MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL OCEAN PLANNING

MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL PLANNING BODY MEETING

HELD AT

CHARLES COMMONS

10 E. 33RD STREET

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

ON

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2014

FROM

PROCEEDINGS

MS. CANTRAL: All right. We're glad. It's good to see you all back. Good morning, members of the public. Thank you for joining us for day two of this meeting.

Before I review the agenda and get us going with our proceedings, we would like to welcome Megan Massawau (phonetic) with the Department of Energy who's able to join us today, wasn't here yesterday.

So welcome, Megan. Good morning.

Is there any other housekeeping things that we need to say before I just do a quick agenda review and get started?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

MS. CANTRAL: No? All right.

Well, just as a refresher, yesterday's highlights included approving the framework for regional ocean planning that lays out goals and objectives, principles to adhere to, and a vision for regional ocean planning in the Mid-Atlantic.

And we also had some very good discussion around several sector specific activities that are underway in this region related to ocean planning -- I mean, to ocean energy and also to habitat related activities.

And we learned about those and recognize that there is a lot of relevance to those activities that are underway by individual institutions and how that can inform the planning effort and provide opportunities for coordination and better learning among the members that are represented here at the table.

And we will do some more of that kind of discussion, that kind of substantive discussion, and what that suggests for the work of this RPB later this afternoon when we have some presentations about navigation related activities in the Mid-Atlantic.

But before we do that, we are going to be devoting the majority of today to talking about now what? Now that the framework has been approved, the RPB is moving into the next phase of its work and that includes developing a work plan that leads into the creation of a -- what this group has decided to refer to as a regional ocean action plan and then further from that, the implementation of that action plan.

So we want to talk about how do we get there from here, what is the time line associated with doing that, and how should the RPB organize itself around different components that it sees going into not only that work plan but other important fundamental parts

of the process that will transcend the work plan.

So there aren't clear lines between stages and components of the work, but we do need to talk about what each of those components are and how we go about accomplishing them.

about today is already underway, things related to the development of the MARCO data portal that is a key tool that supports this planning work, the regional ocean assessment which we've had some dialogue about already, but we'll talk about in more detail today.

And then other aspects of the work so far has come to a conclusion, for example, the work that the -- a work group around the framework drafting has not concluded, and so we will be talking about what are next steps and how do we reconstitute some working groups and organize around getting things done.

So the co-leads have put some thought into

this and are making a number of process suggestions for how to do all of that and they're going to walk you all through their recommendations and get some discussion and hear thoughts from the full membership about how to proceed.

Is that all clear? So we're going to spend the morning doing that. We're scheduled to break at 12:30. We'll come back and finish up with discussion of the work plan and the process going forward, timing, et cetera, and then we'll turn to the navigation activities presentation.

And we are scheduled to have a public comment session this afternoon. I believe it's at 3:30, correct? Right, right. It's at 3:30. And we'll, you know, we'll see how the timing goes. We adjusted a little bit to account for the realities of how -- of our pace yesterday and we'll do the same today. But right now we're scheduled for a public

comment session at 3:30.

Is that all clear? It all makes sense? Folks hearing me okay? I'm going to ask you that. You're going to get so tired of it, but I'm traumatized by yesterday.

All right. So with that, I think I'll turn it over to Gwynne.

MS. SHULTZ: Okay. And, again, start waving in the back if you can't hear me and I'll work to raise my voice.

I'm going to be spending the next few minutes walking through three slides. And the first slide, what I'm going to do is spend some time talking about the recommendations, on the bigger process, and terminology.

So this first slide yesterday when Kelsey introduced it, and I'm going to just briefly revisit it so we're all on the same page with regard to that,

you know, big process and the big terminology.

My next slide is going to dig deeper into the time line, so it's going to be the same process, same terminology, but we'll be spending some time getting an overview of what we propose as being certain deadlines for different activities.

And then on the next slide, what I'll do is spend time talking about the work plan, what we think, you know, could go into the work plan, as well as the work, the process to get that accomplished.

So we have the creation of a work group to help put together that work plan. So those are the three things that I'm going to go over on the next three slides.

So going to that first slide -- so I'm going to go to the first slide and this is just a revisiting briefly what we went over yesterday. On the far left, you'll see the first part of that arrow says the

framework. This is the document that the RPB approved yesterday and it describes the RPB goals and our objectives and describes the initial geographic focus.

The next thing as you move right on that image -- no, stay on this slide -- the next thing you see as we move on this image is the curve up on top which is the work plan.

Now, what we're planning to do is start development of this work plan next month and it will contain the actions, time lines, and capacities needed to develop a regional ocean action plan. It's also going to include actions that are going to be -- that are informed by the goals and objectives that we approved in the framework and then also identifying time lines.

So -- and I'm going to get into a lot more detail on that work plan, but what is it that it's going to take to do the regional ocean plan, what is

it going to take to develop some of the other products such as the regional ocean assessment, as well as all the time line that it's going to take to do that.

And everything within -- all of the actions in the work plan will support the goals and objectives that we identified. This work plan will be -- we're calling it a living document and the reason being is we see this really as our regional planning body work plan that's going to get us from here to the regional ocean action plan and beyond.

So it's going to continually be adapted as we learn more. The development of the regional ocean action plan and the work plan is not going to be sequential. It's going to be happening as an ongoing basis, both of them complementing each other.

Then that middle box, it does talk about the creation of a regional ocean action plan. The actual nature and purpose of that document is to be

determined. And we have a session on today's agenda that Mo will be leading, kind of walking us through a process of determining what's going to be in that document.

There's a lot of options. It could first focus on developing better understanding of the ocean ecosystem, current ocean uses, major trends, or it could be other things. So that's all still to be determined.

You know, that, too, it's going to be another kind of living document that's updated as new information comes our way as well as technology improves.

Then the third big item there is called implementation and what we see is that maybe following the development of the first iteration of this regional ocean action plan, we're going to come up with really some specific maybe implementation

actions, you know, in order to be able to keep this regional ocean action plan updated.

So, again, it's going to be adaptive, iterative, and then when we hit that last part, we're going to be, you know, implementing a lot of the recommendations when we get into 2017 and beyond, so kind of that big picture.

All right. So then moving to the second slide, this digs down a little bit more into the actual time line. The co-leads are -- have suggested some detail, getting into a little bit more detail for the next seven months. And then we set a general target of mid 2017 for completion of this first iteration of the regional ocean action plan.

So some of the specifics between, you know, starting this next month through October and November of 2014 include the following.

We recommend that this work plan be

developed by a number of different regional planning body facilitative work groups and work groups facilitated by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean.

These work groups would convene during like regular teleconferences to make progress. Then the full RPB would be discussing some of this work of the work groups over our monthly teleconferences. We'd be talking about some of the actions underway, refinement of draft work plan ideas.

Also during this time between now and October or November, we see possible engagement with technical experts and stakeholders that we may hold through roundtables, workshops, and other convenings or subcontracts to further kind of dive into these specific issues.

Then in October, November of 2014 would be our proposed target date for release of this draft

work plan.

Then kind of moving on down, late November, maybe early December of this year, we would propose holding another -- our third in-person public RPB meeting to discuss progress on the ongoing actions in this draft work plan.

And these are actions that don't really depend on us having a work plan completed. It could be on the regional ocean assessment, capacity assessment, work on enhancing the portals, so things that we're doing that don't have to wait for the work plan.

Another thing we would potentially discuss during this next in-person meeting is refinement for the draft work plan as needed based on, you know, input, based on public input, and then also during that meeting would be kind of really spending some quality time on the determination of the nature and

purpose of what the regional ocean action plan is and then what information and actions are needed to develop it.

And there's a variety of things we may be discussing like the types of performance metrics that are needed, the time lines, you know, all those different things we would be discussing at our next in-person meeting.

Then moving -- so that's 2014. Moving into 2015 and '16, we see maybe in early -- in April or May of 2015, we may want to hold another regional, you know, RPB in-person meeting open to the public to make further modifications to the work plan and then maybe anticipate two to three meetings kind of per year going forward.

And then in 2015, '16, we see development of the regional ocean action plan, again refinement of the work plan. And then in 2000 -- mid 2017, the

first iteration of our regional ocean action plan would be completed, possible implementation plan is developed, and then also implementation is underway.

And just a note about implementation. When we're saying that, we're meaning those -- kind of hang out our existing mandates and authorities that are in the context and informed by this kind of consensus based regional ocean action plan that's going to be periodically updated. You know, so that's one of the things we need to be clear about what really implementation does mean.

So kind of then shifting to the third slide really is just to dig down a little bit deeper into the very next thing that we're going to be working on over the -- you know, this year is the work plan.

We propose that the work plan, again, include those actions, time lines, capacities needed to develop the regional ocean action plan, include

other actions such as development of the regional ocean assessment, enhancement of the data portal, and then also identify the time lines for the upcoming RPB decisions and the information that's needed to support it.

And, again, all the actions would be supporting the document that we approved yesterday, those goals and objectives that were within the framework.

And, again, these are -- when we're talking about actions in this work plan, we're not necessarily talking about individual actions by individual member entities, you know, those of -- we're not talking about your agencies, your entities, your -- at the table here, but mainly what are the activities that the RPB as a whole can carry forward in order to meet our objectives.

And with regard to the second to last bullet

there about content of the work plan would be developed by work groups. What we would like to do is, you know, have establishment of some internal work groups, and we're going to be talking about those, you know, after my presentation, the different types of work groups we see, and those would be composed of our RPB members, alternates and staff, all informed by stakeholder input.

And let's see. What else? The -- we see that work groups would be drafting most of the content of these different products and that the co-leads are going to kind of work to get the support needed to do a few things such as, you know, providing a template for the work groups to use, to help pull together all the different pieces of the work group into a coherent document, doing things like maybe drafting language for the introduction, transitions and conclusion, editing and formatting, and, you know, managing any

specific subcontractors that we're able to get to kind of help with this whole process.

And then, again, during this upcoming

November, December, we see this in-person RPB meeting

would really get a look at this work plan, figure out,

you know, are we happy with it, how does it need to

continue to evolve so we can achieve our different

objectives.

And, again, just finally, this is going to be a living document, so you're going to -- we're just going to be using this as a really key tool to move all of our different activities forward.

And I believe -- I think I've covered everything.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So why don't we just have some discussion, reactions, questions, comments, reflections about what Gwynne has outlined in terms of the timing and the nature and purpose of

the work plan and other things that she covered.

Kevin, go ahead.

MR. CHU: Yeah, I'll start. And thank you for putting that together and sort of laying out the vision. That makes a lot of sense.

But I am a little confused as to the relationship between -- can you hear me back there?

All right. Can you hear me now?

MS. CANTRAL: That's good. You're good.

MR. CHU: So that's the key. We've got to talk right into the mike.

I'm a little concerned about the relationship between the work plan and the regional ocean action plan. It seems to me that we can't really make too much progress on the work plan without knowing what the ocean action plan is all about.

So -- and just clarify to me that you were proposing, I think, that the face -- the next face-to-

face meeting would be the kind when we sort of start talking about the regional ocean action plan.

But it seems to me we've got to start that conversation way before then so that we understand what our thought processes are in order to develop a work plan and we can put the two together at the same time and say this is what we're thinking for the regional ocean action plan. We won't have a plan, but we can share thoughts on that and then share thoughts on the work plan to support that.

Is that what you're intending or --

MS. SHULTZ: Yes. Mo can take this one.

MS. BORNHOLDT: Well, I think what we'll do is try to do a little change up. And let me just go ahead and get to my slide and kind of talk to this first key work group which would be the work group responsible for bringing options to the table and doing some investigation for the RPB, full RPB with

regard to what this regional ocean action plan could be.

And perhaps one of those questions that they can answer is, you know, what is the interface and integration with these ongoing tool developments. You know, as Gwynne mentioned, we have the portal that's launched. We know we need to do some, you know, working with MARCO with regard to that.

We know that we'd have the regional ocean assessment that you're going to be talking to us later on today. That's one of those products that's going to feed into the consciousness of what a regional ocean action plan is.

So you bring up a very good point. Don't have a nice, little, neat answer, but let me go ahead and talk, if we can go to the next slide, just kind of talk about what this concept is that the co-leads came up with for discussion around the table.

One of the things that I learned from our public listening session was the confusion around terminology. We all have our internal lexicons. And I think what happens when we meet internally, we develop our lexicon together and we loaded some framework. We thought certain words meant certain things.

One of the experiences I had at the public listening session was -- you know, kind of confirmed that plan is really a loaded four letter word. And when we were listening -- when I was listening to some of the conversations around the table, you know, people said, oh, yeah, we'll do ocean planning like we do land use planning. We have this area that we have jurisdiction and we'll invite people in. We'll get an understanding of who's there, what's there, who's interested, and we'll do this overlay and wa-la, you have an ocean plan.

But I thought to myself, well, really I wish it was that simple in the ocean because we don't have that one land use manager. It's not like federal lands, Bureau of Land Management lands or Department of Agriculture lands or state lands where there perhaps is that property manager that can do that.

And so one of the thoughts that we had when we huddled with the co-leads was how can we still do ocean planning, get something documented that's not a bureaucratic process, which is the other thing we heard from our public listening sessions, but try to address what this thing could be that is a documented plan.

And so what we came up with was this regional ocean action plan because it may not be just a plan. It may be a series of related activities and action that becomes under this umbrella of what we want to do that makes -- issues we want to address,

investigations and leveraging of opportunities that we may want to partake in as a regional planning body.

So we came up with this regional ocean action plan option. So then as we were huddling, I tried to figure out, so what is this thing. It dawned on me again, your point exactly, Kevin, that I don't know exactly what that is, but we have a lot of resources around the table.

And as we were successful with the framework in having a limited number of people just do a deep dive, maybe that's what we can do because we'll have the benefit of having the discussions around the table. As we move forward with the portal, as we hear feedback from the regional ocean assessment, as we get public input, just based on what the public hears from this, you know, high-level conversation today, we can task a group with really doing some investigation as to what should that be, what should

that plan be.

We also heard yesterday this hope that we could do whatever we're going to do, whatever way, shape, or form it will be by 2016. So, again, the ahha was, well, maybe what we can do is, you know, tap into our resources around the table and that's another aspect of what a regional ocean action plan can be.

What can we get done in 2016 to be able to reveal as a product from the regional planning body knowing that, again, your point, we have a lot of these things that are going on that we'll never perhaps conclude but can inform that.

So the thought was is that we'd get, you know, a group of folks together. We -- I wish we could lock them up in a room until we came up with what it could be, but we'd task them with take into consideration the public concern about having something ready to be released in 2016, fold into the

fact that we want to have a robust public participation process with regard to what we're going to design as our regional ocean action plan.

What are the issues that we should consider under this umbrella knowing that we had the regional ocean assessment, how can that feed in, knowing that we have the data portal, how can that support, and basically having a tiger team, you know, work forward and help us.

So the time frame we were thinking of was starting this, and if you go back to -- oh, wait.

Actually, it's on this slide. You know, from that

June date to November, have this tiger team take a

look at that, do a deep dive, come back with various

options and facets, what they feel we could produce in
a 2016 time frame or that mid 2017 time frame, what

can we do.

And so we can talk about, hey, some of those

options resonate with us, this is how we want to move forward, this is what we want to put forth in the public realm as our concept for a regional ocean action plan, have that revealed and begin that dialogue along with working on these other tools that we would have at our disposal.

So that's kind of jumping ahead, but I think your question was --

MR. CHU: Thank you.

MS. BORNHOLDT: -- the perfect segue.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Karen.

MS. CHYTALO: Yeah, that was kind of sort of

__

MS. CANTRAL: All right. You're going to have to get your mike up.

MS. CHYTALO: -- something I was thinking of, too, and it almost seems like to be able to do an effective work plan, you'd really need to know what

your outline will be for your regional ocean action plan and make a decision on what is the level of detail you're going to create that at, you know, how high, how low, or whatever.

And I think that gets to the question of the options then and that's something that the group has to agree and stakeholders have to say, okay, you know, let's go to that level and stuff like that. And then we get to the point where a real work plan can be developed to make the action plan.

MS. BORNHOLDT: To support it, right.

MS. CHYTALO: To support it, like who has to do what. What are the connections that have to be made? What are the supporting pieces that have to be there to create that document?

So I'm hoping that, you know, we fine tune, you know, not just come up with the option type things, that it is something that we can almost, okay,

we just have to put a little bit more into it and that it's ready to go.

MS. BORNHOLDT: Right. As Gwynne mentioned, and I think I've been redundant but with purpose, there are some things that are ongoing, but there are some things that are yet to be mapped. And that's why you see this overlap of time frame for the work plan development along with the conceptual construct of what — this regional ocean action plan, just getting to your point, because there will be these ah-has when this work group goes and does the deep dive as to what are those issues, what is the information that we need to support.

Then circling back to Laura McKay and the MARCO portal team, you know, talking to Kevin and Sarah with regard to, hey, we understand this is the status of the ROA, you know, what are you discovering. So it becomes this synergistic development of the

options for us then to consider, as well as informing, you know, as the work plan is being developed, informing those particular action items under there.

And, again, you know, to add some detail to the bullets, we're not just going to have a big, you know, wonderful group hug and this sounds really good, but we actually need to have some structure to that with milestones, critical actions, you know, points to come back to the RPB saying, hey, got stuck here, is this really the priority you want to hit, these are the issues we've run into, and get that feedback and be disciplined about doing that because I think as we heard yesterday, you want it done quickly, yes, but I think the most important thing for us is not only do we want to be efficient with our time, we have to be thoughtful.

We only get really one shot at being successful and energizing all the folks around the

table with our limited resources and time, so we want to make sure it's a thoughtful process, that it's dynamic, that we keep our finger on the pulse of everything else that we have go around the RPB, as well as our own individual agencies to come up with something that is thoughtful.

So, you know, mindful of 2016 push and if we can make that an option to see what we can produce, then -- but it has to be thoughtful.

MS. CANTRAL: Laura.

MS. MCKAY: That was helpful. I think I was getting confused between the work plan and the ocean action plan myself. And it did look like a long delay before we were going to really start talking about an ocean action plan. So that was helpful.

And I think if we -- if the RPB can come up with a draft for what an ocean action plan might look like by November, that that would be some really good

work. And I feel like we can do that.

I may have too simplistic a notion of what an ocean plan or an ocean action plan might look like, but, to me, what -- we have a plan right now. We have an ocean plan. We have an ocean zoning plan right now. It's out there.

And when you turn all the layers on in the portal, that's our current plan. And so what we need to do, I think, is look at what's there and have discussions and work groups about what's right about the current use, what's wrong about the current use, and start to do some of that work about identifying where the most appropriate places are for things.

So that's where I'm anxious to get to. So that was helpful. Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Uh-huh. Great. Sarah.

MS. COOKSEY: Just to go along with what Laura said and then ask for some information, I agree

with what's been said. I really like this chart. I don't know if everybody in the public got this chart or not.

VOICE: Yes.

MS. COOKSEY: Here's the chart. Do you want to put up that slide? And what's, you know, your best boss in your career is also often your worst boss, but that best boss used to talk about implementation all the time and how important that was.

And I think we are already implementing the duties that we're charged with and that's reflected at the bottom of this chart. And I think that's really important, continuous stakeholder engagement, data collection, sharing, integration, et cetera.

And I would add to it the points that have already been made, I think Mo made them, about making sure all these things are coming together, the regional ocean assessment.

We heard yesterday that some folks didn't even know about the meeting today and yesterday. I think we also need a communications plan. Those types of things, I think, should be listed on here for two reasons.

One, to note their importance and get credit that we are working on them, but also a little bit of accountability that we know that those things need to be done. So I think this should be posted on our Web page when we're finished with it. Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Great.

Karen.

MS. CHYTALO: Yeah. When Laura was talking about the portal, and it's like -- it's basically the spaghetti map now, I would assume that that's the spatial planning. I think we really have to make sure we articulate what the -- we have a vision, what would that vision look like on a map, you know, or

something, somewhere down the line maybe be able to get to that point rather than having just spaghetti out there and seeing what sticks, what works.

And I get a little nervous, but I want to make sure that our vision is clearly articulated through these documents, our goals that we've worked so hard on, and people -- you know, and that those are going to be demonstrated through the activities and things that go out there.

But I think another recommendation and I would like to see something like -- as part of our ocean action plan, when we even get to that point, it has things like recommending pilots, doing pilot programs, pilot studies.

That might be something that would help us to become more comfortable with certain types of things or activities and that's something that we could -- and those are things that would be monitored

and studied.

You know, I'm getting ahead of the discussion, but I think it's just that we need to start putting some things down on paper and start, you know, adding some of the issues up.

MS. CANTRAL: And I think those are the kinds of things that we're imagining could be part of the assignment for this work group that would explore options for what could be in an action plan and how you would go about execution.

Megan.

MS. MASSAWAU: As we get more towards conversation about sort of what's on the map and what could be on the map and is that the right direction for this group in terms of developing a regional ocean action plan, and I apologize if there was discussion on this yesterday because I wasn't able to be here, but I think maybe a task for that subgroup would be --

MS. CANTRAL: You have to speak louder.

MS. MASSAWAU: I think maybe a task for that subgroup would be really considering, you know, without the -- any sort of authority that this group has, how do we work within existing authorities and where are those lines and where we can work with them and where are they hard, you know, because there are authorities and everybody here represents some different elements of those authorities.

So we do have the ability to use them, but we don't have the ability to create new things. So I think that's one of the really sticky issues that's going to have to be worked out as we move forward.

MS. CANTRAL: Other thoughts, comments, suggestions?

Sarah, that's from earlier. You don't have any --

MS. COOKSEY: No.

MS. CANTRAL: Gwynne.

MS. BORNHOLDT: One of the thoughts I had that was seeded by something that you said, Laura, with regard to what we have on the map and you turn on the lights and we see, I think that's the really low-hanging fruit when it comes to planning.

I think how we have to think about the future stake could be becomes a little more nuance.

This is one of the things I know I want to charge this group with is that you're taking a look, at least in my little corner of the world, the technology that is advancing so rapidly.

And that, you know, for example, we spoke earlier about the opportunity off the Commonwealth of Virginia with regard to testing technology because a particular entity was just awarded a DOE grant to actually carry forward to --

MS. MCKAY: Thank you, DOE.

VOICE: You're welcome.

MS. BORNHOLDT: -- to Winter Lines

(phonetic) in -- you know, off of the Commonwealth of

Virginia and talk about pilots, the opportunity that

can have for the stated, you know, reasons why that

particular project won the grant.

But there are also probably opportunities of

-- synergistic opportunities associated with other

kind of monitoring. So I think that we do have the

ability to help us gather data for that futuristic

look that presently isn't when you turn on all the

little, you know, widgets on the portal, you know,

show up.

And I think that's probably going to be the biggest challenge to us is how can we see a future state, you know, with the Panama Canal opening, with perhaps, you know, other ocean energy opportunities, offshore wind, maybe oil and gas, who knows, LNG, you

know, how can we see those future states.

So that's one of those taskings of that work group maybe to be a little bit look in the crystal ball, reaching out to all of us and our assets to see what we have in our individual, you know, entity planning, what we know that's down the pike to be able to bring that to the RPB table to be considered in this regional ocean action plan.

But something you said kind of spurred that.

MS. MCKAY: Right. And that's what I meant to say, too, is that when you turn the portal on now, that's the current state of affairs. But what we're working on through stakeholder engagement is identifying future locations of things.

For instance, working with the ports and shipping, we now know from talking to our harbor pilots that they have in mind, very clearly in mind another navigation channel they'd like to see put on

the map.

So we're gathering those future desires as we go out and talk to stakeholders and those can go on the portal ultimately so that we can see where we want to head in the future and to see that future vision.

MS. CANTRAL: Go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: This is probably going to extend into the presentation this afternoon, but thinking about the -- some of the conversation yesterday from Kevin about right whales, wind farm development, the vision for the future is not that far off. The future is not far away. It's tomorrow, right?

But I'd say within the next year, the Coast Guard is going to lay out a plan for navigation on the ocean that will probably be in existence for the next 25 to 40 years. So we're looking down the road, but we need the information from BOEM. We need

information from NOAA about the right whales.

How do the right whales, and this is just -I'm just throwing stuff out, how do the right whales
interpret a wind farm? Is it a wall that they have to
go around? Do they interpret it as a wall of holes
they can swim through or other mammals, other
creatures that are out there?

I don't know if there are any studies out there that have been done to say how these critters will perform when they come up against a wind farm.

And if they do interpret the wind farm as a wall and they have to swim around it and we are planning to put a shipping lane adjacent to that wind farm, are we now creating a situation where we're putting ships right in the path of these mammals and is there a path around that? Don't know.

What are the future uses or needs for defense in the offshore waters and how is that going

to change? If we start routing ships in a certain area and that's also where the Department of Defense is exercising, that introduces a whole new set of hazards.

So we need contributions, and maybe as part of the RPB, each agency will have to do its own thing, but I think there's a collaborative nature and a plan beyond 2017 that's a little bit -- as an agency, we have to move ahead. And we're going to work with DOE also because DOE is investing money out there which is going to affect navigation or there will be an impact somehow.

So I would like to use this body to be able to exploit your talents, knowledge so that we come up with a best plan for navigation.

MS. CANTRAL: That's what this venue is designed to do, so that's a great illustration.

MS. CHYTALO: Yeah. We just had an incident

in New York where a cruise ship hit a sea whale and killed it and brought it into the harbor and it was -- got stuck on his nose and stuff like that. It was brought into the harbor.

So there are interactions. There are those types of things that are going on and we want to minimize that as much as possible or eliminate it if we can. And so there will be some port activities or things that need to be examined, maybe just slowing ships down at times or whatever. I don't know. We'll see.

MS. WAKEMAN: Can you hear me? I don't know if this is possible, John, but are there correlations from what's going on in the Gulf around the deep water ports that they will -- the deep water port and the Gulf mammals, the animals in that area went around it, went through it, that there could be some correlations drawn there?

MR. WALTERS: I don't know. I don't know if there are any studies.

MS. WAKEMAN: I don't either.

MS. CANTRAL: Mo, maybe we should skip ahead to -- skip two more, one more, yeah. So this is very relevant to the points that you just brought up, so Mo is going to go over some of the ideas that the coleads have been talking about, another component of designing a work plan and organizing a working group or a process to get at inter-jurisdictional coordination and how we can improve that kind of coordination looking for those kinds of opportunities.

So, Mo.

MS. BORNHOLDT: I actually planted John so he would --

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, that was beautifully done.

MS. BORNHOLDT: Okay. No, John, it was --

is perfect because that's always what I saw as the number one benefit to this. It's just the knowledge and the network that we have around the table in talking about issues and trying to arrive at now what we're going to call an ocean action plan because I got to understand better.

You know, I met Joe. I'm going to get a better understanding of the Fishery Management Council through Mike, talking to Karen. I mean, I get those and I upload, you know, the knowledge and the expertise that they have.

And so it would be disgusting if we just focused on the regional ocean action plan and didn't kind of partake in what can we do about this synergy, not just to make it informal and passive, but make it really active around the table because we all individually as entities have missions and targets and goals that we want to meet.

And this is the forum to help us, you know, make those really informed and better decisions. So this inter-jurisdictional coordination is something that we can do on a parallel path, but not just make it passive, make it more active so that we are talking about -- not just about procedures but talking about what we do in a daily basis uploading these concepts of consensus and information sharing into our regular business -- our business, how we transact our business as a federal entity, as a tribal organization, as a state agency, et cetera.

And so what we wanted to do here was just affirm that this is a major overarching goal and purpose for the regional planning body and that the RPB products, whether they're the individual tools like the MARCO portal, like the regional ocean assessment, or the ocean action plan itself, the regional ocean action plan, we have that at our

fingertips to be able to use in helping us do our daily business with this philosophy of extraordinary coordination and if we have a question, being able to reach out to Lorraine who says I don't get it, and having a person that can help us navigate her organization or knowing that we have these obligations for government to government and Section 104 of the National Historic Preservation Act consultation, I can talk to Kelsey and get an inside understanding of we're having these discussions, but I don't get it, and being able to kind of have a jumpstart to really understanding their issues and concerns so I can do my business better when I'm interacting with first nations.

So we want to make sure we take advantage of that synergy. We want to identify specific processes because we don't just want to have it as an informal byproduct, which is great, but we really want to step

this up and make that just as important as coming out with the regional ocean action plan, as working on our portal, working on our way.

So, again, you provided the most perfect segue because I think that's really what we all wondered, how can this help us do our job better. We see the potential and want to highlight that.

MS. CANTRAL: What do people think about that? Make sense?

VOICE: Yes.

MS. CANTRAL: So this would be, you know, a process that we would need to design with some care and thought. It would be iterative as it says on the line, as Mo referenced.

And I think it might be helpful -- and,

Nick, so I'm putting you on the spot, if you want -
you might -- if folks agree, it would be -- could be

useful to hear from what the northeast is doing

because they are engaged in trying to address just this need.

And it's going to, as we talked about yesterday, it's going to be important for these two regions because they're two regional planning bodies that are adjacent, the regions are adjacent and the work is at similar stages, to be closely coordinated just makes sense for a lot of reasons including a lot of the same people are engaged in both of those regions.

So, Nick, do you mind sharing a little bit about what the northeast is doing with regard to inter-jurisdictional coordination?

MR. NAPOLI: Sure. Is that working?

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, good.

MR. NAPOLI: I'll speak into it. So the northeast RPB has a framework document that includes work plan elements in it and it has three goals which

basically are, you know, boiling it down to characterizing existing conditions, which is the regional ocean assessment or baseline assessment, what we're calling it, looking at future trends, future scenarios, how those existing conditions might change, and then, third, how do we use this information through existing regulations and through the existing regulatory framework to improve coordination and enhance decision making.

And that's a -- we have a work group for that. That's a discussion that we're having right now with the agencies, the states, and shortly we'll be -- actually, I think we're beginning that this month -- beginning to discuss it with industry and NGO stakeholders and others about how do we take all this information and use it in an existing regulatory context.

That initial discussion wraps up in the fall

and we'll produce some initial options for the RPB to consider about how we would use that information through existing regulations. And that sort of helps us think about, I think from there, what an outcome of the planning process might look like.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, Sarah.

MS. COOKSEY: Thank you.

Again, I'm a broken record here. I'm concerned about our ROA, so -- because it could be gigantic and it sounds like what NROC is doing, you're doing a -- I think your words were existing condition baseline?

MR. NAPOLI: That's right.

MS. COOKSEY: Okay. Do you have any idea how many pages that's going to be?

MR. NAPOLI: So this discussion has come up several times. We don't want it to be a huge document. There are a lot of ecological assessments

out there that are many pages that we don't, you know, want to repeat.

We just put out a request for proposals. We had some general ideas. We had some -- actually, we had some specific ideas of how long it should be and what it should include, but we wanted to hear -- so we put out some more general -- a more general framework in the RFP and wanted to hear from respondents about what their thoughts were so that we could get some ideas and pick the one that best suited us in terms of what the chapters, what the content might be, and ultimately what the length of that might be.

And that's actually in our request for proposals that has just closed. We haven't made a decision on it yet. But generally, I think we're looking, you know -- I can't -- I actually looked at this again, and I said this yesterday, we did have a page limit in there at one point. I think we took it

out in the final RFP.

MS. COOKSEY: Just to follow-up, do you think it will be -- do you have any feeling as to whether it will do a needs assessment?

MR. NAPOLI: For a data and information needs assessment, that was included. And some that's integrating a lot of existing -- so there's a lot of projects going on through our data portal team, through our engagement of different stakeholders.

And really what the baseline assessment for us is integrating a lot of the information, so there are needs assessments in each of those individual areas that need to be integrated in one place.

MS. CANTRAL: Marty.

MR. ROSEN: Are we talking about the ROA now?

MS. CANTRAL: Right now we are and then we're going to come back to the inter-jurisdictional

coordination, yeah.

MR. ROSEN: All right. Well, since Nick's here --

MS. CANTRAL: All right. You need to talk in the mike a little bit more directly.

MR. ROSEN: Nick, how did you decide who you -- I mean, in order to craft the ROA, you have to figure out who the audience is and how they're going to use it.

So how did you -- what will be the answer to those questions? I mean, it's not supposed to be an authoritative compilation because that would be too exhaustive. Something high level wouldn't be that useful for decision making. So how did you figure out exactly how to characterize that it could be useful on a ongoing basis for a decision?

MS. CANTRAL: So it's an audience question, right, how do you --

MR. ROSEN: Yeah, primarily --

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, right.

MR. ROSEN: -- or who -- right. Is it the audience, general public, stakeholders that becomes a reference or is it actually a document for making decisions with the RPB?

MR. NAPOLI: I think we're still open to what we get back from -- in some of the proposals and discussion as to what we like, but I think that our intent was really -- it's a baseline assessment for the RPB to use in its deliberations and for the public to use to weigh in on whatever comes of the planning effort.

Recognizing that some -- you know, we think that there's some stuff that -- a lot of our baseline assessment, that's what we're calling it, is we have pieces of it and we have big pieces of it. And we really just need to integrate it into one place and we

think that there are parts of that that can be done absent the conclusion to the discussion about how we use this all in the regulatory context.

MS. CANTRAL: Go ahead, Karen.

MS. CHYTALO: Nick, can you share your RFP and your responses with us just so we can get a look and see what kind of --

MR. NAPOLI: I can send --

MS. CHYTALO: It's a --

MR. NAPOLI: Yeah.

MS. CHYTALO: -- form of flattery to steal.

MR. NAPOLI: We steal from each other consistently and that's good. We certainly --

VOICE: Sharing, sharing.

MR. NAPOLI: Yes. We share.

MS. CHYTALO: It's the (indiscernible) of coordination.

MR. NAPOLI: The RFP, certainly, it's on-

line. I think we -- I'd have to check. I think we can share some of the proposals, but --

MS. CHYTALO: Thank you.

MR. NAPOLI: -- certainly the outline portion of it, I might extract in some way. I forgot how to share.

MS. CANTRAL: Nick, going back to the process for thinking about interagency coordination, could you talk a little bit about the approach that the northeast is taking to focus on some particular subject issue areas and also the relationship of the data portal to informing the coordination?

MR. NAPOLI: Sure. So we've set up what we're calling an internal regulatory work group that is composed of the federal agencies and the states and our tribal coordinator. And we've been meeting via phone conference call for about maybe six months and through that came to some conclusions, at least to

move us forward, about areas where we might be able to make the most progress.

And that is starting to look like, you know

-- we have all this information we're developing. We

have all of the federal agencies and states with their

own jurisdictions, and how do we start to use the data

and information and the data portal in those existing

decision-making processes.

And what we decided was that, you know, we need to start talking individually to the agencies and the states, that's actually starting this week, to further detail what those options might be and then bring some of that out to the industry, to the NGO stakeholders, to others, and hear from them about how this information might be used to be more -- improve decision making.

Then from that, come together with some options and perhaps have some public comment or public

workshop that then leads into an RPB meeting where the RPB would make some decisions about which of those options we could go forward with.

So that's the process and the timing is we're aiming for our November RPB meeting, mid

November, to have this initial process about how we would use that information in existing decision frameworks, options on the table for the RPB in November that has public input and then we move forward from there.

MS. CANTRAL: Great. That's helpful. And so I think what the co-lead said and Meridian working with the co-leads are suggesting to you that there may be some lessons to learn, some modeling that could be done given that you're already several steps into this process and with a desire to do something similar to that in this region, again with the logic of this being closely coordinated across the two regions, then

we could capitalize on that.

MR. NAPOLI: I think the third bullet up there says almost exactly what we really work through in that work group. And Maureen has been involved in that and so -- and there are others around the table who've been involved in that.

MS. CANTRAL: So are there any other questions from Nick at this point?

Laura.

MS. MCKAY: Yes. Thanks, Nick.

Just wanted to clarify. So is your focus more -- I keep hearing you say how you would incorporate thoughts into the regulatory process. So -- but are you also going to try to create some kind of future vision or some desired future ocean plan where you wouldn't do things as a signal to what -- where developers should and shouldn't go or that, you know, that sort of thing?

MR. NAPOLI: Yeah. So I don't think we've come to a conclusion like that yet and that's really what the next six months are about. That could be an option, but that's really discussions comes out and gets put on the table for the RPB.

MS. CANTRAL: So I just want to flag that we're going to be talking about the regional ocean assessment this afternoon and clearly there is a lot of interest and questions and concerns.

And so, you know, if you're going to be around this afternoon, we may want to talk to you further about that as we get into that topic.

MR. NAPOLI: Sure.

MS. CANTRAL: Great. All right. So where are we? Should we move on to the other -- Gwynne, to your presentation of the connection to bays and estuaries?

MS. SHULTZ: Sure.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So we need to go back a slide and --

MS. SHULTZ: Yes.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, there we are.

MS. SHULTZ: Okay. I'm going to talk a little bit about a proposed process for going forward to looking into the whole issue of connections between estuaries, bays, and the coast.

You know, based on the public listening sessions and feedback we received, we had a good discussion yesterday about the better coordination or, you know, this related to the discussion we had on the framework.

And we, as a result of the discussion, we agreed to strengthen the framework to acknowledge the importance of the estuaries, bays, coastal lands to ocean planning. So we did that in response to the public comments.

And what we're proposing to do here really is to have a small team of folks get together which would include the regional planning body members and staff really to develop some initial products for consideration by the full RPB.

And those would be to look into what are some of these important and relevant connections between ocean, estuaries, bays, and coast lands that we should account for in ocean planning.

Some of these things we may not really have a handle on until we move forward a little bit more, until we start putting together our regional ocean action plan, until we move forward a little bit more with the regional ocean assessment.

But it really is an important activity that we need to do to understand those connections, and this small work group would be charged with working to identify those and bring some of those back.

We really also would like to ask this work group to spend a little time understanding the trends that might change these connections over time and then what are some of the existing management entities that we really should be coordinating with and then also getting, either through those existing management entities, get some ideas and technical advice on this question, like what is -- do we need some technical input to better understand these connections.

So mainly what we're doing here is just kind of very briefly putting on the table the need for a work group to dig into this a little bit more and to come back to the full RPB, especially, I think, with who are some of those entities, who are some of those sectors that we need to engage in to really be able to understand these issues.

We've heard clearly that we should have a dialogue with the national estuary programs. We've

heard that we need to have a dialogue with the sea grant programs. You know, each of these are going to be bringing different issues to the table, have a sense of what some of those connections are as it relates to, you know, our ocean planning objectives.

You know, other regional ocean partnerships, we've been talking with Nick from the northeast RPB.

We'd like to engage with folks from the south Atlantic regional planning body, and then also the idea of perhaps having some sector-based meetings, meeting with the ports. You know, what do you see might be some connections, meeting with fishing community, how do you see connections.

You know, so just maybe having this work group identify the right people to be talking with so that we can better understand the issues to figure out what we need to take into consideration as we develop our regional ocean action plan. And we would have the

regional planning body, you know, kind of facilitate, you know, help facilitate this work group.

So I think that's it unless there's any questions.

MS. CHYTALO: Gwynne, what would be the timing of that work group, overlaid with all these others at this time or --

MS. SHULTZ: Yes, the question is what would be the timing.

MS. CHYTALO: The timing.

MS. SHULTZ: And, yeah, I would think that we would want to convene this again as soon as possible to start exploring who should we be talking to, what should be, you know, some of the issues that we need, and then start doing our outreach activities.

MS. CHYTALO: So basically we would be going to the estuaries, the other programs to ask them what their issues are that they feel that would be

connected to the ocean? Is that the question we would be asking them?

MS. SHULTZ: That's what the co-leads are, you know, putting forth as an option for this group to think is that the right direction to go.

MS. CHYTALO: But since we have not identified all of our issues, we're not ready to go to them to ask them what some of our issues would be.

MS. SHULTZ: I think having initial dialogue could maybe, you know, pose the issue that we're grappling with. I mean, we've heard some of through the public comments about, you know, we want to kind of understand issues outside of water quality. I mean, we've heard some things. So maybe in the initial discussion, just start the dialogue, but --

MS. CHYTALO: I mean, it would help drive or could affect the ocean assessment then if something is going to be raised as part of those discussions,

whatever, or something that we'd need to be evaluating a little bit more or something.

I want to have that done. I want to have -
I want to make sure it's a two-way thing, but also

that we don't, you know -- we can have limited

resources, limited issues that we can handle. I want

to make sure that we are grappling with the most

important for the entire region and not just -- I

don't want to get sucked into local issues, you know,

real localized. You know what I mean? That

wasn't -- it's going to be regional.

MS. SHULTZ: And really I think that would be one of the charges of the work group to kind of come up maybe with that, actually the time line, how does it fit into all the other ongoing activities.

MS. CANTRAL: Right, right. So these ideas are very helpful for thinking about the framing and the scope and the timing and give a clear charge to

the working group and then let them explore some of these questions.

So let's go to Andy, Joe, and then Doug.

MR. ZEMBA: Yeah. This is an important topic for us in Pennsylvania, so highly supported. I think some of the -- I think Gwynne answered Karen's questions quite well. The work group should be tasked with figuring out some of these.

Some of this is simply developing linkages and developing communication processes for some of the larger programs like the Chesapeake Bay program. So I would volunteer us to not only be on the work group, but if we need a co-lead of some sort, we would volunteer to be that.

We could use a little help with some of the NEPs that we don't normally deal with. So if we could get some expertise there. Really our strengths are going to be Chesapeake Bay program, Delaware,

partnerships with the Delaware estuary. Beyond that, we could use some help if there's another co -- someone who may want to volunteer that has some experience there, it would be helpful, so --

MS. CHYTALO: ANEP, Association of National Estuary programs would be a good one.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. That's great. Thank you, Andy.

Joe.

MR. ATANGAN: I'm going to circle back to one of the discussions we had yesterday and that was the critical -- the critical piece with this was we need to be careful about what question we're asking. We need to identify what those questions are that we're asking of the estuaries and coast. We can't just go in there and say, hey, what's important to you.

We have to identify the proper context so

that we can factor that into what it is that we're doing because my fear is is we go in there and say, hey, you know, what do you guys think is important and they'll give you the whole laundry list of things that they're working on and that's not the question that we want to answer.

I think we have to shape it in such a way that we say, hey, we're about to embark on an ocean planning evolution here and we know that the bays and estuaries and coasts are going to need to be factored into this. And so we have to shape our questions so that they can provide us with the kind of answers that we need to proceed forward.

So, you know, everything goes back to this group having to identify the series of questions that are going to help shape what our ocean plan is going to be and we really need -- we need to keep that in the back of our mind because it's real easy to go down

a rabbit hole and all of a sudden, you're going to end up with this 5,000 page document that sits on the shelf.

So it's got to be very targeted based on a very specific set of questions that we're trying to address.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So a lot of people want to respond to that. And I think that that's a good reminder overall and I think that in the -- what the co-leads are thinking about with regard to this working group would be to do some initial thinking about that scoping and bring that back for RPB consideration, starting to identify who are the people and entities to be connecting with, where is the expertise, and not going directly to -- that's not the first step -- start taking the inventory and figuring out how to proceed in a way that's grounded in the work that this body is trying to accomplish.

All right. So let's go to Doug and then Mike and Kevin.

MR. PABST: Thanks.

Hi, everybody. How we doing? Been quiet since yesterday, so I figured I'd chime in now a little bit and see how we're doing over here.

I think this -- this to me is more of the what versus the how. I think what I heard is a lot of people were asking about how are we going to be coordinating with the estuaries and the bays and the coast versus -- I almost think we're going right to the what we want to coordinate with them about. We're missing the how.

So I was going to suggest two things. One, and I know from a federal perspective, we don't use the survey word, but if there was some surveying monkey type -- we've done a lot of those type survey we could send out that would ask people who do you

want to be coordinated with. I've participated in many of those from the various coastal programs.

And, secondly, I think the social media aspect, I've liked several of these programs on Facebook, for example, and I get lots of blasts about everything they're doing, events that are going on, and it's automatic. I don't have to really look for it. It just comes to me in that regard.

So that social media might be another avenue to get really beyond even their own -- they all have their own bureaucracies and I think that to get to the people that are actually part of those organizations might be another way.

So, again, focusing on the how versus the what is my issue.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

MR. PABST: Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Hi.

MR. LUISI: Okay. I'll just -- I'll tie in with that and as much as, you know, the how is important, you have to figure out how you're going to get that connection established. The what is what's going to drive the use of the information.

And there was a point made yesterday, and I don't remember who said it, but it was about the direction of how we're going to tie the bays and estuaries together with the ocean. Is it going to be the planning efforts in the ocean and how they'll impact the bay and estuaries or is it going to be what's happening in the bays and estuaries and how that's impacting what's going on in the ocean?

And I think that that's a really important first question to try to understand and try to answer because that's going to provide you the what when you're figuring out how. You're going to get that content after making a decision on which direction you

want to take the information gathering.

So thanks.

MS. CANTRAL: Kevin.

MR. CHU: Yeah. Thank you very much.

I love this idea. I think it's a great idea to form this body. And NOAA certainly should be on it. Unfortunately, I'm not in a position to offer as Andy did to co-chair, but will certainly participate.

MS. CANTRAL: Kevin, you're hard to hear.

MR. CHU: I'm sorry.

MS. CANTRAL: That's better.

MR. CHU: I'm about to chew on the microphone. But -- all right. I'll lean right into the microphone.

So, anyway, what I said was that NOAA certainly supports the formation of this committee and we would be a natural participant on it.

I am a little unclear as to what we're being

asked at this stage. Are we being asked as a body to agree that we want to set up a small team to do that? In which case, I sense around the room an answer yes, but we should be clear on that that the answer is yes.

Last point I'd like to make is I take Joe's point. He's always perceptive about all of this stuff. But I also think that asking open-ended questions can be very valuable. If you only ask the questions that you want to know the answers to, sometimes you miss things that you didn't know were out there.

So -- but that's an issue for that small group to figure out. And so what this slide is is setting up a group to talk about all that stuff and we should do that.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Other thoughts on this topic?

Yeah, go ahead, John.

MR. WALTERS: Question about membership on this team. We have finite time, finite members. Can we look within our organization for entities that are not members -- people who are not members of the RPB to maybe sit on this team?

MS. CANTRAL: Do you want to speak to that? Why don't you --

MS. BORNHOLDT: Absolutely. I mean, I was thinking for this particular team, we have Fish and Wildlife Service and Park Service who probably have assets that would, you know, bring some different points of view to this issue.

So we were going to definitely reach into the DOI family for that because in BOEM, you're right, we're now launching how many task forces and work groups within the RPB. So we want to make sure, yeah, that we reach back into our organization to be able to bring, you know, folks that can lend a subject matter

point of view and assist in this.

You know, with regard to outside of the organization, that becomes a little more challenging. I think that for me if it appears that there is need to have a lessee of BOEM, whether it's an oil and gas lessee or a wind lessee or even someone who's receiving marine minerals, there's probably a way to have a presentation for a work group to help elucidate an issue, but not to necessarily have them as a regular member. That's when we get into that stepping over the line with regard to FOCA.

We also have available to us the SLC that MARCO has put forth. So to the extent that we use that as our first go-to resource to be able to reach out and grab, you know, expertise, an expert outside of our federal, tribal, state family, I think that's probably preferred.

MR. WALTERS: I saw an opportunity possibly

for the American Association of Ports Authority to contribute or participate, but, again, it's not a federal member. But they might be made up of government officials.

MS. BORNHOLDT: If it's a governmental official, whether it's a tribal, state, or federal, local elected, that's not a problem.

MS. CANTRAL: So just perhaps to further clarify, what we are -- what the co-leads are asking of you, because, I think, Kevin, you asked this question, and John building on it with some questions about membership, so the three topics that have been presented this morning, and we have a few others that we want to cover as components moving forward with developing a work plan, what the co-leads are suggesting to you is the creation of some RPB working groups that would be populated by members of the RPB or staffs and other parts of your institutions and

that we're hoping -- the co-leads are hoping, and we've heard you react positively to the three things that we presented so far, that being a working group around ideas and options and scoping of a regional ocean action plan, so we would need some people to organize around that. That's number one.

This one that we're talking about, the connections to estuaries, bays, and coasts, a small group to organize around that, and we had some discussion about the charge to that group.

And then the third thing that we talked about so far is designing a process for exploring improving inter-jurisdictional coordination and regulatory processes in the context of this planning work and the goals and objectives that are in the framework and issues of importance to this region.

And that's not necessarily a small working group, but that is designing an approach, might be

similar to what the northeast is doing, but make -starting to make some progress on that set of issues
and how this is a dimension of the planning process.

So for each of these topics, what the coleads are looking to you from is a sense of comfort with that and also before we leave today, you know, to the degree that you're willing to put up your hand as Pennsylvania has done, as NOAA has done, Coast Guard, around one or more of these assignments, that's great.

You heard the co-leads say that there is an expectation that all of the members represented on the RPB will find a way to contribute to these efforts.

And then, as I said, there's some more that we want to talk about that we're going to get to.

So you want to -- yeah, go ahead.

MS. SHULTZ: And she's teased out each of the different work groups that are going to be focusing on these different themes, but kind of

circling back to what my charge a little bit earlier is to talk about this RPB work plan.

The content of that work plan will be developed by all the work groups that we've just discussed, you know, teasing up ideas and recommendations on a lot of the different themes that we've been discussing.

So that's kind of how recommendations from a lot of these work groups will be funneled into this larger kind of work plan that sets our day-to-day activities.

So correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm just trying to put that within the work plan group within the context of all these other work groups.

MS. CANTRAL: Right.

MR. PABST: I'm Doug from EPA. How we doing? I'm not sure if I need that, but I'll -- how's that? Oh, wow. We'd like to --

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, they like that. They like that, yeah.

MR. PABST: I feel like I'm calling a race or something here with the -- we'd like to volunteer for -- you know, we certainly want to participate in all the various groups, but I think from EPA's talents and our reach capabilities, probably their reach back into the bays, estuaries, and the estuary programs would probably be our best area.

We have a lot of relationships with the various national estuary programs, watershed associations, and things, so I think that would be a natural for us to sort of be the lead agency on unless the group would like us to be elsewhere.

Wow, I left that wide open, but I appreciate your discretion.

MS. CANTRAL: So there's a suggest -- I think there's a suggestion that EPA and Pennsylvania

could co-lead on this working group.

MR. WALTERS: Sounds good.

MS. CANTRAL: And we can talk about further populating it as we go along, so people be thinking about your interest in being part of that group.

Karen and then Joe and Kevin.

MS. CHYTALO: I volunteer to be on the OAP, you know, the ocean action plan work group and be the state co-lead.

MS. CANTRAL: Great.

VOICE: We couldn't hear her.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Karen has volunteered to be the state co-lead for the regional ocean action plan work group. Okay?

Joe.

MR. ATANGAN: I'm sorry. I just -- would it be possible to get a kind of listing of all the working -- I'm losing track, so just to keep tabs on

what it is that we're going to be signing up for, could be signing up for?

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, yeah. Yeah. I know we're kind of getting a little bit tangled up with ourselves. So what I'm going to suggest is that we round out this discussion with people who have comments right now. We're going to take a short break and regroup and then come back so that you can get a clear picture.

Part of what we're doing is we're midstream in making a presentation on several elements of moving forward and co-lead ideas about work groups or processes. And we -- in some ways, we need to get through all of those and then you take a step back and go I'll sign up for this, that, and the other. But we're not going to turn down any offers for assistance along the way.

All right. Kevin.

MR. CHU: Thanks.

NOAA should be also part of the -- that work group on the regional ocean action plan. I view that as the essential work of this group and we want to be involved in that early discussion.

I'm not entirely sure that that is actually a separate discussion than the third group designing a process for formally improving stakeholder collaboration. It seems like it's the same topic, at least in some regard. So --

MS. CANTRAL: Well, let's further explore that when we get into that topic, yes.

MR. CHU: Okay. Good, good.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Other thoughts before we take a short break?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So why don't we come back at noon? And what I think we can do --

we're supposed to go until 12:30. That's what our agenda says and then break for lunch. But it feels like we could take a 15-minute break and come back and pick up another one of our topics and then break for lunch and come back and pick up what's left.

Does that make sense to folks?

VOICE: Sure.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So we will come back at 12:00 noon. Thank you.

(Whereupon, there was a brief recess taken.)

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Thanks, folks. We're going to get started.

of you listening to these discussions that we're presenting a lot of new ideas, new information. It's a lot to digest all at once and we recognize that.

So let me try to take a step back and

summarize a little bit of what the co-leads said -are presenting to you. And after I do that, we'll
turn to the MARCO ocean data portal and hear what's
going on with the work of developing that portal and
what that all suggests as -- for the portal being an
element, a key tool, and a part of the planning
process.

That will take us to a lunch break and we'll do that and we'll come back and resume our discussions.

As you heard from Gwynne, the process that we are proposing, that the co-leads are proposing and that has been designed has several elements to it.

There's the framework that was approved yesterday. It lays out the goals and objectives for the regional ocean planning process.

What we're suggesting now is that the phase of the work needs to turn to developing a work plan

that helps with the creation of the ocean action plan, so actually what are you going to be doing in the planning process.

But you can't go directly from a framework to an ocean action plan. There's got to be some thought about what needs to be in that plan. So to that end, the co-leads are proposing several working groups to focus on those different components and processes that are going to help deliver those components.

And some of them we've already talked about and some of them are yet to be discussed. So let me just go through them all so that you're aware.

There is a proposal for a working group to focus on the regional ocean action plan, options for what that looks like, what's in it, what's the scale, what's the scope, what's the timing, et cetera.

There is a working group to look at the

connections of the ocean planning process to bays, estuaries, and the coast.

There is a process to put in place to look for opportunities to improve inter-jurisdictional coordination around issues and activities that are important to this region and that are consistent with the goals and objectives that are laid out in the framework.

So that's three and we talked about all three of those so far.

What we're about to talk about is the ocean data portal and its relationship to the planning process is something that is managed by MARCO with contributions and participation from other RPB institutions. And we'll hear some more about that in a moment.

And then what we also need to talk about that the co-leads are suggesting becomes part of

developing a work plan is the regional ocean assessment and stakeholder engagement and a strategy for stakeholder engagement and how to go forth and do that stakeholder engagement.

When you stitch all of those things together, that's a work plan. And some of the things that I just described transcend -- they're already underway right now and they go all the way through the process. Other parts of what I am speaking about are things that help inform the development of the action plan.

So this morning, when I said there aren't bright lines between phases or different aspects of the work, that's what I'm talking about. And I know that that's -- and that's why it's confusing and we're getting, you know, some -- we're going down in the weeds and then we're zooming back up high and it's -- we're at that point where we just have to kind of

muddle through.

So I hope that provides a little bit of perspective and helps us be oriented into what we're talking about and what the co-leads are presenting for your consideration.

And if there are any questions or comments, we could talk about that a little bit right now.

Otherwise, I'm going to turn it over to the data portal people. I hope that was helpful. Okay.

Great.

All right. Laura, I'm turning it to you.

MS. MCKAY: Okay. Thanks, Laura.

And I'm going to hold the microphone so hopefully when I turn my head, you can still hear me and the RPB can still hear me, too.

So, yes, I'm Laura McKay with the Virginia
Coastal Zone Management Program and MARCO and the RPB.
And I also at this time want to introduce Tony

McDonald who is with Urban Coast Institute at

Monmouth, and Jay Odell with TNC. And I think you've

maybe met Al Lombano (phonetic), I hope, out in the

hall who is -- he is out there today, isn't he, giving

demonstrations of the data portal if you want a little

one-on-one time.

So I hope everyone by now has seen the portal and played with it a little bit, but we want to go to the next slide and show you. This is the Website. That's where you can find it. And basically it has these three areas on it.

To the left, there's the learn button and it talks about all the different data themes that we have in there. The explore button, which I'll talk more about, we'll all talk more about a little bit later, but that's where the data catalogue is and data priorities and some other things. And then the main button there on the right is the visualize and when

you click on that or up in the blue box, you can just launch the planner.

And then if we go to the next slide, Tim, there are basically these seven data themes that you can open up and there's more layers under those and turn things off and on. And so those are the basic seven themes that we have for now.

We're trying to keep it fairly simple, clean, and clear so it's easy to use, easy to navigate, but, of course, we're always open for suggestions. You see the little feedback tabs in blue in the lower corner there. You can have that data legend turned off or on and get more real estate if you want.

If we go to the next slide, there's many functions that the portal offers. You can bookmark things, share maps, but I think rather than me going on about it, we have a really nice video that Tim is

going queue up for us now and that will give you a nice little tour of the portal.

One of the things -- I think the video says this, too, but we keep encouraging people to register for an account. There we go.

(Whereupon, a video was shown.)

MS. MCKAY: Can we dim lights a little? Can you turn the volume up at all? Is that better? We should have been doing that all along. We lost the volume, didn't we?

Hopefully that's a fun change of pace to have a little video inserted in there. And thank you so much to our wonderful portal team for putting that together.

We hope you already knew all that, but we also wanted you to see it to know that that's a product that's available now. So if you know some other people who are shy about using the technology,

you can, you know, give them at least the link to this video and maybe that will help get the word out that this tool is available and growing.

So with that, we can go to the next slide and I just wanted to elaborate just a little bit on the data priorities and standards.

Do you want to keep the lights off?

VOICES: Yes.

MS. MCKAY: Yeah, because I think it's much easier to see the screen. I don't know who just turned them back up. Oh, thank you over there.

Thanks. Whoa.

So I just wanted to draw your attention in case you've been on the portal recently looking at the data priorities list, that was just updated this past week and so take a look at that again.

And you can see there's a number of data layers that are about to come on line. I believe the

-- did the coral prediction model go up, Jay? So that's a new layer that's up there which is really fun.

And I think the NCOS seabird data layer is going up soon, so -- and the recreational use data layer, so there will be a lot of things coming, but that's the way to find out what's in the queue.

The other thing that we just put up there are data standards, criteria and standards, that bottom button there. So take a look at that. We have, as I mentioned yesterday, five basic standards that we're looking at and they revolve around the issues of relevance for regional planning, methodological rigor, staying true to the FGDC federal data standards and meta-data standards, the geographic extent of the data layer, and the currency and basically the best available, much like we say best available science, best available data.

So -- but you can read those there. They're up there for now. We may improve them and -- over time if needed.

But if we can go to the next slide, what I wanted to talk to you about today was how we go about adding data and functions to the portal and where the different opportunities are for the RPB and the stakeholder liaison group and all these different people to have some input to the portal.

So this is just a graphic showing you the basic steps. And so the Monmouth portal team there in the kind of orange box and something called the MARCO ocean mapping and data team are kind of the first line of defense on this thing.

And I'll go into what the membership is of that ocean mapping and data team in a second, but just wanted to show you in step two requests for inclusion of data, so the MARCO management board might have

ideas, the RPB might have ideas, MARCO's Stakeholder
Liaison Committee, and those of you -- I know we have
some of our committee members here, Jeff Dee

(phonetic), Nicky Rovner (phonetic).

There's a way for you -- when you're interacting with your stakeholders and they have ideas about data or functions that are needed in the portal, you know, lead them to us, give us a call, and we'll work on that.

We have another step if there's some question about the quality of the data, if it's maybe, you know, not a basic data from an authoritative source like Joe with the Navy or something, we might want to send it out to an external data review team. So that's a group of experts that we can go to as needed.

And then finally, the MARCO board retains that final steps of saying yea or nay in terms of what

we do or don't add to the portal. And then the Monmouth portal team will go ahead and update it.

So that's the basic process, but let me talk for a second about that ocean mapping data team. We started out in MARCO having a similar group. We just called it our ocean planning action team, but when the RPB was formed and the RPB decided that the portal would be its major planning tool, we wanted to ensure that the RPB was duly represented. So we're trying to kind of reconfigure the ocean mapping data team a little bit.

So we can go to the next slide now. And what I'd like to get from the RPB today, especially the -- well, a number of the entities and the RPB, we'd like to have one person per agency and what's up there now in some cases are people who are -- have been with us in the past, which is great, but we found the group was -- we had about 50 people and basically

I'd lead this group and we'd do quarterly conference calls. And having 50 people on a conference call is really tough.

So we're trying to streamline it a little bit, but, of course, we want to be inclusive as well. So we have NOAA, BOEM, Coast Guard, EPA. Those were people that were already working with us on the portal. Department of Defense, we'd like to get somebody and Department of Energy and Transportation and Ag. So if we can talk about that later, that would be great.

And then if we turn the page, the slide, sorry, we also have -- we need someone to represent the Shinnecocks. That would be great if somebody is interested in the mapping aspects.

And then the four state people, I believe have been constant, but, again, if any of you states want to recommend someone else, now is the time.

Let's get the right people there.

And then the Fishery Management Council, we've had Jim Armstrong on the data team. And so, Mike, if that's -- if we're still good to go, let me know.

And then, of course, the Monmouth portal team with Tony and -- representing Monmouth and leading that group and Rick Lathrop (phonetic) from Rutgers and Jay from Nature Conservancy and then we also have MARACOOS represented.

There's been a lot of talk about the need to incorporate the -- and if you don't know, that's the Mid-Atlantic Regional Association of Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems and they are really focused on a lot of real-time data, but we want to work with them to see how we can convert real-time data to something that's useful for long-term planning.

So I think that was pretty much all I needed

to tell you about today. And so what we're going to do now is have Tony come up and tell you more about some of these exciting new data layers.

MR. MCDONALD: Great. Thanks, Laura, and I appreciate the opportunity.

And, again, it's pretty exciting for us right now because we feel like with the RPB advancing sort of, we really are in a position that the portal really can inform and be used by the RPB members and also the stakeholder groups to actually engage in some of the dialogue we've been talking about.

You've seen from the videos -- really that's the first of three videos we have in our immediate work plan. We really are trying to make this a, just as some of the speakers have talked about, the RPB being a single place that they can go to and reach many different agencies. We see the portal as a single place in the community that people can get to

to access information in ways that are meaningful for regional ocean planners.

But we wouldn't be here if it wasn't for the partnerships that Laura was suggesting that we already have with the federal agencies and the state agencies. So this information all comes from -- we stand on the shoulders of many others to do this and our job is to now make it simple and also entertaining. So increasingly, we are trying to -- actually try to move in that direction.

So some exciting -- just a couple of examples of some things that are sort of being added.

We heard yesterday from Mike about how important corals are in the Mid-Atlantic, so we are very excited to actually be partnering and have the portal sort of work with the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Council to actually look at a very complex issue and Laura already mentioned adding the deep sea coral predictive model

information.

Again, a lot of credit goes to NOAA and the other agencies that have some of the data inputs and to the Mid-Atlantic Council for the hard work that they're doing in actually looking at alternatives. So we think this is an excellent example of how the portal might actually be used in other cases in the future.

Another specific area that we heard very early on in our process, and, again, we are very stakeholder driven, our process in terms of developing this. That's who the client is. That's who the users are. And the stakeholders are both the RPB and the public. So we actually see this as being a fairly full service model.

But we heard from a lot of groups that recreational information is one of the main gaps that they saw. So we went out and worked with groups

through a variety of different strategies and partnerships to start gathering some of the recreational use data.

So we have three major efforts, the participatory mapping workshops that we held in each state, the -- we've partnered with Surfrider actually and they've been an excellent partner. Actually gathered some information about non-consumptive recreational users, surfers obviously, folks like that. So they've got some information. That has a mapping component as well.

And we also have engaged in a recreational boater survey. And as I indicated, we kind of stole that idea or borrowed that idea or shared that idea from some work that went in New England. So we have a very consistent methodology that we've developed a recreational boater survey.

So now we're in the process of turning it

over to people smarter than myself or the technical side to really make sense of all the data we've gathered and reconcile it so that it can be put on the portal consistent with some of the data standards that Laura was suggesting.

So we are moving forward to actually look at the different sort of mapping information and use information that we've gathered through these efforts and directly with other partners. We're now trying to integrate that information, as Laura indicated, at a regional scale.

We're not going to lose any of the specific data, but we're going to make sure that the data that is added to the portal reflects the regional planning objectives and goals that the RPB and MARCO has set out. So we're in the process of looking at ways to actually integrate that data consistently across the different mapping sets.

And eventually, this is just sort of looking forward, we really will anticipate adding this in a way that is searchable. You saw some of those cool things on the video, but we will have similar things for the recreational use data that can -- if you're specifically interested in a specific user group, you can go in and look at that data moving forward and also some of the participatory mapping issues.

Also, this is the beginning of our process, not the end. We're not done. We anticipate and we actually have some plans to go back out in the states to actually not only validate this information again but also improve on that and enhance that in the coming year. So that's a real priority for us.

Another priority is commercial fishing. You know, a huge issue. And we really found in some of our initial outreach to communities that the current data is a little coarse. It's sort of in these ten

minute squares, hundred miles that really don't -aren't necessarily that useful for really
understanding specific conflicts in development.

So we're trying to work with the commercial fishing community to identify a new approach and this is sort of all this VTR data, vessel trip reports that are required to be filed. But that sort of doesn't really tell you very much over there on the left.

So we've been working with really smart, creative folks at Rutgers and others to develop what we're calling a communities at sea approach. And so the map in the left really reflects where fishermen fish and where they care about from a community level. It's based on not only communities, but it also reflects the specific ports, so where the different ports fish, and it also reflects the different fishing types, bottom drawing gill types.

So we've developed a lot of information and

developing methodology to really reflect the community so that the fishermen can see themselves in this data in a more specific way.

What's really important to say is this is not going to happen until we validate this and meet with the fishery community. So this is not -- we're not putting any maps. We're not telling a story. We want to make sure it's their story, so we've begun a process of one-on-one meetings, small group meetings with them in the various ports to review the data.

So, again, these are just examples. These haven't been validated yet, so I won't go into great detail, but you can kind of see we have data from a fully regional level. So this is information we can share with our folks.

Our partners, they have a slightly different approach that they're using in New England, but we're regularly talking with them to be sure that they will

be compatible over time, so we have regional level data.

We then have port specific data that actually reflects what are called sort of heat maps, intensity of fishing activity. And it really reflects a cool feature which is really the extent of labor. So it really says where are we really putting our effort as a community of fishermen.

And this sort of suggests another story.

Sometimes NMFS might look at overall fishery level.

This will tell you what is really very significant to that individual port.

So one sort of major decision at a regional level might have a disproportionate impact on a specific community and it's great to be able to understand that better so that you can actually fine tune your management actions in ways that are -- have less impact on the communities whenever possible.

So, again, we're currently reviewing and improving the draft maps in consultation with the fishing community and we hope to add that -- this data if we can be successful working through this in the fall of 2014.

We already discussed the data priorities, so I won't go into this anymore. But, again, this all is clearly indicated on the portal where that information is, who's developing, how it's developing, and also as you heard in the video, anybody has an opportunity to comment on that if they suggest that there's better data or we should do -- go about it in a different way.

So back to sort of where we began with the video concept, we really want to reflect the communities in this portal. We want to make this -- I think we've really started to get the data right.

We've started to make it a simple, organized

framework, but we want it to be a more welcoming framework for communities.

So we really are moving in a direction of telling more sort of voices of the Mid-Atlantic. So we would really like to work with the RPB and the stakeholders to make sure that we are actually reflecting information about the activities in the Mid-Atlantic.

And the regional ocean assessment, I think, is a very good example of that. As the RPB develops that kind of information, we want to make sure that the data reflects that on the portal and that perhaps we can almost have an interactive live reflection of the regional ocean assessment and identify data needs if there's a specific question or management question that might come up that might be additional data.

So we are trying to think ahead about how this portal can actually reflect the planning

interests of the ocean community as well as the RPB. So it's great. Thank you very much.

MS. MCKAY: Thank you so much, Tony.

Jay, did we forget anything?

MR. ODELL: Perfect.

MS. MCKAY: All right. Good.

So, Laura, are we going to do questions from the RPB?

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah. So before we open it up for questions, one suggestion that I have is back to you, Laura McKay. And, Tony and Jay, you should stand nearby -- stay nearby just as you are so you can help field questions or ideas.

You put up the one slide about hoping to get some participation among federal agencies and the tribe to be part of the working group. And I'm forgetting the name of the mapping.

MS. MCKAY: Ocean mapping and data team.

MS. CANTRAL: That one, yeah. So that's one thing that I think we should invite some discussion around.

And then the other one, it would be helpful to hear some discussion perhaps started by you portal team folks about how you see the relationship between the stakeholder engagement work that you're doing in the context of the portal development and the stakeholder engagement that this group needs to be doing as part of the planning process because those are so inextricably connected, but I'm not sure those processes, we've felt through exactly how those connect up.

So one thing that I would pose to the group for some discussion, and maybe you all have given it some thought, that you could offer to get it started.

MS. MCKAY: Sure. I think it does get confusing. One way to look at it is for the portal,

we're kind of tackling, you know, one issue at a time, one data layer at a time.

So, for instance, in order to get some good maps of what are -- where the important recreational areas, we worked just with that group and in each state, state by state mapped 22 different recreational uses. And so then that job is done, so that was, you know, purely a mapping job.

But there's other kinds of stakeholder engagement that, you know, will go beyond that that I think the Stakeholder Liaison Committee will help with and the RPB as well.

So I like to think of it as the ocean mapping data team is really very spatially data oriented except for the fact that we, as Tony mentioned, we do want to move into visualizing on the portal the regional ocean assessment. But, you know, that's after that assessment work is done.

But, Tony, you look like you want to go ahead.

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah. Again, if I could suggest a couple of things. One is I want to say our correct funding and our work plan is actually tied very much supporting RPB work. So we actually have actually set aside some time and resources within the portal team to specifically work with the RPB on its specific outreach objectives.

And actually we work very well with Chris and the staff to actually identify what might be your stakeholder needs in order to scope our -- both our portal development, but also some mapping that might support a dialogue that you would set up. So we have specifically set that up.

We've also specifically set up a joint planning calendar, so we actually will be very aware of what planning we might have specifically for

outreach that Laura suggested around technical development of the portal.

So we are always talking to the communities about data information. So we're not driving the planning questions. RPB drives that. But we do have some outreach plan specifically around the data development.

So I think that's the distinction, but I -in terms of both scheduling and collaboration based on
past efforts of the RPB, the portal has been
identified and is incorporated into the ocean planning
data team group.

MS. MCKAY: Ocean mapping data.

MR. MCDONALD: Ocean mapping data group. So we are on the record supporting that, so that will also, I think, lead toward integration of those efforts. And we also are engaged in the stakeholder liaison group, so we participated in that first

meeting.

And we've asked our technical team to at least make some preliminary recommendations for how we might think about how the MARCO and RPB and the Website sort of engage stakeholders and provide some input, but that's a question that's still open for further discussion.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Thank you.

I think that's very helpful and I would encourage all of you to be thinking creatively about how to best leverage those stakeholder engagement opportunities. I recognize that there's need to be clear about what you're reaching out to them about so that you're not confusing them and that is a challenge in and of itself.

But it sounds like some good ideas and some things that we can further explore as you move forward with that work and the RPB moves forward with this

work and we integrate them along the way.

So I see some people have questions and comments. So let's go to Kelsey first and then, Mike, we'll go to you and Karen.

MS. LEONARD: Thank you. Hopefully you can hear me.

So to start, the Shinnecock Indian Nation is already in the process of working with MARCO to develop indigenous and tribal content for the portal that is responsive to the needs of tribal nations in the region, so that the portal can also be reflective of the diverse communities we have here in the Mid-Atlantic.

So I just wanted to put that out there and to also say thank you to MARCO because I believe this is sort of the entre into this integrated management and thinking ahead to include tribal nations and their interests in developing this data, so --

MS. CANTRAL: Mike.

MR. LUISI: Thank you.

Let me -- I'll just first start by thanking

Laura and Tony and Jay and all the rest of the data

team, the portal folks. I think this is a tremendous

product. It's going to help -- used the tremendous

too many times, but it's going to be a tremendous

asset to the management decision-making processes that

we have to go through. So I just want to compliment

you on the work that's been done and the work that

you'll continue to do.

The one thing -- the one question I have is, and it was having -- when you're looking at the fishing data, fishing effort information, it's -- it changes constantly. If you were to look at recreational harvest information on summer flounder five years ago, it may be extremely different than it is today.

And I assume, but it would be nice to know, and we do, you know, we -- Jay is a fixture at our -- at the council meetings and, you know, he's there all the time. There's a definite relationship established between the Mid-Atlantic Council and the portal team.

But I -- it would be nice to know what the
- how often and what the plans are for continued

updates. Are you going to be soliciting for that

information or is -- or do we have certain folks in

the industry -- I know that there's a new Stakeholder

Liaison Committee that's been put together. Is that

going to be the source for new information or as

fishing activity changes?

MR. MCDONALD: I think there's several questions imbedded in there. I'm going to look to Jay also to add a more technical response to this or more -- correct me if I'm wrong, but a couple of issues.

Even in our initial outreach, this current

data is actually 2010 to 2013, I believe, and so we have looked at a certain window. You want a certain planning window to reflect data in a way that things - it's meaningful because if it's too broad of a window, it can actually distort the data.

On the other hand, we have data back for '95 and we have that. And one question that's come up is should we also maybe be looking at it for a time series to say what has the historical change been.

That is a planning question that somebody needs to inform us that that would be helpful.

So we are -- just those kinds of questions have just come up in our process, but we, I think, are -- again, thank you to the council for being so open to sort of working with us and both staff and the principals.

So we certainly could have a discussion about how the data that we currently have should be

gathered in different ways effectively to reflect whatever planning questions you might have and that could be a time series of data.

I think we've raised the question about future, but I don't think we've tackled it yet in terms of trends data because I know that is of interest, although that's not specifically a core focus of what we're doing.

So, Jay, did that get it right? You have additional thoughts?

MS. MCKAY: I think funding is going to be key for future.

MR. ODELL: Your question gets to the heart of a lot of things that relate to how we reflect an ocean that's moving people and critters and water in a relatively static planning tool, but -- so I'll resist the temptation to go into a (indiscernible) about that, but we're sort of starting to focus on that

larger question.

But regarding the fisheries data, I think there's two things which Tony touched on really. One is how do we develop a schedule so that the most recent data is updated, so people are looking at current information, but also how we look at the longer time series so that people don't get the wrong picture or run -- or jump to the wrong conclusions about why a particular fishing pattern occurs now which might be the result of some particular combination of market forces and regulation and may not really reflect where the resource is.

And so to that end, we are -- our team at Rutgers is actually this week looking at a series of options for doing trends analysis. And when they look at these data, they can actually almost see some of these communities start to disappear.

And so we want to capture some of that kind

of information, too, and present it through a user interface that we develop over time where you're not just looking at one map image, but there's ability to sort of dial it up and down and in different directions to get a fuller picture.

MS. MCKAY: But I think to get to your question really of how are we going to update in the future, you know, we each with our Moore Foundation grants and picture about ocean planning, we can only go so far into the future in terms of funding.

And how we keep this going long term, I think, is an open question. And, you know, that's true for every data layer because they're all going to want to be updated pretty regularly or as frequently as we can. So it will be an ongoing challenge.

MS. CANTRAL: Karen.

MS. CHYTALO: I guess this question is for Mike and for Tony, too.

MS. CANTRAL: Can you speak in the microphone?

MS. CHYTALO: Oh, sorry. I guess one of my questions, too, is, you know, this -- this stuff is great, is really very helpful to portray the industry, the types of activities that are going on there. And I think the trend issue is very important, too.

But then it also comes down to some data accuracy type issues, and I wasn't sure if you had access to the vessel monitoring system data, the VMS data versus just the VTRs, which sometimes the VTR data can be eh-eh-eh, not a hundred percent on the mark, but that's a monitoring system that really gets you to the -- you know, clumsy terminology. It gets you to where the activity could be going or the, you know, location plus fishing activity. So I just didn't know if that -- if they were given that access to --

MR. LUISI: Well, I can't speak to the data that are used for the portal. However, not all vessels -- I know that in Maryland not all vessels have vessel monitoring systems. They're all required to fill out a trip report.

MS. CHYTALO: Correct. Correct.

MR. LUISI: But -- so -- but to what is used in the portal, I'd have to turn that question over.

MR. MCDONALD: And Jay will expand on this, but I'll say a couple things. We all (indiscernible). We know the limitations of VTR data and we acknowledge that and we talk about them in our process so we understand how we included the VTR data.

Jay will get up here and tell you that we do have access to the VMS data, but we've chosen a certain approach. I believe that New England is actually using VMS data as one of their foundational aspects for their planning purposes.

So, again, it's a little bit of, you know, how do you skin the cat and how do you manage the data in a way to reflect the issues.

So, again, Jay, I don't know if you want to expand on that, but I think at this point, we are focusing, although we're very aware of what they're doing in New England with VMS, but right now, I think our primary focus has been building this communities at sea approach out.

MR. ODELL: Yeah. I mean, I don't have a lot to add. This is an area, one of many areas where Nick Napoli's team -- you've heard from them a couple times -- and our team really are working together.

And they -- the data that we've been developing with Rutgers, the communities at sea data will be shared with their team and the data that they're developing with vessel monitoring system data will be shared with ours.

Each has its strengths and weaknesses. Nick and I had the opportunity just to look on laptop screens of PDF files of the two exact same years and data of VMS and this and it was amazing how similar they looked when you take out the transportation route information of the VMS data.

So there's -- I'll get down too far into the details if I say more than that, but we're working on it and none of, you know, none of these representations are going to be perfect. And it's progress, you know, it's progress on an important frontier.

MS. CANTRAL: And just stating the obvious here, this is another example of the logic of these two regions coordinating closely with each other. It just makes good sense for lots of reasons.

Now, Kevin, you -- did you want to respond right in on this point because I know there are

others, but if you want to do that and then we'll go to Lorraine and Jon?

MR. CHU: Just a point of information. The VMS stands for vessel monitoring system for those who don't know and many but not all fishing boats have to carry a transponder so that we can see where they are fishing.

However, that specific information is usually considered business confidential and we don't release it. You can release in some capacity as sort of mixed signals, but in general, it's very difficult to release information about where individuals are fishing.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah. A helpful clarification. Thank you.

MR. MCDONALD: There are protocols that you can app fine scrub it, but that is very closely controlled, monitored, and agreements are explicit

with NMFS before they would release it. So there are definitely protections in place to be sure that they do not violate any of those confidentiality issues.

MS. CANTRAL: Lorraine.

MS. WAKEMAN: Yes. Laura, I just want to commit to identifying the proper person at DOT to serve on your data and mapping team. And I will put you in touch with that person. It's a holiday week --

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

MS. WAKEMAN: -- but I'll do it as soon as possible.

MS. CANTRAL: Thanks. Great.

Jon.

MR. HALL: As a follow-up to the same question, I want to do the same, but I wanted to know what do you expect that person to do and how much time would be involved in serving on the team?

MS. MCKAY: Sure. It's just quarterly

conference calls that we do and probably I'll try to set up the next one, I think, for probably July if we can pull that off. And so it's not too onerous a time commitment, I don't think, for people who are dialing into that conference call.

Beyond the conference call, I don't know that it's really that much work. But it's really just to provide those relationships and connections so that if, you know, there are data layers that your agency is aware of that you think would be useful or important to regional ocean planning, you're there and you can tell us about it.

And we do -- we'll -- we send out an agenda beforehand and we always have that opportunity for the member entities -- we're learning to use that term today -- of the RPB, you know, to stay connected and keep in touch with us on all of those things. So we'll send an agenda out and people will have an

opportunity to participate.

MS. CANTRAL: Great. John and then we'll go to Megan, John Walters.

MR. WALTERS: Thank you.

With respect to the Atlantic coast port access route study, we were under the impression we needed that VMS information. We were unable to obtain it. But if you have -- if this other information -- you have the vessel reporting -- trip report, if that will fill our need, we'd like to work with you to reintegrate that into the ACPARS (phonetic). But we're not interested in individual vessel transits. We're interested in the information of those vessels as it affects all marine traffic.

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah. I didn't discuss the port data development activities, but we've had a wonderful partnership with the ACPARS team. They've been really wonderful technically in terms of both up-

sharing ideas and also collaborating.

And so we are -- have a plan to move forward with some of the port data based on input we've gotten from our first round of meetings and certainly we can discuss it specifically with the team about that question, John.

MS. CANTRAL: Megan.

MS. MASSAWAU: I just also want to respond to the DOE vacancy there. I'll take it back as an action item. We don't have as deep a bench as some of the other agencies for these issues, but I think, you know, it's important that -- you know, and we're not as data rich, ocean data rich as some of the agencies, but, you know, identifying the layers that are of interest, I think we can figure a way out for that to happen.

MS. MCKAY: That's great. We really appreciate that because even if your agency doesn't

have a lot of data or people or time, you know, we mentioned this idea of having some case studies on the portal, too. And so there may be ways that you could interact with us to help develop some of those case studies. That would be really cool, especially offshore wind area for Virginia.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay.

VOICE: There's a theme here.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Any other questions for the data team or comments?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you to those of you that are agencies who have volunteered to fill vacancies,

Mar Ad, Ag, and DOE. Very helpful and appreciate it.

Great. Thank you to all of you for sharing this update.

I will repeat myself and encourage you all to think about ways to leverage the stakeholder

engagement opportunities and look for those intersections. And we will be talking more about stakeholder engagement strategies for the regional planning body as part of what we're going to do after lunch.

So what I'd suggest that we do now is take that break for lunch and come back to talk about the regional ocean assessment, the stakeholder engagement strategies, revisit the big picture of moving forward with the development of a work plan and working groups to support components of that work plan.

Hopefully that -- that's becoming clearer to all of us as we muddle through all this. And then we'll talk about navigation related activities, see what other business we need to do before we wrap up and have a public comment session.

Does that all make sense? So let's take an hour for lunch and come back at 10 till 2:00. Thank

you.

(Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken.)

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So welcome back, everyone. Can you hear me? Am I on? Okay. All right.

So what we're going to do now is take two more topics for discussion about the work going forward for the next phase. And we're going to take up two of those components that we haven't talked about so far, the regional ocean assessment and the stakeholder engagement strategy.

Then we will turn to hearing about some navigation specific activities, open it up for public comment, and have a chance for some concluding discussion among the RPB about how you're feeling about what we mapped out as the next phase of work and any ideas, suggestions, questions, concerns, and see

if we can leave with a hopefully somewhat clearer path forward for the next phase of work.

So, Kevin, I'm ready to turn to you if you are ready to talk to us about the regional ocean assessment.

MR. CHU: Yes. Thanks.

I like the Laura McKay approach. You're right in my mouth here.

So could I have the next slide? Yeah. The

-- one of the components of marine planning is a

regional ocean assessment. It's something that has

been identified by a number of high-level institutions

and it's basically our mandate.

And so I think I volunteered to co-chair with Sarah Cooksey of Delaware to help to develop the -- at least the starting of a regional ocean assessment.

VOICE: Thanks, Kevin.

MR. CHU: You're welcome.

There are a number of people on the team that are helping us out and I would like to read them off. Phil Stafford (phonetic) of Maryland; Marty Rosen, New Jersey; Doug Pabst with the EPA; Joe Odell with the data portal; Michelle Moran (phonetic) of BOEM; Tony McDonald of the portal; Mike Luisi of the Maryland and the Mid-Atlantic Council; Kelsey Leonard of the tribe; Michelle Lennox (phonetic) of MARCO; Karen Chytalo of New York; Mary Voteman (phonetic) of BOEM; Christy Bailey (phonetic) of the Coast Guard; Pete Anderson of EPA.

So we have a wide array of people working on this and we've had a couple of phone calls. They've been fairly great. People have been working very well together and a lot of good thought going into it.

And we've developed two key questions that we want to put before the regional planning body

I've made my presentation and after you hear from the stakeholders about their reactions to what I'm presenting that the regional planning body will tell us whether we're on track or not. And I'll make sure those two questions are clear as we go.

So the first thing that we -- the working group wrestled with is what the heck is a regional ocean assessment? And I'd like to just reiterate this because it was one of the hardest things for me to wrap my mind around, so I'm punishing you all by having to go through this.

The clearest, simplest description of what a regional ocean assessment is that we found in the marine planning handbook, and it's very simple, a regional assessment uses maps and information to describe the marine environment and human activities.

That's what we're aiming for. It's a --

it's not the plan itself. It's -- but it is to paint a picture of what is going on currently in the Mid-Atlantic. It's to identify trends in the Mid-Atlantic, identify conflicts and issues that we need to be addressing.

One thing that is not made clear by all of the high-level and National Ocean Council's descriptions of the regional ocean assessment is what the document is for. So if I could have the next slide.

The working group talked about it and decided that the best use of the regional ocean assessment is to provide to decision makers the ability to identify factors and issues that affect the marine environment of the Mid-Atlantic that they should be aware of when they're making decisions.

So we -- we're viewing it as a reference tool for decision makers and that is one of the

questions that we're going to ask -- we would ask of the regional planning body. Is that the right target audience, because, if it is, it constrains in some key ways what the regional ocean assessment will look like.

It almost surely means that it will not be a large compendium of -- an encyclopedic description of everything that's going on. Rather, it will be quick summaries of issues for the decision makers.

That is not the only use of a regional ocean assessment and I would hope that my providing this document for the decision makers -- it will, of course, be a public document -- that it would be useful for many other purposes including it would be useful to inform the public of issues that the regional planning body sees as important to wrestle with in the Mid-Atlantic.

Next slide, please. So the working group

discussed what topics should go into the regional ocean assessment and this slide and the next slide sort of list the things, the key topics that we would propose to include.

We would have a description of physical characteristics of the Mid-Atlantic. We'd have a topic -- a section on biological and ecological characteristics. We would call up areas of particular ecological importance that may not be a separate topic maybe under the previous slide.

We do want to identify connections between the Mid-Atlantic and other areas. That would be the south Atlantic, the New England waters, the bays and coasts, the fresh water inputs. And I think it is important to make sure that those issues are clearly spelled out so that the decision makers realize that the Mid-Atlantic is not isolated itself.

And we would like specifically to call out

some of the ecosystem services that are provided by the Mid-Atlantic.

Next slide, please. We also -- and this slide is more of the policy half of the regional ocean assessment. We would identify current uses of the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and there would be commercial uses, recreational uses, cultural uses, and we'd do what we could to assess the economic value of those uses.

And we would identify future uses and trends in the Mid-Atlantic as well to the extent that we can identify trends in the biology or trends in the physical characteristics as well would all be included in this.

We think it's important to highlight the conflicts that are possible in the ocean to the extent -- again, to the extent that we can identify them.

And I strongly suspect that the -- that our first cut at listing the conflicting uses will be woefully short

of the full list that we'll end up with.

And this is one of the best uses, I think, of the public input because as we take this to the public, we'll certainly hear many, many more conflicting uses that are important to people.

And I include the section on relevant laws and regulations. And I apologize to working group members because we never really talked about that as a topic. But I think if we're having a compendium of information that's important to decision makers, it would be useful to have a section on the laws and regulations just so everybody can see the vast array of laws and regulations that do pertain to the Mid-Atlantic.

And I also put it in because I found a
Website in the National Ocean Council, a Web page on
the National Ocean Council which lists them all. So I
know it's a short, easy task.

VOICE: Low hanging.

MR. CHU: Low hanging fruit and I think we might as well put it in.

All right. Next slide, please. So to give an example -- further example of one of the main topics was current uses. And under current uses, we would propose to talk about security, talk about (indiscernible), talk about the tribal uses, talk about fishing, sand and gravel, dredge waste disposal, underway cables, wind energy, mineral extraction, historic preservations, and non-consumptive uses.

And, again, I suspect that that list is not complete, that there are other specific uses that people would like us to deal with. And, again, I think the process -- I'm viewing this as an iterative process and living document and we can add uses as we identify them.

Next slide, please. So the question we

wrestled most with is how to present the information.

There's a vast array of information about the Mid
Atlantic out there and it is constantly being improved upon, constantly growing.

And so what we think is going to be most useful for a decision maker is to have relatively brief descriptions of the factors and issues and then simply provide links and references to more comprehensive sources of information. Very, very short.

We wrestled with -- there really are two
possible ways that we could go and this is the second
question that I need to ask of the RPB is, do you want
us to work on a brief succinct document that
summarizes the issues and that has links to other
sources or do you want us to try to make a more
comprehensive document that would be more encyclopedic
in nature?

There are advantages to having a more comprehensive document. It would be the authoritative text for what is going on in the Mid-Atlantic and it would be a very useful reference document maybe.

But there are disadvantages as well. To do a really good job of identifying and fully describing all of the issues in the Mid-Atlantic would take a very long time to be thorough and careful about it.

It would result in a document that is probably about four feet tall.

And my sense is, at least a decision maker is not likely to use it for anything other than a chair behind a desk, is that they would not delve into it. So we prefer a simpler approach of very short descriptions of each issue and links to the data portal that we're developing. It's going to be very useful for this and other authoritative sources.

For example, one of the conflicts that we

would identify would be whales getting tangled in fishing gear. And you could have a description of the rate of entanglements. You could have a description of the regulations that the National Fishery Services has put in in order to try to minimize the entanglements. You should discuss the process that we go through in order to reach -- well, try to reach consensus on those reduction efforts. You could talk about the whole -- the status of whales. You could include a really long and very useful document or you could simply say whales are entangled in fishing gear. This particularly is a problem for right whales of which there are only about 450 in the north Atlantic. For further information, go to the data portal to see tracts of whales and where they are found. Go to the National Fishery Service Website with information about the status of whales. Go to the National Fishery Service

status for regulations.

And that would, I think, be a lot easier to keep up to date, to -- for a decision maker to just glance at and say that's an issue that I need to think about or I don't need to think about that. And it would be also achievable in a much shorter amount of time.

So three reasons why we think that this would be a better approach.

Can I have the next slide? Oh, yeah, the next slide. Maybe I've finished my talk. No, here you go.

So there are next steps. Hopefully today we will get either -- well, I hope today to get guidance from the RPB. Hopefully you'll approve the concept.

And the next step would be for us as a working group calling upon the rest of you also as sources of information to compile a draft, a regional ocean

assessment.

And NOAA has assigned one person, Laurie

Fenstermacher, who's, I think, in the audience today.

Maybe she -- she was here yesterday. Anyway, she is

going to -- she's available to us for six months to

help compile this. And she and Michelle Lennox have

already been working together. They certainly helped

me get this presentation together.

So they're a good team and we have resources to work now on this to move it forward. And we may be able to get -- well, we'll certainly be able to make progress by our next face-to-face meeting.

And then I would propose that we issue a public draft and invite the public to comment on it. I'm sure we will not hit every target in the bull's eye. So there will be changes or improvements to be made.

And after that, after those improvements are

incorporated, we would send it back to the regional planning body saying this is our regional ocean assessment. So that's our -- that's what I'm viewing as next steps.

I think steps three and four possibly are iterative depending on whether our (indiscernible) is adequate. And if there are major, major changes, we might have to go out and seek public comment again.

Okay. Next slide. So the two questions I want to ask of the regional planning body are first, should this -- the primary user be envisioned as the decision makers within the member entities of the RPB?

And the second thing is should we proceed with a document that's relatively short and has short descriptions and then links to other references or would you like to see more -- a more comprehensive document?

My recommendation is we don't decide that

until after we give the stakeholders a chance to weigh in on those concepts. But hopefully by the end of the day, if we can take that topic up in our last session, that would be great.

And that, I think, is the end of my slides.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Great. Thank you for that update and for posing questions for your -- for the RPB to consider.

And lots of people have some reactions and maybe questions back to you. So let's just dive right in. And, Joe, I saw you first and then we'll go to these three right in a row that put their tins (phonetic) up as well.

MR. ATANGAN: I'm going to start with in one of the previous slides, I just want to get a clarification on -- regarding the potential for future uses.

My concern is that a regional ocean

assessment is essentially a -- an as-is snapshot of the current state and I fear that when you go into -- go one more. There you go. Potential future uses in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean, I don't necessarily object to the language there, but I just want to understand what that entails.

If what's included in there is, for example, the strategic plans that are already in existence that say, hey, we're looking out five years, these are, you know, these are an example of things that we need to include in our current assessment, then I think that's probably appropriate.

What I don't want and I think is inappropriate is for the regional assessment to include projections that are made by the team itself on, hey, here are potential future uses independent of what's been done by, let's say, the Fisheries Council or what BOEM has done regarding their strategic plan

for offshore energy uses. I think those need to be in sync. So I just want to be clear on that part.

And the second comment is on the -regarding the question being posed, the document
should be provided to the decision makers. I'm a
little bit confused by the decision makers' aspect of
this because my understanding is the regional ocean
assessment is going to be essentially the baseline
that's going to be what we're going to use to shape
our plan.

So I don't know where the decision makers' piece comes into that. When you say decision makers, are you referring to the regional planning body or, you know, should that be more appropriate to say, hey, provide planners with a source of information rather than decision makers?

MS. CANTRAL: Go ahead, Kevin.

MR. CHU: So with regard to your first

point, I think you're -- it's a good clarification. We don't intend to identify new potential uses that haven't been already discussed around this table, I think, or that each of our agencies haven't already identified as something coming up.

So we'll be looking at things that are currently in planning or may come up, but not to sort of say, well, how about offshore casinos or something like that, whatever.

MR. ATANGAN: Exactly.

MR. CHU: I don't know. With regard to the decision makers, I was envisioning at least one level of me as a decision maker. My boss should be able to view this document and sort of thumb through it and say, well, what will I need to think about in my job of managing the fishing in the Mid-Atlantic region, what are some other issues.

So I was thinking the higher level than me.

But, in fact, we didn't really define that and it would be a useful topic, I think, for this group to weigh in on.

MS. CANTRAL: Right, right. Exactly. And since you have posed that as a question that you're looking for some feedback on, let's have some feedback.

So let's go right here in a row, go to Marty, Lorraine, and then Karen.

MR. CHU: Laura.

MS. CANTRAL: Laura, I didn't see yours.

No, you don't have one?

MS. MCKAY: Well, you go that way.

MR. ROSEN: Just, Kevin, thanks for the presentation.

One piece of information which may have been implicit there, but I just want to make sure folks --

MS. CANTRAL: Marty, mike.

MR. ROSEN: I'm sorry. Closer?

MS. CANTRAL: Closer.

MR. ROSEN: Kevin, thank you for the presentation.

One piece of information which I think was implicit, but I just want to make explicit is the fact that trends information and the directions of how a resource is moving or how a lease is moving, I think it's important to also include what the drivers are which are affecting those trends, you know, because I think -- I mean, if we're talking about management decisions, we want -- we need to know what's causing either a positive or negative trend and what we can do about it so the drivers, I think, are critical to that, to that assessment.

MR. CHU: Yes, that's right. That was not explicit and I didn't make it so.

MS. WAKEMAN: Kevin, the committee on the

Marine Transportation System, and NOAA is a member of that committee, in one of their documents, they did a metrics that showed in a strict federal level which agencies were involved and which major category such as navigation, safety, environmental issues. And they just did little Xs under a column.

Particularly since we're not all familiar with each and certainly not the first nations, who -- having a similar metrics like which tribal entities would be and which state agencies would be involved in these kind of issues so that we'd have more of a frame of reference as we're reaching out to one another.

MR. CHU: I love that idea. That did not surface in our conversations or if it did, I didn't hear it. But I think it's a great idea and a quick reference that would be useful.

MS. WAKEMAN: I can send you a copy of what the committee on Marine Transportation System did.

MR. CHU: Great. Thank you.

MS. CHYTALO: With a lot of the issues or things that --

MS. CANTRAL: Karen, you need to speak into your mike.

MS. CHYTALO: A lot of the issues are things that are going to be described in the regional ocean assessment. Some of the things, too, a certain degree of significance, I'm thinking have a certain level of impact, but it could have just a -- you know, like a -- I broke my toe versus I broke my back, you know, little difference in level of triage that needs to be done.

So I really hope that through the assessment, too, other than it have static as to -- and I go -- building on what Marty said, too, about the trends and the drivers of those trends, you know, usually it's not just one issue. Hardly anything is

being driven by one issue or one cause or something like that, and have some level of significance to those causes of what's going on.

And I think -- and that's going to be difficult because we're going to have to come up with some sort of value system or something, supporting text to say that as to what the level of that issue is because I -- you know, to take corrective action or to do things or to do whatever, you know, needs to be done with that, you know, I hate spending time on something that's going to cure one-tenth of the problem when you could do another activity and that takes care of 99 percent of the problem.

Do you know -- I know you're shaking your head, but I think that's -- I'm hoping that that -- we can get to that level in there. So, therefore, that would help prioritize certain types of things.

MR. CHU: Karen, I think that would be

really a wonderful thing if we could do it. But honestly I doubt we can. We should talk about it. We should certainly see if we can.

My guess is that the level of significance varies with the individual and how they're looking at it and that it could take a huge amount of time and be very controversial to label this one is significant and this one is not significant or a set of -- series of gradations of level one significance, level two significance.

I think that could be very tricky and it may miss the mark if all of us going to use this document because what's really significant to NOAA may not be that important to EPA and vice versa.

So you've raised a good point and we should certainly talk about it in our working group and let's see what we -- how far we can get with that, but I'm not entirely sure that it will work out.

MR. ROSEN: Just a clarification. Karen, are you talking about the relative importance of a problem or the relative effect of this of a management option?

MS. CHYTALO: Well, I'm talking about the problem, the drivers of the problem because a lot of times, it's not just one thing that's causing something. Like the whale entanglement, I mean, that's a very important issue for northern right whales, but there could be other issues, too, that would need to be addressed to really help that species out.

So, therefore, I just want to make sure that, you know, we don't do short shrift on something and, therefore, it's like going after one thing or saying that this is the biggest problem in the world, but, meanwhile, the scale of the world is, ah, it's not much, you know.

MR. CHU: Very well said. Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: So, Laura McKay, let's circle back to you and then we're going to go to Sarah,

Gwynne, and Mo.

MS. MCKAY: Thanks. I -- thank you, Kevin.

I just wanted to weigh in on the question section and although I can't wait to hear what the audience thinks about what the regional ocean assessment should be, but I'm kind of thinking I like the idea of a really brief document and summary and the idea of hyperlinks to other agency actions and programs and plans so that it will always be current that way and we don't have to update it if we're linking, you know, to other sites.

So I just wanted to say I thought that was - I hope that would be a good approach and I think it
would really well utilize our portal, too.

MR. CHU: May I? Thank you for that.

And, you know, I think this document could be really a creative, educational and out-of-the-box kind of thing, a new way of portraying information because it would link heavily.

By implication, it's almost truly primarily a Web-based document. We'd have a printed document as well, but it would be primarily Web based and, you know, kind of a different way of -- for the -- at least for the federal government to be presenting information.

MS. MCKAY: Well, it just creates that onestop shop idea where people can go and it's almost
like a clearinghouse so you can understand this huge
mess of spaghetti as Karen keeps saying, you know, to
get a better handle on really where everything is and
who's doing what and what's coming up because it's so,
so complex.

So I think anything we can do to simplify it

is going to be very helpful.

MS. COOKSEY: Kevin, thank you for all the work you've done on this.

He's really done most of the work. I've done very little. I think that we only had three conference calls, maybe four, but I want to take a stab at question number one which is the audience of this document.

And I really liked this morning when we heard from our sister regional ocean partnership, regional planning body that the regional ocean assessment was for the RPB. And I just thought that was a great idea. Instead of making it for our bosses which is often what we do or whatever the general public means, whatever that is, wouldn't it be great if we had a document that would help us with our -- the mission of the regional planning body?

So -- and I do like -- I just want to chime

in on what Laura said about the Web based. I think that that would -- certainly with the number of resources we have to give to that, I think that that would be a good idea.

MS. CANTRAL: Gwynne.

MS. SHULTZ: I just want to get a little clarification. You know, I'm shifting down to that second box there about what would be in the plan.

In your outline, you talked a little bit about conflicting uses and then potentially also the laws and regulations being topics.

I have a reservation about those in that it shifts us from an assessment of resources and uses into what are some of the management entities, the management challenges or the management approaches.

And I don't see the assessment personally going in that direction.

So I wanted to better under -- you know, I

see the overall maybe the regional ocean action plan going that way understanding some of the challenges and trying to help to work some of those through looking at laws and regulations, but not necessarily the assessment.

So I'm curious if you could clarify that.

MR. CHU: Well, the working group thought that identifying for the decision makers, again, at least in my mind it was the level above me, but identifying for them the conflicts that we know are going on or could go on would be a helpful tool.

We did not look at the question the way you are looking at the question and ask is this -- should this rightfully be in the regional ocean assessment or should it be somewhere else or should we let the advisors to the decision makers flag those things.

So we really -- we simply put it in there because we thought it would be an important piece of

information for decision makers and also for the public to see the issues that we thought were leading to conflict.

But, you know, I take your point and maybe more appropriate not to identify the conflicting uses in this document and put them elsewhere, so I'd like to hear from everybody else about that.

MR. ROSEN: Can I just respond to that? I don't think you can characterize a resource when we're talking about things which are affecting the status.

I mean, it must be one -- I know you want to know whether a resource is, you know, in a threatened state or a healthy state. And if you see a threatened state, you need to know why it's threatened.

And so I don't think you can talk about it without understanding what it is that's causing that effect. To me, that would be a conflict and it needs to be highlighted.

MS. SHULTZ: Great. Once you get into kind of the laws and regulations and manage those or the entities that manage them, I just want to make sure we're not kind of shifting into the management of these resources discussion versus kind of character -- a little bit more of the characterization of the issues.

MR. ROSEN: Oh, I just think that's baseline information about an issue. That's all.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Mo.

MS. BORNHOLDT: Actually, Gwynne, I was thinking along the same kind of lines and trying to get a sense of like the clearinghouse description that Laura was using and the dialogue that you had.

And I guess I was concerned with regard to assessing something as conflicting use. I could see having a descriptor or the character of the status of that particular stock population. Is it listed as

threatened?

I would worry about using conflicting. I guess to me, that is a subjective term. You know, right now, for example, for wind energy development, we don't know if we can't configure something so it's not conflicting.

That said, I also know that the fact that facilities with -- take space, you know, on the sea floor, that that perhaps is a conflict associated with certain uses there.

But I guess I would worry about trying to be
-- opine versus characterize. I guess that's the

concern that I would have because then I would ask if
we begin to characterize with regard to conflicts and
things like that, what are the analytics to support
that?

So then I'm circling back to the first question as to what kind of document do you want to

present. I really think it's kind of cool to be able to provide that kind of index card -- telling you how old I am -- pulling out the drawer at the library, but that -- to keep it alive so that if I -- the purpose that I'm looking for to help me make my decisions and, you know, when I'm back at my desk, I have the latest and greatest, you know, assessments and understanding what's going on so that my team who does the analytics has the best available information to be able to then, you know, opine as to the significance of a conflict, also having the access to -- this is maybe where I differ a little bit from Gwynne -- if there's literature that talks about conflict resolution or management controls that have been used to assess and that should also to the extent that we can flag those, that would be good.

But I worry about analytical conclusions versus characterization.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. I see three people with tins up and want to offer comments and feedback to the group. And let's take these three and then see if we're ready to close this out for now and move on to the stakeholder engagement topic.

Jon.

MR. HALL: Yes. My comment was along the same line. The conflict, I guess I was going to ask how would you handle -- with conflicts, they're not static. So how do you handle when you identify conflict and then there's resolution and then there's something that happens that -- another conflict emerges? So how do you manage -- you know, what do you have in the assessment when you have that kind of, you know, spontaneity associated with, you know, what could happen?

MR. CHU: That is a wonderful question and not one that we wrestled with in the working group,

but my sense is the part of the advantages of having a very short description of each topic is that you can change them relatively quickly.

I'm envisioning this as a living document and so when conflicts have been resolved, you can either take them out or you can say conflict resolved and here's how it's resolved because that could also be useful information.

So I think if we choose that brief descriptive format, the index card format, then we could relatively easily update the document and address conflicts that have been resolved.

MR. HALL: So this was about conflicts and use. So when you get to laws and regulations, I know knowing a lot about what's happening out there in the ocean, you could have a lot of entities and groups and federal agencies, state and local travel agencies that have laws and regulations, so when you have --

sometimes you have those regulations that conflict with each other.

So is that part of this or it's just about use and conflicts?

MR. CHU: Yeah, no. That -- I don't want to get into that. I would recommend strongly that we don't try to opine on the laws which we are given.

We're not the body to resolve those. Those get resolved in the courts. I think we should stay out of it. That would be my recommendation.

MS. CANTRAL: Mike.

MR. LUISI: Thank you.

I'll keep it very brief. I'm looking forward to hearing what the public has to say on this.

But just speaking to the conflict issue, I think if we're going to define an ocean assessment as describing the marine environment, in the world that I live in in Fisheries Management, it's -- conflict is

what it is. It's the rubber hit the road. It's everything that has to do with managing different users on the -- in the ocean that it needs to be identified because it is a description of what's -- of the users in the ocean.

So I just -- I would support, you know, moving forward with developing some -- you know, discussing some conflicts, but I also think it's important this decision we'll need to make about who the audience is for the assessment. Is it going to be the RPB or is it going to be decision makers?

So I -- you know, I'll -- what you decide there may address what needs you have as far as the description of conflicts. Thanks.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Joe and then Kelsey.

MR. ATANGAN: When we started this, part of the regional -- my understanding of the regional ocean

assessment is is it's going to help us frame what the regional ocean plan is. So to me, it's not a tool for a manage -- it's a tool for us to shape what it is that we're targeting as the regional ocean plan.

So to that extent, you know, one of the questions I have is is, okay, so you've got this assessment, and I'm not necessarily advocating this, but is there a plan to perhaps make a recommendation for here are the potential high priority topics that we should address in the plan?

I mean, to me, an assessment is is you characterize and then you say, hey, oh, this is a really bad area. We should focus on this area first. Is it going to go into that extent or is that going to be left up to the body now to after the regional ocean assessment has done its characterization to come up with those priorities?

I think that's a critical next step that we

need to think about now as he's, you know, formulating this assessment.

And before you answer, I just want to make one additional comment on the regulations piece. I think Dan Hubbard has already left, but one of the dangers that I see in this regulations piece is Dan Hubbard in the northeast just took an example of the various regulations and laws associated with a very simple scenario which is a maintenance guy stepping from a boat to a wind turbine platform and came up with, I think, about a hundred plus varying regulations association with that that were from the various state agencies.

And so since this is going to be a Web-based tool here, my concern is is that this could rapidly degrade into a long laundry list of here are all the regulations that apply to this.

So I understand the need to do conflicts. I

just want to tread lightly into identifying the various regulations because that is a very, very slippery slope because -- and that was just an example for the wind turbine piece.

So when you get into the whole fisheries piece, that may be a whole 'nother, you know, hornet's nest that you don't want to step into. So I'd tread lightly on the regulations piece even though there's a White House link.

MS. SHULTZ: Just a federal clause.

MR. LUISI: To just a federal clause, exactly.

MS. CANTRAL: So, Kevin, I know you want to respond to some of what Joe said and then we're going to take Kelsey's comment and wrap this up. Your group, your working group has gotten a lot of really good feedback and we can have some more discussion about it this afternoon, but let's close this out.

MR. CHU: I only want to respond to the issue of will this document set priorities. And I think I would recommend that it not do that. I think that's not the job here. That's -- the characterization is not a policy.

MS. CANTRAL: Right. Right. It's informing.

Yeah, Kelsey.

MS. LEONARD: All right. This will be a brief comment because I think Joe touched on it.

If we are going to go down the route of laws and regulations, we may be -- we may have a lot of information that we need to be gathering because I would advise that it include federal, state, tribal, and potentially even local laws that may be applicable so that we're completely inclusive if we go down that route.

MS. SHULTZ: He's thinking twice about it.

MR. CHU: At least twice.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. All right. Well, thank you. Thank you very much.

This was a really, really good discussion.

And, like I said, we can come back to it if other

thoughts occur to you, and good work on behalf of this

team and good feedback to the team as it continues.

All right. So now we're going to shift gears to cover the final of these elements or needs or components that we've been talking about. And this one is related to a stakeholder engagement strategy.

And I'm going to ask Gwynne Shultz to -- I'm going to turn to her in a moment. She's going kick this off with some opening thoughts and then I think turn to Darlene -- Darlene, there you are -- to go through ideas that have been developed that she has worked very hard on along with Marty Rosen and a few others.

So I'll leave it at that and turn it over to Gwynne and just talk right -- just right into it.

MS. SHULTZ: Okay. So I'm just going to be focusing on this first slide to set the stage, kind of a co-lead recommendation about a process -- I get to talk process again here -- for moving forward with stakeholder engagement.

So I'll set that stage, but then most of the presentation will be by Darlene who's going to be talking more -- getting -- doing a deeper dive into this concept of a stakeholder engage -- developing a stakeholder engagement strategy.

So we all know really that stakeholder engagement and transparency are going to be key to our success. We do have within our framework this overarching principle that we all agree to.

That's -- I'm going to just briefly read that, saying the Mid-Atlantic RPB will seek meaningful

stakeholder and public input in the regional planning process using multifaceted tools to encourage public participation and understand expressed needs.

So we've got a charge that we've given ourselves. You know, we have high expectations for what we want to achieve with regard to the stakeholder engagement.

So the co-leads kind of thought through a process as we have had for a number of the other issues we've addressed and what we'd like to do is convene a new work group starting out.

We've had a work group that's worked on a number of, you know, stakeholder engagement in the past or some communications outreach tools. But as we're entering kind of into this new approach and phase of our work, we'd like to kind of make sure we've got some new folks that have the skills and techniques to move us into this next direction.

But it would be composed of RPB members, alternates, and staff that would provide the leadership for this stakeholder engagement.

The responsibilities of the work group, and

I'll focus first on kind of this next six months, from

June through November and December, and that could

include fully developing stakeholder engagement

strategy which could include conducting an assessment

of Mid-Atlantic stakeholders and the most effective

ways to engage them and then also ensuring stakeholder

engagement actions and milestones are reflected

appropriately within the RPB work plan.

So additional responsibilities of this work group could be, that would also start in June, but are much kind of longer term activities, would be ensuring all RPB activities include appropriate public engagement. And once the official kind of strategy has been developed, making sure that all those

activities are consistent with it.

Another responsibility would be coordinating with MARCO, the portal team, and potentially other close partners on their stakeholder engagement activities related to ocean planning.

And then also longer-term activities might be developing certain RPB materials for major public engagement opportunities. We would like if -- to hopefully get a -- you know, one federal co-lead and one state federal co-lead to kind of champion the team and we're certainly hoping that it will be pulling in a lot of the staff within all of our entities and institutions that really have a good handle on public relations, communications, all those good things.

So let's see. We would have -- the RPB, we would be kind of facilitating this work group and potentially pulling in -- we need to be pulling in our in-house capacity, potentially a contractor to help

provide additional capacity in this.

So while this work group, and I think this is really key for us, while this work group is going to hopefully provide the leadership that's really essential for success of our RPB engagement activities, it really is going to be critical that the full RPB kind of keep responsibility for implementing a lot of these.

We need to not just depend on this team, but we're all going to have to really step up and help deliver these engagement opportunities.

So, again, fortunately, we've had some folks, Darlene and some of the folks she's been working with, who have already put some thought into what strategy — engagement strategy might contain.

We could use, you know, the ideas within this as our launching point for discussion today and in the coming days.

The document that Darlene is going to be talking about is in your packet. It's also posted online. And now I'd like to turn to Darlene.

MS. FINCH: Okay. Let me see if I can master this. Am I close? Hello. Can you hear me?

MS. FINCH: I have a really loud voice, so like this, take it out?

VOICE: Yeah, take it out because you can turn your head.

MS. FINCH: Like this?

VOICE: Yeah.

MS. FINCH: This is getting really scary.

Okay. Hi. My name is Darlene Finch. I am Kevin

Chu's and NOAA's alternate to the Mid-Atlantic RPB.

I'm also a Mid-Atlantic stakeholder, so I feel like

I'm right between the two of you all.

I -- I'm here on behalf of the

communications and messaging team. We actually were having a lot of conversations about material, incoming messages that we need to develop for the RPB. And out of that really we started realizing that what we needed was a more integrated stakeholder engagement strategy.

We were doing bits and pieces of it. We had folks working on the portal team, folks that were working with the Stakeholder Liaison Committee, but we really needed to put this in a more comprehensive framework.

So can I get you to move to my second slide? Thank you.

I also want to recognize Marty. Marty promised me he would hop in here if there was something really important that I missed and Leanne Walls (phonetic) who was part of these discussions.

So I'm just going to lay this out for you.

We're going to kind of walk through what this process is. It's not really rocket science. It's really kind of a logical approach to looking systematically at how we engage stakeholders, how we actually more effectively pull their input into the process and look across the landscape of the RPB and all the people that are involved.

So I think it's really important to start by saying that the RPB has already been investing in stakeholder engagement. It's not that we aren't doing it. It's just that we're doing it and we have more capacity to do it with all the people that are a part of the RPB and participating. And we really need to do a better job of pulling all those pieces together.

I think our sense has been that we've had pretty much of a piecemeal approach that didn't look across the landscape and to be as effective as possible with the limited resources that we had, we

really need to put together a comprehensive strategy.

And that strategy needs to define, develop, and tie together all the engagement efforts and the outreach efforts being conducted on ocean planning.

So next slide, please. So sorry that my notes are somewhat of a -- I pay attention to them so I'm not completely lost. We're -- today we're going to recommend that the RPB actually support the process that we're going to outline here and we're going to walk through some goals and objectives for this effort. And we're going to ask the RPB members to consider a couple of questions as we walk through that process.

I'm going to confess. I'm not a stakeholder engagement expert. I did pull some people in, work for my office that have some expertise in this area. This is not a perfect process, but it's a logical process and hopefully it will end up at a good point

where we have a better plan for overall stakeholder engagement.

Next slide, please. So this is the process as we've laid it out. It makes sense. It doesn't have to occur in this order. I mean, these steps, I think, all need to happen at one point or another, but they don't necessarily have to follow in this sequence.

The first step in this is really clarifying our engagement goals and objectives. And I think that's where we are today is we're going to ask the RPB to look at those goals and objectives and kind of affirm that we're at the right starting point.

The other steps for this process is I think we need to really sit down and identify and analyze stakeholders. We need to look across the swath of people that hold interest in what's happening in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and think very thoughtfully about

how we pull them in and how we engage them.

Next step is to look upon the level of engagement appropriate to those stakeholders, to look at specific strategies of work. Not all stakeholders are going to come to a meeting like this. Some stakeholders we're going to have to go out and have conversations with.

Each individual stake -- not individual stakeholder, but the same approach does not work with every stakeholder. I think once we kind of have a better game plan about where we need to go, we really need to look at what our available resources are and what efforts we've already got, who already has ties into these communities, who already has connections with these communities.

We need to look at the risks and pitfalls.

We have to develop the plan. We have to get

commitments from the RPB. Everybody else did this

before me, so it should make it so much easier is who actually wants to help out with this, and then we have to evaluate and modify as necessary.

So the quest -- the discussion question here is, is this project logical, process logical, is it comprehensive, and does it need to be modified in any way.

Next slide, please. So we actually had two overarching goals for stakeholder engagement and they pretty much mirror each other. I mean, one is really more process oriented and one is more outcome oriented.

So these are the two that I think -- Gwynne, did you read the first one? Is that what you read when you provided --

MS. SHULTZ: Which --

MS. FINCH: When -- all right. The framework.

MS. SHULTZ: I read from the framework.

MS. FINCH: Oh, you read it from the framework.

MS. SHULTZ: Yeah.

MS. CANTRAL: Yes.

MS. FINCH: So I -- the discussion question here is, does this -- either one of these versions -- we're going to ask for a preference on which one of these versions do people prefer, but the second question is, does it really capture all the things we need to think about as an overarching goal for stakeholder engagement.

Next slide. So then this kind of evolved down into very specific goals. So overarching, the big picture, and then we came down with these -- I guess there are six here. I'm going to make one -- well, the first one is provide as many opportunities as possible.

The second is actually not in the packet.

This was added as we were having a discussion putting this presentation together, but we thought it was really important that we clearly acknowledge how stakeholder participation has been incorporated, addressed, and how it's really influencing the ocean planning process.

The third is we need to work with our stakeholders to understand what were the past, current, and anticipated future uses. A lot of you folks spend a lot of time on the water. It's really critical for us to understand what you know.

The fourth is to obtain significant and diverse input. Kind of makes sense.

And the last two are really, I think, about not only communicating with you but having you feel part of this process, endorsing it, understanding it, and supporting what the RPB is doing.

So those are the specific goals. So, again, you know, are they inclusive enough, do they need to be modified, do they need to be added to.

Next slide. So, of course, after you have the goals, you have to hop into the objectives. So the objectives for this, and, again, think about these questions as I read them, do these objectives effectively describe what the Mid-Atlantic RPB wants to achieve by engaging stakeholders and do they need to be modified.

So key objectives here, identify, assess, engage, and establish partnerships. Makes sense.

Strengthen mutual and shared understanding about the relevant problems and opportunities. We think that part of this is educating ourselves about what we understand about what's happening in the ocean and the uses and the resources that depend on it.

Building the knowledge, skills, and

understanding of regional ocean planning so we all have a better understanding what this process can accomplish and not accomplish for us and we need to capitalize on previous related efforts.

I don't think we have the history of -- or we don't have the depth of state ocean planning activities that they have in the northeast, but there are definitely things that are happening in the state that are relevant to build off of.

Next slide. So I guess my -- I'm pointing to this to say there are an awful lot of ways to do stakeholder engagement. All of these things on this slide are various approaches that you can use and it's really figuring out where you want to go, who your stakeholders are, and then applying these various engagement opportunities to pull people in and advance the dialogue.

Next slide. So the questions back to the

RPB is, should the RPB be moving forward with this process as discussed and modified today depending on whatever input comes in for developing a more comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy and then who can actually help with collecting this information and compiling the document.

So that's it. Do you -- Marty, Leanne, do you want to --

MR. ROSEN: Just thanks, Darlene. That was great. Thanks for all your efforts to getting -- she actually did the lion's share of the work and we're all very grateful for that.

Just to emphasize a couple of points. One is that I think everybody here agrees that stakeholder engagement is really important. However, I think we have to remember that it's not just a complementary piece to this process. It's actually -- this process is on behalf of that -- on behalf of those folks out

there. So they really need to be partners in this process as stakeholders.

That said, I think that there's -- you know, we have to be obviously conscious of resources and so any engagement strategy, we have to be careful how ambitious we make it because we don't have false promises and under deliver.

And on that point, I think that -- to the point you made earlier, I think it gets back to it's going to be a shared responsibility. I think there may be some message management from the RPB, but I think the model that we have to commit to is a decentralized shared delivery of those messages.

MS. FINCH: Great. Laura.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Darlene.

And before we open this up for discussion, I want to just do a little time check and agenda

suggestion. We are scheduled for a public comment session at 3:30 and I know a number of you have been waiting patiently for that opportunity. And we want to give it to you.

So let's have discussion for the next 20 minutes and then close this out. I know that 20 minutes won't do this topic justice. It's very important. But let's pause and have our public comment session.

We'll then -- at that point, we'll probably all need a break and we'll come back and finish up business including circling back to the navigation presentations that we want to hear and have some discussion about and what other business and discussion we need to have about any of the things that have been taken up over the course of the day.

So 3:30, we will be transitioning to the public comment session. If you haven't signed up and

you want to, if you would do that in the next few minutes and we'll look forward to hearing from you.

Yeah, Andy.

MR. ZEMBA: The only concern I have is I think the agenda says that public comment would include comment on navigation activities.

MS. CANTRAL: That is true. And in thinking about the tradeoffs of having people -- so I guess those of you who want to comment, you know, you could speak up and let us know if you want us to keep rolling on and push that back for an hour, but I'm just mindful of what we advertised as the session and people who may not be able to stay as long.

MR. ZEMBA: Well, I would be more comfortable, and I don't want to extend the meeting, but I would be more comfortable if we would offer a public comment period after the navigation activities also because I think this is a very important topic

and I would like to hear reaction to our discussion on it.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So are folks comfortable with that suggestion and we'll -- so we'll offer that as an opportunity and see if people sign up and want to offer a comment on those presentations.

Okay?

So now the floor is open for discussion about stakeholder engagement strategy.

Karen.

MS. CHYTALO: Yeah. I have just one question about the strategy. How does the stakeholder liaison group fit it?

MS. CANTRAL: Want to take that?

MS. CHYTALO: It wasn't mentioned, so I just didn't -- wasn't sure.

MS. SHULTZ: One of the tasks of developing this engagement strategy is to look at the other

ongoing engagement opportunities such as the Stakeholder Liaison Committee, outreach that the portal team is doing, or outreach that our entities and institutions are doing, so kind of looking at all of them and putting them in -- seeing how they all mesh and can help us to engage, so part of the process.

MS. CANTRAL: Sarah.

MS. COOKSEY: Thank you, Marty and Leanne and Darlene.

I'm quite supportive of this. However, I think it's really important that somehow we -- and it's mentioned here -- we have some sort of measures to know that what we're doing is working because from what we heard yesterday, so far what we're doing is not quite working.

So I think we need to have course corrections and some people might say that goes

without saying, but I want to make sure that we say that and do that.

MS. CANTRAL: Doug.

MR. PABST: Hi. How we doing? Excellent.

I just want to -- I mean, I think it's an assumption, but just to clarify that, the work or what we discussed about the interconnections of the bays and estuaries group that we -- that we're working on also will relate to the engagement since that also is a form of engagement.

So we need to make sure that there's some collaboration between the two groups. Some of the recommend -- some things we discover would be helpful to this and vice versa, I think, as well.

Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Mike and then Kelsey.

MR. LUISI: Thank you.

So I guess to understand this is we're

looking to develop some comprehensive list of a number of different strategies that all of our member institutions use for communicating with stakeholders and then we may prioritize what we could use as a group based on need, based on cost or based on other resources that would be expected? Is that how I'm understanding from the purpose of --

MS. CANTRAL: Marty, do you want to take that?

MR. LUISI: -- this discussion?

MR. ROSEN: Darlene, you should jump in on this also.

I think that just to have a more precise strategy such that we understand who the audiences are, what kind of message and delivery works for them, and then moving -- react accordingly. So, I mean, some of that -- some stakeholders may require -- because of their importance, they may be more involved

in a consultative role. Others just may want to track what's happening and that message is an e-mail or newsletter.

So I think it's just a kind of more refined, precise review of who the audiences are, what their roles are in this process entail or the delivery accordingly.

MS. FINCH: So I think we'd argue that the plan would help us put all the pieces together, but also make sure that the investments that we're making are really used efficiently. I mean, if we use the same approach with everybody, it's not necessarily going to work.

So I don't think it's a standard tool that everybody has to use, but it's stepping back and saying who do we already connect with as stakeholders.

We all have stakeholders at this table. You know, who do we already have stakeholders with and how can we

build our connections to those networks and how can we put that together in an integrated piece.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Kelsey.

MS. LEONARD: I think as many of you heard Roddy say yesterday in our nation and in our community, we often plan and have each action that we take in consideration of future generations. And I think that was one area that I think we were missing in this is the inter-generational capacity.

I'm actually looking for youth voices. I mean, I think if you look around this room, you can see that the voice of youth is not readily apparent.

So really being able to go to your various stakeholders or figuring out how we as an RPB can bring that inter-generational capacity to this body because, you know, whether it's in, you know, 10 years, 50 years, or 100 years, we want to make sure that we're developing that institutional capacity that

we have future leaders that are going to be coming in to take over and are as invested and have ownership over this process as we do currently.

MS. BORNHOLDT: One of the things, too, that I know that we're partnering with the Coast Guard to try to work on a better network with the maritime committee where we'll be undertaking this initiative all along the Atlantic coast, but then particularly focuses on the Mid-Atlantic. So I guess it's kind of a question to note. I know that we can learn from our experiences around the table.

That said, I think to be able to have this strategy embrace those individual ongoing bureau agency tribal efforts, I think is something we cannot lose sight of being able to kind of fold those in as kind of the little cherry on the sundae in addition to the base that we're building here.

MS. CANTRAL: Jon and then Laura McKay.

MR. HALL: I think that the stakeholder engagement piece is wonderful.

I guess my question is, who -- who's going to be the keeper of this information so that we could maintain some consistency in how we all make this engagement? Is there going to be a process, have it somewhere so it can be shared so we know we can engage different partners and their preferred way of being engaged?

MS. FINCH: I'm going to hand that back.

MR. HALL: Isn't that a work group?

MS. FINCH: Hold it.

MR. HALL: Isn't that -- wouldn't that be a role of the work group?

MS. SHULTZ: Yeah. I think that is a perfect task also for the work group. And just to comment on this work group, I mean, really good ideas and it's going to depend on all of the entities here

stepping up and, you know, helping identify staff and folks that can kind of help with development of this engagement strategy and then doing things such as, you know, kind of keeping track and preparing materials.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So just to underscore that, there's a responsibility for a work group to drive the process, but the responsibility for actually engaging and participating is up to all members of the regional planning body.

Laura McKay.

MS. MCKAY: Thanks.

That was helpful. At first, I was getting confused, too, in terms of what the MARCO Stakeholder Liaison Committee interface would be. But I think I understand it and it makes a lot of sense that we do need a broader umbrella strategy.

But I wonder if -- is there somehow we can make a really strong connection between the MARCO

Stakeholder Liaison Committee and the RPB stakeholder engagement strategy work group and I know we can't violate FOCA, but I don't know if maybe there's -- is there a Fishery Management Council person on the Stakeholder Liaison Committee or is there some way we can find a government person on that committee so that, you know, folks like Jeff and I don't know if we have any of our other (indiscernible) and those folks that are on that committee have a good clear understanding and connection to what the RPB strategy is doing?

And I think this could really help that

Stakeholder Liaison Committee, too, with understanding what their role particularly is and what they need to do versus some other things that might be handled by the RPB stakeholder group.

MS. SHULTZ: Well, to be truthful, not clear.

MS. MCKAY: I'm just saying is there a way to make a really strong connection with MARCO's SLC and the RPB stakeholder engagement work group.

MS. SHULTZ: Right. And I think we're going to work at that. I just didn't understand when you started talking about the Fishery Management part of it. But we do have --

MS. MCKAY: I was just looking for -- trying to think is there a government person on that group but maybe could not --

MS. SHULTZ: It's a stakeholder --

MS. MCKAY: Yeah.

MS. SHULTZ: -- in government.

MS. MCKAY: So I don't know how we do that without violating FOCA, but somehow we need to make connections.

MS. FINCH: It's nobody's fault. It's nobody's fault.

MS. MCKAY: Right.

MS. FINCH: But you can ask for input if you don't have governmental input. You can still ask for input.

MS. MCKAY: But we can't do something -- can we -- or can we do something formal like have one of the SLC members be a liaison to the MARCO stakeholder work group? Would that be violating?

MR. ROSEN: You mean the RPB work group?

MS. MCKAY: The RPB stakeholder work group.

MS. BORNHOLDT: It would be a state member of the RPB who's on our work group that would be the liaison to the SLC. We can always -- as Darlene pointed out, the SLC can make presentations to us.

Anybody -- individuals can make presentations to us.

We just cannot use them as a routine go-to source.

MS. MCKAY: Uh-huh. Maybe I should restate it then and suggest that someone on the stakeholder

RPB group be that liaison to the MARCO Stakeholder
Liaison Committee and ensure that that information is
transferred very well and so that that MARCO group
understands the big picture.

MS. SHULTZ: And then just a quick follow-up is because MARCO management board members who are also kind of at the table here also are clearly involved with the --

MS. MCKAY: You're the liaisons?

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah. We're built-in liaisons.

MS. MCKAY: I'm just trying to focus responsibilities to one person.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Other thoughts, questions, feedback on the stakeholder engagement strategy?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

MS. CANTRAL: Go. Are we ready to

transition to public comment?

So let me try to clarify because I think maybe we confused matters with regard to our agenda and offering you who are with us opportunities to comment into what you're hearing today.

So we're going to take public comment. It's going to open up in just a moment. We've got several folks. Looks like we have about -- I think we have seven people signed up. So we'll hear from you and after the public comment session, we'll take a short break. We'll come back. That will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 4:15 or 4:30 and we'll resume with the presentation on the navigation related activities.

And then at that point, as Andy has suggested, we'd like to offer an additional comment session and that will be depending on how this timing all goes somewhere in the neighborhood of 4:45 or 5:00.

And so I suggest that we offer another, let's say, 30 minutes for an additional comment session if people have things that they want to comment on based on what they heard from those navigation presentations and that discussion.

As always, you are invited to provide comment on anything that you choose when we're asking you to tailor to what is on the table. That will take us somewhere to the neighborhood of 5:30 which leaves us an hour or so if we need it to wrap up and assess where we are, next steps, concluding thoughts, and adjourn.

So does that sound like a reasonable use of our term this afternoon?

VOICE: Yes.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So -- all right.

So let's hear from our first commenter who is Matt

Gove and then Ali -- why don't I read the order. Matt

Gove, Ali Chase, Sarah Winter Whelan, Jeremy

Firestone, Jeff Erie, Peter -- I can't read Peter's

last name --

VOICE: Himchak probably.

MS. CANTRAL: Oh, yes, yes. And then Noah Chesnin.

You signed up? Well, you're not on the list. So -- all right. Then you'll go after Noah.

MR. GOVE: Hi. I'm Matt Gove. Sorry. I have to correct you on that, Laura. I know you are all government, but --

MS. CANTRAL: Gove, Gove. I thought it was Gove rhymes with dove. It's not Gove.

MR. GOVE: Think cove, I guess.

MS. CANTRAL: Cove, okay.

MR. GOVE: Gove. Anyway, I'm from Surfrider and --

MS. CANTRAL: Sorry, Matt.

MR. GOVE: No problem. There's a lot to tackle here. Thanks for letting us do another little session here.

I just wanted to clarify on the work plan versus the ocean action plan, so your plan will have actions just at the RPB meeting, just the meetings, and then the ROAP will have actual -- will it get down to agency, individual agency actions? So please clarify a little bit there.

And is the work plan, is that retired then once the ROAP is finished or do we keep that as kind of an easy driving document of what the RPB is doing?

I'm not sure. Okay.

Next thing, the regional ocean assessment.

Thank you, Kevin. We talked about conflicts and should we have conflicts? What should they look like as far as analyzing them? I think we've said this before, but I think a gradient of conflicts is

probably the best way to go on that.

Does this thing work with this thing, yes, no, but how -- you know, some things definitely don't work together and some definitely do, and then there's a big gray area in the middle.

But I think we can add that to the ROA and definitely need to know where, you know, spatially in the Mid-Atlantic because that does matter if they're going to work together.

And do we have a time line for the ROA? I don't think you mentioned any sort of -- if there's any sort of ballpark, that would be great to have a discussion. Obviously it's going to fit right into the -- whatever the ROAP is going to be. It's going to fit right into that it seems like. So there's going to be some things happening at the same time.

I think the (indiscernible) document, I think that could work, especially for a lot of

background. I don't think you need to rewrite

everything that's out there. A lot of the stuff I

just talked about, though, you're going to have to do,
so it's going to be new stuff.

So -- okay. And the stakeholder piece, thanks for that. I think that looks good. And I like the -- I'm not sure, Mike, if you were saying this exactly, but as you know, I'm always harping about using all the existing pathways of communication.

So I think it would be nice to have a okay for an RPB meeting. We are definitely going to use these ten pathways that we already know are out there. For a RPB document, maybe we won't use all those, but having something really specific like that, I think, would be great and make it easy for when we -- when you guys do stuff to just send it out.

I noticed 2017 is still the time line for the ROAP. Is that -- do we -- is that just decided or

-- okay. Everyone is looking at me. Obviously we want you to go faster, so I hope that's still under discussion. I hope that hasn't already been decided.

I think that's it. Thanks a lot.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Ali Chase.

MS. CHASE: Hi, everyone. So I feel like there's so many things I want to talk about.

MS. CANTRAL: You're going to have to speak up.

MS. CHASE: There we go. Better?

So I feel like there's so much I want to talk about, but I'm focused on a couple of key ones for us.

So it was helpful to hear the presentation of the work plan and the regional ocean action plan, what you're thinking of. You know, I think you'd mentioned this morning that you're hoping to move it

up to 2016. I do think that that is the goal.

I think that, you know, as a number of us mentioned yesterday that the regional ocean action plan including the implementation action component of that should be submitted to the National Ocean Council in 2016. So we definitely hope that that is the plan.

And I mentioned yesterday that we want to see the plan itself identified based on the assessment which we spent some time talking about areas that are appropriate for different uses and areas that need protection in order to ensure that the underlying ecosystem is healthy and can support many of the other uses that we already rely on, fishing and certain recreational uses.

And I know that this sounds to some extent like an extremely intelligent concept, especially when you think about all the different, you know, sort of spaghetti layers that were being discussed and the

drivers and those sorts of things, but when I think about it, I think of regional ocean planning as something that we to a certain extent do already.

I mean, when you think about how you organize things in your house, there are certain activities that occur in certain places because that's where they make sense. So you cook in your kitchen because that's where the oven is. You shower in the bathroom because that's where the shower is.

And so part of this work is about determining where certain uses happen and when they happen at certain times and which activities are compatible. And sometimes it won't really -- sometimes the timing won't matter so much. Like it doesn't really matter where you eat in your house, but sometimes you make decisions upon if a room is busy, if it's being used for something else, you avoid it.

So trying to think through some of those

scenarios, I think, is critical to this work and I think you can find it by looking at the drivers and also thinking about looking at the different activities that are showing up on the portal and that you have learned about.

The regional ocean assessment component of this is really important because it's going to lead -it's going to help you figure that floor plan out.

It's showing on a map where, for example, marine mammal migration is happening or important fish habitat is occurring and where industry has prioritized development which is often based on the location's characteristics as well such as substrate or wind speed.

It should analyze how well different spatial configurations of uses meet diverse planning objectives. It needs to analyze the cumulative impacts. It needs to think about where activities are

able to coexist.

And in terms of then using that, the action plan that we'd like to see takes a step beyond that assessment to say, well, here is what the optimal floor plan could be. And that would maximum the different benefits of where and when things can occur, how things are working together and how we can protect the environment.

One thing that we heard in the regional ocean assessment was the need to identify different important places and to think of those as a network and that, I think, allows you to protect the environment. And seeing that in the ocean action plan, okay, so we figured we need this. Now what actions are we going to take in each of our individual agencies to ensure that we can reach that optimal floor plan for different uses.

So that's something that I hope is guiding

as you move forward with this because I definitely hear a lot of struggling about, well, what exactly is the plan. And I think a number of the products that you have rely on that as a decision.

So I think that the sooner we can reach closure on what that needs to be and looking back at the final recommendations document provides a lot of guidance on that, I think that would really help.

I just want to use my time to talk about one other quick thing related to the stakeholder outreach, and, again, this is something that I mentioned yesterday, but the establishment of a science advisory panel.

At NRDC, we've reached out to a number of scientists to just get their thoughts on the framework and this process and start having some of those discussions about what might be coming up because we really wanted to hear from them what they saw as

important components of this process.

And I just wanted to share with you that,

you know, a -- there were -- there was a great deal of

support from the community for the work that you're

doing and a real willingness to assist in doing that.

And I don't feel like I can speak

necessarily for the scientific community, but from

what they shared with me, a lot of it boils down to

knowing exactly how to fit into this process. So

having a body set up for them, I think, is a perfect

way for them to come together as a unit and discuss

it.

They really need to know concrete ways that they can contribute to this. So as you get down the path of the regional ocean assessment and you're struggling with certain data layers and is the data, you know, showing everything that you need, they really want to come to the process and be engaged.

And I think that the earlier that you pull them into this, the better overall product that you'll have at the end. They can help you with some of those decisions about evaluating the conflicts and figuring out how to resolve them as you move forward.

So thank you very much.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Sarah.

MS. WHELAN: Hi. I think this is actually the first time I've formally sat and given some comments. So my name is Sarah Winter Whelan. I work for the American Litoral Society. We're based in New Jersey, but we have offices along the Atlantic coast.

ALS is a coastal conservation organization and we work to empower our members to care for their coast through education, advocacy, and outreach.

So I want to focus my comments today on stakeholder engagement. I think that Matt and Ali did

a great job at talking about the ocean action plan and the time line and they brought up some good questions. I appreciated Ali's metaphor of building and the floor plan of the house, so I won't take the time to reiterate that other than maybe just incorporate their thoughts are some of the same as mine.

First, I want to thank you for creating the stakeholder engagement strategy. It's -- as you all have mentioned today, it's a vital component for this process. And I really appreciate that you guys have taken the time to put it together. I can't say strongly enough that having something on paper like this as a start is really important.

I wanted to ask a question. On the draft strategy, it talks about taking comments till July 15th. If that's something that the RPB is still planning to do, it seemed like in the presentation that there might have been a couple of changes to

that.

If there were, if you can make those changes and put that on-line again for us so that I have the updated version or if maybe it's not the time to comment on this, that would be great to clarify.

So some initial thoughts as you move forward, I think stakeholder engagement as you work on the strategy, it should be really integrated into your time line. I think the time line could be fleshed out. And as the work group works on the strategy, it should, you know, have various points.

You may not know all of them now, but even within the work group process, it will be great to engage stakeholders in that work group process and to put that into the larger time line that you laid out today. I think that's really important for you as RPB members and for us as stakeholders as where there might be very specific points where our input is

wanted and needed by you as you move forward in this work.

I also wanted to urge you to use your existing resources for engagement. I think you guys have talked about this a little bit already, but -- and I won't take credit for this.

last night and he came up with the great idea of having someone from the federal family, one of the agencies, one of their communication officers or maybe officers be here and take part in this process so that they can then go back to other federal family and work with state agencies as well with how to develop and integrate the work that you guys are doing back into all of the other work that you as independent, separate agencies are doing.

I didn't have this at the listening session, but I mentioned, and Doug mentioned this earlier,

about social media. I know it scares some of us.

It's not always perfect, but it does certainly reach

people. And I don't know if you know this, but

between the people -- between the agencies on the

federal, state, and tribal level in this room, your

Facebook -- those of you who have Facebook accounts

reach 2.5 million people.

That's not a small number. I mean, granted, not everyone gets Facebook, but it's a tool and I urge you to use that and the same can be said for Twitter. You guys reach almost 2.5 million people. And there are people paying attention to what you do and integrating them into this process is really important.

So I will just say thank you again for the work you're doing on stakeholder engagement. I look forward to working as a stakeholder and providing input and talking with people on the work group that

are working on it.

And as a coastal conservation organization,

I can't leave the table without saying we also

appreciate the heightened language in the final

framework on the connection between bays, estuaries,

and coastal areas. We think it's really important.

Our work focuses on Barnegat Bay and Jamaica Bay and

important coastal bays that have, you know, their

issues that you may not even realize you can help

with.

So we look forward to opportunities to engaging on that as well. And I thank you again for this time.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Jeremy Firestone.

MR. FIRESTONE: Good afternoon. Jeremy Firestone from the University of Delaware.

I want to commend you for moving forward on

stakeholder engagement. I think we need to look at the word engagement. It is -- connotes active and action and that this shouldn't be a passive process. It should be an active process.

There's -- certainly over the last several decades and more so even over the last five years, there's been a decrease in social trust of institutions, not just government, but all institutions. And so engagement is really key.

There are many of us who are more concerned with what's referred to as procedural justice than we are with substantive or distributive justice, that having a fair process is critical and having a fair process, people can ultimately live with results.

And when you're trying to do planning,
that's key because people -- you know, there are going
to be winners and perceived losers and -- but people
can live with results if they think the process was

fair and their voices was heard. So I think that that's quite important.

One thing, I want to commend on the MARCO portal. I think that that's quite useful. I think we have to remember and we've found this in our research and I know it's also true in the climate change research, for example, climate change, we know that the more knowledge people have, the more that people who think it's a hoax think it's a hoax and the people who are concerned may become more concerned.

People basically cherrypick information.

They use the information that agrees with their position to further support. We find the same thing with offshore wind. The more we educate people, people who aren't supportive are more supportive and people who are opposed are more opposed.

(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings.)

MS. CANTRAL: You ready?

MR. FIRESTONE: Okay. Thank you.

So as I was saying, information is good, but information without analysis can -- and when we look at all of that spatial data, you're going to just present what your issue is is birds. You would look at that spatial data and say, God, there are birds everywhere. And so I don't know anything else anywhere.

So analysis is going to be really important going forward and I would urge this board to think about how you might do that. I think the suggestion and part of the scientific advisory board is a good one and that would be a good first step to thinking about how this data might be used to be more informative for decision making.

I think with that, I'll leave it. And thank you. And as a recovery lawyer, I'm used to being

interrupted by judges, so not too big a deal. Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you, Jeremy. Thank you.

Peter Himchak.

MR. HIMCHAK: Thank you very much. Peter Himchak. (Indiscernible.)

You know, in the last couple of days, I've been in this mental quandary on how or what to get the commercial fishermen to do. And one of my comments are addressed to data portal. And the dilemma I have is that it would behoove them to come out swinging and get their footprint on all their prime fishing grounds because what's currently in like CZM rolls and everything, boy, that's archaic and it's rather unsophisticated.

But what they need to do is get the data portal. I have a few comments on that and I understand the data portal was well received. Were

you the presenter? Okay.

So -- and I've dealt with commercial fishermen. I've dealt with them for 39 years and it's a tough group, believe me. They do not -- they begrudgingly give out information, only when they're backed into a corner. So how do you get the information out of them?

Back when the deep sea coral amendment was being developed, and I still have the Mid-Atlantic Council, the -- you know, it's like how in the world do you protect deep sea corals and continue fishing.

And it didn't take long for commercial fishermen in Cape May to come out with records of every troll line they've taken over the last ten years and they all lay on top of each other. Very sophisticated mapping. And what they were doing, and they were all like this meandering type of a troll line, they were doing it specifically to avoid deep

sea corals. They have been protecting them for decades because they're going to lose \$60,000 worth of bond here.

So when I saw that, I said, boy, that's a rather sophisticated set of information. They have books this thick with numbers. If you think you're going to get it out of them, the deep sea coral you might get when they start talking about the depth gradients and where restrictions may be made.

And I think the industry is all -- is willing to come forward with that essentially to show that, you know, their fishing is clean.

VTRs, just a caution about VTRs. And believe me, the state, federal regulatory regime crossing the three-mile line is very complicated and it's -- and VTRs, many state fisheries where there are no federal permits, they don't -- you don't have to submit a VTR.

So I'll give you an example. The conch pot fishery, which is pretty big and it's managed tremendously, you won't get VTRs out of there.

There's no federal plan. There's not even a state plan. Gill netters in state waters that don't have a federal permit do not have to do a VTR.

But if you go into Barnegat Light, you got most of the fleet there. So anybody that fishes exclusively for croakers in the EEZ, I think, you know, you'll get them captured.

Monk fishermen can fish in state waters and not have to do a VTR. If they're in federal waters, they have to do a VTR.

So you see the complexity, and I'm sitting here thinking of loopholes, and I could probably come up with a long list.

So the bottom line is that, yeah, I look forward to the -- I guess Jay was talking about the

Cape May, going down and have the Cape May, New Jersey experience, Point Pleasant. It's essential to get -- boy, I don't know. You know, if they're satisfied with the VTR data as covering them without divulging other personal information, I guess you got it covered.

But a Monk fisherman that's not submitted

VTRs fishing in state waters, his areas are so secret

that, you know, if he doesn't come out and say, you

know, this is where I fish, then he could be out of

business.

So the surf clam issue is another issue, but you can get that from the assessment surveys on the concentration of surf clams and quahogs.

So I'll keep talking to Jay. Look forward to this Cape May experience. And, again, you know, if they don't speak up and put areas down as off limits, so to speak, then they may be off limits. They may

lose them.

Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Noah Chesnin.

MR. CHESNIN: Thank you.

Noah Chesnin with the New York Aquarium and Wildlife Conservation Society.

First off, thank you very much for this indepth conversation today and for the opportunity for participation.

I want to reiterate some of the comments I made yesterday in terms of the regional ocean action plan. I think it's really critical to set a deadline of 2016 and so I'm pleased to see that you're evaluating that and considering that. So thank you.

In terms of the regional ocean assessment, thank you, Kevin, for the presentation. I think it's important to consider this document in terms of how it

can best serve you as members of the RPB, that it will tee up what the ocean action plan will really frame in terms of the action items to address conflicts or uses that are a conflict in the region.

And so I think it's critical to look at it spatially, put things on that map, and not just have index cards, but to look at where conflicts are happening in the water or near the shore so that you can have an action plan that tries to de-conflict those uses moving forward.

And I think that will also tie into the stakeholder engagement piece that you've been addressing most recently.

I mentioned last -- yesterday that, you know, I've been discussing your work with some college students that have been coming up to -- that came to the New York Aquarium a couple of weeks -- a week ago and they had just gone through -- you know, had sailed

through the region and they didn't talk about the issues in terms of, you know, abstract principles or abstract conflicts. They talked about the resources in terms of places.

They had gone and done tows looking at phytoplankton in Hudson Canyon. They came into New York Harbor and they saw all the different navigation channels that are converging on one really important place.

And so I think as you consider the stakeholder outreach and the sort of need in the ROA and the ocean action plan, identifying places will help people connect. And I think that was very clear from the way the students were sort of engaging.

And then finally, I wanted to thank Kelsey for your point. As perhaps one of the younger people in the room, but also working for an organization whose bread and butter are the students who come to

the -- through the door, the kids that come with their parents, aquariums or other formal education institutions are really important ways that you can outreach to that audience.

Whether it's through NOAA's, you know, coastal America partnership or others, there are ways to connect with the younger generation and try to build that inter-generational, you know, connection and considerations you make your decision.

So thank you very much and I look forward to continuing to participate in this process.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

Brent Greenfield.

MR. GREENFIELD: Good afternoon. My name is Brent Greenfield, again with the National Ocean Policy Coalition.

And at the outset, I'd like to begin that in seeking feedback on the process for moving with

developing a stakeholder engagement strategy that the RPB acknowledged last week, quote, that there's not yet been a systematic, thorough assessment of stakeholders that this body needs to engage with, the key issues to discuss, or a comprehensive approach to engaging them.

The revised framework states that, quote, stakeholder engagement and transparency are priorities of the RPB, are key aspects of many RPB actions. In that regard, the RPB work plan should not be developed or finalized until a comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy and sufficient transparent engagement mechanisms have been developed and fully implemented. Proceeding otherwise would be putting the cart before the horse.

In addition, the revised framework states that, quote, a small team of RPB members, alternates, and staff will provide the RPB with the information it

needs to make a decision about the nature and purpose of a first iteration regional ocean action plan.

As stated yesterday, in the absence of a stakeholder engagement strategy and sufficient and transparent engagement mechanisms in place, it should not be prejudged that the region desires a regional ocean action plan.

In addition, the RPB should make clear that determinations as to how the RPB proceeds will be made based on a regional consensus and formed by a formal and meaningful stakeholder engagement and not on the judgment of small teams of RPB members.

As to stakeholder engagement more broadly, the coalition is still reviewing the proposed stakeholder engagement strategy and will provide written comments on the proposed strategy in advance of the July 15th comment deadline.

On that note, I'd also like to echo the

request that any changes that are made to the initial document that was released is provided in an updated document on the Website.

In the meantime, the coalition has significant concerns about engagement so far. While numerous requests have been made for the RPB to immediately work to establish a formal role for commercial and recreational user groups, at minimum through the development of a formal advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the RPB for now has regrettably decided to proceed in another direction utilizing a Stakeholder Liaison Committee that would provide guidance and feedback to MARCO which in turn will report back to the RPB.

As the coalition previously noted, using a third party to serve as a conduit between the liaison committee and the RPB does not serve to meet the needs of the diverse stakeholder group.

The coalition previously conveyed that in the event that the RPB continue to pursue the establishment of a liaison committee as the advisory mechanism for stakeholders to provide input, that user groups and the public be provided with an opportunity to review and comment on its proposed establishment structure and selection process.

While the revised framework espouses

transparency, some recent events raise significant

concerns. For example, the revised framework notes

that the committee hold its inaugural meeting in

March, yet there was no advanced public notice about

the non-open meeting and an open and public nominating

process with defined selection criteria was not

conducted.

Briefly on the regional ocean assessment, it was noted that the regional ocean assessment is to help inform the development of the regional ocean

action plan. To ensure that the regional ocean assessment does indeed fully inform in the eventual regional ocean action plan, deliberations on the contours of a regional ocean action plan should not take place until the regional ocean assessment has been finalized and the RPB activity time line should incorporate that sequencing of events.

In closing and as discussed yesterday, RPB decisions should not be proposed, adopted, or completed until a comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy and sufficient and transparent engagement mechanisms are developed and fully implemented.

Given the implications for the regulating community, Mid-Atlantic RPB stakeholder processes and standards must be at least as rigorous, clear, and transparent as those accorded the statutorily authorized ocean use planning processes.

Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Thank you.

So that concludes this public comment session, so now we're going to transition to the presentation that will cover navigation related activities in the Mid-Atlantic.

And just in terms of timing, I think we should be able to transition back to a second public comment session, the one that we've added in case there are those of you who want to comment on what you hear out of this upcoming session related to navigation activities.

So we will plan to do that at about 4:45, and you can sign up. If you haven't already, please do so and we'll look forward to hearing from you.

After that public comment session, we'll take the time that we need for the next hour or so to wrap up including reflecting on questions and comments that have been raised during this session and the one

coming up at 4:45.

In the meantime, I'm going to turn it over to John Walters with the Coast Guard followed by Joe Atangan with DOD and Lorraine Wakeman from DOT Mar Ad. And they're going to share some thoughts with you and then we'll open it up for some RPB discussion.

MR. WALTERS: Thanks.

We're going to play tag team here as Laura said. And thank you for your tenacity, fortitude, and forbearance for hanging on this long. I know these chairs have become accustomed to certain spots on our body.

The aspects of navigational interests, we're talking about the balancing, competing navigational interests. What's going on out there? And this is primarily more discussion or presentation of what we perceive as the real world. What's happened on the water and what are we contending with? What are we

working with every day?

And I'll touch briefly on each of these little slides and then we'll delve into it a little deeper with each of the other presentations. And my presentation is three minutes, so we're going to go through this pretty quickly.

The Atlantic coast port access route study was kicked off 2011, I believe, in response to an understanding that wind energy, wind energy development was expanding on the Atlantic coast and the impact was more than impact to a particular state, that there was a region-wide potential impact of placing wind energy areas offshore.

So we suggested early on 2011 or so that a port access route study be initiated to understand the implications on traffic between the ports, basically between the Canadian/American border and Key West, Florida.

At the time, our analytical tools were limited. Prior to about 2009, it was a matter of conversation with ships' masters. In 2009 and forward because of the development of automatic identification systems, the Coast Guard has been able to go back in time and review some records that were put into storage or held in an archive at -- in West Virginia. This is not the National Security Agency. And they were retained more than 18 months.

What are the other things we're looking at?

Obviously recreational fishing, maritime shipping, all phases of maritime fishing, all sizes, shapes, and colors, military uses, that's our military, the Department of Defense, of course, offshore renewable energy.

Everybody is wondering what's the impact of Post-Panamax vessels. More important to some of the port partners I've been discussing or as important is

shipping around the Cape of Good Hope and through the Suez Canal. What's the importance of the maritime highway as proposed and as proposed by Mar Ad?

Submarine cable, somebody mentioned in passing why is that such an issue. Here's a small picture of a submarine cable after impact with a propeller. It could be an anchor, but in this case, it's a propeller and it's a fairly small cable. It's not owned by the Coast Guard. And it's only electricity versus the talking communications cables coming out of New Jersey and heading for northern Europe.

This is a three conductor wire with an armor and ground. All the armor was pierced and the conduits or conductors were cut. I hate to imagine what those would be like if it was the fiberoptic cable, thousands of strings of fiberoptic heading across the ocean.

So that's a potential impact that we're looking at and commercial fishing which we don't have much visibility with respect to the Atlantic coast port access routes and which I'm hoping Kevin could help us out with.

What's the Coast Guard's interest in this?
We're interested because of the marine transportation
system. We want to ensure the marine transportation
system operates safely and efficiently.

What's the bottom line here? The -- getting the goods and services to the American public, getting those goods and services overseas. It's not only affecting the population that lives on the coast.

It's the population in the hinterland and the heartland, the goods and services moving in both directions.

Most recently folks have heard about the Balkan oil going to or running off the tracks and

falling into certain rivers in Virginia and other places. Where is it going? Nowhere in the news did I hear anybody say, well, the oil was on Route 2. It just said it fell off the tracks and fell into the river.

Where was it going from there? It was going to

Philadelphia for refinement. Same thing. There's

just not enough pipeline. So this marine

transportation system you could say extends to North

Dakota through its linkage with the railroads.

So what are we doing? We are looking at all aspects of the marine transportation system. On the lower right, that diagram there is a port-to-port picture of the towing fleet operating between Delaware Bay and Newark, New Jersey. That's just towing. That doesn't even involve the deep draft shipping. And it's a heavy concentration. There's some holes in it,

but it's obviously a lot of traffic that moves up and down the seacoast in New Jersey.

What's the impact on wind farms? The potential is there that the wind farms are in the path of ships. So there may be a need for some adjustment on both the wind farm configuration and possibly on shipping, too. But there are some considerations to be made in both regards. But we want to make sure that any transit that occurs is done safely and efficiently.

Next the Atlantic port access route study.

I mentioned when this started. It's continuing. The

-- there was a closed comment period. However, the in

box for comments is always open. If anybody has any

comments, suggestions, input at all, that is accepted

at any time up until the point where a port access -
when the access study is actually closed and we look

into recommendations for waterway changes.

We're still working with BOEM, with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. PNNL is a contractor for BOEM and part of its tasking was to develop a tool to assess what is the impact of placing a wind energy area in a certain spot and what's the impact on shipping.

Is there -- what's the degree of risk that changes? What's the potential change in economics and its potential output from this plan or the tool? But the biggest thing is what is the change in risk to ship operations?

Next. Some more examples of what's going on out there with respect to the Atlantic coast port access route study. This is all traffic between the main border and South Carolina. The information shown is only that information that is transmitted on AIS and received by an AIS receiver.

So there may be vessels that aren't

transmitting or some which the antenna is below the height of a receiving antenna. And all vessels greater than 300 gross tons are required to carry AIS.

So this is a partial picture. It also does not capture Department of Defense, Navy and Army transitions. So, again, a partial picture. Fishing vessels are not reflected here. But even so, you can detect or observe there's a lot of activity offshore.

In the previous slide, we showed the towing vessels between Delaware Bay and New York and I think we slipped backwards. There we go. Stay there, please. And here we have a picture of towing vessels between Chesapeake Bay and Newark. And you'll see that there's a red line that goes inbound or inside the -- almost up to the mouth of Delaware Bay and a lot of traffic going offshore.

We're looking at the impact of the Delaware and Maryland wind energy areas as well as the

potential for the new New Jersey wind energy areas.

You also see on the lower right-hand corner the

Virginia wind energy area and the Kitty Hawk. It's

not a wind energy area.

VOICE: It's a planning area.

MR. WALTERS: Planning area. In the lefthand picture, you also see three subsets or three
small photographs. Those were the initial attempts by
the Coast Guard to identify the level of risk
associated with the wind energy areas or wind planning
areas based upon the amount of vessel traffic passing
through those areas.

Red was our assessment that there should be no development. Yellow there could be some development, but further study would be needed. Green was we had no real problem with the development of offshore resources in those areas. That was based on work done in 2009 with very few, if -- well, there

were none, no analytical tools available to us.

VOICE: Protractor, compass.

MR. WALTERS: Protractor, compass, then the Mark 1, Mod 1, eyeball.

VOICE: Right.

MR. WALTERS: So very rudimentary.

Next, please. This is a compilation of activity in the entrance to Chesapeake Bay. And I need to, if I could -- don't do it, but if we could, I refer back to Kevin's slide that showed all those areas where or those subjects that should be included in the regional ocean assessment.

You had security for marine transportation, cables, wind, fishing, sand and gravel, dredge material placement, and I just want to point out a few of these activities in this area. I know it's going to be hard for you all back there to see. Maybe I'll point like that. All right.

There is an ocean disposal area operated by the Army Corps of Engineers permitted or licensed by the EPA? I don't understand the relationship there.

Is it completely designated by the EPA?

Inside that cell are specific hot spots

designated for certain materials to be placed

depending upon their toxicity and origin. These other

little red circles here indicate arcs of operability

of Navy ships. Shallow draft and deep draft naval

vessels operate in that area to calibrate their

onboard sensors prior to deployment to their theater

of operations.

This is the inbound and outbound northeast traffic lane limited to 33 feet drafts. This is the inbound traffic separation scheme into Chesapeake Bay where the Army Corps of Engineers maintains a 50 foot project into Hampton Roads and Baltimore authorized to go to 55 feet.

There's inbound and outbound traffic lanes.

The lane right in the middle is called a deep water route and is authorized for use by those vessels drawing greater than 42 feet and naval aircraft carriers and submarines. Very specific as to who can use it.

Down here is a firing zone for use from Dam Neck and a rifle and smaller arms range from Camp Pendleton. There's a sand borrow pit and there's another sand borrow pit inside. There's an ocean -- another ocean disposal area that is also used as a sand borrow pit.

It was mentioned earlier about the

Department of Energy grant that was awarded to

Dominion Power for the Virginia offshore wind

technology advancement project and that is occurring

in these two aliquots which are located outside of the

wind energy area off of Virginia. These are two

research aliquots that have also been identified by BOEM.

This is the submarine cable route anticipated between the vo tap (phonetic) turbines going to shore through the firing zone under the shipping. And in two weeks, the 1st of June, the hydrographic, geologic --

VOICE: Surveys.

MR. WALTERS: There's another comp wanted there. But, anyway, three component surveys being conducted in support of that cable and I think that's supposed to run about a month.

This line signifies a potential cable route by Atlantic Wind Connection. That's -- that was proposed to BOEM as part of a right-of-way lease, I believe is the terminology. So this whole diagram is intended to indicate all those activities happening at the entrance to Chesapeake Bay.

What's the concentration of shipping? Well, on the AIS map, it's all red. But essentially there's 25 to 3,000 ships headed to Baltimore annually, 2,500 to 3,000 ships head into Hampton Roads, another 2,500 to 3,000 ship -- Navy ships and Army vessels transiting through this area.

Unknown fish -- fishing, commercial fishing and recreational fishing activities in this area.

It's a busy place. Rudee Inlet is about here and I believe that's going to be the point of departure for the offshore supply vessels once this field is built out. So it's going to be a busy area. It's a busy area now.

What's the port of Hampton Roads doing?

It's looking at a -- I think the Army Corps of

Engineers has initiated a study for a 60 foot project
headed into Hampton Roads. So they'll be looking at
these waters, too, to find out if there's access for

60 feet into Hampton Roads. And 60 feet is the max before the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel sections have to be sunk further.

So what's the impact to navigation? There has been a suggestion from some users that a traffic lane be established in this area to lock up or identify the deepest water to sea. The Coast Guard may or may not establish a traffic lane there. We may just leave it open.

Once we establish a traffic lane, the commercial ships essentially say, though it's not -- or traffic lanes right now throughout the United States are voluntary use. However, shipping companies impress upon their masters that though it is voluntary, they shall use it.

So once we designate as a shipping route or a traffic lane, those commercial ships will be using those areas. So we're -- what are we looking at?

We're looking at the area or the distance right between the dump area tangent to the naval exercise area and the edge of the wind energy area.

How far is it? I think it's around six miles. So we have 7,500 ships a year that will be going out this way and this way and a very small population coming into the bay this way. This is primarily tug and tow and some very shallow, less -- 33 feet or less commercial ships.

So that's the challenge in this area to accommodate all that different shipping. And, by the way, the states of Maryland and Virginia have compulsory pilotage from this point in. From this point out, pilotage is not required, so you'll have all -- we will have all the international masters transiting this area inbound and outbound and we still want to make sure they can make it safely and efficiently.

And at this point, I think that's my last one. I'm going to pass it over to Joe.

Joe, would you like my pointer?

MR. ATANGAN: I've got one. Thank you.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. ATANGAN: Us military guys. If you go back to the last slide real quick.

I want to first of all thank John for that very thorough description of the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay. This is an area of critical importance to the Department of Defense. He's described to you how busy is it with just the commercial interest, but I want to highlight some of the Department of Defense interest as well.

In this region is the largest naval base I would say in the world and although John mentioned something about how many thousand vessel --

MR. WALTERS: About 7,500 combination

commercial and Navy.

MR. ATANGAN: Yeah. I just want to make sure. We don't have -- the Navy does not have a thousand ships. We have less than 300. So these are multiple transits of sometimes the same ship. About half of those ships are in the Pacific coast. So you can imagine probably no more than 150 ships associated with the Navy going in and out of the Hampton Roads area.

I want to remind folks that while John has covered the surface navigation aspects of this thing, please keep in mind that part of our navigation challenge includes the air traffic as well as the submarine traffic, submerged traffic that goes -- that are taking place in this area.

Sometimes we forget that in the vicinity of our coves, there are also very important airfields like Langley Air Force Base and Naval Air Station

Oceana which is our primary jet base in the Atlantic.

Also, in fact, we have Oceana right around in here and it's on an auxiliary field and right around in here. And Langley is just further to the north. So there's a lot of air -- military air traffic that are being used in this area as well.

As far as the surface danger zone that John identified here, this has been in existence for a long time. There's an awful lot of, I guess, munitions expended or otherwise that have been in there for, you know, I'd like to say probably 1775 when the Navy was formed, but it was used extensively up until the point where I was a young commissioned officer back in the early '80s. Yes, I'm old. I'm young at heart, though.

VOICE: Experienced.

MR. ATANGAN: Yes. So as you can see, this is an area of vital importance, that we have a

significant amount of concentration of Navy, Air

Force, and Army assets that are transiting through
this area at any given point.

The calibration range that John mentioned over here is particularly challenging for us because it requires an installation to have a -- there's a fixed -- there's a building here that is the calibration station and it monitors the ships as it circles some of these buildings.

And there's only two of them on the entire east coast. So if you can imagine if we had to go all the way down to Mayport to do our calibration, what kind of cost that would take. That would be an additional two day transit down to Mayport to do some calibration and another two days back. And think about the amount of fuel that that would take just to — it would become a very expensive endeavor for us just to calibrate our sensors.

Okay. Next slide, please. Somebody
mentioned that, yeah, there's an awful lot of ocean
planning going on already. So I kind of want to make
the RPB aware of some of the things that we've already
undertaken in the name of ocean planning, I guess,
before it was called ocean planning.

We've been working close with BOEM. This has been -- this is based on a DOD/BOEM study conducted and released in 2010. The study is the compatibility of DOD activities with oil and gas resource development in the outer continental shelf.

The study did not include renewable energy activities or infrastructure. It identified locations where there are potential conflict between testing, training, and other DOD activities with offshore oil and gas development.

We try to keep it simple using some, you know, colors. I prefer the red, yellow, green, but I

didn't have a choice in this one here. So we use a little bit different color set here.

But most of these conflicts that were attributed were attributed to future use of live munition and support fleet gunnery exercises, air to surface bombing, and anti-severing warfare and test operations. I think you can understand the incompatibility of fixed platforms with live ordinates.

So four categories of potential compatibility were developed as a result of this analysis. The first one is unrestricted. There's no DOD restrictions for oil and gas infrastructure or related activities. The only thing we were requesting was early in prior coordination if oil and gas activities were contemplated in these areas.

The second category is, you know, we didn't object, it was just some site specific stipulations.

There are essentially areas where specific stipulations above surface oil and gas infrastructure may be feasible. Examples would be like, you know, electromagnetic emissions that might conflict with some of our sensors, site evacuation protocols, location pre-coordination, some density limitations, et cetera.

The other cat -- the next category is no permanent oil and gas structures. And you can see that there's basically shades of yellow, orange, and red associated with these restrictions. And then the obvious one is no oil and gas activity altogether.

And those are the areas in red.

So this kind of gives you an indication how much has gone into just looking at the oil and gas compatibility piece. This study is being updated now for the 2017-2022 five year plan. So we're participating in that study now.

Next slide, please. Okay. So that worked so well with the oil and gas that we actually participated in the task force that Mo mentioned earlier, the state alternative energy task force. We wanted to make sure that DOD was involved with that.

So this is specific to an offshore wind area studied over a three to four year period. The areas of interest for wind energy development are overlaid on top of the Department of Defense training and operating areas and special use air spaces, the areas lined in the ocean there.

But you can see there's specific areas of interest to the DOD in the Mid-Atlantic. And I want to zoom in a little bit on the areas that we consider -- in fact, I can identify some of them for you here.

There's some just major air training bases, some associated with Dover, Delaware, some associated with our base in Pax River, and then as mentioned at

the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, the activities associated with Langley, and Oceana Naval Air Station as well as our Norfolk naval base.

So I want to take the time to zoom in a little bit here. Next slide, please. And this is just a close-up of what the -- our concerns are in the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay.

The vo tap areas that John mentioned earlier is this area right here. The rest of the areas as previously mentioned were primarily for gunnery exercise areas and areas where we operate our aircraft carriers so that they can -- so that pilots that are training can, if they get into certain sort of trouble, can go to shore rather than trying to land an aircraft on an aircraft carrier that's bouncing around in the water there if they have shoots.

So this is just a quick snapshot of some of the DOD areas of concern. Again, keep in mind that

our issues are not just at the surface, but our concern for the aviation activities associated above the water as well as some of the submarine and antisubmarine warfare exercises that take place underneath.

And I'll turn it over to Lorraine.

MS. WAKEMAN: Good afternoon. I'm Lorraine Wakeman. I'm with the Department of Transportation and specifically the Maritime Administration.

Mar Ad is a promotional agency, so I'm going to talk to you about some developing activities.

They're not new. We've all heard of them, but there are things that we expect to grow in the near future.

And one of those is marine highways and short sea shipping. Generally public uses the terms interchangeably and that's fine with us. We don't have a lot of short sea shipping routes or marine highways these days, but we think that they will be

growing and we are promoting their growth.

We think that as the population grows, as there's more congestion, and as we have a greater use of fully social accounting, that people will see the real benefits to marine highways and short sea shipping.

Right now most of our interstates are not tow roads, so it's a lot less expensive. But as more tow roads come into play, we think that there will be greater use of marine highways.

And so as we plan for things in the future, we're going to have to allow for the development more of marine highways. They will be smaller vessels.

They'll want a quick turnaround. So we're going to think ahead as we plan because we don't want to build some main infrastructure and then find out that it does not incorporate the smaller vessels as well because there will be challenges.

You want to go to the next slide, please.

And as you can see, I don't have a pointer, but the green lines around the coast show where we think there is potential for marine highways. And that's almost everywhere. So we're hoping that they become a primary means of -- thank you -- of moving freight and getting it off the highways.

Next slide. We talk about vessels and everybody likes to talk about the Post-Panamax vessels. The Department of Transportation does not think that we're going to see a big change in freight movement with the opening of the Panama Canal. We think that the Suez Canal has handled the increased traffic, the larger vessels.

But still as our population grows, we have to have more goods. We're going to need more food.

We're going to need more clothes. And most of these things are imported on vessels. So you will see more

vessels.

And we're also seeing new types of vessels. There are floating liquid natural platforms. And so we're going to change the way that we approach planning again. We're going to have to think of what traffic patterns will these vessels -- will they all come into all ports? Probably not. There will be shuttles. And that will facilitate the marine highways.

So we need to think ahead because these things take a lot of time. It takes a year to build a ship and that's just for the building portion. Got to go through the naval architecture, so it's a two, three, four, five year process depending on exactly what you're doing.

Next slide, please. One of the things that the Post-Panamax vessels require is larger cranes, wider cranes. They'll have a greater reach out over

the water. And we also see our cruise ships getting larger which means that the larger cruise ships may not come into the ports of Baltimore or Philadelphia like they have been.

So, again, another change and it requires -particularly for cruise ships, you have to get people
from the airport to the ship quickly. So that's
another consideration, the linkages for passengers.

And, of course, we will see other changes in designs
for vessel types like our oil tankers.

Next slide, please. Energy is another area that will be affecting navigation. The United States has a new market. We might become an energy export.

We might export petroleum. We could export LNG. And that will bring more tankers into our ports, different safety requirements that the Coast Guard will require.

And we are -- our newer vessels, particularly some of the smaller vessels that are

going to Puerto Rico from the east coast, are being built using LNG as a fuel source. So these vessels will need fueling stations.

Some environmentalists, and rightly so, are adverse to or have concerns about having LNG stations in highly populated areas and we need to address the safety and make people comfortable with that and explain to them how this is really an environmentally safe form of transportation and fuel.

That concludes my presentation. Thank you very much.

MS. CANTRAL: Great. Thank you.

Thanks to all three of you.

I think that these presenters and RPB members have painted a vivid picture of what a busy place this region is.

We're now -- we've offered a second public comment session and ask people who are interested in

providing a public comment after hearing this presentation to sign up. And we have one person who signed up.

So, Jeremy Firestone, if you would like to come share your thoughts.

MR. FIRESTONE: Thank you once again.

Jeremy Firestone from the University of Delaware.

I want to thank the three speakers. It was interesting presentations.

I have found in my personal dealings that the Coast Guard and the Army Corps and the Naval Submarine Cable Office are all people who are trying to do the right thing, trying to work with other uses and we've been able to work things out through common dialogue. So I thank them.

We did just do a recent study which we -- was recently published on changing commercial routes.

These are just the commercial vessels and not the tugs

or barges and large commercial vessels. And we looked at changing the routes looking at ships that came from Chesapeake Bay to Delaware Bay or Chesapeake Bay to the port of New York and New Jersey, or Delaware Bay to the port of New York and New Jersey.

Our analysis shows that providing that you could ensure safety for very modest cost both in time and money, we're talking about an average of ten additional nautical mile journey that you could build wind projects closer to shore and that would save \$13.6 billion on the wind side and only cost 200 million on the vessel side.

It's also important to note that one-third of those costs were social costs because, you know, we're policy analysts. We like to include everything that we can and so we included the added carbon dioxide, the added knocks and socks and particulate matter that would be emitted into the atmosphere from

going to these slightly longer routes.

So, you know, how much is it, what's -- you know, if we can sort of break this down, if we're looking at a metric ton of goods, we're talking 25 cents per metric ton. It's not going to raise your TV sets very much.

We -- or we can take that cost savings and could build an additional 2,240 megawatts of wind power which would be enough to power an additional 600,000 households and would displace 133 million tons of CO2, or, alternatively, we could take that savings from building closer and reduce the cost of the electricity for -- by three cents per kilowatt hour.

So I think we -- these are the kind of things that we need to look at. And I think, you know, the diagram up there along the Chesapeake Bay is a good one. It is a busy ocean with a lot of uses.

And this is where I said that we need to -- to a

certain extent, we need to move beyond mapping it into analysis and look where there's potential gains from trade from rearranging the deck chairs.

Just one other thing about GIS. We also needed the good consumers of GIS depending on how you scale things and by that, I mean the numbers and everything. You can make things look very red. You can make things look very green. You can make things look very yellow. You can differentiate more.

And so sometimes a picture is not worth a thousand words and that can be true of GIS, too. So with all things, data is data, but any analysis which would include GIS, we need to be good consumers of the analysis and understand what we're interpreting.

Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Thank you very much.

So as we head into the home stretch for this

meeting, I would like to invite the RPB to reflect on the public input that you heard. There were several questions that were posed and other comments and observations and advice and also -- so reflecting on the public input as well as the topics of the afternoon.

And then as we wrap up our objectives for this session which will close out no later than six o'clock is ensure that we are clear about next steps for the process for this body and that we're also clear about the overall time line that you have been discussing, recognizing that some of the details that you will likely want to build into that time line are still TBD, but let's have some clear sense of direction and what you're going to be focusing on for the next phase of work and that you feel good about that before we depart. All right?

So, Gwynne, would you like to start?

MS. SHULTZ: Uh-huh. Yeah. I think two of the comments that we heard were about the regional ocean assessment and who the intended audience was.

And I heard that, you know, they're saying, well, kind of the decision maker in this process really should be the RPB is kind of what I heard.

And I know we can discuss that a bit, but I don't recall if we resolved that and, if not, just a little bit about what is our process for going forward to resolve that.

And I guess that's to maybe Kevin's thoughts.

MR. CHU: Yeah. Okay. So we did talk about it. I don't think we came to a resolution. But as I've listened to people, my sense is people would agree that we are the target audience of the RPB. No, I never thought of that to be honest. It's kind of nice to be writing for this group and I think it would

actually free us up.

I sense support for that position from some of the comments I've heard. So I'm not seeing much objection, so I would propose that we agree to that.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. People comfortable with that and clear? Can we be very clear that the audience, the primary audience for the regional ocean assessment is this body?

VOICES: Yes.

MR. ROSEN: And just to clarify it even further, we're the audience because we want to see this document be the input to the planning process, correct?

MS. COOKSEY: Yes. Why else would we do it?

MR. ROSEN: Well, that's -- I just want to understand. It seems obvious, but seems to be some hesitation here.

MS. COOKSEY: I think what -- yes. I would

say yes. If not, why are we doing it, so -MR. ROSEN: Okay.

MS. COOKSEY: And then just -- I know that some people were uncomfortable with the decision making part. It's my understanding that the regional planning body collectively will not be making any decisions, correct, but we might use this information as we go back into our -- the job that pays our salary?

MS. CHYTALO: Can you say that again, Sarah, because I don't know? I kind of lost you. Are you saying that whatever information is developed for that, it's not part of decision making or what? I don't --

MS. COOKSEY: There was -- there seemed to be some uncomfortableness, I don't know if it was today or yesterday, it's been two very long days, about our role as the RPB and I -- these are my words

of what we've decided. If I had the framework right in front of me -- but it talks about we're information sharing to do better government, no new rules or regs.

So I just wanted to clarify that the regional ocean assessment, I really like that it is us collectively, that the RPB is the audience for the ROA, but the ROA is not going to use that to say yea or nay to any permanent decisions.

MS. CHYTALO: Oh, absolutely, not for any regulatory decision, but it --

MS. COOKSEY: But that it will be for the planning process?

MS. CHYTALO: Correct. It will be used for planning.

MR. ATANGAN: I think it's important to put it in the proper context. I think the end state that we have in my mind here is the regional ocean plan.

Okay? And the start of the plan is an assessment of

what is our as is. Okay? The regional ocean plan is going to help us get to the --

MS. SHULTZ: Action plan.

MR. ATANGAN: -- action plan, excuse me, the regional action plan or action plan is going to be our -- is our -- you know, regional ocean assessment is the as is, the current state. The action plan is going to be the desired to be.

And so what we're -- in order to understand the where we're going is you got to know where you're at. And so the regional ocean assessment to me is the -- this is where we're at right now.

So I push back a little bit on the decision making process piece because I really think that the assessment, the result of the assessment is to inform this body and the decision we're making is is what are we planning towards? It's the basis for what we are planning towards.

That's the decision. Okay? It's going to inform what we're going to -- what, you know, the options are for ocean planning.

MS. BORNHOLDT: The work of the RPB.

MR. ATANGAN: The work of the RPB. So it's really not about decision making. It's about informing the planners about what they need to be working towards.

MS. CHYTALO: I've heard that to a point.

It --

MS. CANTRAL: Karen, mike.

MS. CHYTALO: Oh, sorry. It's good on a regional basis of looking at this from -- because that's how we're looking at things, from a regional basis. But from an individual state's point of view, for our own outward looking area, we might choose to be more conservative or something because of something that might be more important to us in that area where

on a regional basis, it might not be.

MR. ATANGAN: Well -- so --

MS. CHYTALO: I don't want that taken away.

MR. ATANGAN: No. I don't know that we're taking it away, but I -- you know, let me call your attention to this is a regional planning process. So while we have to consider all the state and federal interests, then we have to keep in mind that, and the tribal interests, it is -- just keep letting me know. I'll get there, Kelsey. I'm a little slow, but I do get there.

So, anyway, what I was saying is is I understand. I'm sensitive to the individual states' priorities and agree that they should be factored in there. But let's keep in mind the whole reason why we set this -- this whole thing was set up is is for the regional perspective.

MS. CHYTALO: Correct.

MS. CANTRAL: Anything else on this issue?
Doug?

MR. PABST: It's just sort of a housekeeping question. Hi. We still have a few people left.

That's exciting.

We did revise a few documents. There were some questions about whether or not they were going to be distributed, posted, or I don't know if we were going to cover that in the wrap-up.

MS. CANTRAL: We will cover that in the wrap-up.

MR. PABST: Okay.

MS. CANTRAL: The short answer is yes. We made some edits to the framework and that will be posted with those revisions. They'll be circulated to you so that you can take a look at the edits that you've agreed to and make sure that we've captured them correctly and then it will be posted.

The -- a question -- I think this is -- since this is a process matter, maybe I can address it. The question that came up during public comment related to the stakeholder engagement strategy and the time for offering public comment to July, yes, it is correct. So we would invite those of you who want to comment on that to do that.

MS. SHULTZ: With the version that's on the Web.

MS. CANTRAL: With the version, right. The version that's posted is the version to be commenting on.

MR. ROSEN: Well, I don't know. I thought I heard -- what Darlene presented was slightly different than the posted version. And I thought I heard comments from folks asking that the revised version be re-posted in order that folks have the opportunity to comment on that because there was some additional

information in her slides that was not in the version that was shared.

MS. SHULTZ: And I'm not honestly sure how to answer that in that I believe that version that's on the Web was the one that we had all kind of reviewed and posted.

And, Darlene, please correct me if I'm wrong. But then -- I actually don't know how to answer that question because I -- I'm not sure if there were -- how that happened.

MS. FINCH: I don't know how to answer. There were minor modifications, so --

MR. ATANGAN: I think based on that answer, the safe bet would be to just post the document with the modifications that were mentioned and let's just be done with it.

MS. SHULTZ: Even though that none of us really -- I don't -- did we -- did you see that?

VOICE: It's in the documents.

VOICE: Yeah.

MS. SHULTZ: I'm just -- I'll just comment on the document that's on the Web and the reason why I say that is this document is just to go to the newly formed -- it's -- the comments are to go to this newly formed work group and they will consider that kind of as a launching opportunity for the discussion and then their revised document will be coming back to everyone. So it's --

MR. ATANGAN: So there's another opportunity to --

VOICE: It's an iterative, organic process, yes.

MS. SHULTZ: So it would be commenting on the version that's currently on the Website and that will then be provided -- the comments provided to the work group who will continue to work through this

process.

MS. CANTRAL: Is there anything else? Any other documents that I didn't speak to, the framework?

MR. PABST: Well, I think the charter -- I know we had some -- did we want to close the loop on the charter for that -- what we were going to do with that just to let the public know that we --

VOICE: What are we going to do with it?

MR. PABST: -- that we're going to -- we're close. We're going to look for final red flag comments or --

MR. ATANGAN: Yes. Yes.

MR. PABST: Okay.

MR. ATANGAN: We're waiting -- we're awaiting --

MS. CANTRAL: You need to speak up.

MR. ATANGAN: Yes. Where we're at is is we're going through the final review process for the

states and then we'll get the thumbs up or thumbs down on if there's any future changes.

MS. CANTRAL: Karen, did you have something else?

MS. CHYTALO: Yeah. I wanted to just raise another issue that was brought up in the public comments having to do with a scientific advisory committee. That's something that we've been chatting about off and on throughout all of our different processes.

And I don't think we've made any decision yet as to formulation of something like that. And I don't know we're going to have that at the next meeting or what or --

MS. CANTRAL: Those are -- those have been - that's been identified as an important need, but you
haven't engaged in a discussion about exactly how to
meet the need yet and it's something that needs to be

part of the next phase of work. And we -- I don't have any other insights.

MS. CHYTALO: Yeah. I guess -- I'm not sure which of the groups now would be the one that would -- other than the ocean assessment group would be -- love to give them more work -- as to a formulation of something like that or what kind -- how would we entertain something like that.

MS. LEONARD: I think in the public comments, they mentioned that it should be under stakeholder engagement because these are individuals that haven't previously been brought into the process that could inform how we're reviewing data, how we're reviewing the scientific material.

So maybe that is something that we charge with the stakeholder engagement work group, but I don't know how the other co-leads feel.

MS. CANTRAL: Go ahead.

MS. BORNHOLDT: I know we had this discussion as to keeping our FOCA exempt status, how can we embrace.

MS. CHYTALO: Right.

MS. BORNHOLDT: And we've had a couple telecons talking about that. So what I suggest is we put this on the next agenda. And now that we kind of crystalized with our framework done and getting ready to do some of these work groups where we really see and we can actually pinpoint the need for advice outside of the group here, perhaps whether it's using the SLC or not, now we can really frame that question and have that thorough evaluation discussion about that.

MS. CANTRAL: You -- is your tin up because you have --

MR. ATANGAN: Yes. I agree with Mo, but I also want to be clear that there's two -- I think

there were two sets of scientific engagement that were discussed. There's the part where we need to engage the scientific community to have them participate in the process and then there's a second part to that.

There's going to be a point downstream where we're going to be taking action or looking at specific issues that may be outside the expertise of the people that are sitting on this group right here where we will be required to then look to the scientific community to -- for some advice and counsel on that.

Then that's what -- that's another aspect of it. So really there are two separate parts there.

There's the outreach that goes to the scientific community and how they can contribute and then there's the later on perhaps when we've gelled on to here's the specific items in the ocean planning effort that we need your advice on whether it be deep ocean coral or whatnot that we'll need to look at another

opportunity to engage the -- to have the scientific community participate in.

And so mindful of the FOCA stuff, I know that the northeast is heavily engaged in trying to figure out how to do this as well. I -- they're further along in the process in coming up with options.

And my recommendation also at this point is just to monitor what they're doing very closely and leverage the lessons learned that they're going to go through here because I think there's a lot there that we can learn from them in this -- specific to the scientific advisory community.

MS. BORNHOLDT: Agree, Joe. In fact, we had a discussion with -- I can't tell you how many lawyers were on the phone as well as Betsy and myself --

MR. ATANGAN: And scientists.

MS. BORNHOLDT: -- just about this FOCA and

how can we reach out to get the technical expertise that we both need. So we were doing that, so that's a very good point.

MS. CANTRAL: Sarah.

MS. COOKSEY: Different subject, I think, under housekeeping. It would be really helpful to me

-- we had a lot of talk today about work groups -- if someone could do just a simple chart of the name of the work groups, who's the leader of the work groups, and then what staff from RPB members are going to populate that so that we can see where blanks are and where we need to get them filled in.

MS. CANTRAL: Well, I can take a shot at that before we wrap up, but I'll do that as part of summarizing and next steps and make sure that you're comfortable with that.

But before I do that, let's see if anyone has some reflections that they want to bring up.

Doug. All right. Doug and then Kevin.

MR. PABST: Well, I mean, I just wanted to say thanks again to everybody for really working with us on this as it is a work in progress. But to my colleagues on the RPB, just I'm always impressed when we get together just how much experience and knowledge we've got moving forward and the passion that everybody brings to this is what's making this work. So it's a pleasure to be working with all of you.

MS. CHYTALO: I thought it was because we were old.

MS. CANTRAL: Kevin.

MR. CHU: I'm not sure if this is the time to raise it, but I want to sort of wrap up the regional ocean assessment plan. And it's partly in response to the question that was raised by the public about a time line. People were saying, well, when.

What I'm sensing is that or what we have

decided is that the RPB will be the target audience.

I'm assuming also that the RPB and people that we can corral from our agencies will be developing the regional ocean assessment. And, therefore, I'm assuming that we want a short document rather than a comprehensive one.

I didn't sense any objection either from the public comments or around the table to the idea of having a relatively brief description of each subject and then including a bunch of links.

MS. CANTRAL: Uh-huh.

MR. CHU: So I am sort of seeking final nods around the table that that's how we will proceed.

There were two issues that I think were still up in the air. One is do we or don't we include conflicting uses. I don't think we resolved that.

But I would propose that when I get the working group back together, we'll talk about that again and give a

recommendation to the RPB on that.

If we can then -- laws and regulations, you know, I thought I had a pretty quick fix. Being it not so quick, so we'll talk about that one as well.

MS. CANTRAL: All right.

MR. CHU: So we'll leave those two sort of still unresolved, but what I hope I sensed is that we should develop a document that has short descriptions and links to as many appropriate sources as we could find. At this point, we will go out to the public with some draft of it and get some feedback on how close we are and what else we missed.

MS. CANTRAL: Uh-huh.

MR. CHU: And if we -- and we understand that that document is going to help us to develop our ocean action plan, so we need to move quickly on it.

MS. CANTRAL: Right.

MR. CHU: And we also have resources now to

do that in terms of the time for NOAA and Defense Department.

So what I would propose is that we make a push over the course of the summer and try to get or give back to the RPB by, say, October whatever we've got and try to have it as -- in as good shape as we possibly can so that you can at least see whether it's on track and whether it makes sense.

We would be reporting to the RPB on our monthly calls anyway.

MS. CANTRAL: Uh-huh.

MR. CHU: So you'd know what we're doing.

And a lot of you are on this team, so you'll know what we're doing as well.

But I think if we are waiting for the ROA to make some -- guide us in our next steps, we'd better move quickly.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah. Okay.

MR. CHU: So if that plan, that sort of quick work plan works okay for everybody, I'll push forward with the team.

MS. CANTRAL: Right. So these are comments, reactions to --

MS. MCKAY: I just want to respond to Kevin.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah.

MS. MCKAY: Just a quick question. How -- will that time line mesh with the RFP that the Monmouth team has?

MR. CHU: Well, I think the Monmouth team needs to move -- needs to move forward to issue its RFP. So we've got to talk with them sooner rather than later about how they -- they could use that pot of money to fit in with this. And I think their -- it will take them a little while to put the RFP on the street and get bids and process it.

I foresee that this approach that we're

taking will have -- will end up with many, many links between the data portal and the regional ocean assessment. And, in fact, it may really be the same thing essentially, you know, some multipurpose Website that feeds into it.

And I would imagine that the contractor for the data portal would be charged with making the links between our work and the data portal work, but we'll talk with them.

MS. MCKAY: Sync that up.

MR. CHU: Yeah. We'll sync that up.

MS. CANTRAL: Lorraine, did you have --

MS. WAKEMAN: Yeah, to respond to Kevin.

Kevin, since most of DOT's employees would not be experts in many of these things, just having a short synopsis so that we can reach back to our various environmental people, but our permanent representatives to this body would not be experts, so

a short synopsis would be much better with links that they can then take that to consult with the people in DOT that are experts.

MR. CHU: Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: Joe.

MR. ATANGAN: I can't help but be impressed by the folks who stayed for the entire afternoon for this.

But I want to go back to the discussion regarding the -- you know, what I struggle -- you're going to go over the working group stuff. And so one of the struggles that I have was just how it all flowed and I'm struggling with that.

So between the time we had these discussions, we've been kind of scribbling and drawing. So I think we've come up with a -- kind of a basic construct that we'd like to send out to the RPB members for consideration to -- and it may be wrong,

but it's how, you know, my pea brain envisions some of the flow of how things fit together because it's kind of a roadmap of sorts because, frankly, I was getting a little bit lost and I don't want to be lost.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah. All right. Well, that's great. So let's hold that thought for a minute. Before we have any more discussion about the work groups and the work flows and the roadmap, I want to come back to Kevin's summary of the regional ocean assessment work and make sure everyone is really clear and comfortable with what he's proposing. And he's asking questions to make sure that everyone is onboard and comfortable with the timing and the way he's describing the work of that group.

Everyone's comfortable with that?

VOICES: Yes.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Great.

MR. CHU: Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: So at this point, just pivoting off of what Joe said, would it be helpful for me to outline at least my understanding of the discussion that you had about moving forward with the next phase of work, organizing into some work groups, and developing some other related processes to go into this next phase of work?

I'm intentionally avoiding calling that a work plan because I think that's part of what is confusing people like Joe. And maybe what we need to do is agree that breaking -- organizing around these six elements or components or work flows, whatever you want to call them, that you are comfortable with that and people are -- have volunteered to work on some of those things and give Joe a chance to circulate his diagram or roadmap and have some further discussion after this meeting about some of the implications of

that.

Does that make sense to people?

VOICE: Uh-huh.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. So this is what I captured and you'll need to correct me if I got it wrong. One work group that was proposed and was discussion around and I think some interest in pursuing is a work group that would focus on the -- developing options for the regional ocean action plan.

And that would include scoping out what that action plan could look like, what it would contain, the time line associated with producing it, all those kinds of options. And by time line, I mean 2017 or 2016 and what you can achieve in those different time frames. This group would develop ideas and options for full RPB consideration.

And, Karen, you volunteered to lead that.

Kevin, you noted that NOAA should be

participating in that.

Laura McKay is putting her hand up right now. Thank you, Laura.

MR. PABST: And EPA.

MS. CANTRAL: And EPA. All right. And BOEM.

All right. So moving along, and this is great if -- as I'm going through these and you want to do what those individuals just did and put your hand up, we can note that. And I'm also going to be cognizant of we're not going to walk away with a fully populated group around each one of these, but we at least got a start.

The next one is the -- a working group that would focus on the connections to the estuaries, bays, and coasts. And Andy Zemba and Doug Pabst agreed to volunteer to co-lead that group and we'll need some colleagues to assist them.

Again, remember this is -- what we're imagining these groups would be members, RPB members and alternates and staff, so you can, as Mo likes to say, reach back into your agencies and identify people who can help and are -- have the appropriate expertise.

MS. SHULTZ: Can I --

MS. CANTRAL: You can.

MS. SHULTZ: Yeah. Catherine McCall before she left asked me to let you know that she wants to serve on the bays and connections one.

MS. CANTRAL: Great.

MS. MCKAY: And DNR.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Excellent.

It's coming together. VOICE:

MS. CANTRAL: Yes, Kevin.

MR. CHU: We'll find the right NOAA person for that.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. All right. The next one that we talked about is moving forward with inter-jurisdictional coordination. This is what we're describing and the co-leads were suggesting is not a working group that would take this on, at least not yet, but that the co-leads working with Meridian would suggest to you a process for moving forward with figuring out that dimension of the planning process, working closely with the folks in the northeast who are a little bit farther ahead as you heard from Nick, and that that would be how we would proceed with that particular element.

So this was really -- some of this is DVD, but acknowledging that it's an important dimension of the planning process and something that this region needs to at least get started on.

Folks comfortable with that? Laura.

MS. MCKAY: I am, but are we also going to

include the south Atlantic, too, just look at the border to the south as well?

MS. CANTRAL: Yes. The reason I said the northeast is because they are mobilized around the --

MR. ATANGAN: When they get organized.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah, when they get organized. Absolutely.

All right. So then the next one is the data

-- the MARCO data portal and the mapping and data team

that I can never remember quite the right words for.

MS. MCKAY: MARCO ocean mapping data team.

MS. CANTRAL: Ocean mapping data team. And we -- Laura put up a slide that had membership and some gaps from federal agency participation and we had some volunteers during our discussion including Mar Ad and DOE -- Megan had to leave -- and USDA.

MS. MCKAY: And Kelsey is going to find --

MS. CANTRAL: Kelsey is going to find, yes.

Thank you.

MR. CHU: And I will be your DOD --

MS. MCKAY: And (indiscernible).

MS. CANTRAL: All right.

MR. CHU: And -- I'm sorry.

MS. CANTRAL: Yes.

MR. CHU: Laura, if you could just make Renee the EPA person. We'll just have one person instead of just --

MS. MCKAY: Okay. Thanks.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. The next one is the regional ocean assessment and we just had a very good discussion and I think some clarity about how that group is going to proceed post haste and be working over the summer.

And then the final one in this lineup is the stakeholder engagement strategy and we have acknowledged a few things. There was a group that

organized around communications and messaging that then acknowledged that a more complete stakeholder strategy is appropriate, put forth some ideas, and we had discussion about that this afternoon.

The stakeholder engagement is a critical part of this process and it's the responsibility of everyone around this table to be part of that process.

And we still need some people to be thinking about and driving that process.

So we didn't talk about populating that group yet and that -- so that remains something that needs some further discussion. If anybody has any thoughts about that now or if we're taking that into our next --

VOICE: I think we pick that up at the next meeting.

MS. CANTRAL: Yeah. Okay. Mike.

MR. LUISI: What I'll say is as far as the

council participation among these work groups, I can't speak for the executive director of the council as to whether or not his staff are going to be able to participate.

But I will bring all of this back. I think that the two that would fit most closely would maybe be the regional ocean assessment and the stakeholder group given the work that they do with the data to put together the amendments to our plans and the stakeholder interaction.

So I'll be following back up next time about that. Thanks.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Great.

MS. BORNHOLDT: And just as a note, I really want to put the hard press on John Bull. I guess he has this kind of work in his resume. And so maybe we can get him to kind of as a new member with fresh ideas to pull up the work that has already been done

and maybe can kind of wrangle this. So just as a kind of a little nudge.

MS. MCKAY: Okay. I'm not sure what background work you're talking about. His background is actually as a reporter. Is that what you mean for stakeholder engagement?

MS. BORNHOLDT: Yeah, communications.

MS. MCKAY: Okay.

MS. BORNHOLDT: Right.

MS. MCKAY: But I had just a quick clarification for Mike. Do you think someone from the council would want to be on the ocean mapping data team or do you think just those two that you mentioned would be sufficient?

MR. LUISI: Well, yeah. Why not?

MS. MCKAY: Okay.

MR. LUISI: I'm going to mention all of it.

MS. CANTRAL: Okay. Joe.

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY
Court Reporting and Litigation Support
Serving Maryland, Washington, and Virginia
410-766-HUNT (4868)

1-800-950-DEPO (3376)

MR. LUISI: I'm making a lot of friends.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. So that's my summary of the next phase of work as you discussed it today and where we are with that. So does that make sense? Are people comfortable?

VOICE: Yeah.

MS. CANTRAL: There are obviously a lot of unanswered questions and we're going to need to go back and, you know, do some further discussion in bringing -- organize the next discussion to have on the teleconference and on and on. This is an iterative process. But I think this seems like a good set of steps forward.

What else do we need to cover before I summarize just a few of the highlights of this meeting?

MS. MCKAY: Did we do the -- sorry. Have we already covered regional ocean assessment? Is that

the --

MS. CANTRAL: We did. No, we did cover that. That was the --

MS. MCKAY: So that's -- so it's staying with Kevin and Sarah.

MS. CANTRAL: Anything else?

MR. ZEMBA: Are we thinking next face-to-face full meeting November, December time frame? I thought I heard someone say that.

MS. CANTRAL: Yes, that's correct.

All right. Anything else?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Well, then just -let me just hit a few highlights of what happened
during this meeting the last couple of days.

The Mid-Atlantic regional planning body approved its framework for regional ocean planning.

That framework identified goals and objectives and the

work going forward will be organized all toward meeting those goals and objectives.

You heard about important activities that are underway in the Mid-Atlantic region related to ocean energy, ocean habitats, and shipping and navigation and defense related activities, heard very helpful public input and comment that was -- is critical to the process.

And then as we just summarized in these last few minutes, explored the next phase of work moving on into realizing what has been articulated as a vision and goals and objectives that are contained in the framework.

So that was a lot of work over the course of two long days. And to underscore things that Doug said a moment ago, your commitment to this work and the passion and the expertise that you bring is impressive. And we very much appreciate your active

engagement and those of you -- I mean, speaking of active engagement and willingness to hang in there in two long days, thanks to those of you who are with us. It's very much appreciated and essential and important to have your input and your expertise.

So that's all I have to say as the facilitator. I will hand it over to the co-leads for any closing thoughts.

MS. SHULTZ: Again, I just -- I want -- really want to thank everyone for coming. It's so much easier to be productive and have a good dialogue when you can see the faces and the expressions. So I'm hoping that as often as we can, we can kind of try to have these in-person meetings. And I just -- I do think it was very productive. I want to thank everyone for their contributions.

MS. CANTRAL: Kelsey.

MS. LEONARD: Well, I just want to say thank

you. Like Gwynne said as well, I really enjoyed my first RPB meeting. I've gotten to know a lot of you by phone, so it was nice to put names and voices to faces. And I look forward to the work that we're going to be able to accomplish. And on behalf of my nation, thank you and look forward to working with you.

MS. BORNHOLDT: And I guess I can say to all the new members, welcome and we've hit the ground running. We waited for all this work to be done for you to arrive. And thank you for those of us who are not necessarily the new members because we wouldn't be here without you guys. So really appreciate everybody who hung on. And, again, the work that we've done these past two days, we should really feel very, very good about it. Thank you.

MS. CANTRAL: All right. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the aboveentitled meeting was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY

I, DAVID RITCHEY, the officer before whom the foregoing testimony was taken, do hereby certify

that the testimony of said parties was taken by me by stenomask means and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; that said testimony is a true record of the testimony given by said parties; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this testimony is taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

This certification is expressly withdrawn and denied upon the disassembly or photocopying of the foregoing transcript of the proceedings or any part thereof, including exhibits, unless said disassembly or photocopying is done by the undersigned court reporter and/or under the auspices of Hunt Reporting Company, and the signature and original seal is attached thereto.

DAVID RITCHEY
Notary Public in and for
the State of Maryland

My Commission Expires: