

OPAC Marine Reserve Working Group Meeting Summary
OIMB Boathouse Auditorium, Charleston, OR
5/21/2008, 1-5 PM

Working group members in attendance: Frank Warrens (chair), Jim Bergeron, Jim Good, John Griffith, Robin Hartmann, Ed Bowles, Dave Fox, Paul Klarin, Roy Lowe, Paul Engelmeyer and Laurel Hillmann. Jane Barth (facilitator). *Absent:* Jack Brown, Jeff Kroft and Brad Bettinger

Other attendees: Pete Stauffer (Surfrider), Jan Hodder (OIMB), Barb Seekins (NOAA Fisheries), Megan Mackey (PMCC), Andy Lanier (DLCD), Peg Reagan, Steve Bodnar (Coos Bay Trawlers), Susan Chambers (The World Newspaper), John Holloway (RFA/Oregon Anglers), Paul Mertz (Troll Fishery), Cristen Don (ODFW), Onno Husing (OPAC), Susan Allen (Our Ocean).

Note: Unless specified in the meeting summary that a decision was made on a particular topic or action, the notes that follow document MRWG meeting discussion only. Comments represented in this summary do not necessarily reflect MRWG consensus on the topic.

1.) Introductions, meeting ground rules, agenda and announcements

- Main focus of meeting-full work session. Discussing what is now going to be called marine reserve proposal form that will take the place of former nomination form.
- Ground rules (reminder)-Jane Barth.
 - Consensus is the goal; Open, frank communication; Respect others (e.g., no side conversations); Listen to understand; Balance airtime; Whole group monitors ground-rules; Stay on the agenda
- Review of meeting objectives (Ed Bowles)
 - Outline marine reserves process
 - Outline schedule for the proposal process
 - Outline Oregon Sea Grant public outreach process
 - Finalize coarse review criteria
 - Finalize proposal form for sites for further evaluation

2.) Overview of process, timeline/milestones and outreach (Ed Bowles)

Overview of Marine Reserves Process (*handout: available online at: www.oregon.gov/LCD/OPAC/docs/meetings/Distributed_Materials_May_2008.pdf*)

- Proposed sites for further evaluation submitted
 - Response to public comment, not ready for fully vetted sites. EO responded so considering sites, wanting proposals for areas that warrant further consideration and review

- Nomination of sites after more detailed review. Right now going to have proposals for further consideration and evaluation. Get ready for legislature to provide funding for more detailed review
- Developed this summer and early fall (2008)
- Course review of those sites
- Develop more detailed criteria for evaluation in next biennium
- Develop budget for more detailed review to be submitted to the Governor.
- Budget developed Jan-June 2009. For those sites that are moved forward at the end of this year through the OPAC process and agency recommendations
- Potential for pilot MR sites to be designated and evaluated. This next biennium. For those sites that are ready, the evaluation and implementation would occur this next biennium.
- 2009-2011-Evaluation dependent on funding.
- Implementation would be 2011-beyond and also dependent on funding
- **Discussion:**
 - Jim G-would see that Jan-June 2009 could be some baseline monitoring planning done for each of the reserves that could look at. Could prioritize those. That is a big task. Who is going to do that? Ready to go once funding is clear or not clear, a good thing to do.
 - Ed-getting ready for implementing more detailed evaluation, trying to get all that done by January. That would be what moves forward so the legislature could fund it
 - Dave-Budget, not just the money, also the whole plan
 - Ed-Somewhat iterative through the legislative session. The preemptive budget has to be in this Fall but a lot will be placeholders, will modify accordingly to make sure have clarity once gets to ways and means
 - Ed-Broad scope of getting to implementation.
 - Roy-Limitation on number to move forward for further evaluation?
 - Ed-It's ambiguous in the EO and from my perspective the intent of the EO is to ensure that actual designation of sites is less than ten. Open question. Isn't anything in there that dictates how many move forward for consideration. The intent was to designate less than 10
 - Paul E-If anything comes forward, want to make sure we get to vet things. I agree. Need to clarify that.
 - Ed-something the group should discuss. In the criteria it speaks to the number, but that is more on designation.

MR Process: Schedule for the Proposal Process (*handout: available online at: www.oregon.gov/LCD/OPAC/docs/meetings/Distributed_Materials_May_2008.pdf*)

- Takes us through Dec of this year; top line shows tangible events
- Launch in June-carry through to recommendations coming in Dec. 1st.
- The proposals are shown in the 3rd line down. The first block is develop the course review and proposal form. Those are the two we need to do today and

tomorrow. Then in June, public proposal process begins. Oct/Nov agencies/OPAC reviewing based on coarse criteria.

- The shaded part is the outreach process. Jay R. and Jeff F. taking the lead. Public needs to know what has happened since then (first round of outreach meetings). What is different vs. expectations in the past? Clearly ID what sort of proposals we are looking for, what type of criteria. Those informational meetings will take place on the coast and touch base in the valley. Minimum of 3 meetings. Help launch the proposal process.
- **Discussion**
 - Frank: talked about a window for the proposals. Seems to be June-Sept. After Sept no more accepted?
 - Ed-If folks are nearly complete may not shut them down. Not viewed rigidly, maybe on case-by-case basis. Folks that are putting a good faith effort, final stages, receptive to that
 - Frank-agree flexible to some degree. If Depoe Bay NSAT have proposal submitted but some discussion about how big/small, then that would be in the queue for accepting?
 - That plays into a little why doing 2 steps. If different opinions, that could roll forward for more detailed evaluation. Then the group would have to reconsider after have that new information with science and social/economic aspects.
 - Jim B-doing baseline studies, will increase knowledge and hopefully find some areas with significance. Getting knowledge before we have the proposals. To do this intelligently need to do it after you have the knowledge.
 - Ed-the intent is there will be limited resources, the intent of the first step is to narrow down the range of options that then we can look more closely. Need to focus resources. Unlikely that what goes forward for funding would be outside these areas. Exception would be that most of these sites, if designated, will become reference sites. So, in the proposal form, folks can ID similar sites that have impacts. Baseline should include those areas.
 - John G-When is ODFW going to start the agency course review?
 - Ed-starts in October, but iterative. Part of this outreach is so folks don't go all the way through the process and bring the wrong rock. Will have workshops to have feedback so get some clarity on what is going to work or not. Provide feedback that plays into this during this period (during proposal from June-Sept). Intent is to have iterative dialogue to help them be successful.
 - John-Proposal to Governor by Dec 1. If waiting and get a big wad on Sept 15th, not going to make it.
 - Did it this way to show you could theoretically end up with a 2 month window of intense work
 - John-get the word out, the earlier the better so people don't waste their time.
 - Ed-the review by agencies and OPAC, if work iteratively, shouldn't be a huge surprise when get to the review. Should know.

Not overly rigid during that review period. Rigidity during fine review.

- Provide ongoing support to community teams-most important. Hands-on. Custom tailed to each group. Not going to have a detailed plan with dates/times/products. Going to take a lot of time working with these folks. Other workshop piece is for those not yet formed and provide venue so don't disenfranchise those that are interested. 2 tracks-most investments on working with community teams.
- Frank-conservation community is anxious to work with coastal communities/fishing groups. Important to stress that these should be collaborative groups. If about to propose a site, important to involve fishing interests so can sit down and discuss the potential impacts on the community. How can we get the word out that conservation community sits down with fishing communities?
 - Cristen-part of plan to start linking groups to work on proposals together or at least get feedback
 - Ed-in these ad hoc meetings-make sure they have the contacts they need.
 - Paul E-one of the delicate things, to get fishermen who won't talk in front of a group of people. A lot of folks don't want to be perceived as supporting it but want to get engaged.
 - Jim G-seem a good idea to get those ideas out on the table early for others to react to. Work with Jeff, ODFW to try and figure out who needs to know about this and move forward. Sensitive thing, don't know if people want to show their cards up front, but a good way to proceed to narrow things down.
- Ed-conceptualizing long enough, need to start talking details. Ad hoc initially, hopefully eventually will be collaboration. Don't have a whole lot of time. Want to reward that sort of approach. Now set up primarily-Sea Grant and ODFW. Definitely room for assistance. Sea Grant would love assistance. Need to give them some latitude.
- Paul E.- The presentations at the STAC size and spacing (S&S) workshop, I'm ready to look at them and use them. Right now, should be on the website. Pull out key parts to tell a good story about how it can work. Key players that didn't get there.
 - Ed-still waiting on STAC follow-up on S&S workshop. At that point, will move forward with products being out there. Because not looking at full vetting about if they are exactly the right size and spacing, don't want to overplay detailed criteria, will develop over the course.
 - Paul E-STAC memo in draft form, have some questions and reviewed notes. They were going to vet the memo with the participants.
 - Jim-talked to Selina last night. Very busy and said she doesn't know when that is going to be ready. Has had grad student working on it. Pulling key things from presentations may be ready

earlier. Even what they developed this first go around will need vetting and research. Won't have any basis for suggesting narrow range of sizes.

- Ed-large enough to be ecologically meaningful and small enough not to have significant economic hardship. Up to proposers to address it.
- Paul E-urge to use that expertise that was in that room. Other folks that are willing to help Selina and the STAC.
- Dave-when the folks in the WS said they would review it thought it was a quick review, not an approval.
- Paul-just want to make sure that is going to happen.
- Ed-will come back with a more detailed update at the next meeting. Good information, anything that comes out to feed into the process as possible.
- Paul-agency course review and OPAC review?
 - Ed-Marine Cabinet (if agencies)
- Robin-on the socioeconomic studies, would that be under the items funded during legislative session? Rule-making? Where does that come in?
 - Ed-this year, develop fine review criteria, include social and economic considerations. Feed into the budget request. A lot not readily available. Not just baseline data. Also, baseline on social and economic. Discuss at 2:15 agenda item
- Jim G-ought to give some size guidelines, minimum before we start the process. As an example, asked Selina if one square mile would be big enough? Probably would not be. Scientists want the final answer but we need to provide some sort of guidance. In CA, doing away with MRs that are so called "postage stamp" reserves because they are too small to do anything with. Just saying that is a concern of mine to not be giving people hopes that a half a nautical mile square is going to be an adequate size to do the necessary ecological analysis. Keep on the radar screen. What can we do to provide some ball park estimate of minimum size
 - Robin-under the assumption the STAC memo would be posted and get it out during outreach. As well as social and economic workshop. Post on website and have that available. What else are we going to use that for?
 - Paul-it is unclear in the memo. They can clean it up. The public will wonder what it really means.
 - Dave Fox-working with Jeff and Jay R. on outreach plan, one of the biggest thing saw was helping people through the size part of it. Using the information. The problem with those requirements is that it is not straightforward. Don't know we can have a webpage to make everyone know how to address size
 - Onno-looking for precision when these are guidelines. Talking about conceptual terms. Appreciate what STAC has done but trying to put the screws that with wordsmithing will provide

something that applies to the whole coast. Messy and complicated. Unfair to people. The world is messier than that.

- Jim-the economics and culture workshop will be just as important as the spacing workshop. Won't have that information when go out to the public.
 - Ed-If collaborative teams, not blind to those issues until we have the workshop. Coastal folks know where the impacts are. If collaborative, get plenty for the coarse filter. I agree it would be nice to have it earlier, but it feeds into the fine filters.
 - Dave-workshop will identify gaps. Not actually generating that information at the workshop
- Robin-still think our job as OPAC, people don't know the science. Not insignificant workshop. S&S draft report-as soon as finalized, should be posted up there. Out to communities, know this is abstract. We don't want to lose the opportunity of bridging the gap. Having social and economic workshop in July so should be a goal to have that up and ready. Help people know we are doing our best to look at science and economics.
 - Ed-STAC needs to figure out how to deal with the summary of the workshop. When they get that done we will post that. Need to keep those lines as clear as possible. Independent advice. Turning STAC stuff into hard criteria. Going to resist that. If proposals coming forward are too small, will find that out with the more detailed criteria. Hard line is dangerous. If in this range, odds are not going to capture home ranges of this, being clear on that. Not saying square miles.
 - Onno-Depoe Bay has a site that is about 700 acres. Is it everything that is going to be there forever? Would be a hell of a thing if couldn't move forward and learn from that. Begin research. That is a breakthrough. Know both the spacing and economics...no precision here, but do something that makes some progress and works for your communities
 - Jim G-ask STAC to finalize the draft memo-don't need a lot of detail. Something before we start the process. Not asking for the detailed final product. Agree with your position, even if had hard science guidelines, not the only thing we are considering. Need to balance it all. Nothing supersedes something else.
 - Jim B-depend on what the reserve is reserved for. If do it for sessile organisms...will depend on the reason for the reserve.
- Paul E-on the social workshop, the public was clear it is social and economic workshop. Right now, acknowledge that gets vetted out, the social change. As long as it happens it is okay.
 - Ed-Susan made it clear not able to pull together the folks to actually do the social aspect of this. This will focus on the economics. Will have to do that later.
 - Dave-not like removing social from the process, just not a formal part of the workshop
 - Onno-these are the kinds of things we learn about

- Dave-talking about the evaluation phase. Don't have that information now.
- Jim-workshop to look at data gaps, useful to look at social gaps. Community impacts are a social piece. Remember a story about what happened down in CA and people moved out, that is what hurt the community not just economics of where people fish. Ports and infrastructure.
- Onno-wave energy trust just okayed to start doing that sort of work for wave energy. This will go forward.

3.) Present and discuss proposal documents and related material

- Overview of terms
 - *Proposal process*-Activities needing to occur by the end of 2008, including: public proposals, coarse review, outreach, development of state agency budgets, and development of fine review criteria.
 - *Public proposals*- Sites proposed by the public, in state ocean waters and rocky intertidal areas, to be considered for further evaluation as potential marine reserves.
 - *Coarse review*- review that happens this year to see if should move forward to next biennium (2009-2011)
 - *Sites for further evaluation*: Up to nine sites that will undergo a detailed evaluation.
 - *Fine review criteria*-more detailed criteria developed this year but not applied till evaluation.
- Course review based on 1.) draft goal and objectives 2.) Governor's sideboards (*draft OPAC Coarse Review Criteria handout considered at OPAC meeting: available online at: www.oregon.gov/LCD/OPAC/docs/meetings/Distributed_Materials_May_2008.pdf*)
- **Discussion**
 - John-doesn't agree with the goal language. Conflicts with what the Governor has said.
 - Jim-on the goal and objectives, do we start all over again and just look at the EO or build on everything that's gone before? Starting with what the Governor asked us to do in June 2005 and subsequently asked us to do in April 2007 and on and on. To just look at the EO negates all the work and public testimony we've received.
 - Jim B-word that bothers me is significant. We define almost every other word, we ought to define it.
 - Dave-we didn't want to change language from the EO. We could choose to define it or work with community groups to come up with agreement that it is not significant. Not a one-size-fits-all definition.

- John-you work for the Governor and he works for the people, I commit to you that you will avoid.
 - Ed-the intent is to avoid hardship. We should move forward with that and sort that out, not try to nuance the wording.
 - John-if the last one that takes precedence, then all the previous work is wiped out. Like I said before, that other stuff is obsolete. June 05, June 07 that is wiped out.
 - Jim G-we are also an advisory group and we can provide recommendations.
 - Dave-where there was a conflict the latest took precedence
-
- Dave-The criteria are not absolute on/off switches. Don't have to meet to the nth degree. 2nd is that look in combination. A site doesn't have to meet 100% of them but they should strive to meet as many as possible. Not on/off or absolute rules.
 - **Site-specific criteria:**
 - 1.) Habitat representation
 - 2.) Size
 - 3.) Reasonable proximity to non-reserve comparison area
 - 4.) Spatial conflict be considered and documented (other uses)
 - 5) Adjacent (existing) protected areas
 - 6.) Avoid significant adverse social and economic effects.
 - 7.) Priority to collaborative teams
 - 8.) Enforcement is realistic
 - **System-wide criteria:**
 - 1.) Nine or fewer sites
 - 2) Not all clustered (dispersed)
 - 3.) Representation of habitat types in replicate
 - 4.) Large enough for scientific evaluation but small enough to avoid significant impacts
 - **Discussion**
 - John-the ones that reference the EO, don't have problem, but the others come from something OPAC hasn't approved yet.
 - Robin-most of these can be easily tied to the EO as well. They have to be large enough to do scientific evaluation of ecological benefits. 1 is tied to the EO, have to know what the habitat is. Can go through each one if you want.
 - Dave-4/5 tied to objectives but also information that makes a difference as to economic impacts and whether or not the site would be appropriate or adequate to study for ecological benefits. Are those ones of concern or others more of concern?
 - John-1 is of large concern, 4 next one, 5 probably already know that.
 - Paul-don't think worthwhile to assume the EO will provide guidance for coarse review and that only what is mentioned in there is what we can use. Certain amount of obvious and logical things we should look at. Existing uses. Some discretion for OPAC to look at what to do. EO only-is a little shortsighted

- John-7 is only the EO. Depending on what you get or don't get could make the others moot.
- Jim-also the planning and implementation guidelines aren't in there. A lot of what is in the EO came from the guidance document.
 - Paul K-it didn't negate things it didn't mention.
- Jim-pretty sure won't be able to do consensus on this.
- Ed-would like MRWG to move something forward to OPAC. You are informed by the EO, not meant to be prescriptive. Sideboards. Where it does specify some things, those are meant to be prescriptive. Have some latitude. Of these 8 plus 4 what don't you like and why, and is there anything missing?
- Frank-think of these from course filter perspective. This is going to get another go around at the OPAC meeting. Go around and get input.
 - Jim B-one things that might be missing, a very significant biological place. Places in ocean that are really important.
 - Laurel-Special natural features?
 - Jim G-maybe special natural features and characteristics
 - Paul-safety issues.
 - There are a whole bunch of things that could go with the "such as" under number 4
 - Infrastructure issues, like outfalls? Under number 4?
 - Paul E-what do we think proximity means?
 - Dave-don't have a specific number. If 30 miles probably too far. Have to be of similar habitat.
 - Paul E-3.2 system-wide, nine or fewer sites (in the end or to start with?)
 - Ed-That is one that we flagged. Ambiguous in the EO.
 - Frank-needs to be resolved. Before the site proposals start coming in we need to clarify that. We could be looking at more site proposals but there is a limit of 9 or less.
 - John-problems with 3.1-1, 4/5, 3.2-2 and 3.
 - Robin-can't imagine asking to give a proposal that we wouldn't know what habitat is in the area and if they have information about things like dredge spoils. Flag that would be concerned to remove those things.

BREAK

4.) Continue discussion of proposal documents

- **Criteria** discussion continued
- Frank-need to look at documents in a way if have strong disagreement, need to highlight and try to resolve. If can't, one option is to highlight area of disagreement and can bring up at OPAC or we can vote. Prefer not to vote but if group wants to.
- Dave-the 9 or fewer, unclear if more than 9 could be recommended. Looks like 9 also applies to the proposals to the Governor. 9 is maximum of what is moved forward. See item 3 b of the EO.

- Jim-OPAC could recommend the 9 best sites in terms of coarse review but could include all those that move forward and if the legislature wants to take a different one...
- Ed-the OPAC recommendation isn't to the legislature, it is to the Governors office. If OPAC can come to terms with 9 or fewer but potential others as replacements.
- Paul-In terms of the EO, 3d-to allow scientific evaluation of ecological benefits, want to be able to use the STAC S&S guidelines.
- Dave-size criterion on item 2 in a general way. Intention is working with communities; help bring in information to make determinations of appropriate size.
- Jim G-If don't do a vote, would like Jane to poll us about how we feel about the criteria and record that and transmit that and with the concerns noted are so they are brought up tomorrow.
- Paul E-look at size and spacing, see final STAC memo
 - Cristen-more than just the memo.
 - Paul E-just don't want to lose it. If need to allow for evaluation of ecological benefits.
 - Ed-from my perspective, for coarse review, don't have final clarity on what they are summarizing from the workshop. 2 relates to size and spacing, this idea of being able to evaluate ecological benefits, not just S&S, far more to it. STAC folks I've talked to, very reluctant to provide criteria that would be on/off. Risk continuum, the smaller you get the fewer home ranges going to capture, the larger the more. Reluctance to get to on/off switches. Fine with getting the final recommendations to the public.
 - Paul E-when I went to speak with Depoe Bay, you are a little premature, you need to look at what comes out with the S&S
 - Jim G-okay with verbal commitment that will take recommendations from STAC into consideration as it becomes available. If can tell us you will be using that, it's okay.
 - Ed-will come out in the agency review
 - Dave-will also be used in the outreach process as well-very important
 - Robin-the social and economic study needs to be referenced as well. Like idea to use results of both of those in the outreach process, as soon as it is done get it out. Eventually will use those and more on the fine screen when evaluate the sites overall
 - Paul K-S&S, having hard/fast criteria would take certain opportunities off the table. May have a proposal that may not meet those but many of the others and have the support of a local group.
- Jim-is the intention, or have you thought about the rating process for proposals? Will each get a 1-5 rating and add them up. Any thoughts on that?
- Dave-what we have so far doesn't address details of the coarse review process. Something for future meetings.

- **Proposal form review:** (*Draft Proposal Form for Sites for Further Evaluation* handout-draft considered at OPAC meeting available online at: www.oregon.gov/LCD/OPAC/docs/meetings/Distributed_Materials_May_2008.pdf).
- 1.) Where is located? Boundaries?
 - Need to specify the standardized maps. Need to provide lat/long as well
- 2.) Size, location, characteristics of the site.
 - Size isn't the only consideration, up to the community group to come up with that description. Important part of the outreach.
- 3.) Document habitats at the site
 - Collapsed the relief, took out the relief factor. Did reword some things like the kelp for clarification.
- 4.) Animal and plant species known to exist at the site?
- 5.) Enforcement of future regulations.
- 6.) How avoid significant effects.
 - Mostly from experiential knowledge. Estimate of the effects of any potential future designation
 - Jim-seems to be connected to number 2
 - Redundancy. Change 2 to ecological benefits. 5 has the same stuff. Make sure worded consistent with the EO.
- 7.) Gets at community support. Ask to list who is involved in the proposal process. Collaborative process.
 - Paul-Maybe doesn't need names
 - Allows them latitude to put what people want (and/or)
- 8.) List research potential opportunities. Including wording about being collaborative with fishing communities.
 - John-What you think would be potential.
 - Cristen-this includes opportunities for collaborative research.
 - Jim-including potential for cooperative and collaborative research. I would hope that in the future, groups adopt MR to help with research, cooperative enforcement etc. Get people thinking in that direction.
 - Ed-we use enforcement a lot, I use that generically to indicate compliance. If other folks aren't viewing that as voluntary compliance. More outreach. If that isn't shared, we should build that in. Accentuate voluntary compliance.
 - Change 6 to "how was enforcement/compliance considered in the design of this site." Or compliance/enforcement.
 - Parallel change in the criteria. Include compliance
- 9.) Comparison areas.
 - Change from can. Change to "is there an area? If so, what are they?"
- 10) Additional characteristics
 - Paul K-what about federal waters? If adjacent.
 - Any marine area adjacent to the site would fall in there. Good thing to put as an example, federal protections.
 - Fishery regulations

- Place based protected areas?
 - Paul E-an example, species in our nearshore but also in Heceta Banks RCA.
- What recreational non-fishing uses exist on or adjacent to the site?
- Dave-that isn't in 10, that gets to socioeconomic impacts. Old number 6.
- Jim-where do we talk about oceanographic characteristics?
- Cristen-special natural features (part of outreach).
- 11.) Potential Economic Development Opportunities (another part of the EO). Allow communities to have some opportunity for other types of economic development to come. That opportunity doesn't have to be tied to the MR.
 - Robin-"if" money is made available not "was"
 - Jim-why just coastal communities. Businesses might be involved. For anyone that is submitting a proposal.
 - EO-could interpret (3d) as anyone nominating a particular area, if coastal communities. Specifically brought up to encourage and reward communities to step up and take initiative.
 - Is it optional?
 - The form shall address...potential economic development opportunities
 - So could be optional as long as form addresses
 - Potential economic development opportunities
 - Then add coastal to the bottom part
- 12.) Describe other reasons site warrants consideration. Open ended if there is something else for you to say.
- 13.) Another catch all-any other information but also opening for if someone going to propose more than one site.
- **Discussion**
 - John-need to add Oregon.
 - Will be a cover sheet that has contact information.
 - Paul E-will there be websites etc. Cristen-will have a cover letter. Dave-the outreach in June will launch the process, where this info will be brought out in detail.
 - Thumbs up/down neutral/fist to five to get a sense of the group
 - Assume all the small changes will be incorporated.
 - Frank-Consensus with the changes noted? Flagging concerns. Approval to forward to OPAC as discussed?
 - Jim-Recommend for consideration for approval

5.) Marine reserves guidance document

- The document was reviewed and edited on-screen. Therefore, the note-taker was otherwise engaged. A copy of the document (as edited during this meeting) is available online at:
http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OPAC/docs/meetings/Distributed_Materials_May_2008.pdf
- The edited version (that was modified by OPAC the following day) will also be available on the OPAC website under the MRWG meeting page:

http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OPAC/workinggroups.shtml#Marine_Reserves_Working_Group

6.) Next steps and proposed date for next MRWG meeting

- Next MRWG will be June 20th in Salem (location TBD)

7.) ADJOURN