

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY  
SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**FINAL MEETING NOTES**

**Friday, May 21, 2004**

**8:30 am – 4:00 pm**

**Casa Las Palmas**

**323 E. Cabrillo Blvd. • Santa Barbara, CA**

*Note: Audio tape recordings of the SAC meeting are available upon request; contact the SAC Coordinator at 805-884-1464.*

**Attending:**

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Member Mark Helvey

Alternate Tonya Ramsey

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

Member Russell Galipeau

**US COAST GUARD**

Alternate John Luzader

**MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Member Joan Barminski

**US DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

Alternate Walter Schobel

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

Alternate John Ugoretz

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Member Rebecca Roth

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Member Dianne Meester

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

**TOURISM**

Alternate Monica Baker

**Non-CONSUMPTIVE RECREATION**

Member Jim Brye [SAC Vice-Chair]

Alternate Eric Kett

**CONSERVATION**

Member Linda Krop [SAC Secretary]

Alternate Greg Helms

**BUSINESS**

Member Michael Hanrahan

**RECREATIONAL FISHING**

Member Merit McCrea

**EDUCATION**

Member Craig Taylor

Alternate Barbara LaCorte

**RESEARCH**

Member Dr. Robert Warner

Alternate Dr. Dan Brumbaugh

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Robert Duncan

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Dr. Matthew Cahn [SAC Chair]

Alternate Jim Knowlton

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary**

Chris Mobley, Manager

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary**

Alternate Sean Morton, Management Plan  
Coordinator

## **Absent:**

### GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

#### **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

Alternate Gary Davis

#### **US COAST GUARD**

Member J. Wade Russell

#### **MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

#### **US DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

Member Alex Stone

#### **CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

Member Brian Baird

Alternate Melissa Miller-Henson

#### **CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

Member Marija Vojkovich

#### **CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Alternate Gary Timm

#### **COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Alternate Jackie Campbell

#### **COUNTY OF VENTURA**

Member Lyn Krieger

Alternate Jack Peveler

### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

#### **TOURISM**

Member (seat vacant)

#### **BUSINESS**

Alternate Darren Caesar

#### **COMMERCIAL FISHING**

Member Harry Liqournik

Alternate (seat vacant)

#### **RECREATIONAL FISHING**

Alternate Steve Roberson

#### **PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate Avie Guerra

### NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

#### **Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary**

Member Bill Douros, Sanctuary Superintendent

#### **Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary**

Maria Brown, Manager

## **Attendance**

At roll call 12 of 20 voting member seats were represented, with 17 of 20 present in the afternoon. Voting seats absent for the day were Commercial Fishing, California Resources Agency, and the County of Ventura. A total of 25 SAC representatives were in attendance for the day (13 members, 10 alternates, 2 non-voting). Chumash seats did not yet have representatives. Public attendance peaked at approximately ten individuals.

SAC Vice-Chair Jim Brye presided over the morning portion of the meeting in Chair Matt Cahn's absence. Jim explained that Matt would be arriving at 11:30 am following a teaching obligation.

## **Administrative Business and Announcements**

Jim Brye introduced the new National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) alternate, Tonya Ramsey. Tonya explained that she is the NMFS Southwest Region liaison for the Pacific Fishery Management Council. She is an expert on the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and previously worked on groundfish stock assessments and surveys for ten years in Oregon.

Jim Brye announced that there are four open seats on the SAC: Tourism Member, Research Member, Commercial Fishing Alternate, and Public At-Large Member. Applications will be accepted until June 20<sup>th</sup>.

SAC members approved the draft January and March meeting notes.

### **Sanctuary Manager's Report: Chris Mobley**

Chris announced that Sean Hastings is home on paternity leave with his new son Finlay who was born on May 8<sup>th</sup>. Chris also announced that Columbine Culberg with the National Marine Sanctuary Program has relocated from the Silver Spring office to the Santa Barbara office of the National Program where she is now stationed with Claire Johnson and Todd Jacobs. He explained that Columbine would be available later to explain the projects that she will be working on. Chris then provided a few highlights from the current edition of the Sanctuary Manager's Report:

- *Local High School Team Wins Regional ROV Competition* – the Sanctuary is working with local schools and the UCSB Marine Science Institute to develop an ROV curriculum. Cabrillo H.S. recently won a regional ROV competition and will compete in a national competition for high school and college students June 25-27 at UCSB.
- *From Shore to Sea Lecture Series* – this ongoing lecture series covers a variety of topics, is held at the Channel Islands National Park Headquarters in Ventura, and is free and open to the public. Chris encouraged everyone to go, adding that it is important for SAC members to have a broad understanding of issues and the status of resources.
- *Sanctuary Adult Education Course* – this course is another great way to learn about the Channel Islands through three evening sessions and a field trip on June 12.
- *Seabird Monitoring* – one of our Naturalist Corps members was able to go out on a monitoring trip and she provides a good story in her report. Chris noted that the SAC would be going out on the Shearwater in the afternoon, and that the Sanctuary goes out on about 200 or more trips per year. He indicated that if any SAC members would like to come along they should let Sanctuary staff know and the Sanctuary will try to fit them in. He added that the same is true for the Sanctuary plane, it often has an extra seat.
- *Research and Monitoring* – Chris noted current projects from Xantus's murrelet monitoring, to a REEF survey with volunteer divers counting fish in and outside of marine reserves, to a recent Plumes and Blooms trip, and a recent trip with Chris Crisman, the Resources Secretary, to do some ROV monitoring in and outside of reserves.
- *Changing of the Guard* – Chris explained that former Sanctuary Pilot and Executive Officer Andrea Hrusovsky is a NOAA Corps officer. So, like other uniformed service members she has rotated on to another assignment: to fly with Matt Pickett. We now have Julie Helmers as our Sanctuary pilot. She was in the Navy for 11 years and served active duty in combat. She flies jets, helicopters, and other craft. Julie is also our new Executive Officer, or Assistant Manager.

Chris encouraged everyone to read the Manager's Report.

Robert Duncan asked if there was anything new on the berthing situation for the Shearwater. Chris replied that Sanctuary staff are working with the General Services Administration to set up a long-term contract in which the Sanctuary could place the money and then pay it to the harbor. In the meantime Sanctuary staff have been talking to Mick Kronman about the marina four configuration, and hasn't had any trouble getting a visitor end-tie.

### **Management Plan Update**

Sarah MacWilliams and Mike Murray provided an update on the management plan.

Sarah explained that the plan is in internal clearance and noted that the July SAC meeting would focus on preparing the SAC for review of the Draft Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Mike Murray added that the NOAA National Center for Coastal Ocean Science Biogeography Team is crunching data on various species that will come together in a final report. The report is currently undergoing review by experts who provided data, as well as by Sanctuary staff, and is available to SAC members who would like to review it. The report looks at biodiversity indexes and compares five boundary concepts the SAC helped develop several years ago. The report will also provide a sense of where the regional biogeographic hot spots are. The Biogeography Team has agreed to step us through this report at the July SAC meeting. In addition to being an important tool for boundary analysis, the report can also be an important tool for education, outreach and research. Chris Mobley added that a large section of the report on fish distribution and ecology uses the same data sets and analyses used to develop a new NMFS Essential Fish Habitat analysis, which should ensure consistency between the two analyses.

### **Council Member Announcements**

Jim Brye announced that this is Robert Duncan's last meeting. Robert has been a long-standing member of the SAC and led the Ad-Hoc Group on Enforcement which developed a very useful brochure. Chris wished Robert good luck with the Maritime Museum Board and presented him with a framed poster including a plaque thanking him for his service.

Jim announced that there will be a SAC barbeque at the Ventura Yacht Club Saturday August 21 with modestly priced food and drinks. There will be six sabot yachts and kayaks available. Jim offered that SAC members will get more information on this activity soon.

Michael Hanrahan announced that the Santa Barbara Ocean Film Festival took place on Wednesday night (May 19). The festival included ten short films and one long film, with a few films featuring the CINMS. Michael acknowledged that both the Sanctuary and Susan Sember from Essential Image Source were festival sponsors. Michael extended many thanks to the Sanctuary and its staff for sponsoring and volunteering at the event. It was very successful.

Russell Galipeau announced that David Begun, who spends 365 days per year on Santa Rosa Island, was selected as the National Park Service Pacific West Region recipient of the George B. Hartzog, Jr. Award for Outstanding Volunteer Service. Russell also announced that Glacier Bay Tours has approached him looking for opportunities to expand their operations in the Sanctuary and Park in 2006. They are a high-end scale operation that usually carries 60-70 passengers, and plan to operate out of Long Beach. Russell said that Park and Sanctuary staff will talk to discuss the appropriateness of the proposed expanded operations. Russell also announced that the Park is conducting inventory and planning for monitoring and research – and added that it is important for Bob Warner and Dan Brumbaugh to be involved if they want to play a role.

Craig Taylor announced that the Marine Technology Society recently published a book on marine acoustics with broad based and specific articles. Craig also announced that he is on the board of the Marine Conservation Research Institute of the Aquarium of the Pacific in Long Beach. They are hosting a symposium to bring together national aquaculture experts in the first week of June. Call aquarium for more information.

Robert Duncan announced that through the Maritime Museum over 400 school kids came aboard the *Spirit of Dana Point* in the last few weeks, and that the Maritime Museum is revitalizing several exhibits.

Bob Warner announced that the Science and Statistical Committee (SSC) of the Pacific Fishery Management Council has issued a draft white paper on procedures for reviewing proposals for marine reserves. The draft is in the process of being revised and the SSC welcomes public comment. Bob can provide the web site address on request.

Monica Baker announced that Channel Islands National Park is putting together an underwater video program every Tuesday and Thursday at Anacapa Island. This is a live, interactive program at the dock on the east end of Anacapa. Monica added that Island Packers vessels have been seeing humpback whales around Anacapa and Santa Cruz islands lately.

Greg Helms announced that there will be a June 7-9 “Consensus Conference on Integrating Marine Reserve Science and Fishery Management” hosted by the National Fisheries Conservation Center, held in Long Beach, and aimed at addressing synthesis of marine ecological research with fishery management research and science. Details are on line here: <http://www.nfcc-fisheries.org/>.

Barbara LaCorte announced that humpbacks are in the Sanctuary and everyone should get out there. CINC naturalists are taking pictures of flukes and dorsal fins for John Calambokidis’ photo identification project. Chris Mobley added that the Sanctuary is currently reviewing a proposal John submitted to use the R/V *Xantu* for photo identification of whales in the channel.

### **Hi-definition Film Project - *Jewels of the Pacific: the Channel Islands***

Chris Mobley acknowledged Susan Sember who was seated in the public area. Susan is working on an educational film joint project with the park and sanctuary. Susan explained that she is the President of The Essential Image Source Foundation, a non-profit foundation aimed at developing environmental documentaries. She explained that they submitted a proposal to develop hi-def film and a hi-def image library for the sanctuary and park to use. She indicated that hi-def gives viewers the experience of being right there, while Scientists find the resolution useful. Chris reiterated the importance of the project’s scientific value in providing information on the 2004/2005 resource status and baseline, noting a 1980 park film showing abalone covering the intertidal zone. Susan assured that they are working with scientists to ensure this project has archival scientific value. The working title of the project is, “Jewels of the Pacific: the Channel Islands,” and the lead writer is a member of the Channel Islands Naturalist Corps. Production recently began with a shoot at Anacapa Island and more shoots with the sanctuary and park planned soon. According to Susan the foundation is being deluged with volunteer offers and their greatest need is vessel use and office space. More information is available at <http://www.incameraproductions.org/>. For more information you may also contact Susan at 969-9010, or contact the park or sanctuary.

## **Working Group and Ad-Hoc Group Reports**

*Conservation Working Group* – Greg Helms

Greg explained that updates on marine reserves and management plan review were provided at the last Conservation Working Group meeting, though the group spent the bulk of their time discussing next steps for their inquiry into marine acoustics. Greg explained that Shiva Polefka, an Environmental Defense Center research fellow, has put together a great report on this subject. Greg added that with the support of The Ocean Conservancy and Sanctuary Shiva was recently able to attend a conference on acoustic impacts that was also attended by representatives of the shipping industry, resource managers, and scientists. Greg indicated that all interests recognize potential advantages in minimizing shipping noise, from decreased acoustic impacts on marine animals to improvements in fuel economy and other aspects of shipping. There will be a panel addressing acoustic impacts at the next SAC meeting, and the SAC will be able to review Shiva's report in advance of that meeting. Anyone interested in a copy of the report should contact Greg. Greg concluded by noting that the Conservation Working Group also discussed next steps for the water quality needs assessment.

Merit McCrea asked whether it is possible to make ships too silent and increase the risk of collision? Greg replied that while there have been attempts to use alarms, ship strikes could increase if animals cannot hear them. So, going silent comes with risks that need to be assessed. He added that modern cargo carriers are so long that sound is generated 100s of meters from the bow where the ship strike may happen.

#### *Recreational Fishing Working Group – Merit McCrea*

In the interest of saving time, Merit shortened his working group report by summarizing what happened at the group's May 11th first meeting in Santa Barbara, in which the group also met jointly with the Commercial Fishing Working Group. Merit explained that an overview presentation was provided to the working group by Chris Mobley, and that it was very helpful. Merit commented that even he learned something about fisheries management authority that he didn't previously know about. Merit mentioned that based on work he has been doing at UCSB, he had provided the working group with a simple presentation about how marine reserves work. Merit also mentioned that he distributed a survey to recreational fishing participants at the group's first meeting, and that while he did not have time to present the results, he noted that the results are interesting and he would be happy to share them with whomever is interested (contact Merit at [meritmccrea@hotmail.com](mailto:meritmccrea@hotmail.com)). Merit also mentioned that a second joint recreational/commercial fishing working group meeting was held on May 18<sup>th</sup> in Ventura, and resulted in a smaller group of fishermen working together on marine reserve and conservation area mapping that they wish to submit for consideration as an alternative in the forthcoming DEIS on federal marine protected areas within CINMS.

#### *Commercial Fishing Working Group – Chris Miller*

Chris Miller (filling in for Harry Liquornik) commented that he felt it was a positive step that the commercial and recreational fishermen had been meeting jointly, and he appreciated the time Chris Mobley has been taking to work with them. He explained that the mapping proposal being worked on by members from the two working groups was taking a habitat coverage approach, and with consideration to a sustainable fisheries goal had resulted in extending proposed closure areas southward beyond Gull Island and the CINMS boundary. Chris Miller also commented that he felt the PFMC Science and Statistical Committee's (SSC's) white paper on marine

reserves would be helpful for resolving some of the lingering issues associated with the CINMS process.

#### *Sanctuary Education Team (SET) – Craig Taylor*

Craig Taylor reported that the SET had met on May 12 in an effort to recruit new members. The effort was successful, Craig said, with several new prospective members expressing interest in the SET. Referring to the meeting summary report he handed out, Craig explained that the SET has decided to form two sub groups: a Curriculum Development group and a Speakers Bureau. The Curriculum Development group, Craig explained, would be tasked with identifying, qualifying and archiving existing standards-based curriculum that could be made readily available to regional educators and students. Craig described the SET Speakers Bureau (SB) as a group to be tasked with identifying qualified speakers who would be able to present both existing and newly created outreach products to a prioritized list of constituents. Craig also reported that the SET agreed to meet on the second Wednesday of every other month from 5:30 PM to 8 PM alternating between Vieja Valley Elementary School in Santa Barbara and the Channel Islands National Park Visitor Center in Ventura. Finally, Craig said that the SET would like to hear from other SAC Working Groups if they feel there is something the SET could assist with. Barbara LaCorte (SAC education alternate and SET co-Chair) added that the SET can help organize a bank of teaching materials, products, and qualified speakers that can be utilized at classrooms. She also added that she hopes the SET's new Speakers Bureau will be able to go to civic organization meetings.

#### *Research Group Discussion*

The SAC voted unanimously to approve a motion, offered by Bob Warner, to create a Research Activities Panel (RAP) that will serve as a working group of the Council. Bob Warner said that the RAP could function somewhat like the RAP in place at the Monterey Bay NMS, serving as a coordinating body among several research institutions. Advice and input from the RAP, Bob said, could assist the SAC as well as the CINMS Research Coordinator. Membership of the new RAP had not yet been determined, but suggestions can be sent to Bob Warner.

#### *Inactive Working Groups*

SAC discussion about Working Groups that were no longer active resulted in several groups being put on "hold" (rather than completely disbanded). Groups now understood to be "inactive" include the Business Working Group, the Military Activities Working Group, and the Ad Hoc Committee on Enforcement. The status of the Ports and Harbors Working Group is still uncertain, requiring follow-up with absent members Jack Peveler and Lyn Krieger.

### **Public Comment**

Chris Miller, commercial lobster fisherman from Santa Barbara, provided public comment on the "Barefoot Ecology Program" he and the Sea Urchin Harvesters Association of California (SUHAC) are involved in. Chris reported that a related program, "Fishing for Data" is being developed to provide area-based sampling protocols that fishermen would employ while collecting catch. A core group of divers will help implement the protocol, Chris said, with a small tax on fishermen going towards paying the divers for their time sampling marginal and poor fishing areas. Chris characterized this as a big step for the industry, noting that this involves providing rather than withholding data. Trap fisheries are doing this now, Chris said,

sheephead will hopefully be next, and he would like to see other fisheries participate as well in a way that is helpful for marine reserves monitoring and compatible with other monitoring programs.

Susan Sember, President of The Essential Image Source Foundation, a non-profit foundation aimed at developing environmental documentaries and now working on a docufeature about the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and Park, suggested that perhaps the now-inactive Business Working Group and the Sanctuary Education Team can work on projects that could dovetail with the film projects efforts. Susan said that she believes the film project could serve as a catalyst for the business community to get more involved, especially next year in conjunction with the CINMS 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

## **Marine Reserves [Part 1]**

### **Valuing Marine Protected Areas: A Monitoring Protocol for Recreational Non-Consumptive Use Applied to the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary – Kris Herrington and Hélène Scalliet**

Kris Herrington and Hélène Scalliet of the UCSB Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management provided a PowerPoint presentation on their group master's thesis project. In this 1.5 year project the students looked at the recreational non-consumptive use value attributable to the sanctuary as whole, as well as the value that may be attributable to marine protected areas in particular. The project used the travel cost method in order to translate non-market benefits into a market price. The students developed a survey tool and surveyed charter vessel passengers (only recreational non-consumptive users) to assess how travel costs might influence visitation rate. At this time they did not see much difference between the value attributed to the Sanctuary and the marine protected areas, but expect that more of a difference between these values may occur through time. The group also determined that residents of counties closer to the Sanctuary had higher values. Other interesting results of the survey included: 42% of visitors were aware of MPAs and the extra level of protection they provide; 60% of visitors thought the Sanctuary provides regulations to protect the Sanctuary from fishing. Based on this study the group developed recommendations for the Sanctuary:

- use the survey protocol for ongoing monitoring since values are likely to change over time;
- use protocol to account for seasonal variations in users;
- utilize three survey options: travel cost survey, knowledge and perception survey, combined survey (combining both previous surveys);
- use passenger surveys and operator questionnaires (important to stress the confidentiality of the survey data);
- additional MPA education is needed;
- conduct additional studies perhaps looking at impacts on businesses and the greater community, as well as surveying private boat users.

The group delivered to the Sanctuary a step-by-step manual of the protocol and the database that they created. More information about this project, including the final report, is available on the project web site: <http://fiesta.bren.ucsb.edu/~marine/content.html>.

### *SAC Member Questions and Discussion*

In response to Robert Duncan's question of whether the Sanctuary is looking at non-commercial craft Chris Mobley replied that the Sanctuary is funding Bob Leeworthy, a NOAA Economist, to

conduct a socioeconomic analysis of the private boats, partly because of the recommendation from this study.

Rebecca Roth asked how many observations they made. Kris Herrington explained that their sample size was over 100 people, adding that they used data from charter operators to develop a scaling factor of annual visitors. Rebecca also asked if they conducted a knowledge and perception survey. Kris and Helene answered that they did both in a combined method but separated them out in their recommendations, in part since if the value of MPAs changes slowly over time it may not be effective to monitor the change every two years while the education team may want to know year by year how education and outreach is working. Rebecca then asked if there is anything in the management plan that would specify how often we would look at doing this? Mike Murray responded that the management plan is not specific but acknowledges that we need to conduct socioeconomic monitoring and also acknowledges the past work that has been done to help build monitoring programs.

Barbara LaCorte indicated that the SET would be very interested in the knowledge and perception survey results, and asked whether the surveys were conducted prior to or following charter trips. Kris replied that surveys were conducted prior to charter trips, in order to survey passengers in advance of having an experience in the Sanctuary.

John Ugoretz inquired as to the timeframe when in which the surveys were conducted? Kris replied that surveys occurred between October and November 2003. She acknowledged that there are distinct peaks in visitation varying between different types of use, but they captured what they were able to capture in their project timeframe.

Craig Taylor suggested that the Glacier Bay operation is a whole new type of vessel, with a new audience coming from a long distance, and may provide a new opportunity to get a baseline. He suggested that the Sanctuary and Bren School could work with the operator to monitor this new activity.

Greg Helms asked if the charter vessel operators were aware of the MPAs. Kris replied that the owners were aware, noting that vessel captains offered different of opinions about the MPAs but all were aware of them.

Eric Kett asked what effects increasing visitorship due to MPAs may in turn have on the MPAs, and expressed concern that he has not seen anybody address this. He also asked if anyone has ever looked at the maximum capacity. He pointed out that we've now singled out specific areas as points of interest, which before you had to discover on your own. Those 12 areas are now magnets to draw people to the islands. Eric stated that the impacts could be far more detrimental than effects of fishing. Hélène replied that there probably is a maximum carrying capacity, though she is not aware of any studies to quantify carrying capacity. However, she noted that there are studies of the impacts of visitorship to MPAs, especially in Australia, though not many studies in the U.S. This will need to be addressed.

Due to the time Jim Brye suggested that SAC members pose additional questions about this project over lunch.

### **Marine Stewardship Council – Jim Humphreys**

Mike Murray acknowledged that several partners are in the early stages of considering the concept of having a sustainable fisheries label now that we have marine reserves in place. With that concept in mind he introduced Jim Humphreys, the Regional Director of the Americas for the Marine Stewardship Council.

Jim Humphreys provided a PowerPoint presentation about the Marine Stewardship Council or MSC. The MSC started in 1996 as a partnership between the Unilever Corporation (world's largest food company) and the World Wildlife Fund. Unilever buys 20% of the world's whitefish catch and saw fish stock collapse as a long-term threat to their business. The WWF was interested in a program to protect coastal communities and marine biodiversity, and had been involved earlier in a sustainable Forest product certification program.

Jim stated that 75% of world's fish stocks are fully exploited, over exploited or depleted; no traditional measures to remedy this situation have worked so far (strengthen fisheries science, catch limits, laws, regulations, establish no-take zones); the public is largely unaware and unconcerned about these issues. Europe and the U.S. are the two largest environmentally progressive seafood markets (16% of global consumption (53% of imports). Studies show consumers are interested in environmentally responsible seafood labels, and that people are willing to modify their behavior to maintain healthy fisheries.

Overview of the MSC program:

- a voluntary consumer label (“The best environmental choice in seafood”) and logo used to identify sustainable fisheries products;
- three components looked at: status of fish stocks, ecosystem impacts, effectiveness of management;
- MSC does not certify fisheries, they develop standards and accredit independent third party certification companies that use the standards to evaluate and potentially certify a fishery (eight companies are accredited worldwide to conduct the assessments, including three in the U.S.);
- A client representing the fishery is chosen through an application process and may be a partnership between organizations, or a processor (do not allow environmental NGOs to act solely as a client since MSC tries to actively engage fishermen and managers);
- A unit of certification defines the fishery and may be the entire stock or a definable sub-part of the stock;
- A pre-assessment (cost of \$5K to \$30K) is conducted using confidential scoping, and the pre-assessment is often used simply as a tool to influence fisheries management, e.g. to improve enforcement;
- The pre-assessment may be followed by a full peer-reviewed assessment (cost of \$20K to \$100K) using a scientific audit (across the three components looked at) and a fishery must end up with an average score of 80 (anything between 60 and 80 becomes a condition of the certification, and below 60 it precludes certification);
- A formal objection may be filed with the MSC HQ in London if there is disagreement with findings of an assessment;

- Cost of assessments goes to certifiers and their scientific teams, a certification is good for five years, and requires annual review;
- 203 products from certified fisheries are being sold in 17 countries;
- MSC goal is to certify 4% of the world catch.

All documents on particular fisheries can be found on MSC web site.

Jim explained a long list of certification benefits, for example, independent recognition of good fishery management, stability of supply/fishery, traceability, and environmentalism. He acknowledged a commitment to purchase sustainable seafood by Unilever, Whole Foods, Sainbury's (U.K.) and Xanterra (operates concessions in National Parks and some State Parks). Jim also acknowledged other programs that have come forward providing advice, namely Monterey Bay Aquarium, and the Blue Ocean Institute. However, he noted that while many seafood advice programs get people to make a first step toward awareness of seafood stability, they are not able to get into a lot of details and don't provide traceability of seafood products. More information, including documents on particular MSC certified fisheries and those applying for certification, may be found at <http://www.msc.org/>.

#### *SAC Member Questions and Discussion*

Chris Mobley asked whether, as in the case of the dairy industry or beef industry, any agencies are concerned that special certification for specific products would make other products look bad if not certified. Jim replied that from a legal aspect the MSC certification is clear of this problem. Jim acknowledged that labeling products for sustainability is early in its development and pointed out a different example of organic produce: now both organic and non-organic produce sells well. The MSC doesn't say, "These are good and those are bad." We only say, "These have met our certification program." So it's up to the consumer.

Craig Taylor asked whether the MSC has considered developing best practices, standards, or a label for seafood consumers' concerns such as "farm raised vs. wild", or whether to eat seafood when pregnant. Jim replied that the MSC program is simply designed to assess wild caught fisheries, though some new programs are looking into aquaculture. He added that most programs look at the environmental side rather than health, noting that no one has really stepped into that arena. However, Jim acknowledged that the entry point for most consumers is personal health; then they think about the environment; then they consider global effects (this is more where we thought the organic consumer was 5 years ago).

Rebecca Roth asked Jim how the MSC program may interface with the NMSP. Jim replied that if there are fisheries within the NMSP that might be viable candidates it would be worthwhile to consider both the logical client, and the unit of certification. He suggested that a pre-assessment could be done to see if fisheries are certifiable, and to indicate issues that need to be addressed. Jim reiterated that the audit process can have a lot of value itself by having outside specialists evaluate a fishery, and an added advantage is it's a multi-stakeholder process that brings different constituents together.

John Ugoretz asked Jim to clarify the unit of certification, and asked if there could be a Channel Islands certification for a fishery that occurred more broadly statewide. Jim explained that there must be a logical reason for a separate certification (e.g., a different gear, separate stock, or other

special reason). John asked if MPAs could potentially allow a fishery to be certified. Jim responded that the issue is traceability, and noted that costs can go down if the certification is spread out across a larger area.

## **Update: Marine Reserves [Part 2]**

### **State Marine Protected Areas Report – John Ugoretz**

John Ugoretz reported that the 2<sup>nd</sup> in a series of ROV surveys was completed in and outside CINMS marine reserves in deeper water using the R/V *Shearwater*. Researchers are finding good habitat, and good comparisons of fish and invertebrates in and outside reserves. The ROV survey was able to cover 3 different locations with inside and outside MPA research sites. John thanked the Sanctuary for use of the *Shearwater* and for cooperation. The ROV surveys will be linked with SCUBA surveys in the shallower depth range. SCUBA survey training is in June and surveys start in July. This year's SCUBA surveys will cover the same locations as last year, and will be conducted statewide by contract with many outside groups to get diving done. Future monitoring includes two potential lobster tagging/trapping projects: 1) a Bren School tagging study involving commercial fishermen that is a continuation of a previous Bren project; 2) a PIER (Phleger Institute of Environmental Research) acoustic tagging and trapping project at Anacapa Island. These projects will be very interesting since we have no lobster movement information in California.

John also reported that enforcement from February 2003 to February 2004 involved three primary Fish and Game enforcement vessels based out of Dana Point, Santa Barbara, and Ventura for a total of over 3000 hours. Enforcement officers made 1500 contacts with commercial and recreational fishermen. In total, one commercial and four recreational violations resulted in citations. The recreational citations included violations beyond fishing in an MPA. Reasons cited for the compliance record include presence of the National Park Service skiffs, Fish and Game and Sanctuary vessel presence, and Fish and Game and Sanctuary overflight presence. John acknowledged the need for outreach to non-consumptive users, but noted that from a consumptive user standpoint awareness of the MPAs is very high.

John concluded by mentioning a NOAA and Coastal States workshop held in Rhode Island on monitoring marine protected areas. John was asked to provide a presentation at this workshop, which provided an opportunity to get our monitoring plan some recognition. He noted that at least one person in North Carolina completed a Master's project using our example as an example of what North Carolina should be doing.

## **Additional Announcements**

Chris Mobley introduced Columbine Culberg from National Marine Sanctuary Program Headquarters. Columbine now works in the Santa Barbara office of the National Program along with Todd Jacobs and Claire Johnson. She is working on two projects: ocean etiquette, and a partnership with the Long Beach Aquarium of the Pacific.

Columbine explained a bit more about her work stating that she is working with sites, primarily in California, to develop guidelines for responsible interaction with marine wildlife. She will be

going to various California Sanctuary communities and asking for help and indicated that she may come back to the Channel Islands region later to solicit input once the project has reached the materials development stage. Columbine also noted that she will be working with the Long Beach Aquarium on projects that involve the Channel Islands.

Next Chris introduced Greg Haas from Lois Capps' office. Chris indicated that Greg's presence is a reminder that this Advisory Council is a very important body. He added that this is serious business that we engage in and has national importance.

## **Update: Marine Reserves [Part 2] Cont'd**

### **Federal Marine Reserves Environmental Review Process**

Chris Mobley provided a brief PowerPoint presentation focused on the current status and future steps of the federal marine reserves environmental review process. Chris explained that the National Marine Sanctuaries Act requires a full environmental impact statement (EIS) analysis for any changes to Sanctuary designation documents, so the Sanctuary didn't need to conduct an analysis to determine whether or not an EIS was necessary for this project. Chris indicated that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) EIS process is similar to the process one would go through in developing an environmental impact review or EIR for the state. Then Chris provided an overview of the major steps of the state process up to state implementation of marine protected areas on April 9, 2003, and an overview of the steps in the CINMS federal process to consider establishing marine reserves.

Chris highlighted the current status of the federal process and explained that the Sanctuary will soon be providing the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) and SAC with preliminary documents from a forthcoming draft EIS for technical and policy review. Chris summarized the components of the environmental documents (purpose and need, description of proposed action and alternatives, affected environment, and analysis of environmental and socioeconomic impacts). Chris indicated that the proposed timeline includes seeking input from the PFMC through two scheduled PFMC meetings, a PFMC Ad-Hoc Marine Reserves Subcommittee meeting, two scheduled SAC meetings, and also through SAC working group meetings, by the end of September. The Sanctuary would then develop a full draft EIS based on that input.

Chris explained that a typical EIS involves public comment only at scoping and after a draft EIS is released. He stressed that this preliminary working draft document is an additional step that is not required, but it provides an additional round of feedback. The Sanctuary anticipates that releasing a preliminary draft will yield more specific, focused comments on how to improve the draft environmental document. The preliminary draft also gives PFMC members, and their staff, the opportunity to provide very specific comments. According to Chris this process kicks off the need for changing the designation document since alternatives call for management of fishing. Chris also pointed out that prior to implementation there is a National Marine Sanctuaries Act requirement that for any regulations to be implemented in State waters of the Sanctuary, if regulations require changes to the designation document, the Governor of California has the opportunity to object. After completing that stage a final EIS and Record of Decision are developed, followed by implementation with monitoring, enforcement, and adaptive

management. Chris also stated that it is important to note that there is a no-action alternative which would be status quo.

The SAC will be notified as soon as NOAA has cleared preliminary documents for public release.

#### *SAC Member Questions and Discussion*

Matt Cahn asked whether the agency develops a final EIS, then consults with Governor, or if the Governor may provide input prior to the agency making its final decision. Chris explained that the agency wants to get the Draft EIS right so the preferred alternative will be sound. However, he explained that if we get feedback that indicates we need to do something different, that would typically lead to development of a supplemental EIS or SEIS. Then the final EIS essentially memorializes the decision, responds to comments, and concludes that an SEIS is not necessary.

Rebecca Roth indicated that as soon as the preliminary document is available publicly she would appreciate receiving it as a SAC member.

Matt Cahn stated that one more element to discuss is determining how the SAC will structure its review. He indicated that in addition to the SAC developing general comments, working groups should be free to comment from their perspectives. Chris Mobley added that Sanctuary staff are developing templates with targeted questions for the public review for the purpose of ensuring that the Sanctuary receives answers to all of its questions. Chris offered several example template questions: “Is the statement of purpose and need clear? Is range of alternatives adequate? Is there important data missing that should be considered?”

With regard to other alternatives Chris stated that he will tell the SAC and PFMC that the Sanctuary is aware the local fishing community has come up with an idea that they would like to be considered. He indicated that the goal of the preliminary draft is not just to get feedback on the contents of the document, but also what is not in the document, noting that if an additional alternative is viable, addresses the purpose and need and is implementable, it is reasonable to add it to the mix. Chris Miller stated that it would be helpful to have the alternative developed through consensus between the recreational and commercial fishermen analyzed so that it can be compared with the preferred alternative. He asked when that alternative would need to be ready as a product and when to expect the Sanctuary to be able to analyze it. Chris Mobley responded that the sooner the Sanctuary has the alternative the better and stated that at the June 13 PFMC meeting the Sanctuary would inform PFMC members of this other alternative being developed by fishermen and reviewed by Sanctuary. Then the PFMC could start to consider it in August, and fully consider it in September.

Rebecca Roth asked if the working groups would meet to develop recommendations. Matt clarified that the working groups have comments that the SAC will pass on, but the SAC will not seek consensus since they already went through that with the MRWG process. Matt also clarified that the SAC will conduct their review independent of the working groups. Mike Murray suggested that the scoping process last summer was a model of how to handle this: there were comments from 360 degrees, all of these were passed on to Chris Mobley, and the SAC indicated certain statements that they could agree to with consensus. Matt Cahn said the SAC

can discuss the contents of the working group comments, but this will not be the only focus of the SAC comments. Chris Mobley added that one type of feedback needed is considering how alternatives can be implemented.

Mike Murray provided a list of working groups and the SAC discussed which were likely to provide comments on the document:

- Fishing Working Groups will comment;
- Conservation Working Group – Linda confirmed they will comment;
- Research Activities Group – Bob Warner was not present but Dan Brumbaugh confirmed that they plan to work on it;
- Business Working Group – to be determined;
- Ports and Harbors – need to discuss with Jack Peveler and Lynn Krieger (who were absent);
- Military activities – Walt Schobel indicated that they would probably not meet on this;
- Sanctuary Education Team – to be determined.

### **Aquaculture – Jim Sullivan**

Mike Murray introduced this topic by noting that the Grace Mariculture project proposed a few miles outside of the Sanctuary peaked SAC member interest in this topic. Mike also noted that at the recent National Marine Sanctuary Program SAC Chairs and Coordinators' Meeting aquaculture was one of the national policy development topics discussed. Hence, at that meeting Michael Hanrahan suggested that someone from the National Marine Sanctuary Program provide a presentation to the SAC on both NOAA's aquaculture policy and National Marine Sanctuary Program aquaculture policy development. Mike then introduced Dr. Jim Sullivan, the aquaculture lead for the National Marine Sanctuary Program, and Grays Reef National Marine Sanctuary Regional Projects Coordinator, here in response to Michael's suggestion.

Jim began his PowerPoint presentation [slides available upon request] by stating that one-third of fish products entering the market are farm raised. He provided an overview of world and domestic aquaculture, summarizing various types of aquaculture, and commonly cultured species. He indicated that the U.S. ranks 11<sup>th</sup> in aquaculture production, and third in seafood consumption. Within the U.S. approximately 30 marine species are cultured. He explained that the proposed Grace Mariculture project would be an offshore facility located within the U.S. EEZ and listed a number of reasons given for pursuing offshore aquaculture: **avoid delicate coastal ecosystems, avoid shallow bays and estuaries, avoid/minimize conflicts with other ocean users, increased current, increased flushing, healthier, less stressed fish without steroids, hormones or genetic modifications.** Jim also noted that NOAA supports Sea Grant aquaculture projects in Maine and Puerto Rico.

Regarding environmental impacts of aquaculture Jim suggested chapter six of the Pew Commission Report (available online: <http://www.pewoceans.org/>) as a resource. However, he did highlight a number of particular issues: effects on marine transportation, targeting marine mammals for predator control, use of fish meal and fish oil (though he noted that 50% of protein in fishmeal is now soy), non-native species (all species except one proposed for the Grace Mariculture project are native except striped bass which is now well-established in the area), drug introduction to the environment (all facilities that are presently NOAA-backed do not use steroids or hormones), herbicides (to control algal growth on facilities), genetically modified

organisms, accumulation of waste leading to low oxygen, new diseases and parasites. Jim acknowledged that offshore facilities have greater flow and therefore proclaim to have fewer of these effects.

Next, Jim covered the history of aquaculture policy as it pertains to NOAA and the National Marine Sanctuary Program, from the U.S. Department of Commerce aquaculture policy, to the National Aquaculture Act of 1980, to the National Marine Sanctuary Program's current aquaculture policy development. He explained that the National Marine Sanctuary Program currently has effective permitting authority for marine aquaculture in about 150,000 square miles of U.S. waters. According to Jim since 12 sanctuary sites have explicit regulations against altering the seabed, and 12 sites have discharge regulations, the National Marine Sanctuary Program would have to permit aquaculture for it to occur in most sanctuaries.

Linda Krop asked how aquaculture could be permitted if it is prohibited. Jim Sullivan explained that if one wants to violate a prohibition one can apply for a permit to do so. He indicated that there are permits for special uses and research, noting that Grace Mariculture's permit application is for research [note: the referenced permit application was not submitted to the Sanctuary]. Sean Morton added that there are some prohibitions in which the law states that a sanctuary is not authorized to issue a permit relating to a specific prohibition. Jim also covered several other applicable regulations: no commercial fishing (1 site), limitations on vessel operations (1 site), exotic species introductions (2+ sites), damage to sanctuary resources (several), enter and injure regulation (8 sites).

Next Jim began to provide details on the aquaculture policy that the National Marine Sanctuary Program is currently developing. Jim explained that this is an internal policy for that program alone.

Rebecca Roth asked if a proposal, such as Grace, was found to affect coastal zone resources under the Coastal Zone Management Act or CZMA – could the same determination be made that it would affect the Sanctuary. Chris Mobley said that this would be a separate determination. Jim replied that it would have to be shown that there is a likely impact on the sanctuary. Chris Mobley added that within NOAA Fisheries they may promote aquaculture for increased production, but a different part of NOAA may be concerned with potential negative impacts. Jim Sullivan noted that the National Marine Sanctuaries Act indicates why a sanctuary is established and what sanctuary qualities need to be protected.

Next Jim described the steps involved in developing the National Marine Sanctuary Program aquaculture policy: information gathering is complete; a white paper is currently being written; in July 2004 the policy will be submitted for National Marine Sanctuary Program internal review; in August/September 2004 the policy will be submitted to partners (may invoke advisory councils) for review; in winter 2004 the National Marine Sanctuary Program Director will be briefed; policy implementation is anticipated in 2005.

Jim referenced the Pew Ocean Commission and U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy recommendations dealing with aquaculture that may potentially influence the future U.S. direction on this issue: establishing NOAA as the lead authority for marine aquaculture, increasing funding for research and development, working with the UN Food and Agriculture

Organization to encourage adherence to aquaculture provisions of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

*SAC Member Questions and Discussion*

Greg Helms asked what the role of the National Marine Sanctuary Program is given the concept of “one NOAA voice,” NOAA’s support for aquaculture, and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act discussing facilitating compatible uses. Jim responded that the Program will follow the letter of the Sanctuaries Act and that resource management should be balanced.

Linda Krop asked whether a permit has been submitted to NOAA for the Grace project. Greg Helms replied that the EPA has it.

Jim Sullivan acknowledged that another issue is whether one group should be able to lease or use part of the ocean for profit.

Craig Taylor asked what institutions are in lead on environmental impacts research. Jim indicated that those research projects that acquire grant funding have environmental impact components; yet there have not been targeted research projects with this as their focus.

Craig asked who is providing enforcement. Jim replied that the permitting agency is responsible for permit enforcement.

Eric Kett asked whether the California Department of Fish and Game would have any input in Platform Grace. Chris Mobley replied that certain fisheries are managed by the Fish and Game Commission in Federal Waters.

Linda Krop observed confusion as to who has lead jurisdiction. She indicated that so far we have EPA considering NPDES permit, MMS, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: each looks at discrete issues while no one is looking at the whole project. She added if it were in Sanctuary waters maybe the Sanctuary would play that role, but since it’s not that’s not the case. Linda concluded that it seems like applications should be put on hold until NOAA determines how to address these projects. Chris Mobley indicated that all those agencies need to comply with NEPA. If the action has potential for significant environmental impact they would be required to develop an EIS that would look at cumulative impacts.

Linda also asked if there are any discussions within NOAA regarding the recommendations from the ocean commissions. Jim and Chris replied that all parts of NOAA were charged with developing responses to the reports for NOAA to develop its overall response. Jim said his instructions were to determine whether what is described is accurate, and if there are any significant omissions.

Rebecca indicated that the ability for people to participate and understand is place-based, so the SAC is very important in this process: it allows people to learn more about the issues, and be heard. She added that the Coastal Zone Management Act is important because it does require public participation. Rebecca concluded that there needs to be something more than a small notice in the Federal Register and the role of regional governance is something that should be considered.

Dan Brumbaugh asked whether one agency developing an EIS would address the management quagmire. Chris Mobley responded that good government would dictate cooperating agency status among involved agencies. But, he noted that this is on the periphery for a lot of those agencies.

Jim Sullivan noted that aquaculture is not among the top 12 issues identified by the Pew Commission.

Sean Morton asked Jim to give an example of a NMSP policy that has been completely developed. Jim cited an artificial reef policy as the only policy that has been completed and added that it resulted in permitting guidelines. He indicated that the aquaculture policy is so far from the point of being incorporated into an official policy that it is premature to speculate what its result will be. Jim mentioned that the National Marine Sanctuary Program zoning policy is completed but not yet approved. He added that the zoning policy simply identifies all of the things the Program currently does with regard to zoning.

Jim reiterated that as final drafts of the aquaculture policy are in development SAC members will be engaged. Chris acknowledged that when we come together as a group a lot of ideas are raised that others would not necessarily have thought of.

Sean Morton pointed out that feedstock is also an issue and asked if there would be a harvest of products such as krill or kelp.

A member of the public (Sara T.) stated that her friend indicated to her that it was very easy to get a permit to place cages in the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary. She added that her friend was involved in making decisions about cage size and placement and he was uncomfortable with the ease of the permit process since he is not very knowledgeable about it. Jim Sullivan replied that entanglement with humpback whales is the only regulation at that sanctuary that came to play, adding that if a permit was granted the application was evaluated.

In response to Matt Cahn's question of whether the SAC is interested in inviting representatives of Grace Mariculture to a SAC meeting again, SAC members indicated that they were interested.

### **Closing Business**

Matt Cahn announced that since Chris Miller is not present so his presentation is off of the agenda.

Matt asked whether anyone from the public wanted to speak. No members of the public indicated an interest in doing so.

### **Future SAC Meeting Schedule and Agenda Items**

Future SAC meetings:     Friday, July 23, 2004  
                                   Friday, September 24, 2004  
                                   October 12-15, 2004 (Two or three day retreat)

Friday, November 19, 2004

Matt Cahn listed upcoming topics: updates on marine reserves and management plan, possibly hear from Charlie Wahle (MPA center), liquefied natural gas (LNG), U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy final report, and a marine acoustics panel discussion at the next meeting.

Linda if SAC members were interested in a special meeting on LNG. Linda suggested that due to agenda management issues if there is a particular item with public interest the SAC could hold a special evening session. She noted that LNG is one of those topics that won't have time on a regular agenda for awhile. Rebecca suggested having a session similar to that on reserves with an afternoon session for the public. Eric Kett suggested this could draw a large turnout. Matt Cahn observed cautious support, Linda observed Friday night would be difficult.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:55.**

*Meeting notes respectfully submitted by:  
Sarah MacWilliams  
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary  
sarah.macwilliams@noaa.gov*