

11                    MR. PABST:  I would like to say we  
12          were done, but moving on.

13                    What do we mean when we said  
14          Mid-Atlantic region?  Climate change,  
15          dealings and other dealings people, draw  
16          lines in a lot of different places over  
17          the years.  We need to be focused and  
18          specific about the areas and things we  
19          are talking about.  I mentioned earlier  
20          on that the broad scope of this region is  
21          defined by the national ocean framework,  
22          which is north, south, New York,  
23          New Jersey Pennsylvania, Delaware,  
24          Maryland and Virginia, and then going out  
25          into the ocean from the edge of land,

1           which there will probably some discussion  
2           out to the exclusive economic zone on 200  
3           nautical mile area which technically all  
4           of the United States jurisdiction ends  
5           at. That's where we started.

6                     Now, we discussed earlier during  
7           the goals discussion that we wanted to  
8           recognize a focus. There are existing  
9           programs and initiatives that provide  
10          already for interjurisdictional area as  
11          coastal -- we recognize regional planning  
12          bodies cannot manage or regulate inland  
13          activities estuarial activities may  
14          influence the coast regional planning  
15          bodies, may be able to provide insight to  
16          support initial existing programs to deal  
17          with those activities, but on the  
18          constrained resources we are again, a lot  
19          of people are putting a lot into this to  
20          make this happen and we hope we can  
21          continue that level of effort, but we  
22          need to think apart of where we can add  
23          the most value if achieving our economic  
24          and conservation goals for our coastal  
25          and ocean areas.

1           Other considerations we are trying  
2           to keep in mind, the need to include  
3           recognized ecological and certain  
4           jurisdictional boundaries, which are very  
5           confusing, and we need to go through this  
6           carefully and leverage and build on  
7           existing planning efforts and identify a  
8           manageable size level of complexity. We  
9           want to be successful, but want it to be  
10          meaningful.

11           So, we decided we need to think a  
12          little bit more about how we might focus  
13          our efforts than just similar to the  
14          vision outlined by the national ocean  
15          implementation plan or framework. We  
16          wanted to look and identify the focus  
17          area for the Mid-Atlantic. Here are some  
18          of our thoughts: Include state and  
19          federal waters out to the exclusive  
20          economic zone but do not include near  
21          estuary area and extend to the Virginia,  
22          North Carolina border in the south to the  
23          New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island  
24          border. We would advise those and  
25          influence those other areas we can. This

1           was our first area of sort of bringing it  
2           down a little bit to see where we can go  
3           and open up for questions.

4                     Do you agree with the focus  
5           described above?  If not, explain how you  
6           would modify it and other additional  
7           considerations to consider in using  
8           geographic focus and areas we should  
9           focus on other areas and I'll stop there.

10                    MS. CANTRAL:  Andy?

11                    MR. ZEMBA:  I would like to address  
12           the first question, which is:  Do we  
13           agree with the geographic focus, and I  
14           would say from Pennsylvania we do.  
15           Particularly, we feel request the  
16           continuing estuary programs and  
17           interstate programs.  There is no need to  
18           go into the estuaries.  The states that  
19           are represented here can help coordinate  
20           with those programs if needed, and the  
21           other thing is I want to talk about,  
22           support not including the estuarian land  
23           and Pennsylvania largely a land area  
24           contributing to the Delaware  
25           Chesapeake -- Pennsylvania can represent



1 concerns and act as a liaison as needed  
2 if we get into these type of issues.

3 MS. CANTRAL: Other thoughts about  
4 the work group presenting with --

5 MR. NOBLE: One question to me.  
6 Might need some clarification. We say do  
7 not include near shore estuary area. Do  
8 we mean all estuarian area or what would  
9 it include that are not near shore?

10 MS. SCHULTZ: Well, first question I  
11 was thinking is that it's the larger,  
12 like the Chesapeake Bay, Delaware Bay,  
13 really largest area that already have  
14 three robust programs. I do question  
15 about some of the smaller, like seaside  
16 bays that are right behind the barrier  
17 islands, not larger estuaries that may  
18 not have management programs. I thought  
19 through this. Well, is that considered  
20 one of these large near shore areas or  
21 just talking about the larger estuaries?  
22 That's open for discussion.

23 MS. CANTRAL: Did you guys take  
24 that out?

25 MR. PABST: There was a lot of

1           robust discussion and I think we need a  
2           little bit more betting to decide either  
3           we -- we list everything and then you --  
4           I've been in some of these programs. You  
5           get down to latitude and longitude. We  
6           have to come to some understanding about  
7           do you kill the water bodies, and I would  
8           say we didn't come to agreement that we  
9           would ignore a particular body if it  
10          needed attention. We just felt our  
11          resources should be focused on areas that  
12          do have an estuary program or state or  
13          local program or somebody that already  
14          was doing there -- didn't have goals  
15          established for that particular water  
16          body. We would not revisit that and just  
17          work in the ocean where we felt there  
18          wasn't that government structure and  
19          management structure.

20                 I -- not knowing every bay between  
21          here and -- I think that's why we left it  
22          that way, that there would be -- could be  
23          a bay or body of water, maybe it's a  
24          particular loading that we need to worry  
25          about that is not being addressed. I

1 think we left it vague. We don't know  
2 what we don't know, but we are open to  
3 suggestions.

4 MS. CANTRAL: So, Mo and then Joe?

5 MS. BORNHOLDT: I have a question.

6 This was the ultimate card for the course  
7 some time some of these goals drive a  
8 particular variation of the them when it  
9 comes to geographic scope. If we employ  
10 the development of offshore wind we can  
11 have a wind facility off of (Inaudible)  
12 you know, the ocean aspect could be  
13 perfect, but if you talk about bringing  
14 transmission lines, we don't want to go  
15 there. That's where the onshore estuary  
16 and initial waters become an issue.

17 Somehow in developing a geographic scope  
18 we have to leave ourselves flexibility,  
19 talking about what are we talking about.  
20 Some of the ocean activities are not  
21 ocean bound. They do have some  
22 intersection with coastal near shore and  
23 upland resources.

24 Second thing, too, I'm also  
25 thinking of the sand management issues as

1 well. You know, you were talking about  
2 when you play with a near shore you are  
3 really wreaking havoc if you have an  
4 information gathering, if you dredge here  
5 or there, some of those we want to be  
6 able to tap in to help us understand what  
7 the alternative could be or impacts may  
8 be, not to say to blow this wide open,  
9 but think about how this connection about  
10 the goals, the cart before the horse and  
11 horse -- horse before the cart and what  
12 we've all been discussing.

13 MR. MACH: That was an excellent  
14 point. I was remiss of myself not to  
15 mention the Army Corp of Engineers  
16 received an extremely large amount of  
17 money under the -- along the coast as a  
18 regional planning body relooked to that  
19 study that the Corp of Engineering was  
20 doing along the coast with regards to  
21 resilience and some of it that expound  
22 their -- and a lot of that drivers will  
23 be part of that study. We deferred to  
24 that as a coastal process issue, and I'm  
25 not sure where that is going to go if it

1 requires management and dunes and base  
2 behind. This was probably one of those  
3 examples. The wording needs to be  
4 better, but I am looking for input from  
5 my colleagues how we can revise this and  
6 use.

7 MR. ATANGAN: I'm getting a little  
8 worried that Doug mentions they had  
9 robust discussion. (Laughter)

10 But I do want to bring folks back  
11 to there are two drivers in this thing.  
12 First part is the resource piece which is  
13 what can we reasonably tackle, and the  
14 other piece of this is the word initial.  
15 This is our first stab. This is not to  
16 say we are going to preclude addressing  
17 these other events -- areas downstream,  
18 but I think we need to, again, focus on  
19 here is what we can do with the resources  
20 we have, okay.

21 And also be mindful this is the  
22 initial -- we are not precluding  
23 addressing the other estuarian areas,  
24 whether it be the small or large. So I  
25 think we are getting a little bit wrapped

1           around. We are not identifying what we  
2           are not going to do. What we are  
3           identifying what are we going to start  
4           with.

5           MR. WALTERS: Just a question  
6           concerning the  
7           New York/Connecticut/Rhode Island border  
8           in the north. I'm not familiar. There  
9           is one point which the borders of all  
10          three of those states come to --

11          MR. PABST: We've establish --

12          MR. CAPOBIANCO: Yes. If you look  
13          at the state boundaries, there is a sort  
14          of a point off Montauk Point where  
15          Connecticut/New York border --  
16          Connecticut/Rhode Island border, touch  
17          each other. We are trying to essentially  
18          describe it.

19          MR. WALTERS: Fine point.

20          MR. CAPOBIANCO: You'll see it on  
21          the map, it shows the state boundaries.

22          MR. ATANGAN: You need a marker for  
23          -- (inaudible) Coast Guard would know.

24          MR. CAPOBIANCO: At the risk of  
25          being risky, you know, a lot of the

1           robustness of our discussion did revolve  
2           around our Long Island Sound by which I,  
3           personally, in New York maintained that's  
4           not particularly a true estuary or  
5           embayment or Chesapeake or Delaware Bay.  
6           It's a sound, it's marine water open to  
7           the ocean by Cape Cod. Like Cape Cod and  
8           Nantucket sound we had a lot of  
9           discussion and now you start getting into  
10          the edges is Haven Rock to the northeast.  
11          Planning and activities are underway in  
12          New England that do go out to that state  
13          line and include Connecticut's  
14          Long Island Sound waters.

15                 There was discussion about, well,  
16                 you know, there might be an -- a range of  
17                 solutions, but we certainly don't want to  
18                 be -- or east side of Long Island Sound  
19                 waters. There might be some other ways  
20                 to tackle that issue. You know, either  
21                 share issues or just give back on the  
22                 part of one region to the other saying,  
23                 you know, one region covers Long Island  
24                 Sound. So there is a lot of -- when you  
25                 get to the edges, that's where some of

1 the more specific conversations have to  
2 happen and a little bit more of a  
3 challenging aspect figuring out  
4 boundaries if you will.

5 MS. CHYTALO: I was going to raise  
6 the point that Greg brought up about  
7 including Long Island Sound. Since the  
8 end, rock border does not go through the  
9 middle of Long Island Sound and includes  
10 the northern portion. So the southern  
11 portion on the New York side is orphaned  
12 or without being a part of either plan  
13 body which is kind of weird.

14 One of the things we discussed is  
15 what on the phone a few of the  
16 conversations of having somewhat more on  
17 these kind of edges like this having  
18 something of a more flexible boundary  
19 depending upon the issue looked at and  
20 examined and see therefore you don't  
21 discount it, can't be there, but  
22 meanwhile the issue is relevant to the  
23 discussion. That's inclusive of the  
24 whole thing, and so I would rather keep  
25 it a soft boundary that it could be



1 inclusive if the issue pertains to it,  
2 you know, if it does make a -- if it does  
3 make a difference, especially if it comes  
4 to area pipelines, cables, whatever and  
5 all that stuff.

6 MS. CANTRAL: Which is exactly why  
7 with work group needs to take up both of  
8 these matters developing some initial  
9 goals. There is a chicken and egg here.  
10 In some instances, particularly in the  
11 Long Island Sound instance where you've  
12 got two regions coming together, and  
13 these processes move together and mature  
14 you have to figure out how to coordinate  
15 across the region and work the details  
16 out. You can't do that until you have a  
17 better idea what the goals are that you  
18 are headed toward and what are some of  
19 the specific objectives you need to  
20 address related to those goals.

21 So, just a few things I'm hearing  
22 out of this discussion, and let's see if  
23 anything --

24 MR. RAMOS: Just really quick.  
25 Like any good plan, there is always a

1           contingency for boundary changes and  
2           whatnot. I think the one concept there  
3           is we need to make sure when we develop  
4           the process. It allows for those changes  
5           to happen.

6                     Also, I agree with the whole idea  
7           that's up there, particularly with items  
8           two and four, but I think it's important  
9           to maintain the diversity in the group  
10          that you have folks here that do work on  
11          some of the other programs, like  
12          Chesapeake Bay, and make sure they are at  
13          the table, and based on the discussions  
14          with folks you've got a good diversity,  
15          let's keep it.

16                    MS. CANTRAL: Good. Good addition.  
17          And it actually is -- speaks to the point  
18          I was going to make in offering some  
19          summary comments and see if there is  
20          anything else you want to add to it.

21                    I heard that it's important to be  
22          coordinating with existing programs,  
23          Chesapeake Bay programs, upland programs,  
24          upland programs, other kinds of estuary  
25          programs and, Pedro, to your point with

1 the expertise around the table and where  
2 to go to do that kind of coordinating  
3 comes into play, and also related to that  
4 is the importance or a whole lot of  
5 reason of staying focused where this  
6 process can add value and make a  
7 contribution for improving the overall  
8 health of the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and its  
9 economy and livelihood. So being focused  
10 on that is important and capacity is only  
11 one reason to be keeping that in the  
12 forefront.

13 The discussion about both the goals  
14 and the geographic focus is an initial  
15 discussion. You are going to further vet  
16 that through some stakeholder engagement  
17 and you are going to further refine that  
18 as you have of every understanding, what  
19 you want to actually do, particularly  
20 with regard to some of these edges issues  
21 as Greg referred to them, that may come  
22 into sharper focus when you get going  
23 further along. In the meantime you are  
24 clear it is essentially an ocean-focused  
25 effort. That's where you bring your

1 value at.

2 Acknowledging some need to be  
3 flexible over time and to have to work  
4 out some of these questions that are  
5 around the edges will be something that I  
6 think you all need to be comfortable with  
7 and know is going to be part of. As  
8 Pedro said, the process, if it's going to  
9 be a good process, living process, like  
10 you said this morning you want it, will  
11 need to adapt and refine over time.

12 Joe, you have your card up.

13 MR. ATANGAN: No, I fell asleep.

14 (Laughter)

15 MS. CANTRAL: This is my attempt to  
16 summarize where you are on the focus and  
17 bringing you back to the goals  
18 discussion. We are going to transition  
19 in a moment to public comment. Are we  
20 comfortable for now with the geographic  
21 focus discussion? Is that good enough  
22 for going out and doing public  
23 engagement?

24 MR. BIGFORD: Now there is Delaware  
25 inland, but is there a Delaware and

1 Maryland inland base?

2 MS. SCHULTZ: In Maryland, not in  
3 Virginia.

4 MS. MCKAY: Virginia does not have  
5 a national estuary program, but seaside  
6 special area management program we've  
7 been funding for about 12 years.

8 MR. CAPOBIANCO: Tom, just to close  
9 the gap on your question. In New York we  
10 have an inland-based program that is not  
11 an NEP, but a state run to the coastal  
12 management program for the source of  
13 Long Island South Shore base of  
14 Long Island that runs along and inside of  
15 the barrier on the -- and New York are  
16 covered by something is what your  
17 question was.

18 MR. BIGFORD: Thanks.

19 MR. NOBLE: This goes back to what  
20 I was talking about earlier. We do know  
21 some of these areas, can we not further  
22 identify them? I'm -- you know, I don't  
23 want to exclude what we don't know, but  
24 what we do know is we can influence what  
25 do know is what I'm saying.

1 MS. CANTRAL: Are we --

2 MR. WALTERS: All states were  
3 mentioned except for New Jersey. Does  
4 New Jersey also have a significant  
5 program for in shore?

6 MR. ROSEN: Barnegat Bay?

7 MR. WALTERS: Just Barnegat.

8 MS. CHYTALO: Delaware Bay program.

9 MR. ROSEN: (Inaudible)

10 MS. CANTRAL: Okay. I propose,  
11 even though it's a few minutes earlier  
12 than our 2:30 schedule, but we have  
13 several people signed up for public  
14 comment and I think they are all in the  
15 room. I'm looking around, I know many of  
16 you know, at least the first, second,  
17 three who are signed up to go. So how  
18 about we go ahead and transition? Is  
19 that okay?

20 Let me explain how we are going to  
21 structure the comment. We have six  
22 people signed up for this session. As  
23 you can see, we have a table here for  
24 people who want to offer public comment  
25 to the RPB to come get situated at these

1 two chairs, and you'll have three minutes  
2 each to share your remarks.

3 So, if we can get -- just a moment,  
4 not until I'm done explaining the  
5 process. We ask the first, second folks  
6 to come get settled, and when No. 1 is  
7 done, if you can just excuse yourself  
8 from the table. Next person identify  
9 yourself and come to the space and we can  
10 keep you rolling along.

11 So how does that sound? Does that  
12 make sense?

13 Also, just public service  
14 announcement. We will have another  
15 opportunity later this afternoon for  
16 public comment. That will take place  
17 after we have a discussion about  
18 stakeholder engagement, and right now  
19 that is scheduled for 5:00 o'clock. It  
20 will be somewhere very close to  
21 5:00 o'clock when we have our next  
22 session.

23 With that, I will call the first,  
24 second folks who would be Morgan Gopnik  
25 and Ali Chase, and, Brent Greenfield,

1           you'll be third and ready to get up and  
2           seat after Morgan is done.

3                     Just while you are getting settled,  
4           just a couple reminders. We are  
5           preparing a transcript and include your  
6           comments as part of that official  
7           transcript, and if you could, for the  
8           benefit of everyone, including the court  
9           reporter, identify yourself and your  
10          affiliation before you offer your  
11          comment. Thank you for began -- is there  
12          a timekeeper?

13                    MS. GOPNIK: (MORGAN GOPNIK)

14                    Backing up, my name is Morgan  
15          Gopnik. I know a lot of you around the  
16          table and a lot of people in the room and  
17          it bothers me to have my back to the  
18          people behind me. I'm speaking to them  
19          as much as the people in the front of the  
20          room.

21                    I've been doing ocean policy work  
22          for a very long time at the National  
23          Academy of Science, and I -- and I was  
24          advisor to the Ocean Commission and very  
25          southern position as long the way.



1           But I've just finished a research  
2           project, four-year research project, Duke  
3           University, and it's got me thinking sort  
4           of in new waste. I've been in a lot of  
5           meetings, I was the chair and audience.  
6           I'm -- it's very familiar. We've all  
7           done this. Everybody has been on a  
8           million committees.

9           This, you know, lots I want to say,  
10          but I want to just raise an issue. This  
11          is a public comment about public comments  
12          which I'm actually surprised I was first  
13          on the list, but I'm glad I am. It will  
14          inform everybody else. So, to paraphrase  
15          Lloyd Benson, who remembers Lloyd  
16          Benson's? Famous comments. I know a lot  
17          about stakeholder engagement. That's  
18          what I spent the last four years  
19          studying. This is not stakeholder. It  
20          may be legally required and check off the  
21          list of public input. This is not  
22          stakeholder engagement. There is a lot  
23          of research and a lot of people at this  
24          table are familiar with it that shows  
25          this kind of -- you put things out and

1           you get public comment and two minutes on  
2           a microphone not only does not really  
3           provide useful input, but it usually just  
4           kind of annoys the public more than  
5           thinking they feel they are not being  
6           listened to but window dressing and there  
7           will be more discussion later.  It's --  
8           again, we pretend to be science based.  
9           There is a lot of science and research  
10          done about how you involve stakeholders.  
11          If it's websites and places, people can  
12          submit comments.  You are not doing  
13          stakeholder engagement.

14                 The lawyers will raise issues about  
15          FACA and FOIA and NEPA and all of those  
16          things, but there is a long history and  
17          case studies of people that have said  
18          along those rungs, rules and having done  
19          dialogue and one of the times and the  
20          time goes quickly in these little  
21          comments is one of the lessons learned,  
22          and I think it gets to your geographic  
23          focus issues is that to do genuine  
24          engagement and dialogue you need a more  
25          nested process.  You can't have

1 meaningful public input in the entire  
2 region. It has to be broken down into  
3 the smaller places people know and care  
4 about.

5 One of the answers is you are going  
6 to have to -- it's more trouble and takes  
7 more time, but to get, really understand  
8 what people are thinking, you have to do  
9 a more nested process where you look at  
10 specific places and specific areas.

11 And then the other things it gets  
12 to is the goals, and why I bring it up,  
13 the goals in the geographic focus section  
14 you can't begin to draft visions and  
15 goals until you've had that really  
16 meaningful robust stakeholder dialogue.  
17 Once you draft it and put it out for  
18 public comment and people get their  
19 little written documents, comments and  
20 all go into a black hole you sort of lost  
21 the chance to really engage the public.

22 Those are really process things I'm  
23 raising, but I hope you all keep them in  
24 mind as you move forward.

25 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you, Ali.

1           Before you go, I will offer an  
2           alternative, since Morgan made the  
3           statement she didn't like having her back  
4           to everyone else, if you would like, as  
5           you come up for public comment, you have  
6           the option of sitting at the table or  
7           going to the podium. You can do that as  
8           well.

9                       MS. CHASE: (ALI CHASE)

10           I have so much to touch on. You  
11           are going to be my enemy in this and I'll  
12           do my best to keep it short. I  
13           appreciate a comment made about  
14           geographic scope and what we can  
15           reasonably tackle and what are the first  
16           pieces we should deal with. This is an  
17           initial part of this process and I think  
18           that actually is not just about  
19           geographic scope. That's about the goals  
20           and we should think about this as this is  
21           a lot of work.

22           I want to thank you all for being  
23           here. I know you have a ton of other  
24           things you are doing and it's important  
25           to think about those shared goals as

1 people did mention this morning and what  
2 we can talk about and start there and  
3 billed on a process for success.

4 And how everyone comes together and  
5 I do also want to talk a little bit about  
6 something that was raised this morning  
7 about the plan, and the final  
8 recommendations themselves state that the  
9 regional planning bodies are convening to  
10 created speak with one another and to  
11 create a process, but ultimately develop  
12 a plan, and that's important because at  
13 the end of this process you all know each  
14 other and can pick up the phone and chat  
15 about what's going on in the region, but  
16 show what you've developed and have  
17 others build from that beyond the time  
18 you are going to be here and the time we  
19 might be here.

20 But to see this as a process and  
21 plan and this is your first step, and so  
22 at the end of the process there is more  
23 we learn about and you pick that up and  
24 take the next iteration of it. But I  
25 think it's important to come out of this

1 with a document. I really can't  
2 emphasize that enough.

3 In terms of the comments made about  
4 just sitting on a shelf, I think that's  
5 really up to you what happens at the end  
6 of the process. It does not have to sit  
7 on a shelf. This mentions that the  
8 federal agencies are required to comply  
9 with these final regional ocean plans, so  
10 actually it should not sit there, but be  
11 something you are consistently referring  
12 to in your daily work.

13 The goals themselves that were  
14 discussed and up there I have some  
15 initial thoughts on. The protect  
16 habitats an ecosystem functionality, not  
17 just habitats, it's also wildlife. We  
18 have not discussed the goals about a  
19 healthy ecosystem itself. Not just  
20 having the ecosystem continue to function  
21 as is, but there were comments made about  
22 can we make this better? Can we improve  
23 the system? I think that's important.  
24 We want to know what we are getting out  
25 of this. I also think, too, there has to

1           be some prioritization about the goals.

2                       Now, a number of the organizations  
3           I work with and NRDC certainly may fold  
4           differently in other regions. There are  
5           some goals that may be and should be  
6           prioritized. The other is the need to  
7           protect the healthy coastal and  
8           ecosystem. I refer you to the work being  
9           done in the northeast in the Regional  
10          Planning Body. I think their goal that  
11          talks about the need for planning  
12          framework to develop that sort of healthy  
13          ocean and coastal system is really  
14          important, and I also appreciated another  
15          one of their goals that talks about the  
16          planning process should work so that it  
17          develops compatibility among the  
18          different uses, and I think that's what  
19          you are getting at with some of the goals  
20          you have here. But listing that as that  
21          gives me the feeling is business as --  
22          gives me the feeling of business as usual  
23          and not looking ahead to how these things  
24          can work better together.

25                       MS. CANTRAL: Brant will be next.

1 MR. GREENFIELD: (BRENT GREENFIELD)

2 Thank you. I'm pleased to make the  
3 following comments on behalf of the  
4 National Ocean Policy Coalition regarding  
5 the ideas put forth for initial  
6 Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Planning and  
7 Geographic Focus.

8 While more extensive comments on  
9 user group engagement will be made  
10 following the stakeholder engagement  
11 discussion, the following suggestions are  
12 prefaced with this caveat.

13 Although appreciated, opportunities  
14 such as today's meeting and last month's  
15 webinar cannot substitute for the  
16 information and perspective that would be  
17 gained through the formal engagement of  
18 commercial and recreational interests  
19 through direct representation on the  
20 regional planning body or at minimum, a  
21 formal stakeholder advisory committee.

22 By proceeding in the absence of  
23 such engagement, even at this early  
24 stage, the Mid-Atlantic regional Ocean  
25 planning process is threatening to



1           inadequately reflect the input and  
2           perspectives of the regions most  
3           significant existing and future potential  
4           economic contributors and result in  
5           unintended and adverse consequences.

6           With that as the context, the  
7           initial draft goals should be modified in  
8           at least several respects. First, in  
9           addition to detailing the meaning of  
10          responsible, the goal to facilitate  
11          responsible renewable energy development  
12          should be revised to state facilitate  
13          responsible energy development. This is  
14          necessary to reflect that certain areas  
15          represented on this body support offshore  
16          conventional and other types of energy  
17          activities, as mentioned this afternoon  
18          as well as renewable energy development.  
19          In Virginia, for example, there is  
20          bipartisan support both at the statehouse  
21          and in congress for both types of  
22          development. For the same reason, the  
23          sub bullet for the first principle that  
24          references enhancing efficiencies in  
25          renewable energy siting should be revised

1 to enhancing efficiencies in energy  
2 siting.

3 In addition, the goal to ensure  
4 access for existing and traditional uses  
5 should be revised to state ensure access  
6 for existing, traditional and future  
7 potential uses. This modification is  
8 needed to acknowledge the importance of  
9 ensuring that the region can obtain the  
10 significant economic and societal  
11 benefits that could result from access to  
12 new as well as existing commercial and  
13 recreational activities.

14 Finally, especially given the  
15 continued challenging economic  
16 environment, goals to promote  
17 opportunities for job creation and  
18 economic growth while maintaining  
19 existing jobs, as well as to promote  
20 infrastructure revitalization, should be  
21 added to the list.

22 A to the principles, in addition to  
23 the recommendation just made, the final  
24 bullet should be revised to state that  
25 the use of the best existing and new

1 ocean data will require utilization of  
2 sound science and compliance with federal  
3 data quality laws and regulations.

4 With regard to the process and  
5 timeline for further developing and  
6 finalizing regional goals, such timelines  
7 must be based on the availability of  
8 sound science, data and information and  
9 provide commercial and recreational  
10 interests with a sufficient and  
11 reasonable opportunity to actively and  
12 directly participate in providing  
13 guidance and advice. More detailed  
14 comments on the proposed five-year  
15 timeline will be provided during the  
16 public comment session on operational  
17 considerations.

18 Thank you for the opportunity to  
19 comment.

20 MR. HEMPHILL: (ARLO HEMPHILL)

21 My name is Arlo Hemphill with the  
22 Maryland Coastal Base Program, and that  
23 is one of the national estuary programs  
24 you guys were discussing just shortly  
25 back ago.

1           What I would like to address is the  
2           issue of geographic scope and in  
3           particular, this issue of leaving out the  
4           nearest estuaries when it comes to the  
5           large estuary such as the Chesapeake and  
6           Delaware Bay. Those areas are so large  
7           and complex they deserve their own unit  
8           of planning.

9           However, the near shore base that  
10          basically outline our entire region are  
11          very small. The programs that work them  
12          are -- work on very low budgets and they  
13          are immediately connected to the ocean  
14          environment. They are part of the same  
15          exact system. The national estuary  
16          programs are not the solution you think  
17          they are. We focus almost entirely on  
18          water quality issues that come from  
19          land-based sources of pollution. We work  
20          with -- manage the services from farmers  
21          and worry about things what people are  
22          putting on their lawns. We create rain  
23          gardens, living shorelines. Everything  
24          is coming from the land. We are not set  
25          up to deal with impacts coming from the

1 ocean. We do not have a history of  
2 dealing with multiple water spaces and  
3 the issues that you are talking about,  
4 the things coming down its pipelines,  
5 energy and military and fishing, these  
6 will have impacts on us. We are not set  
7 up to do the offshore within -- farm off  
8 Maryland. We hear so much about the  
9 training area and long-term maintenance  
10 operation center will be located in the  
11 Maryland coastal base, something that the  
12 Maryland coastal base program has no  
13 history of dealing with.

14 There is an enormous offshore  
15 recreational fishery off of Ocean City,  
16 Maryland, and those fishing boats come in  
17 and harbor within the coastal base. The  
18 fisheries themselves, the commercial  
19 fisheries, the things they are fishing  
20 for, most of those organisms have a live  
21 history that has an offshore stage and in  
22 shore stage, they migrate between  
23 different parts of their locations. Its  
24 decision have an immediate impact on the  
25 in shore environment and to draw a line,

1           its estuaries are covered by the national  
2           estuaries program is not really true  
3           because of the focus of the national  
4           estuaries program. It's one unit. One  
5           large ecosystem we need to consider, the  
6           near shore base.

7           I thank you for your attention.

8           MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

9           MR. GOVE: (MATT GOVE)

10          Surf Rider Foundation. Thank you  
11          for your time.

12          If you don't know what surf riding  
13          is, we are not opposed to surfers and  
14          other people that use the beach, water  
15          access. We have the volunteer chapter in  
16          its Mid-Atlantic region with 3,500 paying  
17          members and 3,500 supporters.

18          We appreciate what Morgan said  
19          about the process of involvement and get  
20          into that more this second time today to  
21          speak.

22          There was a lot said before. I  
23          want to touch on a couple things.  
24          Definitely Surf Rider, having an ocean  
25          plan seems to have the process without

1           the plan and also seems plans are being  
2           made without us. We should go for a plan  
3           with this group. I agree that sitting on  
4           the shelf, that does happen to plans, but  
5           that is usually because of abandon. If  
6           we stick to it and doing reiterations  
7           you'll have a great plan for the  
8           mid-Atlantic. The document that comes  
9           out, there was a small situation, areas  
10          of special concern seemed to be that  
11          beaches and recreation seemed to be  
12          missing from that list. So if you can  
13          add something about the beach environment  
14          and all of the recreation that goes on  
15          there.

16                 And then one of the draft goal  
17                 about habitats and ecosystem function.  
18                 That does seem to need some more to it.  
19                 There does not say anything about  
20                 wildlife. Maybe that's part of the  
21                 ecosystem function, but wildlife should  
22                 be in there, and so far I agree and  
23                 restore needs to be in there.

24                 We got into ensure access to ports  
25                 but I was confused what that point was,

1           yea or nay. I was not sure what that  
2           meant, access to ports.

3                     I think I agree that we should push  
4           towards the shared interest. There is a  
5           lot of things we do agree on, some big  
6           things, maybe some of you don't, but the  
7           shared interest seems to be the place to  
8           start, at least for now.

9                     I think for me to get much interest  
10          from our folks with, if we say  
11          renewable -- facilitate renewable energy  
12          we want that and that will be great, but  
13          I think I'll get a ton of comments if we  
14          say let's facilitate all energy so  
15          just -- people will get really interested  
16          in that.

17                    And as far as geographic scope,  
18          that's a tough one. We struggle with  
19          that with our surf riding I'll talk about  
20          more with later or tomorrow, but maybe  
21          some sort of area, you know, maybe  
22          initial focus area or primary focus area.  
23          Okay? That's all I wanted to say. Thank  
24          you.

25                    MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.



1 Cindy, you are next.

2 MS. ZIPF: (CINDY ZIPF)

3 Clean Ocean Action.

4 I thank you, but I thank you for  
5 being here and providing us an  
6 opportunity, structured as it is, to  
7 provide some comment. I do want to say a  
8 few things. I'm not sure I'm going to  
9 get swept into the three minutes or  
10 not. I'm here representing 135  
11 organizations that I represent, so in my  
12 mind I get three minutes time, that's  
13 135. Get comfortable people.

14 I do want to say from the outset  
15 that we do support the idea of the  
16 National Ocean Policy and that it  
17 contains within it some great vision and  
18 frank words to protect the ecosystem so  
19 many of us depend on, whether it's for  
20 livelihood or whether it's to enjoy the  
21 amazing resources and ecosystem that it  
22 is.

23 I want to also support and what  
24 Morgan stepped up to say and she really  
25 did I think articulate how I feel about

1           the process and the structure. So far I  
2           know we are deferring stakeholder until  
3           later, but the structure versus  
4           established, us versus them system that  
5           has to be unhelpful. I do also want to  
6           thank Tony for providing the college and  
7           university. We worked with them on a  
8           variety of things. It is a good for --  
9           up to have these discussions. I don't  
10          know when you are going to be back, but  
11          you should be much more involved in the  
12          public process.

13                 Your timeline is really kind of,  
14                 you know, very long and there is huge  
15                 decisions going to be made in the very  
16                 near future about whether or not to  
17                 develop liquified natural gas facilities  
18                 off our coast, whether or not to allow  
19                 seismic testing to blast the eardrums of  
20                 every living creature from here to  
21                 Florida in search of oil in all of the  
22                 wrong places.

23                 On the goals and particular they  
24                 were extremely thin, if you look at the  
25                 northeast regional planning bodies'

1 goals, they are much more thoughtful in  
2 containing sort of the overall ocean with  
3 all of its resources and much more  
4 protective. I think it was Sarah that  
5 talked about wanting to add beyond just  
6 protect but improve and restore.

7 Now, we've been through a lot in  
8 the New York, New Jersey. We've had 30  
9 years of ocean planning and did it in the  
10 wrong area. We worked really, really  
11 hard to find an environmentally sound  
12 alternative and to stop ocean  
13 industrialization and it's a really good  
14 plan. It would provide to protection for  
15 the sand resources we need for climate,  
16 that adaptation and to deal with  
17 resiliency. We need to allow for the  
18 shipping. Shipping is a very good  
19 environmental sound way to move lots of  
20 cargo and allow for renewable energy  
21 resources and protect the clean ocean  
22 that we've all come to depend on. It's a  
23 little frustrating. There is a new body  
24 in town and one made up of new acronyms  
25 and complicated to the public and one we

1 don't know how our vices are going to be  
2 connected, but it's definitely here and  
3 there.

4 We are not at the table, so I  
5 would, just again, reaffirm what I  
6 suggested down in April meetings is to  
7 bring the public to the table, and  
8 finally on the geographic focus.

9 I would add to Mo's point about,  
10 you know, upland versus inland impacts  
11 and G terminal off our -- is not imports,  
12 it's for exports. If we allowed exports  
13 of natural gas from the region in  
14 New York, we have an explosion of  
15 fracking which is already causing  
16 extensive land-based harm to our  
17 waterways and air and truly to negative  
18 impacts towards climate change and I do  
19 know want to be sure that as we reflect  
20 on activities that will be happening that  
21 poor guys arms are going to get tired.  
22 We actually will look at the upland  
23 impacts and we have an initiative called  
24 the Clean Ocean Zone and present you with  
25 copies and that establishes the New York

1 and New Jersey zone as a clean ocean  
2 zoning. That's our idea of clean ocean  
3 zoning.

4 We'll continue on with the  
5 dialogue. I guess I want to reflect on,  
6 you know, the -- how ironic we are in a  
7 puppet show. We need to know who is  
8 going to be the puppets and who is the  
9 puppeteers and I hope that we can all  
10 work together to come up with a common  
11 team to work together for this amazing  
12 resource of our ocean.

13 MR. DiDOMENICO: (GREG DiDOMENICO)

14 Thank you for allowing me an  
15 opportunity to speak. I know your staff  
16 made it to the table. I didn't sign in  
17 earlier. Thank you.

18 My name is Greg DiDomenico. I  
19 serve as the director of the Garden State  
20 Food Association. Garden State is right  
21 here in New Jersey. I won't go into the  
22 reason, given the time constraints, I'll  
23 get to the meat of the issue.

24 As a way we see it, we have been  
25 following this issue since its inception.

1           We put in comments and have given  
2           presentations over the last couple years  
3           including presentation that actually is  
4           in your preceding book, which is out  
5           front here. I want to read from that as  
6           a resource to remind you of how long  
7           we've been working on this and seriously  
8           taking its share. I said two words that  
9           are absolutely key, measurement and  
10          achievement. Goals should be measurable  
11          and achievable. The fishing industry  
12          knows this well. We have been dealing  
13          with fishers management issues and a host  
14          of other issues that absolutely have  
15          become measurable and achievable. We  
16          made it and it's made a difference, not  
17          on the environment, but in other  
18          industry. So this group should do the  
19          same.

20                 I also want to add that while there  
21                 seems to be a very overall and broad and  
22                 vague approach as outlined in these  
23                 proceedings and I want to quote directly  
24                 from CMSP and EBM, you know the acronyms.  
25                 This is a particular, in light of both of

1           these, manage and regulate. The  
2           potential of key issues are critical to  
3           ecosystem function. Resiliency, improve  
4           species adaptation and achieve healthier  
5           and more productive environment. Restore  
6           protected species populations, ecosystem  
7           and diversity.

8                     These are undefinable terms. They  
9           are not regulatory terms and some cases  
10          not even biological terms. I can tell  
11          you right now that we lack the science  
12          and resources to do exactly that. So,  
13          either the goals have to be to create the  
14          science, reach out to the scientists and  
15          academics and into region to get this  
16          information to achieve that you should  
17          not post that is one of your goals that  
18          is not measurable, not achievable.

19                    Second part and I'll be brief, I  
20          have only a minute left, geographic  
21          focus. Every person within your  
22          stakeholder group, whether it be a  
23          server, a commercial fisherman, bay man,  
24          recreational fisherman will absolutely  
25          tell you the key to your success is

1 starting in the estuarian environment,  
2 whether it be up in the Delaware Bay or  
3 right behind the barrier islands of  
4 New Jersey. That's the key. If you  
5 don't start there, I don't think you have  
6 a very good chance at achieving some of  
7 these goals. Specifically, Madam  
8 Bornholdt, you said one of the most  
9 important things today that is whatever  
10 offshore development we do if we generate  
11 wind power, it has to be delivered.  
12 Those transmission lines are going to go  
13 to a fish habitat and we fish and enjoy  
14 and everybody else the in value of these  
15 resources. They are dependent. If we  
16 don't have a healthy is estuarian  
17 environment, we won't have any of these  
18 species.

19 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

20 Do we have Doug Pheister?

21 MR. PHEISTER: (DOUG PHEISTER)

22 Thank you for having me. I'm Doug  
23 Pheister with the Offshore Wind  
24 Development. We represent the Offshore  
25 Wind in the U.S. about 230 to 235



1 members. We represent those of the  
2 offshore wind developers here in the U.S.  
3 and much of the supply chain that comes  
4 here first. Offshore wind farms do get  
5 built here.

6 I appreciate your opportunity. It  
7 was great listening to all of you today  
8 and provide public comment, and I want to  
9 comment on two of the slides. The goals  
10 I know, problems people have been talking  
11 about, the goals, but we are in favor of  
12 the first goal you list of facilitating  
13 response for new energy development, and  
14 we would be in favor of all offshore  
15 wind, specifically in that goal, and, you  
16 know, we think there is a risk in  
17 expanding to other energy sources if  
18 goals become defuse. Everyone has noted  
19 resources can be limited to pursue ten of  
20 these goals effect and cause is warranted  
21 here and also note that with my knowledge  
22 the five states part of this group are  
23 all in favor of offshore wind and all of  
24 the policies in favor of offshore wind  
25 and also true with the current

1 administration in Washington.

2 And the second thing I want to talk  
3 about, principles.

4 I didn't know the third point is  
5 provide for past, current and future  
6 official uses. That is something we are  
7 encountering a lot as we try to build  
8 offshore wind in the U.S. is historic use  
9 of every usage in every area is not  
10 necessarily going to be preserved for the  
11 future. That's a disaster for ocean  
12 planning. What you are saying, what has  
13 happened up until yesterday will continue  
14 to happen forever into the future and  
15 every OCS and that's an important  
16 principle to keep in mind, like offshore  
17 wind and other offshore uses. We can't  
18 be stuck in the past.

19 That's it. Thank you.

20 MS. CANTRAL: So, I think this  
21 concludes that public comment section.  
22 Thanks to all of you who signed up. And  
23 I'm feeling compelled to say a few things  
24 to clarify how we feel. The public  
25 comment portion is working, so hopefully

1 I can rectify this.

2 As I mentioned before, you'll  
3 have -- we'll have another public comment  
4 section today, that starts at  
5 5:00 o'clock or thereabouts. We also  
6 have a built-in public comment sections  
7 into the agenda for tomorrow. Our idea,  
8 and this was what I was referring to as  
9 an experiment was to pause the discussion  
10 of a particular topic and invite public  
11 comment for people who wanted to weigh in  
12 on the discussion on the table, in this  
13 particular instance being about goals and  
14 geographic focus, and many of you took  
15 advantage of that and offered that, but  
16 that does not preclude anything else you  
17 want to say. You can sign up for any  
18 public session. You can sign up for all  
19 of them and talk about anything on your  
20 mind, and you are very much welcome and  
21 encouraged to do that.

22 I think the RPB recognizes that the  
23 formal structure of this and presenting  
24 your comment and they are listening and  
25 that's this is all formal and for the

1 record is unsatisfying in many ways, but  
2 also an important part of this particular  
3 meeting -- this kind of meeting and this  
4 one of several mechanisms, so please  
5 understand and participate and help shape  
6 some of the discussions we are going to  
7 get into in the afternoon, and we'll  
8 continue as the process evolves about how  
9 to provide as many opportunities for  
10 meaningful engagement in the ways that  
11 many of you are asking for and have ideas  
12 about, and I think that those ideas are  
13 received by the people here because they  
14 want to add those opportunities for  
15 engagement. That's one reason why this  
16 is an evening event, so you can do that.  
17 That's not in this formal structure.  
18 This is, I think, I just want to clarify  
19 this is, but one of a number of  
20 opportunities and they are going to do  
21 their best to identify as many other  
22 opportunities as is possible.

23 So, with that, we are right at  
24 3:00 o'clock and I think we'll take a  
25 break and come back at 3:15 and we'll

1 resume the discussion about goals for  
2 regional ocean planning, geographic focus  
3 and we've taken care of and we'll wrap up  
4 and see how we see fit and stakeholder  
5 engagement.

6 (Recess.)

7 MS. CANTRAL: We are ready to get  
8 started.

9 In just a moment we are going to  
10 review the draft ocean Mid-Atlantic  
11 Regional planning goals. We would like  
12 to identify some next steps and be clear  
13 about that. We have a few ideas to share  
14 and see what you see about that, but  
15 before we return to the topic at hand, I  
16 want to say a couple of things to  
17 reinforce some of my overview of the  
18 agenda. Because I wanted to make sure  
19 everyone is clear what we are doing the  
20 remainder of the day.

21 Once we wrap up this discussion  
22 about goals and geographic focus, we will  
23 then shift our focus to hear from the  
24 work group that has been developing ideas  
25 related to engagement, which includes how

1 to engage stakeholders, everything is  
2 this body, but that in particular,  
3 because we are talking about developing  
4 goals, is a very obvious and immediate  
5 connection. And then we will have some  
6 discussion about that, pause for our  
7 second public comments session, as I said  
8 earlier, around 5:00 o'clock. We'll then  
9 adjourn for the day. This part of the  
10 meeting will adjourn, but I may not have  
11 been very clear about. If you look at  
12 the agenda for today, from 6:30 to 7:30  
13 p.m. is what's called -- what is being  
14 referred to as a networking reception.  
15 This is intended to be an opportunity for  
16 you as members, the public stakeholders,  
17 to engage and network with the RPB and  
18 vice versa. So it's another mechanism,  
19 another chance to have some informal  
20 dialogue.

21 I'm supposed to tell you there will  
22 be free pizza. We are on a university  
23 campus. We have pizza and we  
24 encourage -- invite and encourage you to  
25 participate in that event that will be

1 immediately after this setting concludes  
2 for the day.

3 So, Tom, what else do I need to  
4 add?

5 MR. BIGFORD: Pizza and salad, but  
6 plenty of food and opportunity for plenty  
7 of talk.

8 MS. CANTRAL: Great.

9 The other announcement I would like  
10 to make for the remainder of today, we  
11 have been joined by the campus TV crew  
12 who is, as you can see, camera man  
13 waving. He'll be filming for this  
14 afternoon and make sure you are all aware  
15 of that.

16 So, a couple things to get this  
17 conversation kicked off again. As was  
18 reflected by you in your comments earlier  
19 about the draft goals after Doug's  
20 presentation of the work groups thinking  
21 on that is a recognition that it's  
22 important as a point of departure or  
23 perhaps a frame of reference for your  
24 thinking about the development of goals  
25 to keep in mind the shared interests that

1           you all represent for this region, the  
2           shared interests across the five states,  
3           the federal agencies that are represented  
4           and the kind of roles you play in this  
5           region and if that's important, to keep  
6           in mind as a focal point for developing  
7           these goals. There is a lot you could  
8           do. You can't do everything, but perhaps  
9           focusing on where there really are strong  
10          shared interests is a good place to  
11          start.

12                        Related to that which you heard me  
13           say a few times and it's my way of  
14           summarizing things, all of you have said  
15           is also looking for where this body can  
16           bring its best value and to making a  
17           difference for this region. Again, you  
18           can't do everything. There are lots of  
19           things you could do where can you  
20           maximize your impact and have the  
21           greatest contribution to the overall  
22           regional help this and the goals you come  
23           up with initially and recall we are not  
24           making decisions about goals today,  
25           that's not the point of this discussion.



1           The point of the discussion is to get  
2           comfortable enough and close enough with  
3           what you've got so far to go out and talk  
4           to stakeholders to have some meaningful  
5           discussions and input that can then be  
6           added to the refinement, but initially  
7           thinking about goals that can be flexible  
8           and you are comfortable with that fact  
9           they are flexible. They do need to be  
10          science based and informed by the  
11          expertise, the multitudes of experts that  
12          people in this region possess and want to  
13          help provide to inform all of your  
14          thinking.

15                 So, a few things that I heard in  
16          the discussion and then I would like to  
17          open it up and hear your additional  
18          reflections including reflecting on some  
19          of what we heard during public comment as  
20          a practical next step. I heard that you  
21          are keen on this idea of developing a  
22          similar vision statement. What I refer  
23          to is on top of this list of goals so  
24          setting the predicate for these goals and  
25          starting with taking a look at the

1 national statement and then perhaps  
2 customizing that with a description of  
3 what's unique about this region you would  
4 like to include in that is something you  
5 would like to develop. And then we  
6 heard, had some very good dialogue around  
7 the goals and the words that are on this  
8 side and the way they are articulated  
9 including some of the people who had  
10 comments to share. I'll not summarize  
11 that right now, I would like to open it  
12 back up to see what other kind of  
13 reflections or ideas you would like to  
14 share at that point and then we'll see if  
15 we are ready to wrap this up and as I  
16 said I have and I think about how we  
17 might proceed and transition to the next  
18 discussion.

19 But any thoughts around the table?  
20 Anything --

21 MR. PABST: Yeah. Again, I think a  
22 lot of the conversations that are  
23 happening here, we had at least probably  
24 might have over simplified some of the  
25 bullets on the goals and that's -- I

1 heard a lot of good examples of things we  
2 can look at and certainly look to the RPB  
3 members to input or definitions on some  
4 of the issues we can get. But I think  
5 the other comment about prioritization,  
6 that is something we need to talk about.  
7 You know, are these all dual track or all  
8 happening in realtime? I think there is  
9 different levels to these goals. Some of  
10 them are going to happen and some are  
11 happening right now.

12 So this sort of that way of looking  
13 at this as well. There is a natural time  
14 projection for some of these things. If  
15 you talk about future development, that's  
16 to be had. If you talk about what's  
17 going on now, identifying areas that need  
18 to be restored, I think we can take a  
19 different stab at some of these things.

20 To me it was not much prioritizing  
21 in the sense it was more what do we need  
22 to do first and then what do we need to  
23 do second. My initial thoughts to get  
24 the conversation started.

25 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. Karen and

1 Gwynne?

2 MS. CHYTALO: After the public  
3 discussion one of the things that came to  
4 mind was, you know, about being ocean  
5 stewards, something that four of the --  
6 one of our goals should be partners, know  
7 ocean stewardship. All of these  
8 different, be it a state, stakeholder,  
9 state, federal, be it a tribe, that we,  
10 as a collective group, that's one of the  
11 things that we should vet one of our  
12 important values we have in the ocean and  
13 that -- almost like you know that should  
14 be our goal.

15 One of our major goals is that we  
16 be partners in ocean stewardship. I  
17 think that's gets to the issue of  
18 collaboration, cooperation, information  
19 sharing, that whole blah-blah-blah, and  
20 that kind of stuff which actually could  
21 help make things work better. Be more  
22 efficient.

23 MS. SCHULTZ: There were two  
24 comments that really resonated with me  
25 and got me thinking about a couple of our

1 draft goals.

2 The there are a number of folks  
3 that raised the issue about some of our  
4 goals should be oriented towards the  
5 economy and jobs and the other one was  
6 someone mentioned about ensuring access  
7 for new uses.

8 So, when I compared those against  
9 what we had for our RPB goals, we had a  
10 goal, ensure access, existing and  
11 traditional uses and not uses. We had a  
12 goal for ensuring access to ports. I'm  
13 thinking we may want to think about, you  
14 know, you want to ensure, ultimately want  
15 to ensure access to those uses that  
16 really help us have a strong economy and  
17 strong coastal communities.

18 We might end up kind of -- we may  
19 want to spend some time thinking through  
20 and maybe not necessarily digging down,  
21 but some ways elevating a bit, you know,  
22 being more generic because then, as we  
23 develop our objectives, we -- that's when  
24 we get into save efficient access to  
25 ports. How do we ensure existing uses or

1 access for uses? There is a different  
2 way of looking at it.

3 MR. MACH: The other thing I want  
4 to approach is to keep it as simple as  
5 possible. The more you try to put into  
6 it, the more people you are going to  
7 exclude, but you have not covered a  
8 particular subject area. So, make it  
9 short and simple as possible.

10 Same with the vision statement. If  
11 it goes more than a statement, ten words,  
12 probably said too much. That's not to  
13 say any of these subjects that are not  
14 mentioned should be excluded, we are here  
15 to listen to all subjects presented  
16 within the group. But leave it to anyone  
17 who wants to come along and present.

18 As time goes on we are going to  
19 find that some of these specifics that we  
20 can list will be dropping off and new  
21 things will come along. So keeping it  
22 very short and brief going in is going to  
23 be the best approach. Some  
24 consideration.

25 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

1           MS. COOKSEY: Thank you. Just a  
2 couple of ideas. I think an RPB member  
3 said it earlier, but Ali Chase said it  
4 about the primary goals and then Morgan  
5 had this concept of nesting. So if you  
6 sort of blend those two things together  
7 and lay on top of it a process that the  
8 SZM managers use every five years, we  
9 look at eight or ten things important to  
10 the coast and ocean and then we decide  
11 what we will work on and develop a work  
12 plan.

13           I guess what I'm saying is from  
14 everything that I've heard, both with the  
15 public and today, I think there still is  
16 a way to do that and identify our  
17 priorities for now as well as recognize  
18 those that will be coming up that we  
19 don't even know about.

20           Ten years ago I never thought we  
21 would be working on offshore planning,  
22 yet we are. We can do a critical riding  
23 exercise that would be backed up by sort  
24 of today's thinking and why we are  
25 choosing to work on the things that we

1 are and that would be equal to the  
2 resources available.

3 MS. CANTRAL: Are there thoughts?  
4 Reflections? Doug?

5 MR. PABST: I think there is a  
6 couple of parts we can go down with a lot  
7 of these and I'm seeing several. We are  
8 clearly going to have to reconcile one of  
9 the most important things we can do for  
10 ourselves and our public. We have to  
11 manage our expectations whether we use  
12 the word action, priority or objective.  
13 We all want to restore and promote and do  
14 all of those things.

15 Where I grew up we are concerned  
16 about saying everywhere we need to manage  
17 what we can do in a one-year or two-year  
18 or three-year time period. We've had  
19 these conversations. We've had them for  
20 a long time in different groups, but just  
21 for the members to keep in mind the  
22 concept of now we don't want to -- we  
23 were concerned about getting too big. We  
24 would be setting us up to fail which is  
25 the first thing we tried to do, but a



1 balancing act we are trying to keep here.

2 MS. CANTRAL: Anyone else?

3 MR. RAMOS: Just a couple things.

4 You kind of reminded me just now, Doug,  
5 about the things we may not be able to  
6 do. I think it's important to include  
7 some of those things we were not sure  
8 this is going to work and kind of keep  
9 our finger on the pulse for that next  
10 emerging issue that will come up. Maybe  
11 there is one or two things to focus on,  
12 but we need some kind of emerging  
13 issue-type portion written into our  
14 plane.

15 The other thing I took out of the  
16 comment period is the public comments is  
17 the geographic area. I still think we  
18 need to -- there needs to be maybe a  
19 priority area, geographic area, but the  
20 secondary geographic area. I think we  
21 can accommodate that and include the  
22 estuaries and what not. But keeping our  
23 focus out, you know, in the oceans  
24 themselves.

25 The other thing I heard, last thing

1 I heard was the word enhance that someone  
2 actually said. I don't remember who it  
3 was when we were talking about habitats.  
4 They started thinking about protect,  
5 restore, enhance. Very different  
6 meanings. Protect has a very combined  
7 meaning in my mind which basically is  
8 like a national park on monument, areas  
9 we are not going to touch at all where  
10 restore and enhances there is going to be  
11 some mixed use in there. So I'm not  
12 saying we need to define that today or  
13 right now, but that's something the group  
14 needs to decide what exactly does protect  
15 mean.

16 MR. MACH: Comment on that, Pedro?  
17 I feel the estuaries and base are  
18 represented. We have the nation here.  
19 We have the states here. The subjects  
20 that come out of the areas become  
21 important. Those will be presented as  
22 they ride to the ocean level. So, I  
23 think they are there.

24 MS. CANTRAL: So, how about this  
25 for the next step, this was all very good

1 additional ideas and thinking to be  
2 factoring in and that coupled with ideas  
3 that you were all shares in the earlier  
4 part of this discussion there were some  
5 very specific ideas about some tweaking  
6 to the wording on these -- on the slide.

7           There were some questions about the  
8 general approach. There is some still a  
9 need for clarification. I think at least  
10 and in my recollection there was a  
11 question about what we really mean by its  
12 424 bullet. The one about access to  
13 ports with John's comment about being  
14 efficient said of saying sufficient that  
15 may be a direction we may want to go.

16           In any event, what I'm thinking we  
17 could turn around a revised set of  
18 bullets that reflect the thinking, the  
19 situations and the questions that have  
20 been presented today and put those back  
21 in front of you tomorrow. We've got some  
22 time. We built in some iteration into  
23 this agenda because we knew that as you  
24 got more into the discussions you would  
25 want to circle back to some things. This

1           may be one opportunity for doing that and  
2           then we can see if you're close enough to  
3           at least if not deciding that's what  
4           you -- that's the set you are ready to go  
5           out to the public with then deciding what  
6           needs to happen before you are ready to  
7           go out and have some discussions about  
8           the goals.

9                         So, how does that sound for the  
10           moment? We will revisit this tomorrow  
11           and look at a new slide and it's got to,  
12           I guess you've got presented in it and  
13           see what that suggestion.

14                        Is everyone okay with that?

15                                 (Chorus of ayes.)

16                        MS. CANTRAL: Everything I ask you  
17           to think about when we do have that  
18           discussion part of that has been --  
19           hasn't been addressed what needs to  
20           for -- in phase of your discussion about  
21           goals. Given the framework that the  
22           worker has presented with the goals in  
23           principal and objectives, what do you  
24           want to do about articulating objectives?  
25           And what I mean by that, some early ideas

1           about what an objective might look like  
2           to help people understand what you really  
3           mean by these goals, which are high level  
4           right now. It might be frustrating to  
5           have a discussion about something at a  
6           very high level without some, for  
7           example, we can do that. So I think you  
8           should have a discussion about what you  
9           think about that.

10           MR. PABST: Yes.

11           MS. CANTRAL: For that we'll be  
12           revisiting this tomorrow.

13           So, at this point I think we are  
14           ready to shift our focus and turn to the  
15           topic of stakeholder engagement and for  
16           this session I'm going to recognize --

17           MR. PABST: Excuse me. With the  
18           geographic focus are we going to sort of  
19           have that keep going or have something  
20           similar in -- I don't think we can do  
21           something similar on those bullets, but I  
22           wanted to make sure if the RPB was  
23           comfortable having -- I'm not sure we  
24           want to go with that.

25           MS. CANTRAL: Well, I don't know.

1           Maybe we should think about that. Let's  
2           revisit that as part of the next steps or  
3           when we wrap up today and you did get to  
4           a place where you asked are you  
5           comfortable with what you said about  
6           geographic focus for now? The answer to  
7           that was yes and you have yes, and you  
8           have comments about the focus which may  
9           change your thinking and we want to be  
10          respectful of that.

11                 MR. PABST: Yes.

12                 MS. CANTRAL: Are we ready for  
13           stakeholder engagement?

14                 MS. COOKSEY: I'm first.

15                 I'm Sarah Cooksey, again, from the  
16           state of Delaware and Tom Bigford and I  
17           will do a little tag team.

18                 First I'll take a moment to  
19           encourage someone, everyone to hang  
20           around and I'll finish the formal part of  
21           the meeting. I think it's the south side  
22           of this building upstairs. We are going  
23           to have a conversation for at least an  
24           hour. The RPB members will be available  
25           and we'll have folks taking notes, but

1           there will be no formal reporting out of  
2           everything that was said. We are having  
3           pizza and salad and cookies and pass the  
4           hat because we don't have any money to  
5           pay for that.

6                         But it should be time for us to  
7           really talk to each other or continue  
8           this conversation because I think I can  
9           speak for everyone at the table that we  
10          all recognize the limitations of this  
11          type of format. And while there have  
12          been times when I've been very grateful  
13          when I've been in front of an angry  
14          crowd, they can only talk for three  
15          minutes. So far everyone and this  
16          process that MARCO has been working on  
17          has been very polite and I'm grateful for  
18          that. I hope you stay around to talk to  
19          us and engage with the RPB members while  
20          the tables are set up in spite of what it  
21          is and you'll have opportunities to talk  
22          on all of our issues. Please attend.

23                         So, with that, what Tom and I will  
24          do is talk about what we have done and  
25          hope to do in the future and present some

1 ideas to the RPB to discuss and hope,  
2 either reach a decision or agreement for  
3 a path forward. Both the short-term  
4 goals and long-term aspirations of our  
5 work group have been identified and the  
6 machine -- potential mechanisms we've  
7 identified with stakeholders and gather  
8 your input into our discussions that  
9 we'll make as an RPB with a special  
10 emphasis this is important. On whether  
11 or not you we should move forward with a  
12 state stakeholder liaison committee  
13 that's on top of the RPB right now, I  
14 would like you all to give us a  
15 recommendation specifically with whether  
16 we should use a stakeholder liaison  
17 committee which we'll go into in a  
18 minute.

19 What have we been doing is what I  
20 refer to as the more traditional ways of  
21 engaging people that yes, we know it's  
22 not stapled engagements, but doing your  
23 best with the limitations we have that  
24 includes we have the website, we have an  
25 email, we've developed a database of



1 people that have said they would be  
2 interested in this and we have some  
3 lists, we've been putting out  
4 announcements. We have in the first time  
5 the RPB was stood up was in April 2013  
6 and that was a stakeholder workshop.  
7 Many of you were there. We had, already  
8 been mentioned, the webinar we had in  
9 August and then of course today.

10 So, the work is mostly focused on  
11 insuring tools and mechanisms exist for  
12 information exchange and that stakeholder  
13 engagement opportunities are built into  
14 the RPB events.

15 So, our short-term goals have been  
16 to improve capacity for communication  
17 between the RPB and stakeholders. We  
18 would like the RPB to think about how  
19 effective this has been. We have  
20 improved our distribution list to include  
21 sectors. This will allow the RPB to  
22 formalize our data sets both by people  
23 and regions and sectors and states where  
24 they live. By doing so we'll be able to  
25 identify gaps in people we have not

1           reached out to yet and also clarify  
2           potential leaders in the sectors.

3           So, some of the ways we might do  
4           better is improving our distribution list  
5           to include the distribution and Marshal  
6           and Stach is working on this. We would  
7           like to encourage the stakeholders to  
8           sell offerings. Making participant lists  
9           available to the stakeholders will allow  
10          them to identify who's been involved and  
11          I interested in our activities. This  
12          will provide opportunities for discussion  
13          at the RPB events and facilitate the  
14          development of relationships between  
15          stakeholders. Ultimately it will be  
16          important for us, the RPB to ask  
17          stakeholders how we can motivate them to  
18          self organize.

19          So that's a question to the  
20          stakeholders. Now, how can we help you  
21          self organize? That old adage. What's  
22          in it for me? How can you make something  
23          in it for you that would help us? The  
24          collective us.

25          The group also recommends we



1           about the formal stakeholders committee  
2           option, but first just respond to a few  
3           of the comments we heard during the first  
4           public comment section. Morgan's comment  
5           about engagement and how today, realize  
6           isn't stakeholder engagement. We realize  
7           this is not all we need to do. This is  
8           not all we are going to do. You are  
9           going to hear in a few minutes about  
10          other ideas. We are thinking about the  
11          networking events over pizza is another.  
12          Certainly the nested approach that we  
13          heard from people that fits into our  
14          plans.

15                 My personal goal is to have it not  
16          be us versus them as Cindy referred to  
17          it, I wanted to move to we and that means  
18          instead of talking to or hearing  
19          statements from the conversation with and  
20          have that be what we aim towards, how do  
21          we do that? We have to do this formally  
22          during meetings. We want to do more in  
23          the meetings. Do we balance what we can  
24          do with the staff we have and the time  
25          you have? How can we make that most

1 efficient and effective? That's what we  
2 aim towards. The one idea that came out  
3 of the work that MARCO did. Thanks to  
4 MARCO for the work that they did in the  
5 past.

6 The states had given us this, a lot  
7 of thought MARCO had done, a paper on  
8 options. The stakeholder liaison  
9 committee is one option we think is worth  
10 considering because I think it meets most  
11 of our needs. The idea is to identify  
12 liaisons and have them as part of a  
13 standing committee that provides input.  
14 MARCO would have a lead role therein  
15 coordinating with the committee in making  
16 sure they engaged and know what we are  
17 doing and we hear what they are doing.  
18 So the information goes back and forth.  
19 There would be a keen responsibility for  
20 the liaisons from various sectors, could  
21 be geographic sectors, industry sectors,  
22 intersectors, people interested in  
23 ecosystems, so there could be wind echo  
24 systems, the Northern Mid-Atlantic,  
25 Mid-Atlantic so we get that nested type

1 of philosophy into it, but MARCO and the  
2 liaisons would be talking back and forth  
3 to make sure the information goes back  
4 and forth in both directions. There  
5 would be a geographic, local sub  
6 regional-type aspect to it. This is in  
7 addition to the opportunities we have  
8 together to participate in.

9           Someone on a committee of any kind,  
10 they serve a role of any kind that does  
11 not preempt them from seeking. This is  
12 another way to hear from interests and  
13 interests would start talking with each  
14 other and realize they have more in  
15 common and something in common they may  
16 not now realize they may have an interest  
17 in time or space or their particular  
18 interest might be more compatible than  
19 they thought. We want to get  
20 stakeholders talking about each other as  
21 much as we get them talking with us.

22           One thing you'll hear about through  
23 this is FACA, our intent to communicate  
24 effectively with stakeholders. There is  
25 a FACA rule out there or federal rule

1           that has to do with advisory committees.  
2           If you cross certain lines you have to be  
3           much more formal about it. We want to  
4           respect our intent to communicate what  
5           the public and our intent to comply with  
6           FACA and figure out where we want to go  
7           on that line.

8                     Do we want to go the extra step for  
9           something formal that would require a lot  
10          of effort by the RPB and make things,  
11          communication public, more formal or be a  
12          little less formal and find a way to  
13          work -- work towards our objectives with  
14          respect to FACA and not around them.

15                    So, benefits to a stakeholder  
16          liaison committee, this could be done  
17          quickly working with industries, working  
18          with geography. We can identify liaisons  
19          that could participate.

20                    As I mentioned the third bullet,  
21          there has a lot to -- would do with what  
22          we are trying to do to earn cross-sector  
23          communications. This is a way to get  
24          things going quickly. The primary  
25          benefit is time and encouraging the

1 stakeholders to act quickly, not only the  
2 RPB getting the benefit, but the  
3 stakeholders organizing themselves  
4 quickly and starting to identify shared  
5 interests and opportunities.

6 There are a few costs so to speak  
7 or challenges as I mentioned. We have to  
8 staff, we have to make good use of  
9 whatever committee or structure we want  
10 to develop. We want to make sure they go  
11 to the effort. They communicate with us,  
12 we want to hear their points. MARCO  
13 would serve as an intermediary and RPB.  
14 But it's crucial that we have people on  
15 that committee who represent all of the  
16 sectors, that no one gets left behind so  
17 every sector has a voice through a  
18 liaison they are comfortable with and  
19 that works through MARCO through the RPB.

20 The RPB and MARCO and you, we all  
21 have constraints on how much time and  
22 effort we can commit to this. How do we  
23 make that work? How do we meet everyone  
24 in a fair place?

25 As I mentioned, the last bullet has



1 to do with FACA. We have to be fully  
2 respectful, especially the federal agents  
3 around the table, but the same  
4 obligations and expectations apply to  
5 everybody here which is to make this work  
6 in a most efficient and effective way.

7 So, few short goals and the  
8 questions to the respect RPB. Does the  
9 RPB want to move forward in -- is that  
10 one of the preferred ways to engage with  
11 stakeholders and as we described it?  
12 Does this option trigger FACA? What we  
13 have to do to not trigger FACA. If we  
14 close the line what do we have to do to  
15 comply with FACA? We have to be  
16 respectful of that. How do stakeholders  
17 feel about that? Will the liaisons  
18 identify themselves and serve in sector  
19 leads? In other words, are there people  
20 out there in the audience and people that  
21 can't be there today, are they willing to  
22 get engaged, have the time, energy and  
23 interest to work on this? That's a very  
24 important first step.

25 Longer-term aspirations. Sarah

1 mentioned the more eclectic approaches we  
2 have. There are certainly in-person  
3 meetings like that. We are certainly  
4 thinking beyond those ideas. The  
5 stakeholder committee is beyond that, but  
6 also the sector base, meeting, visits to  
7 places that can be part of this too, but  
8 the authorized star there, considering  
9 the development of a formal FACA, that  
10 could be a much more formal stakeholder  
11 of the committee and can be it -- it's a  
12 very formal process that requires select  
13 people who are on the committee and  
14 public notice of each meeting and  
15 documenting the meetings. It's a more  
16 formal, costly intensive effort and one  
17 of the important points is the short term  
18 and long term, give it the appropriate  
19 consideration what we wanted to do.

20 Certainly other ideas I mentioned  
21 MARCO did a lot of work on options that  
22 came up with several and there are  
23 certainly more than we can consider here.  
24 So it's important the RPB consider these  
25 aspirations, consider what they want to

1 do, but the stakeholders do the same  
2 thing at the same time so RPB makes a  
3 decision they've got input from  
4 stakeholders to inform that decision.

5 Again, resources, staff dollars.  
6 It's very important to you and very  
7 important to us. We have limited  
8 resources to be able to support that what  
9 we would do we must make sure we support  
10 that to success.

11 That's it for comments. To open  
12 this would hopefully that will inspire  
13 some discussion.

14 MS. CANTRAL: Hopefully you have  
15 inspired discussion and have comments and  
16 reactions to what you heard from Sarah  
17 and Tom, both of whom posed some specific  
18 questions about what you think about what  
19 they have developed working with their  
20 work group, building on ideas that have  
21 been developed by MARCO. What do folks  
22 think? Have some conversation? What are  
23 some of the other RPBs done, have they  
24 formed as their -- have you guys looked  
25 at some of those?

1           MR. BIGFORD: One is advanced as  
2 far as we are. There is four altogether  
3 so the northeast, there are -- they are a  
4 couple months ahead of us. They have a  
5 stakeholder event like we did. I'm not  
6 aware of a standing committee. They did  
7 go out and have what I would consider  
8 what I heard, I think they did that.  
9 They paid visits to places around New  
10 England. And being a subset of the RPB  
11 and went out and talked to people about  
12 goals, scope, charter. I don't know,  
13 maybe somebody else knows, Joe? Joe is  
14 on that group.

15           MR. ATANGAN: Nick, he is one of  
16 the folks involved in the sector. That's  
17 a more robust program proceeding very  
18 nicely. I guess defer to Nick to answer  
19 some of the questions if there is time,  
20 but also -- but I guess more concise is  
21 they have a different effort and they  
22 have dedicated people to go out and  
23 engage by various sectors. There is a  
24 fishery marine industry engagement  
25 opportunity and things like that that

1 have taken place already.

2 MS. CANTRAL: I'm going to chime  
3 into, address your question and Nick, I'm  
4 putting you on notice. I'm putting you  
5 on the spot in asking you during public  
6 comment section if you would be prepared  
7 to share some of the details of the  
8 things that Joe was referring to and Tom  
9 referred to in particular, apart from  
10 what you hear Nick give you a better  
11 overview than I can is over the course of  
12 the summer after the RPB had their second  
13 formal meeting just like this at their  
14 first meeting they had exercise just like  
15 you are having to make an initial  
16 discussion about goals. They did some  
17 further work to develop that like I  
18 suspect you'll be doing and talk about  
19 that at their second meeting in the  
20 spring and they went out in a series of  
21 meetings state by state and engaged  
22 people in those states in a discussion  
23 specifically about developing the goals  
24 and objectives related to the goals.

25 There is some other things that

1           they are doing that Nick, I hope you  
2           don't mind being put on the spot to talk  
3           about.

4                   MR. NAPOLI:   (NICK NAPOLI)

5           I think everything you mention so  
6           far we did develop goals, objectives. We  
7           did have several comment periods during  
8           our RPB meetings and did bring those in  
9           draft form out for public meetings  
10          through out the northeast.

11          May and June and had a less formal  
12          sort of interaction and those goals and  
13          activities we had a public comment period  
14          for it on line. And our summarizing  
15          those public comments and revising the  
16          goals and objectives.

17          We are right now revising the goals  
18          and objectives and take those back out in  
19          October to states, specific groups that  
20          have been setup to support, some support  
21          some of the state planning efforts. We  
22          don't have a state stakeholder liaison  
23          committee. We've actually had a lot of  
24          discussions about this. It's still an  
25          ongoing discussion whether to do that.

1 I'm curious to hear where you land on  
2 that, but we did decide there are  
3 existing bodies in New England that  
4 helped support some of the state planning  
5 efforts that we are going to use at,  
6 least in the interim until we get that  
7 figured out and whether we do something  
8 more regional.

9 In late October we'll be in each of  
10 the states to have the state specific  
11 bodies to provide feedback.

12 MS. CHYTALO: They are doing the  
13 state by state approach basically and  
14 gathering the information and bringing  
15 that to the table, right?

16 MR. NAPOLI: Yes.

17 MS. CHYTALO: But Tom, one  
18 clarification on the structure you and  
19 Sarah and another have come up with, will  
20 there be one liaison committee -- will  
21 there be a state, each state would have a  
22 replicate committee and then there will  
23 be one committee who puts them all  
24 together or something?

25 MR. BIGFORD: Maybe.

1 MS. CHYTALO: Clarity.

2 MS. CANTRAL: Tom, I was asking  
3 Nick about that states, another way to  
4 get into it would be state by state,  
5 sector by sector or topic by topic. To  
6 cross state boundaries there is a lot of  
7 to do it.

8 MR. NAPOLI: Yes.

9 MR. BIGFORD: Maybe there would be  
10 one, more than one committee. Another  
11 one state by state, or by sector. We can  
12 do it all. We have to support it and the  
13 stakeholders have to be able to support  
14 it. If it falls, either way we've  
15 established something that was not the  
16 metric? It was attainable and what did  
17 Greg say?

18 VOICE: Achievable and measurable.

19 Not that I was paying attention.

20 (Laughter)

21 MR. BIGFORD: We have to set it up,  
22 but I like state by state is to make sure  
23 we have a voice from each locale.

24 MS. CANTRAL: John, do you have a  
25 comment on that?



1 MR. WALTERS: I did.

2 IS there any restriction or any  
3 reason why RPB members could not attend  
4 various meetings held throughout this  
5 region by various organizations?  
6 Committee meetings are held in  
7 Philadelphia and Baltimore, New York and  
8 Hamilton Roads. Why can't we attend  
9 those meetings representing the  
10 Mid-Atlantic RPB and voice or listen to  
11 the comments from those groups?

12 Likewise, Mid-Atlantic fisheries'  
13 management counsel though Jack is a  
14 representative to the board from the  
15 counsel, could not members of this RPB  
16 attend those meetings also to gain inside  
17 as to what's being discussed at those  
18 meetings with the guard on state seafood  
19 industry?

20 Do you have meetings or are you a  
21 lobbying group and could some of members  
22 of the RPB be invited to your meetings to  
23 find -- to listen and find out what's  
24 being discussed?

25 Surf Riders, are members' meetings

1           being held and if the RPB is to gain an  
2           understanding, acknowledgment, awareness  
3           of what you are doing, would we be  
4           welcomed to those meetings? To listen?  
5           To converse have a conversation?

6           MS. CANTRAL: Okay. A lot of good  
7           questions to get some reactions and  
8           several people have their tents up. I  
9           saw you, Joe, but maybe you are getting  
10          in the queue to that particular point.

11          MR. ATANGAN: A little both.

12          MS. CANTRAL: Let's to go Joe,  
13          Laura and Frank.

14          MR. ATANGAN: So part of the  
15          engagement that Nick has been  
16          participating in the northeast, one of  
17          the things that they certainly tried to  
18          do is have an RPB member. So it's not  
19          Nick and John. They try to have an RPB  
20          member present there to, I guess, though  
21          presence and interest in what they are  
22          doing. So that's certainly one aspect it  
23          of.

24          I agree with you 100 percent we --  
25          and I kind of try to include this in a

1 charter. I got some push back, was one  
2 of the duties and responsibilities of RPB  
3 members is to, in fact, represent the RPB  
4 to these various organizations. I got  
5 push back RPB members represent their  
6 organizations and so I think that comment  
7 was misunderstood a little bit. But I do  
8 feel it's the responsibility of every RPB  
9 member to be advocates for what the RPB  
10 is doing and in doing so we need to be  
11 able to participate in these  
12 organizations as part of our outreach and  
13 our stakeholder engagement activities.

14 The other point I want to make is  
15 if you heard Nick in there, what they  
16 have was an evolutionary process, you  
17 know. They had a draft set of goals.  
18 They took it out to the public --  
19 engagement on that received to input for  
20 are now modifying it and going back to  
21 the public. Okay?

22 So, I -- one of the earlier  
23 comments was well, you know, you already  
24 had the draft goals and lost the public.  
25 I couldn't disagree more. It gives a

1 starting point of departure to start the  
2 conversation. It's not etched in stone.  
3 This is what we are thinking and  
4 interested in your inputs. Bring them  
5 along.

6 I want to stress that this is an  
7 interpretive process. Here is what we  
8 are thinking. We are interested in what  
9 you are thinking and we are willing to  
10 modify as we go along to make sure we are  
11 reaching the right objectives or  
12 identifying the right goals and  
13 proceeding in a way that is inclusive and  
14 will meet, you know, that is heading  
15 towards our vision yet which is still to  
16 be articulated.

17 MS. CANTRAL: Laura.

18 MS. MCKAY: One comment first that  
19 I think we have as an RPB or as MARCO  
20 started to do some of that kind of going  
21 to other people's meetings. I know I  
22 have presented to the Mid-Atlantic  
23 Fishery Council about the MARCO portal  
24 and had some discussions with them a  
25 couple years ago now, but we routinely

1 get asked to various meetings and again,  
2 it's often a resource constraint that how  
3 much time do we have, who is paying for  
4 the travel and that sort of thing, but I  
5 wanted to ask Nick, too, in the northeast  
6 as you go state by state, what resources  
7 are the states using state by state in  
8 order to engage public?

9 MR. NAPOLI: So, in we've done  
10 state by state. That was through some of  
11 Emrock's funding supporting the RPB.  
12 That was last May and June? In October  
13 when we go through their state advisory  
14 bodies, it will be a combination, I  
15 think.

16 In Massachusetts and Rhode Island  
17 they have a structure set up and planning  
18 process and so we are sort of leveraging  
19 for that. And in other states we are  
20 helping them to put that local or state  
21 specific stakeholder group together and  
22 so it will be probably a combination of  
23 in time support.

24 MS. MCKAY: We do have some of that  
25 capability with or RPB grand and Monmouth

1 team. It's slow going, but we do have a  
2 set of meetings coming up. Tony's been  
3 working on organizing with ports and  
4 meetings with commercial fishers over the  
5 winter and so you know, we are not  
6 totally starting from scratch. We have  
7 some things in place and we also in our  
8 region have some state by state, not  
9 quite as far as Long -- New York just  
10 finished its big ocean study. I had some  
11 Section 309 grades from NOAA for CZM for  
12 five-year ocean planning strategy, but  
13 not every state has it. So it's going to  
14 be kind of piece work, piecemeal a little  
15 bit. How we can patch this together  
16 given the resources we have to have  
17 effective Stakeholder engagement process?

18 MS. CANTRAL: That's actually what  
19 Nick was describing has been the case in  
20 New England as well there is existing  
21 advisory bodies. Some of your states you  
22 have those as part of your coastal  
23 management program or some other kind of  
24 existing group you can tap in to and  
25 where you don't have them figure out the

1 best mechanism for creating them. So  
2 there is -- they are somewhat parallel  
3 and let them evolve.

4 It's quality, quality, quality,  
5 quality, quality to reiterate or expand  
6 upon what I said before. Every state is  
7 represented here in multiple agencies,  
8 based throughout the region are here.  
9 Resources are realized on our activities,  
10 but if there is a meeting in New York,  
11 could not the New York represents like  
12 its port of New York being held? Or in  
13 Delaware? Could the Pennsylvania  
14 representative attend that maritime  
15 meeting? Maybe a short drive, maybe  
16 within commuting distance? I don't know.  
17 But for those of us then southeast  
18 Virginia to come to New York involves  
19 some travel funds the next day that kind  
20 of stuff, but there might be some  
21 benefit.

22 Port of Baltimore, you are within  
23 the commuting distance, no tolls to go  
24 through either. So maybe there is an  
25 opportunity at the very least will cost

1 time is about the biggest cost where no  
2 funds are actually required to spend  
3 overnight meals or whatever.

4 MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Let's hear  
5 from Frank and then Mo.

6 MR. MACH: The bays and estuaries  
7 can be righted by the Shinnecock Nation  
8 and the states. Certainly the various  
9 groups within its state areas could be  
10 represented by the states. The states in  
11 and MARCO have a grip on issues and  
12 groups within their purview and  
13 territories to bring issues to us that  
14 they feel we can do something about.

15 As far as I think individual  
16 members of the RPB visiting these groups,  
17 it would be somewhat difficult because  
18 how would you answer the question what  
19 are you going to do for me? And I don't  
20 think we are prepared to do that.

21 MS. BORNHOLDT: I was going to take  
22 a slightly different approach. If we  
23 have a liaison committee, MARCO can help  
24 with the care and feeding to get out to  
25 sector state -- it's important that we



1 can access it. That's important. But  
2 that's not the last piece. I think we  
3 have to try to leverage our opportunity.  
4 It may be I can't answer the question,  
5 that's U.S.D.A. But what I can do is  
6 carry it back and I can contact Pedro or  
7 whomever, say I was here. This is what I  
8 heard, bring it back our table and have  
9 that discussion.

10 The MARCO workshop said these are  
11 going to tough times, tight budgets. We  
12 have to think out of the box and I can go  
13 up to Baltimore at a maritime meeting and  
14 take notes on six people that cannot --  
15 it's multi there. I might be there as --  
16 but you know what? I'm listening as an  
17 RPB. We can't stop there. We need to  
18 find an additional tool we can use and  
19 this is the beauty about not only do they  
20 know who -- what the issues are on the  
21 landscape. But Doug's out in the region  
22 and others are too, but we have that  
23 entree into what the issues are on the  
24 landscape. We have the Shinnecock  
25 Nation, the ability to get there and find

1 the issues of interest to the nation.  
2 It's in the MARCO -- within our five  
3 states.

4 I suggesting we maximize our  
5 exposure with our day job, but we need  
6 another tool in our toolbox.

7 MR. CAPOBIANCO: I wanted to make a  
8 point or two and Nick can certainly  
9 correct me if I'm mischaracterizing  
10 anything, Emrock, but I want to put out  
11 there that first of all, all of the fine  
12 work that Emrock and the regional  
13 planning body are doing. They have a  
14 significant head start. It's more than a  
15 couple months and it's to their credit,  
16 one, to put out facts there.

17 Emrock is probably -- has better  
18 capacity than MARCO to do work they are  
19 doing now? I know that across the  
20 MARCO's case and our discussions we talk  
21 very regularly. We are trying to meet  
22 that challenge and build some capacity  
23 and be able to, to some degree, follow  
24 that path obviously with our Mid-Atlantic  
25 signature, but the kind of things that

1           Nick is talking about, take resources and  
2           I think the good side of the story, they  
3           are effective and actually, you know,  
4           they thought it through. There is a lot  
5           of successes. We could model similar  
6           work on in the Mid-Atlantic but, you  
7           know, I just -- somebody said earlier  
8           about expectations. I just, you know,  
9           I'm not sure we have the capacity to be  
10          able to, you know, go where Emrock and  
11          northeast RPB is going right now. We  
12          certainly want that capacity, but I don't  
13          want to give the impression tomorrow we  
14          can do that, but I have the idea of learn  
15          what they have done and they are doing  
16          some great work.

17                    It's going to take us a little bit  
18          of time to get there. Thanks.

19                   MR. ATANGAN: I want to support the  
20          comments of my good friend from the Coast  
21          Guard with regard to the approach of  
22          getting regional planning body members  
23          participating in areas, maybe not within  
24          their area of expertise, but certainly  
25          participating in meetings that are going

1           on within their geographic area that can  
2           be easily reached. I go back to what  
3           Roddy had mentioned earlier. Sometimes  
4           it's all about just shutting up and  
5           listening and taking in the information.  
6           What I'm hearing from the stakeholder  
7           they don't want us necessarily to be in a  
8           transmit mode. So what they are looking  
9           for is for us to listen. So by  
10          participating in some of these individual  
11          sector meetings, you know, whether it be  
12          a Surf Riders meeting or meeting of a  
13          local canoe club, I'm happy to  
14          participate in. I know where it's at and  
15          I can get there in a reasonable time.  
16          I'm happy. I may not know the subject  
17          but I can take good notes and pass it out  
18          and say hey, you know what are we doing  
19          about this? How are we addressing that?  
20          This is there is some real value, whether  
21          or not we have expertise in that  
22          particular subject to go in there and  
23          listen.

24                    I'm a 30-military guy, spend 30  
25          years in uniform. I'm being exposed to

1 things here never in my life I would  
2 imagine I would be exposed to. You know?  
3 And I'm relishing the opportunity. I'm  
4 learning. I'm learning to be, you know,  
5 becoming more sensitive about the issues  
6 affecting fishermen. Fishermen was one  
7 general category for me. I know there is  
8 a difference between the scallop and  
9 shellfish and you know, the recreational  
10 fisherman. That's important, you know,  
11 obvious to everybody in this room but  
12 it's important you get that kind of, I  
13 guess, sensitivity and appreciation for  
14 those varied interests.

15 When I look at it I look at the  
16 military ranges. I look at where  
17 people -- where we can train and stuff  
18 like that. I can always factor all of  
19 these other issues in there, but it's  
20 important I do. The only way I'll get  
21 exposure to that is if I go in  
22 undiscovered territory for me and start  
23 learning by listening. So I really  
24 support what John is talking about with  
25 us going out and participating in these

1 meetings.

2 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

3 MR. RAMOS: We are making a point.

4 Tom made a good job of putting out the  
5 proposal out there on the screen, but the  
6 key thing here is the stakeholders and  
7 input from them. Let the stakeholders  
8 tell us what they would like to do and  
9 then we can figure out how to participate  
10 through that process instead of talking  
11 about -- no offense, but the nickel and  
12 diming about traveling. Surf Riders are  
13 giving surf lessons. I'm on the road.  
14 (Laughter) Let them figure out how they  
15 want to be represented. Thanks.

16 MR. BIGFORD: All right. Like  
17 maybe a dual-headed approach to what I've  
18 been hearing is going to meetings. The  
19 sectors might organize and the other one.  
20 So they already plan on traveling. We  
21 are not adding an imposition, they were  
22 already going to meet. We might get a  
23 little bit of their agenda or a social  
24 networking opportunity before or after,  
25 but the other approach, which might work

1 in some places, we organize the meeting  
2 on their turf. They have an opportunity  
3 to come to us and maybe we are the agenda  
4 instead of a piece of that. Either one  
5 might work. Both might work. All  
6 depends on the capacity to do it. Both,  
7 keeping in mind as we make plans is  
8 absolutely crucial and certainly surf  
9 lessons, Pedro?

10 MS. CANTRAL: Hear that, Matt?

11 MS. CHYTALO: Sorry. I wasn't at  
12 some of the early meetings of the RPB. I  
13 apologize for that, but I wanted to -- I  
14 wasn't sure how they, the RPB formed and  
15 what were some of the limitations on. I  
16 don't know the factor rules or whatever  
17 of having stakeholders or whatever  
18 participate at part of the regional  
19 planning body. Has that decision been  
20 made and done? We are past that? I just  
21 don't know. I -- just curious.

22 MS. BORNHOLDT: One of the  
23 challenges, for example, is one with  
24 renewable energy. How do you gather the  
25 people together and have the frank

1 discussions and Tom and Sarah mentioned  
2 the guys, federal guys are sitting at the  
3 table and what those revisions are. I  
4 can't have nongovernmental entities  
5 having discussions about business.

6 MS. CHYTALO: Okay.

7 MS. BORNHOLDT: When the NCCOS went  
8 and ocean counsel was involved, they  
9 needed to recognize tribes, federal and  
10 state -- recognize the agencies and we  
11 are not it. We have these stakeholders  
12 you don't see, you know, environmental  
13 energy sitting here. You have to go  
14 through here. What Tom and Sarah  
15 articulated on the slide we may get there  
16 and the method is a FACA chart, committee  
17 perhaps, taking that to be -- to have  
18 someone sitting here at the table  
19 conducting business.

20 We have limited resources and time  
21 as we say, but even up and --  
22 opportunities over the next five years to  
23 jump start some of the discussions  
24 associated with goals and develop due  
25 planning. And the key thing is being --



1 not have somebody -- not a governmental  
2 sitting around this discussion.  
3 That's -- that said, as what time Tom and  
4 Sarah and many of us said, other ways to  
5 get out there and we are kind of  
6 challenged by the genesis in our -- we  
7 were formed.

8 MS. CHYTALO: It does not preclude  
9 us in the future going down that path.

10 MS. BORNHOLDT: Right. We can have  
11 members, nongovernmental, the opportunity  
12 for the path to be able to do that is  
13 going through a FACA chartered committee  
14 to do that. With that said you can have  
15 a private entity make a presentation.  
16 You can have a liaison committee other  
17 than the federal body be able to act as  
18 that information gathering so you can  
19 still have that and not be a FACA  
20 committee.

21 MS. CHYTALO: Thank you.

22 MR. BIGFORD: Just to clarify.  
23 They were not be part of the RPB. If we  
24 had a wind industry representative, they  
25 would not be part of this, but a

1 specified way for them to contribute the  
2 composition of the group is as Mo  
3 suggested. Mo stated it's dictated by  
4 the National Ocean Policy.

5 MS. CHYTALO: Okay.

6 MR. BIGFORD: Just state, federal  
7 and tribal representatives. We can  
8 engage with others, that's the FACA  
9 subcommittee, but us. No, they can't sit  
10 at this table.

11 MS. CHYTALO: Okay.

12 MS. CANTRAL: So, just this  
13 discussion and your question this -- the  
14 ideas you are all discussing right now  
15 how to be creative giving those  
16 constraints about how the -- to most  
17 effectively and the most meaningful way  
18 possible engage stakeholders starting now  
19 in the absence of being able to establish  
20 a format, FACA advisory committee.

21 So, the idea about the stakeholder  
22 liaison committee that Sarah and Tom have  
23 talked about is one way and there are  
24 others and so let me just take a shot at  
25 summarizing what I heard now and Tom and

1 Sarah, I think you two need to be  
2 listening and helping me raise questions  
3 still on your mind we have not taken up  
4 during that session and make sure we had  
5 an opportunity to do that.

6 My interpretation of what I heard  
7 from this work group is it is important  
8 to develop a suite of mechanisms for  
9 communicating out to stakeholders from  
10 getting input and from stakeholders.

11 So, there are lots of tools and  
12 things that Sarah summarized about making  
13 information and work product and other  
14 information about the RPB available  
15 through the website, through electronic  
16 means, email, other mechanisms.

17 The notion of creating a network by  
18 having access to participant lists to  
19 cross pollenate and help people self  
20 organize and talk about the work and what  
21 you think about that work you understand  
22 the RPB to be taking up and provide input  
23 is another mechanism or set of ideas that  
24 I think this group would like to hear.  
25 We should have conversations about it and

1 the stakeholders -- Pedro's point is well  
2 taken. You all can talk about the ideas.  
3 You need to hear from the folks in the  
4 room and hear today about what they all  
5 want and what they need and their ideas  
6 how to meet those needs.

7 The notion of now attending  
8 meetings and using those meetings as an  
9 opportunity to be ambassadors for the  
10 process is a natural one. It has to  
11 be -- there has to be the lens of reality  
12 and you are busy people and so time and  
13 managing the expectations, but what you  
14 can do is another opportunity to have  
15 forums and venues to have discussions and  
16 learn from different interest groups  
17 about anything about your process.

18 Looking at the model from the  
19 northeast and deciding what of that model  
20 works for this context is also now a good  
21 opportunity and that may be something to  
22 experiment with and see what they have  
23 done would work for the Mid-Atlantic  
24 given where you are and the kind of  
25 capacity there is to carry it out. Which

1 brings me back to the liaison committee.  
2 I didn't hear any discussion about other  
3 than Sarah tying it up and Tom going into  
4 some detail about it. So I would invite  
5 you all to provide some more input to  
6 what you think about that idea so that we  
7 know, you know, what we are working with  
8 here and to take things to the next step.

9 So Doug? Sarah?

10 MR. PABST: We are -- who we are  
11 and have the best heads forward to get  
12 the maximum amount of input from the  
13 public and the liaison committee sounds  
14 like the best option we have in the short  
15 term. So we'll do multiple things at the  
16 same time. I support that and the other  
17 ideas about being able to go to meets and  
18 outreach and talking to people about this  
19 sort of thing that would be. I see us  
20 going, but I'm anxious to hear more about  
21 the public and circle back on that as  
22 well.

23 MS. CANTRAL: Sarah?

24 MS. COOKSEY: Just a couple  
25 comments. I'm not in any order, but we

1 already heard from at least one member of  
2 the public from the National Ocean  
3 Coalition he does want a FACA. I heard  
4 him say that was up there, long-term  
5 aspirations to consider that, because  
6 there are some groups that do want that  
7 more formal process.

8 We heard from Cindy and that sort  
9 of like our model she said she  
10 represented 113 different groups and the  
11 only way to do this right now is to sort  
12 of work in these -- we thought in the  
13 smaller groups that mentioned up and to  
14 not trigger a FACA they can talk to the  
15 MARCO states and then the MARCO states  
16 bring it back. But I cannot emphasize  
17 enough this is the first thing -- MARCO  
18 is offering up a lot of stuff here. We  
19 need the agencies to at least meet us  
20 halfway. It's the ocean policy and our  
21 states only own out to three miles and  
22 it's the nation's ocean out there.

23 So we cannot do this by ourselves  
24 and even though the people in Delaware,  
25 they want to talk to me, they know where

1 my office is. They know where the  
2 general assembly is, have a direct  
3 telephone line and people know who I am.  
4 They still are going to want to see some  
5 federal people at these meetings so you  
6 guys have got to come and help us.

7 So what I was thinking and again  
8 expectations. This is even doing this --  
9 even having one first date which is not  
10 enough. That's going to take resources  
11 we have not exactly allocated. We have  
12 some work going on, but I don't think  
13 that's what people -- we want to do more.  
14 We need help.

15 MR. ZEMBA: I want to thank Sarah  
16 reminding everyone this is a federal  
17 initiative and resource constraints are a  
18 concern for the states.

19 MS. CANTRAL: Any other thoughts in  
20 particular with the liaison committee?  
21 We heard from Doug in support of the idea  
22 there were expressions of appreciation  
23 about the offer that MARCO is making for,  
24 you know, significant effort. But the  
25 point about it being a partnership is

1 something that you are all going to need  
2 to keep in mind as the work proceeds.

3 Joe?

4 MR. ATANGAN: I'm not hearing  
5 anything against it. So...

6 MS. CANTRAL: I'm trying to get us  
7 to a point. We are ready to wrap this up  
8 and open up the public comments.

9 MR. ATANGAN: Silence is census at  
10 that point, but I'm not hearing any bad  
11 arguments why we shouldn't proceed with  
12 this approach. It's the alternative on  
13 the table and absent another proposal  
14 I -- giddy up.

15 MS. CANTRAL: Greg?

16 MR. CAPOBIANCO: Sure. So at the  
17 April workshop I was extremely impressed  
18 with the stakeholder panel we had at the  
19 last session of the day. I chased them  
20 all down at the social hour there  
21 afterwards and I got to all of them  
22 except one. I did ask some questions of  
23 these folks and folks are you were not  
24 there and do not know who they were, I  
25 can remember most of them, Canmardin,



1 Cape Fresh, Minard, John Webber,  
2 representing surf riding environmental,  
3 Dick Green representing recreational  
4 fishers and Eric Johansson representing  
5 ports and bay activities. That was all  
6 of them.

7 At any rate, what I have offered  
8 and what I think might be a simple and  
9 perhaps productive start and I have  
10 reached out to all of them post-workshop  
11 because when I spoke with them at the  
12 workshop what occurred to me when I  
13 talked to them they have some resources  
14 of their own, this idea of whatever the  
15 self word we are using -- self  
16 organizing. There is some capacity there  
17 for them to communicate with their  
18 constituencies and related groups and  
19 it's sort of a Cindy model.

20 These folks that were on that panel  
21 have a very wide -- I think it makes more  
22 sense to try to continue to talk with  
23 them. A couple returned my inquiries and  
24 I would be willing to continue to talk  
25 about, you know, the kind of kinds of

1 capacities they could bring to that.  
2 This -- what kinds of things they could  
3 do and I'm offering that up as maybe a  
4 way, you know, not sure exactly what the  
5 first steps are in terms of the RPB's  
6 desires, but I think we can come up with  
7 some to come forward and try to pursue  
8 that beginning of liaison committee.

9 MS. CANTRAL: Sounds like a place  
10 to start endorsement and thoughts about  
11 having it started to flesh it out. So  
12 why don't we leave this discussion where  
13 it is for the moment and turn to our  
14 public comment. How does that sound?

15 MR. BIGFORD: Great.

16 MS. CANTRAL: I have eight folks  
17 signed up for the second public comment  
18 section and you all know the format. I  
19 won't repeat it. I'll dive right in and  
20 say you all each have three minutes.  
21 We'll start with Margo Gopnik and second,  
22 Ali Chase and third will be Brent  
23 Greenfield.

24 MS. GOPNIK: (MORGAN GOPNICK)

25 Margo Gopnick, again. I'm going to

1           make a quick comment about all of the  
2           stuff. As a lot of you know, one of the  
3           focuses of my research over the years was  
4           looking at how the public lands  
5           management agencies, forest service, how  
6           they have dealt with stakeholder  
7           engagement. I went to separate  
8           conferences. There are FACA and what  
9           FACA means to stakeholder engagement.

10                    What I hear, some of you have been  
11           with the federal government a long time,  
12           but I think we are being a little too  
13           cautious about FACA we can't talk to  
14           anybody. I'm exaggerating obviously, but  
15           people have really rethought a lot of  
16           those issues and it would be worth  
17           talking to some people who have worked --  
18           I don't mean worked around it, you know,  
19           been sneaky, but really got some lawyers  
20           at the table to say that's not what that  
21           means.

22                    So long as the federal government  
23           didn't organize it and they are not  
24           taking their following what the group  
25           says, so long as input, I don't -- I'm

1 not going to tell you all of the details,  
2 but there is a lot of information out  
3 there to make FACA a lot less scary about  
4 the didactics.

5 MS. CHASE: (ALI CHASE)

6 I want to thank all of you for  
7 thinking about all of the different  
8 options open and for pulling together a  
9 range of things for listening to some of  
10 the feedback. That's the groups in this  
11 room and others that couldn't be here  
12 today and provided what additional  
13 outreach opportunities exist and that's  
14 important.

15 I think that one of the key things  
16 is whether it was a FACA process or not  
17 there be a commitment to making the  
18 materials from the meetings transparent  
19 and open that as you did with this  
20 meeting that materials be posted in  
21 advance so people can prepare for the  
22 meetings. That goes a long way so that  
23 when people come they can participate.

24 And I think that another key thing  
25 is to make sure that you are able to

1 provide opportunities for regular  
2 proactive in engagement. Whether if you  
3 are not listening to people, but  
4 opportunities to comment and early in the  
5 process as possible.

6 Some of the groups I work with have  
7 given some thought to different  
8 representatives that could be on some  
9 sort of stakeholder liaison panel and the  
10 folks that were at the MARCO meeting are  
11 a good start. We also talked about  
12 separating out the environmental NGO  
13 factor and recreational user groups and I  
14 think there is more -- definitely  
15 surfing. We've all wanted to go today.  
16 But you know, swimming, boating, paddling  
17 bird watching, we've not heard about  
18 that, diving. The tourism folks need to  
19 be somehow engaged in this and that's not  
20 necessarily my sector, but that's an  
21 important piece of this puzzle. Marine  
22 trades, marina, shipbuilding. We talked  
23 about wind, aqua cultures, commercial  
24 fishing, fishing imports. I think it's  
25 probably worth taking a step and thinking

1 about the different sectors you want to  
2 engage and maybe being open to having  
3 multiple representatives from sectors if  
4 need be. It does not have to be one  
5 person. If you need that you've got a  
6 wide range of interests in that sector  
7 throughout the room. Nothing is stopping  
8 you from adding additional people to that  
9 or encouraging them to be engaged.

10 One other thing shows up a little  
11 bit in the charter, we have not talked  
12 about it. It's more important to  
13 establish science advisory academics.  
14 Add subject matter, experts working in  
15 the region or engaged in the regions'  
16 resources, because there is a lot of  
17 technical material that's going to be  
18 coming up. I think that's important to  
19 have them engaged pretty early on.

20 Thank you for all of the options  
21 you've laid out and I think all of us  
22 here look forward to working with you.

23 MR. GREENFIELD: (BRENT GREENFIELD)

24 My name is Brent Greenfield. I'm  
25 pleased to make the following comments

1           again on behalf of the National Ocean  
2           Police Coalition regarding Mid-Atlantic  
3           RPB stakeholder engagement.

4                     According to the most recent  
5           federal data, the Mid-Atlantic states  
6           comprised of Delaware, New Jersey, New  
7           York Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia  
8           generated over \$3 trillion in economic  
9           outpour in 2012. As RPB activities could  
10          result in impacts to some of this regions  
11          most significant economic contributors,  
12          it is vital that these and other critical  
13          interests that could generate additional  
14          economic output in the future not be shut  
15          out of the process and formal engagement  
16          opportunities.

17                    An adequate seat at the table for  
18          user groups should mean more than just an  
19          opportunity to comment, attend a  
20          listening session or complete a survey.  
21          Rather, the very groups who could be  
22          impacted by actions that might be taken  
23          by this body should be given a meaningful  
24          and active voice and role in this group's  
25          activities with their inpour helping to

1 guide a truly collaborative process and  
2 outcome.

3           Efforts to achieve a collaborative  
4 process and outcome can be enhanced and  
5 furthered if consensus means that such  
6 activities have the support and backing  
7 of the commercial and recreational  
8 interests that support or seek to support  
9 jobs and economic activity in the region.  
10 These groups represent the human elements  
11 that could be impacted and they too  
12 should have a seat at the table with  
13 their governmental counterparts and be  
14 directly represented on this body.

15           In the event that the regrettable  
16 decision to exclude nongovernmental  
17 representatives from RPB membership is  
18 left unchanged, other mechanisms for user  
19 group engagement including the  
20 establishment of a formal Federal  
21 Advisory Committee should be implemented  
22 before the RPB conducts any further  
23 activities.

24           While well-intended, efforts to  
25 create something short of a formal



1 Federal Advisory Committee, such as the  
2 establishment of a Stakeholder Liaison  
3 Committee that would communicate with  
4 third-party rather than the RPB itself,  
5 would be insufficient to ensure an  
6 outcome that adequately reflects a  
7 collaborative, consensus-based result and  
8 the critical input and perspectives of  
9 the commercial and recreational  
10 communities.

11 The RPB's stakeholder working group  
12 has noted that the RPB currently lacks  
13 the capacity to support a formal Federal  
14 Advisory Committee and that the RPB must  
15 ensure that the stakeholder engagement  
16 strategy chosen does not trigger the  
17 Federal Advisory Committee Act. In this  
18 case, the RPB must embrace rather than  
19 avoid the applicability of the Federal  
20 Advisory Committee Act.

21 To be sure, the challenges of  
22 operating with limited resources are  
23 understandable. However, if  
24 circumstances are such that the RPB lacks  
25 the capacity to establish a formal

1 Stakeholder Advisory Committee under the  
2 Federal Advisory Committee Act, the RPB  
3 seemingly lacks the ability and should  
4 not endeavor to engage in this effort.

5 Thank you for the opportunity to  
6 comment.

7 MR. GOVE: (MATT GOVE)

8 I look forward to the RPB surfing,  
9 when that's going to be next summer and  
10 please come to any of our chapter  
11 meetings. They are open and that would  
12 be fantastic. Most of them are at night.  
13 You are welcome.

14 Just a couple things. I think one  
15 has been said already, great stuff.  
16 Having more regional meetings like this  
17 is definitely key, talked about by state  
18 and mentioned one of per state its not  
19 enough. We want to highlight that we  
20 sent recommendations in a letter and  
21 others where to have meetings and I think  
22 there was 10 or 12 locations. I lived on  
23 Long Island one for a while and people  
24 from Montauk will not drive to the middle  
25 of Long Island or New York, so I'm sure

1           it's the same places. The documents do  
2           need to be out before the meeting. This  
3           worked well this time, having a little  
4           bit of time to look. It would be even  
5           better to look at documents before each  
6           meeting.

7                     We do want to make sure that the  
8           comments we are giving and things were we  
9           are sending are considered and it would  
10          be great to get expenses as we had that  
11          so far, but people want to know if they  
12          make an opportunity come to a meeting and  
13          give a comment that's being heard and  
14          things are going to perhaps change  
15          because of it.

16                    And then just wanted to mention  
17          that Surf Riding in the Mid-Atlantic has  
18          reached out to other groups. We are  
19          trying to reach out to other recreational  
20          groups like divers, ocean swimmers,  
21          coastal bird watchers, beach goers.  
22          Anyone that goes to the beach. We are  
23          trying to reach out to that group. It's  
24          a big group of people to make them aware  
25          but wanted to make you aware of that

1 effort and that's it. Thanks.

2 MS. ZIPF: (CINDY ZIPF)

3 I have a list of thoughts I wanted  
4 to share and I hope I'm allowed to go  
5 through them. We are ahead of schedule  
6 so I'm hopefully able to get through  
7 them. We did sign onto a letter that  
8 NRDC -- I don't know -- jibes. We all  
9 have them.

10 It's sort of the deference -- or  
11 deference to MARCO should really be  
12 thought through and we would like to talk  
13 more about that because I think so far  
14 the MARCO public involvement has not been  
15 robust as it should or could be. There  
16 have been a couple meetings over the  
17 years since 2009 it was established,  
18 right? So that's not necessarily a  
19 really robust public involvement. Maybe  
20 there is more happening now or soon, but  
21 I think that there needs to be some  
22 thought given to that rather than to  
23 deferring, ask the public that's been  
24 engaged whether that's so far a good  
25 system.

1           I think that you know I would like  
2           to thank the RPB. We had significant  
3           issue early on knowing who was  
4           participating in the meeting from the  
5           public participating and so today there  
6           was a list of attendees and the sign up.  
7           You asked people whether or not we can  
8           share their information, some that would  
9           be helpful we try to engage our citizens  
10          to know who is signed up already would be  
11          helpful so we know we are getting our  
12          message out for people to participate.

13                 I guess questions that I have about  
14                 some of the, you know, determining how  
15                 much resources we would like we are going  
16                 to have in participating in this process  
17                 is accountability, you know. Who, if we  
18                 don't like a direction or something, who  
19                 is the accountable once in -- if you were  
20                 an elected official we could vote you  
21                 out, but that's not the case.

22                 The last of -- lack of resources  
23                 really troubles me. There is a large  
24                 amount of resources up in the New England  
25                 area to facilitate meaningful comment and

1           they had grassroots bottom approach up  
2           there to look. You should look at that  
3           model. What role and commitment to the  
4           participation, would the liaison have to  
5           the -- what could I argue that we have  
6           this important role to play as a liaison  
7           if we were even considered to be one.  
8           Sort of what is the -- how would we be --  
9           how would we be incorporated in the RPB  
10          given the FACA limitations.

11                    I think the -- I see -- I don't  
12           know if you thought about it and of a  
13           specific ombudsman for the public,  
14           whether it be for wind or for the public  
15           interests to actually sit on the body so  
16           that's not necessarily a specific public  
17           representative, but a public  
18           representative that we can be sure we  
19           have issues of concern we could go to  
20           this person and make sure that they are  
21           at the table. That's a thought.

22                    You know, I think the fact that  
23           there was not an evening -- first of all,  
24           the agenda got out a little late. One  
25           week notice is a little rough and I had

1           made commitments this evening, so I'll  
2           not, unfortunately be able to enjoy the  
3           fuzzy beverages and pizza, but I'm going  
4           to a candidates forum to be asking state  
5           officials what their positions are on  
6           different issues. It's connected to what  
7           you are doing here. We'll have some  
8           feedback, an evening session, real  
9           evening session would be an important  
10          one.

11                 There is a lot of people working  
12           one and two jobs just to survive these  
13           days. Trying to find time to contribute  
14           is difficult for people which is why they  
15           rely on -- or suggests which is why they  
16           are here to represent their views, but it  
17           would be great and I think the idea of  
18           coming to some of our meetings is a  
19           wonderful one as well. I think that  
20           covers some of my lists.

21                 And I just wanted to emphasize  
22           that, you know, there has been a lot of  
23           work done and hopefully there will be an  
24           appreciation of that from the public. As  
25           I mentioned earlier, we've come a long

1 way and want to clean up the clean ocean  
2 economy.

3 MR. RAPP: (RON RAPP)

4 I represent a company that plans  
5 and manufactures and installs fiber optic  
6 cables around the world. One of the two  
7 major contributors used to be part of  
8 AT&T but a lot of separation and mergers  
9 resulted in what we now call T.E. subcom,  
10 but we are the same company. I'm a  
11 member of a group called North American  
12 Sub Cable Owners Association. A  
13 colleague of mine, Bob Wargo is the  
14 chairman of that group.

15 We are here to make the committee  
16 aware, that I'm sure you are already  
17 aware, to highlight the fact of part of  
18 undersea optic cables. I didn't hear too  
19 much discussion of that sector, maybe  
20 it's our fault for not engaging the right  
21 people enough and some discussion. It's  
22 really part of maritime. I wanted to  
23 make the point it's really a significant  
24 enabler of our economy in the U.S. Ten  
25 miles down the beach there are six global



1 international cables that come ashore and  
2 further down in Tuckerton another six  
3 cables, half of the internet traffic,  
4 financial data, telecomm coming into the  
5 United States.

6 So it's suggestive I give this  
7 speech around the world and Asia. Many  
8 people don't realize 98 percent of  
9 international commerce communication is  
10 underneath sea cable and not satellite.  
11 I want to make sure the plans are put  
12 forward and the optics are put in place.  
13 There are corridors and routes remaining  
14 available to bring these cables ashore  
15 and the existing cables we maintained and  
16 new routes and energy planned in this  
17 part of the world. It's critical  
18 infrastructure regarded in many countries  
19 and I think that's being recognized more  
20 and more as we go forward.

21 You know in its industry have been  
22 planning routes and engaging stakeholders  
23 like commercial fishers and other  
24 stakeholders to make clear we plan the  
25 routes away from the best fishing grounds

1 as best we can and we are happy to engage  
2 this body to do the same thing going  
3 forward and I know we've been doing that  
4 with BOEM and other and Army Corps of  
5 Engineers as a matter of course as we get  
6 permits for cables.

7 I welcome anybody that's never been  
8 on a cable ship to come to Baltimore for  
9 a tour if anybody would like to do that.  
10 It's an interesting business and very  
11 exciting business and important one.

12 Second comment, very quickly, maybe  
13 I personally don't understand and maybe  
14 this can be articulated, essentially the  
15 authority of this board and its product  
16 and how that would impact say Army Corps  
17 of Engineers or BOEM for letting leases  
18 or giving permits. It's clearly  
19 important work this board will do and  
20 perhaps it will be a referenced document  
21 or advisory board to those permitting  
22 authorities, but that can be something  
23 articulated in some of the documents and  
24 objectives. Thank you.

25 MR. WILLIAMSON: (JOHN WILLIAMSON)

1           I'm with the Ocean Conservancy and  
2           Leadership. This the fish community. In  
3           general, we are here in Mid-Atlantic and  
4           New England to assist them into engaging  
5           this planning process to engage them.

6           What is going on, I've heard a lot  
7           of good discussion. I've agreed with  
8           some points and disagreed with others,  
9           but it's been very good in all. A lot of  
10          people thinking clearly about this state  
11          engagement I like the idea of a state  
12          liaison committee.

13          Speaking specifically about self  
14          organizing in the fishing industry as  
15          somebody who has been trying to organize  
16          fishermen for 30 years, concept of  
17          organizing fishing industry doesn't  
18          really fit the community very well. It's  
19          probably not the right way to think about  
20          doing it. I'm sure it's a concept that  
21          would work in other industries, but the  
22          fishing industry by -- with exceptions  
23          Garden State Seafood being one, but by  
24          and large fishing industry does not  
25          organize in a representative fashion.

1 But on the other hand, if the subject  
2 were the blue fin tuna today, that  
3 information can distribute from Maine to  
4 Virginia in 24 hours. Okay? The fishing  
5 industry is organized for information  
6 distribution in a very complex network of  
7 relationships.

8 So, if you want to begin to develop  
9 a narrative, which is I think you are  
10 doing, you are developing a conversation  
11 with this user group. You need to have  
12 one or two people who are dedicated to  
13 understanding what that network is, where  
14 the notes of communication happen. You  
15 have a very diverse set of communities,  
16 not just one fishing community, many  
17 different communities, varieties of  
18 interest. Very widely distributed remote  
19 locations within that you have a network  
20 of pier leaders, p-i-e-r, who are the  
21 opinion leaders, opinion farmers in their  
22 communities and other people listen to  
23 and queue off you want to be talking to.  
24 You want to identify those pier leaders  
25 out and send people out to talk to them

1 and develop the narrative and talk to  
2 them.

3 MR. DiDOMENICO: (GREG DiDOMENICO)

4 Greg DiDomenico, Garden State  
5 Seafood Association.

6 First of all, I don't want to  
7 support the comments of Mr. Greenfield  
8 from the National Ocean Policy Coalition,  
9 but you know, urge you to consider what  
10 he is saying and I think his  
11 recommendations would be best for the  
12 commercial industry and a lot of other  
13 groups. State -- used to a formal  
14 process they are used to being in  
15 critical situations where there is  
16 fisheries management, issues very  
17 difficult to get through and we've been  
18 getting through to them, but I urge you  
19 to consider from formal process.

20 With that said I also believe that  
21 the informal part can be just as  
22 important and helpful but I caution only  
23 one thing: If you are going to come to  
24 meetings and if you go out and get  
25 this -- to the these communities, I think

1           what you are going to find is that people  
2           will not have a lot to say until they  
3           know what they are talking about.

4           Joe, your comments hit home to me  
5           because listening is very important, but  
6           the people that I represent are on the  
7           road a hundred days a year, work round  
8           the clock. They want to come to a  
9           meeting if it's not a social meeting.  
10          They want to get down to business, not  
11          have the time to talk about things that  
12          for them right now are too vague to  
13          really, truly understand. I would  
14          caution you before you do that there is  
15          have some specifics of what you want to  
16          hear from people.

17          Lastly, I would like to say there  
18          is one issue that people will ask you,  
19          certainly from the commercial industry.  
20          If you do go out into the public like  
21          I've seen it in a lot of ways. We've  
22          been told regional planning bodies are  
23          not regulatory bodies. Yet, the  
24          executive order for this group says all  
25          federal agencies and departments that are

1 represented on the National Ocean Council  
2 shall quote, comply with council,  
3 certified coastal and marine special  
4 plans.

5 So, now this seems to indicate to  
6 us that the RPB creates a plan and all  
7 federal agencies are required by the  
8 executive order to comply with that. So,  
9 is that true will in regulatory capacity?  
10 Will these agencies be forced to employ  
11 projects it plans? If that is -- that's  
12 a regular free body, that's what people  
13 want to know. What impact will this have  
14 on the Regional Fishery Council. If you  
15 can't answer it, I can tell you you are  
16 going to have a difficult time during the  
17 rest of that meeting. Thank you.

18 MS. PELLIGRINO: I really a  
19 appreciate this and I really appreciate  
20 you guys being so nice and polite right  
21 now. I'll -- also hearing us.

22 As you know, I've or maybe you  
23 don't, but I kind of like been here a lot  
24 in different capacities and in speaking  
25 with you all I'm a paddler and I paddle

1 from Miami to Maine with National  
2 Environmental and the -- and East Coast  
3 Riders Foundation. That was when I first  
4 hired of Oceans 21, which is the  
5 precursor to what our nation it has  
6 changed.

7 Since the -- it was idealistic,  
8 huge bulky oceans. Twenty-one it was  
9 there are those of us who still -- have  
10 high hopes for its ideal set for the --  
11 in that oceans 21.

12 Do I need to go into that?

13 In 2008 I partnered with NRDC and  
14 as advocacy things for some policy. This  
15 is exactly why we need your stakeholder  
16 involvement. We need those paddles, were  
17 extremely supported by a huge bulk of  
18 people. It was -- they are media  
19 campaign events and really, understood  
20 the need for healthy oceans which is why  
21 the stakeholder involvement which was  
22 extremely important. So many people got  
23 behind the ideal. It's not just energy  
24 and serving conservers.

25 Cindy Klein has a huge collection



1 of folks and who is a real strong voice  
2 for the ocean, has so many supporters  
3 it's kind of silly. She's been pushed  
4 aside a little bit and Surf Rider, you  
5 have the reason. It's been polite and  
6 needs so for with -- is that people have  
7 bought into this whole ideal we are  
8 behind. We see the need for this. We do  
9 want involvement because we do understand  
10 that conflicts will arise. We want to be  
11 able to properly voice our experience  
12 concerns. So it's one party that gets to  
13 have the floor all of the time.

14 As far as like it's whole regional  
15 planning bodies and it dictates at the  
16 policy, the National Ocean Policy, broad  
17 spectrum overlooking the whole regional  
18 plan body. It has to be done more  
19 practical. It can be applied where  
20 track -- practical they are not the  
21 independent at all. So you, there is  
22 that. But really, we -- I could go on  
23 and on.

24 I'm going to start babbling any  
25 moment. Basically all been said before

1 but you know, when it comes to two  
2 things, like we've got the push for the  
3 track, destructive strives and seismic  
4 testing and this is where the public also  
5 wants to be involved and find out where  
6 you guys fit in.

7 When I actually testified in Edison  
8 about the proposed elbows. I told the  
9 guys sitting at the table, have you heard  
10 about the MARCO planning tool? It's  
11 amazing amount of data. It's certainly  
12 by no means complete, but what they have  
13 there will tell you right what way.

14 If you look at the maps the cable  
15 guy talking, you know, not cable TV, the  
16 underground communication cables, if you  
17 look at the MARCO planning tool, which is  
18 a must go, you see where they want to put  
19 this port is absolutely inside.

20 Have you guys even looked at this?  
21 If you look at it for other uses it looks  
22 like a huge com -- complicated to me, but  
23 anyway. So that's why, you know, so far  
24 there has been no conflicts and rowdy  
25 kids. We feel supportive of the process

1 and as long as you are -- we will go to  
2 reach out and listen to us.

3 MS. CANTRAL: So I think this wraps  
4 up our second public comment section.  
5 There are more there that are planned for  
6 the agenda tomorrow. Those are you with  
7 us tomorrow, we hope you come back  
8 tomorrow and you'll take advantage of  
9 those opportunities and that -- if you  
10 are able to stay this evening for pizza  
11 and informal discussion you are part of  
12 that.

13 We have some time now for some  
14 reflection what was offered, some ideas  
15 and reactions about your ideas regarding  
16 stakeholder engagement. It's your  
17 opportunity to talk about ideas that  
18 you've heard, things that occurred to you  
19 as you are listening to what or  
20 stakeholders had to share. I see a  
21 couple things, Laura, Greg -- Laura, let  
22 me start with you.

23 MS. MCKAY: I wanted to assure Ali  
24 from NRDC that the stakeholder group that  
25 Greg was talking about we had at the

1 April meeting did include an academic  
2 representative. It was Steve Ross with  
3 the University of North Carolina at  
4 Wilmington, who has been doing the  
5 research having that academic advisory  
6 has been on our -- as well.

7 MR. PABST: This is a lot of ghosts  
8 of social planning past, present and  
9 future to some degree and I think a lot  
10 of these comments are really  
11 complementary to the discussions we've  
12 been having and can accommodate a lot of  
13 it. The rub is going to be a lot that  
14 detail pops up, that conflict, how we  
15 navigate through that conflict. Right  
16 now we are all talking broadly about  
17 ideals and goals. There is something  
18 going to be its decision made, but that  
19 is a group we have not figured out how to  
20 deal with that. There is a secret packet  
21 we have not figured that out. It's  
22 coming. I think that's going to be a  
23 test case as soon as we can tee that up  
24 and start having that. If we can agree  
25 and you disagree, how do you move

1 forward? How do you figure that sooner  
2 than later?

3 MS. COOKSEY: I'm just reflecting  
4 on the fact I wax and wane between  
5 feeling like I understand it and feeling  
6 like I'm completely confused. I did hear  
7 two people who seem that they studied the  
8 documents fairly well and we have a letter  
9 signed by many other organizations that  
10 are recommending we get de facto. I  
11 heard some support for our proposal.

12 MS. CANTRAL: Other thoughts?  
13 Andy?

14 MR. ZEMBA: I found the comment  
15 about the regulatory requirements or this  
16 could be a regulatory body to be an  
17 interesting question and perhaps that's  
18 maybe something that could be brought to  
19 the national social counsel for some  
20 clarification. If I were asked that  
21 question I would have answered the way  
22 we've been moving forward, but the  
23 gentleman that brought it up has raised  
24 something we should get an answer for.

25 MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Any other

1 reflections?

2 MS. MCKAY: It does sound like what  
3 we are hearing from the stakeholders they  
4 would like both kind of informal  
5 stakeholder liaison and the FACA, but one  
6 thing I think Cindy was saying is that  
7 they would like a representative to sit  
8 on the RPB itself. But my understanding  
9 is this can't happen and so just want to  
10 make sure that's understood. If we set  
11 up a FACA and that's a possibility, but  
12 that does not put anyone on this board  
13 because this board has to be just  
14 governmental. That's the way it was set  
15 up by -- through ocean policy.

16 MR. MACH: Yes, I think it was  
17 stated earlier that we are considering  
18 the liaison and FACA may be something  
19 that comes off in the future, but needs  
20 to be mentioned. It was used by a number  
21 of people as evolutionary and we don't  
22 need to jump in and get a good grip and  
23 direction and goals.

24 MS. CANTRAL: Tom and Gwynne?

25 MR. BIGFORD: Getting back to the

1 discussion on scope. We were talking  
2 about north and south and maybe, although  
3 I don't know representatives of states,  
4 could there be an ex officio position  
5 like the ombudsman-type position  
6 mentioned make a nonvoting member that  
7 might move us a little step where we  
8 are hearing but not --

9 MS. CANTRAL: Maybe something that  
10 we could look into getting some clarity  
11 on that approach. Gwynne?

12 MS. SCHULTZ: The fact the issue  
13 having served on the de facto issues gets  
14 six months to get started and usually a  
15 multi-year effort and to one of the  
16 questions I think we have to investigate  
17 this to the future is as the -- our  
18 coalitions are not to rotate so the  
19 federal lead would rotate from the  
20 Department of Interior to another agency.  
21 How did that mesh with -- actually create  
22 a fact? Does each subsequent agency have  
23 to start from scratch? There is, if we  
24 went that direction, it would be a lot of  
25 logistical issues that need to be figured

1 out. So that's why -- is that something  
2 further down the road? I would hate to  
3 do anything until that was resolved. I  
4 appreciate the issue wanting that  
5 immediate FACA or don't do anything, but  
6 I think that it would not serve our  
7 interests, you know, to not do anything  
8 until such time as if we do form a  
9 formal --

10 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. So, Marty  
11 and then Mo and Sarah.

12 MR. ROSEN: Comments would call for  
13 Mo, they call the process understandable  
14 and appropriate, but along with that  
15 conversation is recognize resources to do  
16 that. I'm wondering if there needs to be  
17 a legal resource or something at some  
18 point, find somebody to kind of make this  
19 happen. I think you can have the  
20 biggest, grandest plans you want without  
21 (inaudible) If you can't back it up, you  
22 really can't kind suppress expectations  
23 and I think there has to be another  
24 effort to make the planning.

25 MS. BORNHOLDT: That part I'll



1 address to Joe and Tom, who also are  
2 members of the northeast RPB. For the  
3 efforts we did with regard to this  
4 outreach, how did they gather resources  
5 first thing and second thing, I know that  
6 a sister agency within an interior  
7 borough line management is one of their  
8 requirements that they do not -- they  
9 cannot be the financial membership  
10 manager of that, but yet they can have  
11 the collaborative discussions. So we  
12 know that we can have a group of folk  
13 talk to us it's just a matter of who is  
14 in charge, who manages them and assigns  
15 that.

16 This is a decision, getting back to  
17 my point about where does the northeast  
18 get its dollars. What kind of  
19 arrangement, you know. So it's easy to  
20 say it's state partners, but still an  
21 issue associated with support.

22 MR. ATANGAN: I can respond. The  
23 real issue is grant money.

24 MS. COOKSEY: Reflecting on Cindy's  
25 comment of accountability, I would like

1 to be more clear. The state relies on a  
2 model who is accountable for either a  
3 response to say what we did with the  
4 comments. If there is something, that we  
5 should deal with it and also we have  
6 not -- I am not an expert. What could  
7 FACA bring to this process that we would  
8 wouldn't want? There must be some good  
9 in it.

10 And then also, just thinking about  
11 the record, robust but I think what -- I  
12 think most of the people in this room  
13 would agree is robust is again I don't  
14 think it's something that at least now we  
15 can do. Again, expectations.

16 Oh, sorry. The most important  
17 thing I wanted to say before that ramble,  
18 I like the idea of the scientific and  
19 advisory something. I find that's very  
20 helpful often to have a team of experts  
21 you can go to. You get to that type of  
22 question and I need some advice.

23 MS. BORNHOLDT: You know, kind of  
24 taking a key from Joe's comments we can  
25 ask and invite people to make

1 presentations on particular issues for us  
2 with regard to having access to a  
3 recognized expert in a field or even a  
4 peer leader like John was describing the  
5 challenge to repeatedly go back and have  
6 the appearance of having that kind of  
7 advisory relationship.

8 So, again, maybe the task is to  
9 think out of the box to tap in whether  
10 it's taking a -- looking at the  
11 university systems, whether they are  
12 taking a first look at fishers who use  
13 the resources. We can do some of that.  
14 The challenges to have that regular  
15 standing body you can tap and sign. I  
16 think we need to think about what we need  
17 now and take a look at. Can we acquire  
18 the resources to support something that  
19 is perhaps more permanent with it's MARCO  
20 or eventually through --

21 MS. CANTRAL: Anything else? Any  
22 other thoughts? Joe.

23 MR. ATANGAN: Yeah. I'm brand new  
24 to this FACA thing. I get confused every  
25 time it's brought up. But I do see a

1 couple, you know, maybe I've seen it too,  
2 black and white here. Either we don't  
3 want to do anything until we initiate a  
4 FACA or we try to move forward in a  
5 formal process and get something done  
6 sooner rather than later. In the process  
7 of doing so, develop a case in an  
8 argument for the funds and the resources  
9 that are going to be required to support  
10 a FACA effort. Okay? I don't think we  
11 have enough to go to whatever the parent  
12 organization that's going to set up the  
13 funds for this FACA to go and say, hey, I  
14 need to do a FACA. The question is going  
15 to be what for and you know what -- what  
16 are they going to be engaged? I don't  
17 think we are there yet. At least not to  
18 the left of -- we can get the funds  
19 required to do that.

20 What I'm certainly arguing is we  
21 understand there is great concern because  
22 there is not the FACA thing. Okay? I  
23 get it. I don't understand it. There is  
24 concern out there. We don't fully  
25 understand it. Doing nothing at this

1 point and waiting to establish a fact is  
2 not a good option either. There are  
3 things we can do. There is a process we  
4 can employ here and going through that  
5 process we help us develop up a case for  
6 what we will need and going to use this  
7 FACA group for.

8 I guess I'm, for example, in dull  
9 sense allows us to proceed and go through  
10 the discovery process, hopefully do no  
11 harm in the process, but I think it will  
12 pay dividends downstream to build the  
13 case to establish that FACA it required.

14 MS. CHYTALO: Go ahead.

15 I agree we should start to  
16 establish the path towards the FACA at  
17 this point. But for the interim we have  
18 those other options of going out to  
19 people as much as we can, but also having  
20 this element, the sector groups or  
21 something like that we can get some  
22 feedback from and that we can get the  
23 breath of the issues we need to find out,  
24 you know, the highs and lows on. You  
25 know, we don't want to, we can't expect



1 I think that needs to be set up before  
2 anybody goes out and there and starts  
3 talking.

4 MS. CANTRAL: In formal engagement  
5 does not mean there is no effort  
6 required. There has to be some planning  
7 and organization and structure and  
8 maintenance that goes along with that.

9 So why don't I take a shot of a couple of  
10 some key points I've heard in this  
11 discussion over its course of the  
12 afternoon. One thing seems clear, there  
13 is a desire for more responsive, to take  
14 stakeholder engagement exactly. How is  
15 that is going to create activity? There  
16 is an interest in having both formal and  
17 informal mechanisms structures, call it  
18 what you will, in place including a lot  
19 of interests in it establishing a formal  
20 advisory committee that would be stood up  
21 under FACA. And there is also a  
22 recognition that it's going to be hard to  
23 do that right away and does take some  
24 time, does take some resources. It is  
25 something that is interesting to this

1 group and you've heard the stakeholders  
2 while looking into how to do that,  
3 pursuing all of the details about how to  
4 do that in the interim.

5 Some of these ideas that have been  
6 offered including a stakeholder liaison  
7 committee will get you started and enable  
8 you some mechanisms for engagement and  
9 input that you have the ability to  
10 support right now with regard to  
11 establishing a stakeholder liaison  
12 committee also dealing that is detailed  
13 that needs to be worked out including the  
14 notion of accountability you describe to  
15 those place on what their role is, what  
16 their psyched up for and getting out of  
17 the clear about that. There would also  
18 be some structure and some maintaining of  
19 that effort that would be required.

20 A few other things that I heard are  
21 related to how best to get the science  
22 and technical expertise into the process,  
23 whether it is by identifying those  
24 experts and having made presentations or  
25 some other kind of official role that you



1 can design that needs to be gone through,  
2 this longer term of what your overall  
3 input or engagement will be.

4 One take away or next step for this  
5 group is to explore the viability of some  
6 kind of ex officio or ombudsman role that  
7 could be a seat that someone who  
8 participates in discussion, but is not a  
9 member of the body. That might be  
10 something that could be explored.

11 There is also an acknowledgment  
12 that the RPB has an ongoing job to do to  
13 be clear in communicating what its role  
14 is, what its assignment is, what it's  
15 authority is or is not. And you heard  
16 that in a few of the comments and coupled  
17 with that is a need to be clear in going  
18 to any meetings and engaging stakeholder,  
19 whether going to stakeholder meetings and  
20 participating or inviting them to your  
21 meetings and some kind of participation,  
22 but being really clear about what the  
23 agenda is and business at hand is and  
24 being respectful of people's time no one  
25 has no one has enough time. No one in

1           this room does.

2                     Final two things I've noted in my  
3           listening. Some mechanisms for speaking  
4           of time and respect, being respectful of  
5           people's -- teams of people input and  
6           acknowledging it's being fact forward  
7           into the process. I know it's this group  
8           is very appreciative of the input and is  
9           listening and wants to be incorporating  
10          it and wants to make sure there is the  
11          right kind of feedback. That's somewhat  
12          related but parties' communications and  
13          communications, planning to deliver  
14          messages and being consistent about those  
15          is sort of a cross cutting need and  
16          something you have. At least I have not  
17          heard too much about, but will need to be  
18          factored into the work as it develops and  
19          operates. So those are highlights I  
20          heard from your discussion about  
21          stakeholder engagement and I guess taking  
22          you back to a couple points that were  
23          made earlier that don't have necessarily  
24          to do with this topic, just taking us  
25          back to tomorrow. We have volunteered to

1 take a shot at a new slide, a new set of  
2 bullets for the draft and present those  
3 for further reflection and perhaps what  
4 can be -- I'm repeating myself. I want  
5 you people taking about it. That needs  
6 to be part of the revisiting of that  
7 slide.

8 Well, three things. What do you  
9 think about the revisions and how do you  
10 intend to leave this room and then be  
11 prepared to have some discussion with  
12 stakeholders about what it suggests and  
13 what do you think about this idea of  
14 getting to the next level of details in  
15 terms of objective and how would you like  
16 to approach that.

17 So I think those are things we need  
18 to talk about tomorrow as part of that  
19 discussion. But as for today I know we  
20 are a little bit ahead of schedule I'm  
21 not sure exactly what else we can  
22 accomplish today unless I'm missing  
23 something since I am the facilitator.

24 MR. MACH: You got it all.

25 MS. CANTRAL: I want to ask about

1           if we adjourn now at a quarter to six, is  
2           there a way we can start these earlier or  
3           keep things on track and expect to see  
4           people over pizza at 6:30 or what?

5                     MS. MCKAY: Move everything up 15  
6           minutes and go home earlier.

7                     MS. CANTRAL: Let me be clear. The  
8           plan is to start the informal networking  
9           event at 6:15 upstairs. And we'll -- I  
10          adjourn the moment and see you in roughly  
11          half an hour upstairs and down the hall  
12          and over pizza.

13                    (Whereupon, the meeting was  
14          adjourned at 5:45 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-----x  
MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL OCEAN PLANNING,

Inaugural Regional Planning Body (RPB)  
Meeting

-----x  
September 25, 2013  
9:50 a.m.

Held at: Wilson Hall Auditorium  
Monmouth University  
400 Cedar Avenue  
West Long Branch, New Jersey 07764

JOSEPH ALBANESE & ASSOCIATES  
Certified Shorthand Reporters  
250 Washington Street, Suite A  
Toms River, New Jersey 08754  
(732) 244-6100  
reporter@albaneseassoc.com

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 ÔNOØQÚNÚŠŦiÁQNÛŦNÁONSÚŦNQÊÁRæã↔ä↔á^ÁØ^b\↔\|\æ

4

OŠĚQÓNĚU

5

GWYNNE SCHULTZ

6

ÁÁÁÁÁRáã]→á^äÊÁRNŦOŠ

7

Á

8

MAUREEN BORNHOLDT  
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

9

10 PANEL MEMBERS :

11

SARAH COOKSEY, DelawareÊÁRNŦOŠ

12

MARTY ROSEN, New JerseyÊÁRNŦOŠ

13

JOSE ATANGAN, Joint Chiefs of Staff

14

GREG CAPOBIANCO, New YorkÊÁRNŦOŠ

15

JOHN WALTERS, U.S. Coast Guard

16

PEDRO RAMOS, Acting State ConservationistsÊÁÛUĚN

17

NSĚWÁXÓRÑÑÊÁšæ^b]→{á^↔á

18

ÁQÈÁÔŦNSPÁRNOÏÊÁÛÈUÈÁĚæ\*áã\↑æ^Á~àÁÛãá^b\*~ã\á\↔~^

19

ÁÁÁRáã↔\↔↑æÁNä↑↔^↔b\ãá\↔~^

20 ÁÁÁÁÁÁÁĚŠÛÖQNUÁŠNÑUÚÊÁÓÈŠÈNÈ

21

ÚŠRÁÑØÖŠŦĚÊÁŠá\↔~^á→ÁŠ´æá^↔´Áá^äÁN\↑~b\*âæã↔´ÁNä↑↔^b\ãá\↔~^

22

QNÛŦNÁR´PNWÊÁÛ↔ã&↔^↔áÊÁRNŦOŠ

23

24

25 ÁÁÁÁÁÁÁŠSÛÓÁÛNPÓŦiÁØSÖŦĚÁØŦØŠWÓSEÁRæã↔ä↔á^ÁØ^b\↔\|\æ

## 1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

## 2 PANEL MEMBERS:

3 KAREN CHYTALO, Assistant Bureau Chief Maritime  
 4 Resources, New York State  
 5 Department of Environmental  
 6 Conservation

7 DAVID NOBLE, Department of the Navy

## 8 PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

## PAGES

8	-----	-----
9	MARGO PELLIGRINO	74
		171
10	MORGAN GOPNIK	77
11	MATT GOVE	79
12		170
13	CINDY ZIPF	87
		177
14	ALI CHASE	80
15		166
16	ERIC JOHANSON	82
		188
17	WILLIAM BROADLEY	85
18	BRENT GREENFEIELD	91
19		173
20	JACK FULLER	93
21	RON RAPP	183
22	BARBARA HUDSON	185
23	SARAH CHASE	186

24

25

1 MS. CANTRAL: Good morning,  
2 everyone. Thank you for joining us  
3 today. Two fun-filled, action packed  
4 days with the Mid-Atlantic Ocean Planning  
5 Body. Day two of its inaugural public  
6 meeting.

7 I am not going to belabor what took  
8 place yesterday, but just to share a  
9 couple highlights and talk about how we  
10 plan to spend our day today. Yesterday  
11 we talked about the work that's been  
12 underway over the course of the summer  
13 since the formal establishment of the RPB  
14 in April and also looked at a five-year  
15 time line to break down the work and  
16 identify some milestones. We will come  
17 back to that time line later today and  
18 see what discussions have happened since  
19 first presenting yesterday. We also  
20 talked about draft, initial draft goals  
21 for the regional planning process and had  
22 some good discussion about the way to  
23 shake those goals.

24 Some further ideas and reflections  
25 and framing about those goals including



1 the creation of a very broad vision, a  
2 vision for the future of the Mid-Atlantic  
3 region and we committed to you to put  
4 some ideas together and bring them back  
5 for some additional discussion today.  
6 That's one of the things that we'll be  
7 doing that afternoon.

8 We also had a good discussion about  
9 engaging stakeholders' mechanisms, both  
10 formal and informal in reach out and  
11 outreach two-way communications for  
12 engaging stakeholders, and we'll also  
13 revisit that discussion very briefly this  
14 morning before moving on to other things  
15 that are topics for discussion today  
16 which include use of the MARCO,  
17 Mid-Atlantic data portal to support data  
18 and information needs for the ocean  
19 planning process and what next steps may  
20 be needed to either operationalize that  
21 idea or what the alternatives are.

22 And then we also want to talk about  
23 some operational matters including the  
24 draft charter, which is a document in  
25 your materials that hopefully you've all

1 reviewed and are prepared to discuss  
2 whatever key details need to be  
3 accommodated and what the next steps are  
4 for finalizing the charter. That's what  
5 I have in mind we need to do today.

6 Is there anything else that the  
7 co-leads can think of?

8 MS. SCHULTZ: I wanted to say good  
9 morning to the Mid-Atlantic Regional  
10 Planning body and stakeholders in the  
11 audience. We did have a very productive  
12 day yesterday in part because of the  
13 members and very thoughtful input we've  
14 received from our speakers and guest  
15 speakers.

16 I also want to say we had a good  
17 day yesterday because of a very skillful  
18 facilitation that Laura provided to us.  
19 She is with Meridian. She has a strong  
20 team here that has allowed us to move  
21 along smoothly and the co-lead, took a  
22 lot of pressure off of me and Mo just to  
23 be able to engage in the dialogue. So I  
24 wanted to say thank you to the  
25 facilitation and we'll have a very good

1 day to day.

2 MS. BORNHOLDT: I want to pile on  
3 my appreciation for the Meridian team,  
4 too, allows me to think about what Gwynne  
5 said and we appreciate that.

6 I also want to thank the folks from  
7 our stakeholders' work group, the  
8 champions' work group, Sarah, Tom,  
9 Darlene and others. It was a great  
10 opportunity to show both bookends of the  
11 types of engagement we can get involved  
12 in and more formal business-type  
13 engagement done in the public realm as  
14 well as the little opportunities to sit  
15 one-on-one and listen and like someone  
16 said zip up your mouth and open your ears  
17 and listen. Thank you.

18 MS. CANTRAL: Let's get going.

19 So, as any good facilitator should,  
20 let me be clear about our agenda. I  
21 reviewed the objectives and topics we'll  
22 take up. I need to give you more of a  
23 sense of the structure and the flow. If  
24 you've got the agenda in front of you and  
25 hopefully you all do, we'll be sticking

1 to it. We need to make time adjustments.  
2 We are starting later so we'll start the  
3 day with some additional reflections on  
4 stakeholder engagement including some of  
5 the highlights from the event last night  
6 and then we'll shift from that into  
7 discussion about data and information.

8 We'll have a presentation, Laura  
9 McKay will start that discussion and  
10 present some information for  
11 consideration and then we'll pause and  
12 have a public comment section like we did  
13 yesterday. Our hope and intention is to  
14 marry those public comment sessions with  
15 the topic at hand, but that's not  
16 necessarily the case. You can talk about  
17 whatever you want to, speak to the RPB  
18 about during these formal opportunities,  
19 one of many that they have in mind for  
20 how they engage you. We'll wrap up that  
21 session and come back to the data and  
22 information topic, close that out and  
23 then take a lunch break. We'll then come  
24 back and revisit the goals, discussion  
25 and this is what we'll share with you.

1           Some of what we as the facilitation  
2           team heard you all saying and what that  
3           might suggest for taking the goals  
4           development to the next stage of its  
5           development, and then we'll move into  
6           operational considerations, the charter  
7           and any other matters we need to take up  
8           before we adjourn.

9           I'm not giving you time. I need to  
10          do the math and figure out how to adjust  
11          for a 10 o'clock start. So bear with me  
12          and we'll all keep track here.

13          So, if that's good with everyone,  
14          then why don't we turn to Sarah and Tom.  
15          I think two of you of you had highlights  
16          you wanted to share from the event last  
17          night.

18          MR. BIGFORD: I have notes I wanted  
19          to share. My glasses broke and I can't  
20          read them. The event last night went  
21          really well. Thank you very much for  
22          attending. We must have had close to 50  
23          people there. The tables were full. We  
24          had plenty of food, we were happy, people  
25          didn't want to leave. We had the better

1 part of one hour and a half and that was  
2 very good.

3 Our intention was to move beyond  
4 the real starchy public comment period  
5 and get into relationship building. We  
6 made a good step forward. It's not the  
7 end, that's for sure. A lot of you have  
8 higher expectations and so do we. Sarah?

9 MS. COOKSEY: Ditto to everything  
10 Tom said. Even though it was a lot of  
11 time, it was time away from our friends  
12 and family. I appreciate those of you  
13 who could stay with us. So I'm going  
14 to -- I was a note taker, bummer, I  
15 didn't get to talk but I listened. So I  
16 highlighted a couple things that seemed  
17 to be a common theme.

18 There was some concern about  
19 waiting until 2017 to have a plan. We  
20 need to define exactly what we are doing.  
21 We need some examples of some  
22 accomplishments to show this is not new  
23 zoning, not new regulations. We need to  
24 disprove the feeders.

25 Then we talked -- sorry. Let me

1 rephrase by saying I was on the other  
2 table so we could talk about anything and  
3 we did. We spent a lot of time also  
4 talking about the ecosystem part of this  
5 and how planning is just one part of the  
6 nine elements in the National Ocean  
7 Policy. So we chatted a little bit  
8 about -- what about all of the rest of  
9 that stuff? So, it was informal. There  
10 is not going to be attribution who said  
11 what and other than just the start of  
12 this conversation and the RPB listing  
13 that's all last night was, but it was a  
14 good start and I appreciate everyone.

15 If you note takers have not given  
16 your notes to Kate, please do so. Thanks  
17 again.

18 MS. CANTRAL: Anything else that  
19 anyone wants to add about the event last  
20 night? And as both Tom and Sarah said a  
21 good start and a step in a direction many  
22 of you were asking for.

23 So, perhaps a good segue is to come  
24 back to a notion that you all discussed  
25 yesterday regarding the stakeholder

1 liaison committee and being very focused  
2 in putting the question for clarification  
3 back to the group. You had some  
4 discussion about it. There was  
5 acknowledgment there this was an idea to  
6 get things started. We need to get  
7 started but I think my sense is that in  
8 particular, MARCO, who has made the offer  
9 to do the organizing of the liaison  
10 committee needs a clear acknowledgment  
11 that this is a direction you want to go  
12 and that they should be proceeding.

13           Could we hear some feedback about  
14 that?

15           MS. CHYTALO: I guess we should  
16 direct MARCO to develop a plan for  
17 implementing that type of a strategy of  
18 the informal as well as the formal  
19 development of that liaison group, but  
20 also for them to put together a work plan  
21 that would detail that or what activities  
22 they are going to do, how often and that  
23 kind of stuff and the financial  
24 ramifications of that are so we know what  
25 kind of -- what we are getting ourselves



1           into.

2                   MS. SCHULTZ: I initially I was.  
3           Yeah, I don't have a quick answer for  
4           this one. Getting some input about what  
5           would actually be in involved, the  
6           individuals that we would be -- the  
7           particular sectors that would be engaging  
8           and I think each element you laid out are  
9           things we definitely need to do revisit,  
10          our own budget about what we have the  
11          capacity to do, the staffing to do,  
12          figure out if we do need additional  
13          resources. Once I got past that  
14          directing part of it everything else made  
15          sense. (Laughter)

16                   MS. CHYTALO: If we pay them to do  
17          something well they are basically going  
18          to be like a contractor. So that's all.

19                   MS. SCHULTZ: I wouldn't necessarily  
20          say at this stage the RPB will be paying  
21          us for that. We have some limited  
22          resources that we would be, you know,  
23          kicking off some of this and if any of  
24          the different federal agencies or any  
25          other finding sources have money to

1 contribute towards that, naturally part  
2 of that relationship we would, you know,  
3 really clarify what it is that they would  
4 begin the funding -- we would be getting  
5 out of that funding.

6 I don't know if I've expressed that  
7 well. If anyone else wants to zip in on  
8 this one?

9 MS. BORNHOLDT: As a point of  
10 clarification, we all want to  
11 participate. It was a great start to  
12 have the opportunity to have this  
13 particular work group kind of do some  
14 brainstorming and offer us some options.  
15 Perhaps I'll take advantage of what Karen  
16 said. What was truly intended we need to  
17 have it scoped out a little bit so we  
18 understand what some options are, the  
19 resources to take and not necessarily for  
20 MARCO to do, but find opportunities where  
21 we can all join in maybe a proposal of  
22 sorts so we have a understanding of the  
23 obligations and resources and be able to  
24 join in as a group allowable by law. We  
25 want to make sure whatever process we

1           undertake for formal stakeholder process  
2           that we all have that ability to  
3           understand exactly what it is and see  
4           where we can contribute.

5           MR. ATANGAN: We are trying to get  
6           a way ahead with regard to the proposal  
7           on the table. What I have not heard is  
8           any objection to the -- I see this is the  
9           only idea to put, I guess, meat on the  
10          bones on them by suggesting would be that  
11          we proceed at least with vetting go what  
12          would be required. I think Mo has a  
13          alluded to this. We need more details,  
14          what is required associated with this  
15          stakeholder liaison position. I think  
16          the concept is generally accepted. I  
17          mean I don't want to speak for everybody  
18          but my sense is generally accepted by the  
19          RPB what we need now is this okay. We  
20          like the concept, let's get down to the  
21          details, what the resources are going to  
22          require, what are these folks going to be  
23          doing and what are the RPB members going  
24          to be called upon to do to support that  
25          liaison position as well.

1           If you are looking for a consensus  
2           and the charter says this is how we'll  
3           operate, if you look for a consensus I  
4           believe we have the consensus. This is a  
5           way to proceed.

6           MS. CANTRAL: Go ahead.

7           MR. PABST: I agree and second the  
8           motion.

9           MS. CANTRAL: So, I won't summarize  
10          that except to say that it sounds like  
11          there is a way to proceed and that the  
12          RPB would be very appreciative of MARCO's  
13          offer to further develop this stakeholder  
14          liaison committee idea and bring back  
15          some details about what some of the --  
16          what some of those details would mean and  
17          implications for capacity in all sense of  
18          the work.

19          So is that do you feel comfortable  
20          with that?

21          MR. ATANGAN: (Thumbs up)

22          MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

23          So, another couple of just summary  
24          statements and I invite any of you to  
25          chime in on this.

1           Some reflection on the discussion  
2           about stakeholder engagement yesterday.  
3           In addition to further developing this, I  
4           see as a potential mechanism there were a  
5           number of other ideas, many of them  
6           shared by people who have come yesterday  
7           and also around the table including this  
8           ombudsman idea, some other ways to engage  
9           stakeholders that the RPB is going to be  
10          taking away as a next step to further  
11          explore and develop and figure out the  
12          viability of those ideas and see if it  
13          can continue to build its portfolio, if  
14          you will, of different kinds of  
15          engagement opportunities.

16                 One of those opportunities is the  
17          potential for recreating a FACA committee  
18          which the RPB heard both during the  
19          formal session and informal session last  
20          night that there is an interest in doing.  
21          There are implications for doing that.  
22          There are trade off, there are  
23          obstacles that have to be overcome  
24          because it takes time and money to set  
25          those up. But the mechanism, you know,

1           they heard the idea and want to explore  
2           it the take away for you all is that they  
3           are exploring that idea and seeing what  
4           is appropriate and they can accommodate  
5           in that regard.

6                     In the meantime, putting in place  
7           the mechanisms that can be in place to  
8           get started right now so there can be  
9           engagement happening, you know, starting  
10          at this meeting, starting before this  
11          meeting and continuing to ramp up is  
12          something that is a desire around the  
13          table.

14                    So, if anyone wants to add to that,  
15          I invite you and that's my summary of the  
16          discussion and the current posture of  
17          where you all -- they -- we should head  
18          with the engagement.

19                    MR. MACH: Well said.

20                    MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. I think  
21          we are probably ready to move onto our  
22          next topic and talk about data  
23          information and the MARCO ocean data  
24          portal.

25                    Laura, I hand off to you at this

1 point.

2 MS. McKAY: Sure. Thank you.

3 Laura McKay. Good morning,  
4 everyone. We are going to quick run  
5 through our MARCO ocean data port and  
6 hopefully you've all been going out to  
7 the hall and seeing it and playing with  
8 it and hitting all of the different  
9 buttons. It is a remarkable tool and I  
10 want to thank especially Jay O'Dell and  
11 the Monmouth team for doing so much work  
12 for MARCO on creating that portal. It's  
13 been a long journey already. We started  
14 this back in 2009 we were able to. Some  
15 of our Virginia funds to get started,  
16 through a grant to Jay and we're  
17 fortunate to have regional partner funds  
18 to kick into keep us going.

19 The portal is basically divided  
20 into these 33 sections on the screen.  
21 You can learn, explore, tells you the  
22 range of planning needs. Those fact  
23 sheets issue by issue and explore.  
24 Let's -- you see the current data and  
25 information, data priority and needs and

1 visualize, takes you to actually  
2 launching the marine planner. We have a  
3 new section up there and directing it  
4 back to MARCO, so just want to point out  
5 some of those features.

6 So we've been talking about  
7 stakeholder engagement and I believe in  
8 the context, really, of general planning,  
9 but there is another kind of stakeholder  
10 engagement going on which is really  
11 looking at the data and actually  
12 collecting data and vetting data. We've  
13 been doing that since we started portal  
14 development as well.

15 Some of the things we've done  
16 recently are these participatory work  
17 mapping workshops where we pull people  
18 into a room and actually have them tell  
19 us recreational uses, the important areas  
20 and all five states are working on this  
21 and we are collecting 22 different  
22 recreational uses. We have meetings with  
23 the ports, major ports in the  
24 Mid-Atlantic and we are actually starting  
25 a second round of meetings with some of



1           them in some locations and again, showing  
2           them the data, asking them what's right,  
3           what's wrong, what more do we need in  
4           order to continue on with planning. And  
5           then we are going to be meeting with  
6           commissioners and there will be a lot  
7           going on this winter when its hopefully  
8           off season with them hopefully trying to  
9           meet with stakeholders is important.  
10          We'll look at the data we have from NOAA,  
11          vessel trip reports and vessel monitoring  
12          system data. We know that's not  
13          everything. Tell us what else is  
14          important to you and where else things  
15          are important and help us get everything  
16          right in the portal.

17                 We've had some webinars for the  
18          environmental, NGOs and wind industry  
19          walking them through the portal. Does  
20          the data look right? What other data  
21          should we have in there?

22                 Just getting started I wanted to  
23          remind you that's another aspect of  
24          stakeholder engagement we are all working  
25          on. Some of the more recent data

1           developments, I hope I'm not repeating  
2           myself, I talk about the portal and tell  
3           everyone the same things, but since the  
4           stakeholder workshop and April webinar,  
5           one of the things which we are working on  
6           is the ship traffic data, whatever  
7           information.

8                     MR. WALTERS: Automated  
9           identification system.

10                    MS. MCKAY: Thanks, John. One of  
11           the things the ports told us early on was  
12           well, that's great, but it lumps  
13           everything together and not terribly  
14           useful. We need to see that data  
15           segregated by vessel type. And so the  
16           portal team went off and worked on that  
17           and that's available now.

18                    So, some of the other highlights I  
19           mentioned, the recognition use, data  
20           workshops, they are done everywhere  
21           except New Jersey which is coming up in  
22           November.

23                    Marty, do you want to say the  
24           dates?

25                    MR. ROSEN: There is a flier --

1           there is a flier outside on the table.  
2           Mid November, I think it's the 18th, 20th  
3           and 21st? Kip, do you have the dates  
4           handy?

5           MS. MCKAY: Check the flier on the  
6           table. If you are a recreational user in  
7           New Jersey be sure to go to those  
8           workshops. We had a blast doing them in  
9           Virginia, we did them last summer. I had  
10          a compendium of our maps on the table. I  
11          didn't make a lot of copies, but we are  
12          waiting until all states are done with  
13          their maps so we can stitch them to go --  
14          to make sure they make sense across the  
15          boundaries. But in the meantime, those  
16          that are done you can see Virginia's on  
17          our state data coast and you can see  
18          that.

19          There are two other surveys. We've  
20          been working with Matt Gove, Surf Riding,  
21          and they'll get to make data for us and a  
22          boater survey that had been done in New  
23          England that we've repeated in the  
24          Mid-Atlantic and we'll have that data.  
25          We'll have some great information on

1 recreation rational use which we never  
2 had before. So that's a pretty big deal  
3 to help with wind siting and shipping  
4 lane siting and all towards ocean  
5 planning issues talked about already  
6 about the commercial economic data.  
7 Those workshops are coming this fall and  
8 keep an eye out for those.

9 Another thing the portal team has  
10 been working on recently is the sand  
11 data. Offshore discharge sites are on  
12 there and the sand resource data is being  
13 worked on as well. I'm getting some  
14 information from BOEM.

15 Another thing that came up at the  
16 April stakeholders' workshop, I don't  
17 know if the telecommunications fellow is  
18 here, it was noted the data we had in  
19 April was pretty old and inaccurate.  
20 That actually caused our portal team to  
21 start talking with people at the federal  
22 level and the multi-purpose marine folks  
23 at NOAA are taking that up. It didn't  
24 make sense to clean it up just for the  
25 Mid-Atlantic, it needs to be done

1 nationally. So, it's's going to get  
2 cleaned up and then we'll be able to pull  
3 that into that MARCO ocean data portal as  
4 well which should be great.

5 Another piece of data, another part  
6 of the parts and shipping is that again,  
7 if you can go out and take a look at the  
8 portal on the right you see all of this  
9 great information now about each port  
10 color coded by commodities coming in  
11 which is pretty fascinating. So, a lot  
12 of richness of data there. Whether it's  
13 coal, chemicals or food and farm products  
14 that's all identified when you zoom into  
15 each of the ports.

16 Also, all of the routing measures  
17 in there, the precautionary separation  
18 zones shipping safety, fairways, offshore  
19 drilling, dredge disposal as been added  
20 and cargo vessel density. I believe it's  
21 in terms of kilometers of tracks down in  
22 here.

23 So, we talked about data layers,  
24 also tools and functions that are on  
25 there. This is the big shark that's

1 eating the Mid-Atlantic. Jay had some  
2 fun with us and actually drew that so you  
3 can go into the portal and draw whatever  
4 shape you want, probably not a big shark  
5 or dolphin or fish or whatever, but  
6 perhaps your ideas and you may get  
7 together with others in your stakeholder  
8 group, whether you are, you know, with  
9 the wind industry or NGO looking at  
10 sensitive habitats. You could go in and  
11 draw some areas that are important for  
12 you for whatever reason and you can share  
13 that within your group. So, the ability  
14 to customize your own maps and share them  
15 is one of the functions that's been  
16 really quite remarkable and the  
17 technology. We, a lot of -- there is a  
18 lot of concern about how are we go to  
19 keep this portal going and maintaining  
20 it. We are so fortunate to have the  
21 funding from NOAA that's going to the  
22 portal team.

23 So what's coming up next,  
24 basically, we have the money for another  
25 two years, I guess, through 2014, '15,

1 '16. Thanks Tony. We are going to  
2 continue improving the data and work on  
3 the commercial data and data work on  
4 analysis features and recognize --  
5 Gearhardt is here with us today. The  
6 portal is working with MARCO which is at  
7 the emergent MARCO coastal -- look on  
8 sheet. They collect a lot of realtime  
9 data which, hopefully, will be converted  
10 and translated into long-range planning  
11 type of layers perhaps through some  
12 extrapolation.

13 The data on here now may reflect  
14 annual averages of whether it's shipping  
15 density or wind speed. We would like to  
16 get some more refinement and see if we  
17 can get seasonal information up there too  
18 and more layers going up and further  
19 complicates the portal, but we have a  
20 Cracker Jack team making this user  
21 friendly and I trust they being audit all  
22 that complexity and make this an  
23 easy-to-use, easy-to-navigate type of  
24 system.

25 Also, the portal team will continue

1 to provide assistance to all  
2 stakeholders, the MARCO managers to the  
3 RPB. And another big piece of this  
4 grant -- I should not say too big,  
5 actually small amount of money, but there  
6 is some funding in there to start working  
7 on regional OSHA assessments and support  
8 the MARCO and RPB efforts. And I'm going  
9 to go next now to the regional ocean  
10 assessment and talk a little more about  
11 that.

12 There is national guidance out  
13 there and a lot of you recall what was in  
14 the original inter-agency ocean policy  
15 task force guidance, it was extensive and  
16 descriptive. The planning and basically,  
17 it talked about doing an analysis of  
18 ecological conditions and cumulative  
19 risks, forecast model of cumulative  
20 impacts. A lot of wonderful stuff but  
21 very expensive to document, all that to  
22 do that kind of assessment.

23 So then when the marine special  
24 planning handbook came out this August,  
25 the description in there was quite a bit



1 simpler and basically the guidance was  
2 that a regional -- marine plan should  
3 include a marine assessment that it uses  
4 to describe the activities relevant to  
5 the subject matter of the plan.

6 So, that gives us quite a lot of  
7 flexibility as a region to seaside,  
8 really, what we want in that. But  
9 obviously we want to look at geophysical  
10 biological human uses, history, culture  
11 and do the best job we can with it.

12 The reality strikes and it's only  
13 \$75,000. It's a very tiny amount of  
14 money and so I think, again, expectations  
15 need to be realistic here. So to me what  
16 that says is we really need the ocean  
17 assessment to focus on the priorities in  
18 our plan what we agreed to as the main  
19 gold goals and priorities of that plan is  
20 where we are going to have to focus our  
21 attention on the assessment.

22 So, basically, the Monmouth team  
23 will be putting out a request for  
24 proposals. This money will be sub  
25 contracted and what I hope we can get to

1           today will be some discussion about what  
2           the RPB would really like to say and see  
3           in that social assessment and hopefully  
4           we can give some helpful guidance to Tony  
5           and the Monmouth team as to how to focus  
6           that RPB. That's going to be an RFP.  
7           That's a difficult task. I will leave it  
8           at that and pose these basic questions  
9           for the RPB and the major one is how does  
10          the RPB wish to use the MARCO portal and  
11          to what extent do we want to rely on the  
12          MARCO portal as its planning tool and  
13          what additional data and tools would the  
14          RPB like added to it? And then what  
15          would the RPB like to see covered in a  
16          regional ocean assessment.

17                   I'll throw that out there as our  
18          discussion points for this morning.

19                   MS. CANTRAL: Thank you, Laura  
20          McKay.

21                   To underscore a point that Laura  
22          made that hasn't come up with your  
23          discussion so far, we had not gotten to  
24          the topic is the fact that this, the data  
25          portal and everything she described in

1 terms of reaching out to sectors and to  
2 communities is another dimension of  
3 stakeholder engagement and an excellent  
4 opportunity and there are opportunities  
5 for leveraging some of that outreach.  
6 There is probably an opportunity to  
7 leverage and outreach across regions.  
8 The northeast is also conducting similar  
9 kind of building a data portal and  
10 building it out. So I think something  
11 flagged as you are strategizing to be  
12 more efficient with your stakeholder  
13 engagement you factor that in as an  
14 opportunity.

15 Let's take up the questions in  
16 order and first have some discussion  
17 around the first question that's been  
18 posed here about the RPBs hope to use a  
19 MARCO portal.

20 MR. PABST: I think in a simplest  
21 form use it to achieve our goals as we  
22 would have to make decisions and  
23 objectives and actions so it should have  
24 the infrastructure needed to support what  
25 we are trying to achieve.

1 MS. CHYTALO: What has been done so  
2 far is fantastic. What you put into the  
3 data portal, that's really a remarkable  
4 piece of information. One thing I missed  
5 is resource information in there in a  
6 data portal.

7 MS. MCKAY: I didn't go through all  
8 seven of the themes, but --

9 MS. CHYTALO: I was getting  
10 nervous.

11 MS. MCKAY: I didn't want to repeat  
12 what I've done several times in the past.  
13 There is definitely security, there is  
14 maritime life, maritime industry. There  
15 is marine life which covers all of the  
16 biological. There is administrative that  
17 covers all of the jurisdictional  
18 boundaries.

19 What else am I forgetting, Jay?  
20 Gwynne?

21 MS. CHYTALO: Do you have the old  
22 disposal sites too?

23 MS. MCKAY: Military free  
24 restricted areas and it's quite  
25 extensive.

1 MS. CHYTALO: I want to make sure  
2 we have all of the pieces and other  
3 pieces we should be developing or help to  
4 develop and something we can assist on to  
5 help MARCO more so too. That would be a  
6 positive thing as a partnership and stuff  
7 that would be good.

8 MS. MCKAY: If I go back a few  
9 slides on that intro you can -- maybe  
10 not.

11 I guess we don't have the slide in  
12 here that has the list of the themes on  
13 the right, but yeah, all of the more  
14 reason to go out into the hall and look  
15 at the portal. You all need, as RPB  
16 members you need to be looking at it and  
17 become familiar with what's in there  
18 around hopefully our stakeholders are  
19 doing that as well.

20 MS. CHYTALO: One other thing we  
21 talked about last night at our table, the  
22 things in the three dimensions, organisms  
23 don't stay on the ground. They surface  
24 throughout the water column.

25 Is that worth looking at on a three

1 dimensional scale?

2 MS. MCKAY: To the extent we can,  
3 that may be an area where some of the  
4 MARCO data can be helpful, looking at the  
5 air space above the water as well. So  
6 definitely there is a three dimensional  
7 space.

8 MS. CHYTALO: I wanted to make sure  
9 for resources we do accommodate them and  
10 certain activities can certainly take  
11 place down below or whatever, but in --  
12 activities occur on the surface, but not  
13 at the bottom and we need to know what's  
14 going on in both of those types of  
15 spaces.

16 MS. MCKAY: Right.

17 MS. CHYTALO: Excellent.

18 MS. CANTRAL: John?

19 MR. WALTERS: As a potential user  
20 and active user we are using this tool in  
21 our further efforts to examine marine  
22 traffic on the east coast and we've been  
23 partnering with MARCO and the MARCO  
24 development team on importing and making  
25 A.I.S. data and how we are using that is

1           determining how or if traffic routing  
2           should be modified and that's in  
3           consideration with the efforts of  
4           developing wind energy off shore, but  
5           beyond that renewable energy because  
6           other things are probably coming besides  
7           wind. So we are looking 20 to 30 years  
8           down the road and hoping to use this  
9           information to help us make some of those  
10          decisions about what we are doing.

11                 This is very critical information.  
12          The one piece, I spoke with your team,  
13          was including ocean currents. Ocean  
14          currents dictate -- has a great impact  
15          where shipping goes. If a ship can  
16          capitalize on the current and reduce the  
17          fuel he consumes, he -- if he doesn't  
18          want to capitalize on that, he'll sail to  
19          shore. But having that information  
20          available will help us to make decisions  
21          about traffic decisions now and 20 to 30  
22          years down the road. We can be confident  
23          in the near term, but 20, 30 years down  
24          the road ocean currents may not change  
25          much unless the polar ice caps melts it.

1 But is it being capitalized on and where  
2 do those currents relate to potential  
3 energy area not only existing or proposed  
4 wind areas, but Phase II.

5 What's down the road for potential  
6 wind energy, is it more systems? If so,  
7 where is currents and where is shipping  
8 going to be and we can approach the next  
9 phase in a measured approach, find out,  
10 understand where shipping marine animals  
11 are going and look at those parameters or  
12 constraining parameters and look at where  
13 it's least offensive or conflicting to  
14 place the next phase.

15 This is very critical to Coast  
16 Guard use, very important. You see the  
17 traffic density coming out of Hamilton  
18 Roads out of New York in the previous  
19 slide. There is a slide there that had  
20 the Virginia wind energy which had the  
21 trafficking go right through it.

22 Can you going back to that one  
23 Laura?

24 MR. WALTERS: Where Laura had other  
25 pointer is a designated wind energy that



1           was auctioned off to Dominion Power. You  
2           see the tracks going through the wind  
3           area part of -- how do we reroute that  
4           traffic? Where is it going? Where is  
5           the -- would the water accommodate that  
6           traffic? What is the potential for  
7           expanded Panama Canal coming to Hamilton  
8           Roads and where is the deep water for the  
9           traffic to get this to the part? How  
10          does that affect the danger zones or  
11          military operations conducted by the Navy  
12          or Air Force? And folks don't realize  
13          the Air Force is really active offshore  
14          in its air-to-air combat operations. Not  
15          training -- training, not operations  
16          training.

17                 So there is a more of a military  
18                 impact than you would think in this area.  
19                 There is more than just a Navy. The  
20                 Marines are out there actively and  
21                 surprisingly, so is the Army.

22                 So there is a lot of activity out  
23                 here, a lot of potential conflicts with  
24                 commercial fishing and recreation. It's  
25                 a very busy area.

1 MS. CANTRAL: If you needed an  
2 example of the utility of a tool like  
3 this and John is giving you a great  
4 understanding of how this information can  
5 be important for decision-making about  
6 how to avoid or minimize potential  
7 conflicts --

8 MR. ROSEN: That was my comment. I  
9 think up to now understandably discussion  
10 in process and somewhat abstract. I  
11 think it's prior time to take some of the  
12 information from the portal and start  
13 developing some case studies and  
14 illustrations from Jones' Point. It  
15 involves the (inaudible) to kind of  
16 ground this process and make it more  
17 tangible. I don't think anybody wants to  
18 hear about charters, and unless they want  
19 to see how this benefits and take a look  
20 at the portal and how this process can  
21 be -- this is part of our message to the  
22 stakeholders.

23 MS. BORNHOLDT: How about linkages?  
24 One of the things you've mentioned that  
25 is, of course, concerns how do you

1           continue the existence of this beyond the  
2           maps you have now? I want to know with  
3           data and linkages with our portals.  
4           Something that John said reminded me one  
5           of the dialogues we had at the Department  
6           of Defense. It's not just the Navy and  
7           Marines, Department of Defense does a  
8           red, yellow, green for us. After it does  
9           its in reach and we have those polygons  
10          posted in the MC, do you have a  
11          relationship to be able to upload that  
12          data?

13                 We take care and keep it living.  
14          That link allows you to have that open  
15          conduit without having to manage that  
16          conduit. Do you have the NOAA data?  
17          They have vacuum machines in addition to  
18          currents, air issues, even though we all  
19          know, at least in the case for wind  
20          energy, is a clean generation. However,  
21          when you go and construct these  
22          facilities you talk about using a lot of  
23          diesel and causes issues associated with  
24          some air pollution, et cetera. If we had  
25          that data available we may understand to

1           augment our decision-making what link  
2           questions and what physical things do you  
3           have?

4           MS. MCKAY: We work closely with  
5           Mary Boatman at your agency and she set  
6           up the national ocean data which is  
7           oksdata.gov (sic.) and all federal  
8           agencies are beginning to feed their  
9           layers to that system which makes it easy  
10          for us in the meetings to download  
11          directly whether we are not having to  
12          maintain the data per se, we just go and  
13          I think they are working on alerts so  
14          that the regions are notified when new  
15          data sets go update or data layers go up.  
16          It can be fairly automated that regional  
17          portals get this information easily and  
18          quickly.

19          And then we have -- we are building  
20          links as well to search the state  
21          portals. I'm not sure if we have that in  
22          there yet, but something we talked about  
23          too and we've talked in previous meetings  
24          about the idea of these portals and  
25          databases being nested.

1           So, you have things at the federal  
2           level, ocean.data.gov and multi-purpose  
3           marine -- NOAA works on together and they  
4           provide all of this federal agency data  
5           layer and I know the G.I.S. coordinator  
6           on my staff works with BOEM to also take  
7           out how the data can flow in the other  
8           direction. For instance, we are working  
9           on getting our Virginia recreational use  
10          maps uploaded to ocean.data.gov.

11          There is definitely linkages going  
12          in all directions and good communications  
13          are being established that's going to  
14          make this all pretty nicely streamlined.

15          I think you have had an earlier  
16          question.

17          MS. BORNHOLDT: Other types of  
18          physical data.

19          MS. MCKAY: In terms of air  
20          quality?

21          MS. BORNHOLDT: Meteorology,  
22          ocean -- physical --

23          MS. MCKAY: That's what -- so we --  
24          I wasn't clear. That's what I hope we  
25          can integrate, that data, we can get from

1 MARCO's, the ocean data systems. That's  
2 the kind of data they collect realtime.  
3 The challenge is to take those mountains  
4 of data and sort of, you know,  
5 extrapolate or in into a layer that's  
6 usable for long-term planning.

7 A lot of that realtime data is  
8 critical for emergencies and that sort of  
9 thing, but we don't really need to know  
10 what the temperature is every minute.  
11 You need to have it generalized for  
12 planning purposes. That's something the  
13 portal team is working on with MARCO.  
14 With the continued funding for portal  
15 development, that will be something we  
16 want to work into that.

17 If I could just -- I have to  
18 respond. Marty was talking about the  
19 importance of having case studies and the  
20 portal team was just meeting earlier this  
21 week and they have been receiving some  
22 training about stories and how to make  
23 things real and how to put stories in  
24 case study on to tools like the portal.  
25 So I'm hoping that we'll be doing some

1 really cool work on that. Interviewing  
2 real people, have real stakeholders talk  
3 about why things are important or what  
4 the problem is they are grappling with  
5 and how the portal can help some of  
6 problems.

7 I think that's an excellent  
8 observation, Marty, and one that the  
9 portal team is on top of and hopefully  
10 funding continues and we'll be able to  
11 have those kinds of features.

12 MS. CANTRAL: Several people  
13 have -- I'm going to acknowledge Greg and  
14 Frank and Joe.

15 MR. CAPOBIANCO: Thanks, Laura.  
16 I'm wondering if you want share with the  
17 RPB and audience, I know that the data  
18 portal team is working on some user  
19 agreement language and some data  
20 standards and sort of figuring out that  
21 data and I think that's great, you know,  
22 for a lot of obvious reasons the user  
23 agreement, to my way of thinking, letting  
24 people know what's really on here and  
25 what the data implies and doesn't employ

1           and it's important my understanding some  
2           of the data on the portal is static data  
3           and some is model data and may have a  
4           user when they go into a complicated  
5           repository of lots of data, understand  
6           what's on there and a couple of other  
7           things, but so the user agreement data  
8           standards.

9                        I was interested in your discussion  
10           about state data and I know I talked a  
11           little bit with Jay last night, but  
12           trying to think through how the portal  
13           can house the state data and what's the,  
14           you know, best way to start that process?  
15           I think it's complicated. There are  
16           scale issues, data collection methodology  
17           and there is no dangers of sort of  
18           slapping stuff up without slipping it  
19           through.

20                       The last thing was coordination  
21           with Emrock and edge matching and sharing  
22           or complimenting each others' work, you  
23           know. Great example is Emrock and  
24           northeast data portal. The boater  
25           surveys in New England and Long Island



1           Sound is sharing -- we'll do Long Island  
2           Sound on New York with you by the way.  
3           We'll do your ocean side too, which is a  
4           fantastic offer and general thing to do.  
5           I'm exploring what it is to reciprocate  
6           that effort and coordinate better with on  
7           a regional scale with more of these  
8           folks.

9           MS. MCKAY: There is coordination  
10          and actually there were regular  
11          conference calls between the northeast  
12          and Atlantic portal teams and those are  
13          still going on as needed, but there has  
14          definitely been a lot of synergy there.  
15          There's been a lot of sharing of ideas.  
16          Our portal actually went up first and of  
17          course of the northeast used a lot of the  
18          same kind of look and feel. And then we  
19          are getting things from them as well.  
20          There is a connection. There is  
21          communication. There is back and forth.  
22          I think we are in good shape there.

23          It also has been great in terms of  
24          having similar data needs and data gaps  
25          and so having two regions, really one

1 voice saying what we really need is this  
2 data layer X or Y and those requests go  
3 to some of the federal agencies. BOEM  
4 and DOE have been responsive to those  
5 data requests and there is so much data  
6 being collected right now, not in the  
7 portal yet, it's still being collected.  
8 So I think that collaboration is going to  
9 bear fruit that you will see pretty soon.  
10 It takes a while to collect that data,  
11 but putting the portals up has called  
12 into focus where those gaps are. So I  
13 think that's all been good. Hopefully  
14 I've answered that. Now let me remember  
15 your other three.

16 User agreement. I want to point  
17 out that the way MARCO is structured we  
18 have an ocean planning action team that I  
19 serve as an aid for and that has a  
20 basically a portal team and we had  
21 decided it into portal activities and  
22 stakeholder engagement. We've merged it.  
23 Now there is a data review team, outside  
24 experts that are helping us now with both  
25 the user agreement and setting data

1 standards. We have dropped documents  
2 that they have come up with. They need  
3 to keep looking at that and the MARCO  
4 board will look at those documents again  
5 and we have those data standard set and  
6 those will be visible on its MARCO  
7 portal. When they are agreed to, I won't  
8 go into what all of those are, but  
9 basically what we all want is credible  
10 data. We want to be transparent and have  
11 the best available.

12 We will have to recognize we don't  
13 always have current data and we  
14 probably -- never will have perfect data.  
15 We'll always be in a position of wishing  
16 we had more and better, but while we'll  
17 have to, most ahead with best available.  
18 That has to be clear when you go as a  
19 user to the portal you need to understand  
20 what you are looking at. You need to  
21 understand very clearly and easily how  
22 old is this data, how is it created, who  
23 created it and then it will have to be  
24 user-be-aware after that. But to my mind  
25 that's the only way to move forward we

1 can't wait forever for perfect data.

2 Did I miss one of your questions,  
3 Greg? I think I got three.

4 MR. CAPOBIANCO: You did awesome.  
5 The conversations we were chatting about  
6 state data.

7 MS. MCKAY: Right. Uploading one  
8 of the earlier versions of the MARCO  
9 portal we had a theme or section state  
10 specific. We had the New Jersey baseline  
11 data. We had the Maryland shoals data.  
12 That's something, you know, we had agreed  
13 we would try to put up layers that  
14 covered the entire region and that was  
15 sort of the general idea. But again, in  
16 the best available where we can, I think  
17 the portal team is willing to look at  
18 where we put upstate data or data that  
19 may be available over one state or two  
20 states.

21 To the extent that is important and  
22 useful for regional planning, I think we  
23 need to balance that about does it need  
24 to be something in the regions to see it  
25 should -- could be on our individual

1 state portals, but that's something we'll  
2 look at further.

3 MS. CANTRAL: Before turning to  
4 Frank I see a couple other tents have  
5 gone up we'll go to Frank, Joe, Sarah,  
6 John and Karen.

7 That would be the order.

8 MR. MACH: D.O.T. is not going to  
9 be a big source for ocean information,  
10 but the Maritime Administration, the main  
11 highways programs and sometimes we call  
12 Shore to Sea Shipping. There is a study  
13 out now, the 195 Corridor Study. They  
14 are trying to support D.O.T.'s congestion  
15 goals pushing traffic off 95 and putting  
16 it into the sea lanes. And John's got  
17 issues with, you know, passage of those  
18 vessels in areas that are impacted by  
19 other users that might be -- an have an  
20 effect of America's green highways,  
21 alternatives we'll say.

22 MR. ATANGAN: Just a couple  
23 comments. My hope is the standards you  
24 are looking at are used in our base fund.  
25 Certainly the industry standards, the

1 last thing we want to do is come up with  
2 a separate MARCO standard because I think  
3 that recruits problems down stream with  
4 regard to sharing information and using  
5 additional information. I'm a big  
6 advocate of using whatever industry  
7 standards are out there.

8 As for your data and what you are  
9 going to use I like the portal. It's  
10 come a long way since I first saw it I  
11 think a couple years ago. Massive,  
12 massive improvement. I think it's very  
13 easy to use. I'm a pretty  
14 technology-challenged guy and I was able  
15 to go in there and do some pretty cool  
16 stuff. I believe it has the potential to  
17 assist us in our decision-making by  
18 providing certainly the stakeholders the  
19 common view. This -- it's almost -- it's  
20 always easier if one, you are about to  
21 make a decision. Everybody sees the  
22 information you are making that decision  
23 on -- in a common framework, common  
24 visual. Everybody sees what it is from  
25 the same light. But in order to do that

1 we need to make sure that it is in fact  
2 and you've already said it, it is in fact  
3 the best available scientific data.

4 Also, in providing this picture I think  
5 you -- it will assist in the transparency  
6 aspects of the RPB's decision-making  
7 process downstream. I encourage the  
8 portal development. I believe it can be  
9 a very powerful tool. My only caveat is  
10 stick to the industry standard.

11 MS. COOKSEY: I was going to try to  
12 move us on and cull the question, but  
13 there were more people that needed to  
14 speak. The question I haven't heard, any  
15 other options? So I think at that point  
16 similar to yet with the stakeholders,  
17 unless we come up with something better,  
18 I recommend we accept MARCO's offer to  
19 use the portal to support our activities  
20 with some of these caveats that we just  
21 heard that I think are very important.  
22 However, I would like us to make a  
23 fully-informed decision perhaps at our  
24 next meeting which would -- it would be  
25 wonderful to say what are our other

1 options and how much will they cost. But  
2 I have not seen that today based upon the  
3 information we have.

4 And then I went back and took a  
5 look at what was in CMSP guide book a  
6 minute ago and went back and looked at  
7 the presentation. That again started us  
8 off yesterday with our time line and not  
9 only are we supposed to start the  
10 regional assessment, which I think you  
11 said we only have \$75,000 to do, we are  
12 also supposed to be doing a capacity  
13 assessment.

14 This is food for thought for the  
15 next -- I'm not smart enough to figure  
16 out how to do this, but you think some of  
17 the smart techno people in the audience  
18 and our contractors and staff can also  
19 help us weave a way for it to help with  
20 the capacity assessment.

21 Those two things are tied together.  
22 To be to be able to use the portal for a  
23 as a tool it can be we need to do the  
24 capacity assessment as well. I'm not  
25 sure if that makes complete sense, but I



1 would like to ask the RPB to reflect on  
2 that.

3 Not hearing any other offers, I  
4 would recommend that for now that the  
5 RPB, accept MARCO's offer of using the  
6 portal.

7 MS. CANTRAL: Sarah, thank you and  
8 I was going to focus the group on the  
9 same question, having heard a couple  
10 supportive comments I think are  
11 underscoring what you just said.

12 Since there are few other people  
13 putting their tents up or just put their  
14 tents up, I recommend we hear this last  
15 round of comments, come back to that  
16 question and then move to the other  
17 issue, the other topic which is the  
18 questions that were up and you just  
19 referred to regarding assessments.

20 So, if that sounds okay to the  
21 group the next person in the line, was  
22 John Karen Mo and let me -- John?

23 MR. WALTERS: We had a discussion  
24 the other day about the focus of the  
25 portal, whether it's a 30,000-foot view

1 of things or can it be focused down so  
2 maybe it's 500-foot elevation. This is  
3 also one of the decision points. This is  
4 a static or appears to be a static  
5 presentation of history rather than a mix  
6 of day-to-day operations and planning.

7 I was thinking of the user,  
8 commercial user fishermen, commercial or  
9 recreational can go to the tool and if he  
10 wanted to, find out or his route  
11 planning, what were the weather  
12 conditions offshore, whether -- what are  
13 the currents NOAA weather buoys saying,  
14 can it be accessed to or linked to the  
15 ports sensors. So that this is a totally  
16 usable route planning tool as well as a  
17 strategic planning tool. So maybe  
18 address whether it, can it be expanded or  
19 should be expanded to the day-to-day  
20 operational considerations or only retain  
21 it as a strategic high-level ocean  
22 planning tool.

23 MS. CANTRAL: Okay.

24 MS. MCKAY: I'm not sure I can  
25 totally access it, but I think that as

1           our two different things I don't think we  
2           designed the portal to be someone's route  
3           planning portal. I think we designed it  
4           to be multi-stakeholder ocean planning  
5           portal.

6                       Whether you can add all of that  
7           depth and bells and whistles for specific  
8           other uses that are daily uses for  
9           operations as opposed to planning, I  
10          don't know if the technology would be  
11          there. But if we could, yeah, that would  
12          be the dream, but I'm not sure that  
13          that's anything we can do real soon.

14                      MS. CANTRAL: You want to jump in?

15                      MR. ATANGAN: I want to respond as  
16          someone who has experience in these  
17          operational daily-type use things. That  
18          is a tremendous undertaking that I would  
19          certainly advice against at this point.  
20          The resources required to do that are  
21          pretty significant. Daily manpower,  
22          somebody to keep an eye on the  
23          information, make sure it's updating I  
24          don't think that's something we should  
25          commit to based on the limited resources

1           we have. Let's focus on the things we do  
2           well and the things we immediately need  
3           for the purpose we are setting out to.

4           MS. CANTRAL: Karen?

5           MS. CHYTALO: I guess my question  
6           is who makes the decision on what data  
7           sets get added personally through the  
8           data portal. How are those decisions  
9           made?

10          MS. MCKAY: At the moment it's  
11          through the MARCO board, MARCO management  
12          board.

13          MS. CHYTALO: Who decides what data  
14          sets would be added on? So, therefore if  
15          we were to enter into an agreement with  
16          MARCO to use that for the RPB, that might  
17          have to be modified I assume or for the  
18          decision process to have data sent to  
19          what types of data would be added on.

20          MS. MCKAY: That would be a  
21          negotiation between MARCO management  
22          board and RPB.

23          MS. CHYTALO: That's something we  
24          need to keep in mind for adding pieces on  
25          if its -- right now the MARCO, you've

1           been doing a fantastic job putting  
2           something together for your purposes, but  
3           for the regional planning body might be a  
4           little bit different. Our goals might be  
5           different. I don't know at that point,  
6           therefore we might have to tweak some  
7           things in terms of a decision-making  
8           process in getting those processes on  
9           there.

10                   MS. BORNHOLDT: I have a second  
11           question. Do you think the data  
12           standards will be ready and posted?

13                   MS. CHYTALO: Well, we have a draft  
14           right now and the draft has been shared  
15           with the MARCO management board. I  
16           think, you know, I would like to defer to  
17           Jay and Tony about timing. I know Jay,  
18           you probably want to meet with your  
19           external scientific expert team again.  
20           Is that all right to let Jay say  
21           something?

22                   JAY: So, as Laura mentioned, we  
23           first -- a little quick clarification.  
24           There are internationally and federally  
25           recognized standards, technical standards

1           that address data information about data  
2           and interoperability so that we can  
3           continue to do things we are doing now.  
4           We are consuming data directly from  
5           federal agencies from the MMC -- Multi  
6           Purpose Marine and a couple other sites.  
7           So we had a pretty good handle on, you  
8           know, being up to snuff on those  
9           particular technical standards.

10                     The other question is the standards  
11           that Laura mentioned about that related  
12           to understanding the pedigree of the  
13           data, its credibility is it the -- the  
14           questions and sequentially is it the best  
15           available data?

16                     For -- to address the second set  
17           and you know, its around by who decides  
18           port and who decides what goes onto the  
19           portal. We have established a review --  
20           folks who are external to our team and  
21           recognize scientists in the region we  
22           only met ones and feeling our way on this  
23           we developed a draft list of criteria we  
24           have sent --

25                     MS. MCKAY: Yes.

1           JAY: -- to the MARCO management  
2 board.

3           We did actually do a fair bit of  
4 due diligence and looked at what our  
5 portals around the country, both regions  
6 that will -- portals like ours and  
7 federal sites had done and not wanting to  
8 reinvent the wheel. If we are all ears,  
9 if someone has a list of standards we  
10 they are using, we are treading into new  
11 territory and want to get it right. With  
12 your help we are certainly not starting  
13 from scratch. We are collaborating  
14 closely with northeast teams. Stephanie  
15 and Nick are here today.

16           I just want to add too that in the  
17 process of developing and bringing all of  
18 the data into the portal we are working  
19 with, closely with your staff and  
20 agencies represented at the table. I do  
21 see a lot of -- while there is a  
22 technical distinction or important  
23 distinction between, you know, the portal  
24 team working directly with the MARCO  
25 board and some kind of expanded or

1 different arrangement, that served the  
2 needs of the RPB as well, but I don't  
3 think it should be that hard because we  
4 are all working together already.

5 MS. BORNHOLDT: I had another  
6 question and I'm a -- with regard to the  
7 this kind of discussion and particular  
8 topic -- gross understanding, are there  
9 gross standards for data? What is the  
10 Delta between that and what MARCO is?  
11 The technical standard -- so the other  
12 piece is I guess what Laura and Karen was  
13 talking about, the data meets that  
14 technical standard and it's perhaps more  
15 a policy call with regard to the purpose  
16 of the MARCO portal and how this data  
17 needs -- meets those needs as well as  
18 questions that at that point this time  
19 MARCO has. They want to use the data to  
20 answer.

21 JAY: Yes. That's correct.

22 MS. CANTRAL: Okay.

23 JAY: My colleague -- we want to  
24 support ocean planning. That's the niche  
25 we set out to follow with direction from



1 MARCO and our NOAA founders.

2 MS. CANTRAL: So, what I suggest, I  
3 would like to come back to Sarah's  
4 question, see if we can wrap this up for  
5 now recognizing all of these topics and  
6 questions are a work in progress and move  
7 on to the second question regarding  
8 regional assessment and you know, what  
9 I'm hearing from the discussion is some  
10 expressions of positive like the portal  
11 thing that it can assess the RPB with  
12 their work. There are some caveats,  
13 still some outstanding questions and  
14 needs clarification about the state data  
15 standard and being transparent about  
16 where it come from and now some good  
17 clarifications about that. There may be  
18 a need for some future discussions as the  
19 RPB gets clear about what its goals are  
20 and how that aligns with what MARCO is --  
21 has been developing this portal for in  
22 terms of its goals and some discussion  
23 between its two entities may be called  
24 for -- to insure that the mark -- data  
25 portal has the infrastructure it needs to

1 support the work of the RPB and if it  
2 doesn't, then what are the alternatives.

3 So, seeing the weather alternative  
4 for now, it seems logical you would  
5 embrace this idea and then see how it  
6 evolves.

7 Okay? Have we got that? Feel  
8 comfortable with that?

9 MR. WALTERS: Yes.

10 MS. CANTRAL: So, then, let's have  
11 some discussion. I would like to say in  
12 ten minutes we are going to make take a  
13 break and move to our public comment.  
14 Second option, whether you have fully  
15 dispensed with this question or not we'll  
16 take our public comment and maybe come  
17 back to the topic and see if there is  
18 anything else we need to do.

19 What would you like to see covered  
20 in a regional ocean assessment?

21 MR. ROSEN: If one of the purposes  
22 of this process is to identify,  
23 anticipate potential resource use,  
24 conflicts and help make -- resolve it  
25 then (inaudible), not a lot of money at

1 all to include projections and try to  
2 state allied ones if possible so we have  
3 some idea what the future might bring.

4 MS. SCHULTZ: Step one is to  
5 document what it is we currently do have.  
6 There is a wealth of information on the  
7 portal and information in other places.  
8 What do we have and kind of think through  
9 strategically what we are trying to  
10 answer. Are we trying to get an index of  
11 the help? What are those questions? And  
12 I think we have to have a little bit of a  
13 structure, mechanism to engage the group  
14 in those after we know what data we do  
15 have.

16 MR. PABST: Thanks. I was going to  
17 say something similar to what Gwynne said.  
18 Once we decide firmly on goals, actions,  
19 we can, right now, the task of getting  
20 everything we have critical and assessing  
21 what we need in order to be able do what  
22 it is we say we want to do.

23 MS. COOKSEY: I also would like to  
24 add that I hope we keep in mind what is  
25 unique about our region and part of that

1 is the people and the businesses and  
2 transportation networks and things  
3 already here and some of that will be  
4 land based, but I do think that's  
5 important because the people impact the  
6 ocean. I know my governor is very  
7 interested in the economics of this and I  
8 hope we have the resources to do an  
9 economic study as well.

10 MS. MCKAY: One thing Jay and I  
11 wore talking about the other day as far  
12 as the -- what we currently have the  
13 resources and the human uses, that is  
14 largely in the portal. Not saying  
15 everything is in there, but wondering  
16 about whether you all are expecting an  
17 assessment. That's a stand-alone merited  
18 document which could be done or if we  
19 somehow want to integrate the assessment  
20 into the portal itself, or maybe we do  
21 both. But it strikes me, you know, a  
22 picture tells a thousand words. Using  
23 the portal and pictures and maps you can  
24 create. Might be a nice way to actually  
25 structure the assessment and there can

1           be -- could be perhaps an elaboration of  
2           each layer's fact sheet which describes  
3           the layer. Perhaps it can be expanded to  
4           include more about the condition of the  
5           resource or use and the expected future  
6           uses or whatever that there may be some  
7           nice ways to sort of integrate it into  
8           the portal.

9                     The other thing was in the  
10           Monmouth's team's proposal as an option  
11           to investigate whether or not we want to  
12           use the -- I think it's the Global Ocean  
13           Health Index. I don't know if you've all  
14           seen that on line, but you can global  
15           Ocean Health Index. That lays out a  
16           number of parameters that perhaps could  
17           be adapted to the Mid-Atlantic region and  
18           a way of marking the current conditions  
19           of the condition of the current's  
20           resources. It sounds similar to say what  
21           is the condition of the fishery,  
22           extremely difficult and we don't know we  
23           have all of the science and may never  
24           will to say what the condition of  
25           everything is. The key will be how do we

1 do this in a \$75,000 grant that's going  
2 to be useful.

3 MS. COOKSEY: Yes. Let's put --  
4 I -- let's strive for the perfect word  
5 beyond the portal and have some sort of  
6 document as well on the portal have fact  
7 sheets where we can go further. If you  
8 author those that wouldn't that drill  
9 down and get further information.

10 MS. BORNHOLDT: Point to consider:  
11 Perhaps I know the Shinnecock Nation is  
12 not hear today, but we hear a lot of  
13 information that NOAA collects collection  
14 and BOEM collects and how each individual  
15 state collection, depending upon the use  
16 and objectives, et cetera, our using RPB  
17 and how was use the MARCO portal and  
18 design resource assessment, again,  
19 dependent upon our objectives one of the  
20 things we need to integrate is this  
21 changing world in doing things in a  
22 different way is tradition. This is  
23 knowledge. This is not unique to first  
24 patients. That's what's cool about the  
25 participatory -- we can not forget that

1           we have a first nation that is one of the  
2           youngest thoroughly recognized tribes and  
3           here is a opportunity to perhaps mine  
4           that data, set that tradition and really  
5           weave that into whatever the portal is  
6           for use of the five states.  However, we  
7           use it in concert with some of the  
8           objectives and let's not forget that  
9           element.

10           MS. CANTRAL:  Marty?

11           MR. ROSEN:  Laura, to your point  
12           about trying to develop assessment about  
13           characterizing current conditions.  For  
14           instance, I assume that proposal RPB will  
15           not necessarily be trying to generate the  
16           new information.  It will draw from the  
17           existing specific information to develop  
18           a portal.  So I assume that same a  
19           testament of information or -- a lot of  
20           agencies do that as a matter of force.  
21           So that information will be -- may be  
22           considered.  We are not talking about all  
23           of the new data obviously.

24           MS. MCKAY:  That ties well with the  
25           point that Sarah made.  If we use the

1 portal to try to kind of show where all  
2 this information exists to make it easy  
3 for people to kind find it we can make a  
4 summary statement on the fact sheets and  
5 have hyperlinks right to the current  
6 reports, whatever resource condition or  
7 report is out there. That would be  
8 pretty doable.

9 Do you agree, Tony?

10 MR. McDONALD: All of our  
11 stakeholders have a wealth of  
12 information. It would be minding  
13 government reports and --

14 MS. CANTRAL: Results. The  
15 credible information we are familiar  
16 with, the sectors and hopefully to  
17 capture on that as well.

18 Let's finish out this on Joe and  
19 Karen and close it out and turn to the  
20 public comments and see if there are any  
21 other comments and summarize and see if  
22 we are ready to move on. Joe?

23 MR. ATANGAN: I'm sorry. I'm going  
24 to be -- I'm confused here with regard to  
25 what the deliverable is with regard to



1           the regional assessment. I mean it says  
2           yeah, you'll do one, it's going to be a  
3           business line condition and lists out  
4           these, I guess, subjects, geophysical  
5           history and culture. And my concern is  
6           with the limited resources you have, I  
7           understand we want it all, but we are  
8           clearly not going to do geophysical  
9           survey and not conduct a full biological  
10          assessment of this. So I'm trying to get  
11          a grasp of what's in the realm of  
12          possible based upon the resources we  
13          have.

14                    What are we really expecting as  
15                    deliverables from this regional  
16                    assessment?

17                    MS. MCKAY: I would expect mainly a  
18                    compilation of what's out there, almost  
19                    like a literature search, but putting it  
20                    all in one place. Of course 75,000 is  
21                    not going to do any of these assessments  
22                    it's only going to be barely enough to  
23                    kind of lay out what's being done and so  
24                    there are physical assessments going on  
25                    in the wind. Engineer areas, we can

1 point to those and do hyperlinks to  
2 those. Summarize them to the extent they  
3 are done and available. Same thing with  
4 the Save the Whales. There are reports  
5 out there on that. It has to be cursory  
6 summary statements about the condition  
7 with links to the more in depth reports  
8 is the way I'm imaging now Tony do you  
9 want to say something?

10 MR. McDONALD: Tony McDonald,  
11 again.

12 I'm listening. We are trying to  
13 figure out who to advance what we  
14 perceived to be a small part of a bigger  
15 effort. I'm trying to figure out where  
16 you all want to go in terms of the charge  
17 and opportunities.

18 I guess I would suggest a couple  
19 things: One is that we would really like  
20 to think of this -- beginning the  
21 assessment as setting up a framework for  
22 rolling assessment. So we certainly have  
23 a question about whether a document that  
24 gives you the current state and  
25 consultant gathering information is the

1 most useful thing we can do at this  
2 point.

3           There is a question in our mind for  
4 you. Whether, again, the extent to which  
5 we in the portal are already partnering  
6 with your agency because that's part of  
7 what we do and we also think there is  
8 probably, as Marty observed, quite a bit  
9 of information you already have in your  
10 environmental studies programs and I.S  
11 that you have done that provide a  
12 baseline. We can leverage what you are  
13 doing with our contract to engage in the  
14 knowledge that your states have and only  
15 come out with a static report because  
16 that would be, I think, stale pretty  
17 quickly and that's one idea of engage us  
18 in the portal. It could be essentially a  
19 frame work for rolling assessment.

20           We'll have baseline of information,  
21 might site geophysical physical studies  
22 that need to be done and inform your data  
23 gap analyses and based on preliminary  
24 discussions based on feedback, might be  
25 about how we leverage this small amount

1 of money we have in our grant for your  
2 objectives and how we nest that in what  
3 you all might be doing as a group to  
4 gather information and move forward.

5 That's a thought. We have a little  
6 hesitancy in putting out a contract to  
7 gather existing and do a literature  
8 search. We are not sure how that would  
9 advance your broader objectives as we've  
10 been listening to the past few days.

11 MS. CHYTALO: The regional  
12 assessment I would really like to see is  
13 to some specific data selected and  
14 examined for trend analysis. The last  
15 two decades we've seen some dramatic  
16 changes going on the -- resources where  
17 fish move and that sort of stuff. The  
18 last two decades have been major in  
19 comparison looking in some prior ones. I  
20 think that will help point us if we look  
21 at a data center with 50 years and look  
22 as an average. It does not tell us the  
23 real story. The last two decades will  
24 tell us more of a story where we are  
25 headed in the area where people are not

1           allowed to fish, management plans or be  
2           what you of the resource -- to help up to  
3           plan for the ocean and highlight what is  
4           so important in certain places and stuff  
5           like that.

6                     We are looking -- we are looking at  
7           space analysis. Let the areas talk and  
8           see what they can tell us as to what is  
9           so critical and it's like -- have we  
10          driven things, activities to occur in  
11          certain areas that that is a good thing  
12          or a bad thing or whatever at this point.  
13          We need to get some better assessment on  
14          that. I think -- I think that would help  
15          us in the long run.

16                    Tony said there is a lot of data  
17          available right now. Take a look at  
18          certain pieces and prioritize that in  
19          some of your objectives or something like  
20          that and under the goals and maybe that  
21          will help point the way to tell us some  
22          story.

23                    MS. CANTRAL: Thank you. We'll  
24          have an opportunity to revisit this  
25          discussion including Karen's idea after

1 we hear from some members of the public.  
2 Some signed up for public comment. I'll  
3 tell you the order these people will go:  
4 Margo Pelligrino, Morgan Gopnik and Ali  
5 Chase. You can sign up.

6 Margo Pelligrino.

7 MS. PELLIGRINO: (MARGO PELLIGRINO)

8 I believe the MARCO portal it's a  
9 really cool tool. I -- I don't -- maybe  
10 I'm not policy monkey enough. I'm sorry  
11 to -- if it's an offensive term. I'm not  
12 a physicist. I'm a paddler. As I said  
13 yesterday I paddled from Miami to Maine,  
14 Miami to New Orleans, L.B.I. to  
15 Washington, D.C. on the -- and Seattle to  
16 San Diego. And last year partnering with  
17 Clean Ocean Action, Cape May to Montauk.

18 Being able to paddle in the ocean  
19 and having a clean and melt my own -- my  
20 paddles are not purely recreational.  
21 They are an attempt to educate the public  
22 as much as possible about the issues and  
23 why we do need some kind of a plan for  
24 our ocean.

25 So, I get a little confused. I am

1           sorry if I'm sounding absolutely ignorant  
2           about the standards, because you know  
3           some of it is very simple. Shipping does  
4           not shake. It's fairly static. Some  
5           times big shipping planes -- lines might  
6           shift or whatever. Cables, once they are  
7           laid and put down under the ocean are  
8           pretty sedentary unless something big  
9           happens. For the most part they are  
10          where they are.

11                 Commercial and recreational can --  
12          fishing can shift somewhat according to  
13          species but, you know, there is enough  
14          folks. I feel partnerships that can be  
15          used made with universities like with  
16          Rutgers and Monmouth and stock top the  
17          data. There is it needs to be assembled  
18          understanding. That's a money issue.  
19          The partnerships are going to be crucial.

20                 As far as I got that -- little  
21          fliers about the recreational meeting  
22          upcoming up for Rutgers. One of my  
23          concerns I did email Greg Roth, the  
24          stewardship in ocean policy, director at  
25          America Academy, new association, which

1 is this country's, one of their oldest  
2 environmental and regulation  
3 organization. He was clueless this was  
4 going on. I don't know he was clueless  
5 about New Jersey specifically or if she  
6 he was clueless about all of the ones,  
7 all of the little sessions that had taken  
8 place in the region.

9 He is someone who should not -- if  
10 you care about stakeholder involvement  
11 you'll get these big organizations, big  
12 groups of paddlers together or at least a  
13 lot of them. They are policy people.  
14 They are old and large and have a lot of  
15 folks -- I have 30 seconds. How does  
16 that go fast?

17 I would like -- thinking, too, in  
18 the interest of that working with these  
19 groups, Surf Rider's doing -- doing a  
20 wonderful survey. They attached paddlers  
21 need lines. They are slightly different  
22 uses. We need to tap in to maximize the  
23 partnerships. They are out there and I  
24 actually volunteer my services for that,  
25 but there are ways to get it. We would



1           like to see it put up there on the MARCO  
2           (inaudible), although is a dynamic change  
3           sifting about. Not so much as you would  
4           think. I think I did have another --  
5           that's like one thing, actually sifting.  
6           I'm wearing a T-shirt today I actually  
7           belong the --

8                     MS. GOPNIK: (MORGAN GOPNIK)

9           Morgan Gopnik, I don't think there  
10          is anything new. We've spoken and spoke  
11          a lot last night. I'm going to start  
12          with an addendum to things I said  
13          yesterday which leads what I want to say  
14          about data pretty quick yesterday. What  
15          I didn't say, which I should have said  
16          and kind of assumed I -- it went without  
17          saying.

18          I'm extremely supportive of what  
19          you are doing. If I offer criticism,  
20          it's because I care. I want this to  
21          really work well. I think there is huge  
22          responsibility and there is always ways  
23          of doing things better.

24          On the data, the one thing I wanted  
25          to put on the record, some of you heard

1 me say this before: There is a little  
2 bit of a danger and I'm coming from  
3 somewhat academic point of view, but I  
4 think it's effects the practicalities.  
5 There is a little bit of a danger when  
6 you rely on maps. Anything that does not  
7 fit on a map tends to get ignored. There  
8 are a lot of important things we need to  
9 know and understand that don't lend  
10 themselves to being mapped.

11 So there is a whole lot of social  
12 science data about the communities,  
13 communities' relations to social space,  
14 sort of more cultural information, a lot  
15 of information that is very relevant to  
16 the marine planning, not the stuff you  
17 put on a map when you talk about data.  
18 And I would also say it's not data you  
19 wouldn't -- compliance, but data points,  
20 knowledge. When you talk about data  
21 information and knowledge we need to find  
22 a way and it's not easy and something we  
23 struggle with all of the time to capture  
24 that less numerical data that can't be  
25 easily be put on a map.

1 MR. GOVE: (MATT GOVE)

2 Matt Gove. I can't stop commenting  
3 here. One thing I think you mentioned,  
4 Laura talking about some sort of  
5 breakdown to show what is going on, that  
6 would be a great idea. I've heard  
7 everything from its impossible don't try  
8 it to it's not that bad. It would be  
9 great to see costs, timing of a FACA  
10 process, what hurdles you have to get  
11 through.

12 As far as data, we'll use this as a  
13 time to plug the survey. Thanks. Thanks  
14 for mentioning it. There are postcards  
15 out in the lobby. It has the link to the  
16 survey. If you've been in the beach in  
17 the last 12 months you are our target.  
18 Jump on so we can have some great data  
19 for the portal. It's up until the end of  
20 December so we have a few more updates on  
21 that. We have had 700 surveys completed.  
22 We are on a good track trying to get as  
23 many as possible. That's about 3,000  
24 data points of people on the coast saying  
25 where they've done their recreational

1 activities.

2 As was mentioned, we are doing --  
3 economic dated and demographic data.  
4 That's interesting stuff once that come  
5 in. If you have not connected the dots,  
6 we've been working in collaboration with  
7 MARCO Emrock Monmouth Ecotrust and Nature  
8 Conservancy. The data fits with the  
9 other surveys going on the like the  
10 boater's survey and participate GAF's.  
11 That should all come out great.

12 As I mentioned yesterday, we are  
13 doing the survey. We are reaching out to  
14 the other recreational groups at the same  
15 time to try to get them aware of our RPB  
16 process and get them involved. We are  
17 not only doing the survey, but doing --  
18 telling folks about the meetings and  
19 getting the whole notion of getting the  
20 planning across.

21 MS. CHASE: (ALI CHASE)

22 Thank you again for the opportunity  
23 to comment on this. I have a few quick  
24 remarks.

25 It was asked whether the state data

1           was going to be incorporated to the  
2           portal. That's a massive undertaking.  
3           Each state has its own way of originally  
4           setting up their own data that can be a  
5           goal that's moved toward. That would be  
6           truly helpful. A lot of the different  
7           projects that I proposed have a crossover  
8           between what's happening further out in  
9           the ocean and I'm sure in part of it is  
10          transmission, but also to projects that  
11          will try to straddle different state  
12          federal boundaries.

13                   And so it's challenging to review  
14           if you are trying to toggle between  
15           different databases. Super difficulty.  
16           The folks in the room, also the state  
17           too, but to the extent that it's possible  
18           as projects are proposed and come up a  
19           file can be provided, that makes it so  
20           helpful to be able to use the portal.  
21           You can actually take the shape file. I  
22           know the wind energy areas do that, but  
23           for different proposes that come up and  
24           others, it would be great to drop that  
25           file on top and see where it's impacting

1 different resources. I don't know if  
2 things can be put on the portal as they  
3 come up. That would be probably the best  
4 way to do this. I want to throw that out  
5 there.

6 In terms of the regional  
7 assessment, clearly we think that's a  
8 really important piece and will be  
9 providing additional information on that.  
10 Thank you all.

11 MR. JOHANSON: (ERIC JOHANSON)

12 Eric Johanson. I have a lot of  
13 things in my mind. There are so many, I  
14 don't I hope I don't lose any of you.  
15 You are talking about doing a lot of  
16 studies. I represent the commercial  
17 shipping industry currently right now.  
18 That is a viable and part of our nation.  
19 You know, trades sustained this country.  
20 This country, we must remain with trades.  
21 Why is it so part of the Meridian blue  
22 highway? That's really part in the  
23 future, to make our country run.  
24 Currently a tug and barge can move a  
25 two -- 456 containers for the equivalent

1 of five units of fuel. If we put that  
2 same amount of cargo on a train we talk  
3 about 20 units or four times as much fuel  
4 as a commercial shipping industry would  
5 have. If we put it on trucks, it would  
6 be 100 units of fuel. We have to make  
7 sure we are serious about what we are  
8 doing here and make sure what economic  
9 impacts we are talking about. Roadside  
10 congestion costs us billions of dollars  
11 every year. This industry keeps our  
12 trucks off the road moving the products  
13 safely and securely.

14 I heard the talks about perhaps  
15 moving our routes a little bit that would  
16 force us to go out a little further.  
17 That would reduce our deliverable dates  
18 and also increase our fuel consumptions.

19 What does that impact? Coast Guard  
20 data has told us on an intelligence  
21 report 2012, on any given day there is  
22 4,500 vessels in the Atlantic coast. If  
23 you move everything broadly -- give you  
24 an indication how much additional fuel  
25 this would cost. The entire impact is

1 offshore energy management. We would be  
2 burning more energy by moving the traffic  
3 by gaining from wind farms.

4 What is our overall goal here? To  
5 put in something that everyone thinks is  
6 a good idea or do something good for  
7 America.

8 I'm going to say to this committee  
9 that you should be doing what is right by  
10 keeping our traffic lanes open, not only  
11 just for today currently, but what we are  
12 forecasting for the future. Which, as  
13 the gentleman said, the Panama Canal  
14 opens up, we'll have a whole lot more  
15 specific here -- 80 percent of the cargo  
16 coming into New York Harbor stays within  
17 New York, 20 percent only goes outside.  
18 When that comes here its going to have to  
19 go outside. It's better to be on a  
20 marine highway and hopefully we can keep  
21 it -- keeping its routes open only not  
22 only for today but the future. New  
23 technologies have seen new routes opening  
24 up. We have to identify those new routs  
25 and make sure the wind farms will not be



1 put into an area where the traffic routes  
2 will be.

3 MR. WILLIAM BROADLEY: (WILLIAM  
4 BROADLEY)

5 I'm William Broadley. I represent  
6 the Bay of Delaware. I have worked with  
7 Eric as far as commercial shipping. What  
8 my place in all of this has been has been  
9 what I've done through the years is I've  
10 worked with American Waterways Operators  
11 Ameritus' committee, but more important  
12 as a commercial pilot.

13 I get a lot of different ships.  
14 What I've done is talk to actual  
15 operators, actual captains and mates on  
16 ships and talked to them about routing  
17 measures. I then went and drew up  
18 routing measures, said okay, how does  
19 this look? They threw it back at me.  
20 No, these are terrible. So I tried again  
21 and they still said they are terrible and  
22 I came up with a set and I distributed  
23 some around American Waterways -- pretty  
24 good. I've had some people on the ships  
25 say these are pretty good.

1           Anyway, that's what I've kind of  
2 brought up and then I've sent them to  
3 John Walters and they -- and my own name.  
4 I've not done it with any organization.

5           I would like to bring up to you is  
6 what I modeled these after is I've looked  
7 all over the world. I went into the  
8 North Sea, went into Europe, went into  
9 the English Channel and saw what was  
10 doing -- I also sailed in the English  
11 Channel and North Sea. I remember not  
12 very nice memories years ago wearing out  
13 a grease pencil trying to plot hundreds  
14 of -- static, setting up lanes and doing  
15 these. We made things and it became a  
16 lot better.

17           I'm trying to say every body, every  
18 body is contained here looking at what  
19 the individual states are doing, but  
20 there is also a great model up there.

21           What happened in Europe and the  
22 other thing I would like to say is that  
23 I've seen where it didn't work out very  
24 well. That's maybe just as significant  
25 as what has worked and so I'm going go to

1 tell you if you just want to take a look  
2 at something that didn't work out very  
3 well and maybe say don't go there, maybe  
4 that's one thing. I have not heard there  
5 in this whole conversation don't go to  
6 the Gulf of Mexico. Every mariner that  
7 goes through the West Gulf of Mexico says  
8 please don't do that. Don't do that.  
9 It's a mess.

10 So I can fill you in on the details  
11 of that and maybe that's a little  
12 something different for the conversation.

13 Thank you very much for your  
14 comments.

15 MS. ZIPF: (CINDY ZIPF)

16 I thank you again. Cindy Zipf from  
17 Clean Ocean Action.

18 I have a few random comments. I  
19 have not had as much time to play around  
20 on it as I would like, but I wanted to  
21 just emphasize some of the things I heard  
22 today from a different perspective is  
23 that there is an awful lot going on out  
24 there that people do, fishing, diving  
25 that are secret, that are their special

1 locations that they don't want anybody to  
2 know about. There is a lot of  
3 competitiveness out there.

4 So, from what I've learned from  
5 many of our fishing, boating, diving  
6 friends is that there is a lot going on  
7 out there you might not be able to map  
8 and so I wanted to echo what Morgan said  
9 about what you have on a map doesn't mean  
10 there isn't other things going on that  
11 really need to be emphasized especially  
12 in an area we have so many millions of  
13 people that go out and enjoy special  
14 areas.

15 I also wanted to emphasize that  
16 there is an -- the economics, we know it  
17 usually coming down to economics. It is  
18 hard to put value on plankton, so  
19 plankton, oxygen that's produced by the  
20 plankton. These economic volumes need to  
21 be assessed and considered and I -- it  
22 was on this side of the room the emphasis  
23 was on ocean currents which change and  
24 climate change. We are seeing a lot of  
25 differences now. This is one of the rare

1 places on earth where the cold water and  
2 warm waters mix from the Labrador current  
3 and those warm corridors and how you map  
4 a warm corridor and those are where the  
5 fish are going to be congregating and  
6 that's along the gulf stream is where  
7 fishermen want to fish. So these things  
8 are very dynamic and I don't know how you  
9 map them.

10 So I think, again, goes to more  
11 against the point. We need to have that  
12 context.

13 I also want to remind folks there  
14 are some tools, I don't know if Marty has  
15 brought it to your attention, New Jersey  
16 did a report that identified the economic  
17 values of the beaches, just as beaches  
18 not necessarily a tourism designation,  
19 but a protective zone or as just as a  
20 beach, not with any sort of human use at  
21 all. So I don't know if that can be  
22 translated, but that's important.

23 Also, the lens by which you are  
24 looking at the data, I know when we were  
25 looking at some applications for

1 industrial activities sometimes the  
2 applicant looks at a lens as to the most  
3 valued areas as opposed to maybe areas  
4 that are used, but not used as much.

5 So, for example, in the shipping  
6 example there are -- traffic all over  
7 there, maybe most of them use a certain  
8 lane. There is huge activity going on  
9 throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. So  
10 that lengths by which you look at the  
11 data needs to be carefully considered  
12 because, again, as I said earlier, there  
13 is a lot going on out there. If you just  
14 look at the most utilized in terms of  
15 saying this is going to impact the least  
16 amount of people, if we put it here there  
17 will be impact. But not the most impact  
18 it's going to come down to trade office  
19 and we are going to do our best to try to  
20 not let that happen.

21 That's it. In this context. I  
22 again emphasis just a little something  
23 from yesterday and these opportunities to  
24 provide dialogue and I talked to Tom  
25 about this earlier as a very -- is not

1 very conducive to conversation. This  
2 isn't a public hearing that is supposed  
3 to be a dialogue as. I talked to it you  
4 would be nice for us to have a  
5 conversation. If you have a question  
6 about what I'm saying or something that's  
7 something to consider.

8 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

9 Did you want to offer a comment?

10 MR. GREENFIELD: (BRENT GREENFIELD)

11 Brent Greenfield with the National  
12 Ocean Policy Coalition. I want to make  
13 some comments on the MARCO data portal  
14 and regional ocean assessment.

15 Data and information used by this  
16 body, including any regional social  
17 assessments or specific components of  
18 such assessments, must be based on sound  
19 science, comply with strict integrity  
20 safeguards, laws, protocols and  
21 requirements include socioeconomic  
22 component and ensure that all of the  
23 region's potential economic uses and  
24 resources are accounted for. This must  
25 include data for those uses and resources

1           that although not currently being  
2           utilized could be put to use in the  
3           future.

4           As one example and as mentioned  
5           yesterday, there is bipartisan support in  
6           Virginia at both the statehouse and in  
7           congress for conventional as well as  
8           renewable energy development off the  
9           Virginia coast. Seismic data for  
10          conventional energy resources in this  
11          area is based on data that was collected  
12          in the 1980s and access is now being  
13          sought to obtain new seismic data using  
14          advanced technologies.

15          Thus, data must not be utilized to  
16          inform RPB or individual agency  
17          activities unless and until timely and  
18          relevant datasets for all potential  
19          commercial and recreational uses are  
20          available.

21          One final point is that the working  
22          group's report on MACRO products and  
23          services mentions that a regional ocean  
24          assessment should be guided by and  
25          reflect ocean planning priorities and



1 specific ecosystem management objectives  
2 for the region. Such priorities and  
3 objectives should be developed based on  
4 meaningful stakeholder engagement and the  
5 input and advice that results from such  
6 engagement.

7 Thank you for the opportunity to  
8 comment.

9 MR. FULLER: (JACK FULLER)

10 Something occurred to me on the  
11 possible use of the portal and I'm not  
12 sure how realistic this is, but the  
13 portal is involved with information and  
14 information that might be poor to  
15 stakeholders. One of the things that I  
16 have a problem with is compiling  
17 information on what comes out in the  
18 federal register, so volume must and so  
19 much information it comes out almost  
20 every day.

21 I was wondering if the portal can  
22 be used for publishing a short note or a  
23 paragraph on any federal rule that might  
24 pertain to the Mid-Atlantic ocean area.  
25 It wouldn't have to be the entire

1 register article, it -- it all would have  
2 to do is be a brief paragraph.

3 One of the -- there are problems  
4 involved in that. I assume it would have  
5 to be updated weekly in order to allow  
6 stakeholders to come in, but it's just a  
7 thought. Thank you very much.

8 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

9 All right. So thank you to  
10 everyone who offered public comment and  
11 we'll have another one this afternoon. I  
12 want to take one more shot at the  
13 architecture for this particular meeting  
14 now and how it was designed with regard  
15 to the public comment sections.

16 I think that the members of the RPB  
17 are hearing you loud and clear about  
18 wanting to construct opportunities that  
19 feel more like a dialogue and engaging in  
20 in different ways and we will talk more,  
21 a lot about that and hearing the feedback  
22 about the way the sessions have been  
23 conducted. They have a business agenda  
24 for this first public hearing and in  
25 thinking about designing that and

1 providing opportunities to hear from you  
2 and still get through their agenda and  
3 have an opportunity to talk with each  
4 other because this was their first time  
5 sitting around the table with each other.

6 The approach that they landed on is  
7 the straddling discussion with the public  
8 comment in between is not as satisfying  
9 as a realtime interaction with you as  
10 individuals. The idea was to then come  
11 back to the topic. So there can be  
12 further discussion an reflection about  
13 what folks heard when you have heard your  
14 ideas.

15 In recognizing that is not feeling  
16 satisfying as I've just said I think  
17 there can be an opportunity to be  
18 creative and think about what it is to do  
19 that in the next meeting, continue to  
20 share your ideas to shape that in a way  
21 that can be more inclusive and more of a  
22 dialogue and still enable them to do with  
23 they what they need to do.

24 For this meeting this is the way  
25 the agendas have been designed. We'll

1 play that out for this afternoon and  
2 then, you know, take a hard look at how  
3 the agenda for the next full RPB meeting  
4 is designed to be more accommodating.

5 We have a few minutes before we  
6 take a break at noon, but in the spirit  
7 of what I just said and reflecting some  
8 of the ideas and revisiting what we were  
9 talking about before we heard from public  
10 comments, Pedro you've had idea to kick  
11 us off.

12 MR. RAMOS: Some of the members of  
13 the public kind of asked this question, I  
14 was not really clear, in the portal, how  
15 much land base resource information is in  
16 there.

17 MS. MCKAY: Well, there is the  
18 information that I've described about the  
19 parts. There is a lot of information  
20 about the commodities coming into each  
21 port. As you can see, the portal does  
22 not really draw an inland boundary and  
23 the map continues inland and there is an  
24 opportunity to put on things that are  
25 relevant to ocean planning. But at the

1 moment there is not a whole lot that's  
2 land based that I can think of off the  
3 bat, other than the Newport Commodity  
4 Information.

5 MR. RAMOS: One of the reasons I  
6 was asking the question few of the  
7 reasons is that flyways are really  
8 important, you know, wetlands and where  
9 they are and whatnot. We had some  
10 lessons learned. We had wetland projects  
11 after the oil spill in the gulf and moved  
12 actual flyways for millions of birds  
13 temporarily until we could address the  
14 issues we were having and you know, there  
15 was some things we learned from that.  
16 God forbid there is another disaster in  
17 the Mid-Atlantic in our backyard, but  
18 that type of information will be helpful,  
19 not necessarily more on an assessment  
20 side, here is the wetlands and whatever.  
21 If there is another disaster then we can  
22 use that information and do some more,  
23 you know, building some temporary  
24 wetlands like that which is what we did  
25 not in the Gulf.

1           I guess another area where these  
2 things might be for is endangered  
3 species. If we talk about bringing in  
4 communication lines we want to avoid  
5 certain areas. That is something we  
6 normally do on a regular basis and also  
7 soils and land use that will effect  
8 sedimentation in some of the shipping  
9 lanes. I'm not sure how to make that fit  
10 into this. There are some things to  
11 consider where making culture being  
12 handle that.

13           MS. MCKAY: I think of course,  
14 again, its ideal portal that has  
15 absolutely everything under the sun in  
16 it. Can we billed that? I'm not sure.  
17 A lot of our state portals have that  
18 information you are talking about that  
19 would require some crosstalk between the  
20 MARCO organization portal and our case in  
21 Virginia the coastal problems.

22           If you have two monitors you can  
23 pull them on on each monitor. The  
24 Department of Information is pretty  
25 intense. You could make the connections.

1           Whether we can get it all in one portal  
2           is a really big challenge.  But again,  
3           it's important we strive to find certain  
4           layers, maybe only a few and maybe we can  
5           pry or -- a couple more land based that  
6           would be extremely helpful to have on the  
7           MARCO portal.

8           MR. RAMOS:  I totally agree.  We  
9           want to make sure what is here and what  
10          isn't there.

11          MS. MCKAY:  I just had another --  
12          totally different.  I wanted to respond  
13          to Morgan's comment about the portal, not  
14          everything being map -- not everything  
15          being about a map.  That's something,  
16          again, our portal team is looking at in  
17          terms of trying to tell stories and  
18          perhaps having parts of the portal, maybe  
19          a short video clip with a video of  
20          someone talking about its use.  Why it's  
21          important to them not the space aspect  
22          but, dimension to get at what you were  
23          talking about, Morgan.

24          MR. ZEMBA:  I would like to tie  
25          this back this to a discussion we had

1           yesterday when taking a look at the input  
2           we are getting from the public and  
3           combining it with the input we had about  
4           data here, to me it really hits home and  
5           starting to hit home the magnitude of the  
6           task we have in front of us.

7           I think we talked a good bit about  
8           that geographic focus yesterday and given  
9           just discussion today on the magnitude of  
10          this date for this subject over here for  
11          it reinforced this need. Do we need to  
12          start talking on the primary on the --  
13          realizing there a linkage to the estuary  
14          to the Chesapeake Bay and Delaware  
15          starting the focus without including the  
16          Chesapeake and Delaware and --

17          MS. CANTRAL: You are giving us a  
18          conversation we'll come back to after  
19          lunch and revisit the discussion about  
20          the goals and geographic focus. This  
21          discussion about the tools needed are  
22          definitely in the format. Other  
23          thoughts?

24          MR. BIGFORD: Just picking up on  
25          what Cindy said. We did talk about a way



1 to invigorate the exchange of information  
2 here for future RPB meetings when we  
3 start to think about the agenda. When we  
4 get documents maybe right after words or  
5 maybe with each speaker it would be three  
6 minutes to speak and/or all speakers  
7 provide their comments and we engage  
8 something like that. That makes it  
9 towards that conversation instead of the  
10 static presentation.

11 MS. CANTRAL: A lot of interest in  
12 doing that, finding whatever the right,  
13 you know, equation is something that I  
14 can expect to see in future meetings.

15 Anything else about data and  
16 information? The discussion that was in  
17 progress when we moved to public comment  
18 was with regard to the regional  
19 assessment and what you wanted to see in  
20 there. See in that and you know, what I  
21 heard was that recognition you needed to  
22 take a practical approach. There are  
23 limitations, limitations financial and  
24 otherwise what you can do, but thinking  
25 about needing a better understanding

1           there is a chicken and for example, thing  
2           you are starting to get a sense of where  
3           you may be headed with your goals, but  
4           that's still underdevelopment and that  
5           will inform what should be in this  
6           assessment.

7                     But be mindful about what's unique  
8           about this region including the  
9           incorporation of traditional knowledge in  
10          several senses of that word about kind of  
11          expertise that people who are on the  
12          ground or in the water that have to bring  
13          our friends and colleagues in first  
14          nations. A few other tools that might be  
15          helpful to look at as well as the ocean  
16          in direction as a potential opportunity  
17          to assess and that those folks want to be  
18          available to you to be helpful.

19                    And then, you know, building on or  
20          the opportunities to use the portal to  
21          build on what you have to leverage that  
22          to keep the assessment more than a static  
23          document or something that can be living  
24          and part of a framework of a growing  
25          effort.

1           And then an idea to be thinking  
2           about that I think is related to the  
3           assessment, but maybe not is this idea of  
4           being able to do some trend analysis.

5           So, those are some highlights from  
6           the discussion that I -- did I miss  
7           anything or anything wrong?

8           Anything to say before we wrap up  
9           for lunch? It's about time to do that.

10          MS. MCKAY: Just want to say that I  
11          hope it's -- kind of swirling in my head  
12          now what this whole thing could look  
13          like. I like the idea of kind of rolling  
14          assessment. That kind of marries up with  
15          a rolling plan. I think that those  
16          concepts are coming together a little bit  
17          more clearly for me in my mind and the  
18          idea that we do in fact need a plan. We  
19          just have to remember it's not a point in  
20          time and not carved in stone, but we have  
21          to put something out there to the world.  
22          This is our goal and what we want it to  
23          look like we need to be constantly Lee  
24          updating and adapting as we use  
25          information from more assessments, more

1 information to keep adapting the plan.

2 It sounds like an awful lot of work  
3 and sounds like we what we need to do.

4 MS. CANTRAL: All right. That is a  
5 great. Closing note: For lunch why  
6 don't we take a break and we'll come back  
7 at 1:00 p.m. and we'll pick up the  
8 resuming discussion or revisiting the  
9 discussion about goals and geographic  
10 focus. See you back at 1:00.

11 (Whereupon a luncheon recess  
12 was taken at 12:00 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   (Whereupon, the meeting  
2 resumes at 1:20 p.m.)

3           MS. CANTRAL:  Wherever this  
4 discussion goes today, getting the goals  
5 to a state where it's RPB is ready to go  
6 out an engage all of you and others in  
7 the region in some meaningful dialogue  
8 about the defining goals for this region  
9 and the regional planning process is what  
10 you are have here.  This is still very  
11 early on in the stages.

12           First of all, what we heard people  
13 saying, a high-level statement, not  
14 complex and time consuming vision,  
15 exercise, but perhaps a one-page minimum  
16 with a focus on a vision for the future  
17 of this region.  Perhaps by 2025 you can  
18 see some elements that could be reflected  
19 in the vision statement which is  
20 acknowledging what you want to be seen by  
21 that time a ocean ecosystems helping  
22 coastal and ocean economies.

23           Compatibilities among current and  
24 emergent uses are maximized and conflicts  
25 of minimized.  Public resources are

1 leveraged across jurisdictions and used  
2 efficiently and effectively. States,  
3 federal agencies and tribes make good  
4 decisions, efficiently in a coordinated  
5 under their existing authorities.

6 Stakeholders are engaged in management  
7 decisions that affect their lines, add  
8 life, data is high quality and  
9 coordinated to make inform decisions.

10 So, what we were referred to as  
11 lenses are maybe some framing thoughts  
12 that were occurring ideas you offered as  
13 part of your discussion is that in  
14 developing goals it would be appropriate  
15 to focus on shared interests across the  
16 ocean, across the Mid-Atlantic states and  
17 to be looking to focus on where this  
18 process, this body can add value and make  
19 a difference for the region for  
20 Mid-Atlantic ocean that in the structure  
21 it would make sense to develop high-level  
22 goals and develop the details about  
23 specific sectors, specific actions and  
24 part of the objectives and again,  
25 recurring thought. They need to be

1           achievable practical and measurable.

2                   Some other thoughts. We heard  
3           about draft goals again, not the -- not  
4           to say these are goal statements, but the  
5           things the panel on objectives is that  
6           you would like to take advantage of  
7           traditional and now economic  
8           opportunities.

9                   We've heard a range of views about  
10          ocean energy. We also heard that this  
11          notion of responsible is a key concept.  
12          We heard some discussion about protect,  
13          restore and improve ecosystem health and  
14          another thing that came up around the  
15          table several times and I think merits  
16          more discussion among you is the notion  
17          of resiliency and the changing climate,  
18          the need for offshore sand and  
19          implications of that use and current  
20          experience of Superstorm Sandy came up as  
21          part of that discussion.

22                   So we pose a question and you can  
23          see on the slide how would you like to  
24          account for this in the framework,  
25          whether it's the development of a goal or

1           somehow accounting for the importance of  
2           contents related to resiliency and  
3           claimant change.

4           So, with all of that in mind a stab  
5           at some possible revised goals and some  
6           examples, just place holders and words to  
7           be fleshed out that could represent some  
8           possible objectives are two here, one  
9           focused on stewardship which is another  
10          word that came up a lot in your  
11          discussions. Protect and restore  
12          ecosystem health and functionality  
13          account for key habitat. Some possible  
14          objectives that would be related to that  
15          goal would be accounting for ecosystem  
16          value and of the -- wild life, climate  
17          change. These are all things that came  
18          up in your discussions.

19          These are concepts right? Not  
20          articulated. What you would want as a  
21          goal statement and two, take advantage of  
22          FACA and traditional new economic  
23          opportunities to create jobs in a way  
24          responsible that accounts for future  
25          generations. And then some possible



1 objectives that are related to that and  
2 reflect what is in your bullets and you  
3 were discussing yesterday would be  
4 related to efficient and safe port  
5 access. Facilitate responsible offshore  
6 wind development, ensure access to key  
7 fishing grounds, retain areas for  
8 military testing, training and  
9 operations.

10 So, in regard to the geographic  
11 focus for now because it may be evolving  
12 as you are thinking about the goals and  
13 where you want to put your efforts  
14 evolves that a primary focus on state and  
15 federal waters to the edge of the -- to  
16 encloses water and bays and estuarial  
17 land north and south borders at state  
18 lines.

19 Key connections to be made and  
20 practical estuaries, coastal land and  
21 need to be iterative and may adjust with  
22 the development and evolving  
23 circumstances against it for now. And  
24 then something for you to chew on  
25 regarding a time line for how to proceed

1 with these goals, have some discussion  
2 about it right now, prepare for public  
3 review including a draft vision, draft  
4 goals, objectives and action and have  
5 that ready for review by January. That  
6 would be a document going out for review  
7 that would be you would be engaging in  
8 some fashion and some series of meetings  
9 or opportunities to engage in dialogue.

10 There would be robust public input  
11 and targeted stakeholder engagement about  
12 those ideas in the spring, January, March  
13 the first quarter. Then a revised suite  
14 of ideas that comes back for RPB and  
15 review at a second meeting in April if we  
16 are sticking to the broader time line we  
17 discussed yesterday with assumptions that  
18 a next meeting of this type would happen  
19 in April. An objective for that meeting  
20 to be to finalized. The meeting and that  
21 goal an continuing developing detailed  
22 objectives and actions that become part  
23 of a draft work plan and it would be --  
24 this would be done in concert with  
25 stakeholders in incorporating stakeholder

1 input along the -- through the summer of  
2 2014 and then by the time when you get to  
3 a third RPB meeting in 2014 September  
4 time frame. There would be a work plan  
5 well underway and in draft and be on the  
6 table for discussion at that meeting.

7 So, that's our attempt to  
8 reflect back to you some of what we  
9 heard and synthesizing and give you  
10 something to react to. So, now is  
11 your time to react.

12 MR. PABST: Thanks. That's a  
13 great, you know, set up and distillation  
14 of a way forward.

15 I just had a couple of initial  
16 thoughts based on what I'm hearing and I  
17 wanted to draw attention to kind of  
18 bounce around a little bit, but on the  
19 possible revised goal slide with possible  
20 objectives.

21 We used a couple words protect,  
22 restore and health. In my conversations  
23 just yesterday and a little bit today of  
24 I've encountered different definitions  
25 people have for those words and they mean

1 different things based on a sector,  
2 whether it's fishing, environmental,  
3 whether it's industry. So I think to the  
4 extent we want to incorporate those into  
5 a goal statement we need to put some  
6 caveats or further definition on them.

7 Protect in a lot of areas means you  
8 will protect it from anything, fishing in  
9 a protected area.

10 Restoration, I don't think any of  
11 that have in our mission to do  
12 restoration in and of itself. If there  
13 was an area that needed to sort of  
14 corrective action we should not ignore  
15 that. That was vital to the ecosystem  
16 function. I'll say that. We should also  
17 consider that, but we want to be  
18 realistic and now this is -- we are not  
19 going to develop a civil works program as  
20 a result of this effort, but we want to  
21 take advantage of opportunities.

22 Need and health, I think a lot of  
23 the environmental agencies have moved  
24 away from the term and gotten into more  
25 of a function-based definition. I don't

1           have a better one right now than  
2           functionality. I know that's not a good  
3           word, meets needs -- health offers. The  
4           same thing. What does that really mean?  
5           How do you measure you are that and  
6           thinking along those lines? We'll have  
7           some good discussion about that.

8                       Where in the vision or objectives,  
9           again following up on what Roddy talked  
10          about yesterday is the tribal ways and  
11          tribal knowledge concept and a part of  
12          this is to make sure that's being  
13          retained as still able to function their  
14          ways. I want to make sure that was in  
15          and that came out of the stakeholders'  
16          discussion last night. We were fortunate  
17          to have some of the NEP reps. The  
18          possibility of having a representative  
19          from the various estuaries and bay  
20          programs as part of the state liaison  
21          group possibly as a way to find that  
22          bridge, that gap between the estuary  
23          programs around the -- we are doing in  
24          the ocean and still having a line we feel  
25          might be a way to draw the line. I'm

1 thinking out loud and it may be flushing  
2 go out and maybe some of the others want  
3 to weigh in, but those are my initial  
4 thoughts.

5 MS. COOKSEY: Quickly, something  
6 helped me with definitions was some great  
7 advise was from our deputy attorney.  
8 Joan used the definition in the  
9 dictionary. I'd start with that and  
10 my -- restore is a big part of what we  
11 do. We do restoration.

12 MS. CHYTALO: I guess what the  
13 first note on the -- under possible  
14 pieces of a vision statement where it has  
15 ocean ecosystems helping, able to --  
16 ocean -- I would -- I would like to see  
17 them separated. I want a healthy ocean  
18 for the sake of having an healthy ocean  
19 and also in conjunction they can support  
20 the other things to occur, you know. I  
21 think we should be striving for that  
22 aspect too.

23 I work for conversation. That's  
24 the mission of my agency. I have to  
25 worry about the resources and their use.

1           There is two separate pieces. I kind of  
2           want a few more words put in there.

3           MS. CANTRAL: All right. Tom?

4           MR. BIGFORD: Just to clarify.

5           Also just gets very involved in  
6           restoration. The record is a big part of  
7           what we do for -- they do for the ocean  
8           but I like the benefits and the logic of  
9           protect, restore and improve ecosystem  
10          health. Protection makes more sense.  
11          It's more cost effective than, rather  
12          than cause harm and then have to sort of,  
13          as we try to mitigate it and rebuild it  
14          and restore it we don't do that very  
15          well. Protection makes sense. I do  
16          recognize the ecosystem health approach  
17          is a way to go. It gets beyond  
18          protecting individuals and more about the  
19          ecosystem which is a good parallel to  
20          thinking about the region. It gets  
21          fisheries' management, which is what I  
22          think we should do with everything.

23          Time line, resource complaints.  
24          There is a huge heap of reality. The  
25          time line in slide 6 is slow. Not so

1 much the RPB meeting, but the not getting  
2 to draft A work plan for a year just to  
3 me seems slower than we can do. I know  
4 when we need resources, but hopefully we  
5 can do that.

6 As I said this morning over  
7 breakfast I will never be convinced  
8 anyone of the agencies around here can't  
9 find anyone to work on this. It's  
10 inescapable that you -- we can't find one  
11 from each agency? If we had that, it  
12 would start to match what the state's  
13 been contributing for years. Thanks.

14 MS. CANTRAL: Perhaps we can. We  
15 were going to ask you all to revisit the  
16 time line what Gwynne presented the time  
17 pre presented the time line we wanted to  
18 revisit today and this time line  
19 necessary its into that broader picture,  
20 yes.

21 MR. BIGFORD: Yes.

22 MS. CANTRAL: Your comment is  
23 broader than just this because it has --  
24 you are right. There are constraints  
25 that you are all very well aware of, but



1           there is also a great desire to -- there  
2           is a balancing act.

3           MR. CAPOBIANCO: I think overall  
4           this is -- I was comparing looking back  
5           at some of my notes from yesterday. We  
6           captured a lot of what was said. I have  
7           a lot of thoughts, but I'll share a  
8           couple now.

9           On what we heard about draft goals  
10          are possible objectives. I very much  
11          like the idea of adding specific goals  
12          relative to ocean planning and that  
13          receives some kind of resiliency  
14          objective or result. I think sand is a  
15          smart place to start. I think someone  
16          mentioned that yesterday. This is what  
17          this bullet is reflecting. I like the  
18          idea.

19          The restore word. I'll throw in my  
20          two cents. I was at a -- I can't  
21          remember. 2010 I was at a management  
22          council meeting and there was a  
23          presentation by a gentleman from NOAA,  
24          John Catina, saying, you know, we don't  
25          really know how to or actually do ocean

1 restoration work. I do think and I am  
2 not suggesting we fake restore, but I  
3 don't think we are there. We don't do  
4 ocean restoration it's -- let's not -- I  
5 worry about promising something we can't  
6 deliver.

7 Enhancements? Yes. Mitigation or  
8 things, you know, like the other  
9 activities we are doing in the ocean,  
10 yes, but I don't think that's straight  
11 restoration.

12 I think I would like to have  
13 discussion -- I'll let someone else speak  
14 now I would like to have revisions to the  
15 goals, No. 3444. You have -- I like the  
16 idea -- down the track I would like to  
17 get down into some of these objectives  
18 and start thinking about, as I mentioned  
19 yesterday, boil down what are we going to  
20 do under these goals. Let's put things  
21 down, a receivable and see if we can find  
22 consensus and something in it for  
23 everybody at the table in our respective  
24 places and try to make something happen.

25 The one thing I would like to see

1 added to this is under No. 2. I see  
2 we've modified a piece with efficient.  
3 That's a good edit. I would like to  
4 expand it other maritime industry  
5 development and job creation. That I  
6 tend to believe is on the near horizon  
7 with the all port activities and widening  
8 of the Panama Canal and from the New York  
9 perspective to generate interest in  
10 rebuilding and restoring some of the  
11 infrastructure now on the shore that  
12 could result in amenities for short sea  
13 shipping and real job restoration and job  
14 growth.

15 I'll stop there. We are moving in  
16 the right direction trying to sort of  
17 hone it down. Thank you.

18 MS. SCHULTZ: Focusing on the same  
19 slide, No. 2 with regard to the goals. I  
20 like how we have packaged a lot of the  
21 access issues and others in to concept of  
22 promoting economic opportunities and  
23 jobs. I think that's a good way of  
24 going.

25 There is a couple things that end

1 up getting left out of that that we heard  
2 over the last couple days, things like  
3 recreational access. Recreational access  
4 you could look at is as to your -- but  
5 not necessarily. We may eventually want  
6 to have some form of goal that gets at it  
7 from some of the other uses of the ocean  
8 but not necessarily under the banner of  
9 economic opportunity in creating jobs.

10 MS. CANTRAL: Yes.

11 MR. PABST: Thank you. I did also  
12 want to mention about the climate  
13 addition of climate change, goals,  
14 objectives and we did talk about that and  
15 it's -- I haven't been hearing thoughts  
16 for a measurable outcome related to that  
17 possibly. What's going on with the task  
18 force on Sandy, but maybe even something  
19 on ocean syndication might be another  
20 area we can coalesce around dealing with  
21 that threat continues to grow. Some  
22 thoughts?

23 MS. CANTRAL: Thoughts? Reactions?  
24 Ideas? Things to apply for considering  
25 to add or take away?

1 MS. SCHULTZ: Looking at the slide  
2 on geographic focus for now I still do  
3 want to revisit the smaller base, the  
4 seaside base just to better understand  
5 the degree to which they are being  
6 addressed by other programs. Their  
7 connection with the ocean and the value  
8 of perhaps having some of the goals  
9 addressing those issues, but not the big  
10 larger estuaries.

11 MR. RAMOS: I thought yesterday we  
12 talked about a vision. That was more of  
13 a statement, not necessarily a page  
14 document. I think the idea behind that,  
15 if you want to leave it broad to start  
16 and narrow it later when you get down to  
17 objectives. So a shorter statement  
18 instead, a sentence or two broad and  
19 narrow. If you work your way down the  
20 steps, follow me?

21 MS. CANTRAL: Do you have the  
22 sentence?

23 MR. RAMOS: I do, but I don't want  
24 to share. (Laughter)

25 MS. CHYTALO: I, too -- earlier

1           about the time line, if there is a way we  
2           can speed some of that kind of stuff up  
3           so we get more into the meet? I think  
4           the more we get towards some of the  
5           mapping issues and questions around that  
6           people understand what this whole process  
7           is about more and I think that's what  
8           personalizes it for some folks seeing  
9           some of those tapes of issues and I get  
10          what you are talking about. I think more  
11          we get towards that as there quickly as  
12          possible we don't want to lose all of  
13          these folks with we are talking about  
14          goals and a year from now still it's  
15          like, oh my God. Please don't.

16                 MR. ROSEN: Just to pick up on --  
17                 about the division statement. Not to  
18                 belabor this, this a vision statement for  
19                 this process or the ocean in this can be  
20                 a vision statement for anything involving  
21                 ocean management. That is not this  
22                 effort per se, I'm trying towards --  
23                 stand the distance here. I -- more of a  
24                 question to the group.

25                 MS. CANTRAL: Mo?

1 MS. BORNHOLDT: I was thinking  
2 about the same thing. One of the things  
3 that resonated with me was what Greg and  
4 Sarah said. Sarah talked to the people  
5 in the Mid-Atlantic and you were, Greg,  
6 you were talking about it's something we  
7 can kind of -- there is a benefit for me  
8 to save New York and I'm beginning the  
9 challenge to get down to a key sentence  
10 that to talk about the vision for the  
11 Mid-Atlantic states. The National Ocean  
12 Policy kind of ends up these concepts  
13 already. It's our tradition what to  
14 apply here.

15 This was the other thought I had  
16 with regard to the time line. It's  
17 discouraging. We are going to be  
18 drafting a work plan almost a year from  
19 now, but again what's resonating the  
20 comments we heard about the stakeholders'  
21 engagement, if our work plan table of  
22 contents is being -- is going to be  
23 wrapped up in this -- think we are going  
24 to be constantly revisiting. I'm looking  
25 at the calendar. We are at the end of

1           September. Is it realistic to be able to  
2           have something to go out to the public in  
3           November? And you hit that season of  
4           holiday and I don't, you know, it's  
5           difficult to get robust stakeholder  
6           engagement, but that time of year is not  
7           necessarily the best time. I want to be  
8           able to be aggressive, but I'm also being  
9           practical. Unless we do a good job up  
10          front vetting and making them meaningful  
11          to us in that place you can get it down  
12          sooner, but not to where we want to go.

13                 MR. MACH: Looking at the National  
14          Ocean Policy, if you want verbiage for  
15          vision we -- it's already been provided  
16          essentially: An America whose  
17          stewardship ensues that the ocean, our  
18          coasts and the Great Lakes are healthy  
19          and resistant, safe and productive and  
20          understood and treasured so as to promote  
21          the well-being, prosperity and security  
22          of present and future generations.

23                 You drop Great Lakes out of it and  
24          that covers it.

25                 MR. RAMOS: We tried. It's not



1 even really a sentence. It kind of  
2 covers what you talked to promote harmony  
3 with people. That covers everything  
4 we've been been talking about or adding  
5 predictive of oceans working or people  
6 working in harmony with oceans. That is  
7 a better way of putting it, but I think  
8 it covers everything that way.

9 MS. CANTRAL: Any other thoughts on  
10 this? Gwynne?

11 MS. SCHULTZ: Reflecting on the time  
12 line as we go through this process and Mo  
13 mentioned providing opportunities to  
14 reach out to the state liaison group  
15 along the way and more formal, but I'm  
16 comfortable with the first structure of  
17 the first of bringing us through April  
18 and having the vision and goals and then  
19 really working hard on the objectives and  
20 actions.

21 I also see though at that time  
22 those items are really a lot of the core  
23 of the work plan. We'll have really done  
24 quite a bit of the work plan activities,  
25 even though we have to get capacity

1 assessment, maybe some of the regional  
2 assessment and look at the other time  
3 line in a few minutes, but realistically  
4 if you look for a quality product I would  
5 rather the quality of it in getting a lot  
6 of people engaged and comfortable than  
7 try to move it too quickly.

8 MR. ROSEN: Does that mean we are  
9 not meeting for seven months? Is that  
10 what that says?

11 MS. BORNHOLDT: The thought at this  
12 point this time we are fluid and can  
13 change. We'll have another type of these  
14 gatherings. We are allowed to have some,  
15 you know, conference and executive and I  
16 think that maybe we can, Doug and Greg to  
17 go in and help refine what we have and  
18 keep that flowing around. The RPB has a  
19 good thing. I know that BOEM working  
20 with NOAA is trying to work with a share  
21 of documents and we can still have  
22 conversations and development, whether  
23 it's a webinar for a meeting or just  
24 executive session to work on this and not  
25 set it down and pick it back up. It's

1 going to be a dialogue. It's not  
2 something for prime time and be ready to  
3 employ our robust state. At least that's  
4 my thought.

5 MR. ROSEN: I'm not encouraging  
6 more meetings, but seven months is a long  
7 time to for the momentum. I understand  
8 there will be work sessions, conference  
9 calls. It just means if time goes by  
10 quickly I understand maybe that's a  
11 realistic date, but seems -- that seems  
12 certain amount of --

13 MS. BORNHOLDT: We learned from our  
14 August webinar that we can do that and  
15 have some calls in between for executive  
16 session. You are right. We don't want  
17 to lose this momentum and take a look at  
18 the calendar and see if we can do  
19 something meaningful at a webinar-type  
20 meeting.

21 Phase II says is a challenge and  
22 you know, as we spoke about it over  
23 breakfast we are -- BOEM is now engorged  
24 in contractual negotiation with Meridian.  
25 We have some challenge next week trying

1 to execute that contract on time. We'll  
2 build the opportunity for meetings within  
3 that, maybe if we are ready to go and  
4 feel comfortable how things develop we  
5 can move that up into the winter of that  
6 year. You can't just hold onto -- we'll  
7 do a lot of things in the interim how I  
8 see it.

9 MS. CANTRAL: So here is what I  
10 suggest, since you are have a lot of  
11 discussion around the time line and want  
12 to go back and look at that master time  
13 line, the draft for those of you with us  
14 from the public recall there are big  
15 versions, posters, some outside. If you  
16 want to take a look at all of the  
17 details, but just to close out the  
18 discussion about the goals and  
19 geographic -- and the slides putting  
20 aside the time line slide, what I'm  
21 sensing is a general level of comfort  
22 with the approach and with what we  
23 presented as summary of reflection of  
24 what you said yesterday with some need to  
25 further refine and think about

1 terminology, about perhaps adding a  
2 couple of goals, something related to  
3 resiliency, something in the framework,  
4 an objective perhaps that is related to  
5 sand, sand resources, expending the port  
6 access objectives to be broader and going  
7 for changing and growing needs in that  
8 sector.

9 Looking at another goal or some  
10 kind of refinement what captured the  
11 importance of recreational uses,  
12 noncommercial uses of the ocean some good  
13 discussion about what to do with the  
14 vision. Perhaps make it shorter, maybe  
15 one very sweet statement or sentence, but  
16 that's for some further discussion.

17 I'm sure there is other comments  
18 that were shared I've missed, but those  
19 are high volumes of things I got in my  
20 notes as I was listening. So I think  
21 that the step for now is to move on and  
22 talk about the time line and see if we  
23 can be as expeditious about your views  
24 about the time line and move to the  
25 charter discussion and we'll have a

1 public comments section which I'm  
2 guessing may include some documents about  
3 the discussion we've been having right  
4 now.

5 Does that make sense to folks?

6 We have a time line. That's at tab  
7 3 and Gwynne, I'll kick this back to you  
8 to focus people on the -- one of the  
9 recurring or overarching things of the  
10 meeting is a need of balance and  
11 expectations. So it's the desire to do  
12 everything very well, very thoroughly and  
13 very fast. What you are able to  
14 accommodate. So that has impressions for  
15 this time on. So, stating the obvious  
16 with that, I'll turn it over to Gwynne.

17 MS. SCHULTZ: What I'll focus on is  
18 I think the left-hand column that looks  
19 at the 2013 through 2014. With the  
20 acknowledgment recognition of the bold  
21 arrow data, the collection sharing  
22 integration and adaptation of plan  
23 products that will be continual, but  
24 refreshing your memories again on what  
25 was in that left column. It's about us

1 organizing our operations. It's about  
2 having a stake -- stakeholder engagement  
3 mechanisms instituted and making progress  
4 on both of those bullets over the  
5 yesterday and today.

6 The next one is where it relates to  
7 topic at hand where we were going to have  
8 the vision goals, objectives, specific  
9 actions, principals and geographic focus  
10 area established. Stakeholder input in  
11 here. We actually have public engagement  
12 and further describing skill, which is  
13 relatively -- and the goal is finalized  
14 by the spring of 2014. I believe that's  
15 consistent with what we were discussing.

16 Here is where it parts a little  
17 bit. The fourth bullet down where it  
18 says goals -- the work plan -- start  
19 developing in 2014 and first iteration of  
20 2014.

21 So, I think that what the second  
22 iteration of what this personal meeting  
23 and this would be to make we need to  
24 revisit that. Just what course we want  
25 to take and the last bullet, we can begin

1 development of the product regional  
2 assessment which we've been talking about  
3 on some line capacity assessment is still  
4 an unknown right now. We have not talked  
5 about how we would establish that and 20,  
6 13, 20, 14.

7 And finally the MARCO data we have  
8 been talking about. It seems to me to be  
9 somewhat consistent. What we talked  
10 about over the last couple takes with the  
11 exception of the final work plan and then  
12 I open it up to other things I want to  
13 comment on that as well as other things  
14 that we have not been thinking about or  
15 that we did touch base on over the last  
16 two days that might impact this time  
17 line.

18 MR. ATANGAN: More of a mechanics  
19 question. I see the time line and I'm  
20 trying to get a feel for lots of action  
21 needs to take place here. Who is doing  
22 it? I just want to make sure we leave  
23 here with not just a set of tasks, but  
24 actually some feel of who is going to  
25 produce these documents and if it's a



1 working group piece, that's fine. I just  
2 kind of would like to leave here with an  
3 understanding of okay, this group has the  
4 pass for developing the vision. Who is  
5 going to perform the task and when it's  
6 effective, to be delivered. Time lines  
7 are great as long as you've got someone  
8 working on that time line.

9 MS. CANTRAL: Yes.

10 MR. BIGFORD: Sarah is the one who  
11 put it on the line this morning saying  
12 there was 22 people on the RPB and only  
13 about seven of them or six of us are  
14 doing a lot of the work. I think that  
15 what Joe just said is a challenge to  
16 those people that have not contributed as  
17 much as others. It's got to be level we  
18 need contributions from people who had  
19 have not contributed with others who have  
20 along with sustained contributions.

21 Other thoughts about the questions  
22 that Gwynne posed, putting aside the time  
23 line even though that's not important, we  
24 hear you. But the questions that she  
25 posed related to the development of the

1 work plan and two approaches, one way to  
2 think about it. The work plan,  
3 essentially, the basic outline of the  
4 work plan starts to be conceptualized  
5 now. In some sense you start to get a  
6 sense of what that is going to be. It  
7 has to be built out, but that is -- it's  
8 a process that is starting now and taking  
9 you into greater detail. As the detail  
10 materializes what you put into that. I  
11 think that's what was intended the way  
12 it's written in the time line.

13 What is reflected here on the slide  
14 may be, you know, may be more practical  
15 approach. I think again, Gwynne, I  
16 understand you some have reactions about  
17 that. Sarah I saw your light go off, but  
18 please.

19 MS. COOKSEY: I don't mean to put  
20 people on the spot.

21 MR. ATANGAN: But you will.

22 MS. COOKSEY: Perhaps I will.

23 Based upon this the second goal bullet  
24 which says robust public input and  
25 targeted stakeholder engagement would

1 start in January, so that begs the  
2 question what is supposed to happen  
3 between now and January.

4 MS. BORNHOLDT: One of the thoughts  
5 would be we start working on that liaison  
6 committee. I think we all talked about  
7 the concept was great and needed just to  
8 have a little more some meat put on the  
9 skeleton on that particular concept to  
10 figure out how RPB members could  
11 contribute to that one.

12 I think we heard someone with  
13 regard to reaching out and using our  
14 comment, our database having informal  
15 opportunities to engage stakeholders. We  
16 are going to have to figure out between  
17 now and then these are mechanisms you and  
18 Tom and your worker came up with good  
19 concepts. See what those are to fully  
20 implement them in January.

21 That goes back to Joe's question as  
22 we have an informal interim work group  
23 set up. Are we going to continue to use  
24 the groups with added assistance, the  
25 challenges on the table to help us meet

1           that January push, in particular for  
2           getting out there with stakeholders an  
3           engaging them with goals? It does not  
4           answer the question, but that's the  
5           intent.

6                     I heard around the table this  
7           morning as well as today that is what we  
8           want to do. We have to have a concept a  
9           little more fleshed out to add the  
10          resources and people that.

11                    MS. CANTRAL: Greg?

12                    MR. CAPOBIANCO: Yeah. Looking at  
13          sort of I think this part answering  
14          Sarah's question about what happens, my  
15          thought is having participated on the  
16          goals and objectives group is that we  
17          have a lot of work to do by January 2014.  
18          Really, we have had challenges in getting  
19          really good participation on some of our  
20          calls that Doug and I did and I think we  
21          have to figure out a way of thinking. We  
22          have to figure out a way to, you know,  
23          ramp up the efforts of the revisions and  
24          thinking about the story and how we are  
25          going to frame these goals and engage the

1 whole RPB and what it says is several  
2 conferences or webinars where we get  
3 everybody or most everybody attending and  
4 you know, start to put it on the table  
5 and go through what I was coining  
6 yesterday as the boil down. What are the  
7 things we are going to do? There is a  
8 lot of things to do. We can't do  
9 everything.

10 Good start. We have great feed  
11 back yesterday and I'm sure we'll get  
12 more today and it was a successful way to  
13 get additional feedback. I have a lot of  
14 ideas swirling in my head, not to refrain  
15 the goals, but to tell the story. What  
16 is behind the goal which -- one of the  
17 things I heard yesterday from I think it  
18 was -- maybe it was Mr. Williamson and  
19 Greg DiDomenico, you have to have be able  
20 to explain what we are doing and why we  
21 are doing it or you just going -- if you  
22 don't do that before you traipse out and  
23 start talking to stakeholders and tables  
24 on their turf you are setting yourself up  
25 for the target why everything is wrong

1 and it's not going to be productive.

2 We have a lot of work. It's -- I  
3 don't think it's overly ambitious. We  
4 can get there but we have a lot of work  
5 to do by January. We need regular  
6 discussions and a lot of -- we need to  
7 leave the fun part and get to the hard  
8 part and whittle down to agree to put get  
9 together to benefit our interests across  
10 the agencies and states.

11 MS. CANTRAL: So, Joe, you have  
12 your card up. Do you have a com --  
13 anyone else want to chime in on thinking  
14 about it? Let me know, otherwise I'll  
15 wrap up after we hear from Joe.

16 MR. ATANGAN: The mechanical aspect  
17 of this, because these deadlines I know,  
18 though they not aggressive to some, when  
19 I started looking at the mechanics in  
20 producing essentially four documents, the  
21 vision goals and objectives and actions  
22 documents that have to be drafted between  
23 now and January, through the RPB, you  
24 know and prepare for public comment I go  
25 back to would really need to start

1 carving out some very specific tasks for  
2 very specific members of the RPB. And I  
3 know that there are advocates out there.  
4 You need to get the public inputs but  
5 again, you see the time lines we are  
6 operating under. How I would strongly  
7 urge, basically giving us something to  
8 chew on, now somebody sit down and draft  
9 something and chew on it. Okay?

10 Ingrid is asking for a sentence or  
11 so, fine, but we'll draft something, but  
12 I think we need to somebody able to look  
13 at that so we can start the discussion  
14 and get to a smooth -- so otherwise while  
15 we'll talk about what should go into the  
16 document rather than here is what I have,  
17 so add or subtract to it.

18 I'm getting frustrated and animated  
19 here because I see time lines, but I  
20 don't see a way towards those time lines.  
21 Maybe it's just the serial thinker in me  
22 but unless we start putting pen to paper  
23 and producing these documents we are  
24 going to be sitting around talking about  
25 what should go into these documents and

1           it will be January and we'll still be  
2           sitting around what should go in the  
3           documents.

4           MS. SCHULTZ: I would like to see us  
5           take the National Ocean Council's vision  
6           statement as Greg recommended, circulate  
7           it among us to make tweaks as a starting  
8           point and have that as one of our topics  
9           for one of our upcoming work sessions to  
10          get to that ahead of time so we don't  
11          need to revisit it all and also talk  
12          about the next phase of the goals and of  
13          the draft goals and example objectives.  
14          Not all of the objectives, but that  
15          really should be a larger work session of  
16          all of the members, kind of at that  
17          phase.

18          I didn't want -- I don't think we  
19          want to go back to the work at this  
20          stage, but having that working session  
21          dialogue on that and it may go back to an  
22          existing work group until further  
23          refinement.

24          MR. ATANGAN: I'm not outlining the  
25          path. I want the path to be clear to



1           everybody sitting around this table and  
2           everybody knows what their expectations  
3           are. I don't think we are there. I  
4           don't think it's clear yet. I mean if  
5           I'm wrong, let me know, but to me it's  
6           not clear. Maybe I'm an outlier, but the  
7           suspect, the path is not clear for the  
8           rest of us here.

9           MS. CANTRAL: Listening to  
10          discussion and facilitating the  
11          properties that I have been engaged with  
12          you on our team at Meridian, my  
13          observation is that there is definitely  
14          still things you've got to figure out  
15          about who picks up the pen and does  
16          certain things. You have structure at  
17          work to get you to here, but there is  
18          discussion about how to refine that and  
19          take it on into the next phase.

20          So, some of the lack of clarity is  
21          because that is still underdevelopment of  
22          what that is going to look like with  
23          regard to the goals, discussion. The  
24          suggestion has been made. That  
25          discussion has to be made among the full

1 RPB amongst the content and the remaining  
2 might go back to the existing work group  
3 for the people who are willing to  
4 volunteer to help it and manage the work  
5 flow and the full RPB needs to be engaged  
6 in that discussion. By that discussion  
7 I'm talking about what communications can  
8 happen between now and January, assuming  
9 that you are comfortable with that time  
10 frame and target and it sounds like you  
11 are.

12 So it sounds like the challenges  
13 that needs to be met between now and  
14 January is further discussing content,  
15 substance of what you just shared, ideas  
16 about regarding the goals example  
17 objective, vision, all that.

18 In concert we are designing the  
19 process with January as a goal for going  
20 out to engage the public, engage the  
21 stakeholders figuring what that process  
22 is going to look like and who is going to  
23 conduct it and manage it.

24 And all of that has to be done with  
25 a commitment to step up and do some

1 active participation along, all of you as  
2 members and representatives on the  
3 regional planning body. Doug?

4 MR. PABST: I think step one, Greg  
5 and I will talk after this about what we  
6 heard and go to the smaller group and go  
7 back out to the larger group. We can do  
8 that by email instead of a conference  
9 call in the near future provided we are  
10 working, hopefully, and we -- I think  
11 then we'll see where we are at that  
12 point. I don't know if we can go too  
13 much further.

14 MR. CAPOBIANCO: I agree and am  
15 certainly game to do that. What I see  
16 and what I would offer is that Doug and I  
17 and the group can pick up on this on this  
18 work done where we basically get the goal  
19 statements and started to add some meat  
20 on those bones in terms of objective and  
21 I see a lot of opportunity to expand the  
22 objective portions of the goals, the  
23 general goals. Maybe there is word  
24 tweaking, but let's really think about  
25 what those objectives are and there is a

1 fine line over thinking and going too far  
2 down the road. I fully expect the  
3 objectives we think through will have  
4 value added from the stakeholders and  
5 there would be -- will be new objectives  
6 added that makes sense and doable from  
7 our respective jurisdictions and what we  
8 try to do here in terms of an outcome.

9 So I think we are, you know, my  
10 sense of life is we need to really  
11 continue to add objectives to those goals  
12 and think about them in what is that are  
13 achievable and meaningful and things that  
14 this group here being contribute bought  
15 to making it happen and things that  
16 benefit the region. I'm happy to do  
17 that. If you and I can get to go,  
18 assuming you have a job and report to  
19 work in a few days, we can spend -- have  
20 some focus time and put something back  
21 out to the group for a good robust  
22 discussion and then I think we are  
23 talking about smaller refinements. I  
24 don't think we are that far away and  
25 willing to put the time in with you, Doug

1 and the work group to get it done.

2 MS. BORNHOLDT: It would be our  
3 next one, our telephone executive session  
4 will be October 8 depending upon what --  
5 do you think it's possible, given what  
6 you all do in the day? I assume we'll be  
7 at our desks to have a couple  
8 conversations then to circulate  
9 something. We can at least begin that  
10 conversation as a whole and at that time,  
11 Joe, you are right. We tap on people.  
12 This is the work of the foundation the  
13 work group provided to us. This is a  
14 dialogue which may pull or push these  
15 work products into different directions  
16 and I would also add you've included me  
17 on these calendars or the -- please do  
18 that and I'll make sure I clear my  
19 calendar to have this discussion. Let's  
20 frame it right for our own discussion.  
21 That's where we are not being efficient  
22 with our time and to use our time on the  
23 8th for the majority of the discussion.

24 MS. CANTRAL: Yup, seem like a --

25 MR. CAPOBIANCO: I can make that

1           time frame. I just checked my calendar  
2           and I can now. Depending on Doug's  
3           availability we have some quality hours  
4           together to engage the group in what Mo  
5           was talking about. We can do it.

6                     MR. PABST: Yeah. October I can.  
7           I think it's 1:00 o'clock on the 8th. I  
8           don't have it on my calendar.

9                     MS. CANTRAL: Or the second  
10          Tuesday.

11                    MR. PABST: We can talk.  
12          Definitely make that happen.

13                    MS. CANTRAL: Sounds like a plan.  
14          All right, so...

15                    MS. CHYTALO: I just want to have  
16          one comment or two to make about the  
17          goals and objectives and some of the  
18          actions of some of those things can be  
19          constructed to get a better idea, but it  
20          would be nice if it was in there to  
21          construct to include some rationale as to  
22          why these things are being mentioned or  
23          something like that. It's part of the  
24          intro to those things. At least people  
25          can wrap our heads around rather than --

1 type of a coordinated attempt to put the  
2 pieces together. That would be helpful.

3 MS. CANTRAL: Do you want to tag  
4 onto what?

5 MS. COOKSEY: The base or what you  
6 want to call them. I need a  
7 justification I can run up the chain if  
8 we can keep some in and some out.

9 MS. CANTRAL: Okay. So, very good  
10 discussion. More to come. A plan for  
11 taking at least the next couple of steps  
12 and that is where we are going to leave  
13 it for now.

14 Now we'll move to the next topic.  
15 This is the most exciting part of the  
16 meeting, I promise, talking about the  
17 charter. The best for last.

18 We'll turn it over to Joe, as you  
19 are aware, has been leading the charge to  
20 develop a draft charter for your  
21 consideration and he is going to walk  
22 through the status of that for discussion  
23 and hopefully we'll leave this discussion  
24 with a clear plan how to finalize the  
25 charter, finalize the charter.

1           MR. ATANGAN: Everybody has been  
2           waiting and peruse through the charter  
3           and familiarize yourself and know every  
4           phrase used in there --

5                         (Mr. Mach leaves the meeting.)

6           MS. CANTRAL: Let me interrupt to  
7           say I know you have it memorized. You  
8           need to refer to it as task 7 in your  
9           binder.

10          MR. ATANGAN: I promise not to go  
11          over it word for word. Our thought is  
12          not to wordsmith it at this point, but  
13          basically go over the thought processes  
14          we sent to you and some of the discussion  
15          points and issues that require RPB  
16          guidance.

17                 I'm sure for a lot of the  
18          stakeholders, public out there, this is  
19          probably like sausage making, but a  
20          necessary part of this whole evolution,  
21          our vision is to provide a very  
22          high-level document that is streamline  
23          and it's very simple. Just identify who  
24          the memberships are, what the mission of  
25          the RPB is and the scope of their work.



1 But also offer enough flexibility.

2 As you can see we have not quite  
3 nailed down our goals and objective and  
4 didn't want a web to charter down to the  
5 goals and objective, but make it flexible  
6 so if there are changes in our goals and  
7 objectives we didn't have to change the  
8 cart.

9 The approach that I took was  
10 basically the path of least resistance or  
11 so I thought. Take what's already out  
12 there and copy it. So, I took the  
13 northeast regional planning body's  
14 charter and used that as a start. That  
15 was back in June before an implementation  
16 plan and its associated guide plan came  
17 out.

18 So I started with the northeast  
19 charter and the model charter came out.  
20 So I had to essentially use the hopefully  
21 the best elements out of both, combine  
22 the two into the document you have in  
23 front of you today.

24 The initial review, the charter was  
25 conducted by a small set of the RPB and

1           its support group member from NOAA,  
2           Department of Energy. A few of the state  
3           members, they provided valuable input  
4           that were incorporated into the charter  
5           itself.

6                     We briefed it to the RPB and we  
7           received a guidance, actually briefed it  
8           at the webinar and that prompted some  
9           more discussion and I received additional  
10          input which we again incorporated. We  
11          are at that stage right now. We were  
12          going for additional RPB guidance, how to  
13          specify certain sections of the document,  
14          ask the public, like we are not done  
15          yet. You have your opportunity to an  
16          email address, set the top for you to  
17          provide your input for us to consider and  
18          my goal, and it's rather aggressive in my  
19          mind, is to recognizing that one of the  
20          founding members of that RPB is --  
21          would -- I like to get Tom Bigford  
22          signing this thing November 2013. That  
23          is what I'm targeting here. So that's  
24          the agreement. So, on to the discussion  
25          points:

1           When I first sent the charter out I  
2           had a simple mission statements. That's  
3           the first bullet I'm probing, space  
4           planning in the region or very -- someone  
5           said you can drive a Mack truck through  
6           that mission statement. Since then the  
7           National Ocean Council released their  
8           draft model charter and included the  
9           second bullet, which is coordinate with  
10          stakeholders, sign specific business --  
11          of public and address issues of  
12          importance to the region.

13                 I did the hybrid because I'm about  
14          consensus here. I tried to pull the two  
15          together. I took essentially to  
16          implement advance marine space planning  
17          by coordinating here is what we are going  
18          to do and who we are going to do it with.

19                 So, one of the things I want you to  
20          consider is okay, item 1, 2 or 3 on the  
21          menu. I recommend No. 3, but that's  
22          something for you to consider and provide  
23          me with the feedback.

24                 If you could, next one, this may  
25          prompt a little bit more discussion from

1 the folks, but these commitments are not  
2 commitments that I, Joe Atangan came up  
3 with. These are the commitments that  
4 were identified within the National Ocean  
5 Council implementation plan and Maryland  
6 charter. I don't think I'll read every  
7 single one of them, but as you can see,  
8 depending how you look the it, it can be  
9 real big or no commitments. It's  
10 unfortunately the way it's written. We  
11 are committing to participate what we  
12 agreed to was participation in the  
13 document of a process. We want to build  
14 partnerships in or share information. We  
15 want to -- we want to recognize what we  
16 commit to and this is the tricky part, is  
17 not enforceable and do not create  
18 financial or legal obligations or affect  
19 existing rights beyond those created by  
20 existing statute or regulation. That's  
21 the lawyer's input. But I think the  
22 members need to be clear that this is --  
23 this is what you are signing onto and  
24 this is what you are signing your  
25 agencies onto.

1           And what I would like to hear from  
2           the members is are you okay with this?  
3           Are you willing to commit your signature  
4           to the charter which is on these  
5           commitments and if there are any hard  
6           spots, please let me know so we can  
7           address them and if need be, go to the  
8           National Ocean Council figure out if  
9           there is any additional sticking points  
10          or what is around your concerns or you  
11          know, address your concerns I should say  
12          instead of what is around your concerns.

13                 One of the other discussion points  
14                 was regards to -- I'm calling it the  
15                 executive secretary, but it's let ship  
16                 triumphant at this point. Unlike the  
17                 northeast region we don't have a  
18                 designated executive secretary. This  
19                 appeals to the leadership positions  
20                 within the RPB.

21                 The states have made a decision  
22                 that the MARCO board chair will serve as  
23                 the state co-lead since the tribes have  
24                 an ideal, a committee of one. So there  
25                 is only one tribe so we don't have to

1 worry about them changing every couple  
2 years.

3 So the next question is what is the  
4 term for the federal agency leads --  
5 federal agency co-lead. I think MARCO is  
6 established as a two-year term. The --  
7 recommends two-year term, but gives  
8 flexibility for consecutive term and do  
9 not put a limit on those consecutive  
10 terms. I can see its arguments from both  
11 sides about two years is not enough and  
12 level lost -- a level of consistency,  
13 especially in this early foundation stage  
14 and once you get up and running and this  
15 becomes more routine it becomes more  
16 feasible to work two-year terms. I do  
17 understand that the need for now  
18 possibility of a longer con second if I  
19 have term in order to see things through  
20 a particular in this stage but that is  
21 something we as an RPB need to decide. I  
22 can put down on paper what you all  
23 decide. It is not -- charter and say  
24 two-year terms. I need the RPB  
25 consensus. The other thing we need to

1           consider, we need to stagger the rotation  
2           in such a way we have a level of  
3           continuity.

4           MS. SCHULTZ: I've been here since  
5           June.

6           MR. ATANGAN: We need to work at  
7           staggering the state and federal  
8           leadership, so that also affords a level  
9           of continuity and something we need to  
10          consider on that in this whole charter  
11          with regard to federal agencies'  
12          responsibility. That is what's outlined  
13          within the executive order and in the  
14          implementation plan, provides staffing  
15          and resources necessary to administer its  
16          role to the extent resources allow. It  
17          does not authorize or obligates members  
18          to expend funds.

19          Next step in original discussions,  
20          because the charter is rather general and  
21          to allow the maximum flexibility we do  
22          recognize that we are going to need to  
23          drill down a little bit and provide some  
24          level of detail and additional documents  
25          that includes, you know, our operation





1 draft I sent out it identified some  
2 appendices and some additional, you know,  
3 documents that we were going to commit to  
4 working on and their advice was to remove  
5 it. And so because -- um -- frankly just  
6 delete it. They said you don't need  
7 this.

8 So, you know, it's up to us as the  
9 RPB. This -- this is our document. So I  
10 guess what I'm looking for is some  
11 guidance. What do you need? Do you need  
12 something that has to delineate, you  
13 know, sand operating procedures? How we  
14 are going to conduct this?

15 My preference is not to write a  
16 Roberts rules of order-type of thing we  
17 have to follow. I think this process  
18 needs to be somewhat formal, but informal  
19 that we can have a dialogue of like we  
20 are having right now and have an open  
21 conversation and not the rigid structure  
22 or yielding to one another and doing 15  
23 minutes of conversation followed by a  
24 couple minutes of rebuttal since -- we  
25 don't want to be that rigid in structure.

1 I watched some of Ted Cruz's attempt at  
2 filibuster. I don't want to get to that  
3 point. I guess what I'm looking for is  
4 guidance from the RPB. What do you feel  
5 we really need to advance to keep going?  
6 Frankly, you can spend -- you can spend a  
7 lot of effort coming up with standard  
8 operating procedures to the point where  
9 it's distracting from the overall efforts  
10 from the ocean planning itself? So  
11 that's where I'm at.

12 Here are the next steps: I'm  
13 hoping that now that everybody has gotten  
14 a copy of the charter and has seen it and  
15 think are going to give it their two  
16 thumbs up or like on facebook, whatever  
17 it takes. We can get the comments and  
18 the comments will be this can be so.  
19 Comments will be minimal and I'll able to  
20 consolidate everything in between the  
21 government shutdown and have everything  
22 completed by the 15th of October. That's  
23 a couple of weeks, vet it out to the RPB.

24 Ultimately you are the ones to sign  
25 this and you are the ones that are going

1 to have to identify what the process is  
2 to get approval from the your  
3 organization if you are required to. I  
4 know each group will be different. My  
5 desire is have you, the RPB remember,  
6 RPB, your agency controls that. I've  
7 seen some organizations. It's not the  
8 RPB neck, but the mucky muck above.  
9 That's up to you and your organization.  
10 But the goal is to have all of that  
11 final, smooth, ready to go by 1 October  
12 so that you can run it up your chain and  
13 by the 15th distribute to, you know --  
14 the 1 November piece, some to run up your  
15 chain, vet it through your lawyers which  
16 will have this. Hopefully they can turn  
17 it around, two documents. I know they  
18 look to charge per word, but it's chart  
19 document, by 15th, this thing for  
20 significant.

21 Aggressive time line. I want to  
22 get out thereof before Thanksgiving day,  
23 before everything gets into the holiday  
24 mood and so that's where I'm at. I'll be  
25 subject to your questions.

1 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you Joe.

2 Joe has walked you through the  
3 status of the draft and posed some  
4 questions along the way, so why don't we  
5 take those up in the order that he had  
6 posed them starting go with the mission.  
7 He had invited you to share your  
8 reactions. You saw the options. He did  
9 a blend which is reflected in that third  
10 bullet and in the document itself. So  
11 how do people feel about the mission?

12 Laura?

13 MS. MCKAY: Number three.

14 MS. CANTRAL: Andy?

15 MR. ZEMBA: I'm not sure. The  
16 stuff I want to talk about is exactly  
17 this. Should I hold it now?

18 MS. CANTRAL: Go ahead. We may ask  
19 to you mark it, but --

20 MR. ZEMBA: I want to make sure  
21 the -- thank Joe for the good work this  
22 is, has been documented. Very good  
23 start. I appreciate that.

24 A couple things conceptually are  
25 important at least for Pennsylvania.

1 Does make it quite clear in that purpose  
2 about commitments and conversely  
3 noncommitments. So that's going to be  
4 important to us and we are going to need  
5 the smart perspective to keep that  
6 language in there. We will have to get  
7 it through that internal review and have  
8 other Pennsylvania lawyers take a look at  
9 it.

10 The other thing right now kind of  
11 struck me. I don't know if this is a big  
12 deal. That introduction does not talk  
13 about the National Ocean Council. It's  
14 mentioned several times in the document.  
15 To me it kind of starts to feel like the  
16 stakeholder there is a different role for  
17 them and I just again advocate for some  
18 consideration for -- we were not going to  
19 wordsmith today, but that conceptually is  
20 for me, still not clear exactly what the  
21 re --

22 MS. CANTRAL: So, let's go to  
23 Gwynne.

24 MS. SCHULTZ: Mine is a minor  
25 comment. We've been talking about ocean

1 planning. This is marine spacial thing  
2 in your mindset about why the marine  
3 versus the ocean.

4 MR. ATANGAN: I was told no. I --  
5 big military answer. That was one of the  
6 points of discussion that I had in -- I  
7 started out with ocean planning. I don't  
8 have any problem with ocean planning, but  
9 there are folks within its Enoch that we  
10 went from coast, marine -- that's  
11 verboten now to ocean planning. Now its  
12 fashionable term is marine plan.

13 So I did a blanket change from  
14 ocean planning and part of the reason  
15 I -- I may get this wrong, but my sense  
16 was is the marine planing was picked by  
17 the -- for a specific reason to identify  
18 not open ocean, but include all of the  
19 way up to the shoreline. I don't know  
20 this for a fact. That's a rumor I hear.  
21 But -- I could go either way.

22 MS. SCHULTZ: I'm wondering if they  
23 did that in the inclusion of the Great  
24 Lakes in all of their dialogue and that  
25 was something we want to adopt marine

1 planning versus the ocean planning.

2 MR. ATANGAN: I see a lot of head  
3 nods. I don't have the visibility on the  
4 Great Lake stuff, but again, there was no  
5 more change. I can do it in two seconds  
6 now.

7 MS. CANTRAL: Let's make sure we  
8 get some clarity about what kind of  
9 direction to give you, but --

10 MR. PABST: I was going to weigh in  
11 on the bullets on the screen, per se.  
12 There is a lot of how things happen,  
13 stories out there, but I'm not sure which  
14 was real or not at this point.

15 Couple of points. I guess we talk  
16 about identifying -- it seems the more  
17 you try to add people you leave people  
18 out. I don't know if this is a generic,  
19 we seem to go to great lengths to  
20 identify sectors. I don't know if that's  
21 now we left anybody out looking  
22 carefully. I don't know and secondly,  
23 the word address it. I think this is  
24 issues. We are doing this to identify  
25 and resolve. Is it, you know, I don't

1 know what the right word is, address or  
2 thank you for your comment. That's not  
3 what we mean, but I think it be may be a  
4 more proactive way to choose an address.  
5 I seem to be having grammar problems all  
6 day today.

7 MS. CANTRAL: Any other thoughts  
8 about the mission? I'm hearing people  
9 like No. 3 with some friendly amendments.  
10 Taking a look at the terminology and I'm  
11 also noting Andy's request to take a look  
12 at the introduction to clarify the role  
13 not Ocean Council with regard to marine  
14 planning verse ocean planning and  
15 understanding where that came from. But  
16 also recognizing that this is your  
17 document and you can, you know, you have  
18 some discretion how you want to use the  
19 terminology. And ocean planning is more  
20 consistent with the other things and  
21 documents and your terminology would be  
22 fair and reasonable to do it that way but  
23 maybe I'm stepping out of my realm.

24 MS. COOKSEY: Thanks, Joe, for this  
25 great work.



1           I think what I'm going to ask for  
2           is written somewhere. I had to ask you  
3           to do anymore work. You are one of those  
4           seven people that have done a tremendous  
5           amount of work.

6           With that said I think we can't buy  
7           in because folks around the table cannot  
8           answer the question what is in it for me.  
9           I think that is written in some of the  
10          documents the importance of the ocean. I  
11          love how Andy -- they've given us this  
12          charge with zero resources. There should  
13          be something in here that talks about  
14          them and also why are we doing it. Why  
15          is the ocean so important to us.

16          MS. CANTRAL: That is your comment?

17          So, if there is nothing else on the  
18          mission we still have several elements to  
19          go through and I'm noting the time which  
20          is when we transition the public comment  
21          and I'll come back to that this and put a  
22          pause on this now and come back and take  
23          up Joe's other question. There is a  
24          couple other details in the document you  
25          didn't refer to, but need some discussion

1           about to ensure you take care of details.  
2           When you do go through the time line you  
3           are ready to finalize in the manner you  
4           are suggesting. So, let's transition now  
5           to public part.

6                     We have seven folks who have signed  
7           up to offer public comment and I will  
8           tell you the order we are going to hear  
9           from people and remind you as we go along  
10          so you know when you are up. Ali Chase,  
11          Matt Gove, Margo Pelligrini, Frank  
12          Greenfield, Cindy Zipf, Ron Rapp and  
13          Barbara Hudson.

14                    MS. CHASE: (ALI CHASE)

15                    Thank you all for all of the work  
16           you've done and for taking into  
17           consideration a number of the comments  
18           that were made yesterday. So I was  
19           saying thank you for taking into  
20           consideration the comments that were made  
21           yesterday and trying to take it back last  
22           night and hold things together.

23                    I think you know we are getting  
24           closer to a lot of the goals. I really  
25           appreciate it that the health of the

1 ecosystem, that is important and I'm glad  
2 to see that's part of it. I think that  
3 the NRDC and a lot of groups wanted to go  
4 through them and think about them and I  
5 appreciate the discussion that you had  
6 very -- again recreational accesses for  
7 some sort of -- to engage this meaningful  
8 public input in.

9 This is also important so these are  
10 things that we'll be looking at in terms  
11 of the vision. My first glance there is  
12 a lot in there that is very strong and I  
13 also, you know, appreciate going back to  
14 the national policy statement itself to  
15 look at the text that was used there and  
16 to put it into context. I wouldn't get  
17 too hung up having it one sentence or two  
18 sentence thing. That is important in  
19 that part of that visions to explain what  
20 you are coming together to do. If you  
21 are coming to together to do this plan  
22 that is really the whole of the RPB, your  
23 outcome and that's important to state up  
24 front so people have a context.

25 Another thing, just thinking about

1 the time line and I appreciated the  
2 discussion that you had and sort of  
3 thinking how is that going to get done  
4 and can we think about that and I heard  
5 what you are saying from November to  
6 December. Its tough to motivate people,  
7 but I think that if it is at all possible  
8 to try to get another round out to the  
9 public in October and even if you are not  
10 able to have some of that public reach,  
11 you need to have around the goals. This  
12 is going to set your work. At least it's  
13 out there and the public can start  
14 thinking about it and discussing it and  
15 maybe just leave it out in the public for  
16 longer. Instead of going out in January,  
17 try to maybe go out in October and close  
18 it up at the end of January and see where  
19 you are.

20 I think that our groups have given  
21 feedback about some of the outreach  
22 opportunities we would recommend and I,  
23 following up on those is important and  
24 I -- this one other thing is key is also  
25 committing to try to meet quarterly. And

1 I hear the concerns that you have about  
2 funding and how to get there, but I think  
3 that you do have a lot of work on your  
4 plate and one way to get things done is  
5 to set a deadline and try to stick to it  
6 and I think having those meetings is  
7 going to encourage you to get that  
8 feedback in to keep this moving along and  
9 stakeholders engaged in the process.

10 Just one other quick thing, I'm  
11 running out of time. The vision  
12 statement, there is one piece I think is  
13 important and that's not quite reflected.  
14 It says stakeholders are engaged in  
15 management decision that affect their  
16 lives and livelihoods. Many of us here  
17 in the room recommended stakeholders, but  
18 stakeholders in the public should be  
19 engaged there. There is a lot of open  
20 land, but not one and the same. It's  
21 important. I think that we need to  
22 include that management decisions are not  
23 affecting our lives, my son, his kids.  
24 Hopefully some point down the line that  
25 is something that needs to come and it's

1           so why it's -- and why we have to try to  
2           move on this.

3           MS. CANTRAL: Matt Gove.

4           MR. GOVE: (MATT GOVE)

5           Matt Gove from Surf Riders. Thanks  
6           for working on the goals. We've made  
7           some progress but do feel I got written  
8           out of the goals as right now. So maybe  
9           like Gwynne was saying at a specific --  
10          one good access. I'm not sure of the  
11          jobs, economic opportunities, maybe there  
12          is a way to rephrase it. I didn't see  
13          Surf Riders in there anymore.

14          I was also confused about perhaps  
15          what Ali was saying would sell out about  
16          wind, when to go back to stakeholders  
17          with documents and outreach as proposed  
18          January stakeholder outreaches. That  
19          outreach with RPB and all of the members  
20          there to listen or a separate thing just  
21          a few people go out. I couldn't tell  
22          what that was. I need clarification on  
23          that. Everyone should be here to hear  
24          and get a good sense of comments that  
25          come up at those outreach meetings.

1           And just a little thing about ocean  
2 restoration. I think we do ocean  
3 restoration, oyster fisheries. You could  
4 call restoration in the -- so maybe  
5 not -- perhaps, but we do ocean  
6 restoration. That's a pet peeve.  
7 Thanks.

8           MS. PELLIGRINO: (MARGO PELLIGRINO)

9           Margo Pelligrino. It's really  
10 awesome to be a member of the public and  
11 to be able to comment here and I really  
12 appreciate it.

13           As I said, most of my expertise is  
14 just anecdotal and a based on my paddling  
15 journeys and stakeholders and the most of  
16 this country, at least the mainland. And  
17 kind of finding onto Matt's comment about  
18 ocean restoration. Be we know how  
19 difficult it is, how lots of times when  
20 we try to restore areas it's just a big  
21 tremendous waste of money. So of course  
22 the best way to ensure against wasting  
23 money and time is to not break it in the  
24 first place.

25           Looking at all of this in the

1 shorter and mission and goals, I'm not --  
2 I'm foggy on resiliency and what you mean  
3 is that just beach replenishment? It's  
4 tidal waterways? New Jersey really is  
5 actually a peninsula that, and you know,  
6 so that's really a murky thing that needs  
7 clarification when you talk about  
8 resiliency exactly what do you mean?

9 I don't -- when you look at the  
10 past studies by Pew on the ocean and the  
11 U.S. Commission on ocean policy they talk  
12 about the ocean being in a state of  
13 crisis. I don't personally -- don't see.  
14 Maybe I'm missing it the mission and  
15 goals are not necessarily reflective  
16 the -- of the crisis that we are  
17 currently in. I don't see any  
18 ecosystem-based management. I don't see  
19 the term. I see yes, talking about  
20 scientists and you know dignitaries, but  
21 I don't see where this is coming together  
22 to make sure we don't destroy what we  
23 have left.

24 So I -- most I see the word  
25 ecosystem based somewhere in there. I



1 wish I could see the mission can be about  
2 a reflective of the fundings of the U.S.  
3 Commission and Pew report on the ocean  
4 because this isn't just about dividing up  
5 the pieces of the pie. This is making  
6 sure that we do the right thing in order  
7 to keep the whole thing from remaining in  
8 crisis state. Thank you.

9 MR. GREENFIELD: (BRENT GREENFIELD)

10 Brent Greenfield with National  
11 Ocean Policy Coalition. I just have some  
12 comments regarding operational  
13 considerations related to the Regional  
14 Ocean Planning time line and associated  
15 products and the model RPB charter.

16 As stated yesterday, by proceeding  
17 the absence of direct commercial and  
18 recreational representation on the RPB or  
19 at least an opportunity for formal  
20 engagement through a Stakeholder Advisory  
21 Committee, even in discussions about  
22 things like potential goals, timelines  
23 and actions the Mid-Atlantic regional  
24 ocean planning process is already  
25 threatening to inadequately reflect the

1 input and perspectives of the regions  
2 most significant existing and future  
3 potential economic contributors and  
4 result in unintended and adverse  
5 consequences.

6 Like the discussion about goals and  
7 geographic focus, stakeholder engagement  
8 and data and information, the discussion  
9 about timelines and associated products  
10 would benefit tremendously from this type  
11 of formal engagement and such mechanisms  
12 should be in place before these  
13 discussions continue.

14 With that as context, it is also  
15 important to note that existing and  
16 future potential users of ocean and  
17 coastal resources in the Mid-Atlantic  
18 already must navigate a wide array of  
19 state and federal programs to carry out  
20 their existing or proposed activities.  
21 At the same time, they are confronting  
22 challenging economic circumstances that  
23 also demand their constant attention,  
24 time and resources.

25 Timelines and decisions related to

1 goals, objectives and actions must  
2 account for these circumstances and be  
3 based on the availability and application  
4 of sound science, data and information.

5 In addition, as stated previously,  
6 if commercial and recreational interests  
7 are not directly represented on the RPB  
8 and circumstances are such that the RPB  
9 lacks the capacity to establish a formal  
10 stakeholder advisory committee, then the  
11 RPB seemingly lacks the ability and  
12 should not endeavor to undertake the  
13 development of a formal regional ocean  
14 plan or other products whose use could  
15 result in impacts to commercial and  
16 recreational interests and the jobs and  
17 communities that they support or seek to  
18 support.

19 Any timeline for Mid-Atlantic  
20 regional ocean planning must take this  
21 into account as well as ensure that the  
22 public at large and all groups have  
23 adequate time and opportunity to review  
24 and provide input on RPB materials in  
25 advance of meetings and actions.

1           Timelines must be developed based  
2           on the time that is needed to identify,  
3           consider and implement goals and any  
4           related actions that are ultimately  
5           agreed upon following significant user  
6           group and public engagement efforts.  
7           Practical and achievable timelines cannot  
8           be ascertained before such engagement has  
9           taken place and such goals and related  
10          actions have been identified.

11          As to the draft model charter, in  
12          addition to providing for direct  
13          commercial and recreational sector  
14          membership, local officials should also  
15          be provided with opportunities to serve  
16          directly on the RPB. With regard to  
17          commercial and recreational interests at  
18          minimum the charter should provide for  
19          formal and direct engagement through a  
20          Federal Advisory Committee.

21          The charter should also make clear  
22          that any decision not to address a  
23          particular use in the region is not an  
24          indication of opposition to such use  
25          occurring in the region and that such a

1 decision is not to be used or interpreted  
2 by any agency in a manner that would in  
3 any way restrict or prohibit such use  
4 from being authorized to take place in  
5 the region.

6 Other areas that the draft charter  
7 needs to address include the following:

8 The terms and processes under which  
9 funding would be accepted by outside  
10 groups. How exactly marine planning  
11 would be carried out consistent with and  
12 under the authority of existing statutes,  
13 regulations and authorized programs and  
14 which activities, regulations, statutes  
15 and programs are implicated and how  
16 agencies would adhere to the plan and or  
17 other RPB products.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. CANTRAL: Cindy Zipf.

20 MS. ZIPF: (CINDY ZIPF)

21 Thanks everybody for sticking to it  
22 and staying for the whole day. It's been  
23 a long couple days, but I -- we think we  
24 have made progress and see a great deal  
25 of progress incorporating. I have a

1 couple thoughts to share/

2           Going back to the goals very  
3 briefly, I think they are too limited. I  
4 are what Ali just said about  
5 consideration of -- for us to go back and  
6 consider them. We had recommended in the  
7 letter to you -- to adopt goals that were  
8 established for the northeast region  
9 which would not be exclusive. We would  
10 have additional goals, but those were a  
11 good starting point.

12           I wanted to reflect a little bit  
13 one more time on the importance of the  
14 data and what data you use. I notice on  
15 one of the MARCO sheets it says fisheries  
16 were valued at \$300 million and that is  
17 really low when it comes down to trade  
18 office. Which kinds of trees are we  
19 going to support or not support. For the  
20 economics are going to be --  
21 unfortunately most of the focus, so just  
22 numbers for New Jersey commercial fishing  
23 was \$6.6 billion in sales with a B. It  
24 provides \$2.4 billion in growth, state  
25 product and 44,000 jobs. That's just the

1 commercial and recreational. It was 1.7  
2 billion in sales and 1.71 million in  
3 gross New Jersey product. I think those  
4 numbers need to be told and need to be  
5 emphasized and is critical.

6 As to the charter, my view the  
7 charter is the most important document I  
8 was sticking it out to the end. That's  
9 the promise you are making to one another  
10 and to us. In that context I would  
11 agree, Doug, I'm agreeing with you in the  
12 mission statement to not just address the  
13 issues, but to resolve that the mission  
14 is to resolve the issues. That's an  
15 important distinction so our voices are  
16 considered and not passed over.

17 It's also important to be clear  
18 about what the different roles of all of  
19 the partners you have are. MARCO, that's  
20 an extremely important partnership for  
21 this committee. You are depending on  
22 them for the data in part or in large  
23 part, depending on them for their public  
24 involvement role. Again, those are  
25 really important and I think expectations

1 and accountability needs to be clarified  
2 as to how far MARCO plays.

3 I think the public's role has to be  
4 identified and clarified out of respect  
5 to us. What is its agreement the promise  
6 that we may have between one another,  
7 between our participation in this. How  
8 are you going to conduct the meetings of  
9 the liaison if that's the read you take.  
10 Expectations and accountabilities, and  
11 again, I would, you know, really  
12 emphasize the term full public  
13 involvement. That's are the words I look  
14 at, meaningful public involvement done  
15 not just public comment and mindful  
16 again. How just -- I can't over  
17 emphasize data.

18 Now, some things I understand, Joe,  
19 you've been putting time in your  
20 timetable. You want everybody committed  
21 to it. If you have placeholders where  
22 you describe how it is liaisons work,  
23 however you are going to make up that  
24 MARCO you may not have all of these  
25 things committed to, but placeholders in



1           there so we know those will be addressed  
2           and have some criteria adopted.

3           On page 6, the role of the  
4           colleagues is extraordinary. I want to  
5           emphasize that it says in consultation  
6           with the rest of the RPB, the colleagues  
7           may consider and decide so the colleagues  
8           are the deciders, if you will. Many of  
9           these roles are and many of these whole  
10          operations. So I think that's an extreme  
11          amount of responsibility and I'm not sure  
12          there is -- not clear what -- how we the  
13          public participate in that  
14          decision-making. This is a sorts of a  
15          meat and potatoes how the system will be  
16          returned. I would like to be consulted  
17          on that as well.

18          That's just a point of -- I would  
19          like for clarification of the term  
20          general consensus is I think somewhat  
21          clear here, but it wouldn't hurt to  
22          define what general consensus means. One  
23          person says no there is 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.  
24          How you feel about that decision and also  
25          all sorts of processes for condition

1 census. I would like more clarification  
2 on that.

3 How if at all you deal with public  
4 on the liquified natural gas proposed off  
5 our coast. You had over 25,000  
6 submissions of comments on the document.  
7 Over 25,000 comments, only 19 were in  
8 favor of the application. So there is a  
9 clear vote there and you know, I'm not  
10 sure how the public voice will be  
11 addressed and if you are doing something  
12 or the plan incorporates something  
13 profoundly not in the public -- which the  
14 public opposes, how will you address  
15 that.

16 That covers my comments. I'm sure  
17 I'm way over the -- my time, but you  
18 know, that's in our view the charter will  
19 be the document that we look at to  
20 determine how or whether or in what way  
21 passive aggressive -- passive aggressive  
22 we participated in this process. It's a  
23 very important document to us. I  
24 appreciate your initial work and  
25 hopefully some of these issues can be

1 clarified.

2 MS. CANTRAL: Ron Rapp you are  
3 next.

4 MR. RAPP: (RON RAPP)

5 I want to come back to the summary  
6 of cables as I introduced yesterday. By  
7 the way, my comments will be on behalf of  
8 the International Cable Protection  
9 Committee, a member organization of about  
10 140 international members and North  
11 America and Summary Cable Association of  
12 North American members group.

13 We discussed this yesterday and I  
14 still have it seen in our opinion enough  
15 mention of cables, you know point one  
16 being that in the vision statement. I  
17 think there is talk of a local economy  
18 and ocean economy, but I think one,  
19 regardless of cables, talking shipping  
20 lanes or recreation, mention of  
21 international global economy is  
22 important. These transit lanes of course  
23 are enablers for international trade as  
24 our submarine communication cable and  
25 that's important to highlight.

1           In the area of goals if we are  
2           going to get down to the details, talking  
3           about militaries continuing ranges and  
4           recreation and sand mining, we certainly  
5           want to include summary and cables in  
6           that group. It does not fit in any other  
7           general area and you know, I'll say this  
8           is not just another special interest, you  
9           know, another special interest talking  
10          this is important. We work a lot with  
11          the U.S. Convention Law. The sea, in our  
12          international dealings, even though  
13          United States is not a signatory, the  
14          United States does abide by many of the  
15          provisions and discussions with some of  
16          the drafters. They spend a lot of time  
17          how to treat and consider  
18          telecommunications cables around the  
19          world. So they are explicitly named in  
20          class in many of the provisions I  
21          asked -- ask that this group consider  
22          that and possibly some explicit mention.  
23          Submarine cables in the set of objectives  
24          there for 150 years. So it's not a new  
25          phenomenon.

1           That's the gist of my comments and  
2           I'll be happy to discuss anything  
3           afterwards.

4           Thank you.

5           MS. CANTRAL: Barbara Hudson, and  
6           Sarah Chase, you'll be after Barbara.

7           MS. HUDSON: (BARBARA HUDSON)

8           Why do we need ocean planning?  
9           What are we talking about? Who are the  
10          stakeholders?

11          From my point of view, would be  
12          about bringing a stressed out and dying  
13          ocean. From others it's about probably  
14          organizing offshore drilling, liquid  
15          natural gas and other commercial uses.  
16          So why do I define it? It cannot be both  
17          because things you talk about inside more  
18          commercial -- is the same thing we are  
19          dealing with our stressed out ocean.

20          So I think I'm a citizen. I lived  
21          here all my life and I'm very concerned  
22          and it was in the seventies when we had  
23          offshore drilling and -- all of  
24          organizers fought that firstly and they  
25          kept it from happening. I'm not so sure

1           what's happening now.

2                   MS. CHASE:   (SARAH CHASE)

3                   Thanks to all of you.  We are  
4           excited to be seated at the meeting of  
5           the RPB and we appreciate all of your  
6           time and work.  It's an extremely  
7           important exercise we believe.

8                   I would like to supplement Ali  
9           Chase's comments.  Goals, vision, time  
10          line.  I would like to raise comments  
11          regarding the draft charter.  We'll be  
12          supplementing these comments in written  
13          comments.

14                  In the mission and scope I think we  
15          would like to see mention of the regional  
16          system as well as the capacity assessment  
17          and the reference to work plan I think is  
18          fine here, but it raised a question in  
19          terms of the earlier discussion of the  
20          time line.  Not clear to me what's  
21          envisioned to be in the work plan.

22                  See, I think if there would be some  
23          elaboration, it does not have to be in  
24          the charter, but at some point all are  
25          thinking what the work plan would contain

1           that would be level in understanding you  
2           envisioning it, taking until next summer  
3           or next September to come up with a draft  
4           which is a concern to us in terms of time  
5           line.

6                     I would like to speak to page five  
7           member commitments. A few points there.  
8           We would like to see a commitment to  
9           develop a plan, not just to participate  
10          in the development of a process in the  
11          work plan, et cetera, but a commitment to  
12          develop a regional ocean plan.

13                    We would also like to see where  
14          there is reference to incorporation of  
15          the ocean policy goals, objectives,  
16          principles into the planning process have  
17          referenced not only to the handbook, but  
18          the executive order and task force and  
19          implementation plan, so not a limitation  
20          to the handbook.

21                    And one real concern that I would  
22          like to raise is that the executive order  
23          requires that the federal departments of  
24          agencies participate in the development  
25          of and in the planning process to the

1 full extent consistent with applicable  
2 law and the language in the draft  
3 charter. Only talks about the -- to the  
4 extent -- I know those words matter. I  
5 think it's important. I realize the  
6 obligations on the state partners and  
7 travel partners may be different. This  
8 charter should be consistent with what  
9 the requirements are in the executive  
10 order vis-a-vis the departments and  
11 agencies.

12 So, thank you very much for this  
13 opportunity and good luck as you proceed.

14 MR. JOHANSON: (ERIC JOHANSON)

15 Eric again from the morning.

16 I want to speak about a few things.

17 I'm pleased the vision statement in  
18 regard to the stakeholders engaging the  
19 management decisions affecting their  
20 lives and livelihoods. I would like to  
21 add into speaking about what they were  
22 saying about the economic impact not only  
23 to the stakeholders, but those people  
24 that depend on those stakeholders as  
25 well. That's an important guide that



1           should be put inside in regard to today.

2                     Just now, this last one, mission.

3           It's important and I'm very happy you are  
4           working on a mission statement now. That  
5           is an important part of what you are  
6           going to be doing and I think it needs a  
7           bit more time before you can really nail  
8           it down. I appreciate Doug's comment  
9           changing one word. One word can make a  
10          huge statement in a mission statement.  
11          It would be best to think about it more  
12          before you go forward and make sure it is  
13          a mission statement you can live with.

14                    You are speaking about the bylaws  
15          and you don't know if you want to have  
16          that -- I look in this room. There is a  
17          lot of intelligent people in this room.  
18          However, if you don't have a bylaw to run  
19          by, you are going to be here next month  
20          talking about the same thing. Perhaps  
21          you do need to consider some sort of  
22          bylaws and break the group up into sub  
23          committees. They can report back some  
24          progress that we can get forward on this  
25          I would highly recommend that.

1 I'm the member of a committee, 33  
2 of them, one of task statements. I  
3 currently share on infrastructure,  
4 navigation. This could be something I  
5 would work with this committee with  
6 exclusively not in shore, but offshore  
7 infrastructure we speak about here.  
8 There are a lot more people we can work  
9 into this. The stakeholders should be  
10 identified and one of the questions I had  
11 why is the ICC, not on this sub -- this  
12 group international -- interstate  
13 commerce committee.

14 Since this is going to impact  
15 interstate commercial, wouldn't that be  
16 someone also on this committee? I know  
17 MARCO is on here and Coast Guard, but a  
18 thought, maybe I'm off on this one, and  
19 also I frankly suggest the revised goals  
20 include the efficient and safe port  
21 action test objectives. That's it.

22 MS. CANTRAL: Thank you to all of  
23 you who provided public comment. We are  
24 going to take a break now, 15-minute  
25 break and come back at 3:30, resume the

1 discussion about the charter.

2 Several questions that Joe posed  
3 reflect thinking about what you heard  
4 from several of commentators regarding  
5 the charter and then we are going to see  
6 what other business needs to be done and  
7 summarize and wrap up. Take a break and  
8 be back at 3:30.

9 (Recess.)

10 (David Noble left the  
11 meeting.)

12 MS. CANTRAL: We are going to try  
13 to get started. We are in the home  
14 stretch here. So I think we want to come  
15 back to the discussion about the charter  
16 and finish that up. We had some  
17 discussion if you recall, Joe mentioned  
18 proposed several questions or discussion  
19 points he identified in working through  
20 the draft charter and assessing all of  
21 the input and comments you have provided.  
22 We talked about the mission. There were  
23 some suggestions about that. We already  
24 summarized we want to use this session  
25 right now to talk to some of the points

1 he had said and reflect and have  
2 discussion about any of the documents  
3 that we heard about the charter, about  
4 the public comment and folks wanted to do  
5 that.

6 Let me just remind you what else we  
7 have to discuss related to the charter,  
8 taking a look at the commitment and how  
9 that is articulated in the charter. The  
10 executive secretariat and the role of  
11 that leadership, the appendices and what  
12 is flagged there to be a potential, at  
13 least couple of appendices we had  
14 suggestions for other things that could  
15 be added to that list. And then, you  
16 know, anything else that you flag in your  
17 review of the charter that you want to  
18 raise.

19 So, why don't we take those up in  
20 order starting with the commitments as  
21 articulated in the charter and summarized  
22 in the slide that's up.

23 MR. ATANGAN: Where we were at in  
24 the discussion point was I was looking  
25 for the members to essentially come in on

1           whether I guess your level of comfort  
2           with regard to the commitments that have  
3           been outlined here.  Again, these are  
4           based -- this is what you are going to  
5           have to go to your individual  
6           organizations with and say this is what  
7           we are signing on to do and what we are  
8           committed to do.

9           MS. CANTRAL:  John, do you have a  
10          document?

11          On the RPB member commitments the  
12          first one was fulfill the role  
13          representing the agency governed on the  
14          previous page under federal members.  It  
15          lists departments of executive branch.

16          So, I believe we are supposed to be  
17          representing our departments and not  
18          necessarily our agencies, which is a big  
19          deal.

20          MR. ATANGAN:  That's an excellent  
21          point.

22          MR. WALTERS:  We've tried to  
23          clarify it, whether I'm representing the  
24          Coast Guard or Department of Homeland  
25          Security I have to try to clarify it

1           again. But from conversations with Tom,  
2           and he mentioned yesterday he was  
3           representing the Department of Commerce  
4           and just for clarity.

5           MR. ATANGAN: That's actually --  
6           thank you for flagging this. That is a  
7           good catch. Any further discussions on  
8           this? What I need to know at this point  
9           is any hard spots. Let me know we'll go  
10          ahead and move on.

11          With regard to the executive  
12          secretariat, I mentioned the terms of the  
13          co-leads and issue of consecutive terms  
14          and standard rotation we need to take --  
15          need for you to give some thought to that  
16          and provide me some input and how we can  
17          address that. The way it's addressed  
18          they have two-year terms, but they also  
19          specify it does not preclude consecutive  
20          terms.

21          In the previous versions of the  
22          charter I included that specific  
23          language, but there were some concerns  
24          expressed about, you know, the stagnant,  
25          you know, you get stale after multiple

1 consecutive terms. They wanted to  
2 preclude that. We should keep the  
3 flexibility there to give us some options  
4 and maybe we revise it downstream.

5 MS. CANTRAL: Tom and Mo?

6 MR. BIGFORD: Several independently  
7 elected, so if when Mo leaves we get a  
8 federal co-lead or could we do it when  
9 she does not leave, but another agency  
10 was to change and someone comes aboard  
11 they become co-lead. I'm trying to  
12 figure out the dynamics how this will all  
13 be if and when we get to a point we have  
14 to -- elected from existing or elected  
15 from new people when they come on board.  
16 I don't understand the mechanics of that.

17 MR. ATANGAN: I think the  
18 independently-elected person really  
19 applied more to the states as far as  
20 who -- and the individual tribe, I don't  
21 know they had this in mind when they  
22 talked about electing co-leads, but  
23 that's something we need to get  
24 clarification from the staff on that.  
25 They designated an initial federal --

1 MR. BIGFORD: Yes.

2 MR. ATANGAN: And that transition  
3 from the federal lead to the next federal  
4 lead is unclear.

5 MS. CANTRAL: Right.

6 MR. PABST: Designated or elected  
7 or by caveat it was D.O.I. So it was  
8 not -- it was not elected.

9 MS. CANTRAL: To point out language  
10 in the actual draft on the bottom, page 5  
11 says federal state tribal RPB members  
12 will select their representative co-leads  
13 independently. You summarized the  
14 bullet, you know, to be independently  
15 elected.

16 I think an interpretation is each  
17 of the sectors, governmental sectors  
18 selects their co-lead to, you know, be,  
19 you know, for their sector. The process  
20 of how that is -- how that happens may  
21 differ. In your region definitely  
22 differs. You have one tribe, so --

23 MR. ATANGAN: The issue is not the  
24 tribe or state. The straight answer  
25 transition plan is established. They



1           have done through MARCO and have a set  
2           rotation. This is the same issue that  
3           every RPB is going to run across. There  
4           was an initial -- you are the federal  
5           co-lead and they put this language in  
6           there. Well, you are going to elect the  
7           next one, but, you know, so the  
8           transition of the federal co-lead piece  
9           is unclear.

10                   I don't know at this point where we  
11           have -- what kind of latitude we have to  
12           one, do we -- do we really have the  
13           latitude to elect the next federal  
14           co-lead or is up to the next one to  
15           approve and who the next federal co-lead  
16           is?

17                   MR. BIGFORD: Right.

18                   MS. BORNHOLDT: No. You got stuck  
19           with me in the first round. No matter  
20           how long the term is, then the feds get  
21           together and select the next, you know,  
22           department. To go back to John's point  
23           to be able to be the representative. I  
24           may still be sitting on the RPB. My term  
25           closes and I'll happily help designate

1 the next federal co-lead. That's how it  
2 goes. We have that latitude I need to go  
3 back and address with Chris Corbo and  
4 John Andre and check. That's my  
5 understanding.

6 MS. CANTRAL: Tom and John want to  
7 jump.

8 MR. BIGFORD: The we is us. The we  
9 is not our federal agencies with the --

10 MS. BORNHOLDT: No.

11 MR. BIGFORD: Maybe before elected  
12 or selected, I think that might give us  
13 more flexibility.

14 MS. CANTRAL: It's in the draft.

15 MS. BORNHOLDT: I would strongly  
16 encourage we stagger. We were lucky  
17 that -- Sarah was lucky to that point and  
18 it was continuity and Gwynne stepped up  
19 and transitioned correctly. We should  
20 consider how we stagger that appointment.  
21 That's important for continuity and also  
22 if Roddy and Sal were here they would say  
23 the same thing. That's -- but as a but,  
24 that's a newly-recognized tribe. They  
25 are trying to get their feet under them

1           and they would feel under them as well  
2           having all of a sudden two legs of the  
3           three-legged stool and help with the  
4           transition situation and to the extent we  
5           can stagger, then it would be a good  
6           idea.

7           MR. WALTERS: This addresses it but  
8           not the federal RPB members.

9           Are they in this for life?

10          MR. PABST: Executive orders don't  
11          go away.

12          MS. BORNHOLDT: They do.

13          MR. BIGFORD: Sometimes.

14          MR. WALTERS: That was my question.

15          MR. ATANGAN: Unlike the Cardinals,  
16          most of us are just about as gray as some  
17          of those guys, but that's up to your  
18          individual department. I'll see if I can  
19          clarify by the federal membership. The  
20          way it's written is that they are going  
21          to identify representatives to serve that  
22          agency. So my sense is that, you know,  
23          we are going to leave that up to each  
24          department to identify the path by which  
25          they are designated. I don't want to get

1           into the business of how they are going  
2           to select their representative. I think  
3           that's up to that -- that's an internal  
4           decision.

5           MR. WALTERS: In this organization,  
6           the Coast Guard is, by position, some --  
7           whomever is in my position is on this  
8           board. A couple years you get somebody  
9           else.

10          MR. ATANGAN: That's a -- that's  
11          unique to your individual agency and  
12          example, the other example that we have  
13          is what's already transpired with D.O.D.  
14          in the northeast in that the previous  
15          representative for the D.O.D., the  
16          northeast was Cheryl Barnett in David  
17          Noble's office. When she moved on the  
18          decision was made within D.O.D. to  
19          designate Chris Thompson, who is already  
20          up there and locally available.

21          So, he is now -- it didn't -- it  
22          was if the individual, they switched  
23          organizations based on what the D.O.D.  
24          required. That latitude needs to remain  
25          within the individual department.

1 MS. CANTRAL: What else do you need  
2 regarding the executive secretary?

3 MR. BIGFORD: Just to let Dave --  
4 serious thought to this over the last few  
5 months as it be -- Susan and I have given  
6 a lot of thought to it. The transfer  
7 process is underway. It's not the person  
8 in my position, it could be somebody  
9 else, but we would be glad to share to --  
10 but it might help.

11 MR. ATANGAN: I'm clear on this  
12 piece. So we will make it  
13 independently-elected, two-year term with  
14 the option for consecutive term.

15 Are we -- I guess we have to decide  
16 here, but provide me the inputs and the  
17 language you would like me to include in  
18 that thing and I'll include language that  
19 says we'll stagger the rotation to  
20 facilitate continuity. Moving on.

21 The attendees to the charter  
22 operation procedures, I think we heard  
23 from, certainly from the comments, that  
24 there is some -- we need to consider the  
25 fact we do need to have some established

1           procedures to codify. The  
2           decision-making and dispute resolution is  
3           identified perhaps in -- look at how  
4           adequate it is within its current form.  
5           If there is a level of specificity or  
6           procedures we need to employ, then please  
7           send me your inputs regarding making an  
8           additional appendix with regard to  
9           dispute resolution and decision-making  
10          and dispute resolution.

11                 One of the things highlighted was  
12          make -- identifying the relationship and  
13          clarifying the MARCO and RPB  
14          relationship. That's probably if there  
15          is a candidate or appendix that may be  
16          worth pursuing in there since we are  
17          relying on them for the portal and now  
18          the stakeholder liaison position and  
19          things like that. May be worth extending  
20          time and come up with an additional --  
21          MARCO and RPB relationship.

22                 MR. PABST: Not directly related to  
23          this, that -- another topic I think is  
24          right for operations and procedure. Who  
25          are the RPB members? If they can't sit

1 at the table, who sits at the table? So  
2 the delegations for each federal agency,  
3 we have some people in the state, but are  
4 not the official RPB member or we have to  
5 make sure our procedures accommodate that  
6 and we can proceed and we can't be  
7 challenged because of some breach in  
8 protocol that does not exist.

9 MS. SCHULTZ: I don't know if it's  
10 in here, but I would like to see a  
11 statement to the effect that we can add  
12 additional to-be-determined appendices in  
13 the future. Those things might come in  
14 that we are not aware of at that time.

15 MR. ATANGAN: I think I have -- I  
16 think I -- let me -- merit of the modify  
17 charter, develop --

18 That's a written amendment piece.  
19 I hear you. I hear you. There was a  
20 section in here, we were going to  
21 identify appendices. We were going to  
22 include you, don't need this, it may be  
23 to revise it. That, in general terms,  
24 title, this -- it -- we can make general  
25 statements that says, hey, we'll provide

1           appendices that define the following.

2           MS. CANTRAL: Any other questions  
3 you have to get people weighed in on?

4           MR. ATANGAN: I don't think I'm  
5 lacking in guidance at this point.

6           MR. RAMOS: I would add, maybe we  
7 don't want to specifically call out  
8 certain organizations, not say anything,  
9 not that they are doing any bad, then we  
10 are -- to it from then on forward. Allow  
11 those amendments to be made if we so  
12 choose to make those amendments which  
13 allow us to dissolve that relationship  
14 without having to revisit the entire  
15 charter.

16           MR. ATANGAN: Actually, that  
17 rationale is a reason why there is very  
18 few sitings of MARCO specific in the  
19 document as written. I think this is one  
20 section in which MARCO actually appears  
21 in and it's in the role of the executive  
22 secretariat specifically says we are  
23 going to communicate -- coordinate on a  
24 tactical established partnerships with  
25 existing regional such as --



1           So, you know, that was my wind of  
2           lucy-goosy way of giving flexibility and  
3           understand MARCO is a partner in this  
4           effort. I'm happy to take your answer  
5           and input which way you want to proceed.  
6           It's only pen and paper.

7           MS. SCHULTZ: What I would like to  
8           do is bring this issue back off to MARCO  
9           management board to understand if are  
10          there are things going to be doing for  
11          the RPB where the acknowledgment of the  
12          RPB is important to engaging people to  
13          soliciting funds and where we see that it  
14          would be good for that to be  
15          acknowledged.

16          So, I want to go with the board so  
17          I can understand should it be an  
18          appendices in the charter? Meeting  
19          minutes from these meetings? Yes, we  
20          endure it. I don't honestly know how  
21          formal or informal it should be, but  
22          ultimately getting the job done, what can  
23          help MARCO get work done with the RPB. I  
24          want to figure that out.

25          MS. CANTRAL: That would be the way

1 to get clarity on that particular point.

2 John, you have a comment?

3 MR. WALTERS: Back to the agency  
4 department issue on the bottom of page 6.  
5 Marine planning is a benefit guide agency  
6 slash department decision making and  
7 departments will adhere to the plan.

8 That implies advance of the plan up  
9 to the department level. Then the  
10 departments would have to issue some sort  
11 of guidance throughout --

12 MR. ATANGAN: Yes.

13 MR. WALTERS: -- requiring the  
14 agencies to comply with.

15 MR. ATANGAN: The reason that  
16 language was written that way is you have  
17 departments that are represented by  
18 specific agencies. Yet, within those  
19 departments like, you know, you have --

20 MS. BORNHOLDT: And then what's the  
21 other --

22 MS. CANTRAL: Mark services.

23 MR. ATANGAN: Whatever BOEM agrees  
24 to they are agreeing within the context  
25 of the RPB. They are agreeing for the

1 department and I think what was  
2 envisioned was that the department would  
3 then use that as policy throughout the  
4 department for the Park Services and  
5 other entities within that document to  
6 also comply with.

7 MR. WALTERS: We should clarify  
8 that through the NCCOS or our own chain  
9 of command the only pure agency that's  
10 here is E.P.A. That falls under no  
11 department.

12 MR. ATANGAN: I'm happy to say the  
13 department's an agency.

14 MS. BORNHOLDT: For me I'm one. It  
15 will -- we have few partners to  
16 coordinate and they are basically telling  
17 me I'll hopefully exercise common sense.  
18 But that's -- probably more flexibility.  
19 If we end up doing that it has  
20 implications of NOAA with its  
21 relationship with the Department of  
22 Commerce.

23 Talking about a fish out of water,  
24 in my federal career the struggle NOAA  
25 has nothing -- these are my mandates and

1 getting advise that does not necessarily  
2 advise I would hope we have interpreted.  
3 So if you need to get clearance up to  
4 D.H.S., but maybe perhaps we allow the  
5 rest of us to be able to navigate that in  
6 the bay, we always do using the culture.  
7 I would caution by getting perhaps -- I  
8 don't want to say exact, this is an  
9 exact, but let's not be too constrained  
10 by that intent there.

11 MR. ATANGAN: We are trying to  
12 parse out is what is the definition of an  
13 agency, you know. I think we are  
14 wrapping around the fact that just  
15 because you have an agency in your title  
16 does not make you the only agency. The  
17 use of agency in this context includes  
18 NOAA and the various organizations, the  
19 subsets of the department.

20 MS. CANTRAL: What I'm hearing  
21 about this discussion, leaving some  
22 opportunity for some flexibility to  
23 interpret in what is to accommodate  
24 the -- from the departments and agencies  
25 they are in are not independent agencies.

1 MS. CHYTALO: Just a few little  
2 things. With respect to the Mid-Atlantic  
3 fishery management council member, as far  
4 as I know I'm not aware of any tribal or  
5 local government officials on that  
6 council. So that would not be the draw  
7 area. It would be more since only  
8 government officials can be on this we  
9 would be drawn from the federal, state  
10 members, the other members of --  
11 sometimes other parties and like that.  
12 So I'm not aware of any -- so this is --  
13 just a clarification. They don't exist.

14 With respect to the ex-officio  
15 member, as of the discussion in here to  
16 some of the other groups, maybe if we do  
17 get clear guidance or recommendations on  
18 the ombudsman, that this is a portion  
19 that can be added here to the -- to the  
20 charter. That would be a good piece as  
21 long as we get the clarification is  
22 something we are going to move along,  
23 maybe make a recommendation, explore that  
24 possibility.

25 My third comment to do with local

1 government's participation, the states  
2 and tribe are going to be working with  
3 existing local entities to identify  
4 issues.

5 I'm trying to think of, you know.  
6 I mean there is going to be a lot of  
7 stakeholder sector outreach. I view that  
8 as another success for us, you know. The  
9 local -- they, you know, they want to  
10 maintain the fishing community. They  
11 want to maintain their -- their defense  
12 department in their neighborhood and that  
13 would be a key issue to them.

14 I don't know how -- I mean I'm  
15 trying to think of how the states would  
16 do that or if -- or should be entertained  
17 a little more thorough in that sector  
18 outreach group.

19 MR. ATANGAN: That's the reason why  
20 it's written the way it is. One of the  
21 things we learned in the northeast is  
22 that when you start looking at local  
23 government participation there is a big  
24 push for local government participation  
25 and the question was, well, this local

1 government is not representative of this  
2 local government. How to you pick and  
3 choose?

4 MS. CHYTALO: Uh-uh.

5 MR. ATANGAN: I think the approach  
6 can applied in the northeast now is to  
7 learn some of the state agencies is  
8 selecting with the local advisory groups.  
9 I don't know if that's happening in the  
10 Mid-Atlantic. That's an option.

11 Laura, her capacity as C.Z.M. has  
12 an issue and she taps a local group  
13 because it happens to apply to that. You  
14 know, that other issue that that would  
15 sound as an input from the local  
16 government into this body you have to be  
17 careful. We'll have local representation  
18 and we could easily get to the point you  
19 could see how difficult it is to manage  
20 this group of 23, now you get into bigger  
21 and bigger groups and it just becomes  
22 unmanageable.

23 MS. CHYTALO: I wouldn't advocate  
24 for local representation on this group,  
25 but I recommend it be considered a sector

1 of the state group.

2 MR. ATANGAN: I understand that,  
3 but again, there -- I think you would get  
4 a lot of push back I think from the  
5 locals themselves. There was a big  
6 outcry for local participation. We have  
7 not received it yet in this thing. We  
8 don't have any local officials. I'm  
9 sensitive what to what's happening in the  
10 northeast. You have a -- or from here  
11 and they were interested in getting local  
12 participation in this thing. I'm trying  
13 to think ahead and give flexibility to  
14 operate.

15 MS. COOKSEY: When we talked about  
16 local I was reminded of the G.C.C. which  
17 seems to have -- I don't know what's  
18 happening with that. There was a rep on  
19 the G.C.C. for local and we've gone down  
20 a lot. I'm wondering if -- and I have no  
21 answer to my question which is why I'm  
22 asking it. Does it make sense to  
23 reference the G.C.C. in our charter or  
24 just ignore them?

25 MR. ATANGAN: I don't know. I mean



1 I don't want to criticize the G.C.C. I  
2 have not had any exposure to what, you  
3 know -- what they've done lately. So, I  
4 don't know where they would fit within  
5 the structure. I'm open to if someone is  
6 more knowledgeable with regard to the  
7 G.C.C. and the how they can -- certainly  
8 welcome the input and something we should  
9 look at.

10 MS. CANTRAL: One suggestion. You  
11 don't necessarily need to write it in  
12 your charter, but exploring how the  
13 G.C.C. could be play a role that would be  
14 level helpful to you. That sounds like  
15 something worth exploring.

16 MS. SCHULTZ: One of our, I think  
17 our New York -- is -- and all, but George  
18 Stafford from New York who is the G.C.C.  
19 representative from Mid-Atlantic is also  
20 the alternate from the RPB and I would  
21 see an appropriate linkage having kind of  
22 him carrying the message from here to the  
23 G.C.C. and vice versa. I think maybe  
24 that's one of the more --

25 MS. CANTRAL: Laura?

1 MS. MCKAY: I kind of like what  
2 Karen was talking about in terms of  
3 looking at local governments and a  
4 stakeholder sector. In fact, I feel  
5 that's how we treated them in Virginia.  
6 Joe was with them for the ocean kickoff  
7 meeting we held in Richmond two years  
8 ago. The G.C.C. -- we are lucky in that  
9 we have a planning district and we rely  
10 on those planning district commissions to  
11 be our conduit to the 92 cities,  
12 communities and towns in the coastal zone  
13 that -- certainly work well in Virginia.  
14 Hopefully in other states, too. To the  
15 extent we have to do stakeholder  
16 engagement, state by state, pulling local  
17 government at the state level would be a  
18 good way to make sure their concerns are  
19 included.

20 MS. CANTRAL: Let me ask for  
21 clarification. Sounds like what you were  
22 describing is a way, could operationalize  
23 the language here in the charter.

24 MR. ATANGAN: The question is  
25 then -- is what I'm hearing then that

1 operationalized piece is an appendix or  
2 operation in the charter itself?

3 MS. MCKAY: Are you asking me?

4 MR. ATANGAN: Because --

5 MS. MCKAY: Are you saying -- I  
6 guess if we look at the language that's  
7 in the charter right now says RPB will  
8 provide mechanisms for meaningful local  
9 government input to the regional  
10 government through the state and local,  
11 tribal members.

12 MR. ATANGAN: That's what I'm  
13 asking. I feel like if this cover --  
14 this is a broad umbrella which this will  
15 fit under.

16 MS. MCKAY: Yeah. If there is  
17 additional detail we need to -- about how  
18 we do this, is it more appropriate? Do  
19 that as part of an appendix for here is  
20 how we are going to engage the local  
21 governments and means to do this or we go  
22 to expend the local government section  
23 charter to go into that --

24 MR. ATANGAN: Our preference would  
25 be the latter, to go into that detail in

1 an appendix.

2 MS. MCKAY: I'm not sure we need  
3 to.

4 MR. ATANGAN: Yeah. You agree with  
5 Mo, consensus.

6 MS. CANTRAL: All right. What  
7 else? Anyone else have any thoughts  
8 about this draft? Any input? Any advice  
9 for Joe?

10 Joe, what else do you need? You've  
11 got a time line of seven deadlines we are  
12 trying to meet. You need to revisit that  
13 too.

14 MR. ATANGAN: A lot depends on the  
15 specific inputs I received so I can  
16 factor into the draft. I -- you know,  
17 the way I operate I prefer to set  
18 deadlines. That way I can try to meet  
19 those marks as opposed to -- I'm going to  
20 wait until somebody gets an input and go  
21 around. I think it's important since  
22 this is a charter, essentially the lead  
23 document which this RPB will function. I  
24 think it's important to get it out sooner  
25 rather than later, which is why I'm

1           advocating for a broad, general, very  
2           flexible document that we can work with  
3           and still manage to work specifics that  
4           we are trying to attain.

5           So, my preference is to stick with  
6           the time line and I would rather be  
7           working towards that time line at this  
8           point and if it's late -- but you know,  
9           we can adjust that time line and folks no  
10          later on -- I think there as a driver I  
11          stick to that time line and urge you and  
12          your alternates and public to provide  
13          your inputs to me so I can factor those  
14          in. I do want you to know I didn't get  
15          an opportunity or fail to do so early on.  
16          I certainly didn't do this by myself. I  
17          want to thank the NOAA team, Darlene and  
18          Caesar and Tom because they really did  
19          provide comprehensive documents and  
20          certainly Gwynne and Sarah have been  
21          helpful. Doug and this group, as all you  
22          know, this has been a team effort and we  
23          wouldn't be -- I feel even though there  
24          is a lot of comments and work to be done.  
25          We are pretty far along when you consider

1           that I don't think we are supposed to be  
2           here at this point until November or so.

3           We are making good progress and the  
4           team effort certainly helps a lot on  
5           that. I want to thank you and your  
6           supporting crew for help to move this  
7           charter along and I look forward to your  
8           inputs and look for -- to getting this  
9           next version to you out the soonest.

10           MS. CANTRAL: Thank you for walking  
11           us through that and thanks for good input  
12           and Joe is standing by to hear more.

13           So, at this point I ask if there is  
14           any other thing? We are through our  
15           agenda to the point where we -- is there  
16           anything else we need to pick up before  
17           we wrap up and conclude this meeting?  
18           I'm asking a question and looking at the  
19           32 of our co-leads looking around the  
20           table. Are you ready to wrap up?

21           MR. RAMOS: There is -- comments  
22           have been made over the last couple days  
23           about participation and work groups set  
24           aside so to bring closure to that. Can  
25           we have those folks leading those groups?

1 Say I need two people to help me with X  
2 because without that I don't see how you  
3 are going to get participation.

4 MS. SCHULTZ: What I was hoping to  
5 do was revisit some of the work groups to  
6 see if there -- the way they are  
7 currently structured, their missions are  
8 still what we want and then that, because  
9 I think that's key. So maybe not  
10 existing work groups, but how do we  
11 structure what are they working on and  
12 what kinds of support do they need to  
13 accomplish their perspective?

14 MR. RAMOS: I'm fine as long as we  
15 have some process laid out. I don't want  
16 to come back and say we did all this work  
17 but only seven people helped out. That  
18 ends today is what I'm trying to get at.  
19 I'm not one of those seven. That's part  
20 of the reason why I'm asking. I know I'm  
21 not one of those seven.

22 MS. CANTRAL: So I would like to  
23 put a point on that, finer point on that.  
24 You have scheduled conference calls, but  
25 a proposal coming from the co-leads,

1 putting co-leads on the spot here --  
2 sorry co-leads -- about what the  
3 structure should be and expectations for  
4 the work groups so that people like Pedro  
5 know what the leads are or -- and others  
6 that have been playing a very active role  
7 in the existing work groups can  
8 contribute to helping understand what  
9 needs are -- need to be filled.

10 So, in the absence of having that  
11 discussion right now I don't think you  
12 are quite ready to have, as Gwynne said,  
13 needs to be conceptualizing what is this  
14 next phase of the work and how to break  
15 down the work and share a load and asking  
16 for volunteers and signing up volunteers.  
17 Okay?

18 MR. BIGFORD: I think that's a  
19 really good next step. Talk about it  
20 several different ways today, identify  
21 the tags that need to be tackled to  
22 identify staff to meet those tasks and  
23 complete them and also put us in a better  
24 position to decide to determine how much  
25 money we need, going to C.G.G. or



1 departments or to whoever to get the  
2 support. Good first step answering a lot  
3 of questions I heard during the day. We  
4 need to do it soon to get on marshaling  
5 the extra people.

6 MS. CANTRAL: Let's consider that  
7 the first and last of next steps and  
8 summary of outcomes from this meeting.  
9 It's important and it cuts across  
10 everything else including accomplishments  
11 you made in this meeting, which you've  
12 done a lot of great work in this meeting  
13 and we commend you for that.

14 Just taking a look at the  
15 objectives laid out you touched and made  
16 on all and made progress. I would not do  
17 justice in this our trying to summarize  
18 on all of the good work you did. Talk  
19 about the approach process and a time  
20 line for refining goals for identifying a  
21 geographic focus for now with the  
22 flexibility you'll need to consider as  
23 things evolve. There are next steps,  
24 have been identified in a very short  
25 order for furthering the progression of

1 goals development and ready to engage  
2 stakeholders starting with Greg getting  
3 together just right after this meeting  
4 and being ready for a discussion at the  
5 next working session, the RPB which is  
6 scheduled for October which is a standing  
7 working group has.

8 You also talked about number of  
9 ideas for regularly engaging and  
10 meaningful engagement stakeholders  
11 through all of the steps of the planning  
12 process and in particular our support of  
13 the offer made by MARCO to further  
14 develop the concept they presented to  
15 create a stakeholder liaison committee to  
16 provide a mechanism and there are others  
17 that have been suggested by stakeholders  
18 today and offered around the table so the  
19 suite of those activities are to be  
20 further developed.

21 A good discussion about the charter  
22 and identifying next steps to refine the  
23 places where there was still outstanding  
24 questions and you are engaged and invited  
25 to continue to send your input into Joe

1           who has set deadlines for himself and  
2           hopefully all of you to finalize that  
3           over the next few weeks.

4                     With regard to the MARCO data  
5           portal, another offer from MARCO has met  
6           with recent activity with the region  
7           planning body to take advantage of the  
8           tool that is -- and all of the great  
9           information provided there to inform the  
10          planning process.

11                    Again, recognizing the evolutionary  
12          nature of all of this and there is a  
13          better understanding what data needs are  
14          and where that is matching up and if  
15          there are places where it's not what do  
16          you do about that.

17                    And that discussion also included  
18          some concern of what you want to see in a  
19          regional ocean assessment and a balancing  
20          of the realistic and the capacity that's  
21          available to get started on that, setting  
22          it up to go -- to be something that could  
23          be a living -- living document, a living  
24          body of information that is closely  
25          whetted is you actually what you want to

1 do. Another example, figure out what you  
2 wouldn't do and you need the assessment  
3 and that's part of the fun of this.

4 So, what did I miss?

5 Good job, guys. Thank you. Thank  
6 you to all of you for sticking it out to  
7 the very end with us, this group and for  
8 your input and participation and I'll  
9 call it a wrap. Meeting adjourned.

10 (Whereupon, the witness was  
11 excused and the proceeding was  
12 concluded at 4:30 p.m.)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25