

Northeast Regional Planning Body Meeting Transcript

January 22-23, 2014

January 22, 2014

Laura Cantral: All right, Joe, are we on? Okay, can folks hear me? Do I sound like I'm on? I can't tell. All right, I'm Laura Cantral, I'm the Facilitator for this meeting, and would like to welcome you on behalf of the Northeast Regional Planning Body to its third in-person public meeting.

We're very glad that you're here and that you're able to bear with us as we deal with the challenges associated with the weather and rearranged our agenda for today, just a little bit, which I will tell you about here shortly. But before doing that, I would like to invite the Northeast RBP's Tribal Co-Lead, Richard Getchell, to offer a Tribal Blessing to get us started. Rick?

Tribal Blessing Richard Getchell, Aroostock Band of Micmac Indians

Richard Getchell: Thank you everybody. Hopefully no one had any problems arriving. Basically I'm going to give a blessing in Micmac. I'll translate it in English, something very short and direct. [Micmac] In Heaven, [Micmac] honor [Micmac], hold us strong, [Micmac] this day.

This is a blessing we usually give on all our events within our tribe. I handed out today to all the RBP, on behalf of the Tribal RBP members, tobacco. It's not tobacco in the sense that you think. It's medicine. It's a demonstration of our culture. When we attend meetings, we ask for input. It's customary for us to offer tobacco. This tobacco actually was grown on Tribal property by Tribal hands, Tribal youth, and it's called medicine to our native peoples.

It's medicine because it has sage, sweet grass, cedar, tobacco mixes, ashes from our first sacred fire. And on behalf of the RBP Tribal, we present tobacco to every individual here to give—it's the best that we can give, and in return, we want the best that each participant can give. Thank you.

Introductions and Agenda Review | Laura Cantral, Meridian Institute

Laura Cantral: Thank you, Rick. Just one detail for those of you around the table and mic'ed. The mics are live; you don't have to do anything to mute it or to turn it on. Joe, in the back of the room, is managing that, and you're on and set to go. So you might want to keep that in mind if you've got papers in front of the mic or anything that might cause some interference.

Now, I want to tell you about the agenda that we have in mind for this meeting, and how we've rearranged or compressed some of the time to accommodate our later start time. But before I do that, I'd like to go around the table and do a round of introductions, who among the RPB is with us today.

So Betsy, why don't we start with you, and we'll just go all the way around, come back to me, and I'll do an agenda review. And I'm Laura Cantral, if you didn't hear that before. I'm the facilitator.

Betsy Nicholson: Hi, Betsy Nicholson, representing the Department of Commerce. I'm with NOAA.

Grover Fugate: I'm Grover Fugate. I'm the Coastal Program Manager for the State of Rhode Island.

Paul Diodati: And I'm Paul Diodati, representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and I'm Director of the State's Division Marine Fisheries.

Doug Grout: I'm Doug Grout, I'm representing the New England Fisheries Management Council.

Vera Francis: My name is Vera Francis. [Inaudible]. I'm representing the Passamaquoddy, Pleasant Point, Maine.

Katie Lund: Hi, Katie Lund, Executive Secretary for the Regional Planning Body.

Susan Whalen: I'm Susan Whalen, I'm the Deputy Commissioner for Environmental Conservation at the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection.

Chris Thompsett: Chris Thompsett, representing the Department of Defense for the U.S. Navy.

Ames Colt: Good afternoon, I'm Ames Colt, here on behalf of DM Director Janet Coit from the State of Rhode Island. Kathleen Leyden: Good morning everyone. My name is Kathleen Leyden, and I work for Maine's Coastal Zone Management Program, and I'm representing Commissioner Walt Whitcomb of the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry.

Barbara Miller: Hi, I'm Barbara Miller. I'm here representing the United States Department of Agriculture, and from the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Brian Thompson: Hi, I'm Brian Thompson from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. I'm the Coastal Program Manager.

Jed Flumignan: Good morning, everybody. I'm Jed Flumignan. I'm representing the Department of Transportation. I'm with the Maritime Administration.

Nick Napoli: Hi, Nick Napoli, Staff.

John Weber: John Weber, Staff.

Dan Hubbard: Dan Hubbard from the First Coast Guard District. I'm the Chief of Maritime Energy and Replanning.

Tom Burack: Tom Burack, Commissioner of Nature Department of Environmental Services.

Sharri Venno: Sharri Venno, I work for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians as an Environmental Planner. They are located in Northern Maine.

Chuckie Green: Chuckie Green, Assistant Natural Resource Director for the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe.

Meredith Mendelson: And Meredith Mendelson. I'm the Deputy Commissioner of the Maine Department of Marine Resources, here on behalf of Commissioner Pat Keliher.

Mel Côté: Thanks, Meredith. Mel Côté with EPA at U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I. I manage ocean and coastal programs for New England.

Ingrid Irigoyen: Ingrid Irigoyen with Meridian Institute, and I'm taking notes.

Bob LaBelle: Bob LaBelle, I'm representing the Department of the Interior. I'm with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

Bruce Carlisle: Hi, good afternoon. Bruce Carlisle, also representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I'm Director of the State's Office of Coastal Zone Management.

Rick Getchell: I'm Rick Getchell, former Micmac Chief, Northern Maine, Co-Lead for the RPB and All Nations Consulting.

Laura Cantral: All right, great. It's very good to see you all. I think there are two or three people who may be joining us later today or tomorrow who are still trying to get here due to weather complications. Let me just say a few things about our agenda. And for those of you joining us from the public, we provided copies of a revised agenda. RPB members, you should also have the revised agenda that reflects the one o'clock start time, and some of the sequencing of our sessions that I'm going to review right now.

Even though we've, as a result of starting in the afternoon instead of this morning, we've compressed primarily some of our opening introductory sessions. The objectives for this meeting are still the same. And we're confident that with the time that we have today and tomorrow, that the RPB can still have the discussions that it needs to have, hear from those of you who have comments to share during any of the three public comment sessions that we have built into this meeting, that the RPB can meet those objectives.

So let me share with you what they are. The objectives for this meeting are first, to provide updates on RBP activities that have been underway since the last in-person meeting in April of

2013. Second, and at the heart of this meeting, is to review the draft framework document, and in that review, to do three things. First, to reflect on public input into that framework, both comments that have been submitted in writing in advance of this meeting, and also during the public comment sessions that we built into the meeting.

And I should note—I meant to do this earlier—there are a few comments that we received just over the last 24 hours since we put the materials together for you members, and we have put them in your binders, so we want to make sure that you are aware that there's a small handful of comments that you might not have had a chance to review, and they're in your materials. So reflecting on public input.

Second thing we want to do at this draft framework is identify any needed refinements to and approve the draft goals and objectives that were presented and discussed at the last RPB in-person meeting. And then third, to discuss, identify, refinements and next steps related to the actions that are presented in this draft framework document. These are the activities, the timelines, the capacities needed to take some actions towards addressing the objectives and meeting the goals that are outlined, and that we're hoping that you all will approve during this meeting. So that's really the core of this meeting, and the focus of the agenda.

And you'll see that the sessions are organized around that. But the third objective, important objective—always important for the public meetings, the in-person RPB meetings, and other opportunities to engage with the RPB is to provide opportunity for public input, both during this formal session and these public comment sessions, and also during a formal discussion opportunity to meet with RPB members over some refreshing beverages at the end of the day that we'll be inviting you to join us for upstairs in the top floor of the hotel.

So those are the objectives. And bear with me, because I want to do a rundown of the agenda and make sure that you know what we're going to be spending our time on today and then tomorrow. In just a moment, I'm going to turn to the co-leads to provide some opening remarks and some updates on some other activities that have been underway.

And then we're going to turn to some of the State members representing the New England states that are a part of the RPB to provide summaries of their stakeholder engagement activities and the themes related to input that they've received as a result of those forums.

After that, we will provide an overview. I'll ask John and Nick to give you a walkthrough of the draft framework. These are the—this framework contains the three goals, again, discussed at the last meeting, the objectives also discussed at the last meeting related to those three goals, and then the further detail about how you as a Regional Planning Body can start to undertake work to further inform your process as it moves forward.

So we'll hear an overview about the draft framework, and then we're going to go into a sequence of discussing each of the three goals. That's going to sound familiar, because we're going to do it that same way all—for each goal. And it's going to be like this. We're going to start the discussion this afternoon of the goal that's related to effective decision-making.

We'll have some RPB initial discussion about that goal and related objectives, actions, et cetera, and then we're going to pause the discussion and invite public comment. We'll have a 60 minute session scheduled for public comment, and then we're going to come back as an RPB, we'll resume the discussion of that goal and the related objectives. And I won't keep repeating all of that.

The reason for this sequencing is because the RPB is committed to identifying as many opportunities for meaningful public input as it can, and as you know—and those of you who have been to these meetings before are aware—there's a certain structure that we need to maintain for this meeting to enable the RPB to have the discussion it needs to have.

So we've designed the public input, the public comment sessions for this meeting, to be in the middle of a discussion to provide an opportunity, for those of you who want to comment, to provide your comment on that particular topic while it's underway. The members will be listening to these comments and can factor your feedback into the discussion as it resumes.

So we invite you and encourage you to sign up for a comment session that's tailored to one of these goals, to a topic, that you want to provide input on. But you're welcome to comment on anything you want to during any session. So you're not precluded; it's just that we're trying to enable some real-time opportunity for your input to be factored into the discussion that's going to be happening here today around the RPB table.

So that's what we'll do today. We'll start the discussion of the goal related to effective decision-making, we'll pause for public comment. After the comment session, we'll take a quick break; by then we'll need one. Then we'll come back and resume the discussion about effective decision-making. That will take us through today when we'll be inviting you to the reception, and I'll give you the details on the logistics of that later.

We'll start—I'm almost done—we'll start tomorrow morning at nine a.m. with some welcoming remarks from some Massachusetts officials who obviously are our host state for this meeting. We'll then resume the discussion of the draft frame working, taking up the goal related to healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems. Same format. Start the discussion, pause for public comment, resume the discussion.

Then we'll take a lunch break, we'll come back for the afternoon, and we'll start the afternoon session with an update of activities related to off-shore wind energy development, and discuss the relationship between those activities and regional ocean planning, and how regional ocean planning in this forum may be of value to that set of activities, and what that might suggest.

Then we'll be back to a discussion of the framework, finishing with the third goal, the goal related to compatibility among past, current, and future ocean uses. Again, same drill—start that discussion, third of our three public comment sessions, resume the discussion, wrap it up, summarize next steps, and then we're done.

So I hope that sounds clear, and thank you for letting me belabor that sequence. But I wanted you to understand the method to our madness of structuring the dialog so that you as people in the audience have an opportunity to provide your input while those discussions are happening. Again, those will also be taken into consideration as our process moves forward.

All right, any questions about the agenda? Did I cover that all right? All right, so at this point then, I think I am ready to turn it over to the co-leads for some remarks and updates.

Opening Remarks and Overview of RPB Progress | Grover Fugate, Rhode Island Coastal Resource Management Council and NE RPB State Co-Lead; Richard Getchell, Aroostock Band of Micmac Indians and NE RPB Tribal Co-Lead; Betsy Nicholson, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and NE RPB Federal Co-Lead

Betsy Nicholson: All right. Welcome. Good afternoon everyone. On behalf of my co-leads, Grover Fugate and Rick Getchell, I'd like to welcome our government colleagues here today, and all the folks that have made a big effort to get here despite the weather, to be interested and involved in ocean planning here in New England. Your presence here is a testament to the importance of this initiative. So no, I didn't quite get the forecast right, but I came pretty close. Hey, at least we're not shut down like our colleagues to the south. All right, so nothing will stop this meeting from happening.

So just a few quick remarks. Let's remember why we're here, and remember that this is an effort—this effort presents a unique opportunity to step back and evaluate how we can better work together across government in a transparent way to make more—to more effectively protect our ocean and coastal ecosystems, economies, and communities.

Let's keep ourselves on task to make sure that we're moving forward as a community of New Englanders in a way that ensures that our future ocean decisions reflect the values of this region. This meeting is an opportunity to ground truth where we're going.

Second point is an acknowledgement that these are challenging budget times, and I really appreciate this group's perseverance toward achieving progress on the issues that are most important to us in this region. We still have gaps in our capacity, and this is the time to think about how we're going to work together to fill those, an opportunity to raise our hands today and tomorrow to make sure that that happens.

And finally, I just want to say that this January meeting really represents a critical halfway mark, if you will, where we can take stock of where we've been, what we've heard—very important—and in the seven months of comments and revisions around our goals and objectives, and begin to discuss details about where we're going, and move forward boldly.

It should be stated and restated that much of this work will evolve in 2014 through many opportunities with this regional planning body, our agencies, the interested public in this room, critical partners, and the folks not here with us today, and we look forward to talking about all of

these opportunities with you today and tomorrow to hear your feedback and additional ideas on how you want to be involved going forward.

So I'm going to—I think I'm going to move forward with a quick national update. So the tagline here is that we are not alone. There are four regions that have begun their work toward developing a regional ocean plan. The Northeast, the Mid-Atlantic, the Caribbean, and the Pacific. There have been some changes in leadership of the National Ocean Council that I wanted to make you aware of, if you weren't.

The NOC, the National Ocean Council, is charged with providing helpful guidance to the regional planning bodies, and most importantly, to continue to engage the leadership of the over a dozen federal agencies that are held accountable to this executive order to implement the National Ocean Policy.

I also want to acknowledge someone here today. Darin Babrott has just left his position down as Director of the National Ocean Council after, I think it was two years? It felt like five. Two years. Two years as Director, and I want to take this opportunity publically to thank him for his support and leadership from D.C. This initiative very much benefited from your New England practical perspective, and just to note that with his departure, Brad Moran, who is originally from URI, actually, is serving at the interim until a new Director is selected. So thank you, again, Darin, for your service. And welcome back. And we want to hear your public comment, because you can say whatever you want now.

I also wanted to mention, lastly, that I had the opportunity to brief the NOC steering committee in early January on our progress here in the Northeast. They are very genuinely interested and supportive of our direction, and understands that the draft framework that I've shown them will continue to evolve as we continue our work.

So it's very important, and it's my job as Federal Co-Lead to keep them apprised of our progress so we get the support we need in this planning phase and very, very importantly as we go into implementation, so that we get the support we need to carry this plan and its products and our vision forward.

Okay, timeline. So here is the timeline that we put together actually at the beginning of this process. I just want to reorient folks as to where we are now. We are in phase two. We've made great progress, and we may need to revisit the end of the timeline here. It may be more like early 2016 when we complete a plan.

But to note, that this is, again, not the end of the work. We're not here to set arbitrary deadlines, but rather to use this planning process to move us forward into a space where we can work differently and more effectively together. And you will hear much more detail from John and Nick on the milestones and the timeline over the next two years as this work is shaped by all of us here in this room.

Grover, you're up for operational.

Grover Fugate: Okay, as many of you are aware—and first of all, I'd like to thank all the RPB members that have been diligently participating in the process as we've been going forward, particularly the calls as full RPB members going through this process, trying to get more comfort with the goals and objectives that are out there and continuing to move us forward.

So we, ourselves, the Secretary that has been engaged in biweekly calls to try to get these topics moving and to move forward, to provide some guidance to staff as they start to work through this. There's also been, as I indicated, a full session RPB calls as we get into more of the meat of the process here that we've been working on. There have been a series of work groups that have been established, and we will continue as per established more as we go forward.

This is—I think you have to keep in mind that this needs to be a very flexible and dynamic process that we're working with, because we can't necessarily control the schedule of everything that's out there. But the work groups have been already stood up. They're starting to look at some of the issues in terms of engagement with other parties, such as the fishermen, the marine industries groups, those types of things that are being put out there.

And there are RPB members on all these. We do now have a signed charter that is in operation, and the official members aren't here, but they're identified in our packet here as to who would like to be here but is not here today.

Laura Cantral: Are we ready for Rick? Yeah.

Rick Getchell: Basically we have come up with a Tribal Coordinator position. That position was to increase engagement of Tribal members, participate in work groups tasked to achieve our priorities that we extracted, and support travel to our meetings and workshops as we move forward in the next year.

When we came down, we had a pre-meeting for the Tribal RPB to discuss the timelines, the work that we've done to date, what we're looking at in the next year. And also we looked at targeting existing communications meetings, joining in with EPA, other agencies that have a lot of data and work in the same areas as the Tribal initiatives.

We also were very successful in getting together with our conference calls and extracting our comments and our goals, objectives, and our actions, and being able to come up with a timeframe. So we've done really well this year, look forward to the next year, and hopefully get to the implementation phase.

Grover Fugate: Okay, this is the timeline that I think a lot of you are already familiar with. We had started out with our April meeting. We have been looking at the goals. The goals have been out and on the website for public comment. We have received public comment on those. There's been further iteration and refinement of that.

Obviously today we're here to receive public comment again on those goals, as well as the written comment that we've already received, and we're hoping to continue the discussion,

obviously, of that, and move into greater detail in terms of the objectives, and then how do we actually formalize some of those objectives into some actions that we can actually start to see some meat on these bones.

And there have been a series of advisory meetings that are ongoing. The states have engaged, obviously, in this process, as well as an Officiary Council, and we are here today to look at a fairly significant document.

A lot of discussion I think is going to occur as to the content in this document, but there has been a lot of tremendous work that you all have been participating in and moving forward to get us to this point, and I think you ought to be congratulated, because this is an immense amount of work given the work that we all have to do on a daily basis to engage in. Something of this significant is truly an accomplishment. So once again, thank you.

Betsy Nicholson: Lastly, we just wanted to share some updates on communication and engagement. And again, this is on page five of the framework, the draft framework document that lays this out. But just to remind you that we have a few considerations that we've—sort of principals of engagement you could call them, as we outlined our strategy.

The first, this must be an open, transparent, and efficient process that involves a whole portfolio of different ways to engage. That stakeholder engagement activities must be practically designed to maximize resources and people's time, to respect people's time. And third, and very importantly, that stakeholder engagement needs to evolve over time.

As we said before, we're at this sort of point in time where we are looking to approve the goals and objectives and move forward into detail, and what's ahead of us is going to require different types of engagement than we've done before. And that is part of what we'd like everyone's input on here.

So let's see. In terms of what's coming up, very excited about a new website that I think is going to do a much better job of communicating what's going on, where we're headed, and how to get involved than we've done to date. There is a big button that says "Get Involved" on the new website. Please click on it. There's a demo that's going to be going on of the website in the hall, so please check that out.

And we have fact sheets and social media, and a lot of other types of ways to communicate that we've been working hard on. There will continue to be project-specific engagement, of course. You're going to hear a lot more detail about this as John and Nick walk us through goal-by-goal. It's just all throughout this draft work plan. We're going to continue with the data portal development.

Again, I hope you walked by the—it's live and running for your enjoyment out there in terms of just playing around with it, seeing what it does. We're very excited about the data portal in that it's starting—speaking of engagements, it's starting to get a lot of use. There are up to about 5,000 unique visitors a month that we've tracked in terms of who this portal is—who is using it.

And interesting, you might wonder, well, what are they going for? What layers seem to be most popular?

And their energy is the hot button in terms of off-shore title hydrokinetic projects, the University of Maine wind turbine test project, all kinds of marine transportation data layers, bird habitats, et cetera. So it's interesting to look at the top ten of what's sort of interesting people out there. This spring we will be having, again, as we talk through the detail of each goal, you will see this. Lots and lots and lots of opportunity for workshops.

Essentially, again, what this whole document tees up is it sets the table for a discussion to happen that lays out the timeline for when those discussions are going to happen, and they will all be public discussions, and how you can all be engaged. So we're looking forward to workshops as soon as this spring for really digging into topic-specific input.

We are, as I said in our—as we evolve going forward, we need to start assembling some technical experts, absolutely, around these topics. We have enough definition now, with our goals and objectives, to understand in general what we want to tackle. It's time to build that bench of experts, of particularly non-government folks to become involved in this whole series of workshops in particular.

And finally, there's going to be a couple of more meetings, hopefully in June and November—we're being very aggressive this year—to make sure that we have a couple of big decisions coming forward for the RPB, as well as a whole other round of public meetings all over the region this fall. And again, more workshops for feedback on progress under every goal. So we'll turn it over to John and Nick shortly, but you're going to hear a lot of detail. And just listen to the opportunities to engage, because we very much want you involved.

Laura Cantral: Great, thank you very much. That's it from co-leads for now. So we're going to turn now to hear some brief report outs from some of our state members on the stakeholder engagements that have been happening in each of the five states.

And I don't know what the orchestration is on this. I just have you in order, going—starting with Kathleen, and going on down the geography. You guys don't have any different order in mind, did you? Is that okay? All right, so Kathleen, I'm going to turn it over to you, and then we'll go Tom, Bruce, Grover, and Brian. Okay? No. He's turning you up. Try again.

Kathleen Leyden: Is that better

Laura Cantral: Yeah.

Summary of State-Led Approaches to Stakeholder Engagement and Input Gathered to Date | Kathleen Leyden, State of Maine; Thomas Burack, State of New Hampshire; Bruce Carlisle, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Grover Fugate, State of Rhode Island; Brian Thompson, State of Connecticut

Kathleen Leyden: Okay, great. Thanks to the organizers of the meeting and the co-leads for doing so much work in preparation of this meeting, and being very flexible around the meeting scheduling with the weather. In Maine, we have formed what we're calling an advisors group, an Ocean Advisors Group, whose job is to provide feedback to Meredith Mendelson and I as to how we can best represent folks' interests in these meetings.

We've committed to meet periodically before and after RPB meetings in a way that hopefully isn't too taxing on people's schedules and our ability to keep up with it. We have about 30 people who were asked to participate on the advisory committee. We think we have a pretty good cross-sectorial composition of the group. We tried to keep it manageable in size.

We've had a couple of requests from folks who wanted to join the group, and we've accommodated that. We have had one meeting so far, face-to-face, in October, and that meeting proved very challenging because the folks were kind of split, one-third, one-third, one-third, with equal portions of people saying, "I have no idea what this is. I need more background information," to, "I'm somewhat informed," and other people who are really actively engaged in the process.

So we didn't get very far in that first meeting in reviewing the actual goals and objectives document. We did follow-up with a survey. We had a little bit more than half of our group respond to that, and I'm just going to give some highlights here.

So I'm hoping that the main folks in the audience can fill in when it's the public comment time and then I'll turn to Meredith as well to see if I've forgotten anything that really stands out. I have a limited amount of time here. There is a written piece in the briefing book. We also have made the detailed survey results available to John Webber. So folks, you should know that your detailed comments have been forwarded.

We also, as a caveat, because the full document with the action plan didn't come out until about a week ago, we did not have the benefit of getting folks' input to that, and I would expect that there's going to be more of that today during the public comment session. The good news, I think, for the RPB, is that our survey was organized first around the goals, and specific question was will these outcomes be useful to you or other main sectors?

And then we went on to the actions, and are these the most important next steps under the topic area? Roughly, on each of those things, about a quarter of the respondents disagreed, but three-quarters of the respondents said yes. But it was a, "Yes, but..." followed by more specific comments.

And just to highlight a few things—and again, I’m rolling these up—there still is a real lack of clarity about what the process is, what form the plan might take, how does it benefit people, and folks are really telling us that our ability to engage and keep stakeholders engaged is going to be compromised if we don’t reach some clarity around that. Not that there’s going to be finalization of that, but I think if we could give some examples of what some things that might end up in a plan or what the plans typically look like, and how people benefit from that.

The planning area is still really broad. People tend to think locally and not regionally, so there are continually a lot of questions about how is this work going to affect a certain mid-coast dredging project, or another project du jour that’s high-profile. I think folks think that the RPB is a little bit out ahead of stakeholders in terms of that goal, number one, and the focus on sand and gravel, ocean energy, and off-shore aquaculture.

And I’m forgetting if there were more things than that. They wonder how we got there, what did they miss along the way? They point to existing uses, and the specific articulation that the plan is going to protect, consider existing uses as a priority that they see lacking in the document.

The commitment level on the part of federal agencies to use information and how they’re going to use it and how the information in the data portal is going to affect decision-making is really important to people. I think in the charter, we kind of stepped back because we were at the very beginning in saying we weren’t sure how we were going to commit.

But again, it affects folks’ ability to engage if there is not a clear articulation of the commitment. There were many comments about community level data, user data, non-profit organization data, that government isn’t the only entity that holds data, and people want to be involved. The idea of increasing coordination should not mean that there is regulatory streamlining, inadequate attention to environmental reviews.

Stakeholder engagement, I know people have been satisfied with the process to date, and we’ve heard some comments about the timing of the action plan, the document being released a week before the meeting.

I think hopefully we’ll hear more suggestions on how we can improve that. So we’re walking the walk or whatever that saying is. We need to be sensitive to going out to user groups and asking for data more than once. I think—yeah, I’ll just leave it at that.

Funding, with limited funding, how are we going to address the myriad data gaps that we have, particularly in Maine. If you see some of the regional data sets, there’s—we are lacking some of the data in Maine.

There’s a lot of emphasis on working waterfronts and coastal dependent communities in Maine, because of lack of other economic opportunities in our smaller fishing-dependent towns. There’s very much of an emphasis on the fact that we need to look at a community level. Coastal land and riverine data, and things like water quality. There is an increased call to include that in

the scope of the work. I think there needs to be more clarity. We've heard there needs to be more clarity about this document. These are steps along the way to creating a plan. There is—I think this depends on how you approach a planning process or planning issue, but there were a few comments about the data. We should be really clear about what questions we're asking of the data, and why we're collecting certain pieces of data or data sets.

Let's see. So some examples of questions we would ask the data, what do we hope to learn, what decisions do we want the characterizations to help us make?

And I think that I may stop there, actually. Pardon me while I'm just looking over my notes here. I think I covered what I had to say. Meredith, do you have anything to add there? Did I miss anything? And again, this is a roll-up, so please be aware that we have the detailed comments. There were a lot of really good suggestions in there, really creative and constructive suggestions.

Laura Cantral: Right. Thanks, Kathleen. And I think that it's probably fair to say that for each of these report-outs, it will be the same thing. You're trying to summarize in five minutes or so what is a lot of input, and very good and detailed comments.

And Tom, before I turn to you, I also failed to say that what we'd like to do with this session, we're still just trying to get through a lot of summarizing information and updates, and getting ready for more extended dialog. So at the end of hearing from all five states, we'll ask for any quick clarifying questions, but not have an extended dialog, and save that for later, if that's okay.

Kathleen Leyden: I need to add one more thing that I didn't mention, and that is there is a lot of interest to sit down with scientists, academics, in a way that so we're not just having government folks at the table in working groups, but for the rest of the different ocean sectors and interested groups to be involved in an active way in workgroups, and an additional call to perhaps have a standing regional advisory committee, and have members of user groups involved in a science advisory committee as well.

Laura Cantral: Right. Thank you, Kathleen. Tom?

Tom Burack: Great, thank you. In New Hampshire, we were able to take advantage of a December 18th meeting of the Division of Ports and Harbors Advisory Council, and I will be the first to acknowledge that I had a last-minute conflict come up, and I was not able to be there, but fortunately, there were four members of the Council there.

I know Bob LaBelle was there, Dan Hubbard was there, Doug Grout was there, and Glenn Normando was there, our Division of Fish and Game, who sends his regrets, could not be here today. He has been otherwise detained by our legislature. But I think they had a very good discussion with the council members and some other members of the public who were there primarily from the profit organizations.

There are really three key themes that came out of the conversation as I understand it. One was simply folks looking to get a greater understanding of what this whole planning effort was really all about and whether there were regulatory implications to this effort, and my understanding is that those questions were satisfactorily answered.

We heard from commercial fishing representatives, that they really wanted to see greater transparency as well as more opportunity for them to be involved in developing the actual products that come out of this effort. The third thing that was heard was the belief that New Hampshire, although we're a small place, we should have a unified voice and opportunity to discuss these issues, and so the recommendation was made that we in fact created dedicated stakeholder advisory group rather than continue to take advantage of other existing groups.

And with the goal being to be with the ground truth data to provide input, and also to help guide the state RPB members in our decision-making and development of products. So we will take that to—that suggestion to heart, and we will be looking to form some kind of a new group or forum within New Hampshire to bring people together periodically to get exactly that kind of input and engagement.

In the meantime, I certainly want to encourage any New Hampshire folks who have an interest to either contact me directly or Glen Normando, our Director of Fish and Game, but also I know Ted Diers also is here somewhere from DES. Ted, if you want to wave your hand?

Ted is over here, my left, and Chris Williams, who works with Ted, all would be great points of contact if folks have ideas. We did hear some more specific ideas or thoughts on particular topics such as the effective decision-making goal, and again, really consistent with an earlier theme, and one that I think we've heard from Kathleen as well, which is a desire on the part of at least some folks to really be able to roll up their sleeves and engage in some fashion in making sure that the data collection process, as well as the products we develop, really have substantial input from the folks who were actually on the ocean and on the shore working in these arenas day in and day out, again, so that they can provide input and review on whether it's shipping issues, fishing issues, recreational boating, whatever it might be.

We have a lot of folks in New Hampshire who would be eager to, again, roll up their sleeves and get involved. So that's a quick summary of New Hampshire, and I don't know if any who were actually in the room at the time have anything to add. Did I miss anything, Doug? Bob?

Doug Grout: No, I think it's a good summary.

Tom Burack: Okay, great.

Laura Cantral: Thanks. And Bruce?

Bruce Carlisle: Great, hi, Bruce Carlisle again, from Massachusetts from the coastal program. And Paul Diodati, my partner in crime at Marine Fisheries, can chime in as well. Since 2008, with our

state's Ocean Act, we've gotten two consultative bodies that have been really instrumental in our state's ocean planning efforts.

And we've continued, since our release of our plan in 2009 and beyond, we've continued to meet with our ocean advisory commission and our science advisory council as really key stakeholders who cross both a topical distribution and a geographical distribution, and have been, I would say—and I'll let others speak to this—I would say extremely engaged, and very, I think, conversant in things ocean planning.

And I think that's just sort of a collective process that began some years ago. And we've taken the opportunity to have these discussions around the Northeast initiative at every one of the meetings that we've had since this thing got going, even before it got going. So we've had Betsy come and present, we've had John and Nick come and present. I've done updates all along. So this wasn't a sort of one and done type of thing. This is an ongoing sort of thematic two groups that we rely on.

So in addition to the public and stakeholder meetings that we did this summer, in the fall, we had a special meeting of the Ocean Advisory Commission and the Science Council and opened it up to other stakeholders and in-publics. And we had a good conversation around the goals and objectives. I think a lot of the themes that you heard from Maine and you heard from New Hampshire were also raised and resonated.

In particular, there were some ideas around effective decision-making, and I think encouragement to not make it federal-centric, to be certain that state decision-making was going to be assisted and streamlined. And beyond state. In Massachusetts, we have a lot of local home [inaudible], and we've got two regional county commissions who are actively engaged. And so that was a key theme that I took away from that.

And then again, similar with acknowledging a focus on some new ocean uses, off-shore energy, off-shore wind, off-shore aquaculture. We heard pretty loud and clear to pay close attention to existing uses and use patterns, and we heard that pretty loud and clear.

We heard a lot of support for continuing the work, collective work, that we do, not only at the state, but at the regional level, on characterizing our ocean ecosystems and ocean uses, but moving beyond that. And again, the theme, what are the products that are going to be developed, and how are those products going to be used. So some questions, and a push to really move beyond the characterization to identification of important areas and the treatment related to those. I guess the two last things that I'll raise as takeaways was some comments around the sort of socioeconomics of our ocean—in our ocean areas. So I think folks see the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystem, and they're really linking that back to the human benefits and the human drive uses from that and making sure that we're integrating that completely and fully into our work.

And then there was a, again, another theme around engaging with our NGO partners, our academic partners, a lot of the expertise that's in the area, and doing that in a meaningful way. So I

think those are some of the takeaways that we had. And Paul, I'm not sure if you want to add anything?

Paul Diodati: No, I'm okay.

Bruce Carlisle: Good.

Laura Cantral: All right, thank you, Bruce. Grover?

Grover Fugate: Okay. We have an existing—well, actually, several standing committees that continue to interact with our planning process that we were able to utilize. We have what's called a Fisherman's Advisory Board which has six members from Rhode Island and three from Massachusetts that represent various sectors.

We have a Habitat Advisory Board comprised of scientists and NGOs, and then we have a standing stakeholder group that has about 80 groups assigned to that. So when we engage, those are the people that typically would get an invitation, and then there's a general list serve that goes out to about another couple of hundred groups and individuals that are able and invited to participate.

We actually have had two meetings now. We had a general meeting very early on, on the goals and to get input on that, and actually Doug was there, Chris was there, Betsy, and myself, representing the RPB. There was a fairly decent group that showed up. The interesting thing, to me, was that it was people that we never even saw during our ocean planning process, but decided to come in on the regional process. So that was kind of interesting.

We had a subsequent follow-up when there was, again, more detail coming out in terms of some of the objectives. We had a much smaller group, but I was pleasantly surprised, a fairly decently representative group there to talk about the issues. Again, like the other states are indicating, I think that there was some discussion about the process and the talk concerning that.

We had some fairly decent representation from our fishery community there, so we heard a lot of talk about the fishery as well as several of the NGOs who are obviously concerned about some of the natural resource issues and those types of things.

The fishery groups are very interested in hearing more on how we're going to engage particularly the small-craft fishery, in-shore, fishery that we typically don't see represented on the mapping products that we're working on now in terms of, say, VMS, or VTR data groups, and how we are going to engage to bring those into the process.

And, there was also some discussion about some of the projects that were underway within our state, in terms of that, and how this would interface with that. And although interestingly enough, a couple of the groups brought up some of the climate change aspects and how this is going to start to deal and address climate change. Given that our baseline is changing, we're seeing shifting fisheries.

Several of the fisherman brought up that the crab industry is essentially burgeoning in our state, but there's no management structure to manage it right now, so there are those types of shifts that are occurring that they were curious as to how this process is going to address. Anyhow, that's a quick summary, but I think covers most of the major stuff. Then there are obviously detailed notes in your packet on the rest of it.

Laura Cantral: Brian?

Brian Thompson: Connecticut doesn't have a formal advisory board, but we did identify two venues through which we thought it would be appropriate to gather some input. One is a very informal group of interested stakeholders that has been having discussions for I guess a little over a year now about spatial planning within Long Island Sound, specifically, and so that group includes a couple of the environmental non-profit organizations in the state, as well as our Marine Trades Association.

So representation from a couple of different sectors, but it's a relatively small group. So we did a phone conference call with that group to gather some input, and then recognizing that we ought to have a more formal public sort of meeting, we did a tag-team meeting with our Connecticut Maritime Commission. That is a formal, state-established group of maritime interests, including port authorities, various state agencies, some of the terminal operators.

And so that meeting was held in December, did a presentation, and again, a fairly small group, but a somewhat different sector than was—than we hit through the conference call. So some of the comments—and again, they're in more detail in the package here, but there were questions about timeframe, and so what happens beyond the two years that we've identified in the timeline here within the work plan.

There was a recognition that there are existing data courses and information within Long Island Sound that would be useful in this larger regional effort, and conversely, that the information developed through the regional effort would be useful in Long Island Sound. But also a concern about resolution and scale that the—some of the data that we may have within Long Island Sound is at a much finer resolution than perhaps is being developed in the regional effort.

There was a recognition that social sciences is very important in the process. There's obviously a focus on data, but the outcomes and decisions are ultimately sort of based on human values and behavior, and that needs to be recognized. And finally, I would say there was concern—not concern; a strong suggestion that consideration should be given to sub-regional planning within Long Island Sound.

And I think similar to concerns or issues raised in some of the other states is this idea of what does it mean to Connecticut? What does this regional effort mean to Connecticut? How does it benefit the state? What is the interface between Long Island Sound, which is all state waters, no federal waters, and the federal activity in the regional effort.

So suggestion that a sub-regional effort may be appropriate to this Long Island Sound. And I will mention that there is discussion amongst the stakeholder group of pursuing some state-level authority for spatial planning within Connecticut, either through a legislative or administrative action to conduct and implement a Long Island Sound-specific spatial planning effort.

Laura Cantral: Great. All right, well, thank you. Thanks to all of our state representatives for those overviews. And as you heard, there were slightly different approaches across the five states, and you also heard a number of comments. There were common threads and themes that I think each of you five expressed.

Those themes are also—many of those themes are also reflected in comments that were submitted in writing, and I'm guessing are going to come up and be part of the discussions—or I hope are going to be part of the discussions—today and tomorrow, particularly with regard to stakeholder engagement.

You heard several suggestions and comments about that from the state meetings, and you also heard, as Betsy said, that stakeholder engagement needs to evolve. This process is evolutionary, and as it evolves, the stakeholder engagement and the nature of that needs to evolve along with it. So I said that I would just check in with you to see if anyone had specific clarifying questions for any of the five who gave a report out from their state stakeholder meetings or engagement efforts?

And I'd like to keep it limited to the clarifying questions, because I think any more than that, and we're going to be right into the discussion that we're going to have after we've heard from John and Nick about the overall framework and really get into the deliberation. So any clarifying questions for any of the five that we've heard from?

Betsy Nicholson: Really quick, besides New Hampshire, Tom, you mentioned that the state was interested in actually creating something new as opposed to what you tried the first time. Did that come up in any other state, or was that the only case where it seems like it's working?

Tom Burack: I think we're considering that. We need to create a new advisory body of some kinds. I think we're considering that, but haven't quite reached a conclusion on that.

Laura Cantral: Doug Grout?

Doug Grout: Yeah, just a clarification based on my take on the meeting is that I understood that the two organizations there, the Port Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Marine Fishery were interested in sort of potentially having maybe one meeting a year where they'd be the advisory group, because they have a broad base of—they have conservation organizations on it, commercial, recreational marine maritime groups on it.

There was an offer by this New England Ocean—I'm trying to get the name of the group. Action Network to also participate in such a meeting.

Laura Cantral: All right. Any other clarifying questions or comments? Also, I just want to ask, folks, can you hear us all right? It's hard for me to tell from here. You can hear? Yeah? All right, good. So John and Nick, I'm going to invite you to come up.

And while you're getting yourselves ready to do that—or maybe you're just going to stay where you are—but before I hand the mic over to you, I just want to be clear about the upcoming public comment session.

We have one scheduled today, two tomorrow. The one for today is scheduled for 3:15, to go from 3:15 to 4:15, and many of you who are interested have already signed up, but if you would like to offer public comment this afternoon, we ask that you please sign up at the registration desk by three o'clock so that we'll know who's interested, and we can figure out—you'll have two to three minutes depending on how many people sign up.

If you sign up and you change your mind, you just decide that you want to wait until tomorrow, or you don't want to offer a comment, that's fine too. If you want to sign up for all three, you're welcome to do that. We want to give you ample opportunity to provide your input. But that will come up at 3:15 today.

All right, John and Nick, I'm handing it to you.

Presentation of Draft Northeast Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan

John Weber: Great. Could we have the first slide, please? So hello. So I'm John Weber. I think most of you know who I am. So what we wanted to do was really start setting the stage for the detailed focus conversation we're going to be having in the next day and a half. You've already seen this slide.

A quick reminder on sort of where we've been, how we got to this point. Folks who were with us back in the RPB meeting back in April know that coming out of that meeting, we came out with a series of draft goals and actions, which we then took to a series of public meetings throughout New England. Ten of them plus we had a conversation at the Fishery Management Council meeting in June.

All that occurred within a public comment period that ran through July. We took the public comment that we received and the results of those public meetings, made some revisions, and issued a draft goals and objectives document back in September. That document was available on our website. We have had, as you just heard, a series of meetings through formal stated advisory groups and other mechanisms you just heard about, plus other conversations, since September, over that same document.

And the first point that I want to make is that where we are at now, and the packet of information that you all—we are going to be talking about in the next day and a half—those goals and objectives that were issued back in September have purposefully remained basically the same.

So we have not adjusted those except in maybe one or two areas where we have clarified them, specific points on them, which Nick will talk about when we start walking through the goals.

That was on purpose and our thinking was that we needed to have that draft set of goals and objectives out there for public comment, and come to this meeting and have the conversation about what changes are needed.

And if I could get the next slide, please. And that is a key point, which I'm going to come back to again in this presentation, is that what is in this framework document, the goals, the objectives of the material, which I will walk through, is draft. And that we expect that the purpose of this meeting, as Laura presented up front, is to make some decisions on pieces of this, and then hopefully also then move forward with those elements where there's agreement.

So specifically, if you look at the framework, it's got an introduction, it sets out principals and the general schedule, which I will come back to in a moment. As you've kind of heard alluded to, and as you've seen as you look at the document, it has an overview of communication and engagement efforts, but to date, but also trying to compile a lot of the specific details on this very important piece of this work that are provided in the goals and objectives section of the document.

So it's really meant to do a better job of explaining where we have been. As you have heard, we fully expect things, and particular aspects of this will evolve as we go forward, and we tried to summarize that, because of the importance of this topic. Clearly you have just heard everybody saying how important communication and engagement is, and we all know that.

The framework also then set out goals and provides a brief definition. They are meant to be aspirational, high-level statements. It talks about objectives, defines those, which are really meant to start getting towards actionable things you could do. How are you intending to meet those goals? And then provides even more detail in terms of actions.

And also, as you'll see, specific tasks, products, and capacity to complete those actions. That's a really important point, because for a lot of folks, that is material that when we have been out and having public conversations, one of the things that we've heard is provide us more detail. How do you intend to achieve these objectives? Talk to us about that.

So we added that information for the purpose of informing the conversation today and tomorrow about goals and objectives. But I want to stress that, again, while we were doing that, we want to make sure that people realize that at that level of detail, it is also a draft. If there are changes that come about as the result of the conversation today and tomorrow, certainly those tasks may have to be adjusted.

So please, when you're reviewing that level of information, please do so with the understanding that our intent was to help better inform the conversation of goals and objectives, because it is a very reasonable question to ask. Can you really — do you have the capacity to meet that objective? Can you really do this? And we tried to say, "Here's the answer to that." Again, if those things change, the tasks have to change as well.

Final important point I'll say on this in terms of some questions that we have heard throughout this. What's the ultimate result? What's the plan going to look like? What we tried to say in this framework is that it is the collective outcomes and products that will indeed be informed by lots of future decision-making, which I will get into with a couple of examples in a minute, that will form that plan.

In some cases, we need a lot more conversation, we believe, and focus on specific topics to be able to get to a greater comfort level as to what is going to be ultimately included in that plan. So what we're trying to do with this framework is basically set out information that provides all of us. Here are the topics we're really going to be focusing in on. Here's how we—and important decision points along the way.

Here's how we intend to engage people, develop better information, spatial data, non-spatial data, whatever the case may be, to inform those future decisions. So the framework really has an intent of being in that nature, where we are trying to lay out here are our focus areas that we're going to be working on over the next couple of years, here's how we intend to get to the point where we all in the RPB make decisions. If I could go to the next slide, please.

So you'll see, when you look at the framework, there's an overall schedule which starts to give an idea of if you follow through the goals and objectives as they are drafted—so thus as potentially could change—that here's what an overall schedule should look like.

So we're proposing, for example, that where there is agreement between now and the next RPB meeting, sometime in June, that we would be [inedible] work under goals, there would be public workshops to dive into specific topics, there would be other opportunities to engage, and then that leads to an RPB meeting where we review progress.

Then through the summer, and into the early fall, there is additional work done to more further develop and refine draft products to have a series of public meetings of some sort as we would design to review progress, that sort of thing, all heading into a November RPB meeting to really decide on next steps under each goal. So again—and if you look at what's in the schedule, or in the framework for 2015, same sort of thinking went into developing that schedule.

So what I really want to stress is that, again, the purpose of what we're trying to put out here is not to answer all those questions on all those topics that we have heard about. It is to say that these are areas and topics we will be focused in on over the next couple of years.

And final point, one thing we heard in public comment, loud and clear, has been that there are certainly issues that are out there that will probably need longer than two years in order for us to fully develop and address, absolutely. So we're sort of saying that this is an initial focus. There will be other pieces of work, other issues that will come up that will need longer. So fully trying to recognize that.

Again, and as Nick is going to go into in just a minute with some examples, we developed this framework to reflect public input to date. I've already touched on a couple of instances where

we did that, and just to stress for the last time that we fully—if you look at the document and read it through with this in mind, the idea is that it will absolutely evolve and change based on decisions that we make today, public conversation we have today and tomorrow, as well as future decisions. So the framework is a thing that we will most likely be coming back to and reviewing and updating as the process moves forward. If I could get the next slide.

So I'm going to stop right there in terms of setting the stage for Nick who is now really going to take us through kind of walking through some key points that we wanted to highlight for each goal.

Nick Napoli: Thanks. So I'm going to go at a pretty high level, at least compared to the document in terms of detail for these goals. What I intend to do is just go through the objectives pretty quickly, and then recognize some key themes from the public comments, much of which we've already heard. But I'll sort of place them in the goals and objectives here for further discussion. So these are the four objectives under the effective decision-making goal.

The first objective, enhance inter-agency coordination. A common theme from public comment, which we've heard already, recognized that we decided to initially focus on certain types of development. I think there's a recognition among the RPB that we needed to start somewhere and with something that really are potential types of development that the RPB sees as controversial in the past, or are foreseeable in the future. And some of these types of uses are issues that many of the RPB members are dealing with right now.

I think there's also recognition that these regulations, these regulatory processes for each of these types of development are very different, and therefore we need to get into the details of them. And those details include looking at the natural resources in those existing uses. And I think in the other two goals, you'll see a lot more in terms of characterizing the resources and those human use interactions that will feed into this goal.

The next objective, implement specific measures to enhance public participation. And these are truncated from what's in the document. I think an outcome there is just to enhance understanding and involvement of the public and project review. And that's coming directly from public comment. That's something that we heard, we added this objective coming out of public comment, that the public wanted a better understanding of where and how to provide input.

The third objective, incorporate products into existing decision-making. I think what we're really saying here is this is where—we didn't have a great spot for the data portal to sit, but this is where it is. This is where the data products that we're developing throughout all of this really feed into decision-making, and so this is kind of tied to the rest of the other goals. It's tied closely to the first objective in terms of consistent data and use of a website providing that data as an opportunity to enhance decision-making.

We also heard a key public comment theme here was ensuring that those products that are in the data portal are extensively reviewed, informed through engagement, adhere to requirements and have guidance for use in existing decision-making, and I think you'll see a lot of that

throughout the other goals in terms of how we intend and have developed some of the products that are there and will be there.

The last objective, improving respect for Tribal customs and traditions. Many of you who have seen previous documents say a placeholder here. This is—Rick touched on this, the caucus with the Tribes—and added the language that is underneath this objective.

Next slide, please. So the next slide here is just a quick timeline, and there's a lot of detail in the document about how we intend to achieve some of this. So we decided to focus really on this year and leading up to that decision-making timeframe later this year where the RPB needs to have the information in front of it in terms of options and a better set of baseline information in order to proceed.

So what you'll see under this goal is that we're going to be developing options for improving the products, improving the data portal so that we can improve coordination and consistency and decision-making and proving public input, what options are there for improving public input. How can we improve inter-agency coordination, and how can we—what options are there for improving consultation with the Tribes? How we intend to achieve that is through a lot of engagement.

That's what you'll see in the tasks that are laid out. And in many different forms. Meetings with agencies. We intend to have meetings with each of the states and each of the federal agencies. We intend to meet with industry, with the NGOs, with other groups one-on-one. We intend to have public workshops and public meetings. And all of that will be developing those options for the RPB to make decisions in November.

The capacity for that is basically everybody in the room and several different forums. Staff, there's an internal work group. We do have a request for proposals out for a contractor to help with this. We have the Tribal engagement coordinator through Rick. And of course, the public is going to be engaged in many different forums throughout this.

Next slide, please. Healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems. First objective, characterize the ecosystem economy and cultural resources. Obviously a big topic where you'll see a lot of capacity being devoted. The kinds of outcomes, baseline data and maps that will hopefully go into the data portal. Perhaps a baseline assessment, other information that characterizes the ecosystem, the economy, and the cultural resources.

In addition, we will hope to maximize the utility of those tools and information for management applications, and some of that I already sort of discussed through the first goal, effective decision-making. But this is actually in response to a lot of public comment where baseline data for what? So for example some ways folks have suggested for maximizing the utility of this information, folks have made comment about identifying important ecological areas.

There are also other assessments that could use this information such as vulnerability assessments or cumulative impact analysis, and what we're saying here is that we're going to—we'

d like to proceed in developing that baseline information and better understanding what those options are and how to proceed with them so that the RPB can decide which one of those—or how we would proceed with that.

We also heard some comment related to baseline data being static and perhaps there being a lot of gaps, and possibly not accounting for historic conditions and potential future changes. We also heard comments related to the economic assessment that perhaps we should include a greater focus on working waterfronts and communities, the blue economy, characterizes the blue economy, and a better linkage between the economy and the ecosystem.

The next objective, supporting existing restoration and conservation programs. I think this was one that was also in response to a lot of public comment. There's a lot of existing restoration and conservation programs out there, and perhaps this RPB, this planning process, could be a venue for enhancing the coordination in terms of achieving regional goals.

Last objective, developing a regional ocean science plan. I think that one sort of speaks for itself, but we've put that there in recognition, as John said, that there's going to be a lot of things that we recognize we cannot achieve in two years because there are priority science and data gaps, and this is a way of sort of identifying those priorities and setting a plan for achieving them.

Next slide, please. So timeline. A lot of work here. And this is really what we're working to proceed with in the next seven, eight, nine, ten months and beyond. Developing those draft-baseline products. We have done some work, and we've worked in particular with a lot of industries developing some baseline products, but we recognize that we have a lot of additional work to do to characterize the natural resources, to characterize the cultural resources, and conduct that economic analysis.

We also need to develop those options for how we would use that baseline information that I talked about in decision-making. So how are we going to do that? Really, there's a number of separate pieces, but related pieces of work, there will be—or we have been discussing some contractor-supported work to characterize natural resource distribution abundance for ocean planning purposes.

Rick Getchell is going to be coordination with the Tribes to identify ways in which we can better characterize the cultural resources, and then we're also considering a baseline assessment that sort of takes all the information we've developed, integrates it, and also adds some economic analysis and other types of analysis that may be missing in existing information.

Again, plan on doing that by engaging all you in several different forums. There is at least a couple internal work groups working on different components of this. Staff will be working on it, the Tribal engagement coordinator, there's going to be several different—or we're planning for several different contracts to support different aspects of it, and we're also considering a technical committee, or more than one, for specific subjects as they come up. And we've already identified some examples where we could use those.

Next slide, please. The third goal, compatibility among past, present, and future uses. First objective, develop future scenarios, trends for use in decision-making. Perhaps this goal is the least formed, and I think what you all recognize that in your public comment, which focused a lot on the clarity of the outcome here, and I think what we're suggesting in the framework document is that we really need to engage all of you, the RPB and the public, to better understand what's available, and how to proceed, and how to focus, and what the priorities are for developing future scenarios.

There's certainly a lot of examples that have come up. We could build on a lot of existing work that particularly some of the federal agencies are doing in terms of the Atlantic Coast Port Access study that's looking at shipping. Myriad has been looking at the expansion of the Panama Canal, how that might affect the future. We recognize we need to consider changing conditions, particularly for commercial fishing, how fishing might change, how other fishing might change.

We need to consider merging issues like sand management, and we need to recognize that there's issue-specific planning efforts that already exist, and there are some sub-regional planning efforts that also have to be integrated. For example, our shellfish management plan, aquaculture plans. So all of these sort of become the—all the ingredients to a potential future scenario analysis. And of course, there are ways that we could go beyond that as well.

The next objective, incorporate regional issues, feedback into existing projects. Again, this is an objective that came a lot through public comment, and I think that was just a recognition that we have this regional forum, we have the federal agencies in particular at the table, and it's an opportunity for the representatives of those federal agencies to bring back regional issues into those existing projects.

Next slide, please. And then the timeline, same kind of timeline. We're working towards making decisions later this year, and in this case, we need to determine what those options are for the future scenario interests that we might consider. And we're really going to be doing that again through some of the internal workgroup work, and through engaging all of you as I've discussed through the workshops, the meetings, and eventually an RPB meeting.

That's all I have.

Laura Cantral: Great. Thanks Nick, thanks John. So we have a few minutes now to open this up for discussion and some clarifying questions, keeping in mind that we're going to go into detail here shortly about each of the three goals and related objectives, the activities, all of the things that Nick walked through a summary of.

But now would be a good opportunity to ask any clarifying questions about the framework as a whole, the evolution of the document, the process for getting to what you have before you today, underscoring that the intent here, as John said, is for this document to be a way for you all to focus for the next couple of years on some specific topics, and carry out work that will enable you to get more information to inform future decision-making.

And part of getting that information is working with your stakeholders, your public your communities in lots of different forums and mechanisms that you've been hearing some about, and that we'll be talking about some more. But this is an interim step in a two-year timeframe for doing that. So I think it's important for us to all have that context in mind in talking about this framework and how you feel about it and what you want to do with it when we're done with this meeting today.

So clarifying questions on the framework as a whole? And remember, if you need to get my attention, put your ten up and I'll know you have a question or a comment.

Betsy Nicholson: Am I allowed to comment?

Laura Cantral: You're allowed to comment, yes.

Betsy Nicholson: It's not really a question. I think just in reading through some of the public comment and the RPB comment, just a quick comment. We're going to be walking through these goals one-by-one, and we can't lose sight of the fact that they need to come together at the end of this. And I think really importantly, again, what the schedule lays out is a lot of opportunity to start talking about how that can happen.

So I don't want folks to think that this is a very silo, goal-by-goal approach. It looks that way on paper, and that's unfortunate, but that's just the way it has to be written out. I just would challenge us all to start thinking about interconnections. Nick mentioned a few in terms of regulatory and the natural resource piece, obviously, fitting together and creating the context around which we can make informed decisions. But let's just keep that in mind.

Laura Cantral: Tom?

Tom Burack: I'm not sure if this is the right time to raise this or not, but trying to make my way through some of the comments here, I've noticed that one of the sort of themes or areas of concern, on the part of at least some of the commenters is that there doesn't seem to be an overall message that this is about ensuring long-term, sustainable use of the resources, and sustainable management of the resources.

And I'm just wondering, Nick and John, whether you could sort of refresh our recollections as to how the theme of sustainability has been considered in this process, and where you see that explicitly discussed here, where you think it's implicit, and whether based on what you've seen from comments, folks on the outside, are there places where, if we're all in agreement that that is a key sort of central tenant of all of this, that we could add some language that makes that abundantly clear?

John Weber: Yeah, so we have given that some thought, and we had—so a potential suggestion is this. Thinking back to the April RPB meeting, and the outcome of that, if folks remember that under, I think it had a goal, and even for some of the objective-level, at that level, there was some

italicized language that sort of described, more in the intent overall where themes like that were really raised.

And if I remember right, I think it was particularly in goal two where some of that really came about. So one suggestion and one comment that we got, if you look through the public comment, is well, what we're looking at now doesn't include that. Go back and add that back in, because that provides important context overall for us going forward as we undertake individual tasks. That could be an option to address that [inaudible], add that language back in.

Tom Burack: Thank you. I just think reflecting back on Betsy's comment, all of this coming together, I just wonder where we need to put some language back in here that does the kind of thing that has been described here to sort of make sure that we've got that background for everybody. I've got one other theme that I just want to touch on if I could, and I'm not sure candidly where this plays out in all of this.

Again, looking at the comments, a number of folks saying to us, "We think you need a regional advisory group, but you also need a regional science group." And I'm just curious whether that's a topic that has been discussed among the co-leads? Is this something that you've all given further thought to collectively? I seem to recall at maybe our first meeting we talked about this, there were all kinds of FACA issues that came up, if I'm recalling correctly, but maybe I'm mis-recalling that. Bu could you help us understand sort of how that set of issues might fit in this framework?

Grover Fugate: Yeah, there was a lot of extensive discussion relative to that.

Laura Cantral: You need to get close to your mic.

Grover Fugate: Tom, there was a lot of discussion relative to that, and there were I think some difficulties in trying to deal with that that were discussed at the time, not just from the federal side, but from a practical standpoint. Many of the issues that we're going to get into are very specific in terms of their particular area of influence and what we're dealing with.

So the scientific expertise, for instance, for those is going to be very pointed and necessary to get at those topics. A general science advisory committee probably wouldn't be as useful in trying to deal with some of those very specific issues that we're going to be getting into if you look at some of the actions of the work plan.

The other thing is then how do you appoint such a committee on a regional basis, and how does it meet, how does it work, how does it function? It's quite a large animal to feed and take care of to do that. And so we didn't get over all those issues, there was a lot of discussion relative to that. Betsy Nicholson: I think there are a lot of different options. Part of my job as Federal Co-Lead is to go get counsel. Personally, professionally. No, so the Department of Commerce has been very helpful. I've had a lot of back and forth with our General Counsel, and there's more to come. There are some things that aren't quite resolved, questions I've posed. What about this? What about that?

In terms of our previous conversations about really making sure we're going forward in the spirit of FACA in terms of being transparent and communicative and inclusive and open, yet also be nimble, perhaps more nimble than FACA allows, and meaningful, getting to some of what Grover raised. So there are a lot of different ways we can do that from panels of technical experts, workshops that pull in a lot of folks in addition to being in the public, where we're getting a lot of individual opinion to put together options that then come to the RPB to be discussed and decided.

So there are ways that we can do this that are meaningful and that are inclusive where there can be a lot of people involved in that discussion that are then bringing options forward that are discussed and decided by government officials. So that's a flavor of some of the discussions that I've had with our GC.

Grover Fugate: I think it gets back to what Bruce was raising, too, in terms of what does it mean to the states? So from a practical standpoint, you can imagine if we had some fishery representatives that were appointed to a regional committee. One was from Maine and one was from Connecticut, and I am going to hear about all of that from my fishermen.

So those are the types of issues that you get into from a very practical standpoint. So what we've been trying to do is target it through the state groups to provide input through the state processes, and then also have a much more general, open process here, to allow those discussions. It's not a perfect solution to the issue, and will probably require a lot more discussion and thought. But we've attempted to try to deal with some of those issues.

Betsy Nicholson: But I think also we really don't want to lose the cross-regional conversation as we go state-by-state. We know that. That is something that I said. As we evolve and go more into this specific phase of work, let's think hard about how to make that work. What's the best solution?

So some of these topical workshops are going to be a really good opportunity to get the diverse geography and ocean users and interests and technical experts, some of which are the same, to come together and look at a topic together. So that could be one way to do it.

So I mean, we're certainly open to all options, but that's along the lines of what we've been thinking, and what we'd like to discuss a lot at this meeting.

RPB Discussion of Draft Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Effective Decision Making*

Laura Cantral: All right. Any other big-picture clarifying questions or comments on the draft framework? Are people ready to move into discussion of the goal, the first of the three goals presented in the framework related to effective decision-making? I am stating the obvious, but we have Katy and Nick and John all here at the table to be a resource.

These folks have been hands-on, shepherding this process all along on a day-by-day, hour-by-hour basis, and are here to help you clarify questions or offer some observations that help

inform your dialog as RPB members. So you guys, all three of you need to chime in and we'll be calling on you to clarify, so don't be afraid to ask them.

All right, so now that we've had the overview, let's, again, focus discussion about this draft goal objective and actions related to effective decision-making. And I think are one of you going to tee up a couple of points for context, or just a reminder about the stats of this goal and things that you should keep in mind as we open up the discussion?

Nick Napoli: Yeah, I'll do that. And I think tomorrow—I won't reiterate everything I just said. I think tomorrow may be a little bit of that, so it will refresh people's mind. But two things that I will reiterate, or one that I will reiterate and one that's new. First, just want to recognize the public comment focusing on certain types of development and why we decided to do that initially.

And I won't go into that again, but that's for RPB discussion. Then second is new, and it gets to capacity, and I think in our look through the framework document, we had to do an assessment of the resources we had and the capacity that we have and what we're asking to do, and I think in this case, the second objective implements specific measures to enhance public participation.

In terms of how we characterize that in the document, we have limited capacity for really going across all of the regulatory processes and identifying those options and putting those out in the public in a two-year timeframe. So those are the two areas I just wanted to raise for discussion.

But two things that I will reiterate, or one that I will reiterate and one that's new. First, just want to recognize the public comment focusing on certain types of development and why we decided to do that initially.

And I won't go into that again, but that's for RPB discussion. Then second is new, and it gets to capacity, and I think in our look through the framework document, we had to do an assessment of the resources we had and the capacity that we have and what we're asking to do, and I think in this case, the second objective implements specific measures to enhance public participation.

In terms of how we characterize that in the document, we have limited capacity for really going across all of the regulatory processes and identifying those options and putting those out in the public in a two-year timeframe. So those are the two areas I just wanted to raise for discussion.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so let's open it up for discussion, and keep in mind that what we're doing here is we want to introduce the discussion of this goal and its related objectives, actions, et cetera, have some dialog about that.

We're going to pause at—what time did I say? Three-fifteen. At 3:15 we will pause the discussion of this topic and take public comment, and then we will resume and finish up with any noting of next steps and approval of this goal, if you're ready to do that. And if you're not, what we're going to do, and how we're going to proceed.

So I'm opening the floor to your comments, RPB. Doug?

Doug Grout: Just a process question. As we discuss this, and we get through the discussion of this particular goal and its objectives, and we take public comment, there may be some public comment that we want to incorporate and change a particular objective. Are we going to do this on the fly, or is there going to be a process where we can stand back and have somebody rewrite this and put it out and say, "Okay, what do you all think about this change?"

Laura Cantral: Right. So I think the answer to that question is it depends on the nature of the suggested adjustments. So if we need to take this under advisement overnight, and put something—we've done this before—you'll recall at the last meeting—and put something back in front of you tomorrow that reflects some changes that are incorporated based on some input that you all like, it's resonating with you, and you want to see what that looks like, then we can certainly do that.

That is an option, and that's the advantage of having the overnight to be able to do that on this particular goal. So yeah, I mean, we can certainly do that. You may feel the need to do that. And then you may not. So it kind of depends.

Tom Burack: May I just ask another process question?

Laura Cantral: Sure.

Tom Burack: I'm just looking at, this is page three of eight of the summary of the comments on effective decision-making goal. There's a general [inaudible] there, and then there's specific comments regarding each of the four objectives. What, if anything, has been done to react to or somehow incorporate any of those suggestions that are made in those comments in this document? Are these—we have a—let me just stop there. What have we done with those comments, if anything?

Laura Cantral: So I think that's for you guys to respond to.

Nick Napoli: Well, I'm not looking at the exact comments there, but I'll just address the comment theme that I reference, which was the focus on certain types of development, and I think we tried to, in the latest version, sort of characterize that a little bit better in terms of the fact that there is a consideration in those while we're looking at those specific uses of the resources, and other existing uses. It's not a specific focus on just those activities.

Tom Burack: If I may, I understand that. I guess to be more specific, I'm looking at the member comment section. I recognize there's a section of member comments, a section of public comments. So can we assume then that all the member comments that are summarized in this document, these are things we've heard, but there's been no effort in the draft that we have in front of us to reflect any changes based upon these comments? Is that a fair statement?

John Weber: I'm reading through, I'm looking through them now, so if you can give me a minute.

Tom Burack: Sure.

John Weber: I believe the first bullet under objective one, the addition there, if I remember right, was to include federally recognized Tribes, and I believe if you look at the language, that adjustment was made.

I believe on the second bullet under there, which talks about include language to demonstrate that non-regulatory agencies have a role to play, et cetera, et cetera, I believe an example was added in the revised framework to reflect that, and I think it might have even included the mention of national security.

Laura Cantral: Yeah.

Tom Burack: The third bullet under objective one, consider adding a NEPA-specific action to address this point. There is not a specific NEPA-related action or activity as such, but I do believe that NEPA is called out as one of the statutes/plans that will be looked at.

Laura Cantral: Yeah.

Tom Burack: The fourth bullet, which talks about being more specific and provides an example of specific BOEM, Bureau of Off-Shore Energy Management, wind leasing requirements that should be included, if I remember right, that addition of looking at things at a construction and operations plan level, I believe that note was added.

The document itself in terms of the next bullet, which is talking about looking at various federal mandates and federal statutes as a way of starting to provide all of us with a baseline of information as to what are those.

If you remember, our job is to work with an existing regulatory program, so this comes from the executive order. So one of the things that folks from Roger Williams University and Susan Faraday, if you're here, correct me if I'm wrong, but they've been doing—they have a graduate student who's even doing some of that very basic work, pulling on existing information to provide us all—all of us with a summary of what are those existing regs and starting to provide some level of detail. So I don't think that necessarily is reflected in this draft framework, but that work has been underway.

As Nick highlighted, also not only for objective one, but certainly for objective one, we had comments about specific agency commitments under this objective. And I'll just say one thing about that, is that I think that also was partly intended to reflect the ongoing need to make sure we have federal agency commitments, not only as we're starting out this work, say, now, but along the way as we are further developing options, getting more specific, what might we do, what might we not do, and that we need to make sure that we're doing the check-in with potential implementing folks at a federal level, but potentially at other levels of government too, that those are options that are indeed things we can commit to.

So just to put a finer point on that. I'm not sure, I don't think that there's specific language in the framework that gets that direct about this comment. There is language that talks about ensuring federal commitment throughout the effort. Honestly, the next bullet I'd have to look at, which says clarify beset management practices, refers to stakeholder engagement standards for data collection. I'd have to look at language to remember, but I think the intent was for, if I remember that comment right, was to start again focusing in on what we might look at under this objective.

The next bullet, consider transferring results of coordination with BOEM, et cetera, et cetera. So what this is basically saying is if we're going to have a conversation with BOEM on ways to, as we'll get into tomorrow, coordinate in terms of data sharing or engagement with various folks, let's think about how we then could use something that comes out of that, which could be really good, that we all like, with other types of development activities, going back to Nick's point that if you're talking about specific types of new development out there, that there are different existing regulatory programs for those.

So while we're thinking about, again, as Nick said, while we're thinking about what could work under one specific framework for one specific type of development, let's be thinking about how that could be transferable. We might want to look at the revised framework to make sure if there's—if we need to make sure there's a comfort level with that.

Clarify that best management practices are related to the leasing process, not construction operations. That in part goes to essentially a scale and at an appropriate point along the curve of when—how development moves to operations. Let's try to be more specific about where we're operating.

And I think where the general suggestion that at a regional level, it may not always be appropriate to think about very specific, project-specific, site-specific issues, given the scale of this. But we need to be—at a minimum, we need to be paying attention to that issue. We might want to check I that comment is in there in a way that we're comfortable with.

I would actually, on the next bullet, which is talking about the particularly Tribal consultation practices in the BOEM process, maybe when I'm done going through this list, Rick, you could provide more. I believe there's been quite a bit of comment or discussion among the tribes about that particular issue.

And engagement of non-regulatory government stakeholders, with some examples provided there, that actually relates back to the second bullet under that objective, which is, again, talking about non-regulatory agencies, but who have a very direct and important role to play when we're looking at particular types of ocean development. So I think that's kind of a repeat.

Laura Cantral: Did you want to, Rick, add something to that?

Rick Getchell: Sure. Basically on the—when we talk about consultation with BOEM and other agencies, we were looking at, in lengthy discussion, on how Tribes will engage in consultation,

how we want that to be—some agencies have policies, some don't. Some are developing them. We want to weigh in now, early stages, on how that has to look for Tribes. It does no good—when you talk about that mandate and that executive order, it's consultation.

There is an executive order that outlines that, how it should be. It's not notification, it's not just shutting us down in mid-stream if you're not liking what's going on. So we included in there to make sure that we get to actually be part of the creation of the language of the consultation, looking specifically at BOEM, but looking at who exists, what works, and what's not working so well. So that's one of the pieces that we covered when we looked at this.

And also, we want to make sure in the language in there for significant cultural and ecological resources. Did you want to add anything?

Laura Cantral: I see a few tens are starting to go up, and Katie, I don't know, you might have wanted to respond to Tom's question?

Katie Whalen: Yeah, I just think it's worth reminding people, and potentially clarifying in response to your question, Tom, that the document that you're referring to, the packet 3.2, has some bullets on the first page that are pulled out as topics that need further RPB discussion. And as we went through the draft framework and made revisions based on the series of valuable comments you all provided as RPB throughout the fall and into the early winter, there was an effort to directly incorporate comments that you all made in some for, except for these six series where that further discussion was needed.

And as you look at them, the first two bullets are fairly general and relate to the overall framework itself. But exploring the need to identify partner activities in a better way, and academic research related to each of the goals. Consider—suggest a new intense principal. Again, these are two topics that weren't reflected really in the draft, based on your comments.

The next two, in direct response to your question, Tom, relates to this first goal. And John went through them one by one, but they need to include some kind of language about using social sciences, as we've heard from all of your state updates.

We didn't feel that was adequately reflected in the new draft framework, and so we wanted to highlight that, as well as this idea of transferring some of the BOEM conversation to other types of projects and development. So I'll point out those two in particular in relation to this goal that we're discussing now, as commonly provided to our common RPB members, that we didn't feel were adequately reflected in maybe the draft and potentially need further discussion around the table.

Laura Cantral: Okay, let's go to Kathleen, and then Ames.

Kathleen Leyden: I would make a request that when folks are—there's a lot of material in here, so if we could say under tab something, first blue section, so we can follow along.

Laura Cantral: Yeah, that's a good reminder.

Kathleen Leyden: Just an observation is tackling goal one first is really challenging for me, and one, two, three doesn't imply that this is the top goal. I think they're just numbered, correct? Because the way I approach this is we would have used—all of these things are occurring, all this work is occurring at the same time, so we don't have the luxury of looking at the outcomes of the analysis under goals two and three to inform which regulatory processes we look at. Just to make an observation that that is difficult.

If we could have some discussion about how the three uses for exploration around decision-making were chosen, are they—I think it's important to focus, because if we try to look at—some people are suggesting we should look at all ocean uses, and that's probably not possible. But are these thought to be those that would have the most important regional impact? Is it because they're determined to be—have more issues with compatibility, or is it just because they're new.

And the third—I guess this is an observation, and maybe translates to a question, too, is the improved public participation. I think it kind of focuses around the existing regulatory construct of how agencies get input into regulatory processes. And I think that's maybe inherently problematic. The informality of it, the formality of it, the timing of it, and an early idea that we had talked about was is there sort of an offline process apart from adhering to the standard public participation and regulatory processes that we could put forward? So that's a lot.

Laura Cantral: So I think Grover wants to respond, at least to some of those observations, and a good point about as we're talking about different documents in the binder, let's all try to be disciplined to point to exactly what we're talking about, where in the documents we're talking about it so that people can follow along. Grover?

Grover Fugate: Kathleen, I think I can respond to at least part of that in terms of the second area that you were hitting, which relates somewhat to the third topic area, too, and that is in terms of these uses, there's a regulatory working group that is working on this, trying to understand how do you take that goal and start to really put it in concrete terms so that it starts to occur.

So if you start out with a theoretical discussion of everything under the sun, we'd quickly get bogged down because certain agencies come into play, certain others don't. These uses that were chosen here are obviously in play right now within the region itself. They are ones that the regulatory agencies identified as being somewhat complicated, perplexing at times, and in need of more coordination and discussion on that.

So they were thought to be three good straw men basically to start to look at that discussion, and how do you enhance that. Those aren't the only three issues that obviously we're going to have to deal with or will come up in the discussion, but they are three that are ongoing

and very active here in the New England region, and ones that the regulatory agencies are engaged in right now that looked as if they would be good topic areas to deal with.

And then getting back to that point then, how do you—increasing that efficiency, how do you bring in other parties into the discussion, both through the RPB and other mechanisms to get more informed decision-making by the agencies that are actually making these decisions.

Laura Cantral: Do you want to add to that, John?

John Weber: [Inaudible] want to add one quick point of clarification. Also, though, I think that I would—I think it's easy to imagine that when you—even within those couple of types of uses that are called out, your point about are they sort of there because they're potentially incompatible with other uses, and the fact that a lot of the specific developments of those types, that have been proposed or permitted or withdrawn or whatever in recent years, have been very controversial, is because they have conflicted with other human activities and/or natural resources.

So if you're going to have a conversation about looking at the specifics of one of those types of activities, you absolutely have to then, as part of that conversation, consider existing human uses, natural resource-type issues because that's where a lot of the conflict arises.

So I always want to make that point—and this is maybe a we can do—we can think about some language to clarify the intent of this—which is to absolutely recognize that, and use that consideration of various types of human activities that are out there—shipping, fishing, whatever—as well as natural resources in that conversation, when and where it's appropriate to do so. So I don't want to give the impression that we're just ignoring all those other types of things. It's providing a context for such a conversation.

Laura Cantral: Do you want to respond to that?

Kathleen Leyden: I just want to acknowledge that we do have a staff person on the regulatory work group, and I think that—I think I knew the answer to that, but I just think it's important to really articulate how we got there, and to include those—that type of explanation in a sidebar of what is this about, and then to further—we keep getting asked about why we're not looking at climate, or why we're not looking at ocean acidification, or invasive species.

And I think I've suggested this before, but eventually to get to some sort of—there is a regional dredging team, there is an invasive species network, there is the NECAN, Ocean Acidification Regional effort that I think that helps explain why we're focusing on these sets of things, because there are other entities, hopefully that are all going to come together in some sort of more comprehensive, regional look. Does that make sense?

Laura Cantral: Okay, thank you. So Dan, it looks like you wanted to chime in, just on this exchange right here, is that correct? You had a different point? No?

Dan Hubbard: [Inaudible].

Laura Cantral: Then I'm going to go to Ames, and then Dan, and then Meredith, and then we're going to close out for now and go to public comment.

Ames Colt: Thank you, Laura. I am looking at action 1.1 starting on page ten, going to page eleven, at least in my version, and I'm looking at this with a reasonably fresh set of eyes. I haven't been involved with the conference calls or really engaged with development of this document. So I look at action 1.1, kind of from a—how is this as a research project?

And I'm not addressing just John and Nick. I mean, this is not the inquisition. This is really about the RPB answering this question as much as you two. But this action 1.1 is really a key thing. We've already talked about how we're collecting information on it, fundamental information about various regulatory and permitting processes work. I get that.

The second step is once you have that broad understanding, or understanding of broad requirements, the idea is to discuss with agency's tribes, the regulated community and others how regulations are implemented, focusing on process-related topics and how information and data related to activities and natural resources are considered. So you're getting—that speaks to me of implementation analysis. And even though you've narrowed it down to four emerging uses, you're still talking about a huge area of analysis.

And I understand in this document, you might want to keep it very broad in terms of the project being described. But for me—and it may be for other external folks—what exactly does that mean, because you're going to have to focus down on specific issues of implementation, specific issues of how information and data are utilized by individuals, by groups, for certain decision processes.

And this is really back to the RPB. What exactly are we talking about here in terms of finding better ways to implement core regulatory or permitting processes, and how can we describe sort of the trail that we are on, some of the initial ideas that we have that underlie this broader research topic?

How can we describe our hunches about that, if you will, in terms of improving information use, improving implementation of regulations. How can we describe that in a succinct way so we understand across governments and agencies, and maybe more importantly, how the external stakeholder groups understand what we're trying to do?

So I want to hear from other folks, not necessarily just from John and Nick, on what specifically are we talking about here with action 1.1?

Laura Cantral: can I ask for you to all be 4thinking about that, and let's have some more discussion about that when we come back to this discussion after the public comment? Because we're approaching our time for doing that. It's a great question that probably deserves some good discussion and some thinking about it from all of you. Dan?

Dan Hubbard: Specifically I'm looking at page eleven of the framework work plan, action one, tack three, third sentence after the comma. Specifically we're talking about ensuring agency commitment, and I think we need to maybe put a little bit more thought into how to achieve that, because we're running a balance between being a group that has no specific authority to implement a regulation, but then we're also talking about changing or correcting a current pattern.

And I think we need to maybe more correctly identify the mechanism that we would utilize to ensure agencies are complying, whether it's, I don't know, perhaps citing something back to the charter, or whether or not there is—exactly what those agreements would look like. I think it would be helpful if we kind of have a discussion around how we do that.

Laura Cantral: Great, thank you. Meredith?

Meredith Mendleson: Thanks. Just following up on Kathleen's comment earlier, it strikes me that in sort of thinking through the answer to that, with regard to regulatory—the regulatory working group, I wonder if some of the feedback that we got from the public related to that could be somewhat mitigated in the future by having some additional clarity around how stakeholders might engage with those working groups?

I know that there are sort of summaries that have come out as part of Katie's updates regularly, but finding a more direct link between the people who are sitting in this audience and how they can communicate with those working groups might help address that in the future.

Laura Cantral: Thanks. All right, so we're going to move to our public comment session in just a moment. I have a couple of little housekeeping announcements that I need to make before we do that. Did you want to offer any sort of context that we need to emphasize before we move on?

Betsy Nicholson: Sure. Right. It's just been called to my attention that there are some new folks in the audience that haven't necessarily been to previous meetings, and that's fantastic. Welcome. But before we go into public comment, a few reminders. Just a little bit of background. As Dan just mentioned, this Regional Planning Body is non-regulatory. We don't have any authority to create new regulations. This is an executive order. An executive order by nature is about making existing laws and regs that are already on the books work better. That's the definition of an executive order. So let's just remember that, particularly for the new folks.

Also, that the Regional Planning Body is building a plan and planning tools and products to achieve our goals and objectives. That's what the outcome is going to look like. Third, there's lots of opportunity in the future for a lot of different ways to engage. I think I beat that one to death earlier.

And, that this meeting, as Laura said at the beginning, in terms of objectives, is really about approving our goals and objectives today, and starting to look at the details in the draft work plan associated with it to figure out how we move forward. So we're approving the goals and

objectives, and we're beginning to—we're considering all the detail that's behind it, and getting some comfort level, and having discussions around how we move forward. So thank you for pointing that out.

Public Comment About Draft Northeast Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Effective Decision Making*

Laura Cantral: We hope that helps clarify, and we don't want to make assumptions that everyone understands the context for what this group is here to do, and where they are in their process. So I hope that helps. So let me make a couple of announcements. We are trying to serve here, so I have a couple of things to share.

If you drove here today, you can check with Shawn at the registration desk, and get a pass, a parking pass, for a day self-parking here at the hotel. So see Shawn if you need a complimentary day pass for parking.

In addition, this is something else that you can see Shawn about, and she will be glad to help you out. There is not Wi-Fi in this room. We're sorry; it's not available. That's a fact. And if you're trying to access the meeting materials that we're discussing right now and you can't get to them because you can't get online, if you see Shawn, again out in the registration area, she can load the documents. She's got them on a USB stick, and can help you with getting them loaded up so that you've got them on your computer and you can follow along. So two things to see Shawn about if you're so inclined.

And now we're going to move to public comment. We've got eleven people signed up, and we would ask that you try to limit your comments to about three minutes. We have a timekeeper who's nearby who can help track your time, and keep us on our schedule.

Some of you have been through our process before, so it may sound familiar, but if you haven't, or just to remind you, I will call the names of our first two commenters and ask you to join us here at this table, and then introduce yourself and offer your comment. When person number one is done, if you would excuse yourself, and I will let person number three know who they are, and they can come to the table, and then we'll just rotate through. That's the way it will run. I hope that is clear.

And we're ready to start with the first two who will be up are Richard Nelson, followed by Pricilla Brookes, and Melissa Gates, you'll be the third person who will come up.

Richard Nelson: It's a little bit confusing because we've been talking about some of these comments as we go, so it's a little bit—some parts of them are a little bit out of time, but I'll just full-ahead here.

Here we are, back again. We've left off in April with a goals document that was openly worded, and fairly generalized. We've returned to find the goals document whose main thrust is in the pronouncement that the RPB will be in the business of facilitating the establishment of

marine energy production, infrastructure, off-shore aquaculture, and mining for beach nourishment, and other future.

Somehow we have transitioned from a summer of public hearings where we strolled about charts, discussing partial efforts at mapping commercial fishing and recreational boating activities to a goal of effective decision-making wherein all the important decisions have already been made. The who made them, when, how, and why they have been made has not been made transparent to us, nor has any reasoning behind why we should consider them as regional choices among the stakeholders of New England.

These decisions represent a very real and major change in the essential nature of what happens on the water, and the way we perceive our ocean. Let's think back to our past experiences on the ocean, and if the addition of hundreds of wind and tide turbines, aquaculture pens, mining, and dredging operations and the such only changes our visual appreciation of our images, I suggest we would consider ourselves lucky, for this transition would also entail economic change for our region, some would say for the better.

But I fear its effects on the small businesses and communities that make up my area of the coast. These coastal regions have relied for centuries on a direct relationship with the sea, and direct economic returns expected from their efforts and the sea's resources. Those resources might be anything from fish to the natural beauty that attracts visitors to our shores, and although these local economies have been long-lived, they can also be very fragile in nature.

The new uses proposed here would, by their very scale, be more corporate in structure, and more importantly, in their flow of returns. No longer would that flow be returned directly to the families and communities. I fear that they might end up trading away their sense of ownership, human dignity, their culture and heritage, along with their fiscal independence for a few salaried positions in a new business.

That may sound a bit sentimental to you, but when you live in a town where most folks are both independent and share the same occupations of their fathers and grandfathers before them, trust me, it's very real. And what of the environmental aspects of these new uses?

It's almost as if they've been presented to us with an assumed clean bill of health, or that because of their inclusion in this document, it denotes some kind of blessing from the RPB, and thereby from New Englanders. I can tell you that is not the case.

And if this assumption bothers a fishermen such as me, you'll probably have a room full of others who are likewise bothered. I'm afraid that even if those who have supported this process are dismayed by the way this document was written, and by the way it was presented, then I would consider it a public relations fiasco. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Richard, you can go on, and Melissa is going to come take your place, because she's going to go after Pricilla.

Richard Nelson: Do I go now?

Laura Cantral: Yeah.

Richard Nelson: Okay.

Laura Cantral: Thank you.

Pricilla Brookes: Good afternoon. My name is Pricilla Brookes, and I'm the Director of Ocean Conservation for Conservational Law Foundation. Once again, I'm very pleased to be here on behalf of CLF, and our thousands of members across six New England states.

As a life-long ocean enthusiast, and Ocean Program Director of New England's leading environmental advocacy organization, I first want to thank the members of the RPB for their continued commitment to developing the nation's first Regional Ocean Plan, and working through this planning process to protect New England's ocean and plan for its sustainable use of the region's greatest public trust resource.

This isn't glamorous work, and it can be especially trying on days like today when you have to travel from home, but for those of us who hold the vision of improving ocean management and creating a better process that's based on science, cooperation, coordination, stewardship, stakeholder engagement, and economic opportunity for current and future generations, we very much appreciate your work.

CLF has submitted written comments; they're in your packet. With respect to—I'm just going to jump to the specific goal of effective decision-making, I wanted to underscore first off the importance of including those very short descriptions of the goals. That language was wordsmithed at the last meeting in April. It's very important language, it's very good language, and it really describes the vision of the ocean plan. So please don't lose that.

I think that a lot of the questions that are going to come up today are partially because that language isn't there to provide the context. With respect to effective decision-making, CLF is concerned to see the language that significantly narrows the RPB's focus regarding inter-agency coordination at the onset, rather than signaling a comprehensive approach to regional ocean planning, as envisioned by the National Ocean Policy, the objective as it's currently written would limit the Northeast Regional Ocean Plan to a narrowly prescribed set of ocean uses, which you've already listed.

It goes without saying that broad inter-agency coordination is critical if existing and future uses are to be effectively coordinated, including uses that are wide-spread in the ocean. Recreational boating, commercial and recreational fishing, scientific research, just to name a few. CLF believes that the language in objective one represents an unnecessary narrowing of the application of the Regional Ocean Plan, and results in the exclusion of many other uses from an objective that seeks to enhance inter-agency coordination; something that I think that everybody wants to see regardless of the use.

So we strongly recommend that all uses be included in this objective, recognizing, however, that the RPB, in this first generation of the regional ocean plan, may need to prioritize specific issues. I understand that. So at the very least, the language should be amended so that it's clear that the objective is not limited to these prescribed set of uses.

And practically speaking, we aren't looking for a wholesale change in the language, but I do think—and Kathleen alluded to this—I think that it needs to be rewritten to reflect a desire on the part of the RPB, on the part of an ocean plan, to enhance inter-agency coordination across all uses, and to have some explanatory language as to why the RPB in its first iteration, in this limited timeframe, needs to focus. And I think that would be really essential.

So I would encourage you to go back and fix the language a little bit. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So Melissa, before you go, Brent, let me just tell you that you're going to go next, Brent Greenfield, and after Brent, Chantal Collier, you'll be next. Go ahead, Melissa.

Melissa Gates: Thank you. Hi, my name is Melissa Gates. I'm the Northeast Regional Coordinator with Surf Rider Foundation.

For those who may not know, Surf Rider is an environmental non-profit dedicated to the protection and enjoyment of the world's oceans, waves, and beaches. So we're surfers, beach-lovers, kayakers, divers, sun-bathers. We're people who enjoy the coast in sustainable, low-impact ways, and we work together on environmental issues that affect our coastlines and ocean. We're a direct-action, grassroots organization, which means that we're local and we're active.

We're in many coastal regions across the global, including in New England. Surf Rider has a robust volunteer network in the Northeast, with one chapter in each coastal state, and a vast network of motivated, knowledgeable volunteers. Surf Rider commends the RPB and NROC for the tremendous amount of time and good energy spent in ocean planning deliberations to date. With regard to the effective decision-making goal, Surf Rider is pleased with tasks added to objective two for enhancing informed public input.

We believe that continuing to improve the public engagement process will aid in the effectiveness of decision-making, as it will expand the reach of communications and return more informed public input. Advanced and well-circulated notice of meetings, timely sharing of meeting materials for public review, clear expectations for public input, deadlines for comments, and easily-digestible websites and diversification of communication platforms and formats would improve the process for public engagement.

Clearly articulating how public input will be considered and potentially integrated into the plan would also encourage greater public participation. Rather than moving forward with the potential approach noted that calls for focusing on one review to provide a detailed example, Surf Rider encourages RPB to first look to learn from the public engagement efforts of other regional planning bodies, to pull from their experiences, and then move forward with strong input from Northeast stakeholders.

With regard to advisory groups, Surf Rider is appreciative of the attention that state members have dedicated to this vital component of the body's work. However, we urge state members to follow the inclusiveness and accessibility guidelines set forth by the National Ocean Council, which call for the inclusion of the full range of interests in ocean planning. The state advisory groups formed to date are heavily lacking in non-consumptive recreational interests.

Surf Rider requests that the RPB members actively seek to include a wider swath of interests from across the spectrum of ocean stakeholders, including ample representation for the millions of New England residents and visitors to our region who enjoy non-consumptive ocean recreation annually. While state advisory groups are likely to provide valuable input to help inform state interests in regional ocean planning, we do not believe that they should serve as a substitute for a regional stakeholder body.

We echo our previous calls for the formation of a regional advisory committee, which is also in line with the recommendations of the New England Ocean Action Network, of which we are a proud member. Thank you for hearing our comments on this goal, and thanks again for all your work.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Brent, before you go, I think I already said Chantal, you'll be next. Nick Batista, you'll be after Chantal. Okay, go ahead.

Brent Greenfield: Thanks. Good afternoon. My name is Brent Greenfield, and I'm making my comments on behalf of the Ocean Policy Coalition, and these comments supplement our previous comments that we've made.

The draft framework published last Thursday endorses an open and transparent process that is accompanied by a robust public engagement. It specifically notes that new details were included in this document to ensure that ideas about potential tasks inform detailed public discussion about the draft goals and objectives. It is unclear, however, how such a detailed and informed public discussion can take place within six days of the document's release.

As the Coalition noted in its January 9th comments about finalization of a work plan, the RPB should therefore not make any decisions on new specific tasks and related timeline information until the public has had a sufficient opportunity to review and provide comments on them. In doing so, the RPB should also explain how new determinations were made as to which proposed objectives would be achieved by 2015, and which ones might be achieved later.

The need for adequate public comment periods and the formation of a formal, regional stakeholder advisory committee to the RPB is underscored by the fact that under the present construct, agencies will be required to incorporate relevant RPB decisions and products into their activities to the maximum extent possible.

With RPB actions thus serving as precursors to regulatory activity, adequate opportunities for public and user group engagement are essential. With regard to the first proposed objective, as the Coalition stated in its January 9th comments, addressing existing inefficiencies by cataloging

flaws in the current system in terms of regulatory agencies and their ability to work with one another could help promote effective decision-making.

The development of any such review and resulting recommendations should include close engagement with regulated community and relative agencies and the utilization of adequate public comment periods, rather than be limited to a few potential future uses. Any such review should address all existing and potential future uses that are subject to requirements already established by statute.

The framework proposes that the RPB, one, identify and obtain agency commitments to implement recommendations for enhanced inter-agency coordination, and two, work with federal, state, and tribal entities to identify and implement specific measures to ensure commitment, to incorporate maps and other products into existing agency decision-making processes.

These proposals should be revised to clarify the agency determinations about whether and how to implement changes to the way in which they carry out their activities, should be strictly voluntary based on their careful, independent, and transparent consideration, and best judgment, and consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations.

As to the frameworks proposal for the RPB to decide on implementation actions to enhance inter-agency coordination in November of 2014, such a decision and indeed implementation decisions under all goals and objectives should be made at a formal RPB meeting that is preceded by an adequate public comment period on both the options under consideration, as well as the RPB's preferred approach.

In addition, any implementation actions should result in informational material for agencies, rather than directives that they are bound or otherwise pressured to follow. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So Chantal you'll go, and then Nick. Valerie Nelson, you'll be after Nick.

Chantal Collier: Good afternoon. On behalf of the Nature Conservancy, I'm Chantal Collier, and I'm pleased to be here today to offer you these comments.

We provided written comments as well in the Nature Conservancy's letter dated January 21st, which hopefully should be in your packets. So I'm going to just touch on a couple of highlights from those, and then provide some additional comments as well. Primarily, I'd like to state that we really support—the Nature Conservancy supports the RPB on its efforts to establish clear goals for Ocean Planning in the Northeast, and really appreciates this opportunity for additional input.

Looking at objective one, enhancing inter-agency coordination, the Conservancy supports the RPB's efforts to specify user groups and associated regulators that need to be considered to fully understand the overlap and interactions among them. This will help to engage stakeholders

in the planning process. However, we also believe this list is not necessarily comprehensive, and that other new uses, as well as existing uses, may need to be considered. Therefore, we ask that the RPB consider adding more expansive language to that effect.

Also with regard to objective one, improving inter-agency capacity to protect habitats is an important goal of ocean planning. However, habitat protection and restoration are missing in the suite of actions under this objective. The Conservancy recommends adding habitat protection explicitly, as well as restoration, to the actions that would benefit from enhanced inter-agency coordination and approved decision-making under this objective.

With regards to objective three, incorporating maps and other products into existing agency decision-making processes, I have two comments. First, with regards to cumulative impacts, the Conservancy suggests conducting a regional cumulative impact review and further analysis of the associated RPB priority actions. Over the last several years, many partners in the Northeast region have created a solid foundation for better understanding the combined effects of cumulative impacts and multiple human uses on natural resources.

Building on this work will provide ocean planners and stakeholders with essential information and tools to inform decision-making. We also suggest that the RPB convene an independent science advisory group to ensure the applicability and appropriate uses of various data and maps and products being produced.

This group could advise on a variety of challenging issues, including the scale of data with regards to specific site decisions, as well as how to account for cumulative impacts of multiple types and overbearing scales and time in making specific permitting decisions.

Finally, overall, we note that while [inaudible] implies that enhanced inter-agency coordination, better maps and data, improved public engagement, and better understanding of the ocean resources and their uses are sufficient as a framework for ocean planning, this document seems to be silent on the question of whether there will ultimately be an ocean plan for the region, and if so, what that plan might look like.

For example, whether it would be spatially-explicit, perhaps objective or criterion-based, or a collection of guidance recommendations or protocols for decision-making. We suggest that an additional objective and accompanying actions and outcomes be added to address the need to develop options for a plan along these lines. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Nick, before you go, Valerie Nelson, I think I already mentioned you'll be next. Rich Ruiz, I hope I'm saying your name right. You'll follow Valerie. Go ahead, Nick.

Nick Batista: Thank you. Nick Batista from the Island Institute in Rockland, Maine. I appreciate the time and effort that it's taken to get the document to this point, and I really appreciate Kathleen's comments about the summary of the main advisory body. I thought you captured the conversation well.

In particular, the issue of existing uses that both Kathleen and Richard raised, I think it's something that this body should talk about further after the rest of the public comment. I'd be really interested in hearing more of that discussion. It was just starting to get interesting when we got into public comment here.

On the specific goals and objectives, the Island Institute general supports your moving forward with them, and looks forward to discussions about the details about what those are, but we encourage you to keep those discussions happening, and preferably happening in front of all of us so we can participate and share our thoughts.

A couple of specific comments on the goal itself. Please keep a clear focus on improving the accessibility of various government processes to the general public, and we see that as both being the knowledge of and the timing of the regulatory processes, as well as the provision of data or the incorporation of data into those processes.

And also, Kathleen, I think you had a really good comment here that we'd agree with, that this might be a flawed process, and worthy of at least looking at how this whole construct fits together. I'm not capturing it well, but you did. I think we're missing the Army Corps of Engineers as a key existing regulatory body and use that could benefit from improved data and coordination. I would encourage you to put that in at the activity level.

In terms of how agencies get information, we'd love to see more focus on user-submitted data, data from individuals, community organizations, states, and included in the data porthole that then ties back into the improved regulatory process so that data that users submit could then be used through various government processes, heading towards the idea if you submit your data once, then you don't have to keep submitting it in a variety of different processes.

Beyond that, we're interested in hearing more conversations about connecting objective two and three together in this goal, ensuring the agency coordination, in particular the Federal agency commitment to the process. I think there's a lot more discussion that needs to happen there, and would love to walk out of this meeting with the commitment from the Federal agencies to actually implement these plans, or at least get to the next level of implementing the activities.

And finally, there's a number of groups in the region who have done a lot of work on stakeholder outreach, and there are a number of documents around there, including one from the Maine Fisherman's Forum in 2012 about off-shore wind and stakeholder engagement. Would encourage you to look at those, and we can provide what we have. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Go ahead, Valerie.

Valerie Nelson: Thank you very much, Laura. Valerie Nelson. I'm with the Water Alliance, and also a long-time former city councilor and activist in Gloucester, Massachusetts. So I appreciate the chance to follow-up on comments I made in the April meeting.

In this case, this session, about the great importance, but the difficulty about getting the public participation process right. And I pointed out that when meetings come to Gloucester on ocean issues, three or four members of the public will show up. And why is that? It's a lot that there's just not a message out there about how important this is, and what the changes could be that could be quite disruptive and transformative. There's a lack of clarity, so people don't show up.

This summer, there was a meeting in Gloucester. I hazard to say maybe as many people in the public—shop owners, citizens, professors, whatever—showed up as in any of the public meetings, and in looking at the background documents, I think Gloucester folks submitted more letters than any other community in New England.

But that being said, you'd have to say there's just a tremendous lack of clarity. The public is not understanding what it is you're doing, what you're about, and how you're doing it. And when they articulate your views, there's no response back. Most people there commented similarly to Richard Nelson, and he and I were in agreement in the April meeting I think a lot as well. Gloucester folks said they're troubled if this is about privatization of the ocean commons, and zoning up for corporate interests. And is that really what you're about? They didn't really like that. But you didn't make it clear that that's actually what you're about.

And how are you going to make these decisions, they asked. And there's a blizzard of maps presented, and your background materials go on for pages. You can't penetrate what it is that you're trying to do. And until—I think you need to really work on what it's going to take to engage the American public in this issue of huge importance. It's one of the greatest natural resources that you're talking about radically transforming the use of, and engage the public in that. That's what they're asking for, and that's what they will come out for.

But there was a suspicion that you're really about sand and gravel mining, and it was like, that must be what you're about. That's kind of amusing, because that's on your list now.

Universally, I think the strongest comment someone reviewing a couple of days ago wrote to me, well, if there was one message Gloucester had said, we don't want sand and gravel mining. But you know what? None of our comments we made in the meeting or letters, there's no response to us. We asked you what are you doing? No one comes back and answers those. No one comes back and says, "Well, this is what we're doing." There's no dialog with the community.

This is one of the biggest ports in the region and there's no public dialog. I do want to point out that we had this suspicion and others have referenced, you now are clarifying what you're about. You are about accelerating, accelerants and time-frames; very, very new and radical uses of the ocean. And I found that NROC has put an RFP out with the regulatory working group for consultants and experts to explore all these regulations in all these areas.

I would say for public participation purposes, if you do not wide open this NROC contract and get the public full bore into that project, which is being done on the side, you have to know somebody who sends it to you, I haven't heard yet mention of this contract in this meeting, you are

not acting transparently, you are not engaging the public, you are not being forthright about what you are doing. So probably Gloucester based on what they said and what I heard before I came down here would say, yes we still are owed a grand statement of what it is you think you're doing, but let's get into where the rubber meets the road. And if you're really going at the regulatory framework to issue permits for these kinds of uses, then let's get right up that and involve the public in that deliberation and not leave it to professors and bureaucrats and a few expert industry groups. That's the real focus, if that's your focus, then bring us in as members of the public. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Rich?

Rich Ruais: Yes.

Laura Cantral: Before you start, Amber Hewitt, you're going to follow Rich and then Rob Moyer, you'll be after Amber.

Rich Ruais: Okay. Thank you very much. My name is Rich Ruais, and I'm the Executive Director of the American Bluefin Tuna Association, and I was greatly relieved to hear Betsy Nicholson's first, original comments. One, I do fit into the category of this is the first meeting that I've ever been to. In fact, last Friday was the first time that I've heard about the existence of this group through the, attending a meeting at the Massachusetts Fishermen Partnership Association and Angela Sanfilippo. And I'm surprised that I've sort of fallen through the efforts that the group has made to assure transparency in the existence of this group and the objectives of this group because in my job, I represent, well, sort of represent, somewhere between 15,000 and 30,000 permit holders over the years; some of them in terms of commercial, it's about 6,000 permit holders in the tuna fisheries, and the swordfish fisheries, and then there's quite a few more, additional people in the recreational fisheries for highly migratory fish. So the constituency of the stakeholders extends from Corpus Christi, Texas essentially to down east Maine, as far as you can go.

So I would suggest that maybe in trying to extend the public awareness of your existence and the mission that you might want to look at some of the alternatives that are used by some of the other groups, like the Regional Fishery Council and the State Divisions and that's look at trade publications, both commercial and recreational, that in some cases offer free space for you to provide agendas on future meetings, with some limitations on space for how far you can go.

The second thing that I wanted to say that, again, Betsy you took away my need to use up all my time was your announcement that you do not, this group does not possess direct regulatory authority. That was my principle concern in coming here, was to make sure that this was not another body that we had to basically track around wherever you were going, in whatever direction you were going, to make sure that ultimately there wouldn't be some regulations that would impact the commercial and recreational fishermen we represent.

That being said, it's also true that even though you don't have direct regulatory authority, I'm assuming that you have, within the executive order, some pathways to provide policy guidance and recommendations to be adopted, and maybe even transferred into regulations such

as some of the marine sanctuaries have been provided. And we're experiencing a current problem here in New England right now with the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Fishery Sanctuary, trying to put regulations in place that will prohibit recreational and commercial fishing in a very historic fishing ground, Stellwagen Bank, through the New England Fishery Management Council. So again, we have to monitor, and when that sanctuary was being considered, we directly went to Congress and said, look, we as industry group stakeholders cannot afford to be watched, to be monitoring and attending all of the different regulatory bodies that are out there – from states, Atlantic States Regional Fisheries Commission, Regional Fishery Management Councils, EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, etcetera, etcetera; please, you've got to keep a limit on that.

Anyways, I see my time's running out, so I just wanted to make those few comments and also point out that I have heard in the past of every once in a while NOAA, the subject of either NOAA or National Marine Fisheries Service moving into another agency or becoming a self-standing agency, or this type of group being made as common, has come and gone, and I'm glad to see that one has finally formed. I think there are awesome, really true legitimate roles that you can play in that. And I wish you all the success in carrying them out and hopefully they won't involve fishery regulations any time soon. I'd also like to acknowledge two of my friends and colleagues, Paul Diodati and Doug Grout here, I've worked with them for many years, thirty-five years that I've been involved in fishery management; first starting with a New England fishery management council and since 1991, working for the tuna industry. Thanks a lot.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Amber. So Rob, you're going to go after Amber, and John Williamson, you will be after Rob.

Amber Hewitt: Hi, my name is Amber Hewitt, I am with the National Wildlife Federation. This is also my first time attending one your meetings, though my colleagues have caught me up to speed on what you've done so far; I'm really glad to be here and appreciate the opportunity to participate in the conversation today.

I am speaking today on behalf of National Wildlife Federation as an organization, as well as our more than 600,000 members and supporters in the Northeast region. We truly commend the work that you all have done thus far, and really enthusiastically support the work of this group up to date, and appreciate this opportunity to participate and add our voice to the conversation. NWF will be submitting a formal and far more extensive comments in writing, so I'll just take this opportunity to offer a high-level sample of where we stand.

National Wildlife Federation fundamentally believes that climate change is the leading threat to wildlife and their habitats, and firmly advocate for the swift advancement of clean energy, utility-scale clean energy development in New England and the Northeast region, and see that as a critical component of protecting wildlife and their habitats from the impacts that they're already seeing of climate change and the ones they know that they are destined for if we don't act quickly.

So as an organization, we do recognize that appropriately sited and responsibly developed offshore wind power needs to be a significant piece of that puzzle for the Northeast region. And as

wildlife advocates, of course I cannot underscore dramatically enough the importance of appropriately and responsibly, if we're going to do this, and National Wildlife Federation believes that must, we need to do it right, and of course that's a matter of bringing the right people to the right table. So that brings me back to where I started in thanking you all for seeing that that's happening, and we do look forward to staying very engaged in this conversation and offering our input every step of the way. And thank you very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you.

Rob Moyer: I'm Rob Moyer from the Ocean River Institute, and the Ocean River Institute's here in Cambridge, and I live in Somerville. I want to thank you for making this a very convenient meeting for me. [Laughter]. Although I love field trips to the ocean, so if you can set one of those up, that's okay, too. I applaud your progress that you're making. I think this is three elegant steps for more robust, long-lasting solutions are the interagency information sharing and coordination, the striving to be inclusive of diverse perspectives, and respect for indigenous and agency decision-making processes.

Now by indigenous processes I mean New Hampshire is different from Massachusetts, the way we make decisions. So we need to be respectful of those kinds of things. New Hampshire is very retail, we're very hands-on, we want to meet our politicians; Massachusetts is very kind of representative and we delegate stuff. If you're seen in a candidate's house party, you're considered in their camp. And in New Hampshire, if you don't go to every candidate's house party, you don't decide who to vote for. So it's very important that we have systems that are respectful of the different decision-making processes the different communities work.

And I've had the fortune to serve on Federal Advisory Councils, and I have found that advisory councils serve government very well and they are very cumbersome. I have found that independent groups serve the stakeholders and are more nimble than are the formal advisory councils, for example, and they tend to be more respectful of the local needs. In Massachusetts, we love advisory councils; we delegate someone and that person has to keep a, you know; whereas in a more hands-on place, we don't need someone else to speak for us.

The FACA of 1972 became a law for the government to engage stakeholders on specific situations; such as, the private beach houses on the Cape Cod National Seashore. So they had to set it up so that those people would be representative. Now creating an AC, to create an advisory council is creating more government, and that's not the kind of message you want to send, I think, when you're doing regional planning. And Regional Ocean Planning is much more complex for one or a dozen advisory councils.

So I would ask you instead to look to the collaborative successes that are happening around us. For example, in the fisheries, 446 stocks of fish are managed by the government in collaboration with fishing interest. Two hundred thirty of those are commercially valuable. Of those, since 2000, thirty-four fish stocks have been managed from being over-fished to sustainably-fished. That leaves twenty-six fish stocks that are still being over-fished, and those twenty-six stocks are

complicated issues. The cod fish example is three stocks; there's the Gulf of Maine cod, there's a Georgia's Banks cod, and there's, what is it South Cape Cod cod?

Male: Just part of Georgia's Bank cod.

Rob Moyer: What's the third one?

Male: There's only two.

Rob Moyer: Only two. And unfortunately, they only sample one region and then extrapolate to the other, so it makes it more complicated. But haddock is an interesting story. The haddock swim with the cod and the flounder, and they found when the nets are set that the cod and the flounder swim down and the haddock go side to side. And so they were able to modify the nets, reduce the by-catch, and in so doing, have moved haddock from being over-fished to sustainably-fished.

So the moral of my story is for ocean managers, we don't need more deciders, we need more knowledge. And please keep up the good work. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you.

John Williamson: I guess I'm the wrap-up, then.

Rob Moyer: You are. You're sweeper.

John Williamson: You gave me a great segue, too. John Williamson, Seakeeper Charters, and consulting, and some of the time, much of the time I'm under contract with Ocean Conservancy to do outreach to the fishing industry in the Northeast, which means New England and the mid-Atlantic. And just a comment on something I see that seems to be missing from the document, and I really can't imagine that it's actually missing from your process, and that is, well I guess I'll start out with saying there's a large marine ecosystem that's recognized in literature, scientific literature. It extends from Cape Sable, Nova Scotia to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, and it's a contiguous ecosystem structure. It's got oceanographic vectors that drive that ecosystem, those are vectors for North-South and South-North, and it's apparently being, you planning for this, so it's going to fall between two regional planning bodies – yours and the mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body.

So I'm here to, I'm prompted to get up to the microphone today just to relate to you a conversation I was having last night with half a dozen fishermen and seafood processors, we were in Baltimore. And over dinner, we were talking about their economic ties to New England. People from Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey had boats that fish on Georgia's Bank, they have businesses that are, they have processing facilities in Virginia and New Bedford. So it's for them, and one man in particular was describing to me, describing for the entire table, what he saw as the permitting structure, the social and economic structure in the fishing industry, extending from Maine all the way down to North Carolina. And he was describing it. It's a continuous, contiguous permitting structure that supports a contiguous fishing economy. He said it's entirely different in Maine than it is in Virginia, but there is no seam in between; it's contiguous, seamless.

So the question is really, we've got two processes going on. I'm getting hints of where the MARCO, or the mid-Atlantic RPB process is headed in putting together their goals and objectives, they're charting a very different course than what you folks are doing. The question is, how are these two processes going to talk to each other, because there's clearly for them to be talking to each other. The data portal clearly recognizes that the two regions are inseparable because the data portal is seamless, so I just, that's the question. It's not in the document. How are the two processes going to work together?

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So John, you were the last of our commenters for this session. We'll have two more comment sessions scheduled for tomorrow. One at 10:15 a.m. and then the third will be at 2:45 p.m. So we're a little bit ahead of schedule, and we're going to take a break now. And I'm going to suggest that we stay with a fifteen minute break and come back at 4:20 and pick up the discussion about the effective decision-making goal, come back to Ames' question to entertaining some of the comments we got from public comment, and seeing where we can go with the rest of the day and this discussion. Is that okay? All right, see you in fifteen minutes.

RPB Discussion of Draft Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Effective Decision Making (continued)*

Laura Cantral: All right, we're going to, as promised, resume our discussion about the goal related to effective decision-making, picking up where you left off before we had public comment; we heard a lot of good input and comments specifically about this goal, in addition to some broader ideas and comments, which are much appreciated. And I'm going to turn to Grover here in just a moment, but before I do that, I want to recognize that Jonathan Perry has joined us over the break, and Jonathan, do you want to introduce yourself, since I just introduced you on your behalf? But you could do it again.

Jonathan Perry: Jonathan Perry, Aquinnah Wampanoag from Martha's Vineyard.

Laura Cantral: Thank you, and welcome. Grover.

Grover Fugate: Okay. Thank you. After listening to the comment, there are a couple of things I wanted to make a point of. First of all, several commenters made this comment, and it is true, somehow we need to re-word this to reflect that it's all uses that we're looking at, not just the four that are enumerated. The four, as I indicated earlier on, I think were chosen as straw men, and it was done, for instance, with input with the Army Corps, the Army Corps was the one that in fact selected agriculture, as one of the ones to be looked at.

The wind energy is self-evident. We have a lease off of Rhode Island right now that the developer has a year to develop an environmental assessment outline essentially, SAP, or Site Assessment Plan, on how they're going to study that area to move forward with the filing of a construction operation plan.

Massachusetts has a leasing process that is about to get underway, and so there will be major leasing activities that occur and development activities that occur off of both those leases. And that needs to be explored in terms of how do we improve those decisions.

The sand and gravel was actually, I suggested that one, so I can explain that a little bit. After Sandy, off the coast of New York and New Jersey, the Army Corps is poised at this point to remove about 700 million cubic yards of material and start to put it back on beaches in those areas. As a result of that, also BOEM has received some Sandy money to look at sand and gravel resources in the offshore environment. Thirteen states have applied for, and thirteen states are going to receive BOEM money to start to look at that issue.

I would suggest that if we are to look at our future, we know that we are going to have potentially more storms, the storms are very strong, and with sea level rise, the need for aggregate is going to increase. So we're going to be under a lot of pressure to look at sand and gravel resources because our upland sources are diminishing rapidly. The Corps is very project-oriented. So what happens is in the event of a major hurricane, the Corps is poised offshore with dredges basically saying where are we going to get the sand? That is not the time we want to start being, to have these discussions on how we make those decisions. This is not an attempt to grease the skids for any of these projects; in fact, it is the opposite in many cases because what we're saying is we haven't figured out a very good process, and how do we have those discussions.

So the intent of this, obviously and particularly with the RFP that's out there right now is, is there a better way that we can knit these processes together? Is there a better way that we can sequence these processes because we're using existing authorities, remember; this is not new authorities. Is there a better way that we can sequence these processes so that we end up with a better decision? Is there information that's necessary that we need to start looking at now, before we make these decisions? Such as, with the sand and gravel, the potential impacts to benthic habitat and fisheries and fisheries and those types of things. Those studies may take a decade to complete in order for us to get a rational approach to this. So these are the types of discussions.

And are there ways that we can bring users that typically don't have access early on in the process to this; in front of the process, rather than at the tail end, which they often are then relegated to, to improve this decision-making. So it's not that we've figured out this decision-making process and we're here to basically expedite all this stuff; it is that we're trying to figure out a process that comes up with a more rational decision, a more inclusive decision, a more thoughtful decision, in terms of how we look at these uses than what we currently have in process. So I just wanted to put that in context, and that's why these uses were chosen, is because they represent a very near real-time issue to us, and we don't have a good handle on how to make these decisions.

Laura Cantral: Tom.

Tom Burack: Grover, just want to ask you a question about that, just to follow up and I don't know if John might have something on this as well. Can we assume that in looking at those four

particular consumptive uses we've identified here as examples of our looking of all uses ultimately that in looking at those four, we will necessarily end up looking at non-consumptive uses as well? For example, that is, I mean, you couldn't just look at sand and gravel extraction without understanding what impact that's going to have on fisheries, on surfing, for example, on whatever else it might be.

Grover Fugate: Right. I guess coming from a planning background where we look at non-consumptive uses as well as consumptive uses, I guess that I assume that's implicit within decision-making, but if it needs to be explicit, maybe that's the way to go about this, too. But yes, it absolutely looks at all those, not just the direct interaction with say the fishery or whatever, but you've got a lot of other users out there; bird watchers, whale watchers, kayakers, you name it. And you need to understand as you go forward what the potential impacts are as you make those decisions and there will be areas that will have higher trade-off values than other areas, so you need to be aware of that.

Tom Burack: So if I may, I think your suggestion is a very good one, that we should be much more explicit in our description of these things that, in fact we're looking at all uses and taking these four specific examples as the projects we would take on first, we're going to be necessarily looking at all the related non-consumptive uses, for example.

Laura Cantral: Bob.

Bob LaBelle: Thank you. Speaking for Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, I want to echo that this list, well, I think two of the items on the floor are being managed out of my agency. And tomorrow, we'll talk about the offshore wind activity. We fully realize that on its face, the way it's presented here, and after reading the comments, it struck me, gee we should have seen this coming. We need to do a better job in communicating what we're doing here because it is fully integrated. The action items sort of, whether it's offshore wind or sand and gravel mining or just trying to get to the potential of identifying offshore sand sites if the nation ever needs them in the future; that will kick off an intensive environmental and public review. Now, each federal agency has a role to play and that has a role to play, and that has its own process for trying to get that input in. And to varying degrees, it's successful, but it's also, as someone mentioned, it can be a stilted process. If you're not reading the Federal Register and you don't realize the comment period is only open for ninety days, you miss your chance to comment on it.

So part of what came out of the executive order is guidance and direction for us as federal managers to expand the way we interact with getting public and sectors' comments input on what we're required to do by law. So to the extent that we're getting a regional take on environmental issues, or socioeconomic fishing, all of them we want to bring to bear before any decisions are made in our specific agency on a specific wind or sand and gravel project. So I just want to reiterate that BOEM doesn't feel that these are the most important things, it's, as people have said here, you have to factor in all of the ocean uses in your determination for the action causing project.

Laura Cantral: Did you have another comment or you just...?

Grover Fugate: Well I was just going to add though that I think in terms of some of the things we've been looking at is, let's say for example that, with the BOEM money we have twelve sites that our geologists have identified. Would it be better to bring the fishing industry in and have them say on those twelve sites, six of these are off the table right out of the gate before we invest any money in studying all twelve, or whatever? Those are the types of things I'm talking about in terms of how you structure the process to end up with better decisions.

Laura Cantral: Other thoughts?

Betsy Nicholson: Okay. In terms of in the spirit of raising our hands to step up and champion some of these things in particular, some of those items that are lacking capacity, I feel very strongly on behalf of NOAA how important it is to make sure that, I think it's objective two, informing the public, the road map that we speak of. Whatever that might look like in terms of maybe the current situation is flawed but just to help people navigate how it works so that we don't miss, as Grover said, decisions that are being made right now, let's take this opportunity to communicate well how those processes work.

And if it's okay, I'm going to ask the Coast Guard and offer to co-chair maybe an effort to move this along. We need internal capacity, and we need some champions, so if there's anyone else that wants in, in terms of moving that forward, we'll take a stab at it. Kathleen now.

Female: I want to speak next, but uh...

Betsy Nicholson: Oh. Yes, Page 14 of 28 in the framework. I just want to mention that. All right.

Grover Fugate: Laura, could I just ask a process question here? Just trying to understand what we're going to try to accomplish here. We have a number of comments, and I'm sure we all have in our own ways identified various comments that we think might lend themselves to modifications of the document. Likewise, in the comments section itself, especially I think it's the first page of the document where Katie pointed out to us the first page of the document that's the member comments section, there are five issues there identified. Are we going to systematically go through these and decide are we going to incorporate each of these items, or not? How do we, how are we going to do this process here to try to get to an end point?

Laura Cantral: It's a great question. Let me take a shot at it. I'm going to ask the co-leads and the staff to chime in, correct me if I get it wrong. For the purposes of right now, is getting through this discussion about this goal and consistent with what I said earlier about our objectives for this meeting, our hope is that this body will be prepared to, by the end of tomorrow, have approved the goals and related objectives and said we are comfortable with a set of tasks that enable the RPB and the team of people supporting the RPB to move forward with some actions that are addressing those in a two-year time frame to help inform future decision-making. So that's the big picture of what we're trying to accomplish.

With regard to the discussion about effective decision-making, there have been some good suggestions and some context about some revisions that probably need to be made to the language

of that goal that makes it clear, and I won't repeat all of that, that we're talking about all uses; there are some that are specified for some particular reasons that, your point about non-consumptive will be part of that. So we could do some work overnight to put that language back in front of you and see if you're comfortable with that and that you're ready to approve it and its related objectives.

Then I think we want to hear some discussion about how you're feeling about the related activities, actions, tasks, volunteering to help with some capacity needs or ideas about how to address some capacity needs, and that that is what we need to walk away from this meeting with.

To your point about systematic going through all of the comments, I don't know that we're prepared to go through in a systematic way in this forum; there needs to be some iterative work that the staff is going to incorporate and put a draft back in front of you. I don't have a good answer to that question, maybe someone can help me out. But does that make sense? Does that seem like the right approach? John?

John Weber: Just to add that obviously with respect to if we're thinking about the first objective that Grover talked about clarifying some of that language, that's absolutely something we can, staff can work on tonight and have ready for tomorrow. It would, if we're going to go, Commissioner, to your point about the five bullets that are listed here, we could also take a look at those and it would be helpful to get direction if there are additional tweaks that emerge out of that conversation, then we could try to tackle tonight, that would be helpful.

Laura Cantral: Does that help?

Grover Fugate: That's helpful. I was just trying to figure out how we can move the conversation along and get to some decisions, that's all I'm trying to help us do.

Laura Cantral: Yeah, right. Thank you. Kathleen and then Meredith.

Kathleen Leyden: I have a question related to the timeline that's actually pretty consistent throughout the whole framework document. Most of the dates are in the November range, where it says New England RPB decision on options to implement, and that language confused me. Was that, is it meant that New England RPB makes decisions on options to include in the regional plan? Okay. So it's not, okay we're going to go ahead and...

John Weber: No, the idea is that, so for various topics between now and November, get much more specific, lots of engagement, define a couple, whatever the number is, a couple of options, bring to November. At November, there would be decisions made on which, any, all, none of those options could go forward with. We just recognize that then coming out of that will be additional work we'll need to do to engage people further, develop refined products, projects, outcomes, that come out of those decisions. So that is the intent of that November meeting. And then there would be is to define, okay, here's kind of the marching orders for the next year. And then additionally then built into the schedule after that is additional public process, additional RPB meetings, etc. Does that help?

Kathleen Leyden: I think that might important to clarify because implement usually means go ahead and do. And then, in the framework on Page 12, under objective one, task three, it says with contractor assistance engage federal and state agencies, NGOs, and the regulated community. What is that? And then later on that section, it makes reference to a public workshop. Is that, how is that, will the engagement happen at the workshop? Or is there some idea of like a working group or...?

John Weber: Yeah, the idea is that there will be engagement prior to and including the workshop. And that part of the point of a contractor, and this is referenced in the RFP that was discussed earlier, is actually to bring some, is to get some contractor assistance to help with engagement prior to the workshop in whatever form that workshop will take.

Grover Fugate: And correct me if I'm wrong, but that's the regulatory working group that's essentially working with that project?

John Weber: Correct.

Kathleen Leyden: And then, in terms of the data portal, you're going to, I'm a broken record on this, but I think identify, I understand how you need to—we need to identify the utility of the portal and how it will be used to help justify its existence into the future and develop champions and financial supporters of the portal. But I think we just need to caution that putting an awful lot of attention and resources into it with right now no guarantee that it's going to be anything more than a snapshot of data or some past trends, instead of something that will live on and be used.

John Weber: In, on Page 5 of the framework, the schedule, if you look at May or June, there's a, some people may have been wondering what this meant: discuss options for RPB future role and maintenance and advancement of ocean planning products, etcetera. So what we're saying is that well before the end of the next two years, we need to have a focused, detailed conversation to address a portion of what you said, which is the long term where is the data, where's the data portal in 2017.

There's also another element of what you said, which is embedded, I think, in some of the conversations that the framework proposes to get into very shortly, which talks about issues that we clearly hear when we go out and think about mapping natural resources and the fact that it's an ever-changing environment. We need to focus in on that, and what exactly are we going to do with that point? I think that is a subtext of some of those conversations that are proposed to start sooner than 2015.

Laura Cantral: Okay, respond just to that.

Betsy Nicholson: Just on the portal comment? When I've briefed the NOC steering committee on our progress and they've asked how they can help, so you've got to be careful how to answer that, right? But I think one of the very obvious ways is to recognize that we all have, every region has

major outstanding data needs and a major need for federal commitment in terms of the data source agencies to make accessible and usable their data on a regular basis. And we've gotten a lot of support for that to the point where folks have turned around and said get our data managers and regions assigned to this effort to help maintain this tool going forward so it's dynamic and useful.

So we're in conversations that are pretty high-level on that, making demands as a region to, for this all not to be for naught, in terms of your point, pouring a lot of our limited resources into that construct and starting to get it used. So we're having conversations at a very high level in terms of its support and starting to identify what does that mean. What do we need agencies to commit to; and also having a lot of very purposeful and enthusiastic conversations with regulatory staff themselves who are excited about the tool, wanting to use it, and talking about the functionality that will be helpful to them. So it's happening at a couple different levels.

Laura Cantral: All right, so Meredith, I haven't forgotten about you, but Rick wants to chime in on this point as well.

Rick Getchell: One of the things that we've discussed repeatedly is the data that we've been collecting and that's been collected for tribes. It's been collected constantly through a lot of agencies, federal agencies, state, and even tribal departments; and that data needs to have a home. And that data needs to go to some place, and that data needs to go on in the future. And we're at an opportunity, when we look at what NOAA and everybody else has, there's not even a place holder for tribes. So as we develop this, it's one of our goals and priorities to be able to take our seat, if you will, and get into a system where all the hundreds and thousands of dollars annually that are spent on tribal levels to create data will actually be used. And that's, I think that's very important as we have this discussion that that's something that we need to push for, especially the tribes and this RPB body.

Laura Cantral: Meredith.

Meredith Mendelson: This is actually in some ways I think building off of that comment. Just in looking at the fourth objective here, I don't mean for this to take anything away from the tribal focus on this because I think that that's appropriate, I'm wondering if we haven't lost something though in the traditional knowledge that other groups, including the fishing industry, also bring. And I think by, the focus here I'm wondering if we should have a fifth objective that tries to get back to that less of sort of the VMS, VTR kinds of data and more kind of cultural values from other types of ocean uses, whether they're consumptive or non-consumptive, that seems to have gotten lost in this goal. And I just sort of in going back to this, it occurs to me that I think that was in earlier drafts, and it seems to have found its way out somehow. I don't have those drafts with me. But also I would note, Betsy, if you are to come back to the very beginning of that discussion when you were looking for volunteers to work on identifying the pathway, I'd be happy to help with that effort.

Laura Cantral: All right, great. Grover, did you have something else?

Grover Fugate: Well, I was just trying to understand from the members, we have four objectives here, and I guess we've had a little discussion on three and four. I didn't, I just think most of it seems to be focused in on one; is that the one we should be concentrating on at this point, rather than the other three? Or I'm just asking because it seems to be where most of the angst was created originally.

Laura Cantral: So it seems to me that you've had a lot of discussion around objective one. I think we've got some clarity about what to do in terms of next steps, bring some suggested language back to you tomorrow. On objective two, we, I don't believe have had much discussion except for Betsy's offer to volunteer on the capacity needed for that, and Dan and Meredith have both volunteered to help with that. Other than that, I don't believe there's been any more discussion. Objective three, perhaps we need to touch on that, and we've had a little bit of an exchange with some comments from Rick and also Meredith's suggestion that we perhaps add a fifth objective or somehow ensure that it's reflected in here somewhere, other kinds of traditional knowledge and cultural values being included.

So it seems to me like the place where I haven't heard any discussion, correct me if I'm wrong, is around objective three. Tom you have your tent up, you have a comment?

Tom Burack: I had a comment on objective two, but I'm, I thought we heard a comment, I believe it was somebody from the Nature Conservancy, I believe it was that under objective two, there was no mention of habitat protection and restoration. I'm not sure if I've tagged that correctly, but I think that is a very important area of work, habitat protection and restoration; and I just want to make sure that if there's an arena in which we should be considering it, that we've got that incorporated here. I think the suggestion was that it ought to be referenced in objective two, but I'm not certain of that.

Male: Objective two or goal two?

Tom Burack: Objective one is where you thought it ought to be. Okay, all right, thank you. I misunderstood, so certainly it's a key piece of any of those discussions, I would think.

Laura Cantral: Yeah, okay, all right. And I think that's consistent, it's another discussion you've had about objective one that we can address. Mel.

Mel Coté: Thank you. Yeah, this is, I'm not sure if it's sort of more of a structural comment on the order of the goals, and I recognize that we agree that they're not prioritized, they're equal and of themselves. I also make this comment because I'm not going to be here during the morning session when we talk about the ecosystem health goal, which is obviously really important to EPA.

And I think from our perspective, certainly from my perspective, the healthy ocean coastal ecosystems is sort of really the overarching goal here, and it's why we're trying to do more effective decision-making, it's why we're trying to resolve conflicts, so we can maintain the health of our ocean and coastal ecosystems so that they can continue to provide fish and other uses. And so a lot of the comments have been sort of angst about the fact that we're focusing in on these

consumptive uses in objective one; and I think that if you reverse the goals, goals one and two, and you address healthy ecosystems right up front as sort of an overarching goal, you make that point more clearly. And then you get to the other goals of how you're going to achieve that by doing more effective decision-making and resolving conflicts.

The ocean policy's out there because the oceans are in trouble, and anything we're doing around this table has got to be focused on that central issue of the oceans are in trouble. We've already got a lot of uses that have led to the state of the oceans, and we've got even more potentially conflicting uses arising through, out of our control, but we've got to deal with them. So I just raise that now and recognize that you'll probably have more conversations about that during the morning.

Laura Cantral: Chuckie.

Chuckie Green: Mel stole my thunder before I could... Okay, I agree with him 100% that we've discussed it at our last meeting of healthy ecosystems. Anything we do here, if we do not come out with a healthy ecosystem up front, if we do not provide habitat restoration, if we do not fix what we've broken, it only leads us to failure. It leads us to failure because all industry that is supported by a healthy ecosystem, or is even related to, will be gone and we won't be able to come back from it.

Laura Cantral: Doug.

Doug Grout: Thank you. Concerning this comment that was made about habitat protection and restoration and where this belongs in the document, as I was reading through this document, there's under goal two, objective two, under Page 24, it seems to be, to me, a more appropriate place to include some of this because we're talking about as an action, identifying, this is on Page 23 at the bottom for those of you who are looking along, identifying existing and potential programs that would be directly related to conservation, restoration, and maintaining a healthy ecosystem. And I would include, as part of doing that, you certainly would be looking at habitat protection and restoration, from my standpoint. It almost seems like it's either already in there, or maybe I'm misunderstanding the comment that was made.

Laura Cantral: Grover.

Grover Fugate: I think, and I can see as a regulator why they would want to focus in on restoration activities being incorporated within the regulatory decision-making process because where you've gone the extra mile to restore an area, you may want to give that extra weight within the process itself versus an area that's been degraded or whatever, because the extra effort dollars and all the rest of it has been focused in on it.

So I agree that it's in goal two and needs to be there, but some acknowledgement within one may not be a bad idea, either. So there's overlap. Reinforcement.

Laura Cantral: So Sharri and then Katie.

Sharri Venno: I just wanted to second what Grover said because Betsy, I think you talked about it not being a stove piped thing, we wanted to look at this as a holistic thing. So if you see the connections between those three stovepipes that we've created, I think it'll improve people's comfort level a lot in terms of what we're trying to achieve.

Laura Cantral: Katie.

Katie Lund: I just want to point out, I guess when I look at the letter from the Nature Conservancy, and apologies, I don't have the hard copy but I think it's the last one in your briefing packs, that it seems like the way it's articulated is that it's almost an outcome of the enhanced coordination. And so it might not be necessary to have it be a separate objective necessarily, but at least to point out that, I guess the way they articulate it is adding habitat protection and restoration to the actions that would benefit from the enhanced interagency coordination. So the way it's articulated, at least in that particular comment, is that it's almost a result of the improved coordination itself. So that could be another way to think about incorporating it into this particular goal.

Laura Cantral: Mm-hm. Go ahead.

Doug Grout: Sorry about that, I'll put it down, but I, it makes a lot of sense to me.

Laura Cantral: Okay.

Betsy Nicholson: Meredith, can we resolve your idea? I don't want to like just walk away and we don't have a place for capturing knowledge and values of other ocean users, I think is what you said, and whether that, it doesn't seem to fit, to me, within the tribal objective there because that goes into consultation and other matters that I think we really need to focus on separately. So what do you think? I just don't want it to get lost, or maybe the staff has an idea.

Meredith Mendelson: Yeah, maybe I can converse with John and Nick and maybe come up with a suggestion unless you have one, whoever.

John Weber: So one potential idea is, and this is where, I'm getting the number wrong, so let me double check. Objective three, on Page 14 and 15, starts providing a topic that's come up other times to other goals that we have. Because what this basically is getting at is while we're thinking about ways to come up with specific options for efficiency and decision-making, let's also make sure that we're paying attention to other products that we're developing. Those products could be things that are used by the data portal, they will be other things as we'll discuss.

So I'm wondering if that provides, an already a link, and if some of this is important context that, or not, it's more than context; it's important work that should be called out more specifically in goal two. Because what goal basically says is we're going to do some work to characterize natural resources and maybe potentially develop other tools to use some of that information, we'll have that conversation tomorrow. But it's not just about that. That one is also about looking at the economy, and there's been some really interesting conversation that I've had last couple of days with people saying, yeah, but it's almost more than just the economy you want

to think about and characterize. There's a, you want to get at some other community-related aspects of traditional activities.

So I'm wondering, if because we have objective three which basically ties back kind of write large to goal two, and then in goal two if I remember right and I'll go find it in a second, there's a further tie back to goal one. I wonder if the way forward is to come back to this tomorrow in a conversation about goal two. That's a potential option, so just floating that out there.

Laura Cantral: All right, so now you may need to clarify at least for the facilitator, at first I thought you were saying perhaps Meredith's thought could be incorporated as part of objective three. No. That's not what you're saying.

John Weber: So maybe what I'm suggesting is Meredith's thought to the extent that that implies developing new information and basically doing work to capture some of what I believe I heard you talking about with a paralleled analogy to what is being proposed under the tribal objective there, objective four. To the extent that there's an information development part of what you're speaking to that that could be a specific component of what we talk about with goal two. Because goal two is about doing things like characterizing natural resources, characterizing, you know right now we have some ideas but need more discussion about, the economy. And then so I was taking that a step further and saying that maybe that's a place you could flesh that idea out further. Does that help?

And I guess then the final point that I'm making is that what we've tried to do with objective three just in general is to make sure that as we are developing products, either based on this specific idea or other ones that are in goal two, we want to pay attention to what those products are and bring them into the conversations that will be happening under this efficient decision-making goal.

Laura Cantral: Right, right, so that's part of the interrelationship among all of these goals and objectives.

John Weber: Absolutely.

Laura Cantral: All right, so Meredith, did you want to respond to that?

Meredith Mendelson: I feel like I need to noodle on it a little bit, before I'm ready to sort of articulate it, but I don't know that I consider it a characterization. So I think I need to think that through a little bit; I don't know that I think of it as quite something that can be captured, but more of a mechanism for engagement.

Laura Cantral: All right, so I apologize, because some tents are going up and I'm not going to get them in exactly the right order, so just bear with me. Katie, I can tell you want to jump into that. Doug, Grover, and Sharri, I'll just go in order around this way.

Katie Lund: So I was pointing out that along the lines of your comment, I think Meredith is potentially the second bullet here that is kind of outstanding that we've heard from RPB member comments, and this came out as a public comment. It's the second bullet under your tab that summarizes the RPB comments; it's tab 3.2. It's a principle that was suggested that relates to not just this idea of tribal sustenance, but I think it's broader because the public comment period over the spring and summer suggested this and I believe it came from a letter from the fishing community where it would be to add that principle, which seems to reflect some of your thoughts about characterizing it in a way that's more than information, it's about the value and the importance of considering these as almost like a principle from the community's perspective. So I just wanted to point out that that second bullet was offered to all of you as RPB members that could potentially be another avenue for addressing this.

Laura Cantral: Doug.

Doug Grout: Meredith, you know, I agree with you in one of the things I was thinking as I was listening to everybody here that maybe this could be included as an action under one of the objectives, whether it's goal two, or whether it's goal one, objective two or three, but have it as a specific identified action, and there might be a process, even identified either as a task or maybe right within an action within those; just as an idea where we might go with this. That way it specifically identifies it.

Laura Cantral: Grover.

Grover Fugate: Yeah, I guess this is a question to the tribal members. Rick has indicated that one of the objectives that you would like to achieve I guess is that there be almost a consultation process that's sort of a model that would be developed so that other federal agencies might be able to use that model. Is that something that could be incorporated within objective four, that tribes themselves can outline how they would like the consultation process to go, or something?

Rick Getchell: Yeah, exactly. That's what we're looking to do, is come up with that model, and also demonstrate examples of good consultation practices and bad consultation practices and be able to take that to the appropriate authorities and have something that everyone can use. And that can be done very easily because we have plenty of data to look back on, so it's almost long overdue.

Grover Fugate: I think that would be valuable if we could get that incorporated.

Laura Cantral: Mm-hm. Okay. Sharri.

Sharri Venno: I wanted to follow up on Meredith's comment because I do think there are some parallels to some of the concepts that we find within tribal communities, there's a phrase, it's traditional ecological knowledge. And it's knowledge based on living close to the land, using natural resources to sustain yourself. I happen to have a father and a brother who fish, and particularly my father will look at a decision made by a manager or a scientist and question it based on his own experience. He will say, well that doesn't make sense because I've observed this, or I've observed that, and the two don't, aren't consistent. Why is that?

So and when we talk about TEK for short with EPA, mostly we have that conversation with EPA, it's about marrying that knowledge and wisdom to statistically based scientific conclusions, or trying to integrate the two so that they work together, and better inform the final decision.

And I think that is similar to the kind of input that the fishing community can bring to the table. I'm not sure how you develop an action or objective around that, but I think that's the concept that we're trying to get at, and I do think it has value.

Laura Cantral: Chuckie and then Tom.

Chuckie Green: I wanted to go back a little bit to Grover's, but as far as that we had some discussion on it and formation of a working group, tribal working group, to be able to put something together for the group to look at and understand because there are agencies at the table that really work well, have great policies in place, and there are agencies within the government that have absolutely no policy that haven't figured it out yet and haven't been able to put policy in place, an Indian policy of any kind.

So I mean, if we were to sit down as a working group, and this is something that I'm throwing out here to the group and maybe the tribal group will want to hang me when I get out of here but I think it's something that whereas, we experienced it, we've worked with it, we've worked with it overall, and we know which ones are good and which ones are bad and, if we could come up with a general policy. We have a real opportunity here because it's not often when we can get in a room with so many federal agencies at one time and be able to discuss these issues. And I mean, if we could draft something that was close, using policies that exist and policies that we've worked with and the thoughts of the tribe, you know, because nobody's ever really come to us and asked us, okay, does this work?

So I mean, I think that could be something that could come out of this process that would be very valuable to the tribes and agencies and everything, could get us all on the same page, and we could put this consultation issue to bed and say, okay, everybody understands how it works, everyone understands how to do it, totally acceptable, we move forward.

As far as TEK goes, in my tribe we work strongly with TEK. We've actually done some work with Woods Hole and done some work with some other people to bring scientists into our tribe to talk about how the two relate, and what we found is the crossovers are real close. We run a camp every year for kids, putting scientists and tribal culture keepers in the same room. And the differences are there, but if you don't talk about them then they're never going to be resolved. But the differences can, they're so close that it's really easy to do. And all kinds of TEK are good to bring into the room.

A mechanism, I think, is going to be tough to try to get everyone in here because then you get convoluted with a whole bunch of stuff that you can't work through.

Laura Cantral: Tom.

Tom Burack: If folks want to continue this discussion on this theme of tribal issues, maybe we should deal with first. I wanted to bring us to this other list of items that Katie had drawn our attention to earlier and see what we want to do with those, and I've got one other issue from the comments that I just wanted to raise. But maybe we want to focus on trying to come to some conclusion on what we can talk about here first.

Laura Cantral: Okay, any other comments, thoughts, questions about this theme about the tribal issues, the opportunities for improving the consultation process, the traditional ecological knowledge that Chuckie was just talking about? Rick?

Rick Getchell: Yeah, again, I support exactly getting everybody on board. I think everybody coming to the table, and we've done this before from a tribal perspective, bringing in all the federal agencies that's supposed to have this unique policy they roll out. And some of them have a nice policy, some don't even have one. Some have a nice website that alludes to one that was never created, so on and so forth.

So I think it's important that, when we create this workgroup, that if the states and federal agencies want to be involved, yep, it would only be that much easier and quicker for us to come to a common theme. And again, we have, fortunately for us, the tribes have a lot of the expertise on, again, what works and what doesn't work. And we could put that out there and say, this is a success and everybody else can compare notes and bring what they have to the table. So we would invite that through a working group, if anyone was interested in that to participate with us.

Laura Cantral: All right, let's go to Vera and then Sharri.

Vera Francis: Thank you. And good evening to everyone here. I've been patiently sitting here with you as well, and have a lot of questions and have a lot of concerns, but I'll focus it on this question on the table as to consultation and also I'm going to couple that with Meredith's initial statement around local traditional and I guess now, ecological knowledge. So I'll try to respond to that in a brief summary.

So first, my comment as to consultation, and Chuckie here absolutely corrected assuming that we do not all agree on putting a cookie cutter approach on the table as it relates to tribal nations and their particular positions might be as to consultation and how that might be defined by them; that is always up to them. So I would reject any cookie cutter approach to thinking we could come up with something like that.

But I would add though that consultation just even now today with the public is a messy, is messy work. So I welcome messy work, and I believe people that are here do as well. So those are my comments on that.

As to Meredith's initial comment around including the language, I would just also reference Maine's comments in the package I received, and they're in there, but they're also basically tagged with this point about it not being just the tribes. So I would suggest that to help us strengthen our communications, that you don't, you know, that you consider words so that they're

not perceived as if they're confrontational or that there's a comparison to be made. You know, because otherwise it mischaracterizes not just for the tribes, because I'm a representative of one of those tribes, and we'd ask that that be taken out, so that we can build communication and strengthen communication.

Because those comments were made in a context in the State of Maine, where the State of Maine and the Passamaquoddy Tribe in particular were in direct conflict about what that meant. So I would just urge that we speak honestly and directly because I read the comments and they're in there, and I would be sure that tribal members, that where I come from would take offense to that comparison.

But I welcome the suggestion to do that because that's very important, but there should be distinctions made, tribal traditional ecological knowledge; I would add also wisdom must be a part of that. Because we can always rely on traditional or the local or any, and they still could be wrong. So we must really be mindful about that it is messy work, and we must strive for the wisdom. In fact, that should be the lens, not just accept any cookie cutter approach or comments. Thank you very much for listening to me. I have more to say, but not tonight.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So Meredith, do you want to respond to that, and then Sharri we'll go to you?

Meredith Mendelson: I would just say I appreciate your point about that, Vera. I think that was an effort in our part to reflect the comments as we received them in our meetings, but I appreciate why that feels like not, or that it feels confrontational, as you put it. And I think we can certainly remove that language.

Laura Cantral: Sharri.

Sharri Venno: I guess I want to say that this whole effort around, this executive order around consultation and the whole work toward developing good consultation, as Vera said, it from when we're working with agencies, we are talking about government to government consultation, and it is one, that is the idea; one on one, government to government consultation, each tribe identifying what is most appropriate for that tribe.

That being said, there's a lot to learn about just general communication with anybody out there who wants to engage in this process or has an interest and a stake in this process. When you're learning how to consult with tribes, you're going to learn some better ways to communicate with anybody out there.

Rick Getchell: Exactly. On that note, when we look at consultation and when we talk about having something a boiler plate that's out there, across the board, it can't be a cookie cutter thing. But what's going to be within that contains the difference between every tribe, whether you're a federally recognized tribe, whether you're a treaty tribe, whether you're a congressional tribe, you know all of these things need to be defined, looked at, and understood; especially by the feds and the states. What are the differences? That's the sovereignty approach, that's the respect of each

nation. Who has their hunting and fishing rights, who doesn't? Who has, you know, so on and so forth. All of those things, ironically, are the burden of the agencies to develop their plans, because it's not up to the tribes to develop these plans. But we certainly need to weigh in to make sure that those plans are developed appropriately to represent that diversity.

Laura Cantral: Chuckie.

Chuckie Green: I'm not looking for a cookie cutter approach to doing this; I'm looking at getting folks to sit down at a table and explain to the agencies what we've seen that works, what we've seen that doesn't. Yes, tribal nations will speak for themselves in every aspect, and I mean I want those thoughts to be at the table when we're sitting down as tribal representatives in that discussion. What do we need to look for? What do we need? What does Passamaquoddy need, what does Micmac need, what does Wampanoag need? What do we need to make this process better? Because this is, this is, it is government to government, it'll always be government to government; that's what the regulation, the regulation is there.

Culturally, you know, it's the law's there that says okay, if you're going to do an action, you have to consult with the tribe that's affected by the action. A lot of times, we as tribes end up coming in at the end of the day because everybody forgot that we even were around to talk to. These are the things that frustrate the process because then, at the end of the day, we stand up as tribes and say, okay, hey guys, you forgot to talk to us. We have a federal law that says now you have to come back and talk to us. This makes the process messy, okay, it is messy work, but if we could establish a process by which every agency addresses the issues early in the planning process, we stop a whole lot of hurdles for both agencies and tribes. I mean, the expense for us to go and consult is not something that's compensated for. So that expense to the tribe is an expensive responsibility. I mean, tribes do not shy away from that responsibility, of course, but if that process were a stronger process where, okay, we get to the table before the issue becomes an issue, then now we have a way to work through that issue.

There's going to be, nothing's going to be perfect because whenever you have nations, everybody's going to have a little bit of a difference here, a little bit of difference there. But if you get a basic platform down that everybody understands and everybody contributes to, you'll be able to at least have a process where you can move forward. That's what I'm talking about. It's not committing any tribe to do anything because I cannot do that; I can't even commit my own tribe to do something. So I mean it's just getting everybody on the same page. That's what I was talking about, that's what I was looking for.

Laura Cantral: All right, thank you. Any other thoughts about this, about objective four and the opportunity for improving the consultation process, not to make it a cookie cutter, I won't repeat a lot of the good comments that were made; but any other thoughts before we close out because soon I'm going to move us over to Tom, let Tom to send us in a different direction with some other issues to take up related to this goal? All right, Tom, take us there.

Tom Burack: Okay, thank you. A couple other topics I just want to raise quickly. One comes out of the comments, and I think they're potentially related comments. We had an inquiry about how we're going to work with MARCO with the other group and how they're work apparently differs significantly from ours. I know we've had a liaison at this table, but I don't think the liaison person is here at this meeting, am I correct about that?

Laura Cantral: Right, that's right.

Tom Burack: And we also heard a potentially related comment that it would be very valuable for us to be cataloging all the laws and regulations that apply in this arena. And I'm curious to know from John whether or not that's work that's already done or maybe Dan, that work's already been done. But it raises a question of presumably that's the kind of activity that every one of these regional efforts would be thinking about undertaking. And are there ways that we could know what the other regional groups are doing, what work they're doing? So that we could either share resources with them, not duplicate efforts, and be able to benefit from their work, and they from our work. So just trying to understand that piece, how those things might fit together, and just using that as an example maybe. If anybody knows how those pieces fit together.

Dan Hubbard: That work is currently underway. It began it's really two-phase project, the first phase is right at the end, which was exactly that, it was a collection cataloging of the laws and regulations that touch on the, through the regulatory worker. And I guess Nick can probably talk a little bit more about what the phase two would be with the contractor. But as far as other RPBs, based on what I've spoke, my counterpart in the mid-Atlantic, I don't think anybody else is at that point where they're doing this yet. And I think it was mentioned earlier, but there's not a lot out there to leverage because we're out front.

Laura Cantral: And maybe I could just add that from my understanding, I think that is correct. You do have an ex-officio who is in New York and participating as part of the mid-Atlantic process not here today. You also have a member of the RPB, Joe [Attengan], who sits on both of the RPBs, so that's another nexus and another mechanism for making sure that those connections are being made. But it's in some ways a little too early to figure out what those connections are because this process is a little bit farther ahead in some of the development of work product. Yeah, go ahead.

Tom Burack: So the last thing I just wondered if we could look at quickly is the five bullets that are there on the very first page of the what's the member comment document here on the framework. I don't know, and again we really haven't talked about many of these, the fourth one we've talked about a little bit about this issue of transference of coordination results with BOEM projects to other projects. I would assume that that's a two-way street.

We talked earlier about the second bullet in the context of sustainability, of adding some language about sustainability, and I'm assuming the place that that probably goes is in the principles, not necessarily, although it could go into one or more of the activities as well. But I just think it would be helpful for us to have a brief conversation, maybe with John leading it, about each of these elements and do we want to do anything with any of these. I mean, I'd suggest on the

second one, we should do something with the, with sustainability to add in; I'm not sure I would do an item specifically on food systems, I think we might want to make it broader because food is just one of the many reasons why we need to sustain the resource.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so just to make sure that everyone knows what we're referring to, this is the first page of the member comments, it's at tab, it's at document 3.2, under tab 3 of your binder, and there are a list of five bullets there on that first page that Tom's just referred to. And with regard to your point about the second bullet, Tom, I would also remind people that one suggestion, and there seems to be a lot of receptivity to the suggestion that the italicized, explanatory language about the goals be put back into the document and that much of that language speaks to the point that is being made here. So that's another option, and it's one of the things that I was going to ask as we wrap up the day, whether you are comfortable with putting that language back in, and that would be something that we would do.

Doug Grout: I know that John has it. Could he just read it out to us so that we remember what because I don't remember?

John Weber: So it was brief and we can certainly provide printouts of this so folks can look at this tomorrow. Under goal one, effective decision-making, the italics language was: improve management effectiveness, intergovernmental decision-making, engagement, collaboration and integration of best available knowledge, reflect ever-changing social, environmental, and technological conditions.

Under the goal about healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems, the language was: develop a framework to protect, restore, and maintain healthy ocean coastal ecosystems that provide social, cultural, spiritual, and economic benefits, account for changing environmental conditions in new information as it becomes available, respect the intrinsic value of the ocean, its biodiversity and act as its steward/caretaker, recognizing humans as part of the ecosystem.

For compatibility among past, current, and future ocean uses, develop a planning framework to encourage compatibility among past, current, and future uses of ocean and coastal waters while minimizing user conflict and impacts to environmental and cultural resources, recognize local priorities and the connection of ocean uses and the ecosystem to shore site infrastructure and activities, facilitate increased understanding and coordination among stakeholders, recognizing the difficulty of resolving certain conflicts. I realize that the last two bits of what I said are discussion topics for tomorrow, but we'll have that available to take a look at when we get into that.

Laura Cantral: So go ahead.

Tom Burack: If I may, I think that language certainly is probably language we should put back in, but I'm not sure that the notion of sustainability is really captured in any of those three statements.

Maybe I'm missing and have to re-read them, but I'm not sure it's really totally there, and I think it's important that it be emphasized somewhere here.

Grover Fugate: I'm not opposed to adding it, but I think it's sort of captured in stewardship, but if we need to get specific, that's fine too.

Laura Cantral: Katie.

Katie Lund: I guess the point Tom's, the first principle, where the word sustainability isn't in it, but basically the premise is sustainability, and I'll read it. It's the first principle and it's on Page 3 of our framework, where all nine principles are articulated, but the ocean and its resources are managed for the benefit of the public, now and in the future, and I think that is the general concept of sustainability without the word there.

One suggestion in public comment was to say sustainably managed for the benefit of the public, now and in the future, but I think the concept of sustainability is communicated through that principle.

Laura Cantral: So Tom, do you have, as you look at this list, are there other points that you think we need to focus on as we, we're going to try to wrap up here in the next few minutes for the day, and I'm going to ask some questions of you about where we are and what we need to come back to tomorrow.

Tom Burack: I think I really would turn to John and ask whether, in the context of all of the activities that we've identified here, are there any of these that if we were to fail to incorporate them, you think we'd sort of be leaving a gap in the overall work effort and failing to make connections that we need to make in the ongoing work? We've already got a lot of work we're planning to do here, but would any of these, from your perspective, help us to get that work accomplished more effectively?

John Weber: I guess I would say that as I look at these, my general take is that for, with the possible exception of being very clear about the fourth bullet, I think that the intent, particularly with the changes we've discussed today and the conversation we just had, I think that the substance of what is in the other four bullets are captured in the documents we have now. And I'd be happy to, I mean, I hear you Laura, we're running out of time, but if it would be helpful, could go through those one by one and explain thinking, or we could do that tomorrow, whatever's helpful. But the short answer, Tom, is with the possible exception of adding language about that fourth bullet, I think we're covered.

Tom Burack: Thank you.

Laura Cantral: You people want, it's up to you. We can take the time to go through it, walk through those, would people be more comfortable if we did that? Want to do that?

Betsy Nicholson: We could do that quickly, why don't we just check it out? We'll do it.

Laura Cantral: All right. Are you prepared to walk through those?

John Weber: Sure. First bullet talks about exploring the need to identify partner activities and academic research, etcetera, etcetera. So we've had a couple of conversations about this. I would point people to places such as on Page 19, again this is under goal two so I realize we have not talked about this, but one of the things we're talking about under that goal is looking at existing efforts that relate to developing products using marine life data. And we'll talk about that more tomorrow. But we specifically say, there are other people who are doing this kind of work and we need to look at that and understand it. That's an example.

There are examples in, when we get, I think when we get into, under goal one, looking at elements of things such as what we just talked about with coordination with MARCO that are very well-taken and I would only add that at a staff level, we also have those conversations with MARCO folks as well, so we don't duplicate.

As part of pretty much any particular piece of work that we've done to date, if you look into the specifics of that, we always start out with, who's done existing related work, and how can we just build on that without reproducing the wheel? So I can give other specific examples of that if that's helpful, but that's my thinking behind why I say I feel like we've covered that one.

Betsy Nicholson: And I think as we go forward with a lot of more topical workshops and opportunities in 2014, we need to just constantly mind what's been done, who're the experts, who should be there, whose work is related, and I would rely on the people on that side of the table to come forward and say we've dug into this, we want to be involved. Because people around this table don't know everything, clearly, in terms of the activities that can really be leveraged through this work. So please be vocal on that. Let's just be mindful as we move into 2014.

Male: To some extent, does the research agenda that's also contemplated tie into that?

John Weber: Absolutely. And the other thing is to reinforce what Betsy just said. These are challenging times for, as far as financing, funding; all that good stuff. So wherever we can, we leverage what's out there, because we are going to need to do that as we continue.

So, onward. We just talked about the suggested new intent to principle, I'll skip past that. Third bullet: social science to understand federal agency relationships. So I would suggest that that is part of what is envisioned with getting, rolling up our sleeves and getting further into implementing particularly some of the objective one, under goal one stuff that we've just been talking about. So have we done that work to date? Any sort of network analysis type of thing? Not formally, as I think is suggested by this comment. Is the option there for us to do that as we move forward? Absolutely, we need to have a conversation about that.

So I would suggest that the intent of looking at federal agency relationships and how we can improve coordination, when we get to the point of having specific conversations about how to

move forward with that, we will be looking at those kinds of options. I would also say that again, if you, and that is essentially built into what is in that RFB that is out now because that is about in part engaging specifically agency folks and how they do their business from a regulatory standpoint in the region. So I think we're setting the stage to figure out if we want to go a formal network analysis route or something else. So I think we're getting there.

Betsy Nicholson: Yeah, and I could offer some NOAA in kind there, too. We've got experts in doing that. So we'll see where that goes.

John Weber: Yep. So that's why I answered the way I did, Commissioner, to that bullet. The fourth bullet, I think that is a point where we could add a quick sentence to be very clear about the intent. And I think we can do that in the context of some suggested tweaks or tweaks we'll bring to you as part of the first objective. Because to my mind, that's what we're talking about, having a couple of specific focal points to start a conversation. While we're doing that, let's be very mindful of the broader context, other uses, other activities, other potential regulations, that sort of thing. So that's why I think we'll come to you with some suggested clause to address that point tomorrow.

The last bullet. So the last bullet also relates to goal two. And the conversation we'll have tomorrow, and in particular, what we're suggesting as an approach to which we've gotten a lot of comment on, on the topic of going beyond just static maps of various marine life, various species, and thinking about taking things a step further than that. We'll have that conversation tomorrow. The shorthand for that is identifying important ecological areas.

What we're going to talk about tomorrow is that we are proposing that we're going to focus very much on that issue, can we not, if we can, how do you do it with the assumption that we need a very good understanding of what data is available and again what work has already gone on in this topic as a starting point for that conversation, because there has been and continues to be a lot of work on this topic.

I think that part of that conversation also though needs to get into the, what's the second part of that clause, which is potential feasibility for existing laws and policies to do something with such an output. So in other words, what this is saying is that, as I read it, while you're thinking about can you scientifically come up with a methodology to do such work, you also need to looking very hard about how you would put the results of such work into play with existing laws and regulations. Because again, that's the framework of the executive order that we're given. We have to work within that framework.

So, if that is right, as far as here's what that really means, I think that is hardwired into the conversation about goal one. Because in that, as we've talked about today, we're going to be thinking about broadening the scope and again, as I alluded to with the third objective, having a conversation about products that come out of the other two goals, how do we incorporate those, can we incorporate those, and if so, how, into decision-making going forward? So again, if that makes sense, and I'm happy to go back through that, I think we've got that covered and built into the work going forward.

Summary of Day 1 Laura Cantral, Meridian Institute

Laura Cantral: All right. Thank you for walking through those. Are there any other questions about that, and Tom, specifically, you had pointed us to them? There's, clearly there's more to come tomorrow, both because it is part of the agenda, the other two goals that we have to go over tomorrow, and because we are going to revisit the goal that we've been talking about today and look at some tweaked language, some clarifications, etcetera.

So I'm tempted to start a bit of a summary about where we are, and then let you go to a reception and have some informal discussion, but I don't want to cut off anyone who has further thoughts or questions for what we've been discussing this afternoon. You guys ready to wrap up? You ready for a drink?

All right, so I'm not going to try to summarize everything that was said today, and certainly could not do that justice, but let me take a shot at a few things that seem to be particularly important for us to keep in mind and to leave with this evening.

The staff team will be doing some work overnight to make some revisions. A few of the things that we will be doing is putting that italicized language back into the document, or at least making it available so that you can see it. John read it to you, but just to look at the words and ensure that you are comfortable putting that back in, it sounds like you are.

We, as I just mentioned, there'll be some revisions to objective one, to make clarifications about the uses and why the ones that are specified are so, and that we're talking about all uses including non-consumptive uses that are going to be implicated in the taking action on that objective.

There have been a number of points made about the reality that goals are interrelated, they're not prioritized one, two, and three; we have to write it down and then we have to break it down to talk about it, and that is unsatisfying in some ways because they're all connected to each other. It may be that at the end of the day, you all decide, as Mel suggested, that you want to flip the order, so that's something else that we want to revisit as part of the discussion tomorrow. But no matter what the order, these are interrelated and we have to acknowledge that and be cognizant of that.

There is still I believe an outstanding question about how to capture Meredith's point about community knowledge and values in a way that is either another set of actions that's nested somewhere, or another objective and there have been a couple of pathways for how to make sure that that is incorporated into the document.

What have I missed? The tribal consultation. My own interpretation of that very good dialog is further understanding, at least furthering my understanding, of the intent around that objective and the related actions and how you are suggesting that the RPB should proceed to take advantage of opportunities with the tribal members at this body helping this forum be of value to

improving that process. But if there's something, if there's a next step related to that, then you got to help me out in what that is.

Grover Fugate: I was going to suggest, because I think the tribal members have already tried to draft something up for consideration by the RPB in terms of sort of the ideal process for lack of a better term, along with some best management practices.

Laura Cantral: That's going to proceed beyond the scope of this meeting, right?

Grover Fugate: Right. But I think if that's drafted up and then brought back to the RPB then we can start to have a much more valuable discussion in how we incorporate that in the process.

Rick Getchell: We can get that done, you know, after this meeting as a priority of ours, get that out to all the RPB, and then of course, getting everybody to weigh in on that, you know, who wants to be part of that work group when we get that created or how we want to communicate that amongst ourselves.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so does that feel like good enough for now? Where we can leave it for the evening and what you can expect to see tomorrow? We'll have a very busy day because we've had this discussion about one goal, and we have two others that we have not discussed yet, so, come ready to work and to think and to participate, but in the meantime, we would like everyone in this room to join us for a networking reception.

It is scheduled to start at 6:15, I actually think it's probably ready now. No, Shawn? Yes, it's ready now. So you can go straight on up to the Empress Ballroom, which is on the fourteenth floor, it's got fabulous views and refreshments, and we will look forward to seeing you shortly upstairs. And we will back here in this room to start again at 9:00 a.m. Thank you very much.

[End of Recording]

Thursday, January 23, 2014

Laura Cantral: All right. Welcome back, everyone. Good morning. Good morning to those of you who maybe are joining us for day two of the Northeast Regional Planning Body Meeting, glad to see everyone. Hope you had a good evening. I think we have every, almost everyone back at the RPB table. I will note that Regina Lyons is sitting in for Mel Côté this morning. He'll be back this afternoon.

Some of our other members may have to depart in progress later this afternoon, but we're hopeful that we can all stick it out to at least close to the very end. I'll do an agenda review and summarize some key points from yesterday in a moment, but before I do that we have some welcoming words for you.

And to start that off I'm going to turn it to Bruce Carlisle.

Welcome to Massachusetts

Bruce Carlisle: Thanks, Laura. Can you guys hear me? I can project. Good morning. My name is Bruce Carlisle. I'm the director of the state's Office of Coastal Zone Management.

On behalf of our governor, Deval Patrick, and our energy and environmental affairs secretary, Rick Sullivan, I would like to welcome to the great Commonwealth this morning, hope everybody is staying warm. I looked at the thermometer this morning out in Sudbury. It was five. That's not bad. And driving in I heard that there's a place in Pittsburg, New Hampshire checking in at minus thirty this morning. So I'm sure there are some Mainers who are looking to beat that, but let me know.

As a strong and consistent supporter of ocean planning, we had invited Senator Edward Markey from the Commonwealth to provide a welcome. Unfortunately his schedule precluded his presence here today. Nonetheless, I am sure that the senator, our governor, my secretary would all extend their thanks, their appreciation to all of you members of the RPB and to all the stakeholders in this room and beyond for the great work underway for improving the stewardship and management of our common oceans.

So when it became apparent that I was going to offer a welcome this morning, I was thinking about some words of wisdom in which to share. And I knew just what to go for. So I'm going to read an excerpt from a report issued in 2004 by the Commonwealth Ocean Management Task Force.

The report's title is "Waves of Change." And you're going to have to bear with me. It's a couple paragraphs, but in doing our ocean plan in Massachusetts and beyond, I think these words are really, really helpful. They help to both guide us and inspire us. And I think they are transferrable completely, a hundred percent transferrable to the northeast region and beyond.

So the words of wisdom go as such. Coastal and ocean waters have played a significant role in the history of Massachusetts for fishing, shipbuilding trade, recreation and scientific research, among other things. These multiple uses of the ocean are well known and appreciated as part of the fabric of what makes our state so special.

With the recent growth in offshore development, together with a variety of other ocean use technologies known to be on the drawing boards, the first come, first serve approach that characterized ocean use in the 20th century has increased tensions and in some cases created conflicts among these activities and other more traditional types of ocean uses and resource protection goals. Public decisions about whether to allow certain development activities often occur on a piecemeal basis, typically based on incomplete information and done in reaction to private project proposals as opposed to a thorough process that considers in advance tradeoffs among potential uses and the various public goals for ocean resource management.

Traditional ocean users often feel threatened by potential new uses of this common area. And potential new users sometimes feel frustrated because they feel just as strongly about their

rights to use the resource, especially in the absence of any advance notice that such developments are prohibited.

We believe that Massachusetts' ocean resources are too valuable and too important for their fate to be left to such a reactive and fragmented policy approach. Massachusetts should reexamine its public trust responsibilities for the ocean. The assets of any trust, whether a land trust and natural resource trust, or a financial trust or a public ocean trust, as it here is the case, must be managed for the benefit of its beneficiaries. And sound management requires a thoughtful and strategic plan to guide the allocation and preservation of its capital.

This concept is particularly true for the Commonwealth's oceans whose resources are so important to our common heritage, livelihood, enjoyment and long-term sustainable prosperity. We believe that the health and welfare of our state is tied to the status of our oceans. And we think that more careful planning for the use and protection of our ocean resources is critical to our long-term interests.

So there you go, words of wisdom. I didn't write them, but I think they're fantastic. And I hope that you guys did as well. So I'm going to turn it over to Dan Hubbard from the Coast Guard, who's going to introduce our next guest.

Dan Hubbard: [Technical difficulty –blank audio] – overseeing coast guard missions across eight northeast states, provides leadership to over 11,000 active duty, reserve, civilian and auxiliary members, utilizing thirty cutters, 200 boats and eight aircraft. In his previous tour he was the commander of Sector Southeast New England, an area including Southeast Massachusetts, the Cape and islands, as well as Block Island Sound, or Rhode Island Sound.

He's a 1987 graduate of the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut, holds two masters degrees from the University of Rhode Island, and lives in Massachusetts with his family. So not only is her personally invested in our planning area, but professionally he also provides an awful lot of leadership and guidance to my branch, as well as all 11,000 people I previously mentioned.

His presence here today is a testament to the Coast Guard's commitment to the public as well as this process. So please join me in welcoming Captain Gifford, Chief of Staff for the 1st Coast Guard District for this morning's welcoming comments.

Captain Vern Gifford: Good morning. I have been now in Massachusetts going on five years. It is – my wife is from New Orleans so we have a countdown of who has lived in their hometown the longest. And finally it's starting to tilt in my fashion. So it's always nice to be back in Massachusetts for a tour.

I represent Admiral Abel, the district commander for the 1st Coast Guard District. He couldn't be here today. It's always my pleasure to be here to represent him, and especially on something as important as this.

The 1st District goes from the Canadian border all the way down to the Shrewsbury River in New Jersey. We cover two regional planning areas, the Mid-Atlantic region and the Northeast Regional Planning Body here today. We've got two outstanding people who are part of the process, Lieutenant, I call him Lieutenant JG because he's also a reservist in his non-civilian time, and Ms. [Michelle Disatel], who not only do an outstanding job here, but an outstanding job with the things they do at the district, two very high energy people. And it's always a pleasure to look at a process like this and see the different collaborative effort that's ongoing to make sure things go well.

Marine spatial planning, it may be a new term of art for the maritime community. However, I think we've all been working together with the public, with industry, with our different commercial partners for decades. This just perhaps adds a discipline and a formality to it.

As an organization we see marine spatial planning is basically the logical progression of where we're going to try to make sure, as Bruce mentioned, that we're using the waterways as responsibly as possible. In New England we have both the 1st District, and we also have five Coast Guard sectors who are very heavily involved in working with maritime stakeholders to ensure that we're properly using our waterways.

Just recently we provided input on maps to navigation and commerce. And we also reviewed the final technical report for the Northeast Recreational Boating Survey. So we're very heavily involved.

The Coast Guard has recently we dedicated an entire issue of our Proceedings Magazine to the subject of marine planning. And when you look through that article after article you realize just how important it is, especially for the northeast region. So I think this group clearly is leading the way when it comes to advocacy on marine spatial planning.

As a member of the maritime community and not just a regulator, I can tell you that the Coast Guard takes this extremely seriously, realize that there's a challenge anytime we're trying to set aside waterways that have been historically used by for other purposes to try to use them for yet another purpose. It's something that we keenly feel because sometimes it can impact our own missions.

As a former commander of sector Southeastern New England, which includes Rhode Island and Massachusetts south of Plymouth, I can tell you that it was always a pleasure to work with two states that are championing this initiative. We're probably further along than almost any area of the country when it comes to trying to responsibly demark where we're going to use our waterways and for how we're going to use them.

I know especially my predecessor went through the challenge of trying to make sure we entertained all the different communities of interest associated with Cape Wind. And he neatly wrapped up a lot of things going into that project before I took over in 2010. So we always got routine briefs on the status of Cape Wind and how things were progressing. And I know Mr. Ed LeBlanc worked very hard to help set up the Rhode Island special area management committee, along with the state. I saw Grover Fugate here. Rhode Island did a fantastic job on that.

We've found that strategic partnerships are key of course, especially with this body. It all works by collaboration and the rapport you establish with the different communities of people that you work with. Especially without necessarily regulatory to set aside these areas it really is the relationships you establish. And this group is part of that.

I know in Boston the Boston Port Operators group, which is the local area maritime safety committee, does a very fantastic job of always entertaining marine spatial planning as part of its agenda, looking out to see exactly what is happening and how it's taking place. If done effectively regional ocean planning will help improve maritime safety, security and stewardship, and help us carry our mission effectively.

And in closing, the Coast Guard is fully committed to advancing the national ocean policy of marine planning. I look forward to hearing more from my staff on exactly what comes out of the group. And I wish you all success during today's meeting. Thank you very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Thank you, Captain Gifford, for your leadership and for being here and sharing your remarks today. We've had several wise words to inspire us and get us started on the work ahead. And we do have a busy day. And I'm going to say a few things about that in just a moment.

I do want to acknowledge that we have Meghan Massaua with us. You weren't here yesterday. Would you like to introduce yourself?

Meghan Massaua: Sure. Hi, everyone. My name is Meghan Massaua. And I'm from the Department of Energy's Wind and Water Power Technologies office. And I'm representing Patrick Gilman here today.

Welcome Back, Review of Day One Outcomes and Review of Day Two Agenda **Laura Cantral, Meridian Institute**

Laura Cantral: Great, thanks. Now is there – there's no one else that I haven't acknowledged, right? Okay. All right. So let me just say a few things about where we ended up yesterday and where we think we're headed today.

Yesterday the RPB dove into the draft framework. This framework presents, as you know, presents three goals, related objectives and a number of actions and related details for how to start carrying them out.

And in the discussion there was acknowledgement that the framework before you is a way to get started. It includes a number of activities, many of those activities designed to have significant stakeholder involvement and input as part of them, all aimed at getting more information and a better understanding so that the RPB can have a basis for making more informed decisions in the future when you come back to your meetings in June and in November and beyond.

So in other words this framework sets out the what, the goals and objectives, and the how, the actions, the tasks, the timing, the capacity needed, et cetera, and sets up a time frame for the next two years. The framework is draft. It's iterative and it's evolutionary by the nature of this process. That is always going to be the case. That being said, it is our hope and it's the primary objective for this meeting to have the RPB approve the goals and objectives, and express your comfort and give guidance to the staff, to the membership, to the apparatus to enable progress moving forward to get some work done, to be able to get that information to further inform your decision making.

So we had a busy day. We need to take up all three goals. Yesterday there was very good discussion about the goal related to effective decision making and some of the structure of the framework as a whole. With your guidance the staff did homework overnight and made some refinements to some of that structure, and in particular to the first objective that is noted under that effective decision-making goal. And we'll be presenting that for your discussion, and your consideration and hopefully your approval.

And then we have the goals, the other two goals that we haven't talked about yet, one related to healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems, and the other related to compatibility among ocean uses. So again just to emphasize and perhaps belabor the point, for each of these goals after discussion and also public comment for the two goals that we haven't taken up yet, I'd like to ask for RPB approval of the goals and objectives, and then any further questions, or suggestions or note your heartburn with any of the actions and related tasks and details that are in the framework.

And to be clear, it's not our intention that we're going to go through each one of those one by one. We are just going to be asking you is there something in here that we need to flag that you don't understand, that you have a concern about? Are you comfortable with it? And then we'd like to move on.

And then also as a reminder, the decision-making rule for this body is by consensus. So we'll be asking for your general sense of consensus and comfort with moving forward. It doesn't mean you love every single detail, but that you'd live with it. And that's the way we'll proceed.

So let me just say a few things about the agenda and the sequencing for today. In just a moment we're going to return to that discussion of the effective decision-making goal, see if we can close that out. And then we'll take up the next goal, which is the healthy ocean coastal

ecosystems. As we started yesterday, we will begin the discussion of that goal as the RPB, will pause the discussion. And at 10:15 we will open a public comment session that is scheduled for an hour, or however much time it takes depending on how many people we have signed up.

We would ask if you are planning to offer public comment if you wouldn't mind signing up at the registration desk by 10 a.m. That would be really appreciated. After we hear public comment we'll take a break. We'll come back. We'll resume the discussion of that goal. We'll hope that we can reach some closure on that one before lunch.

We'll come back after lunch and we'll start the afternoon with an update of offshore wind energy development and the relationship of those activities to regional ocean planning. And we'll hear from the Department of Energy and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management about their activities, and talk about those relationships.

We'll then come back for the third – to discuss the third goal, compatibility among ocean uses, past, present and future, again, pause the discussion for public comment, take a break, come back, resume the discussion of that goal. Hopefully at that point we'll be ready to summarize next steps, close things out, wrap up and get you out of here.

So, co-leads, is there anything I need to add to our plans for today? Did I sound, make sense? Does that all make sense to everyone? Okay.

All right then. I think I'm turning it to John Weber and Nick Napoli to bring our attention back to the effective decision-making goal and share with us – and let me say one more thing. In sharing with you what the staff did overnight, note that we have provided a handout that documents what we did. Those of you in the audience we had copies available at the front desk. Hopefully you picked them up. And at the table you should have it at your place, so just noting that.

John Weber: Thank you. So yesterday there were a couple of things talked about which are reflected in this one pager. That is the intent of this.

So the first is that there was a suggestion from that we talked about in terms of reordering the sequencing of goals. So you'll note that reflected on this page. The second thing is that there was discussion of adding back in the italicized language that had described intention at a goal level that had been in a previous version. That language is added back in and you'll see it as italics on this page.

Also within that though we had a conversation about particularly in the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems goal about ensuring that we're discussing this in a framework of sustainability. So we have added one clarification in there you'll see that I want to call out. It's in the first sentence. It's the very last couple of words that are sustainable in the future. That's an addition. Other than that, this italicized language that we're looking at is the same as what we had had before.

Two other points I want to point out are that we talked about with the first objective clarifying the language in that objective per the conversation yesterday. So and you can see the addition there is the second sentence in the note where it says the intention is to focus on all human uses. Thanks to Grover for working with us on this language last night, really appreciate that. So we've added that.

And then we added in below the bullets an explanation of why these couple of focus areas as a place to start, just explaining that. So those are the additions there.

The one other topic that came up yesterday relates back to looking at the existing objective for goal one language, which if people look at that is on page seventeen of the draft framework. We had a conversation about this objective. And for those in the room the title is "Improve Respect for the Customs and Traditions of Indigenous Peoples in Decision-Making Processes."

We had a conversation yesterday about maybe needing to also think about not just indigenous peoples, but other local or traditional ecological knowledge. So the quick conversation about that before the meeting this morning, a potential suggestion on how to move forward with that is to essentially take the language that you see in the title of the objective and in Action 4-1, build on that language to reflect the intent of also looking at other sources of traditional or local knowledge, but really with the intent of trying to get at what Action 4-1 talks about.

And what Action 4-1 talks about is trying to figure out a way to build into existing decision-making processes, ways that such information can be incorporated early in the process. So the suggestion could be, and we could think of ways to move forward with that, to take the title of objective for Action 4-1 and rework that language to reflect that intent. So we've got that as a change and we've got the changes that you see on the one pager that come from the discussions yesterday.

Laura Cantral: All right. So to summarize, reordering of the goals, adding the language back in, adjustments to specifically some language adjustments to address some concerns and further clarify the intent of objective one under the goal, and a suggestion that is open for discussion about how to capture the point about building in ways to inform existing decision-making processes by the presence of all kinds of traditional, local traditional knowledge, building on and adding to what is an existing objective for, and perhaps adding an action that would supplement what's already there.

John Weber: I think more specifically this, and certainly up for your conversation, but a quick discussion this morning was suggesting adding a new objective, an objective five.

Laura Cantral: Okay.

John Weber: Which would take the language in objective four and do what you said, add that action, as you just said.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so leaving – so a suggestion is leaving objective four the way it is, add a new objective five that captures that spirit, and an action that's related to that.

Grover Fugate: John, I just wanted to ask you. Last night we had also discussed about interjecting sustainability in one of the objectives too. And we had worked out some language. Do you have that language available?

John Weber: We – that language is captured in the description of the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems goal.

Grover Fugate: Okay, yeah. I just wanted to make sure that was highlighted too there.

Laura Cantral: So could we just take these sort of in the order that they were presented, and first let me ask, and I see some tents are going up, but if we could think, if we could focus on first of all do you like this rearranged order, people are comfortable with that? Yes, okay. You like having the italicized language back in. Everyone's okay with that and the addition of the sustainability point to make sure that that's included?

All right. So the objective one language, can we focus now on that? And do you folks want to chime in on that, Tom and Jerry? Is that where your point – yours is on the next one. Okay, so hang on. Tom, is your comment about objective one?

Thomas Burack: No. It's more about one other piece that we talked about yesterday I haven't heard discussed here. I just wanted to know where we are with that.

Laura Cantral: Okay, all right, all right. So let's go to talking about the new point to add potentially as a new objective five or how we're – and just hear some thoughts about that. And then we'll go to your point. Sharri?

Sharri Venno: I think adding another objective is an excellent idea. The point I want to make, not loud enough? That better?

Laura Cantral: Yeah. He was turning you up. So yeah you're good.

Sharri Venno: Oh okay.

Laura Cantral: Now you're very good.

Sharri Venno: Okay. The consultation word in this objective four in terms of using the language in objective five, replicating or revising some of the language I just want to make sure we're all clear that consultation is very defined in the tribal context.

Laura Cantral: Right.

Sharri Venno: It's there's an executive order.

Laura Cantral: Yeah.

Sharri Venno: There are – so it's a little – it's much more formal and narrow meaning and then would I hope be – so I hope that isn't lost. That's what I – I don't want that to be lost.

Laura Cantral: I think the intent is that that would definitely not be lost. That will remain and this new language that we're talking about crafting would be modeled after this, but not in the specificity of the consultation in point.

All right, other thoughts about how to capture these points? Do you like the idea of a new objective five and related action the way John was describing it? I'm seeing some nodding. People are okay with that? All right. So that will be a next step that we need to put together some language that reflects the intent here.

John Weber: And we could potentially think about doing so over lunch.

Laura Cantral: Doing over lunch and then let you take a look at it? Okay. So, Tom.

Thomas Burack: And we had talked yesterday about I believe it was objective one, adding some language related to habitat protection and restoration. I'm just wondering where in your conversations last evening you came out as to how we might address that point.

Laura Cantral: Yeah.

John Weber: So we did talk about that a little bit. And we added in the in that sentence about intention. That's why the natural resources component or those two words are added in there. That's where we wound up with that is capturing it in that way.

Thomas Burack: I think that's candidly a big stretch to suggest that habitat restoration and protection effective is a non-consumptive human use. I'm not sure that most people would read that into that into that language. I just think there might be a better way for us to do that. I don't have the specific language to suggest, but perhaps at the lunch hour that could be thought about as well.

Laura Cantral: Go ahead, Bruce.

Bruce Carlisle: And it's a point of clarification. I'm just trying to get my head around, Tom, your point here, and just to make sure that I know what you're talking about. Your point is with respect to the effective decision-making goal, and in particular objective number one, and where aspects related to natural resource protection and restoration fit into that. Is that correct?

Thomas Burack: That's right.

Bruce Carlisle: Okay. Yeah I mean I think it's a fair point. It's a fair point. It's a little bit different from some of the others in so much as, and especially with environmental protection it's more of a stewardship mandate that the public engages in, and our stakeholders. And these

other ones tend to be more sort of development type of, I don't want to say consumptive, but they're a little bit different.

And then also considering that we've got a whole goal around healthy and coastal ecosystems, there is extensive treatment of that topic there. But I think your point is fair, very fair. And I could see us trying to call it out, but it's maybe not quite one of those bullets that's where it sits under there type of thing. So maybe there's another sentence or a paragraph that can just sit in there which includes that concept? I think it's a very fair point. I'm just struggling with it a little bit.

Thomas Burack: Well and if I may, it may be just looking to provide some additional words around the words natural resources at the end of that sentence that's added there that talks about the intention, because I don't – and that's so broad. And that reference to natural resources I'm not sure it's people would necessarily understand what that's referring to.

Betsy Nicholson: I think the intent too was to have habitat protection, et cetera, be part of the context that we discover and explore as we look at these particular uses that we would start with. A suggestion I have is maybe to get through goal the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystem goal that has a lot of detail on that really dives into the habitat conservation and protection, restoration activities, and then maybe look back at this right after lunch and just see what makes sense, if anything needs to be added or whether that's an okay catchall.

Laura Cantral: Do you want to jump in just on this one?

Grover Fugate: Yeah. All I was going to say is that if we put after natural resources, particularly habitat restoration sites, or something like that it may I think capture what you're trying to do. Is that a fair...?

Thomas Burack: I think that gets us in the right direction. I'm not sure it's just the habitat restoration sites per se. It's the overall notion that that's an important component of what we have to look at in this context.

Grover Fugate: Well yeah. And I think the habitat restoration in general is captured within that goal one now, but I see that from a regulatory perspective we are particularly protective oversights that have been restored because the additional investment and all the rest of it with the public was putting into. So that's all I was trying to say is that there's sort of like a heightened level of protection sometimes versus other sites. I know we treat them differently.

Laura Cantral: So are we okay revisiting this after we've had a discussion about what's now the first goal, the healthy ecosystem goal, and then see if there's any other massaging we need to do? So, Vera, I know you had your tin up. And Kathleen also has a comment. Would you please go?

Vera Francis: Can you hear me? Can you hear me now? Thank you, Vera Francis, [inaudible], Passamaquoddy Tribe. I just wanted to add to this conversation, was not a part of last

evening's process in flushing those points out, but I was here yesterday and heard very clearly, and have read many comments as to the need to make it more explicit as to add and being very clear about the point of habitat protection and ecological protection. So if there's any words that could be added I would certainly press those points to be included in this language, whether or not it's also expressed in the next goal, but that I clearly heard comments pressing this point again and again to be included very clearly the intent that ecological protection is a part of this document. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: All right. Thank you. So again let's get through the discussion of that next goal and then look at the two of them in context and see if there's any other adjustment or if you're comfortable at that point. Kathleen?

Kathleen Leyden: Hi. Can you hear me? This is related to wordsmithing at all. It's just an overall comment about this. And I think there's still perhaps a lack of clarity around the fact that this is – this work is really it's not the plan for the ultimate New England strategy. It's the work towards that, if that makes sense.

I think Grover's response yesterday to the comment that was raised about whether we are promoting these industries somehow needs to be captured, if not in this language then in public materials. I also think we need to pay attention to some of the language that we know what it means because we deal with field, in this field. And I don't know if it's like a mini focus group about testing out some of the language that may still not work. And I think that was it, so not really specifically related to wordsmithing, just things to keep in the back of our mind. Are you – John, do you know what I mean? Because here I'm not sure that I'm really – okay. Thank you.

John Weber: Yes.

Laura Cantral: Sharri?

Sharri Venno: To follow up on Kathleen's comment, I mean I had it in my mind. Last night I was thinking over the day that it might be helpful to actually have a glossary of terms. There are things that I'm not sure, even though I'm familiar with the terms, exactly what we're trying to say. So I think it might be helpful.

Laura Cantral: Good suggestion. Other thoughts about this goal, the revised objective one? You don't have a comment anymore, Kathleen, do you? Oh sorry, Bob.

Bob LaBelle: I don't think we're quite there yet. I think this is moving in the right direction, but it's not clear enough about why we're focusing somewhat on the interagency coordination with respect to uses that are now pending, and the opportunity is there, so and mentioning NEPA without mentioning the other laws that require consultation, for example, not just with tribes but marine mammals and endangered species.

So I think we could maybe wordsmith this a little more and focus on – it says human uses, consumptive and non-consumptive. And then we could expand and natural resources living, including habitat. And by the way, we're starting to look at the following with regard to there's an opportunity for better interagency coordination.

And so we're going to look at this, this and this. There may be other things and there will be other things that we'll look at later. So I think it's closer, but I don't think it's quite there yet in terms of someone picking up this that hasn't come to these meetings, and fully understanding why we're looking at these four things.

Laura Cantral: Bob, could you – I'm just trying to make notes. Could you share the first of the point that you just summarized as a wordsmithing opportunity?

Bob LaBelle: Yes, where it says the intention is to focus on all human uses. That's great, but we need to expand a little bit including natural living resources in their habitats, for example. And then the next sentence I think it's fine to mention NEPA because that is a point where there is interagency, cooperative agencies work together on it, but there are other laws that are just as important that – in fact there's a long list of laws that regulate what we do in the ocean, so some mention of that fact. And some of the words that Bruce said in his quote this morning about the existing situation isn't the best in terms of how federal agencies go about getting their projects reviewed.

Laura Cantral: Okay, great. Thank you for clarifying. So let's go to Kathleen, and then Grover and then Doug.

Kathleen Leyden: Yeah. I think it's important to call out coastal zone management act because that's a primary coordination piece between state and federal government.

Laura Cantral: Great. Grover?

Grover Fugate: I was actually going to suggest that we generalize it a little bit more because while we haven't been clear about the boundary here, some of these activities obviously occur in state waters, so there are state jurisdiction that also applies in addition to the federal jurisdiction. So maybe we generalize this by just recognizing that it has to deal with both state and federal regulatory processes regarding these uses and protection of resources.

Laura Cantral: So instead of trying to capture every statute specifically and worry about leaving something out that's important, be more general about state and federal authorities. All right, Doug?

Doug Grout: I think we're going to revisit the concept that Tom has brought up later.

Laura Cantral: Right.

Doug Grout: So I think I'll save my comment until then.

Laura Cantral: Okay. All right, any other observations about this language? There are two approaches that have been suggested to some further wordsmithing, or modifications. And one is to add some more detail and be more specific. The other, as Grover just suggested, is to generalize. There's also I think, if I'm capturing right from your suggestion, Bob, to emphasize that the intention is to focus on all human uses and to expand that language to be clear that we're including natural marine resources and their habitats.

Bob LaBelle: And also the generalization part of it I agree with.

Laura Cantral: You like the generalization. All right. So that would be include that language about marine resources and their habitats, and generalize state and federal authorities instead of trying to list all of them out.

Grover Fugate: There's well over twenty federal statutes that are involved, so I wouldn't want to have listed.

Laura Cantral: Right, right, exactly, yeah, right. Barbara, go ahead.

Barbara Miller: I just had one comment that goes to sort of the habitat stuff and some of the things that people think might be missing here, because when we talk about interagency coordination, when I look at the bullets I see things that are all regulated that need permits that federal agencies, or state agencies or local agencies have jurisdiction over saying whether you can or can't do it, or how you can or can't do it.

But there's a lot of things out there that federal agencies and other agencies need to work together that are voluntary that we have authority to do. And I think that that's what some of this discussion is about. So our bullets, while I understand why they're included like that, maybe we need one bullet that identifies that everything isn't regulatory. A lot of things that we can work together with are they require voluntary participation by whoever manages that land, or water or whatever, so just something to sort of incorporate that it's not strictly regulatory stuff that we're looking at. That's....

Betsy Nicholson: Yeah so, Barbara, there is language. Agencies with non-regulatory rules are incorporated in this effort to ensure appropriate consideration of issues such as national security, could list a few more. And then in the ecosystem goal we do take up those non-regulatory programs that focus on coastal and sort of conservation and restoration efforts, if there's more that needs to be said than that.

Barbara Miller: Well I'm just thinking that there's been a lot of discussion it seems about just the selection of those bullets. And then there is language around it that sort of addresses the other things, but those bullets seem to jump out at everybody that hears what we're doing with interagency communication, so maybe just and maybe take one of those statements and just stick in a bullet, or take those other things out of the bullet or something, because I think that's where there's a lot of angst about this. It's we're just catering to those immediate issues that are facing all the regulatory people right at the moment. So....

Bruce Carlisle: I'm going to just make two quick points. On Bob's point I know that we're going to have a more full-blown conversations around healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems, but I could see some wordsmithing here after that sentence, the intention is to focus on all human uses, consumptive and non-consumptive and natural resource. And you could say management protection or restoration. And that very clearly says that we are including this.

And then it would flow on to talk about these specific uses, because I do think there is a lot of attention around those. And we consciously called those out. They are sort of new and emerging uses. And that's a lot of why ocean planning has risen to the level it has. So I don't think we should run away from that.

And then the last point I'll make is that I know that there is sort of a call to broaden the reference to regulatory programs, but if we take it out of the – and I'm fine with taking it out of the objective, I want to be sure that we do include in maybe the action language both NEPA and CZMA. Sure there's a plethora of regulatory authorities, but there's a couple cornerstone pieces where in NEPA's case it is a broad, very broad, intentionally broad public process. And it does, it sits on top of these other frameworks.

The CZMA is similar. It calls very clearly on states to work closely with their federal partners. And it recognize the interest in authorities of states broadly in our coastal resources both in state and beyond state waters. And I would be – I think we would be remiss to somehow not mention the CZMA in this document, so just a few points for consideration.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Sharri?

Sharri Venno: One of the things, I wanted to follow up on Barbara's comment with regard to sort of non-regulatory voluntary things. And we do sort of – my tribe does a lot of non-regulatory voluntary things and in terms of restoration and habitat protection and management, but there is still a regulatory component whenever a federal agency is involved. And that is NEPA.

We have to go through the NEPA process even if we're planting or [paring] in a buffer zone, or putting in a sediment basin. So NEPA really is all encompassing in terms of regulatory and non-regulatory if there as a federal agency element to it.

The other things is that I mean I think we all recognize and I think the comments amply identify the issue that we're going to have to actively restore our mean resources. And protection is not going to be sufficient. And that's going to require active interagency collaboration amongst federal agencies, state agencies, nonprofits. I mean it's going to take us all and we need to be able to communicate than if we're focusing on just agency coordination without thinking about the bigger, broader picture, I think we're losing something.

Laura Cantral: Doug?

Douglas Grout: A few comments. First of all, I agree with what Bruce said about still identifying somewhere in the action or tasks the various regulatory drivers where consultation is needed because clearly in the Magnuson-Stevens there's an essential fish habitat consultation which is requested, which would be very, very important in this marine/mammal, I mean in this marine spatial planning effort. So yes take it out of the actual description in the objective there, but somewhere in the actions be a little bit more specific about the key legislative drivers.

And just a follow up on Tom's concern here about not having something with natural resource protection and restoration, as I look through goal two there I see it's mostly related to inventory, ID and support these kind of projects. Well I think what Tom is getting at is this is where we need to have interagency coordination on these things.

And so I think it is important that we try and address some kind of rewording of that sentence. The intention is to focus on to include something that would say habitat protection and restoration in there. And maybe that would have a lot of ideas that have been put forward here by a number of RPB. And maybe the staff could draft, craft that at lunchtime and come back to this after once we get down there.

Laura Cantral: Right.

Doug Grout: I think it's pretty clear that there are two different issues here.

Laura Cantral: So, Chris, please offer your comment. And then I'm going to suggest that we try to wrap this up. And I'm going to summarize and make a suggestion. And it's consistent with what Doug just said. So go ahead.

Chris Thompsett: Okay, thanks. Just taking the comments from Doug and from Bruce, Bruce looking at CZMA, Doug looking at Magnuson-Stevens, everybody will have their area where they're of interest. NEPA being in procedural law encompasses CZMA, encompasses Magnuson-Stevens. It encompasses Marine Mammal Protection Act, Endangered Species Act.

That may not be clear to people who aren't practitioners. So I believe going with where Grover was saying more broad including federal and state concerns and regulations that's more the direction we should be heading as opposed to calling out individual programs.

Laura Cantral: All right. So my suggestion is the staff is already committed to putting some language together that for you to look at that would be a new objective five and a related action. And I think that we should also include one more shot at this objective that reflects very good input and some wordsmithing suggestions. And I think we've captured that in the notes. I won't repeat it all right now.

So let us do that. And let's come back to the discussion after lunch and take a look at it, and see if you're comfortable and that we're ready to approve this goal. It's recognizing that it's important to get this right. The context is important to include and being mindful of Kathleen's suggestion to think about the framework in not just this goal and this one objective, but to be

sure that the necessary context and clarity is there. And that might include defining some terms and other things.

All right. So is that okay for now? Are we good with that approach? All right. So we are going to move on now. And we will open the discussion for about twenty minutes, a little less, because at 10:15 we'll stop for public comment. Okay so yeah, yeah, right.

And I see, Cheri, well I see you've just joined us, if you want while you're getting settled if you want to introduce yourself.

Cheri Patterson: Cheri Patterson, New Hampshire Fish and Game. I'm here as proxy for Glenn Normandeau, the director of fish and game.

Laura Cantral: Great. Thank you. Welcome. All right. So who's kicking this off? Nick? Okay.

John Weber: I'm going to start.

Laura Cantral: Okay.

Public Comment About Draft Northeast Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems*

John Weber: Great. So thank you. So healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems, what I'm going to do is, and this starts in the packet in the framework on page eighteen. I'm just going to touch on a few points as to what is described in there to start. So again thinking back to the overall way that all elements of this framework are talking about, under this first bullet it's important that we note that what we're talking about under this first objective, which there is a lot in there, absolutely, and a big part of the capacity for this effort and multiple contracts, et cetera, goes toward characterizing the ecosystem, its marine life, its economic, the coast and ocean economy cultural resources, et cetera.

What we're suggesting here in this framework is that those actions that we're talking about are really intended to set up future RPB decisions about how to move forward with putting to better use some of this information that we collect, and do and recognizing that we need to have conversations collectively and at these meetings, but also through a robust engagement process about how to do things like take some of this basic information and develop additional products, do additional assessments. An example there, obviously that we have a lot of public comment on, is the importance of identifying important ecological areas.

So what we are saying is that this needs to be a topic on which we focus in particularly the next between now and the November RPB meeting, if people remember back to that milestone schedule. So that's all I want to say about that point. I expect we'll get into further detail, but I really want to highlight that that's the approach that we're setting up here is that

we don't know what the answer to that question is as of yet because we need to have a focused conversation on it, how do we do this, if so in what manner?

And importantly in that we need to engage the public in thinking about how we approach such a thing, develop any products and then finalize any products. That's just throughout the whole thing.

A couple of other objectives that are included here, we were just having a conversation about sort of from other governmental activities that are outside of the regulatory world. Possibly some of what we're thinking about there is captured in objective two here, because this basically says there are restoration and conservation programs that happen outside of the regulatory context. To an extent we want to support those and make sure that regional goals, if appropriate, are in captured in there.

My point on this is that this objective came directly from public comment. So when we were out, particularly in the spring, there was conversation about the need to do so, and a lot of public input on this. It is reflected here in this framework as a result, so really want to make that point.

The third objective here basically goes back to the conversation we started yesterday, which says, look, there are going to be some science and/or data, and/or other types of questions that we're going to encounter along the way where we're all going to conclude. We don't have enough information. We don't have enough knowledge.

We then are suggesting that one of the outcomes of this effort is what we just shorthand call a regional [load] and science plan. One area of public comment that we got quite a lot on this, particularly in a couple of the public meetings when we got into a discussion of this, was that recognize that there are other efforts in either specific parts of our geography or on specific topic areas that are already underway. So we need to coordinate with those, leverage those where we have opportunities to do so, take advantage of that, no need to reintroduce the [will], funding is tight, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, a lot of public comment on that. So we tried to reflect that public comment in this document.

Next slide? So Nick is just going to wrap this up and say a couple of things about specific topics that we want to call your attention to as things that we think are in need of more focused conversation and input.

Nick Napoli: So thanks, so a couple of things. The first one is so we have identified a few things. They are identified in the framework. And I'll point to some of them as I talk about them, but the first one, capacity, this is actually under objective two.

And it is on page twenty-four. And it's actually on, starts on page twenty-three, goes on to twenty-four, but particularly on twenty-four. We do call out that we've taken a look at our resources staff capacity and basically said if we are going to conduct a task like this suggests where we're going to inventory state, federal, tribal and other regional partners' restoration and

conservation activities, we need to identify the capacity to do that. So that's one thing to flag for the RPB to consider.

Second is in response to public comment, I think what John was going through a bit was our attempt at a couple examples of where we addressed public comment in the revised objectives. And I think that there are some common themes that John referenced here that are also again repeated here that we suggest that RPB sort of discuss, to some degree, and then recognize that what we're asking is the ability to, for the first bullet, where folks are saying, well baseline data and information is great, but there is the potential for you to do additional assessments. Such as identifying important ecological areas, cumulative impacts or vulnerability assessments, and there's a whole host of other things that people suggested.

Recognizing it's a two-year effort right now. What we're suggesting is that we need to scope these things out further and come back with some options for you to consider in terms of how we would proceed. So, that's one thing.

Second, the baseline data. You know, there's public comment about your baseline data is static. It may not account for historic and potential future changes. You know, I think that that's another thing for the RPB to consider; we have addressed that to some degree in the document, and we are working on and there are certainly areas where we are looking at future changes.

Third, economic assessment. We've heard a lot about how we might proceed with this. Folks suggesting we can account for working waterfronts and communities better. We should be looking at the blue economy, and we should be better linking the ecosystem and the economy.

So those are a few things for the RPB to discuss, but also recognize that, for some of this, we're asking for the ability to proceed with, and I'm on page nineteen, you'll see the objective one tasks. We want to proceed with developing some of this baseline data. In addition, we want to proceed with scoping out some of these additional assessments and bringing back options for you to discuss.

The third thing, the third bullet, this is in response again to a lot of public comment, and we've discussed this to some degree, but the need—the potential need for a technical committee to advise or provide options on proceeding with some of, and we think, in this case, some of these marine life habitat-type assessments.

Laura Cantral: Great. Why don't we leave that at, because it's a great way to focus attention as Nick said on the things, in particular, that the staff believes really needs some discussion, and of course other things that are on your mind are certainly fair game as well. So why don't we, I see a couple of, at least a couple of tents up. We've got about, we've got a few minutes before we're going to pause for public comment. So, let's just hear general observations, questions, comments; we'll do that for a few minutes and then we'll have our public comment, and then we'll resume. And at some point in the discussion, if we're not going there naturally, I'll be asking us very specifically to take up each one of those and get some resolution. So, let's see,

I've got, I see Kathleen, Bruce, Chris, Sharri, let's see if we can get through those, and Betsy, let's try to take those in short order and then it'll probably be time to wrap up and have our public comment.

Kathleen Leyden: We've heard a fair amount of public comment about adding rivering systems and water quality and the relationship between fresh water and marine near shore and marine waters, and I'm not sure when we're going to have that discussion, but I think we need to make a decision about that. And then that relates to a definition of the planning area that further refines the planning area to something more reasonable.

And I'm going to sound very parochial in my next comment, but I'm just going to put it out there because it relates to the type of data that's available to characterize the region. And the relative paucity, that's how you say that word, right, of data for Maine near shore waters and you know, I'm not going to make excuses for that other than we're kind of a poor state, but, and haven't placed a lot of, haven't devoted a lot of resources to that. We haven't done a plan for state waters so there hasn't been a tremendous amount of data collection, but going to have to look at the data portal more closely but I noticed at least one area where there was absolutely no information for Maine, and it's really difficult to do a regional characterization without having additional data. So we're piecing away at this, between small projects in Maine to do this work and getting the help of federal agencies to complete some of that data collection, but we could use more help in that regard. Please. [Laughter].

Laura Cantral: Bruce.

Bruce Carlisle: Sure, a few points I think specific in response to some of the sort of topics that Nick's asked for feedback on. The first point is I like to see that objective two there that does call out for an effort to begin to inventory, if you will, and I think we have to recognize, and this is going to be one of the over-arching points I'm making is that, given a two-year window on some of these efforts necessarily need to be evolving and in some cases they are sequential, but iterative. And I'll make that point later on. But we do have a fantastic partner in the region through the North Atlantic Landscape Cooperative—Conservation Cooperative, the North Atlantic LCC, and I'm wondering if they might not be a great potential partner and lead on that effort. So, I'll throw that out there for the RPB and others to consider on that effort.

The second point is, and we, and I know Grover does, too, certainly struggle with the evolving nature of characterizing our ocean areas. And we recognize that any map you make, the second you press print, or whatever you do, it's old. We live in a spatially and temporally variable world. However, we can't let that stop us from doing our best to try to represent information which is extremely helpful as we do characterize that. So, I think as an RPB, we need to be very cognizant but careful of how we treat both of these realms. And I certainly think, you know, in one of the approaches we took in Massachusetts was we do have maps, and they represent the best available information at point in time. And we built in a process for evolving data and updating data on the plan, as necessary, and that's really, really, really important.

But the other thing we've done, and we'll get to this, is we've identified areas where we know we need more work, and we've also done work sort of in a baseline assessment characterizing. And so the baseline assessment is really good at characterizing more sort of historical trends.

When you get to future trends, really, really important, but also really, really hard. So, I'm sure there's going to be some thinking around how we start to pay attention to climate change and what's happening with our eco—our ocean ecosystem, green ecosystems, and our ocean uses, but I think any predictive tool is just that, it's predictive. But we should sort of eyes wide open on that. But I suggest that's a great topic for sort of ongoing and future efforts.

And then, the last point I'm going to make is that the economic assessment is a big and important piece of something that we heard in our stakeholder meetings. I know it's built into this task, sorry, objective number one here, and I believe that we do have some resources from some grants to pursue that. So let's, I'm sort of looking through it, it's sort of, it's tucked in here, necessarily it's tucked in here, but let's maybe think about calling it out as a specific task, or maybe an action or something, and kind of pull it out a little bit and focus on it. So a couple of points for folks to consider.

Laura Cantral: Great. Thank you. Chris.

Chris Thompsett: Thanks. Addressing the capacity for objective two, I'm happy to volunteer someone else to champion it. Bill Hubbard actually, from Army Corps of Engineers, has been lead in the Northeast for Coastal America, I believe that's, for a number of years, and he has volunteered to provide capacity and help in this area, and he has a lot of familiarity with many of the restoration and conservation activities in the Northeast, and so he'll have a head start on things.

Laura Cantral: Great. Thank you. Sharri.

Sharri Venno: A question about the term activity. It could be a general enough term to include plans and proposals, because I certainly think that there are a lot of ideas that have, and things that are basically on the shelf for lack of resources, but that have been fleshed out to some degree in terms of submitting for resources or. And so it would be nice to know what people would like to do if they had resources to do it, as a way to perhaps target resources to folks who are interested in pursuing those things. Because I think possibly just saying activities, what's actually going on right now may not fully characterize what we'd like to know.

And I have a sort of terminology question, and it's poss—I mean, we have the word ecosystem in there, we have ecological modeling in there. Are we talking about modeling, and we're talking about a lot of maps in terms of where things are and what their distribution and abundance is, and what these populations are like, but are we trying to characterize and communicate to some degree the intra-relationships between those, you know, the complex food web and predator-prey relationships and how things ebb and flow and are those, is that part of this effort, is that being thought of? Maybe that's part of the iterative long-term

challenging thing we're trying to get at, because models are a mystery to me. But I think it's going to be really important, particularly as we try to put that, adapt to and respond to climate change.

Laura Cantral: Are you responding to that? Are you, Grover? I saw you put your tent up. Do you have to raise something else? All right, thank you, Sharri. Duly noted about clarifying some terminology. So let's take Betsy, Grover, and wrap up, quick quick. Brian, you just put yours up, you had a comment. Kathleen, do you have one, or is that from earlier? It's another one? All right. So can we, can anyone else who has a thought hold it for after public comment? Let's take these people who've already had their tents up and then we're going to move to public comment, okay? All right, so, Betsy, Grover, Kathleen, and Brian, and then we'll pause.

Betsy Nicholson: First of all, I just want to quickly commend, particularly Nick, for all the work he's done on this piece. This is a massive task, as you can see with all the detail laid out. And it takes a lot of specific conversations with a lot of different experts in the region, so thank you for your work to date.

No one's addressed the last bullet there, so I'm going to try to do that. In terms of the Technical Committee, I think this is certainly something that's called out in the handbook that the National Ocean Council's given us that is important. I think there are a couple of things here. One is, I think we can do a better job of perhaps being more transparent about the experts that are already sort of talking about what we know, what we don't know, through a new website, perhaps even putting those experts up there, who are we already talking to about this, just so folks know what we're doing in that realm. I think that would be a good idea.

And in terms of moving forward, we've talked about Technical Workshops coming up this spring; it's going to be really important to expand that bench of experts as we talk not just about specific species and habitat, but how to integrate that knowledge and start on that track. So I think perhaps, as we struggle with how to set up a Technical Committee and what its relationship might be to this body, we could at least create a bench of experts to pull from, particularly for that first Technical Workshop and start identifying those folks. I think that might be a good step in that direction.

And we certainly need to make some decisions as NRPB about these more formal groups and their relationship to us. And I would hope that we've had some conversations last night and this morning, I think it might be a good idea for the co-leads to actually explore that more deliberately and perhaps even put an options paper on the table, our June meeting, to make some decisions about, not just the Technical Committee, but also some of the comments that have been made about stakeholder panels and sort of how we can engage folks across the region. So I'd like to make that recommendation as well.

And finally, in terms of some of these really tough concepts that are in this goal around cumulative impact, identifying ecological areas, vulnerability; perhaps we could think about a way for us, even in prep for this Technical Workshop, to get more up to speed on what's

known, perhaps some, we could identify a few of these topics for webinars, like a public webinar, to bring people up to speed on where, what's the status of those types of discussions. Maybe we can work with staff to identify some of those topics. And this could be hopefully a low capacity way to share some of that with this body and beyond. So just a few ideas there.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so those of you who are waiting for public comment, if you would just be patient with us for a few more minutes, we're going to round out these last several comments and then we'll open up the session.

Grover Fugate: Yeah, thanks. I guess I'm echoing somewhat Bruce's and Betsy's comments, too, because when we first started this whole process, one of the things I cautioned the body on is that part of this is trying to manage expectations in terms of what can come out of this process. Certainly when we start to talk about designating ecologically valued areas, the word designation itself implies some sort of regulatory authority and we have to remember we're using existing authorities.

But in addition to that, the science behind that is still developing, and we're still trying to grapple with that. And then you come into the paucity of data that would feed that system, particularly at a scale that becomes meaningful for regulatory purposes, can be daunting at times.

And the other terms that are in here like cumulative impacts, I mean, that's the Holy Grail that we've all been looking for, and still trying to deal with. Particularly when we're dealing with climate change, where it's changing our baseline as we speak, that type of task becomes very, um, almost impossible it seems, at times. I know for instance, there are twenty fish stocks that are shifting already East and north, and our fishery's going to change completely on us in Southern New England. We are becoming much more of a mid-Atlantic fishery, much more pelagic in our system. And so there are those changes that we're going to have to try to deal with, which almost comes to challenge the word sustainability at times because I often wonder if the system's even sustainable anymore, given the forces that are in play at this point, and whether we should look at throwing in the word adaptation in here, as part of this too, but anyhow.

Laura Cantral: Kathleen.

Kathleen Leyden: I think I said yesterday that I think this is the most important goal and series of objectives because it lays the work, it lays the ground work for the rest of the work that we're doing. I think this particular piece alone is enough work for, two years is probably not even enough time. And I think that John and Nick have done a really great job in each of the goal and objective areas in laying out the capacity that's available in kind through the expertise of people that are here and other partners. But, and I think John has been pretty articulate with members of the RPB that we're going to have to, I mean, the amount of information that we've processed so far since the creation of the RPB has been very light, as compared to what it's really going to be. So just putting that on the table.

And we really haven't talked about financial resources and budget, and I'm just, I think the expectations are high here, particularly in this goal and set of activities, and I'm kind of trusting that somebody else understands the resource availability in cash and in kind, and that this is all doable. I think there's also been careful attention to note where things have to perhaps beyond the time frame, so additional out-years, but we raise expectations when we say we're going to do this work, so I'm trusting that it's doable.

Brian Thompson: So, I agree, this is all really important and this objective one does a lot. The whole goal captures a lot. Objective one is really important. I think sort of taking a step back, structurally, I find it a little confusing in terms of having the goal be ocean and coastal ecosystems and in the characterization including actions 1-4 and 1-5, relating to commercial uses, assessment of maritime economy; and then looking at the next goal objective one, which talks about increasing understanding of uses. So, I'm not sure where to go with that, but I think there's sort of maybe a reconciliation somehow that needs to be made between this characterization, which includes both ecosystem and use characterization, and the next goal in objective one.

John Weber: Just quickly on that, we had a conversation, and we got a bunch of public comment that said if you are looking at the ecosystem, have to pay attention to the human component of that. And so based on that, and we all know that, so based on that, that's why there's some of that you know four and five imbedded in here.

The way that I would differentiate between the two goals, and we haven't gotten to goal three yet, is goal two starts with the notion of building a baseline. Looking at what data that we have. When you do that, by definition, you're looking back in time because that's what we have available to us. We have data about what shipping patterns were like in 2012, that sort of thing.

What goal three is trying to say is that, in part because we have a shifting baseline, as difficult as it is, to try to look ahead, we should at least try to do that. We'll get into that more in goal three, but it'd be kind of that point is sort of the starting point to the differentiating between the two goals, as difficult as we've already discussed, and everybody knows; as difficult as looking ahead with some of that could be. So, that's a point of starting to distinguish between the two, with the intention behind this.

Male: [Inaudible] somehow links the two makes that crossover?

Laura Cantral: All right, so we will pick up where we are leaving off this discussion after we hear from public comment and then, public commenters, and then take a break. So, let me get my list here, and just as a reminder, or for folks who were not with us yesterday, we will ask, I will ask the first two of the commenters who've signed up here on my list to come get settled at this table and then we'll just start rolling. When the first commenter is done, you can be excused and I'll announce who's going to be up third, and then we'll just get into a rhythm of, I'll let the next people know that they're going to be up and you can come get in the empty chair. We would ask that you try to limit your remarks to three minutes, and if you have anything that

you would like to submit in writing that documents your comment, then that is very welcome and appreciated. And I think that's everything I need to say about the format. So why don't I invite our first two commenters, James Monroe and Brent Greenfield, and Priscilla Brooks and Valerie Nelson, you'll be the next two after them, so just so you're aware.

[Inaudible question].

Laura Cantral: We have thirteen—

Female: —Twelve because he's out—

Laura Cantral: We have twelve.

Public Comment About Draft Northeast Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems*

James Monroe: Good morning, my name is James Monroe. I'm the principal of a company called Blue Water Dynamos, located in Maine, it's a particular an MHK company, and for full disclosure, I also represent a British company that builds machinery and so forth that works on the bottom of the ocean, who it may seem a contradiction, but they're extremely interested in preserving and protecting in all the things they design and all the work that they do around the world.

I'm really more interested in what others have to say, so I'll keep my remarks as brief as I can. I would say that I think Bruce has been reading my notes, so he covered a lot of my points, thank you. When, first I'd like to say that the work you're doing here is critically important, from a personal standpoint, professional standpoint, I just wish you'd finish it. [Laughter]. And I say that in all seriousness so it could be applied by others. I would add that perhaps some here in this panel may be asked to accept an imperfect document, or an imperfect outcome, so that we can go forward.

Some more specific points, I think we can't lose sight that when we're talking about healthy oceans; we're really talking about a healthy planet. And I mentioned yesterday and I would strongly support and encourage it, would be national and international outreach. We must remember that the water that shows up off our coast today was somewhere else yesterday, and tomorrow's water will have come from somewhere else. So it's not just a localized problem, it's far beyond that.

Personally, my interest is in ocean acidification. You can, there are so many subjects it's almost overwhelming, so you almost have to pick something. And quite frankly, I think ocean acidification is probably the ticking time bomb that has hardly been recognized yet.

I would like to speak to one subject, and that has to do with science. I would like, I think it would be helpful, I say I would like, I would always like, I think it would be most beneficial to the whole subject and all the people involved is make some determination or set up a facility

or a capacity to determine, or make some, have discussion about what science's most immediate to know. You can take that any way you want. There are so many people doing so many things, it's really confusing out there. I can tell you only this week, I made a specific inquiry to people who should have known if any scientific, particularly bottom studies, have been done on a particular area of the ocean. Oh no, no work's ever been done there. About two buildings down on the same campus, I am now flooded with all the information I wanted, it's already in existence, but the people two buildings away didn't know it. And that's frustrating.

I think also, I totally support and encourage you, it was mentioned yesterday, just want to re-affirm the importance of it; better general accessibility of science and research which is already been done. I just alluded to the problem that we had. And this really includes the tribes and the tribal impersonations, and all the things that they know. I actually, quite frankly, could probably speak for about eight hours, but I'm going to stop now because I want you people to go to work. Thank you. [Laughter.]

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Brent, go ahead.

Brent Greenfield: Okay, thanks. Brent Greenfield with the National Ocean Policy Coalition, and again, these comments are supplemental to the comments we've previously submitted. With regard to the development of information on human activities that is proposed in objective one, the document released for public review in November proposed that the RPB engaged stakeholders and project design data development implementation and product review, however the draft framework released last week excludes implementation from that list. The RPB should clarify the reason for this change, as well as other changes to the document released in November.

The November document also proposed that one outcome of the first objective under goal two would be the characterization of human activities, cultural resources, and quote, unquote, natural resources, as well as the ocean and coastal economy. However, the draft framework released last week replaces natural resources with marine life and habitats. The RPB should restore the original language pertaining to natural resources and also include its interpretation of the term natural resources. The draft framework also states that one task under the first objective in goal two would be to map recreational uses beyond recreational boating and, if possible, determine the economic contributions of these activities to the regional economy.

Language regarding, if possible, should be removed to clarify that the economic contributions of these and any other activities it addresses will be determined and made available as stated in the coalition's January 9 comments. Any economic assessment should include a complete analysis of all existing and future potential uses, as identified by commercial and recreational stakeholders in the economic and decide all benefits that they do work and provide for the region.

Finally, as to the proposed Regional Ocean Science Plan, the draft framework includes timelines for March 2015 through December 2015, and January 2014 through June 2015, but does not include any proposed associated actions that would take place during that time span. An explanation of what actions are proposed to take place during this time frame is therefore needed. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. And Valerie, you're up after Priscilla.

Priscilla Brooks: Great. Good morning. Priscilla Brooks, Conservation Law Foundation. The narrative that describes the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystem goal describes what should be the overarching goal and vision for the Northeast Regional Ocean Plan, and that is the framework to protect, restore, and maintain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems that provide social, cultural, spiritual, and economic benefits, taking into account changing environmental conditions and our evolving understanding of the ocean ecosystem while also respecting the intrinsic value of oceans and its biodiversity. Thank you very much for putting that language back in, it's very important.

We strongly support this goal as it is described, but have some concerns about the objectives and actions. So characterizing New England's ocean ecosystem and associated human uses is fundamental to the development of an effective ocean plan and we support the actions associated with compiling and mapping scientific and human use data and developing a detailed portrayal of the biological, physical, oceanographic, and human use characteristics of the Northeast Regional Planning Area. We want to underscore the importance of considering the impacts of climate change to New England's ocean as an element of the Regional Ocean Plan.

I want to focus, we did file extensive comments, but I'm going to focus today just on a particular, the first objective, and in particular, action 1.2 to study areas of ecological importance. We find that this action falls really inexplicably short by failing to apply, to actually say affirmatively that you are going to apply a methodology to actually identify important ecological areas. I understand the intent of timing this, and John and Nick have made that more explicit in this new document, the framework, but this is a critical element of the ocean plan, and that is to identify important ecological areas. I think Massachusetts and Rhode Island can speak to that, and the way it reads now, it reads, it's kind of dancing around important ecological areas. We don't want to dance around that, I think you want to be very direct and say that you're going to study it and then you're going to take that step to actually identify important ecological areas.

IEAs are specifically called out in the National Ocean Policy and in the framework for effective Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning. In fact, you know, it says, quote, CMSP's intended to improve ecosystem health and services by planning human uses in concert with conservation of important ecological areas. And defines those as areas of high productivity and biological diversity; areas and key species that are critical ecosystem function and resiliency; areas of spawning, breeding, and feeding; areas of rare or functionally vulnerable marine

resources and migratory corridors. This has to be an element of the work that we do in the next two years. And so I urge the RPB to be much more explicit about your intent to identify important ecological areas.

Just a couple other things I wanted to mention. I wanted to call attention to a comment that my colleague from the Nature Conservancy mentioned yesterday, and that is that this framework is pretty much silent on the ultimate outcome of this, of the next two years, which should be the Northeast Regional Ocean Plan, recognizing that we have a short period of time. But the way the framework reads now is it's kind of like a research into others, there's lots of different activities that we all know are going to be knit tightly together, but it doesn't come through this document that the ultimate outcome is going to be some kind of document and compendium of maps and data that's going to help inform decision-making about how we manage our oceans. You know, it's an ocean plan, you don't have to be explicit yet about what that is exactly because I know we're feeling our way, but we need to talk about the fact that this group is developing an ocean plan. I think that's very important for the public and stakeholders to understand and even you, yourselves, to know what the outcome is at the end of this project.

And finally, I did want to put a plug in for creating a science and technical committee. I know there's sort of an ad hoc one out there. It's really important, you need this committee now to help advise you on how you're going to move forward on the scientific and technical aspects of this, every step of the way of this plan. Okay, thank you very much.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Valerie, before you go, let me just tell Nick. Nick Batista you'll be next, and Paul Williamson, you'll be after Nick. Go ahead.

Valerie Nelson: Yes, thank you. Valerie Nelson, again, Water Alliance and also a long-time member of very extensive discussions in Gloucester about where all of this is headed and in fisheries, in particular. And I would say that it's quite confusing, why healthy ocean ecosystems are not the overriding purpose of this effort. Never mind why it's second on the list.

I mean, in Gloucester, there's such a fundamental understanding that nothing works without a healthy ocean ecosystem. Providing quality healthy fish is not possible without a healthy ocean. We're at the front end of storm surges, pollution, all of this. The top predominant goal of everything should be restoration and protection of the healthy ecosystem because human uses and survival depend on that fundamentally. And I think that's one of the messages that people who live and relate to the ocean would put forward.

In that regard, it's not only troubling that so much work is rushing into how to look at new uses, but even the description of the work about the ocean health is so pedestrian and traditional. I would like to encourage you to take seriously how to think about and develop language and frames and concepts around what it means to have a healthy ecosystem, whether it's oceans or land or forestry or whatever it is. And what it means for human beings to live and prosper within that ecosystem. Because almost, I would say everything in your language is, again, so pedestrian.

I encourage you to look at systems thinking in one big field after another, where there's a recognition of how the pedestrian thinking has destroyed so much of nature and we as humans are suffering. So what are they doing? They're thinking of systems of landscapes. Bruce mentioned, I looked it up a little bit, maybe this North Atlantic Landscape Group is really onto something. If you look at the thoughts around cities, farming, water, forest, they are all looking at the system, and they're looking at how does nature find, how do we use and live with nature in a sustainable way? And for oceans it would definitely lead you to things that Gloucester and, I'll talk more in the next comment period about understanding that the wealth of nature and the ecosystem as a whole is first in food, but also in a host of bio-materials. This is barely tapping into what nature is providing through the ocean and what it means to protect it and to live in it sustainably.

I don't know what your task force groups are, but bringing in the best of international minds round this kind of systems-thinking, and what we, as a nation, should be striving for to protect and restore the ocean and live with it sustainably is important.

I do want to bring up in terms of financing, local capacity, an immediate opportunity that I hope you will support. Gloucester has been part of a proposal to NOAA to use the fishing fleet as an industry-based science project; it's a fishing industry, and it's the New England University starting with [ASMAS] at Dartmouth, the Senate Appropriations Committee is urging a dramatic increase in the use of fishing boats for not only stock assessments, but up, and this is Senator Mikulski's language I will read to you: other parts of NOAA, including the National Ocean Service and Ocean and Atmospheric Research Line Offices shall charter commercial fishing vessels when applicable to augment ongoing survey and research activities. This is a seven million dollar proposal for large numbers of fishing boats to get out across the ocean, their indigenous local knowledge brought in, but they are the most cost-effective way to up the science.

One of the NOAA boats costs \$50,000 a day to get out there gathering data in one spot on the ocean. This concept and proposal right now that NOAA should fund and I hope you'll support it, is for 1100 chartered fishing vessels in a grid across the entire ocean. We're looking for science projects that would benefit from that geographical scope and capacity that our local fleets have and the indigenous knowledge, as well. So, anyone interested in that particular proposal, I'd be happy—and the Senate, Mikulski would like to see you do it, so I hope you'll support that. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Nick, go ahead.

Nick Battista: Thank you. Nick Battista from the Island Institute in Rockland, Maine. The Island Institute is a community development organization that works with Maine's fifteen year-round island communities and other remote coastal communities.

I'm here today for the National Working Waterfront Network, as a co-chair of the policy committee, and specifically, we'd like to comment on action one-five. And when we were

drafting our comments and our framework, we didn't have the benefit of the revised briefing materials, so these are, we appreciate the inclusion of one-five in here.

The National Working Waterfront Network is a nationwide network of businesses, industry associations, non-profits, local governments, and communities, State and Federal agencies, universities, U-grant programs, and individuals dedicated to supporting, preserving, and enhancing our nation's working waterfronts. We have over 1200 members and are growing.

We recently completed a project for the Economic Development Administration that developed a sustainable working waterfront toolkit and characterized the nation's working waterfronts by looking at numerous case studies, historical trends, economic trends, striving change on our working waterfronts, as well as a number of other things. There's a lot of info in the toolkit that could be helpful to this process; I encourage you to go look at it, the link is included in our testimony. The Network believes that Working Waterfront to play a critical role in our coastal communities and provide important connection between ocean uses and land-based markets, 3.4% of the nation's GDP crosses are working waterfronts in the nation. Working waterfronts connect ocean uses to land base markets and provide critical access points for fisherman, ocean energy, and a multitude of other uses. They provide a gateway for our nation's coastal economy.

Many of our communities in New England were built around vibrant working waterfronts and over time have come to define themselves by the connection to their working waterfront, and they're the working waterfronts are the lens through which the public views access to the oceans and ocean space. For these reasons, we think the goals and objectives and actions of this body should reflect the importance of working waterfronts and should undertake a characterization of them, to help flesh out what that means.

And what we might recommend as a course of action, we developed a framework that focuses on compiling information on the public investment in the region's working waterfront infrastructure, particularly focused on federal investment in things like dredging channels, building breakwaters, bulkheads, wharfs, piers, EDA investments in our fishing communities, those sorts of things. And then identifying and summarizing state policies and programs for working waterfronts and data. A number of states have done some of this work, but putting it all together would be really helpful.

And then characterizing the uses emanating from those working waterfronts, this is all laid out in further detail in our comments, and we also recommend staying away from issues related to zoning flood plate management, fisheries management, and other proscriptive policies that do impact [inaudible] waterfront infrastructure but aren't directly related to monetary investments. We believe an important first step is just getting a handle on what the federal investments have been in our working waterfront infrastructure. So if we're making decisions about ocean spaces, we know who, which shore communities will be impacted by those decisions and how they might be impacted. So, it's also worth noting that this is

consistent with the fisheries characterization with the recommendation in our fisheries characterization report. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Paul, before you go, let me just tell the next two presenters will be Sally McGee and then Melissa Gates. Go ahead.

Paul Williamson: Thank you. Good morning. Paul Williamson from the Maine Ocean and Wind Industry Initiative. I just wanted to make a couple of points and the first one in particular in regards to the white paper that was issued this morning and the last goal that's listed on there – compatibility among past, current, and future ocean uses. When you look at the last line that's on there - facilitate and increase the understanding and coordination among stakeholders – I think one of the conversations or one of the opportunities that has been missing in this process so far has been inter-dialogue between the user groups. We have your dialogue and we have feedback to your dialogue, but I think that at some point, it would be really valuable to reverse the way this room is set up, and have a facilitated dialogue between the user groups with the RPB actually witnessing and learning from that dialogue.

And then also, in addition to that, or as a way to kind of further that along and build understanding between user groups and this also refers to the accounting of traditional and future uses and also relates to the mapping of resources, I think it would be really valuable if you added into that the goal to identify criteria for area use; so why does identifying why the fishing community values a specific area.

Identifying the criteria for energy development so that you can look at the grid or map and not only identify where there's current interest, but where there'd be future interest, because then you'd have the criteria for identifying interest and use of areas and building that as a knowledge base and sharing that between user groups will help by building the collaboration and understanding between those user groups. Thank you very much for your work here.

Laura Cantral: Thank you.

Sally McGee: Good morning. My name is Sally McGee, I work for the Nature Conservancy. You heard from my colleague, Chantal Collier, yesterday on the Nature Conservancy's behalf. So with respect to what is now goal one, that's something that the Conservancy obviously supports, it's important to have that up front, and the overall change to the language that you've reinserted to the top of the Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems Goal in terms of sustainability is also an important addition; so thank you for doing that.

With respect to the written comments that we've submitted, we'd just like to emphasize that the Conservancy would suggest that the process of characterization of the region's ecosystem should explicitly include consideration of bays, estuaries, tidal rivers, since those are vital in important components of our coastal ecosystems.

In terms of the collection of data, it's not only imperative to collect and make available a wide array of data, but to make sure that the applicability and appropriate use of this data is placed. And to do that, and I know there has been some discussion about how to carry this forward, but convening an ongoing scientific advisory group that can be available to offer advice on an ongoing basis to address issues like the scale of data in relation to site-specific decisions, the question that everybody's wrestling with in terms of cumulative impacts, vulnerabilities of different marine resources to human uses, and very importantly as was raised earlier in this comment period, the definitions of an appropriate approaches with regard to areas of ecological importance and measurements of marine health. And we would add, as well, consideration of resilience, as well, which was something that was discussed in the context of climate adaptation. And the flipside of that might be considered resilience.

With respect to objective five, this might, could be the place where, as was discussed yesterday and a little bit earlier in this comment period, to include more explicit consideration of what the ultimate plan looks like. So the document should really clearly state that there will be an ocean use plan for the region, and what that plan's going to look like. Whether it's spatially explicit, or criterion-based, and whether the plan will ultimately be a collection of guidance recommendations or protocols for decision-making. So this could be one place for the RPB to consider inserting that. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Melissa, before you go, the next two people will be Caitlin Cleaver, I hope I'm saying your name right, and then after Caitlin, Madeleine Hall-Arbor. Go ahead.

Melissa Gates: Cool, thank you. Good morning, my name is Melissa Gates. I'm the Northeast Regional Coordinator with Surfrider Foundation, which is an environmental non-profit dedicated to the protection and enjoyment of the world's oceans, waves, and beaches through a powerful activist network. Surfriders enjoy low-impact, non-consumptive coastal recreation activities such as swimming, kite-surfing, paddle boarding, surfing, and sailing. And we act to protect oceans, waves, and beaches.

I wanted to take a moment today to share gratitude for the immense amount of time and energy that everybody in this room has invested into helping advance Regional Ocean Planning Processes, from RPB members to NROC to the Meridian Institute to CBI to all the engaged stakeholders in the room and beyond. Through our collective contributions, we are embracing an opportunity to be proactive in helping protect the sea. Surfrider Foundation is appreciative to share in this visionary community with all of you.

We want to note that yesterday was the first time we heard that the goals are not intended to be positioned in an order of priority, but are instead intended to be of equal weight. For the sake of clarity, we suggest explicitly notating that intention in the document. Such a description would fit nicely into the goal introduction on Page 4 of the workplan.

Even given this idea of equal goal weight, we are appreciative of the change made to the start of the goal cycle, positioning the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems goal first.

Ecosystem protection is the primary of the National Ocean Policy, and we here in the Northeast depend upon a healthy marine ecosystem for spiritual, social, cultural, ecological, and economic value. This is why Surfrider believes that this goal should be recognized as the overarching theme of the Northeast Regional Ocean Planning Process, and we are appreciative, again, that the RPB listened to the public and integrated this change.

Surfrider further thanks the RPB for listening to and incorporating stakeholder feedback calling for reinsertion of the descriptive goal language from the original draft document. These descriptions are vital in helping define the intent and purpose of the goals.

Today, Surfrider will be submitting a petition signed by some of our fellow stakeholders who enjoy low-impact recreation on New England's beaches and waves, but could not be here in person for this meeting. These stakeholders join Surfrider in calling for prioritization of the healthy goal, of the healthy ocean and coastal ecosystem goal, as well as stronger actions to restore and protect the environment from existing and potential future threats; calling for the prioritization of sustainable uses over ecologically unsound existing uses and potential new uses; calling for identifying actions to fill the data gap for low-impact ocean recreation; and lastly, calling for better articulation of the public process for participation in regional ocean planning. We will be happy to report back to our fellow petitioners regarding some of the key changes made to the draft goals during this meeting.

We have a great opportunity here to protect the ocean ecosystem and recreational areas before they're threatened, and Surfrider appreciates being part of the process in the Northeast. And we again thank everyone involved in the process for ongoing contributions, helping to advance the ocean planning process in the Northeast. And again, thanking the RPB for carefully listening to stakeholder feedback and working to integrate that feedback into the planning documents. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So, Caitlin and Madeleine will be next.

Caitlin Cleaver: Good morning. Thank you for all of your work this far in a very complex process. And thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Caitlin Cleaver, and I work with the Island Institute, which is a community development organization in Rockland, Maine. We work to sustain Maine's coastal and year-round island communities that are heavily reliant on a healthy marine ecosystem, oh, thank you, and a number of ocean uses.

I am commenting specifically on action one-two under this goal. I would suggest that the term health of the marine system include an assessment of community dependence on ocean space, ocean uses both consumptive and non-consumptive, and marine resources. This type of assessment should take into account economic dependence, but also other social indicators to better understand the vulnerability of these communities to changes in the marine environment.

I think it's important to understand how activities, how human activities affect the ecosystem and in turn how changes in the ecosystem, like shifting species distribution due to

changes in environmental conditions, affect our coastal communities. This work could also be relevant to characterizations of our ocean economy, and to work around responses to coastal hazards by adding another dimension of data we have on the condition of our coastal communities. In addition, this approach could increase the durability of this process by being relevant at a local level and helping communities identify future threats and potential areas of resilience to help insure a more sustainable future.

We plan to submit written comment next week, outlining existing resources and examples of this type of work, and we look forward to providing you additional information as needed in this area. Thanks so much for your time.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Madeleine, before you go, let me just announce that the last two presenters after Madeleine will be Mike Crow and Pete Stauffer.

Madeleine Hall-Arber: Thank you. When Nick yesterday and John today summarized the goals and objectives of this goal, the Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems, they mentioned characterizing the ecosystem, the economy, and cultural resources. Typically, perhaps because managers of planners understand numbers, or at least think they're important, economics, actually as Bruce pointed out today, generally take precedence. And both in descriptions and in impact analyses, that's where you find it.

I'd like to urge you to pay serious attention to culture. I'm an anthropologist, and have been involved with the fishing, commercial fishing industry for many, many years, so that's what I'm addressing particularly. I think a lot of stakeholders, a whole variety of them actually, have cultures that can be important to the planning process and how people respond to it. And certainly, I agree that the culture of the tribes, which has been specifically designated as extremely important and I applaud you on doing that. But the fishing communities also have a culture that's very important, very long-lasting. And interestingly, they have striking similarities across geographies, species targeted gear groups, and scale of operation. In fact, when I was in Senegal, West Africa doing field work as a grad student, I was surprised to hear conversations that paralleled conversations I had with fishermen in Provincetown, Massachusetts. And the scale was radically different. I mean, Senegal they were using pirogues with outboard motors, and in Provincetown, they were using trawlers.

But it's also important to look at each, the details of the culture. It's not just fishing culture as a whole, but the specific context, because it's those differences that can be critically important in decision-making. Now I think that in the decision-making goal, by the way, the TEK and LEK are specifically and appropriately acknowledged, but for this one, this goal, the Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems, as somebody mentioned today, we all know that includes humans, but often that's overlooked in the actual coming down to the wire. So I think you really need to look at culture as part of that baseline, but also to track the culture as planning and implementation goes on because there will be changes and people will be affected and how they respond to the process is really significant.

As a PS, somebody mentioned that they appreciated the fact that all of the goals have equal weight, but I wanted to warn you that even though you may have that as your intention, we have a background with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which controls fishing. They have the national standards one through ten. And originally, they were supposed to be, the congressional intent was that they all be equal. And when, by now, however, it is definitely number one is the most important. And each of the standards after that are based on what position they are in that numbering system. So, be aware of that, and wary. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you.

Madeleine Hall-Arber: Madeleine Hall-Arber. I'm with MIT Sea Grant.

Laura Cantral: Okay, so we've got Mike Crow, and then Pete Stauffer. We have Mike? No, you're passing. Okay. All right, then Pete, you're up.

Pete Stauffer: All right. Members of the Planning Body, my name's Pete Stauffer with the Surfrider Foundation. I help manage Surfrider's National Ocean Program, and want to thank you very much for all your hard work on this important process. I also want to thank you for indulging us to give comments twice during this comment period, and I promise to try and be as brief as I can.

I do want to start reiterating the comments of Melissa, and a number of other folks, who have stated the goal of healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems should be the primary, or the overarching goal, of the planning process. And certainly a really key part of that is a robust characterization of the region's species, habitats, cultural resources, and existing human activities. So to dive even deeper into that, we want to express our strong support for task number five, which is listed under objective one, that's under Page 19. And that task is to map additional recreational uses and determine their economic contribution to the region. So this refers to activities like beachgoing, surfing, kayaking, diving, whale watching, and swimming, just to name a few. These activities engage millions and millions of people throughout the Northeast region. They also generate major economic benefits for coastal communities and the region as a whole, likely in the billions of dollars.

As many folks know, this currently represents a significant data gap in the Northeast Ocean Data Portal, and so we would really emphasize the need to fill that data gap. In addition, Surfrider is willing to provide some in kind support for such a mapping effort, particularly with respect to stakeholder outreach. Over the past year, or I guess last year, Surfrider, through a partnership with NROC, helped identify over 900 recreational businesses, groups, and associations throughout the region. These include, for example, dive shops, kayak clubs, surfing schools, whale watching associations; essentially 900 groups and business throughout the region that represent both the breadth of different kinds of activities, but also the geographic breadth as well throughout the region. And we believe this can be a really valuable resource to engage the recreational communities, and essentially engage these businesses and groups as partners in getting the word out about ocean planning.

Finally, I'll say that we do have some concerns with the timeline that's listed on Page 23 for recreational use mapping. The timeline seems to imply the data collection might not happen until the fall or winter of this year, and we would respectfully submit that you're trying to engage stakeholders in providing data in a mapping effort, doing it for example in the months of November, December, and January probably isn't the optimal time. So we would suggest moving that up to this coming summer, and we think you're going to have really more better results in terms of being able to engage partners like kayak clubs and dive shops and just to sort of leverage the activity and interest in ocean and coastal recreation that does occur during the summer months. So we would encourage you to modify that workplan to include the issuance of an RFP and to move forward with that mapping and data collection effort this winter and this spring.

And just to reiterate, we are talking about the largest and most diverse stakeholder group, or set of stakeholder groups, as it relates to ocean planning. So we see a really important need, both to collect spatial information, but also to engage these recreational communities in the planning process. So thank you again for all your work.

Laura Cantral: Great, thank you. And thanks to all of you who offered very helpful comments and encourage members to reflect on those comments and when we come back, we're going to take a break and we'll come back and resume the discussion of the goal related to help the ocean coastal ecosystems and perhaps some of what you've heard during this comment session informed your thinking as we continue that discussion.

So we're going to take a fifteen minute break and come back at twenty-five after, and pick up with our discussion at that point. Thank you and we'll see you in fifteen minutes.

RPB Discussion of Draft Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Healthy Ocean and Coastal Ecosystems (continued)*

Laura Cantral: Okay, ready to get started? All right, we are scheduled to go now until 12:30 when we'll take a lunch break. And I failed to mention before we took this past coffee break that we have our next public comment session coming up at 2:45, so if you haven't already and you're interested in offering public comment during that session, please sign up at the registration desk, and that will take place at 2:45.

So what we want to do now is come back to the discussion about the goal and objectives and related actions, tasks, etc. related to healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems, and let me just offer a few of my observations listening to the discussion before the comment session just as a way to get everyone oriented and perhaps kick off some more discussion.

There were some, a few general observations about the goal and related objectives, an acknowledgement that this is a really important goal, and that it's a lot of work. We need to be clear-eyed about the capacity needed in all senses of the word, and ensure that it's doable in the two-year time frame. There are some suggestions about further clarifying some terminology

and providing context, and I think that the staff and the co-leads will be taking those comments about context around the whole framework under advisement for the next iteration of this.

Specifically related to objectives, again some observations related objective one, again recognizing the reality of the two-year window and managing expectations and capacity, recognizing the evolving nature of characterizing these systems are changing and dynamic, and that's always going to be the case, so proceed as Bruce said, be cognizant and careful.

Some suggestions and offers to volunteer or volunteering others. One suggestion is to highlight the existence of grant resources to pursue the economic assessment, the economic part of that, and I think Bruce that was a comment you made and maybe you can help us clarify if there's someplace that we need to emphasize that in the document. Some capacity volunteered through Bill Hubbard and Coastal America related to objective two. A proposal to consider webinars as an opportunity for forums that can provide updates and status reports related to the activities that are outlined in the framework. And then again, I'm guessing that there will be some ideas presented around the table related to the issue of technical committees; how to proceed with that, how to structure that. You heard from Betsy a proposal that the co-leads develop some options to present for RPB consideration at the June meeting and to use existing mechanisms and build out the bench of expertise in the meantime. And we definitely want to have some discussion around that over the next fifty minutes or so.

And then fundamentally, I'd just like to remind you all that what we're looking for here ultimately is the ability to proceed with scoping and bringing back options for further consider to you all about how to proceed and informing your decision-making. So just be mindful of that as we're having the discussion about this goal and objectives and the related actions. I'm hopeful that we can have discussion over the next fifty minutes, and that you will be ready and comfortable with approving this goal, and we flagged any concerns or ideas that you have about related actions, and then we can take a nice lunch break.

And I have just been handed a note that in case you did not know, which I did not, check out is noon. If you need to check out, then you need to do it before noon. All right, so, the floor is open. Tom.

Tom Burack: Thank you. I just want to ask questions about a few of the comments that we heard. Our second commenter had some very specific comments about changes that we had made to language about natural resources, language if possible related to economic evaluation of all uses. I recognize that a number of those comments probably tied to discussions of the funding piece, for example, that I think Bruce may have had some thoughts on. So I'm just trying to understand what the, sort of what the sequence has been in drafting on some of those issues, and how we've come to the point where we are on those particular pieces.

Then the other piece, I just wonder if we could explore a little bit is this notion of systems thinking that was raised by one of our commenters here. My understanding as a non-scientist is the direction where the science ultimately would take probably us is toward a more

systems-based way of looking at these issues, but that the science in many respects is perhaps in its infancy in a lot of areas. And further, as I understand it, one of the challenges we face is, even if the science can paint a more systems way of looking at the world, the reality is that the laws under which we operate drive us back to side lobe thinking again.

But I just want to throw the question out there as to whether we should be at least giving some kind of a nod in our language to an interest in looking at and exploring what a more systems or holistic way of looking at all the science and how these systems work together; how that might ultimately benefit us, even if the existing regulatory framework may not be particularly conducive to accommodating those, those types of analyses. Those are just a couple of themes I'd like to be able to explore if we could.

Laura Cantral: So Tom I'm sorry, you're going to have to help me out with the first one where you had some questions about comments about edits? Could you just clarify that?

Tom Burack: Well, and again, I believe these were from Brent Greenfield. They were comments about some original language regarding natural resources that got modified and I'm not sure in which goal that was. And then with respect to economic evaluation of uses, that we have a qualifier in there that says we would do this if possible. I think this probably relates to the funding issue, I'm just trying to understand why we might have that kind of qualifier in there.

Laura Cantral: Okay. Paul, I know you've got a comment, but let's just try to dismiss, and we'll come back to that in a moment. So do you want to speak to that?

John Weber: So on those, and yet I was noting Brent's comments as well. On the first two points, why did we replace what used to be language talking about natural resources with the term marine life? Not a particular reason, so if the comfort level is stronger higher with natural resources, fine.

The second question had to do with a particularly, when we're talking about the recreational uses, and this is on page, I believe Brent, what you're talking about is on Page 19, it is task number five. It says map additional recreational uses dot dot dot and if possible determine the economic contribution of these activities. We added the if possible because honestly we have, with other types of recreational uses, there are in talking with economists there, we have to scope out the methodology for how to do that. So the language there was just reflecting that we have not done that scoping exercise yet. So, and again, back to a point made earlier about setting expectations, that is why we added that.

Laura Cantral: Yeah, did you want to ...?

Betsy Nicholson: Just to address Tom's appreciation for systems thinking and in response to Valerie's comment, I mean, you go back to the National Ocean Policy and it's all about integrated ecosystem-based management. I think perhaps we need to be more explicit with that here, and certainly as we move forward, and I think it's our full intention as we go into this season of more technical workshops to not just get the species-specific experts, but also some of

those more integrated thinkers. We have a lot of folks at NOAA and many other agencies that are also doing integrated ecosystem assessments, IEAs, and a lot of pretty cutting-edge, and there's a lot of cutting-edge work that's not being done by the government that's being done by other folks that need to be involved.

So I just wanted to give you a nod that that's a good observation and perhaps the way, the way the workplan's laid out now is just, it's task oriented and we're just not perhaps seeing how, the importance of the systems thinking.

I also wanted to just recognize comments made by the Island Institute and Madeleine Hall Arbor. The Island Institute, in terms of working waterfronts and starting to explore the economic assessment that we'd like to pursue, that is right up there. I've been pulling NOAA Coastal Services Center folks, there you are, Coastal Services Center folks and Kenneth Walker, who's involved with the National Working Waterfront network, and our economists around eNow to really understand where, what's our baseline of knowledge and how do we need to build on that to complete this economic assessment. So working waterfronts are front and center there.

And the other comment with regard to Madeleine's comment on paying attention to culture. I just wondered, on Page 19 in the third task, convene a cultural work group composed of tribes and federal and state agencies to take a closer look at primarily cultural resources as they relate to significance to tribes. A lot of our comment, not just today, but the written, also pointed out the need for submerged cultural resources to be considered as well. So I wonder if it makes sense to expand that cultural work group to other types of non-consumptive uses or perhaps it could happen separately. But that we need, I just wanted to point out that that could be an addition.

Laura Cantral: Great. So Paul, did you have a comment?

Paul Diodati: Yes. I just appreciate the opportunity for members of the body to be able to respond to some of the speakers because I have to say, both this morning and yesterday, the speakers coming up are very well-prepared, providing some very thoughtful comment, and I for one really appreciate it.

So I will just briefly talk about one thing that I don't think is that important and one other thing that came up that I think is very important. One is how we might sample for different information; it was a concern about sampling during the wintertime might not get a hold of the type of recreational activities that are actually out there. We do a lot of that type of thing in our business, sampling our fishing community, and we find that during the winter, recreational fisherman are actually home looking for something to do, someone to yell at, actually. So we get a very good response during the winter. During the summer, they're out busy with their hobbies or passions, and so I think that's something that comes up with our very abled team in working with consultants to make sure we're sampling, asking the right

questions, getting the answers that we're looking for, and at the right time. But I appreciate that comment, it's important.

The other thing is about prioritizing, or not, goals, and giving them equal weight. And I go both ways on that and what I caution us on is that if we don't prioritize them, something else will. I guess our, the thing we have to keep in mind is what's the purpose of these goals; we're not a regulatory body, we keep saying that, we're providing guidance or pathway. So if we're not going to regulate, then maybe we won't end up in court someday, but if we are, and we do, we will end up in court, then those goals will get prioritized. And that means that they have to be measurable. So you have to pick a goal that's measurable because when you're standing in that courtroom and the judge looks down, they want to be able make a decision, did you meet that goal or not? And if it's some, they'll decide which one is measurable. So I think we have to think about that and how these goals will be used, and so that's it, that's my comment.

Laura Cantral: Kathleen.

Kathleen Leyden: I just want to acknowledge that the work around economic analysis and how it would be used needs to evolve. And our colleague and main Charlie Colgan from the Muskee Institute, University of Southern Maine, often talks about let's think through this, what questions do you want to ask of this data, what are you going to use it for, what are you going to with that big number once you get the big number? So I think just as any, the other data collection that we're doing, we need to ask those questions as we're collecting it.

I think also particularly, this relates also to some of the comments about data collection is that for the economy, it's not just about existing values, it's about trends that are beyond our control, so national and international trends. And I think, you know thinking about how we use those big numbers, is it that we want to protect existing investments that we've already made in infrastructure, or I know when we get into trade-off analysis, that gets really scary to people. And I'm thinking about our experience with, in Maine, with the off-shore wind energy test areas that if you're displacing a lobsterman with a particular territory, there's not room to move elsewhere because the territories are carved out, and I'm stating this really simplistically. So are you having a huge impact on a family or a series of families, or a community, and that economic impact is typically going to be here when you're looking at the value of the wind industry and the economic spin-off of that.

And I don't think the constituents we heard from don't understand how those decisions are made, and how when you're putting a dollar value on it, it gets really complicated. And it's often used, those dollar values are used for mitigation and compensation at the project level. So just some things, doesn't affect the wording, but just some things to think about when we move forward on that.

Laura Cantral: Barbara, and then Chris after Barbara. Go ahead.

Barbara Miller: I wanted to just move onto the second objective if there wasn't any more discussion, at least immediately, on the other stuff we were just talking about.

Laura Cantral: That's fine. Yeah, go.

Barbara Miller: Okay. The second objective that is to identify all the different opportunities and programs out there, I can just speak from my very little microcosm of a small agency in USDA, and we administer the conservation programs of the Farm Bill. And the Farm Bill, if anybody's paying any, you probably don't know, but it's been in flux for two years now, and so when we talk about identifying these existing things, you can't put a period at the end of that sentence. It's a constantly evolving thing. So you might put a two-year time frame, but as soon as you identify them, another law has passed or another storm comes and billions of dollars are dumped out on somebody.

So there needs to be some sort of mechanism to, some sort of clearing house thing to be continually aware of, or have the sources to keep feeding into that because that is such a moving target. I think it would also be good in that realm to not only identify existing opportunities, but where are the gaps, so that when there is opportunities for public involvement on things that are being missed, we know what's there so we know what's not there if there's something that we think isn't being addressed. So that's just sort of a comment on that. There are just all kinds of agencies with programs that are out there with opportunities, and it's hard to keep track of them.

I just wanted to make one comment about the technical committee concept. Because once again in our, I work for Natural Resources Conservation Service, again we administer conservation title of the Farm Bill, and in the legislation that came out I think a couple Farm Bills ago, set up this sort of structure of a technical committee, a state technical committee with sub-committees based at a local level. So you have a sort of top down arrangement where you have maybe all the experts in the scientific ways, you have a mechanism to have the bottom up feeding the local input of that. So when we're talking about cumulative impacts, maybe one town or one county isn't going to really understand those cumulative impacts, but they can provide a lot of input so that somebody else can take a look at it.

And if we look for mechanisms to do that kind of grass roots effort, there's, it's, what's done in our agency is it uses the conservation districts, which every single county in the country has a conservation district, whether it's real active or not. But when you look at one organization that's out there where you might be able to identify a different thing in every town that's on a coast, but you know it would be a place to at least to start to explore to look for getting some local input from an organizational standpoint. And then from the top down could be through webinars, could be this body deciding what scientists need to be at the table or other input of who could participate. But you have to think about how to structure that. And since I'm sort of a surrogate here, I probably won't be participating in the ongoing stuff, but just a little bit of input.

Laura Cantral: All right, thank you. Chris.

Chris Thompsett: Hopefully, not getting too much into the weeds. But we heard from commenters about providing in kind support and data, so I was wondering if there was an easy method for people here and not here to provide that data to the effort. If there is something within the, I know the new web page or something like that, if that's available, so that to kind of ease that collection of data for you guys.

Mr. Napoli: On the new website, NEOceanPlanning.org, there's an opportunity to just provide comment, that's one way any one of us will get that information. Also on the data portal website, there's opportunity to provide feedback, and you can just let us know through that if you have any data. And there are specific themes on the data portal, so if you're in the aquaculture theme, and you actually say I have data in that feedback spot, it'll tag it with aquaculture so that's another way of doing it.

Laura Cantral: Ames.

Ames Colt: Reflecting on Priscilla Brooks of CLS's comments about the importance of identifying significant, areas of significant ecological activity, the thought that struck me, kind of echoing what Grover said earlier is that we are entering a period of undefined length where the marine environment is going to be in a high state of flux in terms of species movements, changes to habitat quality, right down to fundamental chemical parameters such as acidity. And so I wonder if the job is even harder. Certainly retrospectively, we have a lot of information available on the geography of our ecology, i.e. where are those areas of importance for biological diversity and productivity now, or in the past, although if you think about the shifting baselines theme, the work of Jeremy Jackson, what we see now certainly doesn't reflect what existed in the past.

But going forward is this state of change that we're entering for our coastal oceans going to make it very difficult to identify those areas because they're going to be changing so rapidly. So will that lead us to think more as it is stated in task two of objective one, characterizing areas of ecological importance seems to imply what should we be looking for in terms of the dynamics of change in order to come up with some better understanding of the trajectory of these systems.

And then, thinking of the geographic scope, roughly that we're talking about from somewhere east of New York, New Jersey harbor all the way up to Eastport, Maine, we're going to have to start breaking up the geography and our assessment of it because of the unique characteristics. And the Sea Grant work to develop a science priorities for the New York bite, and for the Gulf of Maine roughly is one example of how that was broken up could be a basis for it.

But again, are we really going to, it's more complex than just identifying areas we need to now identify drivers of change and what they'll lead to.

Tom Burack: May I just ask a follow-up question to that, Ames? Would it also entail trying to understand what the criteria are that would, or the characteristics that would define particular

areas? So rather than just saying, oh, this area in front of Ames is a really important area, we want to define what the natural characteristics are about that area that make it so significant so that as we go out and characterize other areas, we can see whether they meet those particular characteristics. Is that a part of this too, or not?

Ames Colt: Yeah, I think that's the easier part. Productivity, species diversity, diversity of upwelling areas, or a bottom habitat; the question is more how are those features, those basic characteristics going to change, particularly in terms of the ecology given changes in temperature, currents, acidity, species movements, and so forth.

Laura Cantral: So Grover, you look like you wanted to chime in on that. Is that this point, or something else?

Grover Fugate: Yeah. I guess there's two things—

Laura Cantral: —And then Sharri, I'll give it to you next—

Grover Fugate: —One is and I know Bruce and Massachusetts have worked extensively on this too, and we have, we've gone through several iterations of it, in terms of trying to look at some sort of ecosystem value index. And when we initially started this, the scientists said it's almost there, all we need is a little push. [Laughter]. It ain't there. And my guess is that it's probably a good three to five years off before we can get to something that may be there. But a lot of it is also going to be very dependent on the data, and how much data we can generate in between now and then to try to feed a system.

But assuming that we could, and we get there, my question I guess is to what end will that be? Because many of the decision-making systems that are still there are going to drive off their own assessment of what is ecologically valuable to their system. So the endangered species guys are still going to look at what's valuable to those particular species. Central Fish Habitat is still going to look at from that perspective. So again, I, you know, we're talking about investing a tremendous amount of time and resources, and at the end of it, I'd like to know that it was done before a very valuable purpose, other than what could be a needless exercise. So that's, I'm just asking that question.

Laura Cantral: Sharri.

Sharri Venno: I just want to bring the North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperation back up as a; they are wrestling with these questions right now and they have already begun developing maps that will identify these ecologically important areas. And so there, I think would be a great resource in terms of helping us wrestle with them as well.

Laura Cantral: Vera, and then Bruce.

Vera Francis: This is Vera Francis, Passamaquoddy Tribe. I just want to make, I don't want to repeat anything, though put emphasis back on the ecological importance, especially from tribal

perspective of marine base culture of bays, tidal rivers, and estuaries. And I know that we had tackled that language initially, and somewhere it also got lost, but also we're still dealing with issues concerning those areas because I've heard other terms and interest being communicated today that are directly related to bays, so I just want to emphasize the inclusion of those very important ecological spaces for people and marine life.

The other question I think that was posed that, was posed once before, yesterday, is as to the RPB's work that's focus, its intended outcome. Is that an ocean plan, I heard was the question that's on the table. So I would like for that question to be considered, it was posed directly to this group. Thank you.

Bruce Carlisle: So that's a great segue because that was, I think I've got a couple points I'd just like to raise, and that was at the top of my list. Sort of implicit in all of this work and I think stated at the beginning of the introductory materials to the workplan is language around the fact that the collective body of this work, the actions, the tasks, and the outcomes themselves become the components of we'll just use the word plan, okay. We're talking about ocean planning, so there's got to be something called a blueprint, you've got a framework, but there's some report, I don't know what it is, but there's something that comes at the, not the end, but at some point during this process. We know some things about that, that it is intended to be guidance for existing regulatory programs.

But there's a lot of sort of variations on sort of what that could do. I think it's implicit in here, and I think the point that was raised yesterday by TNC and echoed today by CLF, I think is a fair one and a good one. And I would think that we might want to consider, like we do at the very end, where we talk about benchmarks, and measuring progress, sort of an overarching objective. Maybe pulling that out and then pulling out some of the plan development process and consideration points into sort of an overarching workplan of this. I mean, it's in here, you can knit it together, we all get it, but I think we can perhaps be a little bit more explicit about that. So that's point number one. And this doesn't need to upend the workplan, okay, we don't need to stop and debate this ad nauseam. I'm very much in favor of progress.

The other thing I've been sort of kicking around is this concept of a technical committee. And this is a really tough nut. We've talked about this at previous meetings and on calls and in terms of stakeholder engagement and all that, and I provide my comments from the perspective of Massachusetts. We've got two essentially advisory bodies legislatively mandated, and I think they are tremendous, as I said before, tremendous assets. But then there is the fact that, so what is a science or technical committee? Because we are doing work across the spectrum of, as we've heard today, I don't know, disciplines if you will.

So there's ocean marine life, okay. And there's biotics, and there's the physical habitat, and there's the chemical components to that. So that's all this sort of groupings in there. And we've got social and economic concerns. We've got, the host of things, ports and operations and industry. Is this technical committee supposed to have representation across that? And if so, that's, we've got difficult geographies. I'm not weighing in, but as we deliberate on this, and I

know you've talked about an options type of paper, and I look to the co-leads to engage some more on this. We could be well-served by some type of standing body by that, but that should not take the place of going to get the technical and scientific and other subject matter expertise that exists outside of that.

And I think we're doing that as well, so it's a careful sort of what do you do. And the other thing is, we've got to be very cognizant of what we're building here, and the care and feeding that is going to go on to on to all this, and also the difficulties that are poised by a geography, albeit a very small geography, you know, but a geography of having different folks across that. And there are ways to work around this. So anyway, good luck to you guys as you guys consider that. [Laughter].

The last point I want to make, I'm sorry about being a little long-winded here, but it was raised in comments, Ames raised it, Tom raised it as well, it's this concept of ecological importance. It's obviously central to what we're doing. The ocean ecosystem and sustainability and all that, but as Grover said, this is a tough nut. We shouldn't, because it's a tough nut, and as Vera said, things can be messy, we shouldn't be afraid of it. But I think we need to put forward a logical sequence as Grover was getting at in order for this to be manageable.

And I think, Tom, to your point, I think coming up with a common vernacular by what we collectively mean by ecological importance is absolutely definitely the starting point. Because unless we can all sit around a table or have our scientific peers nod in agreement when we talk about ecological importance, we're not going to get anywhere in making further progress on that. So, and I think we've laid that out, and I think we need to be cognizant of the fact of, we need to [inaudible] ourselves, but within a period of a two-year framework, we could definitely advance this. Will it be, and we'll have to wait and see, will it be right? We'll have to wait and see.

Laura Cantral: So could we have some more discussion and hear thoughts from others about the idea of this technical committee?

Grover Fugate: Well, I think as Bruce pointed out, we would be well-served at this point to ask the staff to come forward and develop a series of options. We will eventually be bringing those options forward, yes, as co-leads.

Laura Cantral: Some careful sequencing happening there.

Grover Fugate: I don't envision I'm going to be sitting down writing this up at this point. And to go forward and come up with a series of options what the plus and minuses of each might be so that we can, it's an obviously a topic that comes up over and over and over again. But I think if we are to have some meaningful discussion, we need to understand what the options might be and what the plus and minuses of each of those systems might be so that we can see if there's something that we can fashion or not.

Laura Cantral: Great. Kathleen.

Kathleen Leyden: Is it a possibility to have organizations and individuals who want to offer technical expertise, and I think it should be broadly construed as to what experts are so it's academics and modelers and researchers and people out on the water with local knowledge and others, I wonder if it's possible for people to self-organize around that. There are a number of groups in this region that have been funded to support their role in regional ocean planning, and they can do whatever they want in terms of organizing. And then could it be some sort of MOU that they serve in some capacity to us, I mean, just an idea.

Betsy Nicholson: We could certainly consider that as an option looking back at the handbook that is suggested as one of many ideas.

Laura Cantral: All right, so Tom and then Ames.

Tom Burack: Very quickly, I like the idea of an options paper, I think that would be really helpful to us and bring it back to us at the next meeting in June and we can have it far enough in advance, we can really think about it, get our questions available ahead of time and be able to come to a decision.

And without making everybody else, everybody's life even more miserable, I'm wondering if there isn't twice the fun to be had here, that is, we have two different requests as I've heard it from the public, for advisory groups; one specifically for a technical group, and another for a broader overarching advisory group. And my suggestion would be that we develop two options papers, one on each of those themes, and be prepared at the June meeting to make decisions on how we're going to approach both of those sets of requests that we've heard.

Laura Cantral: Ames and then Bob.

Ames Colt: I agree with couple of comments that trying to assemble say a science advisory committee that captured all the relevant disciplines would be pretty much unworkable, given our time constraints, at least. My day job involves a process, a planning process that's quite similar to what you're doing here, except at the state level, and one idea I've been toying with to fulfill our requirement for science advice across a great range of water resource management and development issues is to have a single science advisory committee consisting of folks, whether they're from academia or elsewhere, who specialize in the utilization of scientific and technical information in policy and planning, who have some inter-disciplinary training that allows them to reach either deeply into the social sciences or the natural sciences, but have core training in decision sign support, policy analysis, political science. There are folks who do this for a living, and they could be very adept in handling the transfer of these types of knowledge and information into planning and policy development, including evaluation, including implementation. So it is a clear need for a planning process as diverse and ambitious as this, run and lead by an RPB of extraordinary diversity as well.

And then let, as Kathleen has suggested, the existing disciplinary advisory bodies somehow harness them to provide us specific forms of advice when you're looking at specific issues or disciplines.

Laura Cantral: Bob and then Doug.

Bob LaBelle: I just wanted to make a comment that I have some experience with somewhat large scientific advisory bodies and Federal Advisory Committee Act, FACA, groups. In [Bome] we have a scientific advisory committee that's been around for more than a decade that advises us on our research program, and you know, it's a pretty broad program, so it's multi-disciplinary. I think there are fifteen members on it, including one or two from industry sources, oceanographers, for example. Lots of fair work involved in the care and feeding of the committee, but lots of good things come out of it as well. On other FACA committees brought together that I've served on for specific tasks, for example marine mammals and anthropogenic sound, these are multi-year efforts that are very labor intensive.

But my point in mentioning these two examples, is that when it comes down to specific advice on technical, scientific, local knowledge issues, like we would be doing not so much with what Ames was just talking about, the decision support, but the basic science. We've done an assessment of an organism, how good is this? Even those large groups will quickly form into very small sub-groups, and the biologists on the committee will form a sub-group and come back to the main committee with their review and recommendation. And I think yesterday it was mentioned, maybe by Grover or Betsy, that if we could be nimble here in getting to those small, local science review personnel that we need to, without all the overall committee, we're accomplishing the same sort of beneficial, we'd get the same beneficial advice. So it's not as black and white as it appears, in my experience, if we go on a smaller, more targeted approach, as long as you get the local knowledge involved for whatever you're looking at.

Laura Cantral: Doug.

Doug Grout: Thank you, and I want to lend my support for Betsy's idea of a white paper. I think we have a lot of ideas, several ideas that have already been presented here that could be used as different options for a technical committee in this white paper. One of the pieces of information that will be helpful to me is identifying in that white paper, the technical, the types of technical expertise that this RPB would need on the technical committee, as well as the time commitment for those people and the resources needed to report such a technical committee.

Laura Cantral: Ames, you don't have a new comment, that's from earlier, right?

Ames Colt: Not that I want to share.

Laura Cantral: Okay. [Laughter]. Go ahead, Bruce.

Bruce Carlisle: So my question is whether or not we need to wait until June to deliberate on this. It'd be good, I think, to have that meeting as a final point in time where we'll formalize

whatever decision we have, but recognizing that it probably won't take that long to develop options, do we want to wait that long to start to review and debate them. It's just, a pretty important piece here. So that's my question for the group.

Grover Fugate: The only thing I would say, Bruce, is that there's obviously going to be a lot of considerations that go into that. When we were developing our scientific advisory committee, one of the problems you have is sometimes getting the people you want on there don't want to be on there. So there was that aspect. The time commitment is huge in many of these types of situations and people are stretched thin these days and generally are very cautious about how they invest their time. Obviously the care and feeding of this, travel support, and all the rest of it comes into play, and how you get those people there – are you going to give them some sort of remuneration for it?

There are federal laws that in how we stand these committees up that we need to deal with, so there's a whole host. And then to me, how do we even appoint that committee could be a nightmare in itself, and do you end up with a committee that's to cover all the topics that we need to, fifty, sixty, eighty people; I don't know, it becomes unmanageable at that point. And then you're getting into technical aspects, we're getting down into technical committees and how do they interface and all the rest of that. There are a lot of issues to lay out I think and try to consider and discuss.

Betsy Nicholson: Yeah I think, thinking about, so on your point of timing, Bruce, I think that what's important is actually deliberate and make that decision in public, that's what I worry about. I don't want to make it over a phone call, with just the RPB members, I don't think that's appropriate because those calls aren't decisional, by nature. So there's that issue; perhaps we could be more creative.

Also, just, getting to Bob's point, I think the really important thing here is getting the right people involved in a topical discussion to be pragmatic and respectful of people's time, and to make those workshops and conversations open to the public, right? I mean, so getting to your point of being nimble, and making sure that we have the best that this region has to offer, or beyond, involved, could very well happen through technical workshops, and not trigger FACA, and not delay a lot of this work from happening, we still get the expertise you need plugged in quickly, because we don't need to wait around for technical experts to be involved in this. They need to be part of this now. So I'm I guess expressing a preference for being nimble here and looking into that, in a way that's satisfactory to our, the experts that we'd be pulling as well.

Laura Cantral: All right, a few more thoughts on this. So, Tom, Grover, and then Kathleen.

Tom Burack: Just to echo Betsy's point. I don't think Bruce, to your concern, that we have to hold up starting work on all these topics while we try to figure out what the longer term structure is for how we're going to engage people. We could be in the interim experimenting

with Betsy's notion of workshops, for example, and what are really good ways to pull in the best scientific people into those workshops on particular topics that we would expect to be cued up here in the next few months. So I would see these as parallel tracks.

Laura Cantral: Grover.

Grover Fugate: I'm just going to add to that and say that there's sort of a hybrid approach that we can take in that as we start to discuss these various topics. There are obviously natural people that should be considered in the discussion of these topics, but going back to Betsy's point, if those are open discussions noted on the calendar, open to the public so that whoever gets potentially pulled in isn't limited to those groups then I think we'll have much more robust and open process. And increases the transparency of what's going on. so—

Laura Cantral: Okay. Kathleen

Kathleen Leyden: An observation and a question. I think, Betsy's comment about how we make our work more transparent in between meetings is not only — It's an issue that runs across all the topics and we clearly need to do a lot more work between now and June than we've been doing in the past and I just—I want to clarify with John that I believe that we have public participation experts under contract who can help us with that. I think they understand how to do that and will hopefully be giving us some ideas. I mean, I think it's a fine balance between — it's legitimate for a group of this size to be able to talk amongst themselves in some sort of forum, I think. John, do you have any?

John Weber: Your question was, do we have engagement support? Yes.

Kathleen Leyden: But not only in engagement support, but identifying a construct for how.

John Weber: Absolutely. Soup to nuts, designed through logistics.

Laura Cantral: I think I can summarize this point on technical committees. Very important topic and good ideas. A lot of expertise and experience to share around the table here, and I think the notion is that you all are supportive of the co-leads and the staff working together to develop some options to present to you for discussion, refinement, deliberation, at the ext public meeting which will be in June. However, in the meantime, continuing to look for opportunities, identify the experts, the technical expertise needed, grow the bench as Betsy said, and be nimble and have those things running on parallel tracks between now and June is an approach that I'm sensing that you're comfortable with. Is that a fair summary and are we comfortable with that?

Okay, and then with regard to other points that have been made about this goal? In general, just a few things that I've heard. Again, some observations and perhaps some suggestions for context and other things to keep in mind about this goal and about the framework and a few very specific suggestions to explore further. The notion of incorporating and being more explicit about integrated approaches, the systems thinking idea being paying

attention to culture and the idea that has come up during this meeting and during the last public comment session of very specific suggestions to take another look at task three under objective one. And either expand that or perhaps add a similar task. Thinking about the economic information and how that we all evolved like other information and characterizing. We talked about the evolutionizing nature of that and to be careful moving forward about being clear about how we use those numbers, so a suggestion and this is related to the technical committee discussion specifically related to the farm bill model and may be borrowing from the playbook so that could be something that could be considered as part of the options.

Let me just—a suggestion from Bruce to consider as the next iteration of this framework moves forward that it might be prudent to consider pulling out the planned development, sort of an overarching expression of how the plan is going to be developed and some of the elements are already in there it could be packaged in a way that makes that clearer and is responsive to some comments that you've heard. So I'm sharing that summary because I am now ready to ask you if you're ready to approve the goal and objectives related to this goal, noting that there's been some good suggestions and comments about specific actions and tasks and other things to explore and I'm sure that I didn't do them all justice and I missed some, but they're all captured in the notes. So how are people feeling about this goal? Are you ready to approve? Can we have consensus that this is approved? Yes? All right. Very good. You can go to lunch now.

So great. We will come back from lunch at 1:15. Is that right? 1:15. And we will then take up the update in activities related to off shore wind development. As I said we're going to hear from department of energy and the bureau of ocean management. We're going to have two folks who will be joining us remotely by phone to be a resource to participate in that discussion, so it should be interesting and we'll see you at 1:15.

[Lunch Break]

Update on Activities Related to Offshore Wind Energy Development and Discussion about Relationship with Regional Ocean Planning

Laura Cantral: Okay. So we're going to get started with the session that I've described for you a couple of times now regarding activities related to offshore wind development and how those activities may relate to ocean planning and the work of the regional planning body and we've got representatives from the Department of Energy and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to share with you some highlights from their agency, from about their activities. Joe do we have folks on the line at this point? All right. So we have Patrick Gilman on the line who as you know is the DOE representative to the regional planning body, who unfortunately couldn't be with us in the room today because of all of the weather related travel complications. But his alternate Meghan Massaua is— did I say it right Meghan? Close? No.

Meghan Massaua: Massaua.

Laura Cantral: Massaua. I'm going to have to practice—is going to be here to help with the presentation. And similarly we're going to have Bob Labelle go through an update of BOEM related activities and we've got, from headquarters we've got Jessica Stromberg on the line who I believe, and Jessica you can correct me if I get this wrong, is the Northeast Interagency Task Force Coordinator and these folks are on the line to be helpful as a resource, to answer questions or to chime in to what Meghan and Bob are going to share with you. So I think what we'll do is have the have you both of you go through the presentation and then we can open it up for dialog and Q&A and at that point Patrick and Jessica, if you want to chime in, then you're free to do so and let's just test and make sure we can hear you and that you can hear me. So—Patrick did you hear everything I said?

Patrick Gilman: Yes. I did. Happy to be here.

Laura Cantral: Okay. Great.

Patrick Gilman: Sorry I couldn't be there in person.

Laura Cantral: Yeah. Well, we miss you. And Jessica can you hear us?

Jessica Stromberg: Yes, I can.

Laura Cantral: All right. I think we're good to go. Okay. Meghan I turn it to you.

Meghan Massaua: Well, first I want to say thank you to the RPB for making space for DOE to present on the agenda. The very busy agenda of the past couple of days. We're here to tell you a little bit about our role in the offshore wind industry in the United States.

Next slide, please. So first to kind of set the stage since DOE is not necessarily a traditional ocean agency, we wanted to give folks a little bit of a sense of where we play in the ocean and coastal space. And you'll see that there are a number of divisions that do this. We have the office of fossil energy which chiefly is in the oil and gas division is responsible for issuing authorizations for the import and export of natural gas. So any LNG coastal facility that is looking to import or export natural gas has to go through the Department of Energy for an authorization there. In addition there's a large nuclear energy and security part of DOE and regarding the energy side of that some of the research they do is about extending the life of current reactors, which of course there are coastal ones within the northeast there's the sea brook facility. And then in energy efficiency and renewable energy which is where Patrick and I sit in the wind and water power technologies office, this office is on the land side is concerned with land based wind and hydro power, but on the ocean side we do marine and hydro kinetic energy which is mostly wave and tidal power and other generation sources in the ocean as well as offshore wind energy which is what we'll talk a little bit more about today. There, chiefly our mission is to improve the performance, lower the cost and accelerate responsible deployment of wind technology.

Next slide, please. So a little bit of policy context when we're thinking about offshore wind development in the Northeast. On the national level there are a couple of different drivers at play. There is President Obama's ambitious goal of doubling renewable energy by 2020, and that also plays into his charge to the department of interior to deploy 10 gigawatts of renewable energy on public lands by 2020 as well as the energy policy act of 2005 which gives the authority to work in the offshore space with Bob will talk a little bit about.

And then specific to the wind industry, recently at the beginning of this month, two key tax credits that have incentivized the development of the wind industry in the United States. That is the investment and production tax credits that have recently expired. So that has some implications for the manufacturing and supply chain and deployment of wind energy in the United States. And then also on the sort of fossil energy side you have pending energy EPA regulations for greenhouse gas emissions which has the potential to change you know how energy is deployed in the US and you know working with the markets and how that will progress.

On the regional and state level, we have renewable portfolio standards and in the Northeast, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut all have legally binding targets for renewable energies in their state. Vermont has also has a goal. However, it's difficult. It can be difficult to meet those goals through the use of in state resources given that this is a population dense region and finding the areas that you can deploy wind or solar or other renewable energy resources is little bit difficult. The alternative to that is to build transmission infrastructure to bring in renewable energy resources from elsewhere but that is also has its own challenges associated with it. So sort of those are sort of some drivers to sort of think about moving off shore.

Next slide, please. And on more. There. So t give you a larger context of the wind opportunity in the United States and specifically the offshore wind, you can see there's a plethora of resource and specially in the ocean space, the Northeast has got a lot of that resource. There are almost 400 gigawatts according to a study done by NREL of offshore renewable wind energy and in the northeast. In addition, you have an area that's pretty population dense and you have an area that has higher electricity costs than the rest of the nation. All of those factors contribute to the fact that the Northeast is an area where offshore wind is prime to really take off.

Next slide, please. So moving into how DOE plays into this space, And also department of interior. In 2011, Secretary Salazar and Secretary Chu announced a national offshore wind strategy and that was really to catalyze offshore wind deployment in the United States. With the dual goals of reducing the costs of energy of these technologies as well as promoting responsible deployment. And DOE has a unique role to play in this space because we're not a regulatory agency so we focus our efforts on main key investments and research and development and deployment as well as providing information, convening groups of national and international experts for information exchange, supporting a number of diverse

partnerships and ultimately working to address barriers to enable responsible deployment. Next slide, please.

So here is an example of five investments that DOE has made that have sprung out of the national offshore wind strategy and they're pretty diverse and range from investing in world class test facilities. One of which is nearby here in Charlestown and the Massachusetts Large Blade Test facility to addressing market barriers which I'll talk a little bit more about in a minute to developing innovative technologies including next generation drive trains and then ultimately we want to move towards demonstrating those technologies. A year ago DOE invested in seven off shore wind demonstration projects which are diverse geographically but two of which are in the Northeast region which I'll talk about a little bit more as we move forward.

Next slide please. So moving into market acceleration and market barrier reduction, we're going to focus here because I think the resources that we have here are specifically of relevance to the RPBs work and you can see there's multiple tiers of types of activities which try to address here. One of which is being important to this group is environmental research and the idea there is really to focus on what are the key questions and uncertainties facing the offshore wind industry and facing regulators as they go forward and trying to deploy off shore wind in the US and how can we make targeted scientific investments to address those questions to move the industry forward.

Another is resource assessment so understanding what the offshore wind resource is out there, where it's available and you know using that information for developers and researchers, and understanding how to measure it and how to get at the information that is at the hub height of a wind turbine which when you think about it is not where we traditionally take measurements, so efforts there. Additionally we work on creating a complementary infrastructure necessary to the development of a new industry like buffer wind. There are a number of coastal and offshore things that need to happen to deploy an offshore wind farm and that ranges from ports and vessels to supply chain development and more than that.

And additionally, finally we engage in an annual offshore wind assessment and this provides a sort of a consistent resource for developers and decision makers to look at how the market is expanding and developing over time. Next slide, please.

So jumping into a couple of new England specific examples. Some of you may have heard of this. Stantec is doing some research on offshore bat activity and this is one of the major uncertainties when you think of deploying offshore wind. Are there bats offshore. You know what are they doing there if they are there and understanding that in the potential implications for developing offshore wind. So Stantec was engaged in specifically in the gulf of Maine from 2009 to 2011. And then DOE funded an additional three year study from 2012 to 2014 to continue in the Gulf of Maine but also expand into the Great Lakes and mid-Atlantic regions. The main question here is to determine what the patterns of offshore bat activity are and the species composition and then also to kind of investigate the question of if there are bats out

there is that a function of islands and other platforms offshore or are they really using that area for feeding and migration, so really trying to understand what the bats are doing out there if they're there. They have detected them from April through November with the highest peak activity being from August through September.

Next slide. So talking a little bit more about that infrastructure development, we've done, completed a number of reports recently that look at offshore wind infrastructure and provide a number of resources for decision makers and planners. One of these is an offshore wind manufacturing supply chain report which looks at a number of offshore wind development scenarios and the demand associated with that and then the key supply chain challenges and opportunities to meet that demand. Additionally a vessels report which looked at again a number of scenarios of offshore wind development of the future and how US vessels are and the capabilities of those vessels could meet that and where that might need to be additional investment. Additionally when you talk about planning an offshore wind farm, eventually you're going to have to install it, and operate it and maintain it through its life and there's a number of costs associated with working offshore so trying to figure out the best strategies to optimize that and keep the cost down and contribute to an overall lower cost of energy there.

And then, finally, an example here from our offshore wind readiness report, and we also developed a web based assessment tool, and this really gets at examination the capabilities of existing ports throughout the US and if their port is to support the functions that off wind needs to manufacture and deploy out of those ports, so this example here is of New Bedford. And as you can see in the chart there is a couple of key variables there that are important for turbine manufacturing and the green indicates that yes, that port meets the necessary capabilities for that and the gray indicates that there is more information needed. You'll notice that there isn't red on that one. So red would indicate a gap and that is not showing that.

Next slide, please. So I mentioned our seven off shore wind demonstration projects. You'll see that they're pretty geographically diverse. The blue turbines represent floating platforms and the orange turbines represent fixed platforms. And you'll see that two of those are in the Northeast—that's the University of Maine and Statoil.

Next slide, please. Talking a little bit more about the University of Maine—the investments that DOE has made in the University of Maine, this past summer was the momentous occasion of the first offshore wind grid connected project being deployed in the US off of Castine Maine, and that's the University of Maine's 1/8th scale voltturnUS project. The DOE has invested in the past and this is the culmination of that investment. And it really enables the opportunity to learn from this small scale deployment on a technology side and proving out models and learning about some of the environmental implications of that and really using it as sort of a first step in the US.

Additionally the demonstration projects which is the map I just showed that is their full scale Aqua Ventus project which is proposed for deployment off of Mohegan Island Maine and

that consists of two turbines on floating semi-submersible platforms similar to what you see in the picture there of the 1/8th scale but a little bit different from that but one of the really interesting innovations here is that they're looking at using a concrete foundation as opposed to a steel foundation and that has potential implications for mass production capabilities as well as reductions in cost because you're not relying on steel for that as much. They're also using a composite tower, and then more generally looking at floating offshore wind is really key to offshore wind industries development in the United States particularly in the Northeast because if you will recall that that map I showed earlier, there is a lot of resource in the Northeast in the Gulf of Maine but much of that is in deep water so that you can't use our traditional monopile or jacket foundations without a look at floating systems. And also the entire west coast pretty much you're looking at using floating systems as you move off shore there. And I just want to mention that the University of Maine in conjunction with those other six project is DOE's currently about to undertake a down select process so we awarded seven projects for the past year and will go through a vigorous review process through those projects and their progress and down select up to three that will receive additional funding to move forward.

Next slide. And then finally just want to round out with an effort that the DOE is leading on behalf of the wind industry which is called wind vision and this is really about providing leadership and convening stakeholders to understand what potentially the future could look like for the wind industry in the United States and this includes not only offshore wind, but also land based wind and distributed wind, so a couple of different wind markets that are being considered here. In 2008, the department of energy issued a 20% wind by 2030 report which is the image there and this is sort of about revisiting that report, looking at what could potentially be in the future, not only on that time horizon but also on the 2020 time horizon looking at as I mentioned, Obama's aggressive doubling renewable energy bill and looking to 2030 in the intermediate and then looking pretty far into the future to 2050 and what wind deployment can look like there. This is utilizing a model that we have through NREL which is the National Renewable Energy Lab called REDS or the Regional Energy Deployment System model and that takes into account technology and the number of policy factors to look analyze a number of scenarios for development.

And that's all I have.

Laura Cantral: Great. So thank you Meghan. Bob, I'm going to turn to you now.

Bob LaBelle: The next slide. Thank you [inaudible] just as the person who heads up the intergovernmental task forces that I'll mention in a moment. Go to the next slide, please. So I hope you've had a chance to look in your packet. There's some BOEM information in there so a couple of sheets on the Renewable energy program in general. One on the commercial leasing process and one on the Northeast Project status sheet and then a final one on the many research projects that BOEM has underway and has completed. As a result of the energy policy act in 2005, BOEM was given the responsibility to implement an offshore wind program and Meghan mentioned Secretary Salazar's initiative—the National Offshore Wind Strategy along with other agencies and all the Atlantic coast Governors, I believe are participated in that.

I'd like to just briefly go over how our program is set up and how it works. Along with offshore renewable energy BOEM is responsible for the nations offshore oil and gas program and other mineral and energy resources including sand and gravel off shore.

Next slide. So it's a four stage process which starts with planning and analysis, leasing, site assessment, and construction and operations and touch on each of these briefly. Next slide, please.

Stage one, the planning stage, um. What BOEM has had success in doing is in establishing intergovernmental task forces. There has been over a dozen of these established in various states and it's made up of state, federal, tribal and local officials that bring their specialized knowledge of the issues, data sources in perspective to BOEM's mission of trying to identify the areas of the best wind resources, but the least conflict, offshore.

We employ the National Ocean Policy Principles in this effort to involve everyone early in the process and it's an iterative process. It goes through many meetings and iterations, but we feel that we've had successful implementation off Rhode Island and Massachusetts over the last few years in terms of defining and then refunding areas that would be offered for industry interest. The next step would be publish. We would publish a request for information. Or a call for information, a nomination where we would go out to the wind energy industry and say send us the areas that you feel have the best resources.

Then after reviewing that we'd announce the area for your identification and then conduct environmental and compliance reviews on those areas. Next slide. So as we focus on the leasing step we would publish the leasing notice and the law states that there's two types. Competition must be taken into account so there's two types of leasing. We put out a request for interest if there is only one group that's interested it's a non-competitive situation. If more than one it can lead to a competitive situation that's leads to a lease auction. We've had we've issued five commercial wind energy leases since 2009, including Cape Wind here in Massachusetts, Blue Water Wind off Delaware, deep water wind New England off Rhode Island and Massachusetts. Two leases. And Virginia Electric Power company—Dominion Virginia, electric power. So what a lease gives the right to is the right to submit plans for BOEM's review and approval for site assessment and subsequent development. So after the environmental reviews are complete, we would negotiate—make that determination of competition or no competition and if competition hold a lease auction.

Next slide. Once the lease is awarded, then the lessee conducts surveys in the area to characterize the wind resource, and if they intend to install a met tower or a buoy they need to submit a site assessment plan or SAP to BOEM. We conduct an environmental review on that and either approve, disapprove or approve with modifications. And a lessee has up to five years to conduct these activities. Next, please.

Moving to commercial development. The lessee must submit a construction and operation plan within the first five years of the lease. This is a plan that provides specific

engineering and safety and operational details of the proposed project for example the size of the turbines, the layouts, etc. BOEM then conducts the environmental integrity and technical reviews of the construction and operation plan and again either approves this or approves with modifications. Typical lease lifetimes are projected to be twenty five years.

I think that's basically a brief description of the process and again I encourage you if you haven't had a chance to look at one of the materials in the folder.

Laura Cantral: Great. All right, so go ahead Meghan.

Meghan Massaua: I just want to make it clarification I neglected to mention that New Hampshire has a renewable portfolio standard and they do, so I just wanted to make that clear.

Laura Cantral: Great.

Laura Cantral: I think we're ready to open it up for discussion. Before I do let me just check in with Patrick and Jessica to see if there's anything you wanted to add to what your colleagues have presented.

Patrick Gilman: I believe Meghan covered it pretty well.

Laura Cantral: Okay. Great.

Jessica Stromberg: This is Jessica and Bob did a great job.

Laura Cantral: All right so stand by in case there's any question or comment that you want to weigh in on. Otherwise here in the room we're going to open it up for discussion. Questions. Comments.

Bruce Carlisle: Sure. I'll start. Patrick and Jess, this is Bruce Carlisle from Massachusetts. We've been an active participant in BOEM's interagency task force both for the Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Massachusetts off shore wind areas since 2009. And I think we've learned a lot of lessons through that process, but I think one of the biggest takeaways is that the commitment by BOEM to reach out to their sister federal agencies to state agencies and beyond to local officials. They've really stood by that and made that commitment to their regulations pursuant to the energy policy act and it's been a fantastic model. One of the limitations is it is intergovernmental and BOEM's also been accommodating for both the Commonwealth and for Rhode Island to use our state ability to convene stakeholders. and we've got a fisheries working group and a habitat working group. which we use too as a sounding board and for input and guidance which we then you know as a commonalty bring back to the task force. The task force into BOEM so you know there's a lot of synergy here. With the RPB. It's a great model. So obviously a lot of work underway and there's a lot of work in progress and want to commend BOEM for their efforts to date.

Laura Cantral: Kathleen.

Kathleen Leyden: Hi. This is Kathleen—am I supposed to be doing it—there we go. Kathleen Leyden from Maine's Cultural Zone Management Program. I think it's a question for Meghan. Thanks for your presentation. It was really informative. Two questions. One, did I hear that DOE is a leader in looking at the regulatory system and how to improve that across agencies and if so, how do you do that and the second, does that provide lessons for this group, who one of our focus areas is the efficient decision making and then second is DOE looking at the cumulative impact of wind along the east coast? That, in addition to transmission, I think is—a if we have regional build thereabout on the east coast. What does that cumulative effect look like on resources.

Meghan Massaua: Sure. I'll give it a shot and then I might have Patrick fill in a little bit. Regarding the regulatory system, DOE is not engaging in an effort to revitalize the regulatory system. That's something that the regulatory agencies work on themselves in terms of their own processes. What we do do is try to make investments that can help regulators make decisions, because this is a new field in the US, because there's no full scale off shore wind that has been deployed there are a lot of scientific questions and uncertainty and so we try to make investments to try to answer them on the environmental side as well as the infrastructure side, as I mentioned and then in addition we work with these offshore wind demonstration projects and we take an active management role in those and in helping them advance through the process so we—I think that we have a great deal of knowledge about how the regulatory system works from a perspective that's different from the regulatory industries themselves.

I think that's a perspective that we can lend, but there isn't a specific effort that I can do that says this is where the regulatory stuff is working and not working. Regarding the second one, I think you mean environmental impacts of offshore wind. That's the really big question that I think is a tough one to answer, especially at this state given that there is an offshore wind deployed at the demonstrate nor commercial scale in the US. There are some that can be learned from Europe, but they're really just starting to get a handle on some of the smaller questions about ecosystem or species level impacts and they're just sort of starting to wrestle with that cumulative impacts question. So I think it's a good one, but I we aren't currently addressing it. I think it's a little bit down the road. Patrick do you want to add anything?

Patrick Gilman: Just with respect to the second question, I think that the approach that we're taking. The question, by the way is a great one. The approach that we've been taking is right now we're really focused on seeing how we can best transfer knowledge that's been developed in Europe and develop some baseline data that will help or at least add to the level of baseline data that exists on places where offshore wind is likely to be deployed first in the United States so that there's that context available to start thinking about site specific and cumulative impact. So Meghan mentioned the Stantec study looking at bat activity offshore. We also have an investment in the mid Atlantic that's doing much broader ecological baseline studies. It's a wind energy areas is off of Delaware, Maryland and Virginia. And we just started an international collaborative effort under the international energy agencies, wind implementing agreement to improve the transfer of knowledge around environmental impact of wind on both land based and offshore across borders so that we can better—so that as more knowledge has

underdeveloped the cumulative effects of offshore wind where there is quite a bit of it there in the North Sea, we can more easily facilitate the transfer of that knowledge over to the United States and to the scientific and regulatory communities.

I think down the road we're very interested in pursuing both site specific and cumulative effects research, but as Meghan mentioned I think that the stepwise approach that we're following right now in this schedule we're collecting based on ideas and trying to improve the transfer of lessons over from Europe.

Laura Cantral: All right. Great. Thank you so Chuckie lets go to you and then Rover, I see your tent up. We'll go to you after that.

Chuckie Green: Good afternoon. Hello. Am I here.

Laura Cantral: He's turning you up.

Chuckie Green: Okay. I can, okay [inaudible]. First I'd like to commend BOEM for the ecological support they've given the tribes, and moving forward that. But going back to the environmental side, I'm concerned that we're not doing quite enough work on electric transmission and bringing in the transmission lines to the ground. I know from on my own in my own area that I have three cables that come in from the islands that create an eighteen foot magnetic field around completely around them. And I also know as a hunter gatherer, that power lines change directions and affect animal movement and actually use that to my advantage.

Concerns me is that we're using AC power to bring power to the mainland. We know that the fields exist. We don't have enough data to know what's going to happen when we put this into a grid pattern and bring to a station and ship it on to how is it going to affect the animals I don't think we're doing quite enough work. If we are, I would like to know, and I am a member of the task force so I am pretty up on what's going on in the task force, and I mean, I see a lot of things that we are not doing. With AC power we're setting large amounts of oil out in the middle of the ocean where there is no oil and putting them at risk for that hurricane that the insurance companies on the cape tell us is coming any day now.

These are issues. We're talking about bats offshore. Bats use sonar to navigate. Is the sound from the turbines going to affect their ability to see that there's something actually there? Fish migration. The whales. These are all things that I think that we all here need to consider as we consider wind development, for sure. We need to have a way that these facts can be brought forward and figured out. DOE is funding a lot of programs. I think it would be nice for the DOE to fund some programs that actually look into some of these things that are really important to a healthy ecosystem. Is that not why we're here? I may have some more as we go but I think that will do me for now.

Bob LaBelle: Can I [inaudible].

Laura Cantral: Yes, please.

Bob LaBelle: And just feel free to comment, but I just wanted to mention that BOEM is a good partner and DOE is a good partner and looking at these things, I know BOEM has a lot of research programs targeted on the very things you mentioned. And you can get a sample looking at some of the attachments here. I'm not, off the top of my head sure how many are on cables, but I know that there's one getting under way, off the west coast where there's an existing cable coming to shore, from an oil and gas platform, that carries power where we're directly observing how animals on the bottom either avoid or cross that, with regard to EMF.

The other things you mentioned, Chuckie, fall into our responsibilities because the environmental impact of these projects and construction and operation are something that we have to comply with MEFA on in terms of assessing the impacts and including cumulative impacts. So our research program and our cooperative efforts with NOAA, Navy and many other groups are all sort of targeted. The ones that we fund or co-fund are targeted to answering these questions and providing that information to the folks that do the environmental assessment.

Those are the same folks that as more than one wind project get built will be responsible for incorporating that existing projects impact into their cumulative impact analysis. And also we are to look ahead at foreseeable projects as well in doing our cumulative impact analysis. So if we know that there are more project coming, the analysis that we're doing for a specific document must look ahead as well, so at some point, the cumulative impact assessment will be much more specific and it will be targeted a little bit better than we are right now.

Laura Cantral: So, I see three people who want to be in the queue. Grover, Sharri and Meredith. And not that I'm trying to rush you or pressure you but I do want to tell you that at about 2:30 I want to be trying to wrap up this session and keep us on track to finish the rest of our business for today. If you're thinking about a question or a comment that you want to offer, get in the queue sooner than later because we're going to keep moving. Grover.

Grover Fugate: Yeah. What I'm about to say isn't necessarily a criticism of BOEM it's just a statement of the process. And so I don't want anybody interpret these comments as that this process is necessarily lacking, but we have a lease area that's off a Rhode Island and according to regulations, and I don't know if they've been changed, but they have between six to twelve months, I should say, to develop what's called a site assessment plan. So a site assessment plan is basically an outline of the environmental work that will be done for that project and file the construction operation plan. So it's basically a developer's plan on how they're going to go out and conduct all the surveys, all the studies that will be necessary and then once they are approved, they go to town on thy project. And so when you look at our area and the RFI area in Massachusetts, which is going through a very similar phasing will soon have to have resale. Leases will be issued and they'll be cutting loose on those. There will be these very large projects that are starting to take off shore and doing a lot of environmental work. A lot of it

looking at what we've been discussing today in terms of these ecosystem health goals, involving traditional knowledge and all the rest of it into the process.

As a result of that it seems to me that we as a body would be remiss not to try to interface with that process as closely as we can to see how we can lend value to that process as they go forward. And we've had some preliminary discussions with BOEM and they seem to be very receptive to that particularly in, I see two areas where this body has additional resources that may be beneficial to helping these studies go forward. One of those is obviously the fishery expertise that's here and the other is the tribal expertise that's around the table. So there's discussions ongoing right now to look at how can we help merge that into this process, because quite frankly the offshore wind is the scale of those projects—I've never seen anything like that in my thirty years. We probably never will. Or another couple of decades. So it's an opportunity that we will miss if we don't catch up and play very quickly with this process.

As part of that one of the things we learned in the Block Island process just as an example, we've a very similar project on the small scale off Block Island that is putting five turbines in for thirty megawatts and in some of the studies that we were outlining with the developer to go through the regulatory agency so that they could get their permits, more than once, for instance was fishery studies that we were working on. It went through our national marine fishing service and went throughout our own marine fishery council and everybody signed off on the protocols and as part of our process it had to go to the fisherman's advisory board where it ran into a brick wall.

Set us back about another eleven months to go back and redesign the whole process so that we can bring in additional information that was necessary and eventually set up a cooperative research project where the fisherman interfacing with the development and the scientific team to start to gather the information that was necessary. The whole point of that process is that at the end of the studies, and there will be probably well over five years or six years monitoring that's going on that's part of this, that whatever comes out the end of that pipeline is trusted by the user groups. So those are some of the things that I think need to be sort of elevated and brought into this process so we can bring some of the offerings that the board has to interface and without slowing the BOEM process down. That isn't my intention here, but to end up with a more robust system of looking at these projects. So that's something that we've had in our ongoing discussions with BOEM about this and want to make this committee aware of that.

Laura Cantral: so thinking about that suggestion and what that might mean for some tangible next steps that you could identify to carry out that and play that kind of role? Is that something you think is appropriate and would be helpful. So think thereabout. We'll hear a couple of comments that we've got in line for—let's here from Meredith and Sharri.

Meredith Mendelson: Thanks Grover you actually covered some of the things that I've been knighting about as well—

[Fixing microphone]

Meredith Mendelson: Grover got at some of the issues that I was thinking about as well. But I wanted to add just one piece to that. As Maine as the Statoil Project was starting out one of the things that I heard consistently from interested parties and stakeholders was confusion about the scoping processes that were happening in parallel with BOEM, moving ahead but also the developer holding their own scoping and information sessions and it seems to me very clear that we want both of those to be happening. Certainly the more information the better.

Grover Fugate: Right.

Meredith Mendelson: The more opportunity for engagement the better and so we recognize also that there has to be some arms length distance between the regulating agency and the developer and doing that and I'm wondering if there is a opportunity in this process to think about how we improve coordination between those parallel processes in that scoping work, both at the state and the federal level or at least use this process as a way to help clarify why those things are happening. Separately.

Laura Cantral: Sharri

Sharri Venno: Well, I wanted to follow up on the observations that we might learn some lessons from Europe with regard to cumulative impacts and I wondered if there are any the lessons that we could bring back from them? Are they engaging in some kind of a planning process such as this and what can we learn from it?

Grover Fugate: [Inaudible].

Bruce Carlisle: I'd like to.

Grover Fugate: Okay.

Bruce Carlisle: There have been a number of workshops and exchanges and having experts from Europe come over and also experts from our own offshore oil and gas industry and those reports are all available through BOEM, and the goal was to find out, you know, what works and what didn't work over there and I think we've addressed. There is more to learn for sure but I think we have a good idea initially of what the situation is.

Grover Fugate: I was just going to add that we also when we engaged in our process brought over some European experts particularly in areas that stakeholders had an interest in. Some of it is applicable and as you can imagine because of the European context, some of it isn't. You know for instance, I was explaining at lunch that a lot of the security zones that exists around platforms in Europe are sort of a carryover from the oil and gas days just transferred into the wind industry and in addition the density and some of their fields was so close that it they were afraid of avalanche hazards, and they banned navigation in some of those areas. Those lessons

aren't directly applicable, obviously, to this situation, and shouldn't be construed as being transferable.

There are some other things that are, and one of the interesting things with the crown estate for instance. The crown estate is an entity that's responsible for essentially the leasing of the submerged lands within England and not just submerged lands but other things, and they started off in a targeted approach with what they called round one. That were very near-shore shallow water areas, got into a few development projects, moved into what we called round two. Round two the crown estate then started to say they got into a spatial planning process because some of the phase ones didn't pan out because of environmental issues that cropped up during the review process. And they went into a very strategic look but it was internal within the crown estate itself. It wasn't an external process. They weren't allowing or counting on the licensing entities to conduct those types of public reviews. They are now, and this whole issue became a very interesting discussion not only within England but within the rest of Europe in terms of marine spatial planning and they've now transferred and created a new marine management organization which was responsible for all the planning for their marine industries and they are engaged in a series of marine spatial plans as we speak right now. Trying to take into account all of those development projects as well as a lot of the things that talking about that, they are now getting into. There has been an iterative learning process within many of these that are sort of coming around to that same point that we are now.

Laura Cantral: And particularly interested in how they're—what kind of data they're collecting and information and how that might help us.

Sharri Venno: And again one of the things we haven't discussed here is the budget, but they are well funded I can assure you two.

Laura Cantral: Yes. Meghan go ahead.

Meghan Massaua: I can just kind of lend a resource there in terms of data that's available internationally. Patrick mentioned briefly an international effort that DOE is working with which is through the international energy agency. And that's on the Wind side, IEA, Wind, which is to coordinate knowledge, gain and sharing on offshore wind energy. We've also in the marine and hydrokinetics side been doing an effort through the IEA, Ocean Energy Systems implementing agreement called Annex four which is kind of an obscure name. That effort has been designed to increase information sharing, the marine and hydrokinetic energy deployment around the world and specifically around the environmental impacts and so DOE created an online database called TETHYS which is online. Its url is mnhk.pnl.gov. And so that has a number of resources related to NHK and also offshore wind energy now both in the US and internationally and potentially could grow in terms of the information that's available in wind. So I want to put that out there as a resource for folks if they're interested.

Laura Cantral: Bruce.

Bruce Carlisle: It is really a doing a colleague here a favor, but to share the point, I think there is a pretty, and as Meghan has stated, a pretty rich literature base coming out of the UK and other areas worldwide. And in some of the BOEM science work, um. You'll find references which we have looked at over the past decade, really since Cape Wind, that we have found very helpful. So at the very end of tab four you'll see some completed studies. You'll see, Chuckie, one on EMF transmission there, and pile driving and there's a whole host of references to both workshops and studies they've done in completions from the UK and beyond. So maybe Bob or Jess could share the URL for those science studies. And then the last point is that most all of the E's or ERI's for these off shores have many different points to and references to a host of different studies coming out of the UK. So pretty rich base.

Laura Cantral: Bob, do you or Jessica want to offer a URL or—?

Bob LaBelle: Off the top of my head—Jess, do you happen to have it? They may—

Jessica Stromberg: We're looking it up right now.

Bob LaBelle: Okay.

Laura Cantral: Betsy?

Betsy Nicholson: I just wanted, from NOAA's perspective to express our very strong support for this if you look on page eleven this is one of our tasks affiliated with goal one in terms of engaging BOEM in a couple of things that as Grover has said we've already chatted with MOE about in terms of making sure that the information on that we're gathering for the data portal etc., is used as context in that leasing process and [inaudible] and also to use this forum as perhaps a source for best management practices on engaging tribes and fisherman. I wanted to just draw your attention that that is, we have some tasks language in this draft work plan and NOAA is very excited that this conversation is happening. Much needed. And I think DOE—I just wanted to ask you really quick—Meghan. We had chatted at some earlier point about DOE pursuing some future planning scenarios for around energy broadly that perhaps you could talk a little bit about the time line and your thoughts on that and how they might dovetail with the—the work that we've laid out and the compatibility goal.

Meghan Massaua: Sure. So that's the wind vision effort that I mentioned towards the end of the talk. That DOE is leading, and it's not just you. We were working extensively with members of industry and members of other stakeholder groups including environmental stakeholder groups to kind of create this forward looking document. The goal is to have a draft available in late spring, and then that will undergo a review process and so I don't have a time line for when the final will be executed at this point but I can circle back and see if I can get a clearer answer to that.

Betsy Nicholson: I think the hope is just to dovetail that with our work laid out in that goal area.

Meghan Massaua: I think there's opportunities for that, too.

Laura Cantral: Anything else?

Grover Fugate: The only other thing that I would say is if there are research dollars looking at some of these issues, I'm going to put a shameless plug in for Rhode island and tell you that the Block Island project is a small scale project and it is an opportunity to look at some of these issues at a small scale before we start making these decisions on a much larger scale in some of these areas particularly in some of the uncertainties that are still out there in terms of the environmental questions and also maybe even some best practices on how to deal with certain issues like right whales and those types of things during the construction process. So it is an opportunity.

Laura Cantral: So any other thoughts before I close this session out? Yes, Meghan?

Meghan Massaua: One more just to dovetail on that is the demonstration projects that I mentioned that DOE is investing in the goal there is really to use small scale projects to gain as much information from at that scale as possible from these projects since it's government funded be that environmental data, be that survivability data for the platform. Gather as much information as possible and make that publicly accessible so that's one of DOE's main goals in that project and you know I think those are to be deployed by 2017 so that's a ways out but I think we're definitely moving towards making information available and we'll keep the updated on that as we move forward.

Betsy Nicholson: And perhaps the dovetail too with the second objective of the effective decision making goal to, I think it was the second one. In terms of the road map for the public to better understand how these processes work and also it could be pretty easy to include information on how to point folks to what studies are going on, so that's not just about the regulatory process. It's about what we're learning through the science and investments from DOE and others.

Laura Cantral: Okay. Thanks everyone. I'd like to offer thanks to Meghan and Bob and Patrick and Jessica. Very informative and helpful and one of the reasons we wanted to schedule time for this session as I think Grover and maybe others said, this is an example of realizing some of the things that you've been taking about in terms of the goals and objective as Betsy mentioned. There is specific language for carrying out tasks that are just very much what Grover was suggesting. That this body has an opportunity to interface with the BOEM process, in particular with regard to the fishery expertise and the tribal expertise that is represented here as part of this body. Those discussions are in motion and will be further developing and so we wanted to make sure that we were talking about this with the full group and with you and the public and there will be more of a details materialized as this develops and the DOE work and

the opportunity that that provide for better understanding and ways that this body can likewise interface with what you're doing is also you know a meaningful real time opportunity.

Okay, now moving right along, we are going to—yes, I'm sorry, we're going to sign off, folks on the phone. Thank you. Thank you very much for joining us.

Jessica Stromberg: Thank you. We sent the link to Bob.

Laura Cantral: Okay.

Bob LaBelle: I'll send it around.

Laura Cantral: Bob is going to send the link around. Great. Bye.

Jessica Stromberg: Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. So before I open up the next discussion, I do want to point out that we have two new people at the table, the role of Dan Hubbard is now being played by Michelle Desotel. And the role of Tom Burack is being played by Ted Diers. Welcome Michelle and Ted. And Mel is back. All right, Mel and you're just in time because we are now returning to the discussion of the effective decision making goal. Over lunch the staff made some further adjustments based on your guidance to the language and also took a shot at crafting language for a new objective five and I think a related action to that. And we want to—want you to take a quick look at it and see if you're comfortable and then I don't know. Is there a way to make it bigger. I don't know. We may have to read it to you.

RPB Discussion of Draft Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: *Compatibility Among Past, Current and Future Ocean Uses*

Laura Cantral: Okay so this is the new objective five language.

John Weber: Thank you. Just very quickly thanks to Meredith and some folks in the room who helped put this together. We had a conversation and had some comment on this this morning, so this new objective five is an attempt to capture that comment.

The revised objective one language maybe Nick if you could scroll down just a little bit, captured that comment. Two things I want to say on that. That we had the conversation about the sentence that starts with “This intention is to focus on...” You can see the change there. I want to point that out. The second thing we talked about this morning talked about sort of the tradeoff between identifying all programs that are involved with the various types of activities that we'd be looking at and the fact that if you go and try to list all of them, you're going to forget some but that there's some important ones to try to point out. So try to do a couple of things with this to include a couple of examples in part, specifically I want to point out including the CZMA because the intention of this is also as we've talked about is to look at both federal and state levels of decision making and the CZMA is a primary way that in this type of

arena, state decision making comes about. And we had a suggestion this morning kind of to that effect I think, from Kathleen to add the CZMA. So just wanted to explain the rationale behind adding that specific language in that way and I think there's one I think down in the action you'll see sort of a similar type of thing. NEPA and CZMA. The intention is to provide some examples that will help describe the intent without being necessarily exhaustive for where we're at at this point.

Grover Fugate: John there was an area that was underlined in green, was that for any specific purpose?

John Weber: I think the area underlined in green is Word telling me that that is a really bad run on sentence.

[Laughter]

Laura Cantral: Do we need to have any discussion about these adjustments to this language? Any questions. So capture what we talked about this morning. All right. Comfortable? Doug?

Doug Grout: Can you scroll up on that. Right where the red insertion was. I'm—it says it focus on existing programs and in parenthesis other existing federal and state what?

John Weber: Oh. Uh. Thank you for that. So it, there's an and that should be deleted because that should read and other existing federal and state siting and regulatory programs.

Doug Grout: Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Okay. All right, so are folks comfortable with the revised language to objective one? Do we need to go back up to objective five a new objective five now? Okay. Are you going to walk them through it.

John Weber: Sure. So the conversation this morning, again—thanks to folks that helped craft some of this language was building off of conversation that we started yesterday s well, to an extent, but it was really a point Meredith brought up about thinking about how local community knowledge is brought into decision making processes early in the process including how we do that through those existing process. So identifying what those best practices are and it really does fit in this goal because it's about looking at the existing decision making programs and processes that we have in place and figuring out some ways to bring this type of information nearly into the process.

So the action there you can see, identify those and really I think the notion is the same as we've been talking about with some of the other elated objectives. First step would be to identify some options. How might you actually do this. Let's focus in on that and come back with some options within overall outcome as you can see there

So a similar construct if folks remember to how some I think its particular objective four was worded. Some similarities there based on the conversation this morning that seemed to make sense to parallel here.

Laura Cantral: Okay what do people think about that? Yes. Ted.

Ted Diers: So just so there's— I think that there's a little discontinuity in this in that I'm not sure whether we're talking about communities, meaning—which implies to some people municipalities. That's kind of the way it looks when I see local community it kind of reads like small town new England. I think that's part of what you mean, but I don't think that's truly what you meant here, so down below you say local/community knowledge which seems to be more accurate to what you're actually talking about because you're talking communities at large, communities on the water. Communities on the land and communities of practice. So I think that that needs to be clarified because I'm not entirely sure what you're actually talking about.

Laura Cantral: It seems like there can be some adjustment to the language that would make that clear. I can see why you would do that.

John Weber: I would look back to Meredith or other folks but my understanding Ted, is that you're right. There is maybe a local means municipality but it is more than that. It is the local users you know could think of folks like boaters, fisherman, etc., etc. And that's an easy clarification. If I'm correct and that was the intent and I'm getting a head nod that it was.

Laura Cantral: Does that suggest a tweak that needs to be made to capture that fine point? Do we need? Are we clear?

John Weber: We can, I think with that understanding of folks are comfortable with that, we can add maybe a sentence to 5-1 that says the definition of local/community is.

Laura Cantral: Okay.

John Weber: Are folks comfortable with that? And capture the idea that way?

Laura Cantral: Okay, Doug.

Doug Grout: And if there can be some kind of wording that connects this to the ocean resources, but I know what's an obvious thing but to have communities that are related to—

Laura Cantral: Okay with those clarifications, are people comfortable with this new objective and its related outcomes? Yes? Okay which is leading me to ask the bigger question about the goal and it's now five related objectives and ask if you are comfortable approving the goal related to effective decision making, and it's related? Yes. Okay. So done.

All right, so I would like to suggest a slight modification to our agenda for the rest of the day. Just being mindful of time and what we still need to cover. We are scheduled to start our third of three public comment sessions. I have a list here of some of the folks that have signed up and what I suggest—we are scheduled to start that at 2:45. I suggest if you would indulge us, a few minutes to introduce the third goal that we need to take up, which is the goal related to compatibility among ocean uses past, present and future ocean usage.

Instead of what we have been doing before which is introduce the goal and have some discussion and then pause and have comment and come back, let's introduce the goal. Hear public comment, and then open it up for RPD discussion, and in terms of timing, we'll see how long the public comment goes, but I we are committed to wrapping up—starting to do our wrap up at five and getting you out of here no later than 5:15. Maybe a little bit earlier just depending on how the discussion goes.

Does that sound good to everyone. That timing? Is that okay. Were you going to comment? So I'm turning it back to Nick. Nick and John.

John Weber: Slide coming up. So this goal, a couple of things to say about this and actually earlier today Brian, we sort of—I said some things about this so thinking back to that as well.

One important thing to note about this goal is if you look on twenty five under the first objective, there's a little bit of an explanatory note behind some of the thinking about this and that basically—I do want to focus in on that and that basically recognizes that some of these issues when you start talking about compatibility among uses, a lot of this you need very project specific information in order to decide on the merits and benefits of a specific project. So we need to recognize that. So one of the things, we've had previous conversations and a lot of public comment and input and discussion about this goal and a lot of it was saying we need some clarity on that and so that's what the attempt is here to do and in particular it's that next sentence that sets the baseline for a big chunk of what's in objective one. And basically what that says is that a conversation that we started earlier and I'll use an example when we've been out talking to fisherman particularly. One of the things that always comes up is that you know we like the information and data with some certain limitations for what you have, but it's always looking back in time and if we know anything it's that we know this is an ever changing world.

So with that as context, that's how we approached, And building on those conversations with folks, that's how we sort of approached thinking about objective one, which talks about looking at future scenarios, and trends and really trying to understand that better for particularly looking at some of the products that we develop and how we make decisions.

I really want to stress how hard it is to do this, and we talk about setting expectations. This is a very difficult thing to do. So again, the approach that we took when we talked about this framework is basically saying you know we heard about this across the board of human activities that we're thinking about. This topic kind of comes up and we need to engage those

folks and further explore how we can exactly address this type of issue and meet this objective. And similarly, to what we have said in some of the other goals, the approach therefore would be to move forward with some of that preliminary conversation to develop some options and come back and have a further discussion informed in that way.

We've had a lot of public comment on this. Not just through meetings such as this, but when we've been out engaging various users. Or other various constituency. In the task you can see some other some description of that and an important point is also that there's a lot of work to pick up on because there are lots of people who are looking into similar issues and developing similar stuff. We just heard an example from DOE of some work that they're doing. All of that could and should be part of this.

The second objective basically says that okay, so there are these existing efforts that are underway. If, in doing the work under the first objective, we are noticing things that really need to be plugged in elsewhere, let's make sure we're paying attention to that. So there are other existing projects and there are some examples of that that I've given here that maybe we could plug into. I would also add that one thing that is incorporated in objective two is also another subject that we've had a lot of public comment on and this has to do with some need to look at transmission issues at a broad regional level. You can see some language in that particular action there starting to frame that about why exactly do you need. I think that our suggestion there is that because this is a topic that has come up and we have heard from and we have worked with DOE and BOEM folks on some thinking about this we need to do some more thinking about this and do it more fully, but we do want to capture it because we've heard so much public comment on it.

So, with that, again, Nick is going to tee up a couple of specific things in addition to think about.

Nick Napoli: So much like the other goal, a couple of specific issues in terms of things, we called out, maybe not as specific as in the last goal but in terms of capacity I think that you'll see that some of objective two if not a lot of this goal really requires federal and state agency, in particular, capacity to ensure that both the individual projects that are looking for specific uses or are related to your specific authorities are that are ongoing were being updated with those and likewise, regional issues that are coming out of this are going back into those projects. That's the capacity issue there. It may not be as much of an issue as last time, but just wanted to call that out.

And then second and this kind of builds on what John was saying in terms of public comment, a lot of the public comment focused on the clarity of the outcome for this one and, you know, John referenced that there's a lot of existing work that's ongoing and that really what we're asking for is to move forward, to scope these options out a little bit further and put some options on the table for you. This year. And you know the range of stuff that's out there, building on existing work. There's the AC Barr study in the US coast guard. That's the Coast Guard support access study, DOT is doing Panama canal and other studies to look at eh future

trends associated with shipping. We know there are changing conditions both management and due to climate for commercial and recreational fishing, emerging issues, sand. We heard a lot about issues specific efforts like BOEM and DOE with wind. Like other things, like shellfish planning. There are sub regional efforts. There are regional transmission that came in as through public comment and through industry engagement as something perhaps to look at and then all the way on the other side of things beyond just integrating what's out there, folks are suggesting we look at compatibility. I'm just raising those as here's an initial list of options that's come up through a lot of engagement, that needs to be considered.

Public Comments About Draft Northeast Regional Ocean Planning Framework and Workplan: Goal, Objectives and Actions Related to *Compatibility Among Past, Current, and Future Ocean Uses* and Any Other Topics of Interest to the Public

Laura Cantral: All right. Great. With that context and some important points to keep in mind, let's now move to our public comment session. We have seven people who have signed up, so I'm just going to tell you, who they are—who these people are in order and then you'll know when you're going to be up and if you forget, I'll remind you. But we've got James Monroe, Brett Greenfield, Pricilla Brooks, Valerie Nelson, Sally McGee, Wendy Loose—

Wendy Law: Law.

Laura Cantral: Law. Sorry, Wendy. And William McLintock. So James you're next and Brett you'll be after James.

James Monroe: Thank you again. My name is still James Monroe. And I checked a few minutes ago, and I'm still employed. So we're good. And the first thing I would like to do is to acknowledge my friend Richard, eloquent and quite passionate if you will dissertation on the Maine Shore communities and the concerns over the ocean or potential utility of the ocean and its impact on these coastal communities.

What I would like to do is offer another observation. And for example, a town called Bowdoinham, used to have hotels and shipyards. Now it's just a bump in the road. However, the cities of Belfast and I'll include Rockland on the other hand have reinvented themselves from being downtrodden. Literally downtrodden, ten or fifteen years ago, into let's call it more or less thriving communities. Particularly in Belfast, the waterfront was littered with dilapidated old buildings quite frankly they offered them to me for \$15,000 twenty years ago—stupid me, I didn't buy them. But anyway. Now I have other deals like that if you'd like to hear about it.

Anyway, now it has a thriving shipyard. It has the second largest travel lift on the east coast. There are other good things that could happen. And I would offer that offshore wind and the MHK industry can offer significant opportunity to where these fishing communities, at least some of them. And those that are willing to gamble or look forward can reap benefits. Maine, quite frankly is as you would all know, is notorious for building ships of all sizes and

dimensions—warships and pleasure and commercial vessels. This kind of industry itself, the offshore wind and the tidal and whatever have requirements for those same skills. And I just don't want—what my concern was has to do with really on page two and quite frankly when I listen to you people, I keep rewriting my comments because you are contributing very valuable points. One of the things I'd like you to keep in mind, which is really in my page two, is when we deal with things, and sometimes they appear negative in one form or another or perception, that we balance that with positive. So we end up with a balanced discussion. We don't go down the road of total negativity and then we feel we're so depressed we don't even consider the positive.

The second person I would like to acknowledge is that lady from Gloucester, I find her terribly oh, gosh, entertaining, if you will. And that she speaks eloquently also. The one thing that she did that I think is really good is she offered up something. She offered up to engage the fishing vessels. Offered up to do some research. That's a positive step. I even offered to her personally that we would even offer up our own research vessels to be a part of that. To move this industry forward and start to get things done.

The other issue that maybe this is an overstatement, but I don't think we want to be in the position where we are the Hatfield and McCoy deal between the energy folks and the resident fisheries people or other residents in general. I think we should try to focus, if we can, as much as we can on mutually beneficial relationship particularly offshore energy and localized fishing interest and here's a silly example. We're going to have the technology to do that pretty soon, like yesterday or tomorrow.

What if we have a depleting fishing situation with fisheries population, what if we parked one of these right over a site where we wanted the local fish population to repopulate. So it becomes an exclusion zone for a period of time but at the end of the exclusion time the beauty of these offshore floating platforms that are on our drawing boards is that they can be moved and relocated. They're not drilled into the ocean floor forever and ever. So there's opportunities. Let your mind run a little bit and probably come up even some more creative ideas Than I can out of my simple brain. Anyway, just so you'll know we already have thirty six and one hundred megawatt offshore floating kits if you will already on the drawing boards. We could build those tomorrow.

I'll stop now because again I'm more interested in listening to what other people have to say and what I have to say. But it seems to me you have a rather monumental task from listening and all these objectives you're trying to archive. It's really monumental. And I would offer up to that—Part of what I do is I design some pretty complex stuff and I have to tell you that when we start out on a project there's a lot of things that we don't know how to do, and what we do is we don't get overwhelmed by that. We know something. We haven't solved this part of that machine or that process. I can tell you that we have a lot of experience at it and what we've learned, right up front, really is that we start working and I encourage you folks to do the same thing. Start working on the easier things. Pick the low fruit. What will happen is you learn how to manage those, then you get a little more complex and you learn how to

manage those, these and we've heard several of them now where I thought I did quite clear that there's some challenges out there that you really don't have a handle how to solve.

I would just suggest and reiterate what I just said. Start with the easier ones. Get right on them and the more you do with that the better you get at it. And then these things that seem complex today become pretty ordinary stuff in the future because you're so much better at it.

While I think of it, I'll just throw this out. I'm available to serve. I just retired from twelve years being one of the voting members on the FAA specification committee. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Brett go ahead.

Brett Greenfield: Thanks. Again, I'm Brett Greenfield with National Ocean Policy Coalition and these comments are also offered supplemental to our previous comments. Under objective one, the draft framework includes proposed tasks for the RPD to "determine where and how to develop information such as trends or scenarios related to existing uses, related to future ocean activities" and to "engage the maritime commerce community to identify trends and if possible develop future spatial scenarios due to technological and economic factors. It also includes proposed actions to "decide whether or how to pursue future scenario dependent into a stakeholders to determine the feasibility and utility of developing future scenarios. As related in coalition January 9 comments, if used to address economic activity without injecting additional uncertain risks, and delays the assessment of trends for economic activities be beneficial. Therefore caveats to the ascertainment of future possible scenarios or trends should be removed. Any such assessments should be should include all ocean and coastal resources and existing and future potential uses and be subject to public review and comment and property scoped and refined to meet regional goals and priorities developed through broad consensus.

Under objective one, the draft framework also notes that the RPB will "determine how information from these tasks could be used in regional ocean planning and/or to support existing management activities" and will "determine how to utilize future scenarios." In addition, under objective two, the draft framework proposes a task for agency representatives to "ensure regional feedback and forms existing agency efforts to characterize ocean activities." The RPB should clarify decisions on if and how to implement and incorporate RPB products in regional feedback will be made by individuals statutory created agencies themselves based on their careful, independent and transparent consideration and best judgment and consistent with existing applicable laws and regulations.

Lastly under the overarching objective to periodically assess progress towards achieving goals the draft framework calls for the inclusion of "Input from stakeholders and interested parties" The November document however called for including such documents on a "periodic routine basis." The draft framework should be revised to include the periodic routine language and it should specify how frequently such assessments will take place. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Priscilla.

Priscilla Brooks: Priscilla Brooks, conservation law foundation. With respect to compatibility, mapping patterns of use in and of itself isn't sufficient to really address compatibility or promote compatibility among uses. So our comments on this particular objective went to the need for you know understand how different uses interact whether they're positive or negative. Consequences of those interactions and how those consequences can be mitigated and managed in a way that protects existing uses while planning and enabling new uses.

So one of the recommendations we have for the RPB is to include appropriate actions that more directly address the issue of compatibility and identify best management practices broadly. Best management practices that can broadly promote compatibility among uses. You might think about that. I'm not talking about specific management practices for two different activities, but maybe there's a broad approach that the RPB could recommend that could then be implemented in the various different project reviews. Secondly I wanted to take this opportunity to bring attention back to public engagement and the New England [Inaudible] has commented on this extensively in the past along with the New England Ocean Action Network of which we're a proud member. Last year we'd submitted a letter that really laid out in some detail what we thought would be an ideal public engagement process.

The RPB is now at a stage where a more fully developed and regular time line for public meetings, work sessions, outreach events and other activities is expected by stakeholders and the public who are accustomed to working in other administrative bodies. So we urge the RPB strongly now to develop a defined process for public and stakeholder engagement and solicitation of public comments across a broad range and from the veracity of stakeholders which contains regular pattern and process for notifying the public with ample time of events and meetings and opportunities to comment. The RPB needs to establish consistent time lines for announcing public comment periods and the opportunities for inputs, setting deadlines for receiving comments and conveying to the public the outcomes of assessments and decisions allowing for the review of draft policies and access to meeting materials and other publicly appropriate materials and then convening the deliberations, the decisions and policy conclusions of the RPB to stakeholders and the public timely manner.

The RPB should establish a regional stakeholder panel from diverse ocean user groups, and also a science advisory panel. One thing you might do in—I know you're going to develop a white paper for the science advisory panel. You might do the same thing for a regional stakeholder advisory panel. State advisory groups are great. They've been very effective in the states. I'm on many of them. And they are valuable for providing stakeholder input to inform state interest in the regional ocean planning process. They do not and cannot serve as a substitute for regional stakeholder input and for greasing the skids for a more regional perspective and dialog about ocean planning. We urge you to give some very serious consideration not that and you know essentially now is the time. Let's really define this and get going with a really great stakeholder process because that is absolutely one of the most important elements of success. So thank you very much. And I guess just in closing, thank you very much. Just generally for the two days. You've gotten a lot done. There has been a lot of good conversations this is very hard stuff. Especially at this stage, where you're trying to define

what you're doing and start to put some parameters around this and I think you've done a lot of good work, over the last two days and the last several months and I look forward to continuing to work with everybody. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Go ahead.

Valerie Nelson: Yes. Also, I'll add my thanks for all the listening that I'm hearing and responsiveness. We all, out there, appreciate in this meeting that you're doing that. Again, I think even the title of compatibility of uses is so down in the weeds when this whole topic is really about the economy of ocean use should be looked at in a much more holistic and sustainability framework. First I want to respond a bit though to this sense of your discussion that systems thinking is so far down the road and interesting but doesn't lead to action and also by the way you all have to work in the current regulatory scheme. My experience are frankly that you determine to do systems analysis you can do it rapidly and well.

It's just a decision to do it. And within the current regulatory framework. One example is the waste water issues on Cape Cod which Chuckie knows all about. The fiscal situation of building sewers down there are billions of dollars has led that region to think in a systems way about natural systems approaches and more ecological infrastructure and there's not going to be a rewriting of the clean water act. For God's sake, we know that. So they are living in the world of thinking systems, the natural systems. The economic benefits of various approaches, and they're living within the challenge of operating for transformative change within an existing regulatory scheme, so please don't put—these many cases I think more and more people are saying the fundamental weakness in the United States of America is its overconfidence that what it has always done worked so well. The rest of the world tackles these questions as the prior speaker says, just gets going with them is determined to do a sustainability job and it is eminently doable now.

Please look at systems thinking and acknowledge it can be done within a regulatory system. The other example is what's happening in fisheries in Gloucester. In that case we've hit so far, what's been done to our fishing port is so extraordinarily devastating. Silver lining is that they're either going to go away or they're going to reinvent themselves. If you look at the Saltonstall-Kennedy grants you should look at Gloucester. Gloucester companies, processors, boats are reinventing the future with a little bit of grant money. They're looking at a grant for a local seafood system hub. They're looking at community based aquaculture so there's some environmental justice that it's not just big corporations making all the money. They're looking at waste recovery apart of their economy. Chitin out of lobster. Otherwise it would be thrown out in the ocean. How can they close loop systems. They're thinking of hatcheries. They're looking at a green port using green cement to clean up naturally.

Those are companies, fisherman, local people reinventing a field now with sustainability principles and systems thinking. This is doable and this is another example of the capacity that exists in America that needs to be tapped in your process. On the economics, though, because of how Gloucester has—it almost seems a campaign to destroy us. We've been forced to look at

the underlying economic theories and I urge you one of your groups has to be about the economic systems thinking that these separate regulations or your effort as a whole are based on because whether it's trade off analysis or some of the fisheries decisions that got made, this is a neo-liberal objective of maximizing profits and wringing inefficiency out of your economy. It leads to commodification, international globalization and it is destroying our communities. Look at the income inequality that is in this country. There is a need to focus on economics properly. It's not just about corporate profits and efficiencies. It's an economy that is sustainable, that is just and that preserves cultures communicates that is resting in indigenous and local knowledge. There are economic models for doing those things. They're out there. They're being tried in different ways. Many of those Gloucester proposals are about doing something in a community base. In Denmark, by the way, wind is done with community based projects. That's how wind got going in Europe.

It's vitally important, not jumping to some issue around compatibility of this use over that use, use this opportunity to fundamentally think in a systems way about what the human interaction and the economy is of the ocean and multiple measures beyond what the traditional government economies does, this is not for corporate well being. This is for communities. This is for sustainability, for environmental justice. And it rests in the capabilities of the American people and companies, the local indigenous knowledge. I would like to urge that when you have working groups that you have something on systems thinking and how it can be done now with existing regulations and what it means and also another one on what is proper economics as you go forward.

Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Go ahead.

Sally McGee: Thank you. Sally McGee with the nature conservancy. Just two quick points on this goal. First is that the objectives and tasks as written seem to address identification and mapping of human uses and the RPB should consider adding actions that would also identify, assess, and promote potential compatibilities amongst uses, along with compatibilities with conservation of marine resources. That's number one and number two as the RPB has I know epically with respect to Massachusetts and Rhode Island considered the examples at the state level and the value of integrating existing sub regional and state based ocean planning work, the RPB should consider also what's going on at the very early stages in Long Island Sound and emerging planning efforts there, both within the sound and in ascendent coastal waters off of Connecticut and New York. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you. Wendy, you're next. And then William, you'll be next.

Wendy Law: I'm Wendy Law and the president of the Seacoast Science Center. We're a non-profit marine science education institution in Rye New Hampshire and we're also the first New Hampshire member of the New England Action Network and a founding member of NEOSEC which is a forty member collaboration of marine science institution. It stands for the New England Ocean Education—New England Ocean Science—we are dedicated—it's a great

acronym and we're dedicated to advancing ocean literacy. While I can officially speak principally for the Seacoast Science Center, I think in the spirit of both of those organizations, first I wanted to say that you are all earning a lot of karmic credits. I don't know. I try to be politically correct here but what you're doing is as you've heard and we all acknowledge how difficult it is and to try to balance and include civility and avoid inertia is really difficult. I applaud all of you for doing that.

One of the things that I really am excited about from this meeting is objective five. The science center is known as a translator of marine science for the public and I think that as a nonprofit we're really dedicated to making sure that the public has an understanding of the science but also the policy that goes on to making sure that everyone understands what a healthy ocean is and what their personal roles are in shaping that ocean health.

So in spirit of the gentleman who preceded me who said that we should all offer something. I will offer that certainly the science center, I'm sure some of those other organizations would be happy to be venues and translators of your work for the public, whether it's just for a meeting or I would offer myself—I sound like a sacrificial lamb, now, but to assist as you're thinking about the engagement and how I could put whatever expertise I have to work to help everyone understand it. Sometimes talking to the public is as simple as just this anecdote. I'm looking at my sign. How much time do I have. A minute. Okay. So if you recall in your first meeting in Portland, your guest speaker did this wonderful. And I use this example all the time, when people say what the heck is ocean planning. I said it's really simple. The way it is right now everybody—somebody puts a pin in the water and says this is what I want to do here and then there's a lot of yelling and screaming and jumping up and down and waving their arms and the thing is either moved or revised. A lot of money is spent and a lot of anger and angst goes on.

But this way we do all the yelling and screaming and jumping up and down and yelling and angst first and then when somebody wants to put a pin on the map, at least they're in the right region so all of the conversation can be to look at that particular proposal and make sure that it's the best proposal to do whatever that that activity is. And people go, oh, yeah. I see. So even if we can just help get as many people saying, oh, yeah, I see then we're right there with you. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you.

William McLintock: Hi. My name is Will McLintock and I'm a researcher from the University of California, Santa Barbara. I'm just visiting from the left coast and I've really enjoyed listening in for the last couple of days and I really appreciate the work that you're doing and the level of transparency with which you're doing it. I want to tell you a little bit about the work that I'm doing in my lab, my lab develops decision support software for marine spatial planning and the software that we use now is called sea sketch and we're using it for marine spatial planning and a couple of dozen different places around the world.

For planning of all kinds, aquaculture, sighting, conservation zoning, fisheries planning and that sort of stuff. Essentially what the software is used for is displaying spatial informatory much like the data that is in the ocean data viewer. And then using those data to sketch out perspective management plans and learn something about the consequences of thus designs and share those designs with other users to collaborative build some sort of spatial plan. It can also be used for gathering new spatial information, ocean use data, for example. The reason why I wanted to bring this up is that I've heard a lot of discussion about cumulative impacts over the last couple of days so I wanted to alert you to a sea sketch project which you can find by going to impact.seasketch.org. I've shared that url with Nic, so you can get it from him later if you like. That's a project that I've put together with my colleague Ben Helpburn at UCSB to allow you to visualize cumulative impact data on a global scale sketch out perspective management zones, evaluate the cumulative impact zone within that zone and then dial up or dial down the—I'm sorry—the stressors to see how that might affect cumulative impact score. In essence, simulating some sort of management plan.

So we're doing that on a global scale now. We're adding regional data for various places and sort of piecemeal. In a couple of weeks you'll see full functionality on that site. But if it's of interest to you, I encourage you to go there. It's open to the public and it might give you some thoughts about how you might use decision support technology—collaborative decision support technology for any planning process should it come to be here in the future. I wanted to offer up my service to conduct webinars or help you think about the use of collaborated decision support technology should that be of interest to you and I'm easily reached at UCSB. Thank you very much for the work that you're doing and I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Laura Cantral: Great. Did you want to come in. Come on up.

Male: [Inaudible] of the Island Institute. One really quick comment to the extent that this goal is about compatibility between differentiate uses as opposed to the data collection getting at some of the issues that both Sally and Priscilla raised. Think it's really important to address the issues of scale that are inherent in the regional differences between what Rhode Island looks like and deals with and what we deal with up in Maine and so to the extent that there are decisions about compatibility being made both the regional differences and the scale of the data or the scale that the data is collected at, very important considerations. One of the notes up there is about sub regional efforts. I think that's a really important consideration.

When we get into decisions between different uses that impact people in their communities that probably is better made at the community level or at the sub regional level and not by a different uses that impact people in their communities that probably is better made at the regional level and not by a larger body to an extent that thinking about sub regional levels or sub regional planning. I'd love to see some clarity on if people can contribute their plans to this process and what the process is for that or the format that has to be or the characteristics that you have to have to get included and with the work going on on Long Island Sound and Massachusetts and Rhode Island. There are some good opportunities to start thinking about

that process but if there are other plans that emerge in the future, will this body pick them up. It's an open question but if you start thinking about that that would be much appreciated. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Thank you and I'd like to offer thanks to all of our commenters at all three of the comment sessions that were built into this meeting. I know that the RPB has found your input to be very valuable and I think you've heard some of what you had to share reflected in the discussion and that that will continue.

So at this point we are going to take a quick break. We are going to break for ten minutes and I mean it. Ten minutes. We're going to be back in ten minutes. I'm going to be starting the meeting in ten minutes. In the meantime, take a quick break. Bye.

[Break]

Laura Cantral: All right. Welcome back. We are in the home stretch of this meeting. Before we dive into discussion about the goal related to compatibility of uses, we have a couple of announcements to be aware of, Kathleen you want to share some information about yours.

Kathleen Leyden: Yes. Just totally unrelated to regional ocean planning but in Maine we just produced Maine [inaudible] program just produced this three volume public access guide and we've given about the Southern Maine Volume to the RPB if you don't plan on coming to Maine, don't keep the book. Give it to John Weber and he'll bring them back to us, but Matt also put some postcards about how they're for sale and we have a post card out there that talks about how you can get them and then there's the mid coast and down east volume.

Laura Cantral: Great. Thank you. I want to keep my copy. Can I keep mine.

Kathleen Leyden: Yes. You can keep yours if you come back.

Laura Cantral: I am going to come.

Kathleen Leyden: And if you spend a lot of money.

Laura Cantral: I will definitely spend a lot of money.

The other thing that we wanted you to be aware of Captain Gifford made reference in his remarks this morning to the Coast Guard proceedings and issue on marine planning. Some great articles on this issue and if you would like to have your very own copy of this, see Michelle Disatel. She's got extras with her. And she would be happy to share one with you. So another great resource.

All right. Grover, I know that you need to leave at 4:30, correct, so we are going to time appropriately and either be done by then or take a moment to hear from you before you have to

depart. All right, so the floor is open for discussion about the goal related to compatibility among past, current and future uses. The points in particular that you see on the slide that we've left up that Nick and John reviewed for your thoughts, questions, comments about this goal and related objectives? Yes.

Grover Fugate: This is I guess a little bit more recent update, but I don't think Bruce is here, anyhow. This is relative to the sand and gravel issue. Within your actions there is—you note that there is the northeast sand and gravel group, based on discussions that we've had with BOEM and army corp. There actually is a sub group with that the New England and New York group looking at this issue. Because of the differences within that region, obviously the northeast goes much further south than say New York, but we have some unique characteristics because the glacial limit here and you just may want to reflect that. If we can convince BOEM to take over agriculture we can just ship this whole thing over to BOEM and deal with them on all these issues, but anyhow.

Laura Cantral: Great. Doug.

Doug Grout: Here, pull up my screen here with my comments. Couple of things that really stood out for me, with this goal and particularly objective one is first of all, it talks about the past, present and future uses and many of the tasks and outcomes refer to the future uses. I understand why you did that in an organizational standpoint, at least the way John has described it, but I'm wondering if there might be because I think where we're getting the information on past and current uses is up in goal, too.

At least that's where I'm interpreting, so I'm wondering if there's something to be brought into this goal and particularly the objective that refers to the fact that we're getting the past and present use information from goal, the previous goal that we're talking about. I think that's important because we're grabbing, we're going to have to take all of this information and put it together and hopefully out of that we'll come up with something, also some information about compatibility between the different uses. Clearly we've had a number of our public commenters say that that's an important aspect that we have to have in there and as I was looking under this goal, and any of the tasks and the outcomes, I didn't see anything that talked about information on compatibility. Maybe I missed it. I did a word search and I didn't see the word outside of the first word of the goal.

Laura Cantral: Grover, you have another thought. Is that your tent up from earlier? Do you have another thought?

Grover Fugate: Oh. Sorry. No.

Laura Cantral: No. Anything else.

Betsy Nicholson: I think we just need OT given a lot of the conversation of that about the importance of a healthy ecosystem being the cornerstone of this effort, really want to see, make sure that we connect this compatibility among uses back to the ecosystem in terms of

considering compatibility of a use with an ecosystem and actually perhaps even feeding into the science plan of objective three of the ecosystems goal. As we learn and explore the relationship between uses and between uses in the ecosystem catalog and prioritize what we need to know urgent and make sure that's in the science plan and something that we're pushing for as a result of this process. So let's connect those two thoughts, too.

Laura Cantral: Okay.

Ted Diers: Just two items. One is, I understand it took me a while and I think I read this as other people did is that it's hard to find the comparability in the objectives of this particular goal. It's hard to find compatibility within the compatibility here and I think that what I think what Betsy was just saying and what I heard from the public comments as well is that there's this note that sits here under objective one that says the compatibility is generally on a case by case basis, and relative to individual projects as they come up, and that tends to be a local specific activity. I think this idea and I think this was raised by a couple of the commenters. and what I think you just said, Betsy, is maybe there are ways that we can identify what does compatibility look like?

And I think that's where this is—I think that that's implicit in the tasks here, is that we're going to look at a number of different projects that are currently ongoing that hedge around this issue, but at the end of looking around that there's maybe some idea that would go back to these individual decision making process that say something like "This is what compatibility might look like." Based on the experience of these other projects, what we know around the table and what we hear from people is if you really want things to be compatibility across time, space, use, that this is what it kind of looks like and it seems that that would be a helpful product at the end of all this and might be a way to bridge this gap and address this issue that there's no compatibility in the compatibility.

That was one comment. The second comment that I just had was quickly under action 2.1 and this happens, this is just a language thing that I see a number of other places and this is what my boss would say if he was still here because he's an attorney and looks at language all the time. And everything I get back from him it looks like somebody bled all over it. But that when we say summarize the status of projects such as—this is an awfully specific list, and in fact the tasks which precede it and follow it look specifically at these activities and I guess I would prefer to say if these are things we already know about and we're actually moving forward to look at these things, let's say that. Let's say including but not limited to or something like that instead of such as because I'm not sure that these are examples. I guess I would ask the staff to take a look. There are a couple of places within the document in which that happens and I think it's important to go ahead and say yes, we're going to do something. These are what we're going to do but this isn't all we're going to do.

And it's just again just a language issue.

Laura Cantral: What else? Meredith?

Meredith Mendelson: Since there seems to be a lull in the conversation, I'm going to maybe deviate a little bit from the direct comment on this goal but I think as a sort of going on, we maybe haven't addressed one piece here that I think we may just want to make sure we're all on the same page and that is as we agree upon the goals and the objectives we're implicitly accepting the tasks and activities that go with them, and I want to make sure that that is in the interest of transparency and clarity for the audience that that is in fact what we are saying and I don't know if it's worth discussing whether or not that's an evolving list, something that we're planning will grow and be shaped in the future. I think that's my understanding but I just want to make sure we're all on the same page and that can wait until the end, but I just wanted to flag it. Thanks.

Laura Cantral: So thank you for bringing that up, and I think we've heard some confusion, and we're planning as part of the wrap up to make sure that everyone is really clear about that point. And I would just point people back to the objectives for this agenda, and as I tried to summarize them, a couple of times as we've gone along in this meeting is what is in the design, what we have been intending to ask of you as the RPB is to identify refinements and approve, okay a formal approval of the principles, goals and objectives that are in the draft framework. You've done that for two. There has been discussion about them and there was some refinements made and you looked at language. You approved and we are now talking about the third of those goals and related objectives and then along with that what we have been asking of you is to identify refinements and next steps for draft actions that would be implemented to achieve the goals and objectives and that's all the related details that are in the actions, the tasks, the outcomes, and the time line, all of that set of detail that is that the staff, that the co-leads that we have all been asking.

Are you uncomfortable with us moving forward with these sets of activities? Because we need to, as Nick has put it and others, we need do some work to bring some things back to you to inform future decision making in June and beyond. So let us go off and do our work and things are going to involve the list of those activities, those tasks are going to change, and some of them do represent action, work that is going to happen right away. Commitments, money spent, etc. we acknowledge that. But that's the distinction that we're asking for. The formal approval is around the goals and objectives, and the principles that you talked about in the last formal public meeting and the essence of those things has not changed until this meeting where there were some changes made in the public discussion.

So is that clear? And is everyone okay with that? All right. So any other thoughts about the compatibility? There have been some suggestions to make some clarifications, some compatibility among the compatibility and some very specific lawyer-like changes about including but not limited to, which I can appreciate.

And connecting this the spirit of this goal back to the healthy ecosystems and to the science plan. Susan.

Susan Whalen: So as I go back and forth between the [inaudible] systems and this goal of compatibility, it seems to me the objectives under the first goal of healthy oceans is our effort to characterize the past and present state and this goal of compatibility is really about the future state of the way we consider uses. I know we are trying to break down silos between the three goals, but it seems to me there's some duplication in this third goal that we're talking about that. I've just—it leaves me wondering if we're sort of working too hard on goal number three to incorporate all the past and present uses when really it's about the future state of what we want—how we want to work compatibly in the ocean environment.

Betsy Nicholson: I think, and I'd like to ask maybe Rick or other members to comment on this, but the whole idea of including past was to acknowledge the lens with which tribal members look at the world in terms of seven generations back, seven generations forward and think in terms of compatibility with where we've been and maybe even sustaining some of those. I'll let you talk. I'm not going to.

Sue Whalen: This is so sort of project specific, it doesn't quite capture the native American view of the world which I fully support and agree with so—

Rick Getchell: Basically that was very important to us to have something that's going to look to our future sustainability and of what we're doing now and in the future but also representing the past and not losing that. So that's why it is kind of specific to tribes and you know I don't know if that answers your question.

Sue Whalen: Just doesn't—I think the words we're using it's not quite reflected. It seems to me very sort of project oriented in this third goal and not so much perhaps culturally or represented. I don't know if I'm making any sense but it just doesn't quite capture the intent I think, so I'd be happy to help work on that.

Laura Cantral: Anything you'd want to add?

Rick Getchell: Certainly we can refer to what we had put in there earlier on and there was very specific that got extracted or diluted in the process. John, can you?

John Weber: Just a couple of things to point out. One is that there's also an element overall on this goal that built off a point that Ted made, that part of thinking about this issue we do absolutely have to learn from what we've done. Part of it is what has worked. So there's an element of that.

Susan Whalen: Okay.

John Weber: But to your point, directly. I—the language in the first action there, references purposely that terms, you know, technological management, economic, cultural environmental or other factors. I think maybe a way to approach this is if they need to expand or explain that a little bit more they could do that but the intent was with that language to capture not just the technological changes or environmental changes but also to look at some of those cultural type

of issues that have been raised. That was the intent. If that needs to be further explained, that might be a place to insert such an explanation.

Laura Cantral: It feels like at this point it would be helpful just to underscore, it's been said a couple of times that what we're really asking of you in the discussion and approval of this goal and these objectives is to move forward and to do some work and come back to you with more information and more understanding, fleshing out some of what's here in the narrative that's related to this goal and objective.

All right so are folks ready to take up? Susan are you—you don't have another comment right?

Susan Whalen: No.

Laura Cantral: Are you ready to entertain approval of this goal and its related objectives? Doug?

Doug Grout: Well, unlike the other goals and objectives, which we had some rewrites that were done, there have been some comments that have been made here both by the RPB and the public, about some of the specific, maybe modifying some of the specific actions to include the reference material from objective—goal number two and this whole concept of compatibility. Whether compatibility and the information that we get on compatibility come in a different iteration of these goals and objectives because there's—this is going to be a dynamic process as I understand for not ready to get that information because of the resource limitations. I'm fine with that as long as we reference the fact that we're talking in this particular objective is the compatibility of the different uses and we need to get some kind of information on that at some point and for my standpoint I'm as long as I'd be willing to approve these as long as there's some kind of reference there. About how we're going to get—how and when we're going to get collect the information on comparability.

Laura Cantral: Go ahead.

John Weber: A suggestion for that is there's a couple of ways we can go about it. If you look at the list of tasks there, the seventh I think the intent there was to capture the spirit of what we've talked about and that is they we've developed information Do some of our homework. Bring that back to this body to “determine how information could be used,” etc., etc., etc. Doug, I don't know if that fully gets at everything in terms of the words on paper. That was the intent there. Your other point about adding the note about the relationships particularity goal two, a suggestion would be to add a sense and so stating to existing note that is there under that objective because the purpose of those notes is to explain sort of frame out what's meant by those and we could easily do that.

Doug Grout: Okay. Thank you.

Laura Cantral: Doug, I failed to mention and I should have that and asking the question was

making an assumption that it included these incorporation of these comments that have been shared around the table today. So with that understanding so I should have made that clear. Meredith.

Meredith Mendelson: Thanks. Just also one other piece. Looking at the current uses, that was one comment that came through strongly in Maine, was wanting to see a greater recognition of current uses but I think part of that was framed in understanding that current uses, particularly for the fishing industry, may not be representative of the full breadth of historic use and so current isn't perhaps the full picture that we need to be considering. I'm looking at the trends language and thinking if maybe there's a way we could maybe expand that to use historic trends to help inform what we might use as future trends that would perhaps give us that linkage

Laura Cantral: Meredith and then Betsy. I'm sorry—Meghan. You guys don't need to sit next to each other. It confuses me.

Meghan Massaua: I guess as we're thinking about adding additional language to kind of enhance the meaning of compatibility, I think that in doing so we need to give some consideration to the fact that we're not necessarily going to be readily able to identify what's compatible and what's not compatible, given that there are data poor situations and the other goals address synthesizing data and gathering data and developing a science plan and etc will help to fill those data gaps but there are things that we just don't know now and we probably won't know for ten years in terms of what can and can't potentially coexist and I think we need to be careful about how we frame that.

For instance, if you're using offshore energy. Just because there's offshore energy doesn't mean there can't also be habitat protection for something like that. I think we want to be careful if we want to be moving towards drawing boxes sort of what the lines of those boxes mean that that makes sense.

Betsy Nicholson: I was thinking about Priscilla's comment and a couple of comments around the table thinking perhaps it's necessary to amend the first objective to say something like "Increase the understanding of past, current, future ocean uses and their relationship to each other." Something, because if you look at it, objective one is about understanding. Objective two is about trying to incorporate regional issues into ongoing efforts and getting at that perhaps gap of what is the relationship, what is the interaction between perhaps that can help capture what's in the narrative so it's effective in an objective and maybe even incorporate an action like Ted suggested. What does compatibility look like. So we carry that through. It's not just in the narrative and we don't address it. So in the relationship with each other or something like that. I know we're in real time edit mode, so what do folks think? Is that—? A better idea?

Doug Grout: Excellent idea. Excellent idea. Thank you Betsy.

Susan Whalen: I think for me it helps close the circle. So it makes more sense.

Laura Cantral: Could you restate that.

Betsy Nicholson: Increase understanding of past, current and future ocean uses and the relationship to each other. Does that do it? John gives me the thumbs up. Consensus.

Laura Cantral: Got it.

Betsy Nicholson: Okay. So you don't like it but you heard me. Okay.

John Weber: You're going to wordsmith me now.

Laura Cantral: All right. Sharri.

Sharri Venno: Just a quick question for Betsy: Do you feel that that reflects your earlier comment about compatibility of ecosystems.

Betsy Nicholson: Probably not. It depends on how you define ocean use, I guess. What would you suggest? I look at the first action and as John pointed out it includes environmental factors, but do we want to be more deliberate than that?

Sharri Venno: I think it's the same issue that we confronted early on in terms of sustainability and natural resources and we're focusing on uses, human uses and not sustainable ecosystems. I'm not—I can't give you any. I look at this and I can't even figure out where I put it.

Laura Cantral: Increase understanding of past future and current uses and their relationship to each other and the and natural resources. To connect it. Just an idea.

Sharri Venno: Long complicated sentence.

Laura Cantral: I know. That's not really a good objective. So we've had a number of suggestions for some editing, some wordsmithing that were capturing and we're capturing in the notes, in the notes, in the notes. We've got lots of notes and I've asked if you are comfortable approving this goal and objective we had some more good suggestions to, I think, factor in and now I'm going to ask the question again. Again, keeping in mind that what we're really asking is for you to be comfortable with going forward to do some more work this is a goal and these objectives are and actions are aimed at gathering more information to better flesh out what exactly needs to be done around this goal related to comparability among uses. Susan.

Susan Whalen: If I could make a quick suggestion, maybe if we mirror what is now our first goal which is help the ocean and coastal ecosystem so that if it read compatibility among past, current and future ocean and coastal ecosystem uses. And their relationships to each other would that capture—? What Sharri is thinking?

Sharri Venno: It's still about uses.

[Conversation off of microphone.]

Laura Cantral: Brian.

Brian Thompson: So I think that the goals are all very good. The objectives and actions are all very good. My observation is I think we've tried too hard to sort of fit the actions, the objectives and the actions under the goals and it's really much more integrated than all of that and somebody referred earlier to setting some context and maybe we need some overall context about how these actions all interrelate. And I'm not sure where that goes. Maybe it goes up front and that's my suggestion.

Laura Cantral: And we have talked over the course of the meeting about providing some context that does put things into perspective that helps reinforce the relationship among these three goals and they are interconnected and so perhaps that's something that could be done in the next round of drafting and incorporating the suggestions that you're all making here. So with that, I'm ready to ask again if you want to approve this goal and objective recognizing that the edits, wordsmithing that you suggested will be incorporated. That there would be some context that would help with some of the confusion around this goal, but really help satisfy some of the contextual underpinning that the framework needs. Vera?

Vera Francis: I have a question. A clarifying question. I have a clarifying question to Sharri. As to the meaning of uses, separate from ecosystem you are comfortable with that description now? It sounded a little bit like you were describing something else to me? More of like natural systems.

Sharri Venno: Yes. I'm just having a hard time finding the right language to put in there to reflect that concern that we are just talking about compatibility amongst uses and not what Betsy described and that is compatibility among uses and a healthy ocean and coastal ecosystem. It's just—

Nick Napoli: If we look back at the language that we added back in, it actually references some of that so maybe that would help with folks concerns about adding in the ecosystem and I know this is wonderfully exciting to all of you, but I'm just going to read a little bit really quickly. "Develop a planning framework to encourage compatibility among past, current and future ocean uses of ocean and coastal waters while minimizing user conflict and impacts to environmental and cultural resources." That's the language. That's the first sentence of the language that we added back in. Underneath that goal

Laura Cantral: Did that help clarify?

Sharri Venno: Yes?

Laura Cantral: Yes

Vera Francis: Is that enough, Sharri?

Sharri Venno: I think so. I think it's a different per—way to look at it, a different way to get there but I basically think it does get you there in terms of there is compatibility amongst these uses and a healthy ecosystem. It just doesn't say it quite that way. Yes. Yes. I think I think that is makes me gets me into a comfort zone.

Laura Cantral: I know I see three people who want to chime in and Michelle has had her tent up for a while and Bruce and Ted, I know you both really had a thought that you want to get in there. So you he turned you on. You don't have to turn it on.

Michelle Disatel:: Maybe to provide a clarifying—I was thinking about this in terms of the compatibility, past, present and future and thinking well, we can't just overuse the ocean. So why not understand or add something to—the understanding of the impact on the ocean that gets a little more to the ecosystem and that takes into account that we can learn from the past of what was helpful or not helpful and it starts to get into the ocean acidification and the maybe compatibility about uses and have an understanding of their impact on the ocean. It's not—it's a little bit different than minimizing the impact. Its starting from the ground zero just awareness of their impact on the ocean.

I don't know if that helps.

Laura Cantral: Ted.

Ted Dier: Just maybe a quick way of doing a rewording this very, very slightly that might bring all of this together to say the increased understanding of past, current and future interactions amongst ocean users and ecosystems because that then draws back what you learned and now goal one, which is the healthy ecosystems. It brings in the idea that you've got uses and it brings back their interactions over time and space so that's a very simple way of changing this that integrates the various concerns that have been raised. I can read that again if you want me to. The increase understanding of past, current and future interactions amongst ocean uses and ecosystem.

Laura Cantral: Okay. Go ahead Bruce.

Bruce Carlisle: And I'm going to build off that because I think the intent as folks have been trying to articulate, you know, when you're talking about compatibility assessments very broad or as specific as you can get, recognizing the site specific issues are obviously the responsibilities of specific projects, and to auspices of different authorities, but the point is broadly when you think about compatibility I think the intent always was not onuses among and between uses solely, that there is ocean ecosystem and marine system effects there. And so coincidentally Mr. Diers, I had some language to add into action 1.1, so in that first sentence there it would start "Examine technological management, economic, and cultural environmental and other factors to enhance understanding of current and reasonably foreseeable patterns an changes in human uses that"—how we go here? Um. In interactions and affects of human uses and something about ecosystems. Blah blah blah. Wordsmithing.

Laura Cantral: Interactions and blah blah blah.

Bruce Carlisle: You understand the draft.

Laura Cantral : Got it.

John Weber: Just a clarification is it blah blah blah with an H?

[Laughter]

Bruce Carlisle: Capital. I can't even read my own writing there. I think the point is with the additional narrative that we added back in on the goal with the additions that Ted made in the objective you carry that through to the action which is consistent.

Sharri Venno: I'm sorry, I missed it what was the change in the actual goal statement.

Laura Cantral: Nothing. It's objective one.

Sharri Venno: Right.

Bruce Carlisle: In the goal statement that language that was added back in.

Laura Cantral: The blurb.

Bruce Carlisle: Yes.

Laura Cantral: That would be underneath the goals statements.

Bruce Carlisle: Yes.

Female: Okay.

Laura Cantral: Betsy.

Betsy Nicholson: Let's move forward. Can we is--can we do this? Is everyone comfortable with the edit that Ted made to objective one? And Bruce's chicken scratch which we'll get to the staff about the modifying that action to reflect what's in the objective.

Laura Cantral: All right. Are you guys ready to approve this goal and related objectives with the expectation that those changes, chicken scratching and blah blah will be added in? Okay. So done. All right. What else? Ready to wrap up?

Betsy Nicholson: Yeah. I think so.

Summary of Meeting Outcomes and Review Next Steps | Laura Cantral, Meridian Institute

Laura Cantral: So this is the point where I'm supposed to summarize and offer next steps and I have a very slim list and you must be tired of hearing me talk so I'm going to be brief. So to summarize what happened at this meeting, is you presented and discussed the draft framework. And approved its three goals and objectives. There was a lot of very good discussion and input and modifications as a result of that, and I'm not going to repeat what they all are. In addition you all expressed comfort with moving forward with the related actions, tasks and associated work that will enable more informed decision makings the RPB process moves forward and you will start seeing results of that very soon and most specifically at the next RPB meeting which we're targeting to happen in June in conjunction with one or more workshops that are planned for that time frame.

Now I'm shifting to next steps. June workshops and RPB meeting specific dates and scoping coming your way very shortly. The co-leads and the staff team will be developing an options paper or papers to present options related to establishing a technical committee and a stakeholder advisory committee. The changes that have been discussed at this meeting will be reflected in the next iteration of the framework. And I know there's more, but that's all I've got. So I'm going to turn it to the co-leads who can offer any more that I left out. Close with your comments as you see fit.

Closing Remarks| Grover Fugate, Rhode Island Coastal Resource Management Council and NE RPB State Co-Lead; Richard Getchell, Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians and NE RPB Tribal Co-Lead; Betsy Nicholson, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and NE RPB Federal Co-Lead

Grover Fugate: I don't think I need to add any more other than I want to thank the members for all the hard work that you obviously put into this process. All the thoughtful comments that you guys have made and the struggling that you have gone thorough trying to deal with these issues. It is a very difficult process. I'd also like to thank Nick and John for their hard work and Katie for pulling this together. This requires an immense amount of thought process, obviously interaction with a lot of groups that you have already met with and will continue to meet with, and it represents an immense amount of work. I'd also like to thank the public for their continued following support and criticism of the process because that's very helpful in helping us think about the process as we go forward, and it's a very important step, and I like to thank all you for your attention to this. This is not an easy thing to follow and watch develop as it's going on .

It's probably one of the most difficult things that we will be involved in in trying to make all this gel and work but it's probably one of the most important things that we will be involved in in terms of the regional aspects and I think all of you guys are to be controlled, everybody who's in this room and those that have attended before and left already. Thank you very much.

Betsy Nicholson: After you.

Rick Getchell: Again, Grover said everything I wanted to say here, but basically I do want to point out and I guess we can't point it out enough that we have such a diverse group of people. Feds, state, tribes. And public input coming together to create something that is monumental and very important and again, thank everybody in all the groups, and especially the hard workers behind the scene. Meridian staff and Joan's group and everybody else. You guys work very hard behind the scenes holding us and making this thing all come together. That has to be noted. Everybody have a safe trip back and it's been a pleasure serving on this board.

Betsy Nicholson: I won't delay this but I do want to say, let's go forth and make some progress and get some things done that we can be proud of in the near term and thank you all for being willing to move forward with this work. It's not perfect but let's start trying. Let's make some progress. The patience and the faith involved in this effort is really important and appreciated by the public as well. So new territory and let's be bold and thanks again. I know. I know the hours that all of these people work and it's not eight hours. It's not ten hours a day. Thank you so much for your dedication to this and moving it forward.

Laura Cantral: Okay. We're good. It's a wrap. Thank you very much. [End of Recording]