CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL

ADOPTED MEETING MINUTES[1]

Thursday, January 20, 2000
8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Oxnard Performing Arts Center / Community Center Complex / Oxnard, CA

In Attendance:

GOVERNMENT SEATS

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Alternate Korie Johnson

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Member James Shevock
Alternate Gary Davis

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
Member Drew Mayerson

US NAVY
Member Alex Stone
Alternate Ron Dow

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
Member Patricia Wolf
Alternate Lt. Jorge Gross

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY
Member Brian Baird

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
Member Gary Timm

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
Member Dianne Meester

COUNTY OF VENTURA
Member Lyn Krieger

COMMUNITY SEATS

TOURISM
Member Michael Finucan
Alternate Alex Brodie

BUSINESS
Member Rudy Scott

RECREATION
Member Jim Brye

FISHING
Member Bruce Steele

EDUCATION
Alternate Larry Manson

RESEARCH
Alternate Matthew Cahn

AT-LARGE
Member Craig Fusaro, Ph.D., Chair
Alternate Mick Kronman

AT-LARGE
Member Marla Daily

NON-VOTING SEATS

Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
Member LCDR Edward Cassano
Alternate LCDR Matthew Pickett

---

[1] The Sanctuary Advisory Council approved these minutes as of April 1, 2000.

Not attending:

COMMUNITY SEATS

BUSINESS
Alternate Dr. Dan Secord

RECREATION
Alternate Tony Gibbs

FISHING
Alternate Chris Williams

EDUCATION
Member Dave Long

RESEARCH
Member Leal Mertes, Ph.D.

CONSERVATION
Member Linda Krop

AT-LARGE
Member Jean-Michel Cousteau
Alternate Barry Schuyler

AT-LARGE
Alternate Dr. Jeff Auerbach

GOVERNMENT SEATS

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Member Mark Helvey

US COAST GUARD
Member Lt. Yuri Graves
Alternate Mike Hamerski

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE
Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY
Alternate Melissa Miller-Henson

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
Alternate Jack Ainsworth

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
Alternate Jackie Campbell

COUNTY OF VENTURA
Alternate Jack Peveler

NON-VOTING SEATS

MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
William Douros, Superintendent

GULF OF THE FARALLONES/CORDELL BANK NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
Ed Ueber, Manager

1. Administrative Items and Announcements

A. Call To Order and Roll Call

B. Special Announcements and Introductions

Ed Cassano offered congratulations to the SAC on its one-year anniversary.

Ed introduced Mettja Hong, who has been hired as a new contractor to assist CINMS with event coordination (SAC, MRWG, Management Plan Workshop meetings, etc.)

C. Approval of Meeting Minutes – October 5, 2000

The October 5th SAC meeting minutes were approved, pending the correction of a few small edits suggested by Dianne Meester. The minutes will be posted on the Sanctuary's website as well as made available in hard copy.

The November 18th draft meeting minutes were distributed at the meeting.

D. SAC Vacant Seat Announcement: Conservation Alternate

Peter Howorth has stepped down from the SAC as Conservation alternate. If SAC members know of anyone that they feel would make a good Conservation seat applicant, please tell them about this opening and put them in touch with Mike Murray.

SAC Coordinator Mike Murray explained the process to appoint a new SAC alternate:

1) CINMS will advertise the open seat in local newspapers.
2) CINMS will send application packets to those interested.
3) Per the Charter, the SAC will need to form a subcommittee that will perform a preliminary screening of applications received. This group will identify the top three candidates, to be forwarded to the Sanctuary Manager.
4) The Sanctuary will select the new Conservation alternate, and obtain approval for the selection from the Director of NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.
5) The new Conservation alternate could be selected in time for the March 15th SAC meeting.

SAC subcommittee for initial review of applicants: Craig Fusaro, Dianne Meester, and Bruce Steele. (Linda Krop, who was not present at the meeting, joined the subcommittee at a later date.) Anyone else who is interested should let Mike Murray know.

2. Committee Reports

A. Marine Reserves Working Group

The marine reserves process update was covered separately later in the meeting.

B. Education Working Group/MERA

Ed Cassano reported that MERA met in January to discuss the relationship between the SAC and MERA. MERA is anxious to present to the SAC in the future. One of the major topics discussed at the meeting was the need for a coordinated educational plan within the management plan.

C. Research Working Group/RAP

Matthew Cahn reported that Research Activities Panel (RAP) is on hiatus while the Marine Reserve Science Panel is functioning. Members of the science panel are interested in serving on the RAP in the future. Matt stated that the research working group associated with the science panel for marine reserves is less likely to focus on community-based research at this time. In the future, the research working group will focus on less narrow work and bring out those who are interested in more community-based research.

D. Fishing Working Group

Bruce Steele reported that the group has not yet met because the marine reserve process has largely taken over. He reported attending an urchin meeting with 40 participants and he made a presentation on the marine reserves process. At the urchin meeting, he explained that the marine reserves process is supposed to minimize negative economic effects. Bruce went on to report that the squid fleet is doing excellent. He also noted that there is a significant die-off of bottom kelp in certain areas around the islands, perhaps due to some unknown fungus. At San Miguel this problem is worse.

Bruce believes that it is difficult to get fishermen to come to a meeting without some topic of focus. Craig Fusaro suggested that they could focus on marine reserves or the management plan. Gary Davis suggested that fishermen have a unique opportunity to bring their experience to the Sanctuary since they are out there everyday.

Bruce noted that he saw articulated correlane dying off and opportunistic animals moving in. He is seeing it colonized by anemones; he has also seen many sea spiders at Tyler's Bight. Ed Cassano encouraged that fishermen could, in the future, participate in the Sanctuary's fisherman's monitoring program. Craig Fusaro suggested that the Advisory Council's list-serve could be used more often for dialogue.

E. Military Working Group

Alex Stone and Ron Dow reported that they are still coordinating membership of the Military Working Group. Related to military activity, Drew Mayerson commented that MMS and the Sanctuary share a need to determine ambient noise levels underwater. Alex Stone said that the Navy has a declassified GIS layer that shows the Southern CA Bight's bands of ambient noise levels. At the request of Ed Cassano, Alex said he could explore this further.

F. Conservation Working Group

In Linda Krop's absence, Mike Murray (Sanctuary staff) reported that the Conservation Working Group (CWG) met on January 18th with approximately 20 people present. At that meeting, Anne Walton gave a presentation on the Management Plan. Both Anne and Mike answered questions about the Sanctuary and various SAC working groups, and then collected ideas/issues from the public about what they felt was important regarding the Management Plan. Some of these issues included water quality, oil and gas activities, and marine reserves. It was also discussed how the CWG could develop into a true constituency that will last in the future. A date for the next CWG meeting has not yet been announced.

3. Public Comment

Steve Shimek from the Otter Project reported that the Otter Project chartered a boat out of Santa Barbara Harbor to take people otter watching and try to communicate to the media and public about otters. A

week before the first charter, the Otter Project heard from the charter operator that they were getting pressure from a certain faction of the harbor community. The night before the first charter, the charter operator cancelled, stating that varying lobbying agencies and individuals had expressed deep concern and objection to their involvement in this project. Steve commented that there should be a focus on open communication and dialog so that this will not happen again. The Otter Project still intends to find a charter, and when they do they will invite the SAC.

Extensive Council response followed. Ed Cassano responded that he is not seeking advice from the SAC on this particular issue. No SAC action was taken or decision made.

Roger McManus congratulated the SAC on their efforts. He reported that the Center for Marine Conservation is doing a lot of remote sensing work with NASA. He also commented that he believes it's important that the SAC provide a forum for addressing some of these concerns (e.g., sea otters tour chartering problem raised by Steve Shimek).

Mick Kronman brought up the issue of squid fisheries and brown pelicans. He reported that there has been dialogue about this since last spring and that a proposal was advanced to the California Fish and Game Commission late last year to close areas of Anacapa, Santa Barbara, Prince, and San Miguel Islands to squid fishing during breeding season of the brown pelican. This issue will be coming up again in early February for the Fish and Game Commission to make a decision. He believes that this was an issue that the SAC should have addressed since the beginning. According to Mick, squid fishing is the most valuable fishery in the state and it is currently in jeopardy. As these issues come up, Mick requests that Sanctuary correspondences be presented to the SAC to help them decide whether to take it up as an issue.

Ed stated that CINMS made a mistake of not providing an informational piece to the SAC when it became apparent that this was an issue. Ed was clear in understanding this issue and the agencies involved. In July, the American Trader Trustee Council, which Ed is a member of, received information from a pelican researcher that there was a nest abandonment that was occurring on Anacapa Island. The Council wrote a letter to CDFG that expressed concern about this situation. Ed stated that light boat and squid boat activities at the level that they are occurring today are new. In November, the three federal agencies met and Ed decided not to bring the issue to the SAC because, at that point, it was an internal agency discussion. He apologized for not presenting information to the SAC earlier. CINMS has been thinking about potential impacts from this activity for a while, however, Fish and Game is the body that is wrestling with this issue. CINMS is advising them about its concern with the resources.

Mick Kronman discussed a misrepresentation in brown pelican data. The USFWS' information stated that black rats cannot eat pelican eggs because the eggs are too large. Mick checked with rat experts and they reported that black rats can eat pelican eggs. Mick believes that there is probably more information out there and that the SAC, with various avenues of information, should discuss these issues. Craig also reminded everyone that the SAC is supposed to provide community-based/stakeholder-based advice to the Sanctuary manager. The SAC does not have any authority as a body to regulate resources. Ed emphasized the importance of the SAC. He values the information, comments, and discussions that the SAC makes. Bruce believes that the view of the SAC holds weight. He does not believe that the Fish and Game Commission are the most knowledgeable people to deal with the huge range of issues regarding squid fishing. He believes that squid fishermen should be proactive. They can mitigate the effects of the lights through shielding, lower them closer to the water, self-regulate the wattage, and not turn the lights on until 9:00 p.m. after the pelicans sleep. He suggests either agendizing this issue or establishing a subcommittee to focus on the issue. Ed reminded Bruce that a squid advisory body already exists through Fish and Game. Bruce suggested a subcommittee to go to the February meeting. Marla noted that open dialogue is important at all times and as members of the SAC that represent individuals, they should have

been notified of these issues and the Sanctuary's stance on the issues. Ed believes that CINMS has opened themselves up completely.

Brian Baird, from the California Resources Agency (and SAC member) shared highlights from the Governor's proposed budget for 2000-2001. Brian reported the following:

- Sea Grant research program funding: $681,000 bringing the amount available for grants to $1 million – a tripling of the funding currently available. This could offer many opportunities to focus research on the Channel Islands.

- Wetlands: $46.5 million for wetlands restoration and acquisitions. This includes:
  - $25 million for WCB for opportunity purchases
  - $4 million for Coastal Conservancy for Carmel River
  - $4 million for coastal Conservancy for Elkhorn Slough
  - $13.5 million for Hamilton Wetlands

- State Coastal Conservancy:
  - $5 million to continue the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Program
  - $3.8 million to continue public access projects along the coast
  - See the Wetlands section

- California Coastal Commission:
  - Total proposed budget: $16.1 million
  - To include:
    - $1.3 million to meet operation needs.
    - $899,000 to increase the enforcement and compliance efforts of the Coastal Act
    - $464,000 to expand public awareness and education about the coast and its resources

- Ballast Water Management Program:
  - $2.1 million to implement the provision of the recently enacted Ch. 849, Statutes of 199 (AB 703), the Ballast Water Management Program. Funding reflects support for all agencies involved in this effort.

Brian also reported that the California Resources Agency recently released the final draft of the report on improving California's array of marine managed areas. The report identifies the state's current 18 classifications of marine protected areas; recommends legislation for a system of collapsed into 6 classifications.

In response to a question from Craig Fusaro, Brian commented that the report does not necessarily call for an "increase" in marine protected areas, but rather an "improvement" in the system of marine protected areas. The report is available on the internet: ceres.ca.gov/cra/ocean.

4. Manager's Report

Ed reported that he had met with Gordon Cota and others in the fishing industry to discuss an issue. Gordon had presented a petition to the SAC signed by local fishermen that read, "With respect to the development of marine reserves or no-take zones in the Channel Islands and with respect to the Channel

Islands National Marine Sanctuary's Management Plan Revision in progress, we the undersigned support and endorse the following principles: the management of marine fisheries in the state water shall continue to be in the province of the State, the State of California Department of Fish and Game, and the Fish and Game Commission with full collaboration by stakeholders and in federal waters, by the National Marine Fisheries Service. The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and its programs shall recognize and acknowledge and incorporate the establishment authority of the State of CA and the National Marine Fisheries Service in any and all documents." Mr. Cota had suggested that the SAC could state that it acknowledges that there are established laws and rules that need to be adhered to regarding fisheries management. During the last SAC meeting (November 18th), this issue was addressed through an agendized item called the "Jurisdictional Role and Regulatory Authority of the National Marine Sanctuary Program and the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary with Respect to the Establishment of Marine Reserves." The objective of that discussion was to clarify the Sanctuary's role in fisheries management.

To clarify this issue, Ed Cassano read the following statement regarding fisheries management for the written public record:

The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) does not regulate commercial or recreational fisheries. These fisheries are regulated by the California Department of Fish and Game within state waters, and the National Marine Fisheries Service in federal waters. The CINMS works cooperatively with these agencies to facilitate and coordinate resource protection within the CINMS.

Bruce Steele stated that he was happy with that statement.

Roger McManus commented that it is important not to forget that the Secretary of Commerce has ultimate authority over the resources of the Sanctuary.

CINMS Manager Transition

Sanctuary Manager Ed Cassano is scheduled to depart on March 31, 2000. Assistant Manager LCDR Matthew Pickett has been working closely with Ed to assure a smooth transition to the position of Sanctuary Manager.

National Marine Sanctuary Program Organizational Changes

The National Marine Sanctuaries Program has experienced a significant increase in national attention and the Administration and Congress have increased its budget substantially. Recognizing this increased level of visibility, the Department of Commerce wanted to see some organizational and management changes. In response to the Department, NOAA National Ocean Service (NOS) will make the following changes:

1) The National Marine Sanctuaries Program will be elevated to an Office level reporting directly to the Assistant Administrator of NOS (the process of getting Departmental and Congressional approval will begin in January).

2) Dan Basta, the current director of NOS' Special Projects Office will be detailed for a nine month period to be the chief of the Marine Sanctuaries Program, and will report directly to the Assistant Administrator of NOS.

NMSP Appropriation, CINMS Budget and NMSA Reauthorization

<u>Appropriation</u>

Congress has approved the FY 2000 Consolidated funding bill which provides $23,000,000 for the National Marine Sanctuary Program. The bill also provides an additional $3.0 million in the NOAA Construction Fund for sanctuary interpretive facilities.

CINMS Budget

The Sanctuary Program budget allocation process is expected to be completed by the first week of February. The Fiscal Year 2000 operating budget for CINMS will be finalized at that time. Ed expects that the Management Plan process will be fully funded.

Reauthorization

Since the last SAC meeting on November 18th, there has been no news of further development on reauthorization of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. At last word, the Bill introduced by Senator Olympia Snowe (R-ME) was expected to be considered in January by a Conference Committee (House and Senate conferees). For your reference, an attached document, "Questions About Appropriation and Reauthorization" explains the reauthorization process.

As the reauthorization process moves forward, updates will be posted at the following web site: www.sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/news/newsbboard/newsbboard.html

Resource Protection, Policy and Permit Activities

Pelican / Light Boat Issue

Ed noted that this was already discussed earlier [during the public comment period].

Education and Outreach

1998 CINMS Annual Report

The 1998 CINMS Annual Report is hot off the presses. Stay tuned for the 1999 CINMS Annual Report this Spring.

Sustainable Seas Expedition (SSE)

The duration of SSE 2000 at CINMS will be 25 days starting at the end of May/June. Numerous education and outreach initiatives are planned, including:

SSE CINMS Mission Log (www.sustainableseas.noaa.gov): This year the mission logs generated during the SSE at CINMS will include daily reports on meteorological and oceanographic data for the study sites. The latitude and longitude of the MacArthur will be posted and an electronic chart will be made available so Internet participants can better follow the mission.

- Student Summit Team Research project - This year the Student Summit Team will develop their research project from the proposals they presented last May at the Student Summit Conference with Dr. Sylvia Earle. Project ideas created last year incorporate the use of the DeepWorker submersible to

gather observational data of specific scientific investigations looking into the distribution and abundance of California Sheephead and Gorgonian Sea Fans. Submersible time will be made available for students to work with DeepWorker pilots to collect data at study sites.

- Student Summit Conference - Student Summit Team will report data and research project(s) progress to a panel of experts. Ideally the conference will be regional and include student summit teams from Monterey Bay NMS, Cordell Banks and Gulf of Farallones NMS to share ideas and information.
- Teachers At Sea/Students At Sea - Four teachers representing Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties will be selected to participate in the SSE mission at CINMS as "Teachers At Sea" to collect and interpret data for students and the general public.
    1) Web Chats/Web live video - Students and researchers will participate in web chats before the expedition to help develop monitoring protocols for Student Research Project. Also during the expedition there will be a live chat/video set up for schools to participate in the SSE student research project.
- Traveling DeepWorker Pop-up Exhibit - The exhibit will be displayed at different venues along the Ventura/Oxnard/Santa Barbara coast to provide an expedition access point for the different communities of CINMS.
- Open House- Press Conference - This will be at the end of the Expedition in CINMS and will feature SSE Researchers, MERA exhibitors, tours of the MacArthur and DeepWorker Submersibles.

In the interest of time, Ed did not review the remainder of the Manager's report, but instead referred the Council to the written report.

5. Management Plan Workshop

A. CINMS Geographic Information System (GIS) Project

Ben Waltenberger, the Sanctuary's Spatial Data Analyst, gave a presentation on the CINMS GIS project.

What is GIS?

- A group of connected entities and activities which interact to produce information which will be useful in decision support.
- A chain of steps leading from observation and collection of data through analysis.
- A GIS at least consists of map information, a database, and a computer based link between them (e.g., a street map, a phone book, and a computer interface).
- GIS creates a link between spatial and non-spatial data.

Why Visualize?

- Certain phrases are difficult to understand by people who are not familiar with the language used, i.e., "The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary boundary is 6 nm from the mean high tide line" or "the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary boundary is 6 nm from the low low water line."
- The language of math (map coordinates) is sometimes difficult to visualize
- GIS makes connections between activities based on geographic proximity.
- Examining data spatially can lead to new insights, or explanations of phenomena.

- These connections are often unrecognized without GIS, but can be vital to understanding and managing resources.
- GIS is only as good as the information that is put into it.

GIS vs. MAPS

- Electronic display offers significant advantages over the paper map.
- Ability to browse across an area without interruption by map sheet boundaries
- Ability to zoom and change scale freely
- Potential for the animation of time dependent data
- Display in "3 dimensions" with "real-time" rotation of view
- Potential for continuous scales of intensity and the use of color and shading independent of the constraints of paper maps
- One of a kind, special purpose products are possible and inexpensive

Ben proceeded to present several slides of various GIC covereages.

Comments:

Marla wanted to know who was integrating all of the data into the GIS. Ben responded that the Channel Islands GIS Collaborative is integrating the data, working partially with the U.S.G.S. Federal Geographic Data Committee and different agencies from Santa Barbara to Simi Valley using the CERES database.

B. Management Plan Study Area

Brief Overview

Anne Walton, CINMS Management Plan Specialist, provided an introduction to the session. At the last SAC meeting, it was pointed out to the SAC that there were three steps that CINMS had to take to move along with the management plan process. Those steps were: 1) Budget approval (which is almost approved), 2) Determination of the Study Area, and 3) Decide on the most relevant issues to be addressed in the Draft environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Draft Management Plan (DMP).

Presentation on the Management Plan (Anne Walton)

1992 Reauthorization of NMSA

Procedures for Designation and Implementation
Sec. 304 (e)

Not more than 5 years after the date of designation of any national marine sanctuary, and thereafter at intervals not exceeding five years, the Secretary shall evaluate the substantive progress toward implementing the management plan and goals for the sanctuary, especially the effectiveness of site-specific management and techniques, and shall revise the management plan and regulations as necessary to fulfill the purposes and policies of this title.

Management Plan Review

- Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary was designated in 1980

- The CINMS management plan and regulations went into effect 1982

What are management plans?

- Site-specific documents used to manage individual sanctuaries
- These plans set priorities, contain regulations, present existing programs and projects, and guide the development of future regulations

Why are they being revised?

- Statutory requirement
- Most sanctuary management plans are between 7 and 15 years old
- They may not address current resource protection issues
- They may not incorporate current marine resource management concepts and practices
- They do not contain performance indicators to evaluate effectiveness of the sanctuary

What approach will be used?

- Community-based public process organized by CINMS, and coordinated by the national office
- Driven by site-specific issues, but may also address issues of national concern
- Small team of local and national staff
- Sanctuary Advisory Council to participate in all phases
- Use local contractors/consultants

Management Plan Process

- Public scoping meetings
- Synthesize scoping comments and present results to public
- Workshops on most relevant issues to be addressed by EIS
- DEIS/draft management plan released for public comment
- Final EIS/management plan

Scoping Results: Issue Categories

- Water Quality
- Education and Outreach
- Research, Monitoring and Enforcement
- Boundary Redefinition
- Military Activity
- Oil and Gas
- Marine Reserves
- Sea Otters
- Other Management Issues

DEIS Decision Steps

- Budget approval
- Determination on Study Area

- Determination on most relevant issues

Determination on Study Area

- Contract Let to UCSB to Make Recommendation Based on Ecological Linkages
- Draft Report Peer Reviewed
- Draft Report Reviewed by Staff
- Final Report Reviewed by Staff
- Staff Recommendation to Headquarters
- Final Approval on Study Area

Dr. Michael McGinnis was hired on contract to make a recommendation on the study area based on ecological linkages.

Recommendation on Study Area

- Option: Existing Boundaries
- Option: Cambria to Point Mugu
- Option: Point Conception to Point Mugu
- Option: Point Sal to Point Mugu

The study area options provided for his evaluation were: 1) Existing CINMS boundaries, 2) Cambria to Point Mugu, 3) Point Conception to Point Mugu, and 4) Point Sal to Point Mugu. McGinnis provided a report including a review of the literature and also a recommendation.

Recommendation Based On:

- Area north of Point Conception influences species distribution and abundance
- Studies on fishes, birds, marine mammals and coastal ecosystems at Vandenberg AFB and Mugu Lagoon support a recommendation of coastal mainland areas
- SB Channel includes two biogeographical provinces and the transition zone
- Eddies in the Channel may be important in the distribution, recruitment and survival of pelagic juvenile fishes
- Nearshore waters include habitats and nurseries for regional species
- Transition zone fluctuates between Point Conception and Sal
- This area captures important upwelling centers for Sanctuary resources

To encompass all three bioregions --the cold northern temperate waters, the warm southern temperate waters, and the transition zone--Mike recommended that the study area extend from Point Sal to the south to Point Sal in the north, including waters along the mainland coast.

CINMS Staff Recommendation on Study Area

- Staff endorses recommendation of report taking into consideration:
  1) ecological linkages
  2) overwhelming public and political support
  3) consistency with 1980 DEIS study area

The staff reviewed his recommendation and endorsed it for these reasons: 1) The support material was consistent with the ecological linkages, 2) There was overwhelming public and political support to look

farther north at a larger study area, and 3) It was consistent with the Sanctuary's previous study area from the 1982 DEIS, with the exception of expanding it a little. McGinnis' initial report was open for a blind peer review. McGinnis revised his initial report based on these recommendations.

C. Management Plan Issues to be Addressed

Continuing with her presentation, Anne reported that Sanctuary staff reviewed the issues from the public scoping (from the six public scoping meetings) and prioritized those issues in terms of the resources that CINMS has, including staffing resources, what the Sanctuary could actually protect, and considered ecosystem integrity.

Defining the Issues

- Synthesize comments:
    1) scoped issues
    2) site issues
- Prioritize issues
- Determine feasibility:
    1) ecosystem integrity
    2) work within reasonable budget
    3) can Sanctuary authority make a difference
- Goes to SAC subcommittee for review
- Workshops, contracts, internal work
- Start draft environmental impact statement

Staff Recommendation on Issues to be Addressed in DMP

- Water Quality
- Military Activity
- Oil and Gas
- Vessel Traffic
- Emergency Response
- Visitor Use (recreational and commercial)
- Research Use
- Submerged Cultural Resources

A set of issues emerged from this analysis, and these issues were then taken to NMSP headquarters staff in D.C. Approval to move ahead was then obtained for both the draft Management Plan and DEIS.

Anne stated that in terms of the regulatory changes that CINMS is recommending, it is not definitive and is currently in draft form. CINMS needs to take a look at "Modern Sanctuary" regulations. The program is attempting to standardized certain regulations. CINMS is going for review with the general council and headquarters along with the staff to make further recommendations.

D. Management Plan Budget and Contracting

Continuing with her presentation, Anne reported that Tetra Tech was chosen to help develop the DEIS because they have worked with NOAA before, they've worked on Sanctuary issues before (Florida Keys), and they have both a local and national presence with resources drawn at both levels.

DEIS: Choosing a Contractor

Tetra Tech
- pre-approved by NOAA
- local & national experience with DEIS process
- experience with local/regional agencies
- worked with NMSP

Alice Green from Tetra Tech was introduced and relayed some information about the company. Tetra Tech is both a national and international entity. The corporate office is in Pasadena, CA with 150 offices worldwide. Tetra Tech's contract's consist of: 50% Federal Government., 35% State and local agencies, and 15% private sector. The initial contract with NOAA was a five-year contract. The local office has been involved with marine resource issues for several years. An example of their work in this area is the Wing Environmental Services contract with Vandenberg Airforce Base. Much of their work involves NEPA.

TetraTech's Responsibilities

- description of area of concern
- updated description of affected area
- characterization of status of resources
- description of potential impacts
- analysis of environmental consequences
- oversight on DEIS
- oversight on FEIS

Anne reviewed Tetra Tech's duties, which include: producing a description of the area of concern; developing a baseline inventory of what resources are out there; updating a description of the affected area (those areas affected by any regulatory changes); putting together a characterization of the status of the resources; describing potential impacts; analyzing potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts/consequences; and overseeing general compliance with NEPA and preparation of the EIS.

CINMS' Responsibilities

- establish work plan/schedule
- define sources of information
- gap analysis
- consultation/briefings
- define proposed action(s)
- define alternatives
- compatibility determination
- draft management plan
- compile DEIS
- compile FEIS

Anne then reviewed the Sanctuary's responsibilities. CINMS will be developing a work plan schedule. Satie Airame, Post-Doctoral researcher on contract with the Sanctuary, is collecting data for the DEIS. Anne requested of the SAC that members please go back to agencies/organizations and see what kind of data (socioeconomic or biological) could be useful to this management plan process. Anne suggested that members contact her, Ben, or Satie with any information. Once the data is collected, CINMS will be

performing a gap analysis to see what data is missing. CINMS will also be going through consultations and briefings with other agencies. This process has already started, as CINMS recently met with Alex Stone from the Navy and with Vandenberg AFB.

Anne reported that CINMS will also be defining the proposed actions, proposed regulatory changes, and a set of alternatives for the proposed changes. CINMS will be consulting with other agencies to make a compatibility determination, working to develop the physical draft Management Plan itself, and compiling the physical DEIS as well.

Brian Baird wanted to know how we are handling the analysis between existing boundary issues and issues within a larger study area. Ed Cassano responded that the key question is how the boundary redefinition might help us address specific issues. Anne stated that the answer to Brian's question evolves as we build the DEIS and as we develop the status of the resources to determine if we will expand the boundary. If boundary redefinition occurs, CINMS will have to look at the resources in that area and the change in issues as related to the change in resources. Brian also was curious that if boundary redefinition occurs, will the focus still be on the Channel Islands? Anne explained that we have a mandate to protect these resources of special significance that are defined by the current boundary. The mandate is not being changed, but by potentially redefining our boundaries, we are finding out if there are other resources that should also be included.

Brian also had a question regarding a "policy statement" on decommissioning oil rigs (as listed on one of the handouts). Ed stated that decommissioning of rigs is a very complex issue that will be discussed further if and ever the Sanctuary gets to that issue. Drew questioned if a larger boundary would encompass an area that would then be considered an area of special significance? Both Ed and Anne responded yes to this question.

Gary Davis wanted to know why the southern boundary does not extend out to Santa Barbara Island? Ed stated that the study area boundary should encompass it, that it is intended to be that way, and that the map will be changed to reflect its inclusion. Gary also wanted to know if TetraTech will be working to identify trends to set up a long-term baseline. Anne stated that if the data is available, TetraTech will definitely work to identify trends.

Larry Manson mentioned that a possible water quality data source could be from Public Health in both Ventura and Santa Barbara counties.

Marla was curious about the "roads and trails" data layer (on the handout listed existing data sources at CINMS). Ed Cassano said that a roads/trails layer exists for the islands. She also was curious why there were not any cultural GIS layers. Ed commented that the Sanctuary does have data, but it's not currently available as a GIS layer. Ed asked that if anyone on the SAC has any additional cultural data, please contact CINMS.

Air quality was an issue that was brought up by Bruce Steele, who wanted to know why water quality is an issue and air quality isn't. Anne stated that air pollution was not brought up at all at the management plan scoping meetings, but rather, was brought up by the staff. Ed Cassano commented that air quality links to marine resource impacts are unclear, but other agencies might have some information. Bruce feels that we should include it in our data, even if we can't regulate it.

Craig Fusaro reported that MARPOL has a new Annex 7 which is currently under review. This Annex is about ship air pollution which is being taken up at the international level. International regulations are very slow to come around. They've been working on Annex 7 for at least five years and will probably

take another five years before there is a regulation under MARPOL to deal with this issue. Craig commented that he has seen some work showing a nexus between air pollution and the marine environment. Ed Cassano reported that there is currently jurisdictional play out there with the air pollution control district of Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties. There is a proposal to reduce vessel speed, which will in turn will reduce emissions. Alex Stone reported that that was one of the proposals that was being looked at. There is also a report due to the EPA that will address whether to relocate the Channel or to propose a voluntary speed reduction to meet their state implementation plan for the reduction of south coast pollution. Ed noted that through Port State Control, we, as a nation have the ability to affect vessels as they come into our marina. He also noted that bigger freighters are coming. Steve Shimek mentioned vessel traffic discussions in Monterey Bay that had very fast results in progressing toward getting regulations through IMO.

E. Opportunities for SAC Involvement in Management Plan – Public Workshops

The Council next took up the discussion of public workshops to support the management plan process. During this discussion, a slide listing management plan issue areas was referred to often:

- Water Quality
- Military Activity
- Oil and Gas
- Vessel Traffic
- Emergency Response
- Visitor Use (recreational and commercial)
- Research Use
- Submerged Cultural Resources

Sean Hastings, Resource Protection Specialist with CINMS, commented first to let Council members know that the next marine reserves (marine reserves working group) public forum will be designed to serve as a management plan workshop on reserves.

Dianne Meester wanted a clarification of what the SAC was being asked to do. Craig Fusaro added that additional information is needed on the workshops. Anne commented that the basic objective for the management plan workshops is to take an in-depth look at certain management plan issues.

Craig Fusaro suggested that certain representatives from different agencies and interests might want to get together and address the management plan issues that they have an interest in.

Brian Baird suggested that the SAC brainstorm on the issues. For example, Brian noted, if boundary redefinition occurs and reaches the mainland, water quality would be an issue that would have to be addressed.

Bruce Steele stated that there will also be ongoing workshops on refugia. Anne acknowledged this, but reported that the SAC's Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG) has already established a task force to focus on marine reserve workshops. Bruce suggested that both workshops should be coordinated.

Jim Brye expressed concern with the timeline for the workshops, and commented that March might be too early. Dianne Meester noted that both "visitor use" and "water quality" are important issues. Marla stated that when considering visitor use, do not leave out islands users, both residential and land-based. Korie Johnson suggested that the SAC brainstorm and come up with a list of important issues.

In response to comments from the SAC, Chair Craig Fusaro announced the following SAC Action Item: **If SAC members have data sources/contacts, get in touch with CINMS.**

Anne Walton commented that it was through an extensive and arduous public scoping process that CINMS came up with a first-cut list of issues. Although the Sanctuary then took steps to select a study area and determine the most relevant issues for CINMS to address, the management plan is still a public process. The public can now participate through SAC members/meetings, and with SAC Working Groups, as vehicles for additional public comment on the management plan. What CINMS wants of the SAC today is to consider the revised issues list and decide which ones should be focused on at public workshops.

Bruce Steele expressed concern over the prioritization of the issues, especially when considering the entire study area. Anne responded that the issues list was not prioritized. Ed Cassano commented that if boundary redefinition occurs, the changing issues will be addressed in the "Alternatives" section of the DEIS.

Brian Baird recommended that there might be three or four broad categories, for example, a session on water quality, habitats and resources, research and education, and maybe, marine reserves. Once these broad categories are established, you could address more specific issues as they relate to those broad categories. Korie Johnson responded that the workshops should not be too broad, but should be focused. Otherwise, Korie stated, not much would get accomplished.

Gary Timm questioned if specific issues at the public scoping meetings were focused on, or brought up more often than others. Anne reported that those issues were: water quality, boundary redefinition, and marine reserves.

Dianne Meester asked about the purpose of the public workshops. Anne responded that the workshops are for the purposes of: hearing and learning from subject matter experts, providing the community with an education forum, and providing an opportunity for the public to participate in a focused look at one specific issue rather than an array of them. Dianne Meester commented that public workshops should be used as a vehicle to either educate the public or get information from the public, rather than as a forum for experts to come and talk.

Marla Daily questioned the efficacy of creating a series of public workshops. She mentioned that all SAC meetings are open to the public, but only a handful show up. She does not feel it's appropriate to credit the workshops with engaging the public if only a few members of the public actually participate. As a means to reach the broader public, Mike Finucan suggested recording SAC meetings on video and playing them on public access television. Anne responded that CINMS looks to the SAC to reach their constituents, make them aware of the issues, and encourage them to attend the workshops/meetings.

Jim Brye suggested that the SAC may want a particular issue to be explored further and then discuss the alternatives.

At the suggestion of the Council, CINMS staff then held a caucus to discuss the issues and come back to the SAC with their recommended topics for management plan workshops.

After the caucus, a CINMS-suggested list of broad categories of issues was presented: Water quality, Habitat resources, Research and Education, and Visitor use/Access

Anne Walton presented the Sanctuary's ideas for public workshops for management plan issues:

CINMS Suggestions on Issue Areas with respect to public workshops:

Boundary Redefinition: Public information meeting on alternatives right before the DEIS is completed; at the May SAC Meeting

Water Quality: Hold information (educational) meeting in March

Military: Working group meeting (educational) before March

Research and Education: To be addressed through RAP and MERA

Marine Reserves: Already addressed through MRWG

Visitor Use (on islands and around): No workshop

Status of Resources: Presentation to SAC in May

Oil and Gas: Present status to SAC in May. Get industry perspectives on the status of resources and oil and gas.

Cultural Resources: Create a working group or subcommittee

Emergency Response and Vessel Traffic: Use existing CINMS information; no workshop

Special Biological Significance for the Channel: Handled under "Status of Resources" above.

The above scheme was met with no objections by the SAC. To close out the discussion, it was agreed that the Sanctuary now had appropriate feedback from the Council to move ahead and start planning for the public workshops and other meetings.

6. Marine Reserves Process (Ed Cassano, Patty Wolf, Matt Cahn)

A. Marine Reserve Working Group (MRWG) Activities

Patty Wolf, SAC member and co-chair of the MRWG, provided a summary of recent activities. Patty reported that the MRWG has made a good start on developing goals and objectives for reserves. They also came up with a preliminary list of questions for the Marine Reserve Science Panel. In January, the MRWG received a presentation from the socioeconomic team.

Patty reported that the MRWG currently has developed major categories for goals and objectives: Ecosystem Biodiversity; Sustainable Fisheries; Education and Research; Natural and Cultural Heritage and Recreation; Marine Reserves Administration; and Socioeconomics. The MRWG has completed draft goal statements for the Ecosystem Biodiversity category. This goal is to protect representative marine habitats, ecological processes, and populations. For the Sustainable Fisheries category, the goal drafted is to assist in the recovery of depleted populations, to provide insurance against fishery management

uncertainties, to help sustain fisheries outside the reserves, and to achieve long-term productivity with minimal short-term negative impacts to all users.

Patty also reported that at the last MRWG meeting, Ben Waltenberger presented on GIS, and Dr. Bob Warner gave a presentation on the status of marine reserves in scientific literature. There was also a good dialogue between the MRWG and the Science Panel.

Patty then discussed future meeting dates for the MRWG. She reported that the MRWG process timeline has been lengthened to September 2000. Three marine reserve public forums are intended.

B. Marine Reserves Science Panel Update

Matt Cahn, SAC member and chair of the Marine Reserve Science Panel, commented that while the MRWG has been developing in conjunction with information provided by the Science Panel, the Science Panel is not part of the MRWG. There has been discussion over what the linkage is between the Science Panel and the MRWG, and how it is supposed to function, especially the Science Panel's function to provide information relative to reserves and evaluate potential reserve scenarios as they develop.

Matt then discussed some problems that have emerged. One problem is the cultural tension between all of the players, including the process champions (Sanctuary Staff and agencies), facilitators, stakeholders, and the Science Panel. According to Matt, academics play by a different set of rules. Some tension has festered because the MRWG and Science Panel were at two different places in the process. At the December 17th meeting, the MRWG heard the frustrations of the scientists. It is important, Matt noted, that the process be put out in front of the scientific assessment. Matt also reported that there has also been some tension between the Science Panel and the facilitators. The January 11th meeting was very productive. The Science Panel was able to work through their frustrations. For the record, Matt stated that "goals" are different than "objectives" in that goals are visions of a place we want to be at some place in the future, whereas objectives are specific, attainable milestones that we can actually get to, and that we can measure when we arrive there. Matt also commented that the Science Panel has had to slow down to wait for delivery of goals and objectives from the MRWG.

Brian Baird commented that this marine reserve process is very important, perhaps a world model.

C. Marine Reserves Socio-Eonomic Study

Peter Wiley, NOAA economist and co-lead of the Socio-economic Team, gave a brief overview of the team's work. Peter clarified that the Socio-economic Team's job is to identify potential benefits and costs regarding marine reserves. He then provided an update of the information that they have. Peter presented and briefly explained the following overheads[2]:

Potential Benefits:

- Non-Consumptive Users (sport divers and wildlife viewing)
  - Increased income to businesses directly serving non-consumptive users
  - Secondary increases in income and jobs in local economy
  - Increases in Consumers Surplus (non-market economic value)
- Scientific Values

[2] Due to time constraints, Peter Wiley was unable to provide a complete presentation; however, if you would like a copy of his slides, please contact the Sanctuary office at: (805) 966-7107.

- Education
- Non-use (passive-use) values
  - Option value
  - Bequest value
  - Existence value

- If off-site improvement to fishery stocks, commercial fisheries:
  - Long-term increases in harvest and income to fishermen
  - Long-term increases in secondary income and jobs in local economy
  - Long-term increases in consumers surplus and economic rents

***Potential Costs**:*

- COMMERCIAL FISHERIES
  - Lost harvest and income to fishermen
  - Secondary losses in income and jobs in local economy
  - No loss in harvest, but increased cost of harvesting
  - Losses in consumers surplus
  - Overcrowding/user conflicts/possible over-fishing in other areas due to displacement
  - Losses could be short-term or long-term depending on off-site impacts of protected areas.
- RECREATIONAL FISHERIES
  - Lost income to businesses that directly serve fishermen
  - Secondary losses in income and jobs in local economy
  - Losses in consumers surplus and economic rent

Commercial Fisheries – What we know:

- Catch and Ex Vessel Revenue by Species for 10 x 10 miles grids in study area from 1988 to 1999 (CA Fish and Game)
- California Commercial Fishing Adaptations Study (Contract under MMS by U of NV researchers)
- Economic Studies on Commercial Fisheries Seriously Deficient

Recreational Fisheries – What we know:

- Number of users
- Profile of users

Peter noted that the identification of study area users is a difficult task. The SAC could be a great help to the Socio-economic Team with the identification of users, and by providing any helpful comments on their methodology.

D. SAC Discussion

Roger McManus asked about if/how the Socio-economic Team would conduct their analysis without first having reserve proposals. Peter replied that they cannot complete an impact analysis without reserve scenarios.

Bruce Steele commented that when he talks to his constituents about the reserves process, the first thing that he does is try to convince them that reserves *are* going to happen because the State and Federal governments, and the environmental community, have expressed a desire to do so. Bruce said he tells his constituents that the MRWG is fair, and that they can have faith in these people. One of the difficult tasks he faces, however, is trying to convince them that the MRWG is going to minimize short-term loss and maximize long-term gains. Bruce believes that it is difficult to convince fishermen that there will be long-term gains from reserves when the science on that is weak. Bruce mentioned that he also has to tell his constituents that the socio-economics is currently weak. Bruce commented that it's important to figure out how to minimize short-term loss, because you can't promise something [long term gains] that you can't deliver. Bruce also believes that ultimately, it all comes down to faith, not science and economics.

An audience member cautioned the Council that fishermen are likely to say, "here we go again with more reserves." Bruce Steele emphasized that the difference is that this is a much improved process. Other reserves have been established for weak reasons.

Matt Cahn reminded everyone that the Science Panel may determine that reserves are not a tool that will meet the goals. Matt also commented that if decisions are to be based on only faith and politics, we should not move ahead.

Roger McManus commented that if we don't have the data on reserves benefits, it is still worthwhile to consider reserves experimentally. He went on to comment that the "null hypothesis" will lead you to a ridiculous public policy decision.

Ed Cassano stated that when considering reserves, there is a common tendency to place most of the focus on fisheries because that is where a lot of the pain is going to be, but, in all fairness, we're dealing with public resources that belong to the public in a variety of ways, for extraction and non-extraction. Ed also commented that the work at the last MRWG meeting showed compelling evidence that reserves will address some very specific ecological impacts. While there appears to be little evidence showing that reserves will produce an adjacent benefit to nearby fisheries, with the notable exception of one study in draft form now, Ed believes that we have the opportunity here to answer that question.

7. Future Meeting Dates, Locations and Agenda Items (Craig Fusaro)

Craig Fusaro asked the SAC to quickly look over the future meeting dates and locations to see if anyone had a problem with any of them. No members replied.

Dianne Meester suggested Council member announcements be put on the agenda.

The SAC agreed to a motion to add SAC Member announcements as a standing agenda item.

Final Council member comments:

Dianne Meester announced that she has been involved with SB-241, which is the Rigs to Reef Endowment to be used on marine resources. Her board has taken the position that it is premature to pass this legislation. She also announced that SB-241 was amended to require that such "rig reefs" would be also be reserve areas.

Bruce Steele stated that the squid issue is a perfect example of ecosystem interactions with a fishery. He believes that ecosystem management of fisheries is difficult, and that the Fish and Game Commission should take input from a wider range of people. Bruce also commented that that the SAC should increase it's understand of the Sanctuary's resources, perhaps through a GIS presentation. Ed Cassano suggested the possibility of having the SAC host a CalCofi-style forum some time in the future.

Responding to Bruce's comments, Patty stated that things have changed for the Department of Fish and Game (DFG). She commented that processes like these [SAC and MRWG] are coming, which include a broad constituent involvement. DFG has a broad mandate, and is considering using an ecosystem approach. DFG has set up two advisory groups for squid fishery issues, similar to the MRWG and SAC. Patty believes that the DFG and Fish and Game Commission did not bring the squid issue to the stakeholder groups early enough, and she feels that SAC involvement with this issue would be helpful. Ed stated that CINMS will do a much more concerted effort at reporting to the SAC on Fish and Game Commission matters. Bruce Steele also offered to follow the squid fishery issue for the SAC, and work with Patty.

Meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by:

Mettja Hong and Michael Murray
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary