

This transcript of the January 21-22, 2015 Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body meeting was developed by a third party court reporter and has not been reviewed or edited for mistakes or clarity. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body and Meridian Institute cannot verify the accuracy of its content.

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

January 22, 2015

9:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Jacob K. Javits Federal Building

26 Federal Plaza

New York, New York 10278

Laura Cantral: It's good to see you back for day two of this RPB meeting . We had really good discussions yesterday and I think we are poised to make good progress on a number of fronts today because we have some important work to do. As you recall, yesterday, we had some discussion about the proposed Ocean Action Plan approach. With a number of updates we heard from New

York, from MARCO regarding stakeholder engagement and tribal engagement. We heard about the progress and the path forward for the Regional Ocean Assessment. And we had the helpful public comment which we will do again today. So topics for further consideration today include coming back to the proposed approach for the

Ocean Action Plan and seeking approval of that approach. We want to explore potential opportunities and actions for interjurisdictional coordination. We're going to hear about data analysis and decision support tools that the RPB may want to know about and consider whether it should explore the viability of using some of those tools to support ocean planning. And we need to talk in some detail about what is next. The development of a workplan, the nature of work flows and work groups organized around those work flows, coming back to our discussion from yesterday. Talking about stakeholder engagement now in the context of RPB work.

We heard about it in the context of what MARCO is supporting yesterday. Making sure we have clarity about how to proceed with interjurisdictional coordination IDC work that needs to move forward. And indeed, really the entire apparatus of this process-and the timing related to hearing out all that work.

I listed those topics for today in that particular order quite intentionally. The co-leads in some reflection and thinking about what we need to accomplish today are suggesting that we rearrange the order in which we are going to take up some of those topics today. I think we all believe though, perhaps a more elegant way to move through our discussions to be more efficient between and among some concepts that are important for us to have in mind as we go through the discussions.

So, here's what we propose. We have a slide. I'm sorry we don't have copies. We don't have the ability to

make copies here. We will keep this slide up as much as we can. Unless we have other presentations but as you can see we are little bit behind schedule but we are right here at the welcome back and agenda review. In a moment we are going right into the discussion of the OAP proposed approach and seek approval of that.

Here is when we change things up a little bit. We will move right into the interjurisdictional coordination opportunities and next steps. Will take a break and come back at 11:00am for a panel discussion about data and analysis tools. That will take us up too lunch. We will come back and if we need to continue the discussion about IJC or anything else we need to take care of, then we will have some time to do that. Then we go right into the discussion at about 2 o'clock. The workflows, as I said picking up on the ROA, stakeholder engagement and other things related to the development of the Ocean Action Plan. Not to belabor this too much more but, I think there are several good reasons to make this agenda adjustment.

Starting today with the OAP approval and then going right into a discussion about the IJC is a nice flow. It's the how of the OAP. It is a discussion that many of you have talked about and this will give you an opportunity to get right into that including some discussion about criteria that you need to be comfortable with, as something that is going to guide how you make decisions about things you want to focus on.

Then it is our sense, the co-leads sense, that there was a lot of important concepts in the context of the ROA that really needed some more discussion of some of the other components of the OAP to come back and revisit what you want to do with the Regional Ocean Assessment and be really clear about that in the context of the workflow. That's why we're suggesting streamlining as a way to get through the day. Alright?

So, with that let's move right into the proposed approach for the Ocean Action Plan. Let me just offer a couple of reminders. What we are asking of you here in this session is your support for this general approach and we've heard several expressions of that support yesterday. That support needs to include your understanding that there are still details that need to be worked out regarding the different components of the OAP. We have described the OAP as the overall structure. There are component parts that include the goals and objective, interjurisdictional information, data analysis and decision making tools, the content of the Regional Ocean Assessment. All informed by stakeholder engagement, some criteria and fundamentally the interests that the member entities bring with them to the table.

We just put up a graphic that we hope helps you conceptualize how these different components fit together, the elements of a Regional Ocean Action Plan. We start with goals and objectives. For healthy ocean ecosystems. That guides everything. Including the development of the Regional Ocean Assessment.

Whatever additional analysis you decide you need and can support, and how those two fit together remains to be seen. They feed into the member interests that you bring with you to the table, from your entities and your states; informed by stakeholder input. The criteria that will help you make decisions on what you need to focus on to get started iteratively as it goes forward. That all informs the selection of interjurisdictional coordination opportunities. Both region wide and also the selection of some specific geographic areas that lend themselves to some particular focus. All of that is the Ocean Action Plan. We thought it would be helpful to put that all into some context and we hope that helps.

So, again, be mindful that we had a lot of discussion yesterday about the proposed approach and we had some good points. We had verification of some of the questions folks had. We heard several people expressing support for the approach. I want to open it up now to see if there are

any other things that people have on their minds that you want to raise at this time and see if we are ready to seek approval.

Everyone feeling comfortable with that proposed approach?

I am seeing heads nod. I'm saying, is this group ready to make a decision that you are supportive to make a decision about the proposed Ocean Action Plan?

All Members: Yes

Laura Cantral: Okay. Duly noted. You have approved the OAP approach. Congratulations. Good step forward. Feels good? Alright. Like that. Good way to start the morning. So that will get us back on schedule. All right, so I think having an approach to work with now, let's get into some of the nuts and bolts and let's start by talking about interjurisdictional coordination.

We have a document that outlines the proposed process and propose criteria and present some examples that are purely examples to illustrate and Deerin make your way up to help us to

facilitate this discussion and facilitate some ideas for discussion. While you are getting yourself settled, I will call on Joe who wants to include a comment.

Joe Antangan: Before we get too deep into IJC, I want to take the opportunity to introduce someone who will be a key representative of an organization that is going to be key to the overall interjurisdictional coordination discussion. Jim Haggerty, who is the Regulatory Program Manager for the Army Core of Engineers, North Atlantic Division. Some of you folks know him here and some of the folks in the audience may know him but we want you to know up front that we recognize that this is a key component to the overall discussion and they will be very much part of this whole process. Thanks for being here.

Deerin Babb-Brott: Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to speak to this. I was chomping at the bit yesterday afternoon as I was telling Laura, as you were

having a wholesome conversation about where we are going and how does this fit together and what happens next because this is really a fun way of diving into things. So yesterday afternoon was a great discussion and it was done beautifully and there is a lot of great things to talk about. Hopefully, I can help start this with a brief presentation here on the IJC. On interjurisdictional coordination. Diving in and setting context.

What is IJC? One way that I think about it is the goals and objectives describe what the RPB wants to accomplish. The Regional Ocean Assessment is context for "why" and the interjurisdictional coordination as Bob said yesterday is the "how" and these are the tools and the mechanics. This is simply how the RPB can organize and then use the resources and instruments associated with the existing authority's representative around the table to achieve the kind of things that are reflected in, particularly, the goals and objectives. So going to a more specific definition. IJC are those actions that RPB entities will take to address the four categories that the RPB we've described and developed in the

working group. Inform and improve management, improve the use of information for environmental and regulatory review, identify and address research needs and leverage resources. Four essential buckets for the kinds of authorities and the things that RPB entities to do.

Just briefly, we will talk more about examples but heading into the conversation, I thought it would be helpful to put a couple of things up so we are looking at the subsequent materials and the common starting point just a couple of generic examples for the potential actions of the IJC actions. An action region wide would be to prioritize research needs, identifying programs for resources that can be leveraged to address them. It can be specified by topic, issue, geography, agencies participating, timeline, by however to serve the general component. This is an example of a specific action that the RPB that can commit to that to address a specific thing.

For the geographic specific area in the presentation on the many uses, that coexist in the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay. In talking to the Coast Guard folks, I understand that there are shoals that move and encroach and have the potential to affect how the coast guard thinks about its navigation responsibilities, which could also effect how Navy considers how egrets from the Chesapeake Bay to how other folks think about things. So a specific IJC action in that context could be a bunch of agencies around the table, each of whom have a piece of both the science that would go into characterizing what is going on with that resource and how it is behaving and what the implications are. So focus on that. Work together to develop the data, to characterize what is happening with the shore. Think about the management of locations and then, if it is Coast Guard and Navy and somebody else thinking about how you want to consider alternative navigations or whatever. I am not pretending to be an expert on what the issue is but just as an example of a specific way that you

can focus on a component on a geographic area to solve a problem or something that is challenging that is management.

How would IJC actions be developed is essentially a summary in a short form of the proposed workflow that is listed in the meeting materials. RPB entities and stakeholders identify region wide opportunities. A note on the nomenclature. Opportunities is a sunnier word for issues of interest or importance in the region that the RPB chooses to address. So, opportunities and issues are interchangeable terms. Opportunities would be identified in conversation with RPB entities, with stakeholder input. The source material for what the region wants to address and how individual RPB member entities want to achieve wholesome objectives are going to be a component of the specific interests each of you bring to that and the things that you do individually and the organizations you represent want to accomplish through the planning process.

So there will be a collection of information process associated with identifying the range of potential things the RPB could address. Then could be triaged to subsequent analysis and discussion by you to identify to what you feel you can get your arms around meaningfully and want to put forward as your first line of work. These opportunities as we described earlier are or organized around the four categories.

Based on a larger collection of information, the RPB can through the process of identifying those that they feel can be best addressed by focusing on a specific geographic area; subject to considerations that we will talk a little bit about. As those larger opportunities or issues are being considered, specific actions will be developed. This is and this will characterize additional conversation that characterizes the whole process. This is both a sequential but also a feedback loop to find process. As agencies and tribes and states, as the RPB entities are considered potential opportunities out there, you are naturally thinking at the same time

about what it would take to fix it. What we have been talking about how we can fix that? Which is trending towards action?

So as you are considering the larger group of opportunities, you are already going to be thinking about potential actions so it is sequential because we are going to look at opportunities and the RPB will assess those and then do the same with specific actions. But it is also all rolled up together. So, don't necessarily think about it as a fragmented iterative process.

Then last, and really a focus of the discussion of the presentation to follow is "decision criteria". Supporting discussion at each step. I would stop there for a moment. The importance of decision criteria are to frame and guide the analysis and the RPB's discussion. It is to provide consistency and transparency in a common starting point for the RPB, stakeholder or anyone who is engaged in the

process. At the same time decision criteria, I would offer, should not be inflexible and a very specific thing that you take information or discussion and push it through the filter and you accept what comes out at the other end. The decision criteria essentially represent common sense, logical values and interests that the RPB will have. In thinking about how to address the world around you right? So, certain criteria are important and they will guide and will support the ability of the entire RPB and its larger audience to have a common and similar conversation but I would encourage the RPB not to consider decision criteria to be fixed in stone, decided now, the seal of approval not to be modified down the road. Things change over time. The RPB is going to be learning more things over time as data products are developed and stakeholders bring more information to the table. As the common discussion around the table educates the RPB collectively about things that they are learning from their partner member institutions. Those may need to be reflected down the road in a different way. The RPB may decide that there is a new way they want to think

about this. If they want to see that reflected in another kind of decision criteria. So certain criteria are important, they matter. Use them carefully with caution and respect. That is what I would say.

So, I will walk briefly through a linear progression that has goals and objectives to IJC actions as a way of characterizing how those decision criteria could operate. Goals and objectives have been developed and approved and they are reflected in the text. I just sought of teased them out in a slightly different way than representing them as they are in the goals and objectives. They are fundamentally the same. I believe we can come back if there is a point of discussion. But the point here is that there are goals and objectives on the table. From goals and objectives then the process will move to identify a region wide opportunity. RPB entities and stakeholder input will look at what they want to accomplish broadly through the plan.

Potential criteria associated with that analysis and that discussion are: Do potential actions serve to achieve the framework, principles, goals and objectives. Are they foundational, related to the core authorities? Are they interdisciplinary or interjurisdictional? Do they advance the core interest of multiple RPB entities? Or do they by their nature cross-cut in terms of the number of interests and agencies that need to cooperate or collaborate to address an ambition. Are they regional in nature or are they policy priorities for RPB member entities or stakeholders. Just a series of sort of basic characteristics that, I think, these may not be the way an RPB member might express them. And there certainly may be others and could be part of the discussion. But I think generally everyone around the table is going to come to this kind of list as you think about, how do we want to characterize those things that are important to focus on. Associated with then, region-wide opportunities or geographic specific opportunities. Potential criteria associated with geographic opportunities to include: Do they have the potential to demonstrate progress on

region-wide RPB opportunities. The concept of piloting solutions or approaches or new scientific techniques associated with eco-system based management. Or a new way of implementing an agency mission. We have the opportunity to think about "maybe we can't tackle this issue broadly across the region, but maybe if we think about it in this specific place or if a member entity says, In our specific place, we want to focus on this kind of thing because we volunteer" so that is another and these have been in play in the meeting, RPB, for a while. Areas of distinct and ecological value, similar for social economic value. Or like the mouth of the Chesapeake area where you have current potential, multiple uses, potential for conflict, opportunity to use information and collaboration to assist in management.

So, then having identified region-wide and geographically specific opportunities, developed by IJC actions. So, based on the kind of conversation and

emerging materials which will have been occurring as region-wide geographic specific opportunities have been or are in the process of being discussed. Then begin the process of listing and formalized what the potential things that we can actually can do. The nuts and bolts that we the following three agencies for this thing. Four agencies for this thing. How do they get very specific and potential criteria to assist in triaging and developing those actions? Do they serve to achieve goals and objectives? Always coming to that framework of goals and objectives as the common foundational material. Are they achievable within limitations? Within the planning horizon. We will have a list of things that are important and many people will feel are necessary to do.

Then there is the process of giving it a hard look. And looking across the resources available, commitments within the agencies or other entities in making decisions about whether or not we can pull this off. IJC action that is determined to be perhaps more ambitious, than current resources would allow doesn't need to fall off the face of the earth. It can go into a parking lot which is

comprised of a list of recommendations for Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Action Plan Version II. Or it can inform the scientific priority list associated with the Regional Ocean Assessment- if there is such a creature. So it is all good information. But the RPB will go through that triaging process saying "this is what we can do now." Lead to an improvement in process and/or outcome over current practice. Again it advances member entity missions and/or stakeholder interests under existing authorities and it leverages existing programs, processes, and/or resources. A pretty common sense approach about how do we think intelligently about the universal potential and narrowing that down to what we want to focus on and commit ourselves individually and collectively too in order to achieve.

Brief examples region-wide and then I will do a brief one for geographic specific. Then I will be done. One of the goals and objectives of a healthy ecosystem is to

improve understanding of changes occurring in the regional ecosystem. A region-wide opportunity, focus collaborative efforts of RPB agencies to address key/priority region-wide data/research needs.

Develop more specificity associated with topic or agencies of that kind of thing. It gives you the sense of how you drive out a goal and objective a more specific thing. The action associated with that implement, that focus of collaborative efforts. Prioritize research needs and leverage existing programs specific to whatever thing that has been described. Second could be integrate assessments of climate change impacts to commercially and recreationally important species and incorporate that into OAP/ROA updates or revisions over time. Essentially, the RPB affirmatively describing how the development and subsequent incorporation of information should occur. So it is a very specific thing. Geographically Specific Examples: Improve management effectiveness, minimize conflicts, support regional economic growth. We talked about the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay,

Delaware Bay, and/or similar areas. The point is just to represent a place where there is a lot going on. Specific actions: Agencies collaborate to determine migration rate of the encroaching shoals at Northeastern and Southeastern navigation channels

Identify and address data and/or procedural challenges associated with management interactions among specific uses/situations identified by the RPB, existing management entities, and/or stakeholders. Is there a component on how the Coast Guard looks at navigation? Specifically how they interact with Navy management over navigational traffic. Or the protocols that they establish. Is there a thing there that new information developed in the context of the OAP and the ability to collaborate in a new and more effective way by sitting around the table here can solve/address both of their interests.

So that is a fairly whirlwind tour through. I'm happy to be here as a resource as you continue the conversation. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Deerin, and just stay there, I think you will be an essential part of the discussion. I see tents going up, some people have thoughts they want to share. Let me underscore a couple of things.

First of all there is a work crew that has been working with Deerin, with the co-leads and the facilitation team. They have put this together for Deerin to present to you. It is poised to move forward in the manner that we will talk about to get some reactions from you about both during this session and then this afternoon session when we talk about the work plan it workflows. So workgroup members and John is with us at the table because he is one of the people in the workgroup representing NOAA. Think about the kinds of questions you have for the group or things that you want to interject that would be helpful to move this dialogue

along. Deerin, I invite you to do the same. Deerin, we invite you to do the same.

What we are really interested in, we are interested in all of your ideas. This group has put together a proposed approach as outlined by Deerin. Some proposed criteria that we would suggest that needs some real thought and discussion. The closer we can get to walking away from this meeting with a sense of comfort that those common sense guidelines are something you are comfortable with; the better. Because, we are not going to have time to do that kind of rigorous approach Deerin was describing. Also, having a formal approval. It will need to be more organic than that. I think that that is something you can embrace. We want to hear from you about that. The final thing that I want to say underscores Deerin's point about the examples. They are just examples to illustrate examples. There is a risk in writing down examples because it gives them more credence than they deserve to have. They are just to help

you conceptualize and to serve for illustration purposes. That is a caveat. So let's open it up for discussion and I will go to our co-lead first, then Joe and then hear what other people thought about that.

Bob LaBelle: Thanks Darren. You make it sound so simple. When I read this stuff, it doesn't seem so simple but I think this has been very helpful and I want to point out a couple comments to start the ball rolling here in this robust discussion. I love the research one because that informs that only the ocean health but also sustainable use goal. I will just point out that if the RPB were to endorse the set of research needs or recommendations that would help individual funding agencies in terms of prioritizing what they're going to front. Don't underestimate our ability to influence what gets done out there.

Secondly, the decision criteria, you made a good point

about how it's a guideline and it should be kept flexible. I can certainly envision instances where something that didn't pass muster the first time, went back to the RPB as an idea, using principles of adaptive management which most agencies do not all use. For example, there's a project under consideration for permitting, on its face it may not be approved but with sufficient monitoring and mitigation and adaptive management feedback that sometimes includes research, the project becomes something that can be done with appropriate mitigation. At that point it could be back as decision criteria and pass muster. I want to endorse the idea having decision criteria be sort of like an open corral fence. Where ideas can come in but not necessarily be excluded on the fence. That was my personal point.

Joe Atangan: So I want to piggyback a little bit on the decision criteria, the overall flow makes great sense. The logic makes sense. But to me, that decision criteria is

absolutely critical. What concerns me a little bit is that there is a fine line between flexible and fluid. I think in order to get, I think it's important that the decision criteria be well understood and that whatever changes to the criteria are well-publicized so that the folks that are having to live with the consequences of whatever actions understand what went into the changes or what led to the changes to that decision criteria. Part of the whole RPB thing, to me, is the importance of it was, the reason for the portal is that everybody understands the data that is going in. Everybody will understand the analysis that goes in. Hopefully, in the end, understand the conclusions that come out of it.

What worries me about flexible criteria is you have folks that have to live with the decisions that the RPB and the regulatory bodies made but if that decision criteria is not well-publicized or not well understood that we will end up meeting with a lot of resistance in the implementation of those decisions.

So, yes, I agree with flexible but in that process, it has to be well-publicized and what goes into making those changes has to be

well understood because there science that comes out all the time but is not always validated science. We cannot alter the decision criteria because this new study which will later be debunked by a new study, which can be reversed by yet another study, we end up chasing the kill and I think I can be very confusing for the folks who have to live with the decisions that are made by this tiny body of regulatory body.

Karen Chytalo: Thank you, Deerin, for giving us more of an explanation because I have found it very hard to have my head around it, to be blunt. As to the activities that can be done, I guess I get concerned with, since we are on the Ocean Action Plan, the functions of what each group would do. I see this group coming up with criteria but how we end up with the criteria that will be approved by the

RPB, but then making those decisions as to what actions or activities flow to the top, where do those decisions get made? I'm trying to figure out the work of the IJC group. Are you going to do that? Are we going to do that? Are we all here? I cannot put my head, where do those decisions get made?

Laura Cantral: I will take a shot at that. So the major decisions get made by this group, you are the major decision group for the purposes of this regional ocean planning exercise. The IJC workgroup and any other workgroups that have a charge in admission to execute, including the OAP, you have done the work of developing a proposed approach that got approved. So one of the things that we need to talk about and we will this afternoon is, what is the next assignment for the group, maybe with adjustments and membership, maybe not. We've got some ideas about that that we will present as part of that discussion this afternoon. The mechanics of the operation here is that you break into some workgroups, and come up with ideas that you then present for

consideration by the full RPB which makes decisions on it based on some criteria.

The IJC workgroup views the criteria as a development as an example has proposed some potential criteria for you all to consider using, endorsing, as for use flexibly in deciding what opportunities you want to focus on and then having decided, here are some places you want to start. These are important opportunities that we think we can make a difference on. Now let's identify some actions that can be taken to address those opportunities. So there is back-and-forth between the program, the context of the IJC and other things that are happening with this body. But you all are the ones that are making the decisions about that.

Laura Cantral: Co-leads, would you like to add anything about that, that is a more procedural question. Does that answer the question?

Karen Chytalo: Yes, thank you

Gwynne Schultz: The way I have been looking at this process, is the ultimate outcome that we can be proactive in looking at the processes, procedures and needs and entities to be more effective and more efficient. I got a little confused, Bob with your example of a project that was permitting a regulatory scheme and adapting and we could improve it. That got me a little scared because that got me into a project. I do not think that was what we were doing. If you could take a minute to talk about that.

Bob LaBelle: Sure. I think, I will stick to wind energy. If there are projects to be built out there, there will be a lot of decisions made, there are a lot of guidelines. It must be specific technology and follow best management practices. Depending on the living resources involved, there will be a lot of consultation involved between the agencies, to the extent that that particular project will be a harbinger of things to come, or projects along

those lines, it sort of fits into the region-wide. And I think it is appropriate for the RPB to be discussing and participating in what happens in the federal waters off the Mid-Atlantic. To the extent that we can come up with, monitoring and mitigation approaches through adaptive management is something that the RPB could easily weigh in on in terms of whether they feel it is helpful. It would be a project that is sort of leading to others, sort of like the way this flows back up to the regions.

Deerin Babb-Brott: Bob, would it be accurate to characterize that in the context of the specific IJC action towards them both as the RPB says as an action, agencies identify, collaborate or the agencies identify potential opportunities to assess and you could have it be more careful or less careful, in terms of jumping in and telling agencies to do something that the IJC action is agencies collaborate to identify the best practices to offshore wind

energy development in the context of adaptive management.

Bob LaBelle: Sure. Or collaborate them through consultations and more informed ways

Laura Cantral: I think one way to pick up a part of Gwynne's concern, is that way of characterizing a potential opportunity to identify an action on. It is not specific to a project because this body is not going to be getting in the business of specific projects and maybe that was part of your concern, Gwynne.

Laura Cantral: Let's go to Mike and that Kelsey.

Mike Luisi: That may have just helped answer, I was trying to think of how to best address this question since I turned on my card there. So maybe I will just throw it out there to the group and get some feedback. A couple of years ago the Mid-

Atlantic Council began a process to develop a strategic plan. We worked very hard along with all of the members of the Council and stakeholders to develop this plan. Through the development, research needs were identified. We were working closely with our statistical and science committee to determine what projects, what works need to be done in coordination with NOAA and researchers along the Atlantic coast and the Mid-Atlantic region to help develop the necessary information for fisheries managers who make decisions on fish stocks. And how to factor in the ecosystem dynamics to how we manage other species moving in the direction for ecosystem-based fisheries management.

So as I'm sitting here, listening to this identifying research needs, this approach, with the IJC. Organizations coming together and perhaps prioritizing research needs based on this body, my question to the group and I know that there are some of you who have thought much longer

and harder about this IJC work that we will do but how's this, how do you envision this impacting things that my group, that I represent, has already done. If all the sudden priorities change as a result of the work of this body and certain research is not done as we have already tried to established in our strategic planning, that is a question that I would like to have some answer to because I will have to explain that to the people when they start seeing that efforts are being put elsewhere rather than what has already been set up as far as our five-year approach. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Do you want to take that Deerin?

Deerin Babb-Brott: I will offer one example in response, I guess two things. The first is that the principle, to me anyway, the first principle is the Hippocratic Oath. Do no harm to that which has been constructed as a result of any member entities great work out there, good and diligent hard work overtime fulfilling their

own obligations under their authorities in their own sovereign area. So that establishes a principle of non-conflict.

Secondly, and the specific example is in the effective decision-making report, that was published by the Northeast Regional Planning Body, which reflects similar kind of discussion and analysis for getting specific actions that agencies can take to advance their goals and objectives, under section which is really just under the section, it is just talking about the states, essentially saying, look, states have spent a lot of time and energy out there developing either under their CZMP or under a state Ocean Action Plan, whatever it is, their approach to the world which expresses the values of that state, of that place and all of the lives that make that up, it also is characterized specifically by specific decisions, data sources, data approaches, and data characterizations that are used there. It is the obligation of the regional planning body to develop a plan which will

relate to those individual state efforts. The report says. It is the obligation of the RPB to be consistent with those things that have already been articulated. And are represented by any kind of existing management effort, whether it is the state, fishery management council, national science foundation, 10 year projection, those things to me will be raw materials which the ROA the RPB could instruct a plan to evaluate and consider as existing resources to be enhanced, leveraged and use that process, that opportunity to move those existing priorities that you reference for example, forward, it is an opportunity for a tailwind, it should absolutely not be a situation where you are trying to compare apples to apples and shove a square peg in a round hole. Because you already have a thing out there that represents, very well, what needs to be represented in a different context.

Laura Cantral: Mike, just to add to what Deerin said and point you to page 4 on in the IJC document, where it list the potential criteria being proposed by the IJC workgroup in this

document. The placeholder for what Deerin just said with shorthand in the context of the Mid-Atlantic work is this last bullet, leverage existing programs, processes and resources.

Let's go down the line around the corner here and take Kelsey, Doug and then Liz and Joe.

Kelsey Leonard: I apologize in advance if you have already mentioned this, I want to clarify this question. For the criteria listed for each of the both areas. For example, Region wide IJC opportunities. Do we have to meet all of those criteria and opportunities or just one?

Deerin Babb-Brott: It's a great question and have had some of this conversation that has already occurred. It's a decision for the RPB in terms of what they want a

relationship with the use of decision criteria to be. It could be employed on one end of the spectrum as a checklist. In order to be certain that you are looking at everything critically you want to check every box. On the other side is these represent values and interests that reasonable people would want to consider before making a decision. And while a proposed action might not meet one of them it would address the other four. It is compelling for those reasons to move forward with. I offered that you are all at the table because of your professional capacity and with that comes the ability and responsibility to exercise professional judgment. Joe I think this gets to your point. There is that fine line. Fluid versus flexible. But each of you has the capacity to represent the organizations which do this all the time. This is what you do. I see them more as clear and direct guidance but that shouldn't be an absolute, you need to check every single box.

Laura Cantral: Doug, before I go to you I want to offer this for everyone to think about as we hear from the next few people.

So far we've heard some comments expressing comfort with the proposed approach that is logical and make sense. I want to hear more about that. Are you comfortable with the approach. Do you have questions and what are you confused about. Just make sure that we are really clear that you are supportive of this approach moving forward and if not we need to hear about the too.

And then, I want to come back to the question Kelsey is asking about criteria. I want us to really focus on that too and look up what is proposed here and have some good discussion about it. Does it make sense? Are you comfortable with this fixable approach the way we are talking about it? Some people indicated that they are. Are we really intentional about those two aspects of this discussion. We still have some time in the session before we stopped to take a break. We'll see how far we can get before we wrap up in about 45 minutes.

Doug Pabst: Thank you Deerin, this is not an easy task. I just wanted more clarification. I am on the workgroup so I'm not going to offer an opinion about that. There is no right or wrong place to start. You can start at the top, bottom, middle.

To me the major objective here is to really start taking an example and see what might come out of it. From EPA's perspective, I think this is one of the more exciting parts. This is where we want to memorialize the change, the change in our business practice years from now many of us may not be in this particular function but yet that we want this more memorialized in doing things smarter and working together better. This machine is supposed to turn out what is going to be different as a result of this process. I think that's one of the critical parts of this. It will be iterative and circular but we might develop SOP's within our agency or with other agencies. This is really thought of doing things better and smarter. So people really understand, this is from one federal agency perspective, what we would want to take back

and recommend and institutionalize those recommendations.

Elizabeth Semple: I think it's great and it's logical. I'd like see the diagram that was put up this morning from the overall assessment and plan. I would like to see that integrated or incorporated so we can see how the whole piece fits together. Wearing my state hat, I have to move beyond kumbaya and say that this makes me a little bit is about talking about decision-making . The RPB versus regulatory planning. While we have common sense and I think we can really clearly says that I know this is at every meeting and every document the existing authorities are there. I think it's not just state missions. Its regulatory requirements. The power and authority is not being redirected. If it makes sense for us all to work together. We just have to be cautious the people that are not in this room are not put off by the works that we do.

Laura Cantral: It's a good reminder that we need to have the appropriate qualifiers and caveats

Deerin Babb-Brott: Just very briefly, perhaps a better articulation that the decision-making being her friend is not decision-making in any kind of actual management contacts. It is what kind of things does the RPB want to address through its actions which then tumble into everything that you just described fundamentally, respect existing authorities.

Laura Cantral: Sarah.

Sarah Cooksey: With your approval, I guess the co-chairs approval. I have several questions that might take a few minutes, if that is all right. First, this is very good. A lot of things to think about these are sort of specific. I am curious as to why listed under the specific geographic area criteria, the middle part of the page,

why not significant ecological or social logical values nested under the regional. Why have you called out, these criteria for regional and specific could and should be together. Did the work group discuss that?

Ingrid Irigoyen: It might be helpful to note that in the OAP workgroup, which really started to focus on potential criteria for geographic, identifying specific geographic areas. These criteria emerged in those discussions. So I think that explains the separation of these two. What we have started to consider different flows. There is no reason, I would suggest that you can all do some merging and move things around into different criteria.

Sarah Cooksey: Thank you. I am thinking back to Greg's comments yesterday. Picking what is most important and certainly the way our goals are set up, the

ecological and socioeconomic value are important.

Deerin Babb-Brott: Sarah, just very briefly. I think the rationale as it is written here is an expectation that by referencing that it needs to be consistent with and serve to achieve the goals and objectives in the region-wide, it was necessarily specific addressing through that statement the goal of the important areas in the geographic specific location was being called out, potentially calling out a specific area. As Ingrid said, there is no reason that you can't.

Sarah Cooksey: Right. And then tell me if you agree if you think the statement is correct. I drew a line before the list that talked about the specific actions would you say that that is our implementation plan. For example, we've gone through the criteria of either choosing regional or specific geographical areas and then this last part that's how we decide what we are going to do? That's our implementation? I just started thinking about two years from

now or...

Deerin Babb-Brott: I am sorry, are you referencing them the potential criteria for choosing the actions?

Sarah Cooksey: The specific IJC actions. We've gone through this process and we thought about regionally and then we thought about specifics, and maybe they are running parallel. Eventually we have to get to some implementation plan and how to decide, we have these good things and name meet all of this criteria and now we have to do it. Or is implementation after we've gone through all of those three categories. The question is when does the implementation of these bodies and maybe we haven't discussed this but when do we start doing this?

Deerin Babb-Brott >> IJC actions would be both implemented instantaneously with the RPB's approval of a

plan. This would establish direction for subsequent action. Maybe give you examples of each perhaps. As a component of developing the Ocean Action Plan. Member's agencies around the table with an interest in the management of regulatory interest in fisheries, for example, could say we're going to use some information that is developed by data products based on the data portal. And I am utterly hypothesizing now, we have done some distribution and abundance mapping of a given species, the four consulting agencies associated with the Clean Water Act agree through the context of the plan that we are going to use that distribution on this data associated with a species in the following way. And we are going to agree that the density mapping represented in that data product is sufficient for our information purposes to make a permit decision. That agreement reflected in the plan which would be an IJC action.

That action will be completed by virtue of the agency's agreement to treat data portal information in a specific way in the plan itself when it is published. So it's an instantaneous

implementation.

Sarah Cooksey: So, is this what our plan becomes modified. In other words we are in 2016, we just approved the process, we are now moving forward the OAP and then repeating what we talked about yesterday. This is going to be consistently updated? Is that your understanding? No?

Gwynne Schultz: I didn't make the transition to your question.

Sarah Cooksey: I am just thinking, my next question is about time. Maybe it's just the workflow. Maybe I will just be quiet, maybe it is just the workflow.

Ingrid Irigoyen: Can I chime in? Building on Deerin's example, there are a number of themes and

questions coming up around the table about the purpose of actions and how they would be reflected and how to the time into implementation. I think Deerin's example, which he said very nicely, that might get at Liz's question about what is the intention here? I think you may have a common understanding that it is to provide the kind of context and information and clarity about how to use the information under existing authorities. Not stepping on those toes by any means. It also gets to the point that these kinds of ideas will merge through your discussion as RPB. The RPB's workgroup discussions but also very importantly through discussions with some of your colleagues in your agencies, state, tribes and fishery management councils. They focus specifically on taking that example. So that is a lot of different layers in conversation with those ideas will bubble up. Let's take those four agencies and they might say "yes we want to work on it together". And then it is up to you all to determine that that is worthy of being in an Ocean Action Plan.

The comfort level has to be shared, not only by those who

need to take that action, obviously they need to be comfortable with that. But also you are being comfortable with that rising to the level of being part of your Ocean Action Plan, at the end of next year. So, I hope that's helpful.

Laura Cantral: That is the symbiotic relationship that needs to be in place between you and this body of thinking about the big picture strategically at the people who are in your agencies and entities who have the expertise and implementation responsibilities for the existing authorities. That would be brought to bear in that context.

Deerin Babb-Brott: Can I just pop offer just a really quick one? Elizabeth, this will go back to an earlier conversation, comment that you made. I cannot emphasize enough in the beginning, the importance of when Nick

makes his subsequent presentation and the other panelists talk about the use of data of potential data products or information. The basic point is to use existing and new derived data in order to enhance member entity existing authorities. The opportunity is the brief example of using distribution and abundance data. That kind of product could support the state and fishery management regime through any number of ways. It could support Bob's work and Bob's organizations work with renewable energy. The importance of using the data in the context of the existing authorities to support member entity emissions and interests, it is a key piece of this and I will just put that out there because as Nick talks about the information, it will snap into place in terms of the synergies between agency and a member entity interests.

Laura Cantral: So Bob will follow up on that point. Liz I know you wanted to chime in.

Bob Labelle: My comment relates to what Liz was talking about. As Deerin just said, and I want to channel one of my colleagues who cannot make the meeting. Pat Tillman from DOE, he wrote a very thoughtful about managing expectations about what the RPB is set up to do. I'll just get into one quote which is right on target about what we were just talking about. More appropriate would be to focus our efforts on helping to set context. The agency specific analysis and decision-making by helping to build a collective spatial understanding of what issues are of interest and importance to each agency given its mandates and authority. I think that's the way we go that helps the agency member expand agency funds and resources to move ahead. Because it is right in line with the mission.

Laura Cantral: Greg

Greg Capobianco: I think I feel a little better after Deerin added some things to the conversation from his fishery example. When I first heard I was nervous about how federal agencies decide they want to make a decision to do something. I wasn't hearing the states input and this is what the states want and need. Which I think is the essential purpose of why we're doing this and robust stakeholder stuff. I think the data portals are fantastic but they are not conclusory. The head scratch has to happen you can't just say "well this is the work we did and everybody supports this and this is what it said so this is what we will do". You still have to have, you have to look back and have robust discussions about the specific interpretation of the data and the characterizations of the data relative to the actions.

I am putting those points out there because I got a little nervous when I heard the example. I'm sure it wasn't intended that way but I just wanted to express that.

Deerin Babb-Brott: Thank you for that clarification and yes

I was short handing the inclusion of all the interest represented on the RPB and the circles beyond are a component of that. On the second piece I think Nick may talk about that somewhat, but in the New England's approach to similar material there has been very specific conversation and emphasis by the RPB, that use of the data portal or any specific subsequently derived data products which are incorporated in the plan itself are still not to be used as an exclusive or authoritative source of information by any means. They are essentially intended to provide a more focused starting point for everyone in the conversation to begin from. They will always be subject to project specific or specific interest generated interest in the kind of information that needs to be brought to bear. It in no way substitutes or vitiates.

Ingrid Irigoyen: Can I put it really fine point on Deerin's response to your first question Greg about state

interests and priorities being represented. The use of agencies for shorthand in this conversation. When we get to the work flow discussion which will come next time we start talking about how the workgroups can be modified to really move forward with this. I think our hope is that you are starting to see that this, we are currently IJC bundle of activities, this is really core an essential piece of the Ocean Action Plan going forward. The workgroup currently does not have state membership. Our hope is that your interests is peaked and now you will be more interested in signing up for those groups and that we get some state membership and different entity council membership to round out the membership of that group.

Deerin Babb-Brott: I was going to briefly jump in. As a state person, there's nothing but upside for the state to be part of this conversation. To me this is the primary value of the national ocean policy and the regional ocean plan from a states perspective in a similar way that CZMP's gives states the ability to influence

federal behavior by your participation on assessing and agreeing on what kind of data can be used and in what constructive way to advance your individual state interest. You have the power ability to influence how the federal agencies interact with you going forward. It is a tremendous opportunity and I cannot emphasize that enough. You have the ability as the consensus body to put the brakes on anything that you feel would be counted to your state's interest to say, no I am sorry but we would have to figure out a different answer. So you have the ability to advance significantly the state interest in the conversation.

Laura Cantral: Liz.

Elizabeth Semple: I just had a question. The Ocean Action Plan is a framework and this is a method of

taking action under that framework. Once we're taking actions, those actions don't become a part of the plan. They become the outcomes. We are not modifying the every time we take an action. Hopefully, they could be small actions taken, large actions taken, and if they are successful it is not going to be limited criteria. It will be a use of the criteria multiple times. I just wanted to clarify that. That's not the plan. It's the outcome. The plan is how to get there.

Laura Cantral: I think that's right. Karen.

Karen Chytalo: I'm just following up on what was mentioned. It's true, all of the actions coming out of the IJC are basically a plan. This is going to be our actions. The Regional Ocean Assessment will be added on but this is the guts. This is the core thesis. This is the bread and butter. This is how we're going to do business and stuff. This is extremely important portion. We have a framework and now, as you mentioned we are getting to the

house. These are the agreements. Basically people will be able to see through the criteria that the priorities popped up on research and management and on the geographical of the regional basis. We have some criteria but I feel here's where we are making the big leap. I always felt that that when we first started working on the ocean action workgroup, we thought that way back when a few months ago. "We'll get a plan, yes, we will have a plan". We are taking all the pieces and plopping them into the section more than anything else. I guess our job is almost done. This is the guts. This is a very important decision we're making here on how we're going to move ahead. There is a logical procedure that has been laid out to us from the states perspective. See how it does work. Since we have not participated in all the discussions that you guys have all had. You have your comfort level up. We want to work with you guys and sort things out. We put the plate on the table. Here are the issues we are concerned with and here

are some of the monitoring stuff. There is some research. So we are able to offer some stuff up. Okay, everybody bring your stuff to the table and see how we work through the stuff and that makes more sense.

Deerin Babb-Brott: I think that's a particularly great point about the expression of concern and they need to see what it looks like as you engage in it. That goes back to the point of, well it is laid out as a linear and sequential process. It is essentially composed of inherit feedback loops internally. If, as we get more material for these moving forward, a state brings a concern or issue to it through the actual practice of putting it on the table and poking it. Then you stop and you step back and you say okay, next. It is that internal correction process through the working of the RPP and developing of the materials.

Bob Labelle: That was really good assessment and I think we're at the point we hoped we would reach at this meeting where

we are slowly migrating from planning to doing something. Which is kind of exciting. I would like to propose that we can save some time going forward, if we don't have another meeting or conference call to discuss criteria. I would like to propose that later today when we get into the workflow discussion that we keep in mind those criteria that are up on the board and would we be willing to endorse them with possible additions. This would be helpful so we can start applying criteria as Karen was saying things that we're doing. I hope we can bring that up later. We can talk about the criteria.

Laura Cantral: Yes, I would even go a step further and say we can start to have a discussion about what people think about the criteria in the next 20 minutes. Then we could start doing that now. Absolutely. We would like to come away from this meeting with a good understanding of how you feel about the proposed criteria.

Gwynne Schultz: Just on that point I didn't get a sense of where we landed with regard to Sarah's question. Where the two bullets significant ecological value and socioeconomic value are under this section of specific geographic areas and criteria. During responded that it's really already redressed because of the reference back to the framework. We didn't actually bring it to closure, do we shift it or is it adequately addressed?

Laura Cantral: My interpretation of that exchange was what you heard from Deerin and Ingrid was an explanation of the history of the development. The question that Sarah posed that led to the exchange, there was some sense expressed that there is no reason why some modifications can evolve that way. We could do some adjusting to the way those criteria are presented. That was my interpretation of that.

Gwynne Schultz: That means it would be changed?

Laura Cantral: We would have some discussion about it.

Laura McKay: I would like to propose that we do collapse those. I think there is criteria of significant ecological value and economic and uses of conflict should apply to region-wide issues as well.

Laura Cantral: So would you say more specifically how you would imagine that would be?

Laura McKay: I think you can have just one list for those potential criteria for choosing region-wide opportunities or selecting specific geographic areas. I think all of those can apply to both.

Karen Chytalo: I agree with that, Laura. I

view the specific geographic areas being issues on steroids or something like that.

Laura McKay: I think historically we were separating ideas of specific areas because we wanted to make sure that we didn't lose out on an opportunity because we were protecting very special places. But now that we have come to this point, I think it can be all merged into one comprehensive step of criteria. Whether we looking at something region-wide at something very specific.

Deerin Babb-Brott: This is not a response to the merits of the comments but a reflection of the genesis of this which is, initially this was a more limited exercise intended to be a companion to the public's and the RPB's consideration of the Ocean Action Plan. Which itself had sort of the component making distinctions between region-wide and geographically specific areas. I think it is overdriven its headlights now as you are

planning it out.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne.

Gwynne Schultz: I don't think we would be merging all four bullets.

Laura Cantral: Kelsey.

Kelsey Leonard: I think my comment would be in support of the merger as well. My question is on foundational. You gave a few examples, what does that mean with action making decisions?

Deerin Babb-Brott: Again this is one that essentially the RPB can decide on how it most appropriately defines the term. In developing that our thought was that there are

an infinite number of things that the RPB can choose to address. What are those things that are so important that given the limited time, resources the attention span, and any other constraint that you want to name. What are the things that are so important that affect most of the things? That's what you want to put your chips. What are the most related? Is it a core authority, core management interest? The RPB can look at the criteria decide that it wants the opportunity to have more latitude to address things but it might not seem to be as basic to a given management approach or given authority or a research need. The basic concept was how do you get the most bang for the buck that will affect the most? And the most subsequently to achieve positive change as you make decisions.

Laura Cantral:           Let's go to Mike Luisi.

Mike Luisi:   Thank you briefly able to say that I agree. I think it is easy when you think specific geographical area, you tend to think immediately a small space in the ocean however, specific

geographical areas like canyon stretch all along the Atlantic Coast. So each of the specific areas together is really region work, something you want to consider as a region. I would agree with that approach and support the merger of them into one larger section.

John Harms: I just wanted to quickly respond to Kelsey because I think we that failed to acknowledge traditional values, traditional knowledge and we should probably include that because we didn't mean to just speak to core authorities and regulatory authorities. From now on that might be fisheries management but it should be reflected of traditional values as well.

Kelsey Leonard: Quickly, I just wanted it noted to keep consistent with and or advance principal goals and objectives. It would be great to have traditional knowledge and see it incorporated.

Elizabeth Semple: I thought the region-wide opportunities or the issues for opportunities was separate from geographic specific opportunities because geographic specific was an area where region-wide was an issue. It was my understanding. I don't have a comment on merging the material. I would actually like to see that. That was my understanding. Is that wrong or what?

Laura Cantral: To the workgroup people want to reflect on that?

Bob Labelle: When we had that continuum of options, issues were on the left and geography was on the right.

Laura Cantral: Does that help?

Bob Labelle: In conclusion it should not matter. They apply to whether it is geography or whatever.

Greg Capobianco: I would put out caution I'm getting with the merger thing I just want to put out the caution let's just be careful to make sure that those first four bullets are really addressed, foundational one in particular just because I am worried. I don't think it's this group's mission to chase down places for things to happen without a lot of this foundational work happening first because I think the risk is you're going to get no's around the table. I don't think everybody's comfortable with some of the things that I think are floating around in terms of the ideas about places. I think we've got more work to do before we get there. That's it.

Laura Cantral: We're going to talk more about that this afternoon. Catherine did you change your mind, do you have a comment?

Catherine McCall: I guess the question I have, I am just wondering and maybe there is a straightforward answer, by collapsing the two lists of criteria does this then go back to what is outlined in the Ocean Action Plan where we do have that socioeconomic teased out in a separate section?

Laura McKay:: is that a question of whether we need to go back and revise that in the Ocean Action Plan approach?

Ingrid Irigoyen: If you go to the tab where it says ocean action approach on page 2, the bottom of page 2 there are three sub bullets. This is a historical artifact from the OAP discussions where that group was imagining these kind of criteria for taking some action in certain geographic areas. You could put a period after the word issues. And strike “and other criteria such as “. And really focus of the results of your criteria discussion in a different document.

Laura Cantral: Are other people following the suggestion? Do you approve the approach and are you comfortable with making that modification that seems very logical given this discussion.

Ingrid Irigoyen: In your tab OAP approach. Go to page 2, at the bottom of the page there are 3 hollow circle bullets. Those are essentially the suggested criteria for why you would focus on some particular geographies. And in the context of this discussion it seems that you are taking it slightly different approach toward those criteria. So if you look at the three Hollow bullets. The line above says interjurisdictional issues, you can leave it as follows: “these areas would be selected because they can potentially demonstrate progress on region-wide interjurisdictional issues.” And essentially strike the rest of what you see there. Resuming with “as appropriate...”

Laura Cantral: Because that criteria’s going to be in

another document.

Joe Antangan: My only concern is we are seem to be rushing to quickly dismissing this geographical specific opportunity and I'm not exactly sure why. Because what I'm hearing coming out is there is a reason why a specific geographic areas were addressed upfront. I don't think it was just a remnant of the way we were going with the OAP. For a number of other reasons. I'm throwing a little caution flag out there to say let's not be too quick about collapsing everything in this one overarching thing. I seem to think we have different criteria for how, when you start choking down from the original issue to the sub regional issues and how will you approach them. There may be different criteria needs to be explored in that. I'm a little slow. I'm just throwing out the caution flag. The hairs on the back of my head are saying "why are we rushing to this". I'm just not quite there yet.

Ingrid Irigoyen: I might be able to clarify by saying I think

this particular edit may not be a retreat from the concept that you might take. You might choose to take certain collaborative actions in certain geographies. It's simply to reflect this discussion about making the criteria that appeared in the approach document consistent with the suggestions that have been made. If you disagree with those suggestions and that is really specific to the criteria point, then you should continue to have that discussion about criteria, specifically.

Joe Antangan: let's bring it back into two pieces that, from what you just explain to me, I don't think it's necessary to go back to the Ocean Action Plan and revise that. Keep the specific geographical areas without it impacting the combination of interjurisdictional peace. I'm just uncomfortable in what the full merger and doing away with this whole specific geographical areas. I agree that those things apply for the regional wide opportunities but

I'm getting a little concerned that we are going to lose something in there. I don't know yet.

Laura Cantral: Noting your concern, noting that there are several people that have thoughts that they want to share and noting the time and we want to take a break in the next five minutes or so. Let me ask, those of you who have thoughts that you want to share and keep in mind, we're going to continue this discussion after lunch. This does not end for this discussion. Just to stay on this theme of the concern that Joe has raised and some reactions that I am sensing around the table to your concern. Are there those of you among the people who have their tents up that want to respond to that point directly. Let's stay on this thread.

Laura McKay: I just want to say that I don't feel that we are straying from that two-pronged idea issue on the geographical at all. What got me and probably Sarah too, thinking about this was that I especially wanted the significant ecological value and the

socioeconomic value to also apply to the region-wide issues. So that's the main thing I was after. It does not mean that we are not still going to look both at region-wide and specific areas.

Joe Antangan: We need to be clearly stating that because if we don't, the deliberations here are going to be lost. What stays on the paper, what we remove from the paper and documents that we put out there are going to be long-lasting. My concern is when you start removing and editing these things, is that it will get lost.

Laura McKay:: I wonder if here in the OAP, I guess the problem that we have really is identifying the criteria. There are some inconsistencies in the language in the OAP versus the IJC document right now so we're just trying to clean that up so it matches.

Joe Antangan: I understand we are trying to clean it out but I'm just a little bit leery about when we clean out stuff we lose things in the process that are very important. To me there was a reason and a lot of deliberation that went into separating these, regional wide to a specific geographical area, this concerns me that.

Laura McKay:: Do you feel better if we added all the criteria into this section on page 2?

Laura Cantral: We're trying to create some symmetry between the lists of the criteria. We're not talking about a merger of those two bullets on page 2, the one that talks about region-wide jurisdictional actions and specific geographic areas, those will stay. We will still make that distinction. It's just the symmetry of having a reference to what is now three of a full list of criteria and not the other.

Joe Antangan: I don't see the value in altering the Ocean Action Plan.

Kelsey Leonard: I am coming from the other side of this. Where you noticed that there were things that weren't in the regional section about socioeconomic value, I realized that for specific geographic area you do not have anything referencing the tribes. Where we were initially listed and consistent with the framework, goals and objectives. We gave traditional knowledge and foundational principle. We are not, because socioeconomic, I'm sorry there is a lot of conflicts from where we come from. We would like to see something that represents our seat at the table.

Laura Cantral: John, do you want to jump

in?

John Harms: I just want to say I am comfortable with leaving it to the magical editors that we have. I think everybody will be comfortable. You can put both criteria in the documents or we can separate them. I think it will be clear once it is rewritten.

Laura Cantral: Let's take Gwynne and Sarah let's take a time check and see if we can get the three of you before the break.

Gwynne Schultz: At this point I don't think we should be changing the approved Ocean Action Plan. However, regarding the criteria. One thing I would do is I would not collapse them, I would perhaps just repeat the need for significant ecological value and economical value, just repeat it. It would have that in the IJC document you would say one of the criteria that is region-wide is also of ecological economic value.

Sarah McKay: That doesn't address Kelsey's concern.

Ingrid Irigoyen: We can take those one at a time. First, there are two suggestions here. One is to maintain separate list, one for region-wide, one for geographic but have some mirroring of those criteria in both. The separate point is how do we ensure that the cultural values are reflected and then we go back to that. John you made a point that this could be a foundational but perhaps it needs to be stronger than that Kelsey, so those are separate questions.

Laura Cantral: From what I'm hearing from this discussion overall is first of all, in general you are comfortable with the approach to IJC identifying opportunities and actions and that approach sounds is logical to you. That is what I'm hearing. With regard to the

criteria, I'm also hearing a general sense of comfort, or at least I have not heard a lot of discomfort with what is on these lists. There are some suggestions about how exactly to reflect this. Make sure it is clear and to merge or not merge or mirror and add some cultural values. So it sounds to me what we can do is take a shot at some modification of this list that reflects some of that and put it back in front of you when we come back after lunch because we're going to resume this discussion for some matter of time after lunch. And then see if people are comfortable and what the reactions are. How about that? Let's hear from Sarah.

Sarah Cooksey: First let me thank everyone, my apologies for taking us down that rabbit hole. I just noticed that what we approved this morning that our approach to the OAP, doesn't have the words Regional Ocean Assessment. I never noticed that before until just now, I would love for someone to say Sarah you are wrong. What I was thinking was, in the criteria, it also does not say that any of the choices that we make will be

informed by the Regional Ocean Assessment. I think there's probably a way to fix that. Perhaps that's a discussion we will have later but I just wanted to put it out there. Long-winded.

Laura Cantral: No, it's a good point. I would encourage OAP workgroup folks to chime in but one thing I would want to refer you to is the other part of that document which wasn't what we were asking you to improve because it is evolving. Which is the appendix that is the draft outline of the proposed approach. That is another way of articulating what we have been talking about in the OAP, the structure that has several components. It's a graphical representation of those different components. You see it at an outline in the way a document would look. You can see very clearly that the Regional Ocean Assessment would be all of the things that it says right here and it's an important component

companion and product of the OAP.

Sarah Cooksey: I'm feeling a little bit better.

Ingrid Irigoyen: the other thing I would note is the top of page 2 that there is reference to the action plan being grounded in existing data analysis as well as new data analysis and state input. So there is one place for that to appear. On page 3, the third solid black bullet down talks about improving collective understanding and all different kinds of what that means. So even though the term Regional Ocean Assessment in capital letters doesn't appear, that was the intention.

Karen Chytalo: Just for clarification for the OAP document. Maybe we should memorialize that graphic that you guys did this morning and it should be a part of this agreement or the Ocean Action Plan. So everybody knows and understands, here's what it looks like and here are the words. One of the things I would like to discuss later on this afternoon would be specific

geographic areas. Thinks we should address and look at issues that would be state to state or state to federal and those types of things that would be criteria we use for selection. It is a cultural type of thing. That would be a specific geographical area that would address these issues. Going across state lines, that might be one way to looking at those kinds of things see how we take a traditional approach but then how do we focus on a very specific area.

Laura Cantral: Okay, are folks comfortable now with taking a break? We will pick up on the remaining discussions that we need to have for today on this topic after lunch right now we will take a 15 minute break and come back and hear from our panel who want to talk about data analysis and decision tools. What time will that take us to? Come back at 10 after please.

Laura Cantral: Let's get started please. Let me

introduce what this session is all about. Our panelists who are joining us for this discussion, we have Nick Napoli who's with the Northeast Regional Ocean Council and Pat Halpin, with Duke University.

This panel is going to discuss potential analyses and products that support the work of the RPB going forward. Focusing in particular on existing methods to identify areas of ecological importance with some coverage of methods to identify areas of economic importance. We will start with Nick. We will also be joined on this panel with Nick and Pat, will be joined with Laura McKay: who will talk about work that is going on in her state of Virginia.

First we will hear from that Nick who is going to talk about work that the Northeast regional planning body has been conducting and considering and offering that for food for thought for the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body. Pat is going to talk about the work that his team has been doing also in support of the work of the Northeast RPB, related to marine life abundance and

distribution. The purpose of that work and the potential that he sees for the Mid-Atlantic to grasp on that work, as I have mentioned Laura will talk about the coastal Virginia ecological value assessment and how that methodology or a similar one might be applicable to the regional contents.

It is our sense that the information these panelists are going to share builds on and helps to flush out the thinking of everything we have been talking about over the course of these two days and in particular the discussion we had just had about IJC opportunities and actions to take on those opportunities. So with that I'm going to turn it over to Nick.

Nick Napoli: Thank you, I was asked to provide some examples and options, a range of different data and analysis tools. I'm going to use the five categories and I'm not sure what page it is in your packet but it is the one or two pages on data analysis tools. I'm going to go through

those categories. Those are big categories so I will go to them pretty briefly and generally. And the only way I can think about this is to ground it in the options that we presented to the northeast RPB and stakeholders in the Northeast. The decisions that the NE RPB has made so far. I'm insensitive to the fact that you have your own decisions to make, you are different RPB and I'm just trying to give you the context for the decisions that Bob, Joe and Jeff have made in the Northeast. In an ex officio capacity in New York

Laura Cantral: Nick, let me just interject. The document you are referring to is a tab on additional analysis. I think that is what you are referring to.

Nick Napoli: yes, and I am going to skip over sort of, this all assumes that just like in the Northeast Mid-Atlantic, there are extensive efforts collecting data on different resources and uses. I've sort of taken the next up on analyses or syntheses of the data.

Looking at ecological analyses, economic analyses, proposed ocean uses and restoration priorities, it's more of a data collection but it's in there, I wanted to add it in there. Compatibility, I have moved that towards the end because I think that is after a lot of these other things are done. Then I have the other potential assessments. I say other potential assessments because the Northeast RPB has not decided to proceed with some of these other potential assessments that the Northeast RPB could proceed with in the future. The decision of the Northeast RPB have made to date on how far to go based on public input and everything we have been doing is put out for public input.

The potential for use under existing authorities, Deerin sort of set me up with this one, obviously this all has to be done under existing authorities. Could these analyses help the regulatory agencies do their jobs under existing authorities? Budget, capacity, timeline, what can we get dealt with our existing budget in one year and half

that we have left in our planning process in the Northeast? And the practicality readiness of some of these assessments and I think I will get to that when I talk about the other potential assessments.

So, I am going to try to breeze through these because Pat is going into detail on the potential assessment of important ecological areas. These options that I am presenting here are the exact slides that we have presented to the public starting this past summer, fall and then deciding on in November. So, a series of options in the Northeast that we have presented for identifying important ecological areas.

The first one have presented was just to define important ecological areas based on a lot of the efforts that a lot of the states and federal agencies have already done under existing authorities to identify areas that are important. So some examples of Endangered Species Acts that identify critical habitat, there are maps for that for some species in the Northeast, in a way those are already identified important ecological areas. Magnuson Stevens

Act, there's essential fish habitat and habitat of particular concern under Magnuson Stevens. We are working with the Mid-Atlantic portal team to pull some of the data together and into the portals. In New England, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have state plans, they have identified special sensitive and unique areas in Massachusetts and that is important ecological area. I would imagine in the Mid-Atlantic and New York and Virginia we have also done some of the same things.

The second option and I should mention that these are sort of a progression, I think. The second option here, we have decided we are going to do this, we have been doing this option one: pulling existing information together and into the portals and we're doing it with the regulatory agency that has authority. The second option is to do distribution and abundance density mapping for marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, aliens species, and this is what Pats going to really get into the details of, we are

proceeding with this and have hired Pats team, which includes folks at Duke, NOAA, Loyola University and a couple of different science centers and the National Center for Coastal Oceans.

To develop distribution maps for a series of marine life species, and you see it is a rough breakdown and how it changes a little bit over time here. We have also developed or set up three expert work groups that are over 80 individuals and they keeps growing. They're composed of people from NGOs, industry, academia, the agencies that have expertise in these areas to guide the team's development of these products. We do have a number of folks from the Mid-Atlantic on these teams, some of the agencies like BOEM, fisheries science Center, where they spent both regions, the folks from the York are on three of them, all three of them. We do have some representation from the Mid-Atlantic on the workgroups.

The third option and this is where the Northeast RPB stopped and said let's wait.

The third option is once we get those distribution and abundance maps, let's think about whether we can identify thresholds that says here is a hotspot for a particular species. If the threshold or that hotspot doesn't capture some other important ecological areas like corridors or spawning areas then we have to identify a way to capture those additional core habitat for those species and Pat is going to talk a little bit more about that. This builds upon the distribution and abundance maps that is why the Northeast RPB has decided to wait for the mapping to get done. The timeline for that is draft maps in spring, final in December. Pat will talk more about that. Some issues that come up there backpedal talk about, how do you define a threshold on a species basis, there has been some discussions in the workgroups already, it can be challenging.

Fourth option is to start to overlay different species and look at hotspots that are for multiple species and sort of like an index kind of look. You can imagine that some of the data challenges, capacity challenges, how do you identify thresholds for a specific species and then overlay it with other species and it starts to buildup as an increasing challenge. And so with options three and four, the Northeast RPB is that and let's wait to see advise us to do and go from there.

There was also mention in your packet about measuring ocean health and we also considered a couple of options for measuring ocean health, there is something called the Ocean Health Index which has been developed globally and in some regions. There may be an opportunity to bring that down to the Northeast regional level or Mid-Atlantic regional level , I'm not certain but that is one approach at looking at the region's goals and then scoring them and then tracking progress. Another approach

that we threw out there is that there are a lot of indicator programs Northeast region. EPA manages a lot of these. A lot of these are x-ray programs where they do a lot of indicator work. There are others, so the two options that we were really looking at is, do we do something new, like an ocean health Index? Or do we do something where we build on a lot of the indicator work in the region? The decision on that was, let's wait and see. We are still developing the data we need to learn a lot more about the ocean health index, we need to learn more about existing programs, and maybe we will come back at make a decision. So that's where we are.

Economic analyses. So we have hired a team to conduct some economic analyses and there are two different bits of economic analyses, a more straightforward coastal and marine economic analyses, like you would see

about jobs, total value of the sector kind of thing. This is something that we are actively doing and we are producing from 2005 - 2012 data, state, county and where we can port/town level analyses of different marine sectors, building on the NOAA, ENOW database. That is what this screen capture on the right is. It is a great resource. If you have not seen it, ENOW does a county level analysis of different marine economic indicators from different marine sectors. They do it at six sector level, we are breaking that down to some of the more specific sectors that are really important to the Northeast, like aquaculture, it would fit in to one of those but we are thinking about how to break that down into some of the sectors that are really important in the Northeast that might get rolled up in some of the ENOW types.

Ecosystem services, this always comes up. What about the connection and the production of value that may not be captured in the market. The same team at the Oceanographic Institute is

looking at taking some of the text that is out there and taking some of this ecosystem services and customizing them to the Northeast, and saying here is some of the categories and definitions for those as a starting point. They are also looking at nonmarket valuation studies and summarizing those for us. And what those estimates say, I think our expectation is, because we have been down this road before, there is a lot out there, it is very specific to a location and assessment. So the ability to transfer that value is pretty limited in a lot of cases but that is what they are going to let us know. Here is a summary of evaluation studies across these services and here are the gaps.

Lastly, they will start looking at mapping natural resources and built infrastructure components to economic/ecosystem value. That is another experimental thing where we're expecting you will get insights as to how some of the resources and infrastructure will lend to the values and then decide where and how to use that

information.

This is a quick slide, I've noticed proposed ocean uses and restoration priorities as data sets, that you're considering. We are incorporating spatial data for proposed ocean uses and that is something we have talked about recently, we have doing that with bone for a while and the status of permitting and planning in the states as well and the status of state permitting and planning pilot projects. We are working with FERC to get the preliminary permits in there and those sometimes change. So that in working with the states, BOEM, and DOE to really understand what is prospecting and what is real from some of these. We're talking about bringing in proposed aquaculture projects so that folks know about those in advance. We're not talking about every single coastal oyster project in every state or community, that becomes quite challenging. We are focusing on the stuff that is happening offshore and in our case that is blue muscles in more open water. We're also considering adding large navigational dredging projects

and emerging research on potential sand borrow sites in the Northeast.

In terms of restoration priorities we do have a workgroup that is led by the core and EPA that has identified potential restoration projects. They have developed criteria to prioritize those projects and we are going to look at developing a map of priority restoration project sites.

Okay, I think this one might take the longest time so, bear with me here. So there's a lot of talk about compatibility analysis and I think when we hear that, there is this idealized perspective on a lot of minds about what that might be. And it often goes to what we looking at on the right where there is a matrix. You put all the uses and resources on each axis and you compare them and see what is compatible and what is not compatible. We take that

matrix and apply it in a map. That graphic on the far right, that sort of version is the most research intense, complex, dated needs, a lot of public input needed to get there. When it comes down to it, you can see on the red, green and yellow, this is from the Massachusetts ocean plan where we looked at it and you see maybe 20 - 30% of it is easy. Some things are just incompatible and something are compatible but when you add those things up it is a small percentage of the total. So you get to the yellow, and the yellow comes down to data, understanding about best practices, understanding about the standards, understanding about future trends and other temporal considerations. And ultimately a decision by probably by the regulatory agency about what is appropriate in that space based on that specific scenario. So this is something we are actually working on that now, how far are we going to go with compatibility and we have been approaching that by talking to the regulatory agencies with Deerin's help in the public and working with the data. In order to get to that sort of version on the right if it is appropriate to make it that far, really

need to start with, this is assuming you have the spatial data on resources and uses and conduct a research about future trends, how might that activity change in the future? How does it interact with other things and what are the best practices associated with that activity? Bob, that graphic on the bottom left is from the international cable protection committee. I created this presentation last week, I've noticed that nobody had any cable stuff in their presentations. It's a good example, we talked to the cable industry they said when it comes to cables and wind interactions, we've spent a lot of time putting together a standards and best practices documents. If you go to that document there are a lot of different scenarios and maps where you could see the interactions between cables and potentially other activities. The space needed to maintain a cable and to lay a cable, that graphic is hard to see but that is one of the graphics from that document, it is a good example of really conducting the research to understand the

interactions and sort of lend it to a compatibility assessment. In the middle, once you have all of the data collected, maybe there are some priority sectors or resources we want to start going down the road of really understanding what those interactions might be. In the Northeast, we are here, we are pretty clearly from discussions with the regulatory agencies, and the different users out there that we need to conduct the research before we can decide to go much further. I can see there is the potential for some sectors that we are really focusing on where we might go down the road think about what are the interactions? We talked to the aquaculture industry a lot, offshore aquaculture, blue mussels, there are some folks that are interested in having a little bit more development or understanding of unsuitable areas. A lot of folks do not agree with that in the aquaculture as well so it is a bit of a challenge.

So where are we? We are going to continue to advance special data on uses and resources. I think we all doing that. We are in the middle of conducting outreach and research about future

trends, how these maps going to change? Just because we have a map of cables does not mean we know what's going to happen in the future. Hopefully the cable industry can help us understand what the best possibilities are. What are those interactions, standards, best management practices? Then how do we use all of that information under existing authorities how do the regulatory agencies in the states going to use that information? Is it helpful to go down the road of a the suitability or a compatibility analysis? And then engaging the public, different sectors and interests about whether it is appropriate or helpful in specific context to go down the road of a compatibility analysis. With all of that outreach we are doing, these next three - six months, we are hoping to revisit our decision on compatibility at the June RPB meetings. We are conducting research now, doing the outreach to understand what the possibilities are and a little bit better and then we will revisit.

Lastly, other potential assessments. I think a lot of the stuff up here would fit into anybody's definition of Ecosystem-Based Management system. In November the Northeast RPB decided to establish an EBM workgroup to think about the short-term and long-term possibilities for reviewing what they're doing in an Ecosystem-Based Management context. There is a lot of assessments that fit into that general bin. That have been piloted in both of our regions there are a couple of examples up here. Things like cumulative impact analyses, trade-off analysis, ecosystem service analysis, I think what the Northeast RPB has decided is that as this EBM workgroup progresses we have a better handle on the data, what the regulatory agencies feel they need, then maybe we can revisit this in the context of a broader discussion.

Thanks.

Laura Cantral: Thanks, Nick. You will be at the table and

available for some dialogue once we were all done?

Nick Napoli: yes.

Bob LaBelle: Thanks. On the EBM workgroup, is the current thinking to have a workshop?

Nick Napoli: It is

Bob LaBelle: In March, if possible?

Nick Napoli: It is, literally as of last week we were saying, let's look for something in March to have a workshop where we start to put out to folks, what we're doing, that we feel it fits in the Ecosystem-Based Management context and get feedback from the public and scientists.

Pat Halpin: Alright. Good morning, I'm Pat Halpin from Duke University, the Marine geospatial ecology lab. As Nick has already mentioned I lead what we call the MDAT team, the Marine Life Data and Analysis team supporting the Northeast RPB. My objective this morning is to describe the ongoing work that we've been doing to develop marine life data and models for the Northeast regional ocean council and RPB. But also discuss potential extension of this work into the Mid-Atlantic region. The real question at hand right now would be the motivation to talk to you and give you an update on what we are doing and also look at the potential overlaps. In the Northeast RPB meeting in November, one of the topics that came up that we were trying to resolve is where do we draw the boundaries? I was quite surprised when we went through starting to interact with the RPB's that we actually didn't have boundaries. I do geography and I make maps and you have to have boundaries to make maps. We found that there was a map on a NOAA site which they've since taken down because the GIS guy just made up boundaries for all of the RPB's for the US

because there wasn't one and maybe they shouldn't have done that. It is a little humor. One of the questions that came up in the Northeast meeting was where should we draw the line and there was a lot of interest in having overlaps and buffering between areas. And then one of the questions that follow from that is that we have a lot of the data we're developing and it could be thoroughly readily extended to the Mid-Atlantic region. This topic came up we thought it would be good to bring it up at the session.

So what I want to do is walk through, talk about the team that is currently working on the green light data and aggregation and modeling efforts, talk about the study area and talk about the expert working groups that have been moving ahead. And then go through a few of the steps in stages that Nick has already mentioned on working your way towards important ecological areas and some of those different choices that have been made. Then end on the

potential next steps.

So last year when we were asked for a proposal for developing marine life data for the Northeast, we got together a team that were the primary data analysis and model developers from government labs and academic labs. We thought it was important to get the people who were actually building the models and doing the statistics to be the interface and not handed off to some intermediary that might have a hard time really understanding the data products and what they could be used for an especially what they can't be used for. So we went right to the source and assembled the team from the source.

Currently, the team working in the Northeast has four labs, three main lab groups, the Duke lab that I direct is handling marine animals and sea turtle data, the NOAA and NCCOS in Maryland is doing seabirds, the fish are being conducted by the NOAA, NEFSC. There is also a separate statistic model that are

working with the seabird group or the avian as they like to call themselves at the Loyola University.

The idea was to get specific laboratories that have been building these data sets for years and decades together to actually join in the products of that and have seamless data product for use by the RPB's. This slide here is showing the data flow where we have data products and data aggregation going along at each of these three different main groups. Seabirds, marine mammals and fish. Also you'll see the boxes that say working group reviews. This is been a very big part in the Northeast process is to have multiple stages and interventions when we've been bringing in experts from working groups in each of these different, trying to get by in and expert review from seabirds, mammals, turtles and fish at every step of the way. This has been a fairly time-consuming and very useful

part of the process. So it is not just building maps, it is getting the process moving forward for peer review. Where we are moving to is to develop a single product database that then can be distributed to multiple sources and then used in different planning and management activities. The timeline in the Northeast, a very short time fuse, so we started last summer and went up to November, that red box is going through the November RPB meeting. We are working on data aggregation and forming the working groups and getting initial review. And so as Nick already mentioned, there are 80 experts looking over our shoulders while we work on this so that is a lot of effort to have lots of calls and videoconferences to do this and move this forward. Currently, we are now in a new phase, the next phase of data and model product development. This phase, now that we have a level of review behind us, moving forward on finishing up products and developing them and developing a timeline so by late spring we will have these products pretty much organized for the Northeast. In the summer, we will be doing final data product development and delivery. Here I have at

the bottom, some consideration as a follow-up. Nick already mentioned the ideas that there were options, option one was using the existing maps. But what I've been talking about so far is option two, which is the development of distribution and abundance models in more detail, there are options three, four and five that would be considered so we are looking at where do we go with these next steps.

So, right now this model development phase is this phase here, that you have already seen from

Nick's slide, going through and aggregating all of the existing data that we can get our hands on marine life data and assembling that into distribution and abundance models.

So I want to walk through each of the three main tracks and give you a little bit of an idea about moving ahead with this. So the Marine mammals, does somebody

have access to the viewer, it is actually an animation? It seems like I just hit the... I do not have a computer in front of me. If you just click on the little arrow it should just... If anyone is interested, I have it running on my laptop.

What you would have seen is a time series of all of the effort, survey effort for the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Seaboard over the last 20 years, more than 20 years. It is a nice animation building overtime showing where the data has been collected, you missed, but if you want to see I will show it to you later.

For these surveys, there is a lot of effort along the Atlantic Seaboard. One thing I want to make a point with this slide is that it is uneven by season. Most of our surveys are done in summertime when the weather conditions are better and people are out of vessels or aircrafts. That is one thing people need to consider when considering the data products that we've developed. There is quite a bit of difference between the amount of density of data in winter

versus summer, spring and fall. I want to show, walk through one example. We are doing all of the major species but this is one example for humpback whales. This is showing the survey effort of all of the lines drawn there are ships or aircraft surveys and the green dots are locations of observations of humpback whales. I am just contrasting winter versus summer so you could see the difference in effort and the difference in the density of raw observations. This here is some maps showing data products to look at the observation survey per unit of effort. This is one of the first data product that could be developed, besides just putting the observation points on the map, you can look at normalizing data by how much effort because it makes a difference because if you are looking for an animal at the site and you saw it versus the absence or zero.

The modeling process that goes on is how do we extrapolate from data into areas where we do not have data collected. Can you use environmental conditions and

habitat types to help you statistically produce a seamless map of the density of these animals. So generally the process starts out with observation data aggregation, so the red lines are showing the survey effort and then there is a fusion with oceanographic data. So we take satellite imagery and oceanographic conditions and merge that together through time. So it's a very large data mining operation to go on. From there, there is some mind numbing statistical modeling which I will not go into detail but if people want to, I will be more than happy. What pops at the center maps and model products that will give us generally seasonally or monthly estimates of density of the different animals. We have been developing this work for several federal clients, for NOAA and also for the U.S. Navy. The data we are providing here is the data that is being used by the US government and all of our estimates were taken of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. This is what some final products look like. This is also humpback whales and we are looking here at maps and we have the prediction of density underlying it and then we had the black dots that are the

observation data that was made with the model drawn on top so you can see the correspondence. Here we also looking at winter versus someone to show you the seasonal contrast we have between the different densities of animals. The areas that are warm colors are the areas where you expect high density. What you can see on the northern edge in the Canadian side, you can see an area where we are predicting a higher density than the observations we have. Sometimes that disturbs people but the survey effort was much lower there so you could expect to have areas where we didn't have as much survey but the models were predicting, if we had more survey effort we would see more animals in this areas.

So in addition to producing these standard products, we feel it is important to develop data products that also look at the uncertainties of the data. We feel this is extremely important for any kind of management decisions

to be made with these products. So I want to go briefly through a couple of types of uncertainty types of products that are going to be developed with all of the models. I will start with the bottom two panels. They show the 5th percentile and 95th percentile of the estimates. So what I just showed for the Marine mammal example a minute ago was that the mean estimate for the summer median density for summer and winter, you can also show the high and low-end estimates. We feel that is very useful for managers and fairly intuitive for people to understand, there is a mean estimate and a very low end and high-end estimates. It gives you some bounding so that you can get ideas about what's the range. It is one kind of example of some uncertainty products that are to be developed. The upper two panels are two different statistics. The left panel is a statistic called standard error. The standard error looks at how different their predictions were when you run 1,000 model runs and you see how much difference you get. One issue with that, it is fairly commonly used in the scientific community, I have some concerns about that in the management committee and

with the public is that the highest standard error often occurs when you have the highest abundances. That might seem counterintuitive but that is we have the highest numbers and the highest difference in your predictions. Sometimes people will look at a standard error map and will say, isn't that showing you the most error where you're predicting the most animals? It is just a numerical issue where, if I am predicting thousands of animals off of Cape Cod, that the differences between model runs might differ in hundreds and other places it might differ in small amounts like tens or ones.

One of the upper right, I think is maybe more intuitive for people that is called the coefficient of variation. The coefficient of variation looks at the relative certainty we have in the data and you'll notice with that statistic, the cooler color, the blue area if you're looking at Cape Cod we have the highest prediction for humpback

whales in the summer, is showing you have the lowest variability there. So that actually I think is more consistent with what people will think. As you can see the colors getting warmer offshore and showing where we have less and less data as we get farther off the coast, we have higher and higher variability and higher uncertainty. I think if I was to pick a product to hand to most managers this is the one I would use to say here's a better way to interpret the data that you're getting. Hopefully that is intuitive to people. The next group I wanted to go through very briefly is the avian group, a.k.a. the Seabird group. They like to call themselves the avian group. Okay? This group is led by a team at NOAA, NCCOS and may have been assembling together data for avian occurrence information in the Atlantic. It is a large collaboration with NOAA, USGS, BOEM and USFWS and many federal partners. You will see a huge amount of survey effort there and observation data for Atlantic Seaboard. Similar to what we are doing with marine mammals, this team is assembling predictive maps on the habitat occurrence and also abundance prediction.

The left panel is the probability of habitat, one example is the seabird, the Corey Shearwater, the right side is a density model of abundance prediction and this is very analogous to what I've shown for humpback whales, this is just showing us for seabirds.

In addition, there was additional modeling being done, probability observing individuals and so this is work being done in collaboration with NOAA by a statistician in the University.

To move ahead to the fish group, the NE. Fisheries Science Ctr. has conducted a service of bottom trawl surveys for many years. The map on the left is showing the sampling trawls of all years. The cloud of white points are the trawls. There is a huge amount data over time. Just to show you the density for one year the map on the right shows the 2013 year, that is the trawl data collected for

that one year.

From this type of trawl data they're developing a number of different data products, I have pulled out a couple to give you examples. Here is looking at Atlantic Herring keystone species, here we're looking at the trawl surveys and the size of the points that are drawn here are showing how many were caught in each of the trawl. So you get a little bit of a graphical idea from the trawl surveys. There are other kind of products that are being developed, so this is looking at all bottom trawl survey biomass. And then also for individual species, this animation does not work as well, this is looking at cod overtime in the Atlantic cod distribution. There is the ability to track these for many years and the ability to look at the expected distributions over time.

I wanted to give you a flavor for the three different modeling teams that are working together. At this point I wanted to talk a little bit about some common crosscutting issues that have

come up with the expert working groups. The first is the expert working groups across the board had issues that they wanted to be concerned about on data collection. The sources of the data, geographic scope, how we integrate survey methods, how do we integrate expert knowledge into the process? The temporal extent - how many decades of data are using? Is the data too old? There's an issue when you use data that is 20 years old, has climate change enough that they are not representative anymore? Things like that could be an issue but also the temporal extent in terms of data products, are we going to produce monthly or seasonal maps. That is most useful for RPB's. The treatment of the data and looking at how to summarize by species, some species we do not have enough individual information on species. But we may be aggregate up to a genus or two a functional group. So those are topics that have come up in all the groups, the mammals, sea turtles, seabirds and fish.

As well, trying to anticipate the spatial products and uses for the data. So these are all the things that the 80 different experts that have been working with us have been bringing up over and over again in our conference calls. Probably the most important outcome for the working groups was to set expectations of what species we are going to model and what kind of time periods and what are the sufficient observation data and what are the products going to look like? This is something that is going to be important for this group to consider, how to set the expectations.

I want to jump to the data products that Nick already mentioned. The development of important ecological areas. Nick has already mentioned there is a hierarchy implicit in the way things have been moving forward in the Northeast. So to start out, distribution data is the most basic data, that is - where would you find species? So this is the raw data from taking data points and plotting them or making range maps or basic habitat models. What

is significantly harder to do is to try to create statistical models of abundance or density, how many animals will be found in an area at any given time period. The next level is persistent multiple use or critical habitat areas. This is often we would think about as hotspots. Where are the places that we have multiple species using these areas or they are critical areas in their life history. The next phase after that starts to get into interaction and that vulnerability and viability of the species. That is something that goes beyond what we've been considering so far looking at stresses in areas and different kinds of potential risks to habitat degradation.

Option two is what we are currently working on and trying to deliver frantically between now and the summer. That is the development of distribution of abundance maps for the Northeast.

Option three is the idea of starting to look at hotspots or core habitat areas is the next thing on deck that we need to think about, where will be the next place? I'm going to show a couple of examples of some things that are in the works right now that can start to look at this next level.

NOAA had commissioned a small project to look at identifying visitations, areas called biologically important areas, BIA's. These were done to supplement the density models that we are developing because density models will tell you how many animals you found in the area but it doesn't tell you about what they are doing. Is it an important area for breeding, is it an important feeding area, is it a critical corridor pathway? This was to supplement the data driven products with an expert driven back. The example I have from New England is showing some areas, which a polygon is drawn in there, which are specific areas that experts in the region have defined as biologically important areas with different species. Just to give you an idea of the critical habitat areas.

Another example here, option four is to overlay the next level of abundance of different species together and look for critical areas. And so two examples here from the seabird side is to look at abundance hotspots. So this is combining a large number of different seabird species together and then looking at areas where many species are found in the same place. It is looking at density or abundance hotspots and then here is another map looking at diversity hotspots where you find the most different species all aggregating in the same places.

The last one in this hierarchy is really the EBM approach that Nick ended his talk on, the ecosystem-based approach. This will take significant work so at this point we have really moved directly forward on this because this is something that will take a fair amount of work in the future.

For next steps, one issue we have that we are focused on currently is for the Northeast region but most of

the data that we have developed, we actually have data in hand going from Hatteras up to Canada. So we may be able to help extend some of the data and products that are being developed in the Northeast readily to the Mid-Atlantic region.

So I wanted to go through very quickly, and I am just wrapping up now, what we could extend and what might take some more effort.

So we have a lot of the data development from my lab, from the NOAA labs that are collaborating that we could end up making the data available for the Mid-Atlantic region, generally available. What will take more effort and more collaboration would be model updates, there is new data that is heavily collected that has not been entered into the current models. There's updates that need to happen. We also would need to consider are there data sets that we have not looked at specifically to the Mid-Atlantic region that are merged with the expert groups, who are experts in this region would say, wait a second there is some seabird data that you would not have yet what data you do not have specifically

from New Jersey or specifically from New York or something, so that would have to be considered.

Then there is also product development, are there Mid-Atlantic specific summary maps, statistics, report products. Would there be interactions with expert working group in the Mid-Atlantic that would have to parallel what is going on in the Northeast. So these are the kind of issues that I would like to find out more about what the school might be to actually try to extend this work farther down the coast.

The benefits of extending it I think would be very important. If we use the same types of models and approaches from the Northeast to the Mid-Atlantic, we have seamless data collection models and consistent methods and approaches. I think that would be extremely helpful and make it much more consistent for the end users to use. Also, we would have broader peer review, we already have 80 peer-reviewers, I think we would have a lot

of peer review going on this. And then also more of an ability to scale up assessments to the larger regional context. So I think those would be very powerful reasons to want to come up with a consistent approach moving from the Northeast through the Mid-Atlantic. Thank you

Laura Cantral: Thank you, Pat. Laura, we will turn to you?

Laura McKay:: Good morning again. I just want to give you a quick overview of the type of ecological value assessment that we did in Virginia some time ago now. Not that this is anything that we would directly apply here with the situation but again to try to help put in people's minds how we can synthesize data and how they can become a more useful guide in making those decisions. So what we did was we created this ecological value assessment and again using best science that we had and a lot of professional judgment and all of our scientific experts in Virginia to try to classify the natural systems of our coastal

landscape. This is heavily land-based but it was looking at both the length and the near shore orders. So a big collaborative effort and really what got us here was the frustration that our local government had with all of the different data layers that were on our state border, what we call our coastal gems we call it geospatial educational mapping system. Then we had different letters from different agencies expressing different ecological priorities at the local government level, they were really frustrated saying "how do we use this, which map is the most important". So we set off to try to synthesize those data layers. So again it was a green and blue infrastructure type of approach where we took a lot of existing data that had been collected over many years.

So over on the left the priority wildlife diversity concentration areas that was a big start Department of the gaming and Fish and wildlife action plan. Our Department of Conservation and Recreation National Heritage program

had done so much work on the Natural Land Network. Also in identifying conservation sites. So kind of the difference between landscape scale and specific site scale. Then on the blue side we had all kinds of different layers about SED and oysters and shellfish habitat and some of the layers there. And also in the river and stream systems, Virginia Commonwealth University had done a lot of water assessment of in stream water quality.

Just to run through them real quick what happened was each of these agencies had taken their maps and ranked their areas. This is really the hard part that I'm not sure we can do this on a regional ocean basis. Just again, as an example it is a way start to think about these things.

We took all of this and put it into a five-point scale of priority in terms of value. Again synthesizing things like bird areas like water birds, mammals fish and so forth. That was the game department's map looked like that. I'm afraid you can't see it very well. Maybe you can turn the lights down, it's hard for you to see the color scale on their very well. Anyway, you get the idea. All of

these different layers have gone into that previous map looking at the endangered species and both confirmed and potential habitat for the species.

The next one is a Natural Landscape Network this was a course filled approach, where they looked at course and corridors and again everything was ranked on this five-point scale. Then they have their priority conservation site and this took a more fine filter approach where they looked at rare species and biodiversity significance. So again, you have another map.

Then the stream layer that looked at individual reaches and fishes and habitat and all kind of vertebrates and all of that was ranked in to this five-point scale. Then we came to the estuarine layers. Initially they were ranked on a three point scale but it was a synthesis of 17 different layers. I know you can't read all these. It's not necessary to but just to show you that they had put all these together and did a cumulative resource assessment.

Finally, once all that is done it was just a cumulative addition of all of these maps. So everything in a black and white scale. They were all overlaying so that we came up with one synthesis map of the important areas in Virginia. So, I'm not a TIS expert so don't ask me to hard questions about the methodology but what I gather from it is that you see one plus one plus one plus one and the five maps. The pixel from that was just all one's it was ranked overall a number one. Another example was ranked  $3+2+3+3$  and five and that was ranked a five. So the highest value was always preserved. So that was a very conservative approach to protecting ecological value. These kinds of methodologies are up for all kinds of discussion and I expect we will have those discussions but I think that's all I need to say on that slide again. The main point being, where there is an overlap the highest value is what was preserved.

So we got everything ranked and this is the map that we now have. Maybe simplistic, maybe judgmental. But again, like what we are trying to do here is not using this for regulation or

permitting it is just a guide or a background. The equivalent of a local government level comprehensive planning type of layer. Not a regulatory layer. But it's been extremely useful to us in Virginia to help us prioritize all kind of different management activities and decisions.

I missed a slight up here. We managers are always asking how much time does it take and how much does it cost. We kept track of it and added it up. We did a eight - 12 month grant, \$22,400. We had a follow-up starting October 2010 and we had 16 months to finish it off. It only cost us 43 thousand dollars roughly. That's incredibly cheap and of course that's not going to happen for the Mid-Atlantic Ocean kinds of activities. It is fairly simple but the thing that was really stunning to me was we also added up everything we had invested in our cesium thoughts. Not to mention all the other funds that went into developing all of the data layers that went into the synthesis. Just our money along was 1.5 million dollars over the year for different

data collection efforts and so for \$43,400, we were able to create this lovely synthesis that really hugely increase the utility of these individual data sets.

So, my next slide, all of the uses that they have at the local level for helping to develop their comprehensive plans, just as a guide. We used it tremendously for prioritizing land acquisition. We have done a lot of work on the southern tip of the Eastern shore to protect bird habitats, as you can see the southern tip is showing there in the blue and purple. It was interesting too because over the past years for those of you who have done special area management plans. Those are really interjurisdictional coordination efforts where you pick a specific geographical area and you get federal, state and local government together to try to develop policies to try to protect the coastal resources. So we have been doing that over the past 25 years and I was holding my breath as we created this ecological value assessment map to wondering "oh my gosh are the places that we focused on going to light up on this map". Luckily, sure enough they did. I think that goes to show

that even though we struggle widely to have pure and careful science and data, we also know in our gut, our brains synthesize more than we give it credit for. These places that we had focused on, truly where those areas that stood the test of time for being important ecological areas, so that was a relief. But it also helps us to prioritize restoration, especially if we know where these important areas are. Obviously the areas are adjacent to them, are ripe for restoration to increase the core or to connect the corridors. I would like to propose that the Mid-Atlantic is almost ready but although after listening to talk to help. I know it's extremely difficult, it is so much harder and ocean environments where you have so many animals moving around. It is so much easier when it is rare plants that we're talking about. I am really hopeful that we can really work towards this. This just a shot showing our data portal. Again they are not perfect. There is a lot of data gaps and so much microsynthesis to be done before we can even do

this overall synthesis. I really want to see us work towards it. I would like to finish up by proposing that we create a workgroup action team or whatever you want to call it. A specific group that can really focus on this one project of trying to get us toward some sort of ecological value assessment for the Mid-Atlantic. Time wise, I'm just not sure that how fast we can move on that but again, we can plot some data out there and the important thing is to start developing a model or a framework that can do this kind of ranking and then as the data layers come forward and we get better data layers, you have your model there and you start cranking them back in. I'm making it sound too easy but that's what we are doing with the Virginia model now. We'll probably do a rerun soon if we get some grant money together. We do have a lot of updates already to the layers that went to that. It's ongoing, it's ever evolving, and we've got to get the structure in place to start thinking about that. That's it. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Great. Thank you very much. Thanks to all three of these panelist for this overview. Our intention for putting this session together for this meeting was to give you some specific feasible information, about specific feasible tools that can be useful in the context of Mid-Atlantic Regional Ocean Planning work. You heard about the Northeast approach and you heard in some detail about the marine life distribution and abundance work that the Pat's team is doing and the evaluation work that is being done in Virginia that Laura just described. I just want to be clear from the process standpoint and remind you of some of the things that we heard that came from yesterday. The intention of this session, what we would accomplish in this meeting, is not to make decisions about what tools to use and that would be something that you would be signing off on. Or there is more thinking that needs to be done.

Perhaps one way to do that is to use the proposal that Laura has put on the table. To create a workgroup that can think about how to proceed about the of the ecological importance. I would like to hear your thoughts about that. Depending on that we would need to factor that into our work flow and next steps discussion in the afternoon. These panelists were here to answer questions. As a resource, let's have a few minutes of that and then we need to take a break for lunch.

Karen Chytalo: Okay Pat. How much for the Mid-Atlantic?

We will start passing around the hat, buddy.

Pat Halpin: I will give you the lamest answer possible. It depends. The main issue with the Mid-Atlantic is it actually is a very good spot because of past funding from federal agencies funding of Noah and NASA and the data collection has been done. Also funding from NROC in the Northeast has helped us to aggregate things so we could be the benefactor of some of that. A

lot of the data that we have is already aggregated so that's a good thing.

There are many products and many things that we have developed. I'm at a point where I'm trying to find out what is the scope that this group would need so we can actually talk about an estimate. I think that would be the most efficient possible move ahead. We represent the people that have the data in hand to do what you guys need to do.

Karen Chytalo: You have the capacity to do this? In considering the other work you are doing from NROC, correct?

Pat Halpin: Yes.

Karen Chytalo: Just checking.

Laura Cantral: Greg.

Greg Capobianco: Thanks, I have a few questions and you can stop me if others want to chime in. I would like to ask first if can get your presentations so that can be shared with the RPB so we can see the animation that we were not able to see in our own time. One question I had is how is the fishing industry interests involved in the work that you did? I'm just curious about how the models are tested. I did notice, on the boundary maps, I wondered how that boundary to include New York and the Northeast. I know it's a touchy issue. I'm not suggesting that you have to solve that but it was a little mystifying using the boundary where I saw it.

Nick Napoli: The fishing industries are represented on the fish workgroup and we are up right now and actively going out to the fisherman with fishing activity maps and what we have available from Pat's team and as more comes available will bring it out to the fishing community. Shipping community does not have any representation on the workgroups but we are actively engaging

them. Another round of engagement is actually starting next week in Boston where we will have some of the maps and ask them what they want to be involved in terms of the natural resource mapping.

The study area has been going on for a long time in the workgroups. I want to be clear about a couple of things. It's not suggesting a boundary for planning. It's suggesting or proposing a study area for marine life assessment. The workgroups were pretty strongly suggesting that that if the Northeast RPB is making decisions on whatever the boundary system is that the ecosystem needs to be taken into account. So the southern boundary needs to include us in the ecosystem context. I think that the overlap, maybe the Mid-Atlantic site was washed out; basically your New York waters are in both. It's a proposal and went back out to the workgroups yesterday for them to consider. This is in real-time. Actually the emails went out yesterday saying "here is the proposal based on the feedback we have, so

some folks on your staff have just gotten an email and can take a look at that. It's the start of the discussion about if the Northeast RPB is to make decisions about how you are going to color a map and what's important; the work group is suggesting that it needs to take these ecosystem boundaries into context. Was there a question that we did not answer?

Greg Capobianco: I was curious about the models.

Pat Halpin: During the modeling process, what we do is have several different techniques for building the density models, to hold data and do simulations where you are building models and testing it against the observation data points. That's actually how we develop some of those compass maps that I am showing. Those are fairly standard techniques. Another issue is that we do get additional data and do surveys and that we can sprinkle them over on top of the prediction maps and see how well they are predicting by seasons. So validation is a big part of the current role.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne.

Gwynne Schultz: Can you speak a little bit to the coordination with our Mid-Atlantic Ocean data portal. Did you see any issues connecting some of the data with our portal?

Pat Halpin: We have been in recent conversations with the MARCO portal as well NROC portal and as well as other data portals including NOAA and other data portals. All of the models that we are developing we are intending to make publicly available. We are completely happy to make the data available for the Mid-Atlantic portal; we are trying to work through how to do this process.

Laura Cantral: Greg, you have another question?

Greg Capobianco: I'm just curious about what the thinking is about how the models are contemplating time. As so many of the things that you are looking at the models and over long periods of time or annually. And how do you wrestle with that?

Pat Halpin: Currently, the time issue is one of the ones that the working groups are brought up and temporal issues is a big one. The shorter-term issues was decisions on making data products most of the teams are trying to build models on a monthly scale where available. This becomes a very big issue especially with rare species some of the rarer species we just don't have enough data to get down to an individual month protection. So we have to aggregate data together to make seasonal predictions. Some species we don't even have enough for seasonal predictions. So you may have the ability to predict a rare species in the summer

but we don't have enough data in the winter. The longer term type of trends are something that are more difficult to grapple with. Many of the models do you have predictor variables are tied to climate.

There are ways and there are some efforts going on especially with the fish models right now to look at projections which would be somewhat of a completely separate process to make forecasts in the future. But that is a very big scientific and academic issue right now and it is to start looking at forecasts for 30 – 40 years into the future. What if the oceanographic conditions change, low water in different modes of the year? Are we going to expect species that are currently offshore now to be further up the north coast? There are academic projects now that we are aware of the people working on now that hasn't been planned up the Northeast but that is what people talking about in the next generation phase. Most people are

focused on the most robust models possible for the current time before we start making future forecasts.

Laura Cantral: I see several people who have thoughts that they want share and questions they want to ask. We want to also give you a lunch break pretty soon. So let's take the remaining people who had their cards up and see if we are ready to close this out and take a lunch break. Let's go to Kelsey, Joe and Bob.

Kelsey Leonard: Thank you and I want to say thank you to the presenters and they were good presentations. I want to ask you some questions in terms of your economic analyses and if you have been incorporating the tribal Marine sectors in the process.

Nick Napoli: I didn't mention that there's travel folks in each of those workgroups. There is a workgroup for that piece of work. So they are weighing in on that. I don't know the details of

how they are planning to break that down but the tribes are involved.

Kelsey Leonard: That will lead to my second question which you probably may not be able to answer. The data sharing processes you have established or started to talk about regarding the tribes. It may be too new.

Nick Napoli: I actually saw the presentation that you did yesterday and I'm curious about the work you do as well. I'm hopefully going to learn from you as well. We have our RPB tribal co-lead who has been passed with doing two things. Looking at best practices for consultation and they've made a lot of progress on it. The second is to identify tribal data resources and sharing agreements on those. We haven't made as much progress on that.

Kelsey Leonard: Thank you for sharing.

Laura Cantral: Joe.

Joe Antangan: Science stuff I love it. I understand the concerns regarding boundaries but would like to remind some RPB members that part of what we have to do is to employ the ecosystem-based management approach. In order to properly employ that ecosystem-based management approach, there are times we have to ignore the boundaries for the purposes of analysis on the things that are important. Remember, the fish and critters don't care about man-made boundaries. When you look at the broader scale and map you have to look past the boundary conditions that have been established by man and look at the impact over the entire region. I would focus less on the dividing line between the Northeast RPB when we look at these scientific products and bear in mind that fish don't care and the whales don't care and critters don't care. In that ecosystem-based management approach, that is the way you have to take a look at it.

The second part that I want to toss out to the RPB for consideration is data analysis tools and model products are wonderful, but you have to do something with those products. You have to have a group to interpret that and make something out of that product. You have to start thinking about who the group will be. Will it be the RPB, the scientific community? How are we going to get the right interpretation of those products to make sure that we get a broad perspective as opposed to individual perspective on those model products? That's something we need to start thinking about. It's not just a matter of paying for the services to produce the data products. We have to think of it in total.

Bob Labelle: Thanks to all of the presenters. I guess I will direct my question at Pat. These columns on the map, is this from data and studies in the model runs that have already passed external peer review and now they are

conglomerated. Is there new work and would that be subject to external peer review? And if so, what is the timing before we can use those maps?

Pat Halpin: Excellent question. There is a range of data products and most of those models with seabirds and some of the fish one's are new products. We have gone through extensive peer review internally with NOAA so far with all of the federal scientists. We are in the process of writing a manuscript right now that would go in the spring for external peer review outside of the federal agencies. So we are moving these as fast as we can. We see that in addition to making maps of uncertainty and other things also coming up with cycable citations. These maps these data products, are they the same ones that were cited in the scientific journal article. So that is part of the process and they are in process right now. The cetacean one which is what I mostly deal with. We finished our review internally. We need to move ahead. We are

over time that many script within the next few months by the time these are delivered for the Northeast.

Laura Cantral: Kevin, I am going to give you the final word before I wrap this up.

Kevin Chu: I just have a question. Will we return to this topic after lunch or are we closing this agenda item?

Laura Cantral: I think we are closing this agenda item. With the exception of bringing some of these ideas back into our discussion about next steps and how to carry forward with the work flow including the ROA work. And this potential for creating the new work group that would organize to move forward with identifying areas of ecological importance that may include charging some group of you to think about how to further explore some of the suggestions that Pat has made about what it might look

like and how to build on some of that work. That's how I can imagine this discussion, a continuation of that discussion. Does that sound reasonable and appropriate to people?

Kevin Chu: I don't want Laura's proposal to get dropped. As long as we can pick it up in the afternoon I'm happy.

Laura Cantral: If folks are comfortable holding that into that discussion that I agree with you and I want us to be really clear about how you feel about that proposal and how you want to proceed. Okay, again, thank you to the panel. Are you around for the afternoon or at least for a while?

Karen Chytalo: We want to see the video. We're going to take an hour for lunch.

LUNCH BREAK

Laura Cantral: Welcome back. Let me remind you what we're going to accomplish this afternoon. My suggestion is that we revisit two subjects that we talked about this morning, the IJC proposed process and take another look at the criteria and see if there are any other outstanding questions regarding that work. Then also revisit the data analysis discussion that we had in the presentations that they can impact. See if there are any outstanding comments that you want to make related to the work. Then we are going to proceed into a discussion about next steps.

The development of a workplan that will enable you to proceed with further develop into the Ocean Action Plan that we now approved an approach for developing. The workflows that are associated with that. The workgroups that are organized around those workflows and that includes coming back to the ROA discussion and being clear what that were group is about and some guidance or direction or another work needs to be carried out. And

stakeholder engagement which is something we need to focus on and spend some time on and see what other odds and ends we need to clarify or decide on or wrap up.

Our Meridian colleague, Meghan Massaua, who many of you will recall last time you saw her in the setting was actually representing the Department of Energy as an alternate member of RPB. She is now part of the Meridian team. She will be here helping us navigate through that workload discussion as part of the Meridian facilitation team. We will take a break at 3:45 and have public comment at 4 o'clock. After public comment we should be in a good position to reflect on any next steps or outstanding issues and wrap up by 5 o'clock. No later than 5 o'clock. This FM good to everyone?

Deerin is standing by in case he needs to jump in and be a resource to help with questions. We want to ask again if there are any outstanding questions or concerns or a sense of your comfort with work proceeding as is described in the IJC paper and presented by Deerin. Then we will get to the question about criteria

in a moment. Just for now as a general approach, is there anything else on anyone's mind that needs to be raised at this point? I will point out that in Meghan's presentation it's outlined in detail in the memo from the colleagues in the tab that is labeled co-lead memo. There is a lot of detail about what we imagine taking place, quarter by quarter in discussions and further work that needs to happen across workflows. That we will get into and that includes the IJC work. So some of the nuts and bolts of that will be part of that work group discussion.

One of things that came up in our discussion this morning was a good discussion about the list of criteria that are in the IJC document. On page 4 of the document and some suggestions about how to improve that list and we volunteered to take a crack at what we heard and put it up on a slide and see if that was capturing what people were interested in. Why don't we put that up now and see what people were thinking.

Ingrid Irigoyen: Great, thank you. So I'm listening to the conversation this morning we have taken a crack at making some refinements, originally it was on page 4 of the IGC document. I will quickly describe quickly what some of those refinements are and let's pause and see if we got it right.

First of all, what we have up here are the criteria for selection of the region-wide IJC opportunities. What we have done here is taken the criteria that, on page 40 C listed under specific geographic areas; we've gone ahead and copied those into the region-wide opportunities as well so those are the three bullets in blue. The fourth bullet and blue is related to high cultural and traditional value in response to Kelsey's input. So that is the first change. Then on specific geographic areas, it sounded as though several of you were comfortable with keeping those as separate categories but what you see here is a mirror image of the last four points of the region-wide. Then the final category of criteria if you will is really these actions which I'm not sure if you've had a

chance to discuss in detail yet but we put them up for the sake of clarity and as a resource.

Laura Cantral: We want to hear if we got that correctly and if you are comfortable with what we captured here. I want to clarify that in this discussion we are not asking you to approve this criterion or make a formal decision about this set of criteria. What we are hoping for and the way we have been framing what we would like to hear about from you is a general sense of comfort with some discussions related to potential IJC opportunities and related actions preceding with these kind of draft criteria as a touchstone. We are not seeking formal approval and I think it would be in some discussion with the co-leads, our suggestion that a formal approval process and this is something that Deerin spoke to in his remarks and it's not needed for the purpose of this exercise. I want to be clear about that it is not a formal decision. Your reactions or any

sense of comfort or any other adjustment would be helpful. Yes.  
Joe

Joe Antangan: I'm comfortable with the general proposal. With regards to the criteria, we are not going to make decision on that right now. What are we going to make a decision are now?

Laura Cantral: Deerin, maybe you can reiterate what you are saying about potential content for using these criteria for this discussion. Do you mind doing that?

Ingrid Irigoyen: One way to think about this that might be helpful is to consider these working criteria and you could take off now as to what kind of opportunities that IGC might want to pursue and what kind of actions that are suggests. Have those be working criteria where you reserve the right to make improvements to those and go forward with these discussions, in case you missed something and any other reflections on. That

could be one way of thinking about it that allows you to adopt it as today's working criteria that will be described as touchstones that we will be embarking on. Deerin if you want to add on?

Deerin Babb-Brott: That is fine.

Joe Antangan: I just suspect as we proceed to the comment section there might be some input on these as well so I'm just trying to get a feeling for the timing of that but as a whole I believe that there is enough there to get started and I think we do need to get started.

Laura Cantral: Liz

Elizabeth Semple: I think it's a good set of criteria and it's great that you started from the state perspective. It would be best if we don't approve them and let them be

vetted through our chains of command so we make sure that we don't undermine anybody's authority.

Laura Cantral: Karen.

Karen Chytalo: I like the criteria that has been developed the region-wide. The geographic. Why did it shrink so much? I thought we were going to and include the other ones. I didn't get a chance to discuss about other specific geographic area that would be something that would affect two states and the feds. Some intersections. That would be another way of looking at it and slicing some of these issues that I think could potentially come up.

Meghan Massaua: So the reason we made the change we made is because we thought that's what we heard but if you would like to make further modifications that is absolutely for you to discuss. With regard to the two states and feds, it might be helpful

to clarify what you mean by that. We expected that the bullet on the interdisciplinary or interjurisdictional nature or certain opportunities might cover that. That was one of the intentions behind the bullet. Given that the geographic areas would demonstrate progress on those region-wide opportunities. We would only choose the kind of opportunities that have been that interjurisdictional quality.

Karen Chytalo: I'm just trying to think through that. I just thought it would be very consistent. The only line which I thought would be different would be regional in nature and policy or priorities or something like that. I can think of an issue that, okay, in federal waters algae facility has been proposed it is within the state's coastal zone but a neighboring state might have some comments or something like that. There would be a specific area and other than the federal and state component also state to state. Just as a way of looking at some issues that potentially affect others.

Laura Cantral: Mike, you look like you want to weigh in on that.

Mike Luisi: I was just going to provide my interpretation of it was. I don't know if Karen, this is just how I see it. This is an all inclusive list for which, when you go to the next slide, the top bullet there to me encompasses the first list that we looked at on the previous slide as a way to potentially demonstrate progress on the other criteria that were listed. I'm just viewing this is a large-scale region and then down to the more geographical areas. In my opinion it is all there. As far as how the discussion went earlier.

Laura Cantral: I think that's how we were imagining it in the drafting and fine-tuning it that we try to do over lunch. Are you comfortable with that?

Karen Chytalo: Yes.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne.

Gwynne Schultz: When you look at page 4, it started out by saying this criteria is for identifying region-wide opportunities. Then later on, it goes on that this is criteria for choosing opportunities. Then it goes to selection of geographic areas. Then it goes to choosing actions. So really, what are the criteria before and that follows on Joe's question about, when is it okay for us to be a bit flexible versus really needing to find the criteria for a decision. So I guess I like all of the some bullets and list of items that we have, I like the list of items. Is this for, all this criteria can help us identify and decide which ones to work on. But when we finally do get to picking those actions that are going to be part of the plan, we're going to want and need to find criteria. Is it okay to be a little looser now? We need

to make sure our wording is consistent and then in the long run agreeing to what gets put into the plan or not.

Deerin Babb-Brott: I agree that the wording should be consistent. I would offer as the closest to meeting the letter and the spirit of wanting to be providing structure and guidance but at the same time providing latitude for professional judgment as part of the discussion.

Doug Pabst: Thanks. This is kind of where it started with some of our earlier conference calls or even in the RPB, we were federal partners. In MARCO. And we were talking about what would the box look like? This is where we started with responsibility and authorities. We conflict now. It's not like we are waiting to find conflicts. We have conflicts now and we work them

out the way the way we were to whether it's a conference call among federal agencies or a meeting among states. I think that we are trying to identify some meat that we can work off of. The universe is not huge on this or unknown is what I'm trying to say. I almost feel we are going round and round to talk about some possibilities when there really is a defined number of things that we could just list and work off of. And then those processes that are used to resolve those conflicts can serve as future lessons to work on future conflicts. It's not like that there is 100 of them. And there is not zero. I don't know how much we really want to go around. Whether it's 70, is it 60? I guess I am less concerned about or worried about having to come up with how we're going to identify these things because we can name quite a few right now. We can start working on a few right now right away. Leave it a little open-ended. There will be others. We can just try to set up a mechanism so that people have some way to discuss conflicts rather than

trying to identify the conflict. I just want to lose the first part because we're worried about the second part.

Laura Cantral: Any other thoughts on the topic? Karen is that why your tent is up? Is it fair to say that you all as a group are comfortable with the IJC work preceding the way it is described in the document and in more of the details in the memo from the co-leads about how to move forward with the IJC workgroup and some discussions that need to be happening. With some reference to this list that are on the slides now as some working criteria that provide a touchstone that are some structure and guidance but allow for flexibility and latitude for professional judgment and that we are not making formal decisions and approval of strict rules of criteria that have to be followed because we need to allow for some flexibility but that these are some good common sense touch stones that we can use to refer to it to get the discussion started. That's where we want to get out. Just get started. Liz.

Elizabeth Semple: Can we add Nick slides or have a diagram about how this works? Deerin's slide, sorry.

Laura Cantral: I am feeling like we are ready to wrap this up. Are you ready to wrap this up? Yay. Let's wrap this up. All right. I just want to ask the question and make sure that there is nothing else that you want to talk about for now related to data analysis, tools that can support regional planning, Bob's already putting his tent up. In particular, we heard some good discussion and some really helpful viable questions. One thing that I think would be helpful to get a stronger sense from you on is your enthusiasm for proceeding with investigating some of these, the use of some of these tools. We didn't really hear a lot of that around the table.

Bob Labelle: I think Nick gave us some good information in terms of what the Northeast is finding. We

talked a lot around the table about compatibility analysis. I think what Nick was pointing out is that we are finding that is not a simple thing to do. It is not overlaying some maps. I wanted to throw that out to the RPB to see if there are others who feel the same about how we can approach compatibility analysis.

Laura Cantral: Laura.

Laura McKay: I agree, Bob. I think it is easy to say compatibility analysis but showing us the charts were you doing it, and most everything shows up as seeming as compatible. You do not have an answer. Then how do you better inform management? It is a tough one. I don't have any answers. I wish I did.

Laura Cantral: Joe.

Joe Antangan: This goes back to what I was trying to leave the RPB with before we went on break. All of this data and these

data products are great but we have to start thinking about the mechanism, the working groups, whomever. Whether it be a working group that is a team of scientists or panel that we select or whether it be folks from within our own agencies will have some level of expertise. We need to start thinking along the lines of, that is great but at some point someone has to do the analysis. My fear is that there is so much data out there and so many pretty pictures but we get enamored by the pretty pictures without thinking about the fact that somebody's going to have to do, some incredible, has to do the analysis and put some thought into what those products mean and how can they be applied to the overall ocean planning efforts.

Laura McKay: I would just say I do see the synthesis of the ecological value data layers that are modeled to do that in the output of that is very clear and straightforward and doable. I think the compatibility

analysis, the second tool, is the much more difficult thing. I don't know how we forward with that. That's really where the meat of this is. It's in the compatibility; it's in where we make decisions. I also like to repeat Jeff's approach in New York where you really have to focus on not so much the specific activity and say you cannot do this or that in this or that place but you really have to keep focused on the impact of the human activities. That lets you be more creative about what you can or cannot do in certain places. It opens up our thinking about minimizing our impact, that's where we really start to make things happen.

Laura Cantral: Alright let's hear from Greg, then Karen and then Kelsey.

Greg Capobianco: I'm not sure I would agree with that we know how to do the ecological value or that we are well in agreement of what that should look like. One of the things that struck me at the presentation, I guess what I'm struggling to see is

at least going by my understanding of the definition of ecosystem-based management which does have a very important stipulation that people are part of the eco-system. Human use should be part of the evaluation of these ecological areas. In New York's habitat program, and I won't go into detail, it does use that as a criteria. I think what I'm trying to get out of this is we look at the heat maps or whatever ecological data assessment that comes out of the resource experts and then you overlay the use of maps on top of that and you have high functioning ecological areas that also have multiple uses that has been happening for 100 years. It's not a compatibility issue. I don't want to not be sensitive to that. I think we need to be thoughtful of that. There are a lot of people using the ocean and I don't want to exclude that fact and sort of be a value to processes that we may elect to take. I do think it's a fatal flaw how a lot of this work is done. It's great to get the straight resource data but it's not the whole picture. I really

do have a problem with compatibility analysis stuff. I've gone to workshop and Nick showed that chart. It's laughable if we really have a hard time reaching a consensus on 80% of it. I want to know what the value of that is.

Laura Cantral: Karen

Karen Chytalo: Building upon some of the things that Greg said, I agree that not only do you have to have the ecological information but also the economic information because it helps to build the stories out on how important these areas are. Some areas might be based purely on ecological value and some can be purely economic value that can be those other areas. I would like to take Laura's recommendation and having a workgroup and expand and having it to look at these types of tools and then outline priorities, ecological and economic and how we can mix all these pieces together and work out something like that so that we do come up with some products and try to get the compatibility. Some things

have been going on for long time and in some areas and they work and some areas not so good. I would rather get 80% of the stuff for 75% of the stuff down on maps that we can agree to and maybe the other 25% might be futuristic work. But get something down there that we can all agree to would be fantastic. If we could actually identify things that should go on in certain places.

Laura Cantral: Meghan.

Meghan Massaua: I think I will second what Lauren and Karen said about potentially having some sort of workgroups. I think we all need more information about with the assessments, if we do go forward with them, should look like. One area that was touch on in the presentation was the ocean health index. I wish we could expand more on that, maybe adapting it to fit the Mid-Atlantic to include human uses and potentially that might

serve the compatibility assessment that is a little bit more directed towards what we are doing here in terms of our regional directives

Laura Cantral: Nick, would you like to offer some context from the Northeast on with the thinking is in that region about that tool?

Nick Napoli: I am going to sit at Pat's seat, now it is very confusing. (Laughing.) So ocean health index. We in the Northeast kind of had an opportunity to really push that and decided that we should wait for a couple of reasons. First, we are still pulling the data together and focusing on the regulatory application of the data plus all of the surrounding information that I talked about earlier related to compatibility. And then measuring some progress was really a next step that we needed to understand better what the opportunities were developing indicators to measure progress. The

ocean health index, I am not an expert in it and there may be others that knows a little bit better than me. It is not necessarily a spatial, it might inform decisions, it might inform compatibility decisions but there are certain spatial inputs. It is a scoring based on regional goals that uses all sorts of data inputs. It does include the economic component and the human use component of the ecosystem. But it might not give you the sort of compatibility analysis that you are looking for. Maybe Pat knows better than me.

Pat Halpin: There are spatial products, there are spatial maps but they are fairly broad and implemented on a global basis scale and so there haven't been that many implementations applied to that scale.

Nick Napoli: The real Pat said I think said I'm right (laughing).

Meghan Massaua: So I was thinking along those lines, we want a global scale from what I have heard of it. I don't know if we have the resources to adopt this for the Mid-Atlantic so it is more specific to our region and scale to that level.

Laura Cantral: Why don't you hang around because there might be another reason for you, Pat, to be helpful. Doug.

Doug Pabst: Thanks. Again I am supportive of a work. It's kind of what we've looking for the Regional Ocean Assessment group for a while. We will have some discussion about how that leads into this conversation. I'm not so sure it's a compatibility assessment as much as an incompatibility assessment. The reason I want to bring that up is because the decision-making is not yes or no. We all have words and our statutes about significant adverse effects and certain confidence limits and statistical testing and things like that. The mapping alone isn't necessarily going to or couldn't answer the question because even if you have five people

trying to do something in the same spot, some agency somewhere is going to have to look within its regulations or business practices to say this is acceptable under our regulations, this is compatible under our regulations. There are two types of compatibility is what I'm trying to look at. I look at the interjurisdictional coordination and the Regional Ocean Assessment, to help me to inform that conversation, not the absolute conversation about having five people lacking on each other in the ocean so we have an issue. It's just a little bit of a different way to look at this I think. Maybe that's the easier way to look at this. Resources are everywhere and it is important. I don't think we want to have a debate about this spot is five times more important than the spot, per se. The agency that has to make a decision because they are under a regulatory authority to do that, they will need our help to make the decision. For me the mapping and the siding has always been about who is going to be the driver of the decision and

how do we make them make the right decision. The benefit of this is helping somebody make a good decision that won't have a significant negative effect on all of the uses that are going on. It's just a different way to look at the tool that we're trying to build versus we have to map everything out there because we don't have to have that level of sophistication in the decision-making. There is always going to be one species or one thing that will be the most important part of the decision. Whether it is endangered species or whether it is an economic driver. It's a different way to look at it.

Laura Cantral: I would like to call on Kevin and Mike and then Bob, then I will see if I can summarize and wrap-up this discussion for now. Recognizing that there is a strong interest in talking about a workgroup that would carry these ideas forward and that is a nice segue into talking about the workflows more broadly. If that makes sense, then let's proceed that way. Kevin.

Kevin Chu: Thanks. I will be brief. I would like to lend my support to forming the working group. What we have heard around the table today is interest in a variety of topics that have been raised, a lot of questions about them. We are unclear of which analysis we might need, we are unclear about where the data sources are. We are unclear about how to finance it. I would view a working group as a way to place this out. We do not have time today to answer those questions but we do have time to say yes let's get a group together to address this. And then come back to us with recommendations and I think that's how we can move forward.

Laura Cantral: Mike.

Michael Jones: I will be brief. I keep hearing the idea of mapping. Mapping is great. Doug just mentioned

that there is going to be one species that drives home a decision at times. We just have to keep in mind and I will continue to reiterate this group this process, but there is a human species. They are going to need flexibility to be able to continue to work and other recreation that they do given these lines that we draw in the ocean. Unlike fish a man-made line- fishermen are held accountable to those lines. They have steep fines and all other types of things when they cross those lines. We need to be very considerate of those needs and with all the changes in the environment, climate and other conditions in the ocean, there will be a need for us to continue to keep in the back of our minds the concept that flexibility is going to be vital to continuing, allowing for the industry to continue to provide the economic significance to the country. I just wanted to restate that thanks.

Bob Labelle: I just wanted to agree with what Doug and Mike said. In terms of what we can do as an RPB to advance regional information sharing. I think if we can help focus the

questions that should be addressed by the agencies that have the action. The data portal and maybe some additional research and whether it is on human uses or biological resources, to the extent that we can focus and raise the level of understanding about what those regulatory agencies really should be looking at and interested in and decided upon.

Laura Cantral: All right so just wrap this up for the moment. I think this was helpful to come back and have a little more exploration of this and I think it's important to keep in mind about what you heard about this morning. First of all, the Mid-Atlantic- you are your own region and you have your own responsibilities for making decisions as this group for how you want to proceed and execute visual ocean planning for this region. There is an opportunity to build on the work that is underway in the Northeast and you heard about that from Nick and from Pat who offered

some ideas about that. About leveraging some of that work and how to build on that work. The combination of some further thinking and discussions about what that might look like and a workgroup to explore that and perhaps other dimensions of the use of tools of what it would take in timing and all that. This is something that we heard some strong support for doing. Whether that is a standing up of a new working group on the transition of an assignment from an existing working group or something kind of in the middle. We'll talk about that in a moment. As I mentioned, I think this is a nice segue to doing just that and talking about how to move on from here. Workflows, the development of workplan and the workgroups that need to be organized and prepared to proceed after this meeting. So are you ready to make the transition?

I think it would be helpful to have in front of you; it will turn to the co-lead memo in your binder. The memo does a few things, the co-leads wanted to help orient you to the documents and how they work related to each other and how we are going to use them in the meeting. Part two of the workplan of the memo starts

on page 4. It outlines the co-leads suggestions to you about the development of a workplan and workflows and all the things that we are going to be talking about in this session. So I think Meghan are you ready to take off from here?

Meghan Massaua: Thanks Laura. And thanks to the RPB for having me up here with a different hat on. So as Laura was saying we are having a day and a half of really good discussion that has teed up some great next steps for the RPB. Some of which is captured in the workplan memo that you have in front of you. Also represented in these graphics. We thought it would be worth showing this again. Just to show you how these things that together. A reminder that it is based on the framework that builds on that. Then also these other elements, the ROA and the potential for additional analyses, the interests of our member entities, the criteria that we spent a lot of time on today. How those will inform the next steps and discussions

on selection of region-wide and geographic specific IJC opportunities and actions. All of which in concert with stakeholder engagement and always affects will help us get to an OAP with member actions and potential agreements by the end of 2016. Just a reminder of how this fits together and what we are working towards. We see as a potential way to move forward with four main workflows that would be a combination of existing workgroups but potential for some merging or some new membership opportunities depending on interests and needs for each of the workflows. The first one would be region-wide IJC actions. The goal is envisioning that these are taken up by the existing IJC workgroup that it can be comprised of expanded membership from either new RPB member entities; there was some talk earlier about making sure that there is state and tribal representation in these discussions. As well as additional sister agencies within the RPB entities. Making sure that the folks that are on this workgroup are the ones who can begin to really have

some discussions to identify opportunities and actions moving forward.

The second one there is specific geographic areas for IJC action. One option here is to have the current OAP workgroup which has done a great job in fulfilling their mission, with the approval of the approach this morning. Now it's ready for a new task. It could begin to consider specific geographic areas which would include the additional analysis piece and I will get to more of that in a few minutes.

The continuation of the Regional Ocean Assessment. We'll talk more about that this afternoon but there was some discussion about prioritization of using some of these resources to address from the outline. Deciding on those in moving forward with populating them. Also stakeholder engagement, which would be a key tenet that would run through the other three. As those workgroups move forward and develop draft products or

have discussions or making sure there are opportunities for the audiences that are related to the discussions that are happening to be involved in those discussions and be able to be aware of them. And to potentially be able to assist with informing the RPB as they move forward.

I won't belabor this too much because we spent quite a bit of time on it today. But the idea of region-wide IJC actions would continue, as I said the IJC workgroup or some expanded membership. I want to point out that so with the idea that we are using these working criteria as touchstones to guide discussions, that the first discussion that we are going to start having with the IJC workgroup will start thinking about and start executing on would be discussions both within and between different agencies. Based on these criteria, what are the opportunities and what are the actions that would lend themselves to the things of the RPB might want to take up and consider. Once those preliminary discussions are happening, that I think it would be really important to consider

which staple groups are affected by opportunities that are rising to the top and how to engage those stakeholder groups moving forward with decisions that could potentially affect them down the line.

Specific geographic areas, this could also be considered additional analyses and specific geographic areas. Notably we had some discussions of this morning specific of how specific geographic areas that are similar to region-wide can build on the same criteria as region-wide at the same time they might be a little bit different. So there is bit of a non-linear process here.

When we identify region-wide issues those may lend themselves directly to some specific geographic areas that we can readily know and think of and want to address in one way or another. However, in order to identify specific places we may also want to do additional analysis of economic or ecological importance. This is where we are envisioning that this group which will be based on the

current OAP workgroup membership with some modification if there are others who are interested. Maybe some of the folks want to switch to region-wide and that something up for discussion moving forward. The idea here that this could be the group that devotes some good thought to what types of additional analysis makes sense for the region. What makes sense for the role of the RPB and eventually, down the line, how will we execute all these types of analysis. Again, making sure there is an opportunity for stakeholder engagement of the scientific community, of affected communities, the folks using the ocean that we need to be aware of in terms of the way this impacts their lives as well.

Additionally, the Regional Ocean Assessment will continue to provide some of that crucial description of the current status of that region of the uses and resources. Maybe considering some of the prioritized uses and resources based on the outline that was discussed yesterday. A place to start and continue to populate that and then down the line, considering ways for scientific and public input into those products.

I have said this a few times now but there is also a stakeholder engagement workgroup. I think at this point they would begin to sort of mesh with the other workgroups. There would still be their own but they would need to be tied in and closely related in understanding what is happening in all the other workflows to identify what those key opportunities are, to engage folks and how to do that. We heard yesterday a little bit about some resources and types of opportunities that could be considered. Sector specific meetings, sector specific workshops and webinars. If those are types of activities that we want to pursue, where it makes sense to use those, what method for what purpose, for what audience so we are really thinking through all that. You can see on the graph here, which we pulled out, which is in your workplan memo on page 9, the table. It shows you some of the option for stakeholder engagement in each workflow.

Then finally, just more generally how all of this fits in together to a broader workplan that brings us to a fully developed and realized OAP. The idea of being able to hold two meetings per year for the next two years and right after this meeting to be able to do some good work on developing a workplan that captures all these workflows and captures the rest of the discussion that will happen today. And it provides a roadmap for the RPB in moving forward. That would also be updated periodically, as our needs shift one potential thing that came up yesterday was the idea of implementation and monitoring and how do we know once we get there, and start doing things, did we do what we said we were going to do. Perhaps sometime in 2016, once we have a more clear idea of what would be the content of the OAP, devoting a new workflow and considering monitoring and implementation. That might be an example of how this will change with time to address needs. Then our goal would really be to have a draft OAP fully realized based on all the workflows, all that together, and how all of this constitutes the OAP and have that go out for public

comment and make sure that we have enough time for that. To iterate and revise based on what we received from the public. Make sure that this gets to a national Council for certification by the end of 2016. That is our broad outline and we would be happy to take some questions and have some discussion on it.

Laura Cantral: So that's what the co-leads are proposing and I would recommend to you to make reference the entire table on page 9, the different excerpts on that and slides in may be Meghan will put that up so you will have them for reference. We will through each of these workflows and have some discussion about that. I already see people who have comments or questions. So let's go to Kevin first.

Kevin Chu: Thanks. Obviously there has been a lot of thought going into this. I don't understand. I'm sorry that

I started with but I am really not clear what it is we're doing. A couple of specific questions. One is, it is unclear to me what the two different IJC collaboration groups would do. Are they intended to simply identify areas where we could collaborate or are they actually going to do or organize or oversee the collaboration in itself? The follow-up to that is, why would we want two different groups to be doing that when it might be a lot more sensible to have a single group working on an interjurisdictional collaboration and coordinating region-wide in the more geographically restricted. The other question is, and I did not realize until you brought this up Meghan. The OAP working group, you said the OAP working group is done. It has presented us with the concept and we have adopted the concept. My sense is we need some part of us to be working hard on developing the Ocean Action Plan through the course of 2015. If you look at your timeline, I think it is a good one. If we work backwards we kind of need to have a draft Ocean Action Plan by the end of this year. So why would we

stop the working group of the Ocean Action Plan working group for one year and then start it up again. I just don't understand it.

Ingrid Irigoyen: Maybe I'll take this in reverse. As the facilitator of the Ocean Action Plan working group. It's unclear to me what that group would draft starting tomorrow. Until some of the essential components of the plan has been further discussed, identified and agreed by the RPB. And one of the foundational components of that plan is everything that emerges from this series of IJC discussions. So it seemed to us that certainly there would need to be authorship publicly, a number of authors and then finally one very careful and hard-working editor who brings all of these pieces together into a document that is the OAP. But the components probably still need to be explored further so that workgroup that has been working very hard for many months to think through what that

approach could be, seemed well positioned and in work group discussions, some folks were interested in diving further into the geographic aspects of the work. That could include further exploration of some of the additional analysis, some of which have a spatial component to them. And if you look at the timeline that is suggested on page 9 of the memo, this will lead me to your other question. If you look at the entire bundle of the IJC activity, the identification of region-wide opportunities and actions require some facilitation. By that I mean having discussions, bringing ideas to the full RPB and reaching back down into the various agencies and states and other entities to pull the right colleagues into the discussion at the right moments. The group could really be a sort of an intellectual home for thinking through the region-wide opportunities. Some of that work, one could suggest, needs to make progress before diving in to the specific geographic areas. That would be heavily informed by what those region-wide opportunities are. If you look at the sequencing of the timeline, the suggestion is that the region-wide IJC actions workgroup which is

evolving from the IJC workgroup would start having exactly those discussions. Being the facilitator of conversations about the opportunities and potential actions, in the meantime the OAP workgroup which has expressed that interest in geographic element and the analysis could do the explanation of the analysis, resources available etc. Be the shepherd of some of the results of those analyses as they come forward and bring ideas to the RPB and they can employ that connecting role. And all of that work is closely linked so your question of why would you separate them is an excellent point. We have imagined that both of these workflows really fall under the IJC umbrella but that one group cannot possibly take all of that on in a timely fashion. It is one suggestion for how you might divide and conquer among groups and picking up on some of the benefits of current membership and interests within the groups.

Laura Cantral: Laura.

Laura McKay: "It always gets confusing with the naming of cats, which is a serious matter", to quote TS Eliot. We do get hung up on it but looking at it, it did occur to me like I think what Kevin was thinking was have one IJC workgroup and continue to think about the region-wide and the geographic specifics but it seems a little confusing to suddenly have a geographic scope, specific geographic areas, workgroups, maybe renaming that something like if you want to call it the synthesis workgroup or whatever name you want to give it. But it would be the group that looks and perhaps not only at ecological value but what Greg brought up about economic value. That is another whole kind of assessment and equally valid. So it would be really great if we could do some work towards having synthesize maps and data that showed both the ecological and economic value in it that would then inform

wary go next whichever interjurisdictional action we want to move ahead with. We may want to do a little renaming of things so it is a little more clear. I think we are getting there.

Laura Cantral: Let's get a few more actions and ideas on the table and see where we are.

Greg Capobianco: Thanks, after Kevin explained and I did not read this over this morning so I wanted to get my thoughts together, I kind of like the way the workflows are broken out. I guess from my perspective I see that now IJC involvement doing different things that the OAP work group also doing different things. Whether we rename them are not, I don't care too much but I think, it's a complicated timeline. It makes me nervous. But I think it's fairly well thought out and I want to take this opportunity to just enthusiastically throw my hat in the ring for a state rep on

the IJC workgroup.

Laura Cantral: Great, thank you. So let's go down the line here.

Sarah Cooksey: Just a couple of comments and then a suggestion. It seems to me that our OAP is going to be a list; our actions will be interjurisdictional actions primarily that is what I'm getting from today's meeting. Which is fine. And it looks to me, if you follow my logic, that we will have the guts of the draft plan by April, May or June, that is with the draft for IJC opportunities are supposed to be developed by this new workgroup.

I think that the ROA needs to do some real soul-searching. I have not discussed this with my colleague but it sounds like what I thought the ROA was going to do is not going to be doing what I thought it was. That is just the reality. And then I have a question, I am not sure where the map in the data discussion we had, I guess it was before lunch, a longtime ago already, how does that fit into

these workgroups? Where would that mapping be done in the IJC workgroups?

Ingrid Irigoyen: If you could just say a little bit more it might help me understand the question.

Sarah Cooksey: We had great presentations this morning, great tools available through the portal and it sounds like the ROA, I am just saying this is my feelings, it sounds like the ROA is not going to help us right now. It sounds like we are on a fast-track and the documents we have provided while are very good, are not really going to be an assessment, they are going to be more of the facts. That is okay, Laura gave a good example of how after Virginia had done all of the modeling work, they were happy to find out that where they thought were special places were special places and I think a lot of us know right now some areas that we could just say hey, let's start working on this. So anyway, I think the ROA needs to do some soul-searching as to what we are going to do here.

But I think we still are going to do some data and mapping analysis, if it is not done by the ROA, where will that be done?

Ingrid Irigoyen: That is helpful, thank you. So I think depending on which additional analyses you all would be interested in pursuing an contingent on resources and all of that, those analyses one would imagine would be conducted by contractors. I don't have the expertise to do that for you.

Sarah Cooksey: What workgroup would oversee that and direct them?

Ingrid Irigoyen: What we suggested was that the OAP workgroup that would help facilitate a lot of that discussion and bring suggestions to the RPB, help to convene and to manage some of that work going forward. Depending upon the structure of different contracts and someone that can vary, there is a lot of uncertainty there.

And I think it's possibly, Sarah, part of your question was

where do the results of those analyses appear in the timeline? I would suggest that where they are used is in the identification of the kind of action that would be reflected in the plan. So both region-wide actions, IJ actions that you may wish to take and include in the OAP plan and actions that are specific to specific geographies. That the outcomes of those analyses would be helpful to inform those decisions that you would make. And, very important, also inform your day to day work.

And that one of the major outcomes of this process is not only the actions that you have identified but also a set of products that as you are making the decisions that you already make under your existing authorities that you may find some of those products to be useful to you.

Anyone else would like to chime in, you are welcome too.

Laura McKay: Just to clarify what I was proposing is that there be a new workgroup, initially I was proposing a new workgroup that was about data integration, data synthesis. Whether we want to have that function under the current ROA or the current OAP, I don't know. I want to make sure that we have the right group together to make those things happen and relatively quickly because I think those analyses are key backgrounds for any IJC actions.

Ingrid Irigoyen: So that is helpful and it reminds me of another point that may be helpful to consider. All of these analyses should inform identification of actions and certainly confirm that any actions that are bubbling to the surface are in fact good ones. I hope that doesn't mean that you are stalled out until the results of those analyses come in but as Sarah mentioned there are analyses that could use attention and there is no reason to hold those discussions back. You can go ahead and think about the kind of

interjurisdictional coordination issues that perhaps you may have been wrestling with for years. Maybe this body could help to begin to resolve some of those. There may be geographic areas that could use some focused attention by the people around this table. If those are already in your mind I would encourage you to the workgroups at the full RPB meetings, call me later and tell me what they are. To go ahead and start putting those ideas down and explore them preliminary in the meantime.

Laura Cantral: So two things to flag as we go forward in this discussion about workflows and timeline in the workgroups is two questions related to compositional workgroups, one is the point that Laura just made, there needs to be group that is organized around further exploring and how to move forward with data analysis and that whole bundle of work. What is called and two sits on it, we need to think through and have some clarity leaving

this meeting about what that looks like and you have options. The other thing that Sarah is reminding us that I have said it a few times today, we owe it to the ROA workgroup to come back to provide some more clarity which I think was embedded in your question about what the nature of the ROA and the work that has to be done to inform the ROA, should be given out, thinking has been evolving in the last couple of days. So I'm just flagging for those for further discussion.

Joe Atangan: I keep reminding myself that fear is a good thing and right now I am really scared. Thank you for putting together this visual of the timelines that we have to operate under. While I appreciate the thought of getting a working group here, I'm also ever mindful that it is not just about setting up a working group, it is about getting the right expertise and the right people on those workgroups. Just to be frank, if you look at the competition of the assessments group, of the action plan group, of the interjurisdictional coordination group, you'll find a lot of the same

folks on there. So when you talk about, well we'll get interjection of new stuff in there, there ain't anybody new except for the people at the table right now. And frankly, there is such a thing is working group fatigue that starting to set in. When I look at my overall calendar and I see there's an invite for a telecom and sometimes twice a week, it starts getting overwhelming really quick so I'm just getting a little bit scared right now that where posting a lot of actions that have to be taken care of and when I look at folks in the room that have to take care of it there is a finite amount of resources available. So, call me scared, because I am but as eager as I am to get started, I am mindful of the fact that I am an army of one and every once in a while I get someone to help me out and it is a very daunting task. One other point that I want to toss it there with regard to the timelines, we are focused on the timelines and I agree with the timelines; one, we have to have that draft done by, we're talking about that last night in my big concern is not

getting a draft approved by OAP. My biggest concern is getting a draft through my own agency. I am mindful of that because of the experience I had trying to get the charter signed off and how long it took to get a simple, very noncommittal charter signed off by each one of the agencies. I fear that we are underestimating the time that it takes to get these things through and I need every agency and every state to be mindful of this because it may change the behaviors of how you staff things and how you get things through as we proceed down the road to creating these documents.

Ingrid Irigoyen: You have made this point in the past which we have very much taken to heart and if you look at the timeline on page 9, you could see that the suggestion is that in quarter one and two of 2016 to have a draft OAP for public review and by RPB review we do not mean you all because you will have approved the release of the draft but taking that home and ensuring that you are comfortable with that draft in moving forward. The question to you is, is the sequence the correct sequence and does that allow enough

time for what you think you'll need to do to take this on?

Joe Atangan: I can confirm right now, if we are going to have a draft ready for public review in one year, we have to have a draft ready for our agencies to review sometime this summer. I know that is not what folks want to hear but think about it. That's not too far off, the estimates there, just mindful of that.

Ingrid Irigoyen: So the other timing aspect is that the hope that by the time anything would be put on paper with the label, draft OAP, that any sort of actions would already have been run through your agencies. Your agency would not be committed or be asked to commit to anything that has not already been thoroughly discussed. By all of the various sister agencies and various personnel who need to have been part of that discussion which is why you see starting and quarter one of this year, then again shorthand

using agency for shorthand, Greg to your point, having discussions within the member entities starting that right away. Some of those being agency by agency, multiagency but fairly quickly out of the gate after this meeting, start moving on those opportunities, start identifying the sections, putting those on the table and having meetings with the right people at home to ensure that we are not even wasting time talking about things a given member entity is a comfortable eventually, potentially including in an ocean action.

Joe Atangan: My concern is that, I cannot speak for other fellow agencies or the states, but I am not sure that is how that works. I don't think each agency will be able to put a partial section up for agency approval because they'll want to see the entire thing. I understand that we can staff things and grease the skids a little bit but ultimately we have to come to terms with the fact that before anything goes out to the agencies is the complete package has to be reviewed, and that what's going to take time.

Laura Cantral: We hear you and we understand that reality. I think that the point that we were trying, first of all this makes it look very linear, step-by-step but it is not so linear. I think what Ingrid was trying to describe was that it would be foolish to put things into a draft plan that you already know your agency is not going to be comfortable with and you know that because there has been some discussions reaching up and down and sideways into your agency to understand that. And that is what would be, we would be able to benefit from some so by the time there is a draft that needs to be reviewed, by the RPB member entities, you have some confidence in the level of support that you're likely to get. That's not to be so naïve that that is just a slam-dunk because we recognize that there are channels and hiccups along the way. That may just have to be, we have to see what we get and deal with it because your points taken and the time is what it is and we have to break it down and do our best.

And to your other point about workgroup participation and there is a lot of work laid out here and you are busy people and the group that you are, and the role that you play here, so we are hopeful that you have energy and appetite and willingness to participate and volunteer if you haven't been participating in these groups. Thank you Greg, I hope that others will follow Greg's lead and sign-up for different things. If you're comfortable let us know now or after.

There is an opportunity for you to involve colleagues in your agency or sister agencies or other sister agencies in your state. So we've got some evidence of that and we have people who are participating in the workgroups who are colleagues of the RPP members. So there is an opportunity there, it doesn't have to be just the people sitting here at the table. In some instances, having a broader expertise would be helpful or a good thing and we are already benefiting from it. So where was I, Liz?

Elizabeth Semple: I agree with a lot of what everybody has said and I appreciate all of the work that you all have done. I am

very thankful that this is more thought out than it appeared yesterday morning. There has been a lot of work that has gone into it and it's really good but I do think that potentially we need to take a step back on the assessment. That seemed to be playing a big role in the portal information, the area where the assessment occurs. It seems to me that you don't want to document and create the characterization, and sit on the shelf, it needs to serve a purpose.

We don't know the aim of it yet. And on the other hand, the IJC work, if it becomes and it should be I think the framework or a big piece of the framework of the OAP, that can build and keep that together with the old OAP group and have them start to draft, maybe not the OAP but a white paper to say this is what it is and that could eventually be filled out. The way it is written now, I cannot take this to my upper management.

But, if we had a work plan for the assessment, the

analysis that plays into what data we need and how to fill the assessment out, that is going to interact with the white paper of what is the OAP going to look like and what is the sequence of it. Then when we have those two pieces working hand in hand we only have two workgroups, with the right mix of people in each, that would be less conference calls. Which is the overall aim of everything.

Laura Cantral: Could we stick on the theme about the assessment for the Regional Ocean Assessment and have some thoughts about what that needs to be and points that Sarah has raised and Doug I think you are on the workgroup and maybe you are thinking about this particular point.

Doug; Thanks and great thoughts from the gentle lady from New Jersey. I agree, I think the ROA has really struggled and I have been incredibly impressed with that group and the group that is here, that is the RPP and including the public and

everybody that is part of this process. We have an assessment and I think right now if we would pick a hypothetical project we would have no lack of comment of what is in that area that we are proposing in that project. I think from a descriptive perspective or a research perspective, I think we kind of all have that knowledge base. What we don't have is an assessment of what we need to do to complete the goals of the framework. I think moving forward. I think we also don't have an assessment of the challenges that we're facing, which is where, what I think the assessment is more about. What do we need to do to deal with a changing climate? Things like that for example.

We've really struggled with your typical, write a PhD thesis of water quality in the Mid-Atlantic, which might make a good coffee table book, but won't help us as far as deciding what measures need to be taken or how we should, let me rephrase, how we can provide advice to the

agencies that are making decisions, states and everybody in that, in this area that they will further the goals that we all feel are important moving forward. I think the ROA should be more of a virtual variable document or tool or machine. That's always been, Laura has always campaigned on the portal and moving forward that we struggled by linkage between the two, I think that is the work group that could be reconstituted to deal with that linkage. In the same thing, I think the IJC fits into that as well, how are we going to resolve when we have those conflicts? Because everything we do has an impact. Everything we do in the ocean has an impact, it doesn't matter who we are or who we work for, the reality is we don't want it to have an impact that is such contrary to the goals that we all approved.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne, I know you've been waiting for a while

Gwynne Schultz: I think right now we are totally

confused on all of the different workgroups and admissions of the workgroups. I think part of the problem was we try to reconstitute existing workgroups and to me, it's all about what skill set that we need to accomplish the objective? And regardless of which it's called, we really need people with a strong technical skills and understanding, and knowledge to work also with contractors for the analysis, that's the group. Whether it is some of the folks that are already in the ocean regional assessment group or others, that is what we should be creating. Similarly, the IJC I see right now is often about management practices and government programs and how all of these things work out and so I think we folks that have that strong knowledge of working within the management framework and applying different programs. So that is the skill set for that. So the one thing I keep struggling is this specific geographical area, right now I think it's got to be probably a little bit of both. Once more technical groups start saying, these are

important areas that we really have to make sure we focus on these and then also the IJC might say, wow this could really, this management activity could be further explored in a smaller geographic area. That is the future linkage and whether it is the co-chairs getting together or their colleagues participating in different groups to say this is a place where we can get people working on that. Right now, I think we should focus more on skill sets to get the right people with the right groups.

Laura Cantral:           Karen?

Karen Chytalo:           I agree with you Gwynne, we have to get the right skill sets with the right groups. But I think we still have to define the groups. I don't think we are there yet. I have been trying to think what makes sense here at this point, it is getting difficult. I could see the IJC workgroup, the long views of the coast and all of that stuff. I can see a group of synthesis information as bringing in the portal team to come together and

look at the stuff we have and look at the socioeconomics and look at the habitat stuff, resources and get all of that stuff put together as to what do we really know and ask the ROA, give us a report on such and such to produce more synthesis stuff so they could start to plot out some of these areas and maybe look at the specific areas, I think you guys came out right, as crazy as it might seem. The OAP group, who put all of the pieces together at the end, but in the meantime, get the synthesis and let the old OAP group join the portal group and get to do more the synthesis and see what other further analyses could be done on a short-term. Look at the information we have, talk to the IJC crew to tell them this is what we are seeing in finding and stuff like that and here are some issues. Is this ringing true with what you're looking at the regional basis? Get this stuff down on paper and see how that works. I don't know if that makes any sense but I think we to have to divide up some of the labor on stuff and I really think we have to get more of the

synthesis or information we do have and maybe we do need more detail analyses and some further analysis of looking at what other types of tools need to be examined and stuff like that. I would like to see the synthesis work group, if you want to call it that rather than the old OAP might be better, more along those lines. That's it.

Laura Cantral: All right, many of you have weighed to say you think it's a good idea to have some group organized to focus on the technical aspects of this work. The additional analysis that's needed, synthesis, that bundle of support for the regional planning process. So I would like for us to just try to pick these off and see if we can reach some clarity about what kind of groups we need to be organized and then see where we are. Laura McKay: I am looking at you because you are the one who brought this up and it's been supported by many of your colleagues. If you are prepared, why don't you share your vision for what this group needs to do and how to get some clarity right now or very soon about who is going to participate and help out with that work because the one

thing, and I am the least equipped to talk about the technicalities here but one thing I do know is that I think it needs to be figured out right away because you don't have time to waste.

Laura McKay: So, it seems like there is consensus we want some kind of data synthesis group. Maybe that is all we need to call it and let's just start fresh and not worry whether it's the OAP people or the ROA people. Let's just put out some new group names and let people say what they want to work on. I kind of like what Liz was saying, there really are two streams here. It is either the IJC process stream or the data synthesis stream. All of it is the OAP and all of it, certainly synthesis is part of the assessment. So hopefully we could just create these groups, we could put them up on the wall but it is really that additional analysis piece that I am interested in on the chart up there and forming a group that deals with that.

There may need to be subparts to it because I think the skill sets for the economics synthesis but quite different than the ecological/biological synthesis. But from a GIS perspective, I think our portal team has some great ideas and we have not given them a chance to speak up in all of this and I do not know if Tony or Jay wants to weigh in and say anything I can imagine working with the portal team and MARCO ocean mapping and data team is really focus, and the RPB, and focusing in on getting something done as quickly as we can. Even if we don't have a final synthesis map in the plan, at least this plan you're trying to get fast-track approved can describe how were going about this, even if it's not done. So that at least we kind of meet the deadline and get it out there. So that's what I would propose for that part and I just really like the simplification idea of the IJC process folks getting together and different skill sets in the data synthesis stream. Maybe we can do that. Then for both of them, they both need to integrate stakeholder input. I would say as we get going further down the road on the data synthesis, the basic steps I was making myself some notes

about exactly what would we do, we would look at the data layers that we already have that are existing and what we are about to get in the next couple of months so we know what's coming as we then go into the very important step to reach an agreement of a synthesis methodology. That is no small thing. On how we want to pull the data layers together. Those type of questions are going to be really important.

That would be step two and step three, once we figure out what type of methodology we want, we have to look at do we have the resources, do we have the capability already on our portal team? We probably do but do we have the funding for it? We might have some we may want to look for a little more to get it done. This gives us the opportunity that we know the scientists in our region has been aching for two way in on what we are doing here so we need to get all of the right scientist, not necessarily all at the table with us but on our lists to look at this as we move

along.

Finally, we get a draft synthesis map and I'm talking about this ecological value. I hope we can do something parallel on the economic side. And then once we have some of these synthesis maps then we go out and start betting on our stakeholders. We want to go out and make sure that the people who are out there using the ocean who may sometimes know better than sciences where things are or not, but all of that gets pulled in. So that was just my quick reaction running thrill of how we would actually do this in network group.

Laura Cantral: Thank you for that outline and I want us to stay on this just further explore it and wrestle this to the ground. Is your comment related to this? Go ahead please.

Mike Luisi: I support the recent proposal here, what I would like to ask is, what has happened now to the proposed ROA outline and work that has been done to that point? Is that being put

on hold or are we still thinking that we are going to put some descriptive characteristics of the different topics and subheadings to fill the content of this document that we all were working to put together so that each of our respective agencies could use something like this to be better informed on making decisions? Is that all still going to continue because I understand the resource issue, in my agency, I supervise a program in our state that deals with commercial fish reporting, I get about 5,000 - 8,000 sheets of paper a month they come into my office and little by little I have lost people along the way. A couple of years ago I have found out that there is a women's prison facility close by my office that has the state of the art data entry, a command center, so we contract out to prisoners to do the work for us. One cent per piece of paper. That is not available to us here. There is a lot of work and I'm tapping into what Joe and Kevin have mentioned before, the amount of work that has to be done. I want to ask a

question on top of what's going to happen to the outline that we have.

So, if we all go back to our respective agencies or the folks who work here we are representing whether it is state, federal, or management council or tribal, how are the priorities of the RPB then going to be viewed by those agencies and other entities, do they come to the surface now? If I go back to the Council and mentioned that staff on the Council now have to take on all of these duties to work towards development of the ROA and the synthesis, maybe somebody would sit on the synthesis workgroup but it would detract from work that is expected by our stakeholders for fisheries management. I think we're going to find some challenges along the way, when the rubber hits the road on those kinds of things, we are going to find ourselves in another tight spot. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on that.

Gwynne Schultz: On that point, that was one of the reasons why yesterday when the Regional Ocean Assessment

group asked about prioritizing certain topics to work on first, that is why I was hoping we could do this ecological areas of importance. Can you prioritize that data layer first? As far as helping to characterize it. I see the work of that group helping to feed into this data synthesis work.

Laura Cantral: Joe.

Joe Antangan: So I went to pull up to about 40,000 feet to get a better look at this thing here. In response to what happens to the ocean assessment. I still believe that assessment is critical to setting the priorities for what will ultimately be the deliverable here. I'm struggling with this thing called the original action plan with the actual deliverables are. So I'm focused on interjurisdictional actions in opportunities, that gets me thinking that the action plan is going to be about interagency coordination

things. Okay? That's great but how do you prioritize what those interagency coordination things are without some sort of assessment on that will help you prioritize what the major coordination issues that we are going to tackle.

I think I am still in support of some sort of assessment that will lead us down the path of when we come up with the deliverables that the recipients of the Ocean Action Plan will be able to answer this so what question. The so what question still eludes me that I think we need to come back to them. Each one of the folks sitting here has to go back to their agencies and say "hey, this is why you want to pay attention" that is so what factor.

Laura Cantral: Kevin.

Kevin Chu: Laura has proposed some activities in the workgroup and I want to support those. If that happens, Mike has asked whether the ROA group is going to do and I don't know but one thing I do know with absolute confidence is the timeline where

we are supposed to complete the Regional Ocean Assessment for the next quarter, we cannot do that. I cannot agree with the timeline. That's a red flag. Joe and a number of others are saying, how are we going to figure out how to move forward is really complicated. Many of the things that we are talking about are really going to take five years or more if we are going to do that well. In listening and trying to tease out what we can we take from this conversation.

To me it is clear that we need a roadmap. We need to figure out what we're going to do. Recognizing the efforts of the co-chairs to provide that I don't see that particular one as working. I think it was Ingrid that said the Ocean Assessment, the Ocean Action Plan depends on the work of a number of other working groups. I'm not sure if that's true. What I think we can do and this provides the roadmap, is to develop a plan for how we are going to move forward. I don't see any reason why that cannot be

our Ocean Action Plan that we finish by 2016. To inform everybody of what it is that is important in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and how we're going to go about going forward I think that's what the people in the audience are dying for. Why are we getting together and how will we move forward. What are our goals here?

I think we could develop a draft plan for people to comment on that would say, here are the challenges to the region. Here are the steps we're going to take to develop mechanisms to preserve the ecological value in the area. Here are steps we're going to take to identify and encourage the activities that have economic value. Here are the things that were going to do in order to ensure that traditional and cultural values are being taken into account as we make decisions. Here are ways in which we intend to collaborate across the boundaries. We don't need to have bits of that done before we lay the big picture out. I think that is our plan.

It will be an eight year process, I suspect, for example when you talk about ecological value, we will have to do the kind of assessment that Laura has already done for Virginia. We will

have to lay out what data sets are available. We will have to figure out what are the questions that we want to address. We will have to figure out how do we reconcile the various agencies in assessment. How we bring together models.

Before we do that we should ask what are the models that we really need. There are some wonderful models that we heard about today but with they may not be the ones that we need to address the questions that we have got. Likewise, economic value. Where are the data? What kind of activities are we going to need to know about or how do we fit that into the importance of saving or preserving the ecological value. We have to talk about that and figure out a series of steps that we can take in order to achieve that. I think what my sense of what an Ocean Action Plan should be, could be, would be helpful for all of us is answering those questions first.

Laura Cantral: You go first.

Ingrid Irigoyen: Thank you Kevin it is helpful to hear the perspective and could I take a crack at repeating what I think I heard and tell me if this is correct. Perhaps in other words, instead of conducting some of these analyses and committing in the plan to certain specific collaborative actions, instead, perhaps what you are describing is a plan that would commit to a process for how you would do those things. So you would say "we will conduct the following kinds of analyses.

We will use the following process to identify actions. We have not conducted these analyses or have committed to those actions by the deadline". I think what we had been imagining is the work plan would be that. And that vision of what you described as being the workplan at the plan itself, the ocean plan would actually include the results of analyses and commitments to certain actions is certainly more ambitious. That's my reflection.

Laura Cantral: I have the same sense what you are describing is a workplan that supports the ultimate development of the Ocean Action Plan that has all of the elements that are in there.

Kevin Chu: So I think there is one nuanced difference. Which is that it would be a workplan plus a sense of where we want to go. That provides the rationale for our work and what we aim to accomplish. We do a lot of work but why? We've got sort that out. That's the difference.

Joe Antangan: As Kevin was speaking, I wrote down, Plan for planning. I think we have been down this road once already. Unfortunately, and I do agree with you the work might be set forth for some sort of roadmap but I think the subtle difference there is because of the timelines that this RPB was operating under, we came up very

quickly with an objective. And the framework to get to those goals and objectives. And then workplan and subsequent things followed out of that. So what I think Kevin is proposing here is essentially a more deliberative approach that includes identifying all the critical steps that have to take place. It's almost a sequential type of approach. As much as I would like to support that, I just don't know that it is sustainable. I agree with you. In an ideal world that would be the way we would do it.

However, I am a realist and I do fear that there is a point there where if you prolong the effort too much that eventually people lose interest. People change over. You lose continuity. And then you produce a product or products that nobody is interested in anymore and it becomes overcome by that because of the pace of technology, the pace of the change of issues and the pace of the political environment, the pace of attitude and stuff. So I hear you, but I also am very mindful that the reality is out there that there is some expectations of some sort of deliverable. I hate to throw

away what we have been working on for essentially the past three or four years.

Laura Cantral: Kevin you look like you want to react to that.

Kevin Chu: I just raise the points as usual. The reason I advocate my approach is because I think it is achievable in the time that is available to us. The issue that was raised, we are really under the gun to do something. This is something that we can produce that would be clear and guide us into the future whereas I strongly suspect that if we just continue to move all the blocks forward as we are doing without a better sense of what is the most important thing to take on, why are we doing this? I think we will fail to achieve a plan by the end of 2016. Certainly we will fail to achieve a plan by end of this year. The very reason that I'm advocating is it is a doable task.

It is a plan to plan but the things that we have been talking about are multiyear activities. And we need to acknowledge that and we need to prepare ourselves for a longer-term push.

Ingrid Irigoyen: I am mindful that people want to ask questions and is deathly not all about me. I do have an idea that perhaps could meet all of the above. It would be to have a plan that articulates actions that would be longer-term. This is borrowing some inspiration from the New York Ocean Action Plan. I believe they have short-term actions and you can have a set of those more concrete commitments. You can have the results of some analyses that are achievable by that time frame.

We could have some things that we are describing as IJC actions that are committed to the plan and you could also have some of these longer-term ideas that may take more years and resources that have not yet been secured. Those can also be articulated in the plan so that in some sense an achievable hybrid of the two concepts. It may be important to demonstrate some

concrete value through this process and one of the many comments that we have heard from several members of the public, at the May RPB meeting was urging this RPB to make it by the 2016 deadline in part for those political reasons that are real.

For folks who care about this process and what it to endure, having some concrete demonstrations of the values is something you might want to consider.

Laura Cantral: I too am mindful that there are several people who have their tents up and those of you who don't, if you have any thoughts on your mind before we wrap up this discussion, not that we are wrapping this up now. We will come back to this discussion. We are not going to leave this meeting until we have some clarity on how to strike the sweet spot here. This is a challenge. It is an important discussion. So let me just acknowledge the people I see want to speak. Liz, Karen, Mike and Sarah.

Elizabeth Semple: I was going to agree with Ingrid. I think there is a hybrid, there has to be a plan to plan or plan, a plan for interjurisdictional coordination. I think we should let Laura and the assessment team and the MARCO portal team go. They are willing to take a shot at figuring out what the assessments are. Let them go. The rest of us who are more management people, suffer what the plan for interjurisdictional coordination is. We fold in the science with the coronation.

Laura Cantral: Bob.

Bob Labelle: I think we should too, let them go. And I think the IJC group should get going too. I don't know why we're so timid to grab some of those problems and start working on the. By the way Kevin I think what you said was a great thing that should go in the plan. How to do it right, how to do it long-term

and how to improve as you go along. That definitely belongs in the plan. But, I went back to the national Ocean council's handbook on marine planning. It should be easy for us to find. Here are some of the examples they thought that an implementation plan could do: facilitate more effective permitting, characterize environmental conditions to assistance citing new uses, address management challenges that would benefit for multi-government resolution, better inform agencies on government to government consultations, inform effective co-location on new ocean uses. We've got most of those things out there. This is a great opportunity. We are around for at least another two years, if we don't get started right now I think we will make a big mistake.

Laura Cantral: Karen.

Karen Chytalo: We have to get beyond the plan to plan, otherwise I think I will go crazy. We have too many process meetings, I think I will die. I'm telling you now. I really think that, I agree with Bob, the IJC should get going, synthesis should get going. Let's start working on some of the information we have, get the money to help us along the way, ROA maybe you can write us a white paper. What is special about the Mid-Atlantic. Tell us what is special in thinking about all of the things that are coming up and what are some of the issues or something like that. Throw things against the wall and see what sticks at this point. As a group and then come back with some sort of a white paper that tells us here is three- five pages. This is the essence of the Mid-Atlantic or something like that rather than writing a whole big assessment at this point. More of the assessment will get done through the synthesis group at this point. Maybe that would help too. Put some things out there. Have something like that going out to the public. Some people can say that okay, I agree, I can see myself as part of this thing and I can see the Mid-Atlantic and how it is a different

region than the Northeast and all that kind of stuff. Rather than worms and shellfish and everything else. Let's get to the meat. To start seeing some of these products go.

I appreciate people going back to our New York plan and looking at short, interim and long-term type of things. And that should become a part of the whole operation that we have to do. We have to start with something. We have to just keep building upon it. The more you learn, the more you find out that you don't know. That's always the case. You need to explore more things and get those things down on paper. At least we can push the envelope forward rather than standing. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Karen. Mike

Michael Jones: Thank you. I went to take a quick opportunity here. I want to provide a different way to look at this as opposed to Joe and Kevin's discussion about

timelines. I believe it has a lot to do with managing the public's expectation of what this process is. I'm going to try not to say the word "plan" for this entire story. In my world, the world that I live in and work in, recreational fisheries are understood through an estimation process to determine what was caught by recreational anglers along the Atlantic Coast each year. We can't obviously know every single fish that crosses the docs but there is a survey that is put together. They do the best they can. I'm going to get a few of these names and dates wrong but years ago the survey was reviewed. It was determined to have critical flaws in the estimation procedures for determining recreational harvest. While this was happening anglers were upset and frustrated that their fisheries aren't well understood and we ended up having to do things as managers that impacted them based on inaccurate data that the managers know is wrong but that's all we have. That's all we can use.

So part of this, the national resource council's recommendations required that the federal government put

together a new estimation procedure and a new estimation program to determine recreational harvest. It went from something called the Marine recreational fisheries statistics survey to the Marine recreational information program. When the federal government said they were going to do this they said they were going to do that in two years. Two or three years. I'm just making this up but that is how the information came out. Two or three years we are going to have this entirely new system established and it's going to be fantastic, sit back relax and it is all going to will be great. It's probably been six or seven years or may be more and the program, although it is making progress, nothing against the work that's being done. I would never say that because progress is being made, it's just being made on a realistic pace based on the resources and the available time that people have to get the job done.

To the point that is being made, we may be better off with managing the expectations of the public. I will say

one last thing. After the two or three years, everyone started to get very upset. You promised us this, what do you mean the program is not done yet? Fishermen were upset and managers were upset and that level of anger grew each and every year that the product wasn't completed and is still not done. I think we need to think about going forward with this planning process. Oh shit, I just said planning. I didn't say plan. I didn't mean to say shit either. I am just thinking a little bit out loud about our expectations to the public whether or not a product that we put together is going to be useful. If it's not useful, there is no reason to do it. Is it going to be better to take five years to put something together and have it be useful and tell people down that is going to take five years or should we rush to get something done that is not going to be useful and we face the criticism. I just wanted to let you guys know about that from my world.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so lots of ideas and perspectives and some suggestions for different approaches. And because we are

going to start a public comment session in 10 minutes, a little bit less than 10 minutes. I'm going to suggest that we adjourned for a short break and then we will hear what the public has to say. They have some views that they want to share with you. Then we're going to come back because I have some, my summary thoughts to share based on what I have heard that I would like to offer to see if we have some sense of direction. We're going to come out of this meeting with some sense of direction. We are going to do that. And I think we're getting close.

Kevin Chu: We've only got until five.

Laura Cantral: We are going to get there because do you know what? I think we are closer than what you think we are. I think one thing that is going to help you is when you go into the break room and you eat those three big platters of sugar pastries and you will get all jacked up on

sugar. And you're going to know just how good you are. We will see you back here at 4 o'clock.

BREAK

Laura Cantral: Okay folks let's get started. Brent, are you ready?

Brent Greenfeld: Good afternoon. My name is Brent Greenfeld and the following comments are made on behalf of the National Ocean Policy Coalition. I would like to start just by following up on the discussion that just took place and just make a couple of notes.

One, in addition to the concerns and the comments that we made on the substance of this effort, we also probably know that the process here is certainly critical. There is an essential need to do things the right way in a sequential manner, establishing the

mechanisms for things like formal stakeholder engagement, doing the analysis, making sure that everything is based on the sound science before making decisions that could be very consequential.

I also want to touch on the discussion about decision criteria being interjurisdictional coordination. There were several notations for various individuals earlier about the fact that this criteria is going to be very important and that there is a need to have great transparency and to have this information well-publicized, given the fact that this criteria will be used to identify actions and issues that could be implemented in a manner as a result of this process. In a way again, that could ultimately impact jobs and livelihoods.

And so in that regard, what I would, I cannot stress enough the importance of making sure that before the RPB goes forward in making decisions to identify potential issues and actions to address and include in the Ocean Plan

that the public and the user group community be provided with an opportunity to review the RPB's preferred approach, if it's the bullets that were displayed earlier in the slides and in whatever form they take the public and user group community can be given an opportunity to see those and weigh in on that.

There are a few other comments. The list of potential data analysis and decision support tools developed for RPB consideration, in addition to my comments yesterday about being again sequential and providing for public review of the RPB's proposed approach, that the coalition continues to maintain that the RPB should not develop compatibility assessments, not to influence decision-making for reasons including, redundancy with the current statutes and also the lack of clarity as to how they would be funded, inclusive and reflective of stakeholder input and user resource data as well as how they would be used and applied across various sectors and authorities. To the extent that any compatibility assessments were to be created they should reflect nonbinding reference materials based on sound science and data

and address all existing and potential future uses and resources. They should be carried out under a transparent and public process that has the consensus support of the region's existing and potential future user group communities.

The coalition also continues to emphasize the importance of collecting data and information on all environmental and existing and potential future economic uses and resources in a simultaneous manner to help ensure a comprehensive well-informed and non-discriminatory process. Thus, preparation of a comprehensive region-wide analysis of the marine economy addressing existing and future uses is critical. As to a region-wide assessment that varies in ecological importance, the coalition is concerned that time and resource intensive efforts through this process to characterize the regions ecosystem by identifying new areas of importance through the development and distribution abundance products and identification of

hotspots for migration corridors and other such areas, should cause unnecessary or unjustified time and space restrictions or include an investment in new economic activities, inhibit informed decision-making and drain scarce agency resources.

In the RPB efforts they should be limited in this area to identifying areas already designated through existing authorities. In so doing it should identify the purposes for any such areas that were designated in the manner in which they are managed as well as seek comment on any proposed user application of information resulting from the research effort. In addition, decisions as to the use of existing or new ecosystems measures should be left to the individual statutory authorization agency through their processes. The RPB should avoid engaging in or supporting ecosystem-based management approaches, trade-off analysis and cumulative impact assessments, given the current state of knowledge, practical experience and resource capacity associated with these types of activities.

The proposed process criteria and examples of potential

interjurisdictional coordination actions references the use of formal agreements to secure agency implementation commitments that will lead to changes in their business practices and protocols. Including through actions to influence Coastal Zone Management Act, National Environmental Policy Act and other statutorily based actions.

The coalition continues to maintain that institutionalizing use of an ultimate ocean plan and agency decision making would only serve to heighten regulatory uncertainty of memorializing application, non-statutorily authorized product and statutory decision-making activities. Rather than seek to commit agencies to using a product that hasn't been authorized by statute and its implementation may conflict with processes establish through existing authoring regulation, the RPB should instead closely engage all existing and emerging and future user groups in an effort to provide non-binding data and information for

agencies to voluntarily use as they seek fit based on their own judgment and timelines. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Brent. Matt Gove, you're next.

Matt Gove: 4 o'clock and the second day all right. There is fudge back there, I don't know if you saw it, it looks weird but its fudge and it's good. I didn't get a chance to say this yesterday so I wanted to a quick thing, I'm not sure if everyone knows as far as the outreach that we are doing, Emma was here before and she brought the footage. She has been hired part-time basis to amp our outreach. We have also been doing a lot of our email and webinars, trying to reach out to other non- consumptive recreational groups like divers, packers, those kind of folks. She is going to end it up with more phone calls, in person visits and more research into more groups like restaurants and hotels. We are starting to do

webinars before the meeting so I can bring it here and tell you guys and vice versa.

I would like to recommend, in the next year I think an easy way to check back in with the public is to do more webinars, like you have done in the past in the past. I think those are pretty low as far as time and money commitment and an easy way for people to call in. I don't think we have to do another listening session thing right away. Maybe when we get a draft action plan?

Hold on a second here, I'm just going to play a little motivational music (Don't Stop Believing by Journey). I know it's hard in you guys are really busy and it's tough; it's like a dark part of the movie when the superheroes like oh, and it all goes on from there and I think you guys can do this. You have a year and a half to focus on synthesis of actions and high-value things that you could do as a group. So it's all I have to say.

Laura Cantral: Thank you Matt, Bonnie Brady here next.

Bonnie Brady: Hello I am Bonnie Brady, Executive Director of Long Island Commercial Fishing Association. My comments are somewhat all over the ballfield because we were discussing a lot of issues so I'm going to get to some points as quickly as I can. I truly believe the essence of the Mid-Atlantic can be found in the Fishery Management Council's strategic plan. Like I said yesterday, they have done the work when it comes the assessments, when it comes to the stock status and when it comes the essential fish habitat taking and habitats of concern, which groups coexist peacefully and which are allowed to be in certain areas. That should be the first place that I feel that should be done, I have to keep doing this, pardon me, my eyes are old. Coastal communities were built on fishing, first as food and then as a source of money to their communities. Long Island and I would

gather to say the majority of the coastal communities within the Mid-Atlantic are incredibly dependent on not just commercial fishing but recreational fishing in the tourism, restaurants and hotels all of that.

People come to the beach because of a couple of things. They want to go out on a boat and either dive and spear fish or go out on a boat and catch a fish with a hook, go to the nice restaurants and eat fish and they hang out because they love the ocean and they love the fact that it's a nice environment to get away from though I've had a lot of fun in Chinatown the last couple of days. Traditional knowledge doesn't purely extend and note that is because I am right next door to Shinnecock, I don't want any hate mail but it does not extend purely to tribes, unless you want to call fishermen a tribe. Their knowledge is very, very site-specific. The ocean is our office. To be, perhaps, put over to a stakeholder group, as we would be glad to listen to, thank you for so much for your time, but not have what

they tell you to be utilized forcefully. I might say, when it comes to the interrelationship of fish in the water and the quality and the tidal patterns and the wind, they should be the first resources.

Rutgers has done some amazing research regarding butterfish with fishermen directly, John Manderson specifically, because what he seems to have synthesized, I don't usually use that word, is that when fishermen are off looking for fish, they have plotters and they've got this, but those that do it and do it well and can feed not only their families but keep the communities going have innate knowledge and the three-dimensional aspect of looking at tide, time, weather patterns, changes in temperature, migratory patterns, everything plus you have all of the mechanics and physics of keeping your boat afloat so you don't sink, when there's 20 – 30 miles an hour winds in the sea. That knowledge, while not devised in a science lab or tidal pool, is incredibly valid and to me the biggest problem that we have as an industry is the lack of academia that is willing to perhaps probe the mind of the fishermen and their base of knowledge, which it sometimes goes back 30 - 40 years

when they started and now they are 30 to 40 years on top of that. There is a language like when I was in the Peace Corps and spoken languages, it was a rate down, fishermen have a spoken language.

I would employ you all to utilize fishermen more effectively, they are not troglodytes walking the earth. They may look like an occasional husband who gets a little messy at times but may use a language that hasn't been used so far which is how you can tell the difference between the fishery management meeting and this meeting today? But they have such a body of knowledge that has been put off to the side because it doesn't fit the narrative.

My concern about this group here, is the same concern that I have about the MARCO group. They were funded by outside sources that have a certain advocacy goal. My concern is things like ocean health index which I am sure has really cool applications, but it was founded purely by groups that has spent a lot of money to advocate

a certain position that perhaps would not like to see commercial fishing in the picture unless it was the cute little cottage fishermen that goes out and catches three fish artisanally. I would appreciate more emphasis as far as the data is looked to NOAA, which has compendiums of data, everything, socioeconomic and all of the requirements, 500 pages easy on fishes, there are 245 on commercial species, give or take a couple in the US. There are plans for a 120, the data is there, we have contracted and in the industry, probably I would say, 16<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> of what we used to be. The stocks are for the most part four out of five overfishing is occurring, I believe the latest that's 82% that are not over fished at all. Those were on fishery management plans to bring it back to where it needs to be.

We are very leery at this process because whether or not you are a figurehead that's there to speak about, I am the commercial fishing woman, does that mean necessarily it will be rubberstamped and moved forward with what the intent is. And so I have to say what Kevin talked about deliberately process and

open process that doesn't take stakeholder input does not have, I have to go back to my notes for a second forgive me. Input engagement does not necessarily mean utilizing that input for cooperative result in a balanced conclusion. That is what I really, really ask you all to do. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Ron Rapp, you're next.

Ron Rapp: Thank you, I want to reiterate that we use fishermen extensively to help design routes for these little guys. I have four comments from the perspective of cable installer. One of the stakeholders, one of the seabed users, in addition to installing these, we apply for permits on behalf of our customers AT&T is one of them, Verizon and many others, so our interest is in the regulatory permanent process.

Four points. First one is thank you for getting cables recognized, I know that Greg helped a lot, others like Chris forgetting this highlighted. I see it is number nine in the

plan there. That wasn't the case in Monmouth University when we had the meeting in 2013. So that is great, I appreciate that.

Second one is I think I've learned over the last two days that I did not know this coming in, that the process going on here should not impact the existing regulatory processes and states and engineers with BOEM. Those are pretty much going to go on unimpeded so when we apply for a permit for a new cable, for instance, we should more or less expect the same thing. So I said I hope that understood correctly, so that is good. Otherwise, Barb Forgo will have to cut off everybody's Internet connection. But on the positive side, though the proactive nature of this group and a discussion, when we do apply for the next permit, things are going to be spring loaded. The discussions have already taken place and have taken place with all of the stakeholders, the states, that feds and different jurisdictions. So that maybe the process can go more quickly and more efficiently. Because time is really critical for those investing in these undersea systems, there's a lot of money involved, that they want them installed on a pretty tight timeline.

So, hopefully, the process here proves the timeline but also I think they can also improve the integrity and the quality of the installations. For instance, the cable installation because we're betting different stakeholders and looking at compatibility issues, as you all are, when we get the cable installed as an example will know it's already been considered by these other stakeholders so its long-term viability or reliability will be higher, we hope, less cuts and so forth. The fourth thing is that the data portal is really critical to you and it can be critical to us as a planer of cable routes. Before there was the Internet, we did desktop studies to plan routes using available resources and now we have a plethora of data and we plan to tap into these different data portals to help us design the best and most reliable cable routes. I think what we are going to be than are the end users, for that one end-user, one of the stakeholders for that, so we are pretty excited about that as well.

The other part of the data portal is that we spent a lot of time understanding fishing trends and year use so we can protect the cable so I think that element is going to be really important too. That's from a cable installers perspective, I guess my personal comment is that as a recreational sailboat, cap boater and birdwatcher, I appreciate what's going on here because I enjoy the ocean as much as you all do and I guess for the benefit of others in the room, I was in high school, I watched on the first Earth Day. Us from industry aren't always the bad guys. We tried to do the right thing. So thank you very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you, Ali you're next.

Ali Chase: Thank you for all of the thought and some you put in the last few days. I know it's more than that, I know you work on a weekly, daily basis to some extent trying to shoe this shoehorn this into your daily work and I really appreciate all the time you're using on this. A couple of thoughts, it was very

interesting discussion and I'm still working through some of it but I think that the executive order was very clear that what is encouraged is a plan. What is required is a plan. It is not a plan for a plan. It is a plan. We are hoping this or expecting that this process will result in action. I wanted to get that out there.

We appreciate all of the enthusiasm for the data analyses in support work and it was really exciting to see what they are doing in the Northeast and I'm really enthusiastic about the new work team to start looking at how some of that can be done here in the Mid-Atlantic.

Looking at the timeline that was presented in the briefing materials, I think one thing that we want to make sure is not lost is we start to figure out different names for different workflows and things like that, is that there should be identification of specific areas, specific geographic areas. And maybe falls within the new of synthesis work, it comes out of that. You want to make sure

that that pieces is it lost as things start to fall together.

My dad always had this quote and it drove me nuts as a kid. “There are two kinds of people in the world, the people that say they can and the people that they can't and they're both right.” I think that there are a number of people that are saying we can do this, let us try, let us go forward. Liz, I think you make the comment, let them go, they want to try go for it. Let's do it. Let's try for it lets see what you can get from this. Because I think that is the direction that we need to go in. To the extent that I and NRDC anybody else in the community can help you with that, we are help happy to do that. If you want us to talk at other folks at the agencies, we will do that. If there are other people you need to know, just let us know, I know that there's not, we can't do the actual writing of the document for you for whatever we can do to make your lives easier we want to do that. Thank you very much for your time.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So we've heard from everyone

who signed up for this last of the three public comics sessions and on behalf of the RPB, I'd like to think everybody who stuck it out for these two days and provided really helpful feedback during his public comment sessions. Your participation in the process and whatever mechanism is available in helping the RPB identify mechanisms and opportunities is really helpful, not just helpful but critical to the process. So I want to acknowledge the value of that.

So, I said before the break I was going to take a shot at summarizing what I heard out of the last discussion. And see if it resonates with you if it seems like the path forward and a way for us to think about what needs to be done as we leave this meeting. I am mindful of words that were said in the last go around before the break, and also just now in public comment, a reminder that yes, the work is hard and it's a big challenge and time is tight and there is a lot to be done, but it's an opportunity and you are all smart and

motivated professionals let's go, let's give it a shot. And you have engaged people who are willing to help.

So in the spirit of that, just as a reminder, earlier today you approved an approach for Ocean Action Plan. Now, what is needed and this builds on what was presented by the co-leads in the memo about how to develop work plan, and as modified by the discussion that you all had. Is coming out of this meeting to write something up, to develop that work plan that reflects workflows and that means the workflows, the workgroups, the timelines, this steps all of the mechanics that need to be reflected so that we have the right kind of roadmap. That would be composed of an IJC, people who are organized around the IJC activity.

That would mean, looking at short and long-term actions, starting with a focus on region-wide opportunities and actions. And standing by and be available to also help think about specific geographic areas. But there may be some sequencing that is needed there. There is a working criteria that can be used, I have been using the word touchstone and I will use that word again, and you

talked about that and had some good input and a sense of comfort about starting. This is all about getting started. There is an existing workgroup for IJC. That workgroup, we need other volunteers so be thinking about that, we have had Greg, I am pointing to you again because we are appreciative that you volunteered. Other folks from state and other people in your agencies and all of the member entities, something you going to hear in my summary here is, volunteer! Find the right people in your entities to include, colleagues who have the right kind of expertise to be part of these workgroups.

So if IJC is one workgroup, and they need management expertise to help initiate that work, the other was that you talked about is data analysis group that can look at ecological analysis and economic analysis. So people who have technical expertise and understanding of how this body could move forward with one or more of the kind of tools that are outlined in the document that is in

your materials and that was talked about by our presenters and in the discussion you've had.

Laura McKay: I'll volunteer

Laura Cantral: I made the assumption that you will volunteer so thank you that I didn't have to assume. Kevin, I also heard that you say that you are willing to participate on that group. There is an opportunity to include other colleagues who have expertise from the data portal team, that we are also going to need to populate that workgroup with the right kind of expertise.

And then, the other thread of discussion of a workgroup and a need is the Regional Ocean Assessment. A lot of discussion yesterday and today about the role of that group and what's really needed out of that work and I would just suggest to you, again this is me trying to do some synthesis here, of some things that I have heard is that, perhaps what is really helpful contribution for that group, that can build on the work that you have already done is a

notion of a description of the Mid-Atlantic Ocean, the rationale for the planning. The 'so what' for to the use the military acronym, the BLUF. Maybe that is the right assignment for that group that is practical and really helpful to inform the other pieces of the process and manageable in the time allotted. Just a thought.

Throughout all of these activities will be the critical need for stakeholder engagement. That is meaningful and that can feather in to those different activities. So, we are going to need to work more on finding the right mechanisms we've heard some discussion about webinars and sector specific meetings and other opportunities.

What Meghan had presented in her presentation was looking for ways to use the right mechanism for the right venue and the right audience at the right time. That will be something that needs to be felt through as these other three activities are moving forward and that we are going to need to spend some meaningful time continuing to think about

how to move forward. That is my summary. What you guys think?

Laura McKay: That sounds like we have three groups. Again, I don't really care if we do the synthesis work as part of the ROA or the OAP. But I want to make sure we are clear, do we want three groups or two groups?

Sarah Cooksey: I would like to request that we have the opportunity to go back to talk to our committee of our work. While there are several numbers around the table there are other staff who really put a lot of work into what the product was so far. I think we need to let the results of this soak in a little bit and talk to them about that. Because all I know, they may say I didn't sign up to do the white paper, I signed up for assessment. So in fairness, I think we have to go back to the group, then I expect it has to be reconstituted in a positive way.

Laura Cantral: Kevin, you have had your tent out

for a while and so has Karen and then we can go to Joe.

Kevin Chu: So my main point, I would need a little clarification about what you're looking for in the draft description of Mid-Atlantic. Would you like us to identify issues that the Mid-Atlantic spacing or you want it to be simply a description of the ocean? It's an important question because we started out trying to draft issues and identify conflicts in the group, that was not what you looking for. So I need clarification on that.

I also would like clarification on the length. Karen proposed a five page white paper and I suppose it is probably about the right length. There is an awful lot one could write about. I would like this group to tell us. And lastly, because we are taking a hard left turn here, I would like the acknowledgment from the RPB that the ROA working group has worked hard to meet the RPB's expectations. And that is now changing its guidance and

asking it to take on something else.

Laura Cantral: So, Michael and people who had their tents up, I really want to encourage you all to get some feedback to Kevin's questions. You really need to get this kind of clarity. Recognizing that you need to go back to your workgroup and have some discussion and may be reconstitute it, it seems to me like you need a little more correction about what this group wants from you before you Kovach and have that discussion. So let's hear that and I want to know, what I want to is call on people who can respond to those questions right now. Liz.

Elizabeth Semple: Five pages sounds good, issues and description. I don't think, I think the assessment work has been great so far and I don't know that it's not ultimately going to come back to doing something more like that. Which is right now the critical thing is, to get something else done.

Joe Atangan: I am a little bit leery about binding it to five pages. I think the issue is, do you want us to focus on the primary issues and prioritize and write on those rather than, I want something about five pages.. I think it's the wrong approach. I think the guidance that we, the group are looking for is are we going to tackle what we consider the priority issues and identify those as - in our assessment, these are the main drivers that are going to focus our actions on IJC and what we are going to analyze the data on and what we are going to need the data synthesis group to focus their efforts on providing information and support.

It's got a be something along those lines otherwise we're going to keep going around in circles with about, not enough detail, too much detail, not enough detail. I am leery of the white paper approach.

I understand that we want to keep it concise, but I really do think that top priority or to be, identifying the issues, the main primary issues that we need to address

within the Mid-Atlantic region that is going to be the focus of the action plan. What are we basing that plan on? Along the lines that Kevin was talking about with regard to clear, and concise guidance to the working groups, I think that applies to not just the ROA working group but for what we are expecting to get out of the IJC group as well as the synthesis group so that there's, we can't just say we're going to do a working group. What is the goal for the working group? This has got to be clear otherwise will be back here in May or June saying, what were we supposed to deliver?

Laura Cantral:            Bob.

Bob LaBelle:            Yes, I hope that the RPB goes back into the members of the ROA and thank them very much for their work and shows them that it fits in and in fact that the focusing of where we are going to go is much more than a white paper. I think it is the first step that this body has taken to decide which issues we're going to go to. So that is incredibly an important thing and I

hope that whatever the length of the paper, there are lots of good challenges in there that this body can then further discuss. So it is really focusing on it and I think it is an important step.

Laura Cantral: Gwynne and Greg.

Gwynne Schultz: I know I was one of the first members here that have said that had asked the assessment group not to get into the issues. That was primarily because I just didn't see how it fit into this document as we were doing it. I saw that as being fact base, science-based thing. I was hoping that it would be as an exercise harvesting those issues and saving them but would not be needing them. If we were to do white paper or longer, at this stage I think we need something but I don't understand how that it is different or how it needs to be linked and to the work of the

IJC. I am a little confused on that.

Laura Cantral: Greg.

Greg Capobianco: Sorry. My quick thoughts on it are, and it doesn't have to be five pages or whatever the length is as long as we cover what we need to cover. But I guess I am just thinking of what were looking, key issues and opportunities around the issues and resources that we are all aware of and discussing the last couple of days. Let's try to stay away from everything that is used for the ocean is bad. If we do that I think we will have a setting that provides a wash bed on what kind of things we need to do. Not just in terms of setting a plan for action but how decisions are made across federal and state agencies of the ocean. This is a new territory. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Kristie.

Kristie Bailey: Having been on the ROA working group I felt I needed to comment. I definitely agree with Kevin, Sarah and Joe with regards for continuing with the ROA, the future of it is unclear to me at this time. The graphic up there notes that it will inform going forward but from all of the comments and everything else, it seems to be taking a reactive approach based on IJC opportunities. I think that there are definitely the benefits to conducting the ROA, there is value in the assessment, there's the need to prioritize the issues to include conflicts and key issues.

A lot of time and effort has been invested in the development of the ROA to date. I think it can continue to improve over time. I also see the ROA group working closely other group in time. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: So let's take these two and

they come back to you. Kelsey.

Kelsey Leonard: I think where I am having a problem. It is asking a simple question to the ROA and to also kind of say, to answer that question and to know why. The question is, if we reconstitute the ROA or we do this white paper or it changes from the form it is currently in, how does that align with the framework? I feel like we are losing our goals and objectives in creating this five page paper. If we are not, then I need somebody to explain to me how we are able to do that in this new form.

Laura Cantral: Do you want to respond to that question?

Joe Atangan: I don't think in this reframing of the ROA to identify an issue that has to deviate from the framework. Remember the framework establishes goals and objectives. So what we can do is, with the framework in mind, identify issues and

concerns and support that are directly tied to those goals and objectives within the framework. I am hoping and I am mindful of the framework, I am hoping that we don't ever deviate from that at this point. I do not see that as a problem.

Ingrid Irigoyen: What I was beginning to imagine is that the descriptive work that group has started and the outline that that group has put forward would be still quite useful for this task. There is a lot of the elements of that outline which do come directly from the framework, organized by the goals and objectives in the framework, and the elements of the ecosystem and the way those organized are a quite useful way to proceed in drafting a description of the ocean, what makes the Mid-Atlantic special, what are the kinds of issues that this region is facing and where there is potential for progress. Perhaps it is not such a sharp left turn, perhaps it is more

precise and more focused on some variations, which recognizing that is a question, that you didn't pose and your presentation but maybe it's a shift and not throwing something out and starting something new.

Laura Cantral:           Karen.

Karen Chytalo:           What I was going to say a while ago, was that I really think that the ROA should focus on the priority issues. Come up with a statement, these are the priority issues and this is why they are the priority issues. It gives us a basis to be able to move ahead on certain subjects that would help to drive some of the IJC work and the data analysis type work. So that would be helpful. That would be a big step forward for the data analysis group, it's just as an analysis with regards to economic analysis.

I think from a lot of the work that they are going to be doing that they might be in a better position to recommend certain

things about specific areas and then elevate that up then over to the IJC group and say here is some things that we see that are going on in certain areas and therefore look at that as to what kind of interjurisdictional agreements we can put into place and help benefit those areas, so I see that as a process that we can move through to get the work done. The IJC are going to think maybe we will just take a look at it and maybe we don't want it so much. Looking at the specific geographic areas. I think the data analysis should have been in place.

Laura Cantral: That sounds like the interpretation of how we were hearing this discussion perceived with the point of parture being the way the work flows are described from the co-leads but as modified the relationship between those workflows and getting back to the way you described it and how those interactions could best be made.

Karen Chytalo: I would like to be on the data analysis group.

Laura Cantral: Great another volunteer. Kevin

Kevin Chu: So we have five minutes to wrap this all up. There is a lot of ambiguity still but because we have to wrap this up what I would propose, it is like there are three different working groups – the data synthesis, the IJC, and the new charge of the Regional Ocean Assessment group. Sarah and I will convene the ROA. Next week we have a call scheduled for next Friday. We will submit a plan and discuss this. We will submit a plan to the RPB for its consideration at this next call. We'll see what we can accomplish and work on a timeline.

Laura Cantral: How about that for an approach and this seems to be a very appropriate way to proceed. Especially

since we are running out of time. And you all as a workgroup need some time to dwell on some of this feedback and how to proceed.

Kelsey Leonard: I'm for that and I think that's a good way to move forward. What I would say so on this difficult topic that we have been circling around these last two days on the issues, prioritization. I like for someone who sits on this workgroup for us to talk this through a little bit more if we are going to go through with prioritizing things that we should create criteria for how we go about the prioritization. Because right now I'm a little uncomfortable with how we do that and I think some of the individuals in the workgroup would feel a little bit uncomfortable because they are staff and not in a position to make a priority position. Let's incorporate that into the plan.

Sarah Cooksey: FYI. I am looking for Kim Barber. There you are. The ROA had tentatively on our calendar, I don't know if we picked a date. Just as this is been great to see everybody face-to-face and get some more work done. We are getting together sometime in the spring in Annapolis.

Kim Barber: We're looking at March or April.

Sarah Cooksey: So we were planning on having a face-to-face and Kevin had mentioned that at the break. I think that we can do this. We will see.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Thank you ROA workgroup. I know that a lot of hard work has been gone into this. Your patience as everyone tries to imagine how to bring the best value out of the work. Which I know everyone really wants to do. We want to make sure we get this has value. The RPB looks

forward to hearing your thoughts. And Kevin you have something else you want to say?

Kevin Chu: I would like just to take this opportunity to ask all of the people who have worked in or supported the ROA workgroup together right after the break, for 10 minutes to talk strategy and figure out what I missed.

Laura Cantral: Duly noted. In the spirit of the next steps and the clock is ticking and we will wrap up here in the last minutes. We, the Meridian team, working affiliates will write up the results of this discussion, that will be the first iteration draft of the workplan that builds on the discussion and the memo and the table chart that is in the memo. I've already summarized the great work that you've done over the last couple of days. The great work

that you've done so I will not do that again. What I will do is just thank you for your engagement, for your hard work, or for your contributions, during this meeting and also the many, many conference calls you mentioned that we had so many conference calls. I know that is a fact of life for all of us in this line of work and in this process. Just the contributions to all of the work. So that is my thank you as part of the facilitation team. I will hand it off to the co-leads to seem to have any final words.

Gwynne Schultz: I just want to thank everyone for coming, for dedicating the time and effort. I actually did enjoy it.

Bob Labelle: A little masochistic and I will add to that and thanks the folks in the back of the room for coming and following the issues and helping.

Kelsey Leonard: I guess that leaves me. I would say thank you to everyone, especially to the public for coming out. And going through customs security. I am really thankful to have

you and all of the comments that you made. On behalf of the Shinnecock Indian thank you.

Laura Cantral: All right. It's a wrap.