

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY  
ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**FINAL  
Meeting Minutes – June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2001  
Moss Landing Marine Laboratories  
8272 Moss Landing Road  
Moss Landing, CA 95039**

The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Advisory Council met on Friday, June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2001, at the Moss Landing Marine Labs, Moss Landing, California. Public categories and government agencies were present as indicated:

Agriculture: Richard Nutter	CA State Parks: Bill Berry
AMBAG: Stephanie Harlan	Conservation: Vicki Nichols
At Large: Ron Massengill	Diving: David Clayton
At Large: Jenna Kinghorn - ABSENT	Education: Pat Clark-Gray
At Large: Deborah Streeter	Fishing: Thomas Canale
Business & Industry: Dave Ebert	Ports & Harbors: James Stilwell
CA Coastal Commission: Tami Grove – ABSENT	Recreation: Dan Haifley
CA Dept. of Fish and Game: <i>awaiting appointment</i>	Research: Chris Harrold
CA EPA: Craig J. Wilson	Tourism: Burke Pease
CA Resources Agency: Brian Baird	U.S. Coast Guard: LT Tom Stuhldreier

The following non-voting members were present as indicated:

Channel Islands NMS: LCDR Matt Pickett - ABSENT  
Gulf of the Farallones NMS and Cordell Bank NMS: Ed Ueber - ABSENT  
Elkhorn Slough NERR: Becky Christensen  
Monterey Bay NMS: William J. Douros

Alternates present:

Ruth Vreeland, AMBAG  
Lynn Rhodes, CA State Parks  
Harriet Mitteldorf, At Large  
Dave Danbom, Fishing  
Kaitilin Gaffney, Conservation

**I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 6<sup>th</sup>, 2001 DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

A) Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Stephanie Harlan, at 9.10 a.m. Dan Haifley conducted the roll call, a quorum was present.

B) Approval of Meeting Minutes

**MOTION: (Passed)**

**The SAC unanimously adopted the minutes from the April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2001 Sanctuary Advisory Council meeting, with the following changes.**

- Page 10 - correct “Kate Wayne” to “Kate Wing”
- Name the 4 groups that submitted letters - SOS, CMC, WWF and NRDC.

- Add Vicki’s statement “The 4 conservation groups - SOS, CMC, WWF and NRDC commented that there should be a fair and balanced process regarding the marine reserves issue.”
- Page 3 - correct, “Dan suggested” to “Dan stated that the minutes should be taken by a court reporter.”

Motion introduced by Dan Haifley, seconded by Deborah Streeter  
 Vote: 17 in favor, 0 opposed (unanimous)

B) Approval of SAC Annual Report

**Chris Harrold** - expressed approval for the current process of compiling information for the annual report.

**Pat Clark-Gray** - concurred with Chris.

**Stephanie Harlan** - commented that for next year’s annual report we should start earlier, and she would be happy to work with the chairs of the working group to develop a draft. She would then pass it on to the SAC and staff for revisions and comments.

**Dave Clayton** - responded that we are not following our protocols, but that he is willing to follow the procedures that Stephanie has outlined.

**No Action (unanimous agreement):**

C) COUNCIL MEMBER & STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Stephanie Harlan** – a photo of the Big Sur coast and card is being circulated to sign and send to Brady Phillips. She received a letter to Tom Capos from Gayle Norton, the Secretary of Interior, regarding the national monument. He welcomes thoughts on the Secretary’s views on the traditional and multiple uses, areas to conserve, etc.

**Brian Baird** – Mary Nichols of the State Resources Agency was asked to comment on that designation, and the Department of Fish and Game was involved in specific aspects related to the monuments.

**Pat Clark-Gray** - an interpretive sign is being developed by state parks that show the boundaries. She passed a draft graphic around to SAC members.

**Bill Douros** – alerted people that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) staff want to help with staff recruitment, they are looking for an office in Monterey, and would like to be close the Sanctuary office if possible. He also asked for input regarding the new web-based SAC meeting material distribution.

**Stephanie Harlan** - she had a little trouble initially, but then had an expert update her Acrobat 5 software, and walk her through the process.

**Chris Harrold** - expressed overall approval for the new strategy, and had trouble downloading one document (the Chairs-Coordinators Workshop Report).

**Bill Douros** - we can add follow-up pieces to the agenda after the SAC meeting.

**Deborah Streeter** - suggestions on what to print out would be helpful to her. She requested that we don’t use acronyms in the SAC or working group notes/minutes.

**Chris Harrold** - are the download designation documents available?

**Bill Douros** – you will be getting those today during the Management Plan Review update.

**Deborah Streeter** - is now able to refer people to the website.

**Ron Massengill** - please restrict documents to download size. He deposits all documents regarding SAC meetings at the Cambria public library.

**Dave Clayton** – have a header that tells us how many pages are contained in the document.

**Burke Pease** – you can also print out individual pages.

**Jim Stilwell** - we should let libraries know that this is available on the website.

**LT Tom Stuhreyer** – informed us of a Coast Guard meeting hosted by Carol Teraoka, the NOAA enforcement officer that is working with the Sanctuary. They had an outstanding array of stakeholders attending, from San Mateo to San Luis Obispo County.

**Steve Scheiblauber** – asked if the harbor patrols were involved?

**Jim Stilwell** – this is a sore point with harbors.

**LT Tom Stuhreyer** – we can make sure to include them next meeting.

**Chris Harrold** - Monterey Bay Aquarium has two new exhibits focusing on seahorse and tuna conservation. Project Seahorse highlights the conservation aspects.

**Vicki Nichols** – announced Save Our Shores Benefit Book Signing Cruise on the Princess of Whales out of Moss Landing, with celebrated author David Helving is coming up June 9th at 3:00 PM.

**Dave Ebert** – just returned from South Africa and a symposium on marine protected areas. He attended the IUCN meeting and the Shark Specialist Group.

**Brian Baird** – just finished the last of six public meetings on public shoreline erosion. Policy was developed in 1978, and involves how to utilize sediments for beach nourishment. The meetings had between 6-65 people in attendance.

**Ron Massengill** – gave a Cambria report – there are big changes with satellite office, as it is doing really well with outreach. He is focused on SAC concerns and getting the word out to people. Some local events include the annual awards for docents occurred, BeachCombers was kicked off in May, and Snapshot day in April. He is going to be available for public input on the first Tuesday of every month. Visitation to elephant seals is slower right now, population is at about 105,000. Memorial weekend saw about 30,000 visitors to the seals in one day,

**Vicki Nichols** – Wednesday's SeaWeb presentation in Santa Cruz went well.

**Chris Harrold** - sea otter census is occurring, press release on findings will be coming in the next two weeks. He will forward information on a book to Bill, for him to read, and see if we would like to purchase a copy. The book is by the Ocean Study Board. Let Karen know if you're interested.

**Jim Stilwell** – he noticed a new adhoc modeling group on page three of office report. He asked if the Army Corp of Engineers was involved.

**Brian Baird** – responded that the Corps was solicited about 5 years ago, and the ball got dropped.

**Jim Stilwell** - there are funds available to carry a study forward on erosion in Elkhorn Slough.

**Dave Clayton** – May 5<sup>th</sup> dive clean up. 80 people participated. Fuel tank, old bottles, black cod nets, car parts, and many other types of trash were removed. Karin Strasser-Kaufman, Steve Scheiblauber and Ruth Vreeland handed out prizes. Kelly Newton, from the Sanctuary, cataloged the items. Dive shops sponsored a barbeque. Next clean up dive is scheduled for September. There is the possibility of expansion to Cambria.

**Steve Scheiblauber** - the dive clean up could be done a number of times a year. Some of the stuff is new, and the pier is still being used to dump things over.

**Kaitilin Gaffney** – why can't there be barriers to stop people from dumping?

**Steve Scheiblauber** – we've looked at that, but the area is so used, that option in a problem.

**Thomas Canale** – fishing report – slow salmon fishing all the way from Point Reyes to Mexico. Regarding Wednesday's presentation about MLPA's, he asked why there wasn't a fisherman on the group. This is a large oversight on Cal Fish and Game. Monterey public meetings on MLPA will be at the end of July, or beginning of August. July 10<sup>th</sup> is in Half Moon Bay.

**Bill Douros** – there are two binders circulating; one for the SAC and one for the public. SAC alternate, Heidi Tiura reported seeing a North Pacific right whale in Monterey Bay on Tuesday. Last four sightings outside of Alaska, were in the Sanctuary. Sanctuary staff tried to locate the whale, but unfortunately, did not find the whale. Please call us if sighted. This is good news for right whales.

**Dave Ebert** - mentioned Henry Mollet's research project on whale shark sightings in the Monterey Bay area. Please keep an eye out for whale sharks also.

## **II. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

**Daniel Suman** – Associate Professor at University of Miami, Marine Policy and Affairs. His research project is comparing the state and federal public process; he is also looking at diving industry, the dry Tortuga MPA process, and is comparing the processes of SAC between Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. He stated the goals of the project, and that Sanctuaries have a lot in common. He is interviewing former SAC members and has completed a survey to SAC members. More than 60 MBNMS SAC members (current and past) have responded. He reviewed the results of the survey. Overall, there is strong correlation between the responses given by both SAC's. He will send us the final report when complete.

**Reed Addis** – staffer from Fred Keeley's office who presented a summary of the variety of policy issues that Keely is pursuing.

**Tom Canale** – expressed displeasure regarding the MLPA processes' exclusion of fisherman.

**Reed Addis** – will carry that message back to his office.

**Steve Scheiblaue** – the City of Monterey will be considering sending a letter to Farr’s office to request his presence in the Sanctuary’s management plan review process.

**Pat Clark-Gray** – regarding the May 17<sup>th</sup> Sanctuary Education Panel (SEP) at Garland Park, please change dates on meeting minutes to reflect the correct date.

**Vicki Nichols** – the Conservation Working Group (CWG) is expanding, having presentations on issues of interest, and extends an invitation to anyone to join their meetings.

**Jim Stillwell** – does the CWG support no trawling areas? Is that support for no fishing areas?

**Vicki Nichols** - no, we are simply listing that issue as one of many to address.

**Stephanie Harlan** – the Workshop report is posted on the website. In the NAPA report, the critical role of SAC is emphasized a number of times.

### **III. PRESENTATION: SEAWEB: PUBLIC SURVEY RESULTS ON OCEANS**

**Lisa Dropkin** – introduced the nonprofit, SeaWeb – they are based in DC, with a local office at Monterey Bay Aquarium. The focus is communications; media was the main target to carry the information and engage a dialogue with the public; SeaWeb then expanded to develop and implement a public opinion poll about marine protected areas. They are also launching the seafood consumption campaign.

Lisa gave an overview of the survey’s methodology, and their key research findings. They have found that most Americans have a fairly negative view of the overall health of the oceans, and nearly two-thirds believe that regulations protecting the oceans are too lax. She mentioned that the term “marine protected area” is confusing for everyone. She went on to detail the survey results, which can be found in the following report, SeaWeb: American Attitudes Toward MPA's - May 2001. The report is posted on our website at:

[http://www.mbnms.nos.noaa.gov/Intro/advisory/sac\\_agendas/2001SACagendas/060101agenda.html](http://www.mbnms.nos.noaa.gov/Intro/advisory/sac_agendas/2001SACagendas/060101agenda.html)

**Tom Canale** – personally finds this survey valueless.

**Chris Harrold** – how can we find out how the public thinks? Fishermen develop the survey? This is a statistically robust survey. I would love to hear from another survey,

**Lisa Dropkin** – validates Tom’s feelings. We needed to understand what the public could understand.

**Tom Canale** – has a problem with an opinion poll driving our policy making.

**Bill Douros** – we do not intend to recraft the management plan review based on this survey poll. This is a set of national results that we need to be attentive to. The purpose of this was simply to hear the results.

**Tom Canale** – a more useful tool would be developed by a large group of people.

**Jim Stilwell** – “leading marine scientists” – is included in the question – this is biased. Sure the poll has validity. But, it does not substitute for what I’ve said previously, that we need this information from our local area. Who is qualified as a “leading scientist”?

**Lisa Dropkin** – concurs with Jim that this poll cannot substitute for a local poll.

**Dan Haifley** - can we break out the responses between the coastal and non-coastal states?

**Lt. Tom Stuhleyer** – obviously people don't understand ocean issues, and appreciate its uses. That is apparent by the huge number of people indicated that selected marine transportation as a threat.

**Lisa Dropkin** – there is a difference between what are issues, and how are you going to make changes in your life? SAC members can help figure out how to make these decisions.

**Burke Pease** – it has value. SeaWeb has paid for it. It does not represent the statement of how the public feels – it is SeaWeb's poll.

**Deborah Streeter** – the public has a strong emotional connection to the ocean. We are not good at controlling those emotions. Let's cut ourselves some slack and recommit.

**Kathy Fosmark** – she expressed concern about the poll results. She felt the education process needs to provide more insights as to how uses of the ocean can be more healthy, but not eliminated.

**Steve Scheiblaue**r – the public needs more information; they may be ignorant on many coastal area issues. What people think is one thing – their actions may be different.

**Katilin Gaffney** – she has heard the presentation three times, and finds the poll interesting and valid. It's good to know where the public is at, whether or not we agree. It's good for the SAC to hear what the nation thinks – this is a national marine sanctuary. So understanding what the country thinks about ocean issues is important.

**Tom Canale** – three times may be a charm for him too – he retracted his statement that this is a valueless poll – and thinks that we do need to educate people more thoroughly and with good solid information.

#### **IV. PRESENTATION: MERITO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION PROGRAM**

Karen Grimmer presented this item. In March of this year, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary completed a new multicultural education plan, known as “MERITO” or Multicultural Education for Resource Issues Threatening Oceans. This initial component, (others are planned) is targeted to the largest and fastest growing constituency in the Sanctuary - local Hispanic communities. MERITO translates to “merit or worth” in Spanish.

The Sanctuary is not currently reaching the huge Hispanic population in the Central Coast. Hispanics represent 65% of the city of Salinas, 47% of Monterey County, and 32% of California's total population. Hispanic leaders of government agencies, chambers of commerce and industry (especially in agriculture and retail) are important constituencies for the Sanctuary to connect with on conservation and resource management issues. Through MERITO, we are developing relationships that provide an interchange of communication between the NMSS and its' Hispanic constituency.

Community-based planning is at the heart of this project. MBNMS is working closely with over twenty local partner agencies, schools and universities, nonprofits, inner-city community groups, and industry to develop sustainable projects that meet the needs of the community.

MERITO provides three main services:

1. Science-learning opportunities for Hispanic-serving teachers and Hispanic college students;
2. Support to state and federal agencies (Elkhorn Slough NERR and California State Parks) that manage sites of high visitation by Hispanic families and school students;

3. Support to Hispanic-serving youth leaders in integrating marine conservation issues into their community programs.

We are requesting that NOAA provide three new staff members; a program manager and two bilingual educators, as well as the program support needed for implementation. These strategies are dependent on collaborative efforts, and so time is of the essence. It is important to move now in order to utilize the great momentum that this project has generated.

The following benefits will result from full implementation of MERITO.

1. Enhanced awareness of marine and coastal conservation issues by Hispanic families, youth, and migrant workers.
2. Increased opportunities in science resulting in a larger pool of Hispanic professionals for NOAA.
3. Greater communication and interchange between the NMSS and Hispanic leaders in government and industry resulting in their expanded involvement in all aspects of Sanctuary management. The upcoming joint management plan review is one such example.
4. Greater collaboration by state and federal agencies to pool resources and increase the amount and effectiveness of outreach programs to Hispanic communities.
5. A suite of well-developed and tested bilingual education products that can be used by other national marine sanctuaries, and across the nation.
6. A model multicultural outreach program that can be adapted and utilized by other national marine sanctuaries.

**Deborah Streeter** - suggests that we look to the religious faith-based community. They can be excellent partners.

**Becky Christensen** – agrees that this project gets a lot of talk, but little action. It is mutually beneficial for ESNERR to partner with the Sanctuary and MERITO on the site-based component, as it puts a body to a project, and puts people to work collaboratively.

**Vicki Nichols** – SOS has been doing bilingual education for years. Would we please add SOS to the list of partners.

**Dan Haifley** – it's a good program – likes the idea of sharing a person with other programs.

**MOTION: (passed)**

**The SAC will send a letter of support to NOAA Acting Administrator, Scott Gudes, and include all letters received to date as attachment.**

Motion introduced by Dan Haifley, seconded by Deborah Streeter

Vote made by role call: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

**Brian Baird** – has to abstain, as a proposal to support MERITO is being reviewed by the State Resources Agency. But, he does support the concept embodied by MERITO.

**Dawn Hayes** – explained how the education and outreach team is working on a regional education plan, and how it would soon involve MERITO. She hopes that the SAC will be able to give their input to the draft plan.

**12:25 – 1:15pm LUNCH BREAK**

## V. DISCUSSION: NAPA REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

**Stephanie Harlan** - introduced the one-pager on recommendations.

**Bill Douros** – gave a summary on his take on the report, and which recommendations he would like to see us move forward on. He is pleased to have the NAPA report done, and by an outside group (National Academy of Public Administration). A number of recommendations came out of the report, and he felt the sections that pertain to the Sanctuary were accurate. There was no frustrations or disagreement about the report. He copied and passed out the pages with the recommendations and the appendix (opportunities), as this might give us some insight as to how to proceed. Stephanie had asked Bill to identify which recommendations he thought the SAC could work on assist in implementing. The report contains fourteen recommendations in total. He describes #1, and accepts it overall. #1 involves making sanctuaries more visible to the public via signs and visitor centers and working cooperatively with state highway departments, and other organizations. #8 pertains to “manage for results”, and Bill agrees with focusing on protecting resources as the best way to serve broad statutory goals. He then describes recommendation #12 - “NOAA should provide stronger support to the sanctuary program.” Bill comments that the SAC can help us seek that support from NOAA. There are some other recommendations we need to focus on as well, as they relate back to the broader national goals. How do we have sustainable use as well as resource protection? Does the focused attention on oil leasing and oil spills prevent a clear focus on other, more important, and more likely threats to the environment?

**David Clayton** – we need to look at item #6 “Clarify the role and responsibility of sanctuary councils.” An independent group did the report, they found some issues relative to SACs throughout the sanctuary sites.

**Stephanie Harlan** – should the SAC have designated seats, or have it be open to all? At the SAC Coordinator/Chair workshop this year, they agreed that have designated seats was the way to go. Many people, as we know, don’t have a good understanding of the program.

**Jim Stilwell**– asked if the Sanctuary supports business through advertising or recognition labels.

**Bill Douros** – explained that the annual Sanctuary awards at the Sanctuary Currents Symposium is one level of recognition. In addition, we can raise revenue through marketing the logo. It has moved forward in fits and starts, some sponsorships have emerged such as the one with Robert Lynn Nelson Studios. The Sanctuary seal has been pushed back. Maybe the SAC could look at that?

**Ron Massengill** – State Parks are using oil company logos on plaques.

**Vicki Nichols** – Number 9, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet; think in terms of that.

**Stephanie Harlan** – is there anything that we can incorporate into our working groups? Develop an action plan and bring back to SAC for input. Members of the NAPA committee are Ron, Jim, David, and Stephanie. How would you like to proceed?

**Jim Stilwell** - incorporate Bill’s recommendations into the action plan.

**Chris Harrold** – would like SAC to focus on initiatives to improve resources such as #2, bullet #2 and #9. Be results orientated.

**Dan Haifley** – on #9, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet - would the annual report “*Ecosystem Observations*” apply here?

**Bill Douros** - SIMoN’s annual report would be more useful for this purpose, to measure results.



**Stephanie Harlan** – she would like to know how if Sanctuary Program’s HQ is interested in embracing these issues or not.

**Dave Clayton** – asked if it is worth knowing how Sanctuary Program’s HQ feels?

**Bill Douros** – expressed that actions through the SAC have supported this plan, and HQ is moving out on all these items anyway.

**Vicki Nichols** – we should prioritize our recommendations and convey them forward. Committee could come back after discussion to the SAC.

**Deborah Streeter** - volunteered her time to be on the NAPA committee.

**Dave Clayton**– several items are now being moved ahead on.

**No Action, rather general agreement that the NAPA Committee will return with an action plan.**

## **VI. DISCUSSION: MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW (MPR)**

**Bill Douros** - introduced the change in timeline for the MPR, as indicated. Meetings may be in November or December or January. State of the Sanctuary report will be delayed, and that will affect the public scoping meetings. Responding to Tami Grove’s prior request, here is list of ideas and opportunities for the SAC to get involved. He gave a distillation of memo. Themes exist for each meeting, and he laid out the schedule for next four SAC meetings.

**Jim Stilwell** – please don’t specify trawling as a seafloor impact as there are more general examples.

**Bill Douros** - these are just examples that may or may not be chosen.

**Dave Clayton** – how do we approach the boundary issue and bring it forward?

**Bill Douros** - we may have to reevaluate the management of the three sanctuaries on an ecological basis. There is an effort to collect bioregional data and decide from that perspective. The SAC could evaluate that from a management perspective.

**Chris Harrold** – the MPR is essentially a strategic plan for how we spend energy in the next five years. Public and internal process will need to prioritize the issues for the next five years. For the October meeting – we could hear presentations from each working group on what should be the prioritized issues. Working groups could organize their priorities and present to the SAC.

**Bill Douros** - endorsed that idea, if the SAC directed so.

**Vicki Nichols** – there might be a need to bring the information of the Alliance to the SAC. How can the SAC take that information and grapple with it.

**Brian Baird** – Sanctuary should engage more with coastal erosion as a topic.

**Bill Douros** – requested an endorsement of the timeline, and then for us to decide on a plan for October meeting.

**Stephanie Harlan** – could we request that Channel Island National Marine Sanctuary come here and present their 10 best and 10 worst things to do during the MPR process, followed by one-hour presentations from each of the working groups.

**Deborah Streeter** – endorses Stephanie’s suggestion. Regionally, what is our purpose in regards to systems and our place in this region? How can we address the land-based community issues? Housing prices and the environmental movement has been flagged is a huge issue.

**Bill Douros** - the MBNMS Water Quality Protection Program has worked on those issues and will continue to do so.

**Lynn Rhodes** - suggests that the working group reports are all formatted the same.

**Bill Douros** - handed out copies of the set of key three documents, put together by Sean Morton—the 1992 Management Program, Regulations, & Designation Document. Bill explained that these documents drive where we are today. He asked the SAC to suggest additional tools or materials they might need as educational products.

**Dan Haifley** - asked if the SAC could help with distribution.

**Chris Harrold** – expressed that timing is crucial. He is concerned with the outreach jumping the gun before the scoping meetings.

**Bill Douros** – we want a concentrated effort, two months before. We share the same concern.

**Vicki Nichols** – expressed that the State of the Sanctuary Report is a critical piece, and it should identify the threats.

**Bill Douros** - that will be a section of the report. But, we don’t want to feed the public issues. Secondly, that part may get cut out depending on the NOAA leadership.

**Pat Clark-Gray** – can we borrow equipment to show Power Point presentations? Slides may work better for some.

**Bill Douros** – he will check into that possibility.

**Lynn Rhodes** – asked about using a professional facilitator for the scoping meeting discussions.

**Kathy Fosmark** – offered report – for Jan 2001 has important information and guidelines regarding economic impact.

**Becky Christensen** – this might be restrictive – asked if we can summarize the givens that are non-negotiables.

**Bill Douros** - expressed that everything is on the table.

**Becky Christensen** – housing would be an example. Maybe we should emphasize that there is a clean slate and anything is open.

**Burke Pease** – has a question about the three sanctuary working in tandem process. Asked how will we control the time allotted to people at scoping meetings. Commented that there maybe a level of redundancy if the same constituency shows up.

**Bill Douros** - CINMS has used the small group approach, to control that issue.

**Sean Morton** – presented the proposed schedule and format for the public scoping meetings to the SAC for their input. He explained that the public scoping meetings will be organized in a workshop style. In Monterey, he is thinking of having a day presentation that goes into the evening. There is a large area to cover, and it gives people more options.

**Becky Christensen** – asked if the northern sites will be facilitated by Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank NMSs. There should be consistency between process and facilitators. She requested that we publish all dates and locations.

**Bill Douros** - regarding the Salinas meeting and Sacramento meeting, we need to get specific input.

**Dan Haifley** - commented that a Spanish translator and a daytime meeting in Santa Cruz would be good.

**Lynn Rhodes** – there is value in meeting in Sacramento, as interest and influence exists there.

**Craig Wilson** – concurs with Lynn.

**Becky Christensen** – asks about a possible Moss Landing meeting?

**Bill Douros** – if the SAC directs us, we can. So far, we've heard that we should do a meeting in Sacramento, and Salinas with a Spanish translator. What other suggestions?

**Stephanie Harlan** – suggests a one-pager with a survey that could be in a newspaper.

**Jim Stilwell** – comments that we do not need to hold a meeting in Moss Landing, and suggests that we need to translate some management plan materials into Vietnamese.

**Burke Pease** – suggests that we need to let people know about how to participate without going to a meeting.

**Ron Massengill** – comments that San Luis Obispo is a good choice for southern region.

**Bill Douros** – asks about possible Saturday meetings.

**Chris Harrold** – responds with no.

**Dan Haifley** – responds with yes.

**Action: Bill Douros summarized the general agreement of the SAC. See below.**

**Bill Douros** – gave a summary of appeal process, and that we've laid that out and flagged the state level approvals. Burke had suggested we develop a flow chart that lays it out.

**Burke Pease** – the ultimate MPR document is up to the staff. All authority and preparation of documents is with the staff. What if something we want is not incorporated?

**Steve Sheiblauber** – asks if the MOU with the state is also up for debate.

**Holly Price** – responds that it could be up. It is referenced in the appendix.

**Burke Pease** – requests clarification of the joint MPR process. This was the 2<sup>nd</sup> factor that BTAP addressed. There is a concern that the hearings being dominated by issues from other areas. It seems the Director of the NMSS made the decision. Could that be reconsidered?

**Bill Douros** – responded that the decision has been made - if the SAC felt it was important enough, we could write a letter to ask if we could break up the meetings.

**Burke Pease** – asked if there was a concern by anyone else. He feels we are diluting our process.

**Stephanie Harlan** – commented that people probably won't travel that far.

**Bill Douros** – commented that there will be overlap issues between the three sanctuaries.

**Dawn Hayes** – expressed that during the small group facilitation, we could have separate tables for different sanctuaries. Topical round tables would help alleviate that issue, and give people different opportunities to offer their input.

**Brian Baird** – expressed that each community will come in with an agenda – with ten workshops, you'll hear the party line over and over. So, it makes sense to combine the three sanctuaries. There are common issues to all three.

**Chris Harrold** – doesn't have the sense that people will not travel. The boundary issue is probably why the NMSS wants to do it this way.

**No Action taken by the SAC, rather there was agreement by the SAC on the various management plan process items, as follows:**

*Accepted the following schedule and SAC involvement:*

June SAC Meeting

- Provide guidance as offered in this summary

August SAC Meeting

**Theme: Frame Sanctuary Accomplishments on Existing Management Plan**

- Public presentation by MBNMS staff on program accomplishments, status of natural resources
- Draft list/criteria for narrowing issues
- Preview Power Point presentation for outreach
- At August SAC meeting we will discuss how to decide which items should be reviewed in the MP update.

October SAC Meeting

**Theme: Open – possible ideas include:**

- Presentation by Channel Islands NMS Staff on Draft MP/EIS
- Presentation by Working Groups regarding issues (*suggested and added by SAC with recommendation that WG presentations be formatted in same fashion*)

**October – November:** Outreach by SAC Members to constituent groups regarding MPR process, getting involved; help distribute “State of the Sanctuary Report”

December SAC Meeting

**Theme: Scoping Meeting for the SAC (Tentative)**

- Receive input from SAC on management plan issues.

February SAC Meeting

**Theme: Review, Narrow Issues for Consideration**

- Receive summary from MBNMS staff of issues from scoping process
- Recommend priorities for MPR
- Establish subcommittees or delegate issues to existing working groups

*Accepted Management Plan Review Scoping Meetings;*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Day/Evening</b>
Santa Cruz	Day ( <i>added by SAC</i> ) & Evening
Salinas	Evening
Half Moon Bay	Evening ( <i>Day added if SAC not in HMB</i> )
SAC Meeting	Day
Monterey	Day & Evening
Cambria	Evening
San Luis Obispo	Evening
Big Sur	Day
Possibly Modesto/Stockton/San Jose ( <i>added by SAC</i> )	Day
Sacramento ( <i>added by SAC</i> )	Day
Washington D.C.	Day

*Other Items Requested by SAC for Management Plan:*

- The meeting in Santa Cruz should also include a Spanish interpreter.
- Materials (brochures/notices) should be printed in Vietnamese
- Share outreach materials and notices to SAC member’s (and other’s ) mailing lists, possibly have Sanctuary pay for mailings by others
- The brochure or mailing notices should include a cut-out/ perforated card to mail in responses or comments.
- The approval process should be laid out in a flow chart by July 15th.

Outreach by SAC: PowerPoint Presentation and/or slides will be available for SAC members (*Bill will check on whether MBNMS equipment can be used by SAC members*).

**VII. UPDATE: ALLIANCE OF COMMUNITIES FOR SUSTAINABLE FISHING**

**Holly Price** - gave an update on what has been happening since the initial meeting.

**Kathy Fosmark** – announces that Dave Clayton is now a member. We are in the early stages.

**Steve Scheiblaue** – announces that he had talked to Mike Ricketts, and Mike wants to reiterate that he is looking forward to positive dialogue. Katilin Gaffney is now a member, as is Mary Yaklavich, and Dave Clayton.

**Brian Baird** - is assuming that the group is not an official arm of the Sanctuary, and that both groups are meeting and working together.

**Bill Douros** – concurs.

**Vicki Nichols** – requests clarification for if the meeting open or closed?

**Steve Scheiblauber** - responds that anyone who wants to come can come. There is not an attempt to advertise that fact. They will have an open public meeting at some point in the future.

**No Action taken by SAC**

## **VIII. DISCUSSION: BUSINESS & TOURISM ACTIVITY PANEL (BTAP) STATUS**

**Burke Pease** – the BTAP would like to write and send a letter to NMFS and USFW regarding the fireworks permitting issue. He asks if the BTAP is governed by the same rules as the three official working groups to the SAC.

**Bill Douros** – responds - yes, pretty much the same rules apply. Although they are not an official working group of the SAC, the BTAP that the Sanctuary supports cannot operate outside of the normal rules applying to other official working groups.

**Dave Ebert** – expresses that the BTAP is in the gray area, and were hoping to work this out in the upcoming next two meetings. They would like guidance on how to proceed to become an official working group.

**Bill Douros** - summarizes the background on how the BTAP was formed. In the initial years, the staff wasn't clear on the nexus between the business and tourism industry and the Sanctuary at that time. The other working groups had clear ideas on how they supported the Sanctuary's mandates of research, education and resource protection. A strong nexus between business and the sanctuary should exist. This is policy call for the SAC. Expectations for a new working group should include that the entire Sanctuary be represented, and that there is positive partnership between business, tourism and the Sanctuary staff.

**Dave Ebert** – expressed that he would like to broaden the base and get more people involved in the BTAP. Most people he talked to were a little apprehensive, and it was a new experience for them. He would like to get a good corps of people coming to the meetings, and find out more about the issues that people want to talk about.

**Dave Clayton** – expressed that the multiple use mandate gives us a good opportunity to do this now.

**Dawn Hayes** – commented that there is a tremendous amount of opportunity there – how to market businesses.

**Dave Ebert and Burke Pease** – concur

**Burke Pease**– asks if the Sanctuary want us to be in that status.

**Bill Douros** – responded that we want to work on collaborations and not be adversarial.

**Dave Ebert** - commented that he would like the BTAP to be in the loop, and it would be collaborative.

**Vicki Nichols** – said she believed that a working group needed to be collaborative, and asks what kind of support can be given?

**Bill Douros** – responded that our staff now supports four annual meetings - we could ramp up to 6 meetings.

**Vicki Nichols** – asks if we endorse the BTAP, what would be the expectations made of the staff.

**Bill Douros** – responded that staffing is an issue, and asks BTAP chairs if they can agree to six meetings a year, and the SAC agrees not to get any new working groups going.

**Dave Ebert** - responded that six meeting a year is fine. The group has been around for a few years.

**Dave Clayton** - commented that this is not in the protocols, the protocols don't say a working group has to have staff support. He said the legislative working group operates without staff.

**Bill Douros** – said that the point of being a full working group was to work with staff and collaborate. He said he thought the legislative working group was a subcommittee. But regardless, it's a different kind of group formed to address a single issue. The BTAP is broader.

**Kaitilin Gaffney** – commented that we could broaden what has been a defacto group anyway. Broadening the working group to meet the mission of the multiple use focus needs to be the goal.

**Deborah Streeter** – expressed that she is looking forward to going to a BTAP meeting. She requested that we make it clear at the beginning of the meetings, that this is a formal working group of the SAC, and give a brief overview of what that means.

**Dan Haifley** – moves to make motion that the SAC recognizes the BTAP as a formal working group.

**Chris Harrold** – stops the motion to request clarification. Is the main mission of the group to protect Sanctuary resources? He is concerned with the term “user group” as not sounding consistent with protection of the Sanctuary, a mission that drives the other three working groups.

**Dave Ebert** – responds that the health of the resources is paramount to his business, and takes exception to the question. He comments to Chris that from his perspective, researchers are also considered a form of “user group”.

**Chris Harrold** – responds that it was a question that he needed to ask.

**Dan Haifley** - repeats the motion.

**MOTION: (passed)**

**The BTAP is recognized by the SAC as a formal working group.**

Motion introduced by Dan Haifley, seconded by Brian Baird

Vote made by role call: 14 voted unanimous, no abstentions or nay votes.

**Jim Stilwell** – offers a correction to the record – the legislation working group was established as a working group since it had outside membership.

**IX. ACTION: SET AUGUST RETREAT AGENDA**

Stephanie Harlan requested SAC members to send potential agenda topics to her.  
August SAC Meeting Agenda  
State MLPA process (Tom Canale)

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Submitted by  
Karen Grimmer  
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council Coordinator