

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** MBNMS Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC)

**From:** Deborah Streeter, SAC At-Large Member on behalf of SAC Subcommittee on Council Membership

**Subject:** Recommendations from November 7, 2003 subcommittee meeting on process for evaluating MBNMS SAC membership

**Date:** Monday, November 24, 2003

**Request:** Please carefully review this memorandum and provide me feedback prior to our December 5, 2003 SAC meeting. You can call me (831-624-6581) or email me at [streetcook@aol.com](mailto:streetcook@aol.com). Thank you.

Subcommittee members present at 11/7/03 meeting:

Deborah Streeter, SAC At-Large Representative

Kaitilin Gaffney, SAC Conservation Representative

Chris Harrold, SAC Research Representative

Harriet Mitteldorf, SAC At-Large Alternate

Rachel Saunders & Nicole Capps, MBNMS staff

Other subcommittee members unable to attend meeting but asked to comment:

Dave Ebert, SAC Business Representative

Peter Grenell, SAC Harbor Representative

Dan Haifley, SAC Recreation Representative

Ruth Vreeland, SAC AMBAG Alternate

**Our Task:** The Subcommittee was asked by the SAC to consider what process the SAC might use to determine whether changes in the configuration and representation of SAC seats are warranted.

**Resources Used:** The Subcommittee found it helpful to review the NMSP Implementation handbook (May 2003), especially pages 10-13 on "Council Structure", and pages 32-34 on "Options for Dealing with Common Problems."

**The Subcommittee agreed on:**

A) The following general approaches to this question.

B) Recommendation: A proposed self-assessment process for all SAC members, detailed below.

C) Recommendation: A timeline for the process, detailed below.

**A)General approaches agreed upon:**

1) The issue of SAC representation is important and should not be rushed. We are in the middle of a JMPR that should take priority. Any changes recommended to the SAC should take into account the content of the updated MBNMS management plan.

2) The focus of this inquiry is narrow - on SAC composition and numbers, not on how SAC members are chosen.

3) 20 members seems reasonable and the right maximum number; thus consideration of adding SAC seats should also include discussion of seats that might appropriately be

consolidated or eliminated.

4) Any process assessing the make up of the SAC should involve the public.

Fortunately there already has been an extensive, detailed public scoping process. This issue was not identified by the public or the SAC as a priority during that process.

However, members of the recreational fishing community have raised the issue of adding a SAC seat that specifically represents recreational fishing.

5) We should look at the big picture regarding composition and not just the question of whether a recreational fishing seat should be added. The question is not, "Should there be a recreational fishing rep on the SAC?" Rather it is "What interests need to be represented at the SAC and what's the best way to ensure that representation with the number of seats we have?"

6) As a first key process step, the SAC should be asked to do a thoughtful, careful self-assessment.

**B) Recommendation: Self Assessment by all SAC members:**

We recommend this process in order to assess the areas represented by the different seats, identify any gaps, and identify the best way to address those gaps - either by replacing a seat or changing/expanding the focus of a seat.

**Self-Evaluation Questions and Process:** Primary and alternates should work together in answering the following questions:

1) Definition: How would you define the constituency you represent?

2) Contacts: What groups and individuals do you talk to/contact? Please list the groups and individuals that you talk with regularly as part of your constituency.

3) Input: How do you get input from/hear from your constituents? What techniques do you use to outreach to the constituents you represent? Please be specific.

4) Outreach: How do you inform your constituents about SAC decisions, actions, and discussions? Give examples.

5) Difficulties: Have you encountered difficulties in trying to reach out to your constituency? What are the stumbling blocks or roadblocks? What might help you to overcome those difficulties?

6) Gaps: Are there any groups or issues that are lacking representation on the SAC or are not being outreached to or addressed? Would the seat you represent be the best seat to do that outreach (or address that issue)? Is there another seat on the SAC that would be more appropriate to represent this group? Do you think a new SAC seat is needed to represent this group?

7) Overlap: Are there groups or issues that you feel are represented by more than one seat on the SAC? Do you think consolidation of two or more SAC seats might be warranted?

**C) Timeline:**

1) Send out this memorandum to the SAC 2 weeks prior to the December 5, 2003 SAC meeting and request feedback on this approach prior to the SAC meeting.

2) With SAC concurrence, hand out assessment questionnaire at December 5th meeting to be returned by the SAC's February 6, 2004 meeting.

3) Reconvene Subcommittee to review questionnaires and make recommendations for next steps.

