

August 6, 2010

Chris Hartzell  
PO Box 223174  
Carmel, CA 93922  
(831) 375-9533

Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary

Dear Superintendent Brown:

I am writing in regards to continued Great White Shark research being done by MarineCSI and Dr. Domeier. Additionally, this letter doubles as a petition and the names at the end have reviewed this letter and support its overall intent.

First let me educate you on my background.

I am currently a Fire Captain with 20 years of service with the Fire Department, 7 years with Sheriffs Search and Rescue, and 9 years as a 9-1-1 Dispatcher. How does this background pertain to this issue? I am well trained and experienced in all types of equipment use, cause and effect damage, information analysis, resource management, and most importantly risk vs. gain assessment.

I am currently the Vice President of the Monterey Audubon Society with 29 years of experience in nature and conservation issues.

Prior to my Fire Service career, my educational focus was marine biology with a focus on whales, sharks, and birds. One of my specialties was the Great White Shark. This educational focus started at 9 years old and by the age of 16 I was writing college level papers on the Great White Shark and even was invited to teach the shark portion of my high school biology class at age 17. Additionally I became a SCUBA diver at 16 and have been diving with Great Whites at the Farallones, Guadalupe Islands, and off South Africa. I am fully knowledgeable in both the biology of the Great White Shark and also have first hand experience with their behavior.

In High School I was president of the Wilderness Club and in 1988 lead a public campaign against offshore oil drilling resulting in 50,000 postcards and over 100,000 signed letters sent to state and federal politicians. Our group was quoted at that time as, "the largest public movement against offshore oil drilling in California". This added to my knowledge in controversial conservation issues.

At 15 years old I had put in over 150 hours of volunteering as an unofficial docent with Pt Lobos State Reserve, educating the public on numerous aspects of marine biology and regional conservation. At 16 I was in the second course offered for Monterey Bay Aquarium volunteer guides and after 3 years of service and over 300 hours, I was the youngest volunteer guide the Aquarium had. Both of these endeavors have made me knowledgeable in marine biology and public education and interpretation of marine biology to the public.

I have been doing photography since 10 years of age, and now as a hobby, travel the world to photograph and video wildlife and ecology and make educational travel movies. In an effort to aid my travels financially I have begun using my photography and videos to search for financial assistance with my travels. So I am also experienced with both movie making and how to promote and get corporate media attention and have a basic understanding of how the TV world operates.

Lastly,

I have not only seen the entire National Geographic series involving this research, but was present at the Farallones for one of the captures.

It is my educated and experienced opinion that continued research on Great White Sharks using Marine CSI and Dr. Domeier's technique be halted until the project has a full and un-biased evaluation and further data collection using other proven safe methods have been exhausted. I would like to validate my opinion with the following points:

Based on my research and the information provided in the TV series, Dr. Domeier reports the main goal of his research he has stated is to determine breeding grounds and foraging areas. His form of capture involves 3 major tangible forms of data to determine this; 1) Tagging, 2) Blood work, 3) Sperm sampling.

1) The tags.

There are essentially 3 types of effective tagging processes used for sharks; acoustic, pop-off tracking, and Dr. Domeier's Satellite SPOT tags.

Acoustic are the most widely used but are limited to the acoustic receiver's placement. They are most reliable for tracking long term movement of animals. They allow the shark to be tagged while in the water and do not impair with its natural behavior or biological functions. They can be removed from the shark, depending on the type, by pulling it clean out with a minimal wound or clipping the tag off while the shark is still in the water and have a long history of documenting no harmful effects long term.

Pop-off tracking tags are considered the most valuable. Tracking location, movement, depth, and water temperature among other things. They are limited by their life-span of 12-14 months based on current technology. They are placed in the same way as acoustic tags and pop off after time allowing the biodegradable holding wire to dissolve in the shark without effects. They have been in use for many years on numerous different types of sea and land creatures with nothing but positive results and no notable harmful effects long term.

The SPOT satellite tags are good for at least 2 years and up to 6 years but only provide locational data when the shark breaks the surface of the water and very limited water temperature data. They are permanently mounted on the shark for its entire life. They are bolted onto the fin through both sides as tight as possible using permanent bolts. There is no torque setting used for application. There is no data on the effects of this type of tight attachment over time. There is no data capable of being acquired to test such effects on social behavior or biological impacts on the fin or rest of the shark. The only way they can be applied or removed is by fully capturing and incapacitating the shark. Additionally, Dr. Domeier has reported that as high as a 25% failure rate for these tags. Considering the importance and the effort for placing these tags, this failure rate is unacceptable.

Risk Assessment: with other tags available, the satellite tags provide the least amount of data for the most invasive method.

2) Blood work.

Blood work is attained to determine many things. However, Dr. Domeier has stated his main purpose for the blood work is to determine pregnancy. Blood work can be gathered in two ways, from dead specimens and live. To gather from a live specimen for accurate testing, the blood must be drawn direct from the body and cannot be taken from a piece of flesh separated from the body. Therefore, the only way to collect the needed specimen is to capture and incapacitate a live shark. To determine pregnancy, it should be collected from a live specimen and tested in a short time frame. Dr. Domeier is doing this with his live captures. The problem comes with determining pregnancy. As far as my research has concluded, there are no known accurate and verifiable biological markers for determining pregnancy with a Great White Shark's blood, live or dead. Therefore, the samples he is collecting, although possibly providing some value in other areas, are impossible to determine pregnancy unless confirmed with killing the specimen afterwards and checking for pregnancy. With the known information on Great Whites, from my research, we are not at a place where we can test live blood for pregnancy and reliably trust its accuracy until further dead specimens are tested and validated.

Risk Assessment: Until further testing is done by other means, the collection of blood from a live specimen provides minimal new data in comparison to the potential harm due to capture.

3) Sperm sampling.

Dr. Domeier has stated the intent on sperm sampling is to determine if male Great Whites are ready to mate and therefore establish a mating ground resulting in potentially determining breeding grounds. Similar to blood work, sperm sampling is done to determine readiness to mate. It can be collected from either dead or live specimens, but only live specimens provide accurate immediate data on the timeframe for availability to mate. The only way to retrieve valuable sperm data is collecting from a live animal that must be captured and incapacitated. The sperm sample can be immediately tested and provides accurate results and data. However, it has been shown through historical research data, that in order to use sperm sampling as an accurate means to readiness to mate, a large number of specimens must be sampled. The error factor for random fertility is too high to rely solely on just a few specimens. Example: approximately a quarter of live Sea Turtles sampled have shown readiness to mate

when they are not in their mating grounds, in some fish its as high as half and other fish its as low as 5%. In some land animals there is an even higher difference and in whales it can range from 5% to over half even within the same species in different geographic regions. All of this testing has resulted in other means to validate the data such as actually observing mating in correlation to the data collection. Because we have extremely little data on these rates for sharks in general, let alone Great Whites, there is no evidence to support that sperm sampling accurately shows a shark is within its mating grounds.

Risk Assessment: Without other shark data or a collection of accurate data from a large number of specimens, the results of the accuracy of analyzing sperm samples in correlation to determining mating grounds does not warrant the potential harm due to capture.

There are additional factors that need to be seriously considered that are influential in this type of capture process:

#### I. Lifting technique.

Most sea animals, including other sharks and whales, are usually sling loaded rather than laid flat on a surface. There has not been enough conclusive research on the effects of a sea creature feeling the full force of gravity when brought out of the water, but there is enough concern in the scientific community that all major facilities and researchers, such as aquariums and show parks, feel that sling loading to support the creature's weight is warranted, regardless of the size of the animal. Dr. Domeier's exact words in one interview are, "We know that whales can sometimes incur internal injury when they get stranded on the beach, so this issue was a concern". In human beings the effects of lying down are even validated with written documentation that when a human is in stress or medical compromise, they are laid on the left lateral recumbent position to minimize gravitational effects on internal organs. If this is a standard recognized in humans on land, it must be said there are effects on a 2000 lb sea creature taken from no gravity to full gravity. Dr. Domeier has countered with, "Orcas at Seaworld haul themselves out of the water on a daily basis". This is a shocking statement coming from a well educated marine biologist. Whales are mammals with completely different muscle, skeletal, and organ differences. An Orca can haul itself out of the water in the wild and then lurch back down a beach into the water. A shark will get stranded and die in as little as 6 inches of water. This comparison is apples to oranges. Another quote from Dr. Domeier states, "We could run into problems if we captured a female with a late-term pregnancy, but we target females at sites and times when they are not pregnant". This statement raises concerns since it is contradictory to his previous statements for the main objective of his research. The question rises; why is he drawing blood work to determine pregnancy if he can visually tell if a female is pregnant. If he can't tell visually, then how does he know what sharks not to target.

Risk Assessment: There is not substantial data to be conclusive about the true effects of full gravity on large sea animals. However, there is enough data and concern by commercial and research facilities worldwide that other creatures both smaller and larger than Great Whites are sling loaded. Additionally, the threat to a pregnant female is considerable. The gain of the data collected does not outweigh the potential risk to the animal using the platform lifting technique.

#### II. Capturing technique.

In order to capture a Great White alive and release alive, it must be hooked, fought to exhaustion, and then brought into full gravity, before being released. It is well documented that the lactic acid in muscle buildup due to excessive exertion can be a detrimental factor in the health of a creature. Humans feel this, land animals feel it, whales feel it, fish feel it, and so do sharks. A 2000 lb animal which has less than a 50% hit to kill ratio to sustain food on average of every 2 weeks would be put at great risk by being drawn down to full exhaustion due to excessive exertion and results in a high risk to the health effect on the animal both short term and long term. This is now being documented in numerous sport fishing articles concerning the long term effects they are seeing with catch and release. One article written by the Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries states in summary:

Although most studies of post-release mortality in fishes have focused on survival of individuals, catch and release may have sublethal population level consequences, which are more difficult to assess, particularly for highly migratory species with poorly understood life histories...(break)...researchers may

begin to investigate the extent to which catch and release reduces individual fitness and, thereby, has population impacts in sharks, tunas and marlins.

Additionally, the use of a bait and hook technique is highly risky in assuring no damage to an animal. This was already seen by one of his captures where the shark swallowed the bait and was hooked inside the stomach and also swallowed a buoy. Blood was seen coming from the anus and a member of the crew was seen shoving his boot inside the gills to kick the buoy out of the throat. The hook was cut and a large portion of the hook was left inside the shark. Although Dr. Domeier reports data from the shark, it is generally understood in the fishing world that when a fish is hooked in the gut serious enough to cause blood from the anus, its chances of survival long term are low. Even if it survives, the long term affects are unknown. Bass fishing is one of the biggest fishing sports in the world with some of the most research done. Doug Hannon, "The Bass Professor", wrote on the subject of a gut hooked fish and what happens to the hook and how long it takes to dissolve in the system:

When you gut hook a fish, the point of the hook will, on occasion, exit the stomach and puncture a vital organ. At this point there is nothing you can do. This is when they move down the food chain and become the eaten and not the eater. Also, besides a fatal gut hook, you can hook them in the tongue.

The tongue is where all the gills meet bringing all the blood to this one central intersection. If you poke them too deep or rip the tongue, they'll bleed out and again there's not much you can do to save them.

There have been numerous studies done on sharks that were found to have hooks still embedded in them. In their throats and intestines, among other places. These areas with the hooks showed lesions, tumors, and infections as well as damage to the organs such as gills and esophagus. Studies with other shark species showed chronic systemic disease in stomachs with hook retention. It should also be included in the assessment, the potential damage to the jaws. It has been extensively witnessed that other, smaller species have shown jaw displacement and permanent jaw damage due to thrashing against a taught line. If this is occurring in smaller species, it can be assumed the damage from an animal weighing as much as 2500 lbs could cause significant damage to the jaw structure. The jaws of the Great White Shark are not physiologically designed to support the shark's full force of yanking against a taught line in a sideways manner. In smaller species sharks are still able to feed due to their prey not being as aggressive or elusive. But in a Great White Shark, its jaw structure is critical to its survival. A Great White Shark needs full jaw force and alignment to be able to effectively attack and disable a fast moving prey that could weigh as much as 800 lbs. What adds further to this whole argument is the potential for the animal getting wrapped up in the line. This was clearly shown in one episode and was shown almost happened an additional two times. During the one incident, the shark was immobilized and flipped upside down motionless for what was seen as a couple of minutes, and that was with the aired footage after editing.

Risk Assessment: There is not substantial data to be conclusive about the long term effects of catch and release on large pelagic sea animals. However, there is enough data and research that has warranted serious concerns. When "fishing", there is substantial risk for the fish to swallow the hook, get hooked in the gills, or even the eye. Additional risk of getting caught up in the line are significant. The gain of the data collection does not outweigh the potential risk to the health of the specimen using the catch and release technique.

### III. Population effects.

In the mid 1980's there were numerous scientists and researchers who projected, "probably close to 2,000 Great White Sharks at any given time off the California coast" as stated in one document. Other document projections were similar but most said there were at least 1,000. Today, with further data, we know it is considerably less. With less than 300 individuals documented in all of California's Red Triangle and less than 300 documented off Mexico, although not fully accurate, it can generally be said there are less than 1,000 individuals off the entire western U.S. coast and Mexico. Because of a lack of data on the Great White in general, it is too difficult to tell if we may even be re-counting the same population in different areas. With relatively new data showing that an adult Great White traveled as far as from Australia to South Africa in just a few months, this further supports that there may not be isolated populations but rather a mix of stationary and migrating populations. Great Whites have been known to "disappear" for up to 6 months. Based on the Australia/South Africa data being a few months, it could be said it is possible and realistic that the Guadalupe population contains sharks from other world populations. If one can travel

from Australia to SA in a few months, then one could conceivably travel from Guadalupe to Australia in 6 months. This would further diminish the overall population count of the species. With reproduction rates low in survivability as well as the time from birthing to maturity being counted in years rather than months, it can easily be determined that the growth of the Great White Shark population is slow and sensitive, even under the best conditions on this planet. With shark finning on the increase as well as poaching, any decrease in breeding population, by even a small percentage, could be disastrous long term. This is further worsened if the actual population is less than estimated. The Guadalupe Islands have less than 250 individuals recorded. Of those, only approximately 50 individuals are larger more mature sharks. Dr. Domeier is interested in only capturing mature sharks. Therefore, with a permit for 18 sharks, he is essentially interested in capturing almost half of the sexually mature population in Guadalupe. If he were to have just 1 shark die or become socially damaged due to the research, it would have a profound effect on the breeding population. 2 or more could be disastrous. These are similar arguments for the Farallon population. If it ever was determined the sharks at Guadalupe are truly a mixing population from other populations in the world, this would be even further damaging. Once again quoting Bass Fishermen:

The genes from big fish produce more big fish. By cutting off one of the branches of the family tree, it leaves a void in the reproduction cycle, reducing the overall big fish population.

Risk Assessment: The Great White Shark population is too unknown and too sensitive to lose even a small percentage of sexually mature animals. The gain of the data collection does not outweigh the potential risk to the potential affects on the overall population.

#### IV. Protection

Dr. Domeier has stated the primary purpose for the long term tracking is to establish breeding grounds to provide protection for the species. Realistically, this is essentially not needed and even if done would simply be a cosmetic political maneuver. If you look at all current waters where both Great Whites and other sharks frequent, whether breeding grounds or not, there are 3 types of areas broken down; 1) those, like the Farallones, that offer full protection for sharks, 2) those areas subject to poaching, 3) those areas, like Japan, that essentially provide no protection regardless of data.

The oceans of the world have well established boundaries that are essentially as firm and hardened as land's country lines. Countries who have endeavored to protect species have already placed protection around their waters. Countries who do not recognize protection, regardless of what data about breeding grounds or populations, have refused to place protection. These countries have been provided numerous reasons and scientific data and still have not either placed protection or placed paper protection for political appeasement without any effort of enforcement. Poachers do not recognize any data or legal protection and frequent all waters, even those that are enforced. There are claims that Great Whites could be breeding off the waters of Japan. If Japan has refused protection for whales off its coast even with global pressure, then it can be assumed they would refuse protection for Great Whites even if it was proven to have breeding grounds. If breeding grounds were to be found, it would not affect any new protections. If the breeding grounds were found to be Guadalupe, Mexico already has protection and it would not change anything. Likewise for the Farallones as the regulations of the Marine Sanctuary are already extremely strict. If breeding grounds were found off Japan, the chance of them establishing new protection would be hollow as they would not provide any enforcement to truly protect those grounds. If the travel routes to and from these breeding grounds was determined, there would be no protection offered as it would be in international waters and in fact would provide poachers with a targeted area where they know enforcement would be almost nothing.

Risk Assessment: The establishing of breeding grounds is purely academic. It would not change the level of protection already offered the Great White Shark. Therefore, the gain of any collection of data to prove breeding grounds does not outweigh the risk to the potential affects on individual sharks or the species.

#### V. The researchers

Chris Fischer is a board member of The Billfish Foundation and the executive producer of the Expedition Great White TV series. He is noted as an "Expert Angler". Essentially, he is a fisherman. His background

revolves around fishing. In the early 2000's his show "Outdoor Adventures" was geared on the fishing adventure. In the Great White series he is seen several times talking about fishing and the aspect of fishing for a Great White. The series shows him on several occasions excited about the catch more than what they are doing. On several occasions he is heard saying how anglers dream about catching fish this big and how bad he wants to catch the biggest fish. To validate my claim, it should be investigated into the stories that upon catching one of the big sharks, he submitted a picture to the International Game Fish Association for the purposes of establishing the largest record of a catch and release fish. In one interview prior to the airing of the show, when they talked about this same technique wishing to be used on Whale Sharks, he was quoted, "I just want to catch a Whale Shark, that would be amazing". He is a fisherman with a desire to catch a big fish. Is there anything wrong with this? Absolutely not. I want to make clear I do not fault Chris Fischer with being a fisherman with aspirations to catch big fish. The problem lies that it is coinciding with science that should be focused on the research, not the catch, and is coupled with a sensitive species. The further enhancing of this by airing it on a TV reality show further colors the objectiveness that research needs to take to be truly valuable. Science can be exciting, especially science with a Great White Shark. But Fischer's background brings doubt to whether in that excitement of the moment he is thinking more about the study and the health of the animal, than the catch.

Dr. Michael Domeier has a Ph.D in Marine Biology and is well recognized for his tagging technology as well as his knowledge about Great White Sharks. However, based on extensive documents and many of his own statements both in his writings and in interviews, he seems more focused on testing his tagging technology on the sharks and being the first to discover new data more than really caring about the sharks. I do not know him personally and will not judge his true intentions or character as such, but the fact that there are numerous complaints about him withholding data and even some accusations that he is more interested in using the data to further his own personal endeavors rather than truly and freely provide new data to the global scientific community, further casts doubt to the value of the data collected and his true objective view of safety for the animals. Otherwise, as a scientist, he would have been concluding these same risk assessments rather than relying on others to provide it to you right now.

Risk Assessment: There is too much controversy involved to trust that; coupled with a fisherman and TV reality show, Dr. Domeier's research is critical enough at this time to save the species and his data collected in this manner benefits the species more than the risk of harming it. Once again, the data collection does not outweigh the potential risk to the affects on the overall population.

## VI. Effects of media on research

It is becoming more and more apparent on TV today the rising battle of ratings. These ratings are based upon the viewing population's increase in "office water cooler talk" about the drama of a show. Shows are continually now trying to outdo each other in drama to the point much of this drama is reported to be staged at times or even instigated by producers. Steve Irwin, The Crocodile Hunter, began a trend showing the excitement and drama of extreme measures for conservation. He did wonders for conservation and he always performed in a manner that balanced drama with animal safety. But following in his foot steps has begun a slew of shows attempting to ride the coattails of his success and has created an arms race for the most dramatic shows on TV. Shows like Hooked and Brady Barr's Dangerous Encounters are among many that are over-sensationalizing the dangers of animals. Brady Barr was recently portrayed as diving in clothes with a live Tiger Shark, when it was clearly visible upon review that the shark was hanging by the tail on a rope suspended under the boat, probably dead. Chris Fischer is known for his exciting TV shows and it is even stated on his own website, "...is a leading outdoor-oriented television content provider". He additionally advertises, "Fischer Productions continues to offer viewers adventure and conservation minded programming that is young, entertaining, and most of all, authentic by teaming up with the National Geographic Channel".

This TV influence can further be demonstrated by the presence of Paul Walker as a crew member. Paul Walker, a well known actor from hit movies such as the Fast and Furious movies and Into the Blue with Jessica Alba, somehow managed to get on and be assigned as a crew member doing tasks that most people have to work for years on a ship before being allowed to perform. On DirecTV, hitting info on one of the first episodes stated, "Actor Paul Walker helps crews wrangle a giant Great White Shark".

The trend is especially evident when you examine what footage is being sold to TV producers. I myself have been told specifically, “You have great work, but it’s just not action packed enough”. I have friends who have large amounts of footage in high demand by numerous companies that have been told the same thing. In one example, a friend had extensive footage on sharks, but was told the company wasn’t interested because, “There isn’t enough aggressive behavior exhibited by the sharks...we need to see them attacking”.

All of this can be seen in Dr. Domeier’s show produced by Fischer Productions. Dramatic angles, repeating shots, out of proportion statements about the dangers, over-exaggerating typical ocean going problems, and even the advertisement in the show has proven this show was clearly involved in the TV Reality Show arms race. Most likely, this was not Dr. Domeier’s intention but the result of the show’s producers and editors. Speaking from experience, when visualizing the overall show, the desire to acquire footage to bring imagination to life sometimes pushes the boundaries of both safety and good ethics. It is attempted sometimes to extremes and at the cost of the subjects. There is no way that you can watch the show and see the drama occurring and not be convinced that the cameras rolling in Dr. Domeier’s face didn’t effect is objectiveness. Effective research is done without the influence of media upon the technique. In this case, after watching the show, it is just too obvious that the media format present absolutely influenced everyone’s decision making greatly, if not consciously, then subconsciously.

My wife and I have been all over the world and participated in numerous conservation issues as well as created our own movies. There are those scientific research projects that can be exciting and sometimes dangerous, but to create a full blown reality show on the research of Great White Sharks that competes with the likes of Deadliest Catch or MTV Real World just cannot be done without the filmmaking participating in the scripting of the research and compromising the neutrality of the researchers.

What should be of additional concern is the precedence set. If TV producers see success in this, it could spawn a movement to follow lead. Even if the council does not approve future permits, TV producers could travel to more lenient countries to acquire permitting to make similar shows and shark populations would become the newest targets for sensationalized conservation reality shows.

Risk Assessment: The impact of creating a reality show on the objectiveness of the researchers creates an environment prone to biased decision making. When dealing with a creature as unknown and a population as sensitive as the Great White Shark, it is imperative that researchers maintain a clear, unbiased, and focused perspective on the research and not the filming. When the shark is out of the water, helpless, and stressed, the researchers must maintain being the animals advocate for its health. The presence of filming a reality show has too much effect on the researcher’s and jeopardizes the safety of the animals by compromising that advocacy.

In summary;

It is imperative for the survival of the species that further data about the Great White Shark’s behavior and biology is gathered. However, the sensitivity of the species demands proper risk vs. gain analysis. The desire to obtain new information must not outweigh the care of the animals. I am in full support of research, even intrusive, as long as it is done based on the gains far outweighing any risks involved. The species is recognized as threatened, but it is not so threatened that it is time to go to extremes to save it, even compromising its existence just to save it. Technology is advancing at incredible speed and the technology to gather the needed data without risking the safety of even a single animal is within reach before the species becomes extinct. Therefore, as a scientific community we should truly explore all other means first before resorting to potentially harmful research techniques. I have substantially validated my reasoning for being against Dr. Domeier’s continued research method and hope you will listen to all the facts presented to you today with both my letter and others, to do your own risk vs. gain analysis.

I support the collection of data and even experimental research to help maintain the species. Dr. Domeier has been successful in tagging over a dozen sharks and is receiving data on many of those animals. This is more than enough individuals to gather data off of for now. After a couple of years when data has been collected, technology advances have taken place, and other study means have been further expired, it may be needed that Dr. Domeier’s capture technique is needed to collect further critical data that could possibly save the species. But right now, he has enough successful individuals to gather data off of.

I urge Dr. Domeier to continue his efforts to gather data through other less intrusive means. But I urge you to suspend Dr. Domeier's permit for his current techniques. I believe you will come to the same conclusion as I have. Thank you for your time.

-Chris Hartzell

Due to the short timeframe of being aware of this hearing, some of the people below were not able to provide actual signatures but have provided full electronic signatures as copied below. The following people have reviewed this letter and although some may be unfamiliar with the details provided, all those named below support the intent of this letter to suspend ongoing research using Marine CSI and Dr. Domeier's techniques. It should be noted that this letter/petition was submitted and responded to in only 3 days. Based on the percentage of replies and support, it would be safe to say, given 30 days posting, the number of people in support would be significantly higher, showing a larger public opposition group than those attending this meeting today.

*(Names withheld from public posting for purposes of privacy. All names available upon review of GFNMS public documents)*