

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

**FINAL MEETING MINUTES**

**Wednesday, November 16, 2000**

**8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

**Four Points Sheraton Hotel – Windjammer Room  
Ventura, CA**

**In Attendance:**

**GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:**

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

Member Jim Shevock  
Alternate Gary Davis

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Alternate Christina Fahy

**US COAST GUARD**

Alternate Adam Birst

**MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Member Drew Mayerson

**US NAVY**

Member Alex Stone

**CA DEP'T. OF FISH & GAME**

Alternate LT. Jorge Gross

**CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

Alternate Melissa Miller- Henson

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**

Member Dianne Meester  
Alternate Jackie Campbell

**COUNTY OF VENTURA**

Member Lyn Krieger

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE  
SANCTUARY**

LCDR Matthew Pickett, Manager

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:**

**BUSINESS**

Member Rudy Scott

**RECREATION**

Member Jim Brye

**CONSERVATION**

Member Linda Krop

**FISHING**

Member Bruce Steele

**RESEARCH**

Member Leal Mertes  
Alternate Matthew Cahn

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Jon Clark

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Marla Daily  
Alternate Robert Duncan

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Member Craig Fusaro, Ph.D.

**Not in attendance:**

**GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:**

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Member Mark Helvey

**US COAST GUARD**

Member Lt. Yuri Graves

**MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE**

Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

**US NAVY**

Alternate Ron Dow

**CA DEP'T. OF FISH & GAME**

Member Patricia Wolf

**CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY**

Member Brian Baird

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

Member Gary Timm

Alternate Jack Ainsworth

**COUNTY OF VENTURA**

Alternate Jack Peveler

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:**

**TOURISM**

Alternate Alex Brodie

**BUSINESS**

Alternate Dr. Dan Secord

**RECREATION**

Alternate Bill Kendig

**CONSERVATION**

Alternate Greg Helms

**FISHING**

Alternate Chris Williams

**EDUCATION**

Member Dave Long

Alternate Larry Manson

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate Barry Schuyler

**PUBLIC AT-LARGE**

Alternate Roberta Cordero

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE  
SANCTUARY**

William Douros, Superintendent

**GULF OF THE FARALLONES/CORDELL  
BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES**

Ed Ueber, Manager

**1. Administrative Items and Announcements**

**A. Roll Call**

At the call of the roll, 14 of the 20 voting seats were represented. Two additional seats were represented through late arrivals. There were a total of 22 SAC representatives present for the day (13 members, 8 alternates, 1 non-voting representative).

## **B. Introductory Remarks**

Sanctuary Manager Matt Pickett welcomed the Council and commented on the importance of the meeting agenda. Matt thanked the SAC for two years of hard work and success. He noted that the SAC's mailing list of interested constituents has grown to 1200 names over the past two years. He encouraged members to stay actively involved and thanked everyone for their continued commitment.

## **C. Meeting Minutes**

The Council decided that comments on the draft minutes for the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting should be submitted to Mike Murray no later than **November 30<sup>th</sup>**. After that time, the minutes will be finalized and posted on the Sanctuary's web site.

## **D. SAC Seats**

SAC Chair Craig Fusaro announced that the Tourism seat on the SAC is currently open. Anyone interested in applying for the seat should contact Mike Murray to request an application kit. Applications are due by **December 15, 2000**.

## **E. Election of SAC Chair and Vice Chair**

Craig Fusaro and Dianne Meester were nominated for Chair. The SAC voted by ballot. **The Council election resulted in Dianne Meester being elected as Chair.**

Craig Fusaro and Jon Clark were then nominated for Vice Chair. **The Council's ballot vote resulted in Jon Clark being elected as Vice Chair.**

## **2. Manager's Report**

### **Research Vessel *Ballena***

Concerning the November 4<sup>th</sup> capsizing of the Sanctuary's research vessel *Ballena*. Matt Pickett fielded questions from the Council.

Tina Fahy asked if the vessel was salvageable. Matt responded that it is a total loss, having been completely smashed into the rocks near Point Arguello. Craig Fusaro asked about the status of the vessel's tanks. Matt replied that the tanks are still there. Jim Brye asked what happens next, to which Matt replied that CINMS is actively looking for a replacement vessel. Craig Fusaro added that if anyone knows of vessels of opportunity, they should contact CINMS.

Bruce Steele mentioned that he is planning to write a letter to NOAA about how important it is for CINMS to have a research vessel, especially for work related to water quality and other projects. He would like to ask that a new vessel be provided for the site.

**By general acclaim the Council agreed that the Chair would write a letter to NOAA (Dan Basta) on behalf of the SAC emphasizing how important it is for CINMS to acquire a replacement research vessel.**

Jon Clark asked how much the boat was worth. Matt replied that the *Ballena* was worth about \$500,000, but would probably require \$1 million for a new replacement. Jon also asked if private funds can be donated for this purpose. Matt said yes, and indicated that private funds can be donated to the Sanctuary's non profit foundation (Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Foundation)

Marla Daily asked where the *Ballena* was acquired. Matt replied that it was originally a Navy surplus vessel, then owned by CINMS. Alex Stone noted that the Navy has more vessels that might be of interest to CINMS.

### **CINMS Southern Office**

Matt reported that the CINMS southern office Open House is scheduled for November 28 from 3:00-5:00 pm. SAC Members are invited to attend.

### **CINMS Priorities for Fiscal Year 2001**

Matt reported that the CINMS staff has agreed on the following primary areas of focus for Fiscal Year 2001:

- Management Plan Revision (completion of the process)
- Marine Reserves Process (completion)
- Submerged Cultural Resources Program (full-fledged development)

Regarding the submerged cultural resources program, Matt commented that CINMS is working on hiring a full-time Program Coordinator.

### **National Weather Service**

Matt informed the Council that NOAA's coastal marine weather report for the local region has just been updated to include specific mention of CINMS.

### **Research Activities**

Matt reported that in October, CINMS conducted a blue whale research cruise with scientists from UCSC and the Moss Landing Marine Labs. He also mentioned that UCSB's Plumes and Blooms cruises aboard the *Ballena* have continued on a bi-weekly basis. Given the loss of the *Ballena*, CINMS is now working to find a substitute platform to continue with the project.

### **Education and Outreach**

Matt reported that the CINMS Education Department recently met with faculty at UCSB's Marine Science Institute to discuss development of a floating lab program for underrepresented students from area high schools and middle schools. He also mentioned that CINMS is developing an adult education course about the Sanctuary, which will be held at Santa Barbara City College on the evenings of March 6 and 13, and also feature a Sanctuary field trip on March 17.

## **Weather Kiosk**

Matt informed the SAC that CINMS is looking into the possibility of installing a weather kiosk at the Channel Islands Harbor Fuel Dock. This would be the first of six potential weather kiosks hoped to be installed in the Ventura/Santa Barbara region.

## **3. Working Group Reports**

### **A. Military Working Group**

Alex Stone reported that there have not been any official meetings of the group, but that many DOD representatives have been meeting with CINMS staff to discuss draft regulations being proposed for the Management Plan DEIS. Alex also reported that the Navy's Sea Range FEIS should be on schedule for a release in Spring of 2001.

### **B. Fishing Working Group**

Bruce Steele commented that the Fishing Working Group only met once, a long time ago. Since then, e-mail and phone call communication has had to do the job. He said that he has not been approached by anyone asking for the group to have meetings. Bruce also stated that outreach to Ventura fishermen has been somewhat limited. Bruce proposed that it would be a good idea if the Fishing Working Group could meet jointly with the Conservation Working Group, noting that Chris Miller recently attended a meeting of the Conservation Working Group. Craig Fusaro commented that he supports the idea of a joint meeting of the Fishing and Conservation Working Groups, and would volunteer to help make it happen.

### **C. Ports and Harbors Working Group**

Lyn Krieger reported that the Ports and Harbors Working Group has not met since the last meeting of the SAC, but is working on scheduling a meeting after Thanksgiving. Lyn also reported that CMANC had a Board meeting recently and adopted management plan reviews of Sanctuaries as a key issue they want to track closely. Lyn proposed that the Ports and Harbors Working Group could help coordinate and organize the Fishing Working Group.

Craig reminded everyone that CINMS has offered to help any Working Group get organized and hold meetings. He also encouraged all Working Group chairs to contact each other when a Working Group meeting is coming up.

### **D. Education Working Group/MERA**

Julie Goodson (CINMS Education Coordinator) representing the Marine Educators' Regional Alliance (MERA), reported that MERA is currently modifying its organizational focus to act as an informal networking group. MERA will maintain an e-mail newswire and a web site. A one page MERA resource directory will be published annually. Two MERA member receptions will be held each year. A 7-member steering committee will remain in place.

Julie asked the Council for clarification on the desired role of MERA as an Education Working Group of the SAC. She commented that MERA's role with the SAC has been ambiguous, and that MERA has not received any feedback or guidance from the SAC.

Linda Krop suggested that a focused discussion on this take place between MERA and SAC education reps Dave Long and Larry Manson. She also commented that an Education Working Group could be very valuable for helping to review and share the management plan and to possibly focus on educational aspects of marine reserves, should they be designated.

Bruce Steele commented that the SAC does not have a Science Committee, and that this is a weak link. He suggested that perhaps an Education Working Group could focus on the challenge of how scientists and user groups communicate and work together.

Craig Fusaro suggested that as draft products become available on the management plan and marine reserves, perhaps MERA could help get the word out.

Some ideas were provided that Julie will take to the MERA Steering Committee. Additional discussion on this could occur at the Jan. 10<sup>th</sup> SAC Retreat.

#### E. Conservation Working Group

Linda Krop reported that the Conservation Working Group (CWG) met on November 14<sup>th</sup>. A Working Group report was distributed to the Council. Linda stepped the Council through the report, which appears below:

1. Linda Krop handed out copies of the article authored by Robert Sollen that appeared in the Nov. 12 edition of the Santa Barbara News-Press.
2. L. Krop announced the Nov. 17 BEACON meeting to consider a resolution conditionally opposing expansion of the CINMS. **The CWG recommended that BEACON be advised to: take a more positive approach; consider opportunities for partnership; wait until the draft Management Plan and EIS are available to take a position on alternatives; and take advantage of flexible approaches to sanctuary regulations.** L. Krop will attend the meeting.
3. The CWG discussed the status of the Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG) process. Given that most CWG members had not had the opportunity to review the information in the SAC packet, no recommendation was made. Chris Miller was present and provided his perspectives to the Group. A CWG meeting will be scheduled in early December to allow for a presentation by CWG member Greg Helms and to provide an update from the 11/15 MRWG meeting. In the meantime, **the CWG agreed to advise the SAC of its strong support for the MRWG process.**
4. The CWG was advised about the draft Marine Resource Management Program, and encouraged to **submit comments by Nov. 30.**
5. Future SAC agenda items: **the CWG formally requests that a presentation be made to the SAC regarding the non-regulatory programs of the CINMS, including both current programs as well as programs that may be included in the upcoming draft**

**Management Plan Update. The CWG requested that the presentation be made as soon as possible, as it relates directly to the Management Plan Update process.**

#### **4. Council Member Announcements**

Drew Mayerson reported that plans for a 3-D high energy seismic survey (HESS) proposed at the Cavern Point Unit (adjacent to CINMS) have been withdrawn by the operator in favor of attempting to utilize existing 2-D survey data.

Jorge Gross described a recent decision by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council to implement cow cod fishing closures throughout a large area (approx. 4500 sq. mi.) including Santa Barbara Island and areas further south.

Marla Daily reported that the Nature Conservancy recently transferred ownership of lands on Santa Cruz Island near the isthmus to the National Park Service.

Linda Krop reported that the Santa Barbara ChannelKeeper has a new boat at Santa Barbara Harbor, and a new staff person: Mr. Drew Bohan. Also, she noted that a Ventura CoastKeeper program is being launched.

Bruce Steele emphasized the significance and magnitude of the cow cod closures in southern California, noting that commercial fisheries could be in serious danger.

Jim Brye reported he recently attended a meeting of the Ventura Harbor's newly formed "Task Force on the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary," and that many of the members of that group were present at the SAC meeting.

#### **5. Public Comment Period**

The public comment period was extended from 30 to approximately 90 minutes to accommodate 16 speakers, many of whom were members of Ventura Harbor's Task Force on the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. Many shared concerns about potential negative impacts from marine reserve establishment.

Dave Tibbles, -- Commercial fisherman at the islands for 35 years, primarily in the squid and coastal pelagic fisheries, representing all commercial fishermen. Dave stated that when and if areas are closed, it will be very ominous. According to Dave, fishermen are running out of areas to fish. At the Channel Islands, he described squid as being strong, and sardine stocks as strong and building. White seabass, barracuda, yellow tail, marine mammals, sea otters -- all are on the up and up, Dave stated. He noted, however, that exceptions are commercial fishermen, kelp and rockfish. Dave stated that in this process, fishermen want to hear language such as "retribution," "compensation," and "mitigation" for areas that are going to be lost. He also asked that the process proceed diligently and fairly, and emphasized that it is important to look at every possible avenue of relief for every fisherman that's going to be displaced.

Oscar Pena - General Manager, Ventura Harbor. Oscar recognized and thanked Jim Brye for attending the recent meetings of the Ventura Harbor's Task Force [on CINMS]. Oscar reported that last month the Port Commissioners approved formation of the Task Force to create a conduit to the SAC for Harbor stakeholders. He noted that Sandy Delano has been attending SAC meetings for several months now. Other stakeholders, such as commercial fishermen, can't always be at the meetings, Oscar stated.

Oscar also reported that the Task Force has decided to send a letter to legislative representatives to express concerns about the process. [A letter to Congressman Gallegly was distributed to SAC] The letter, he said, poses questions about the socio-economic impacts to the infrastructure of the port that relies on the dredging, which is tied directly to the offloading of fisheries catch and the federal funding acquired for harbor dredging.

Oscar explained that Task Force representatives include Port Commissioners, recreational operators of the marinas, staff from the City of Ventura, the owner of the Four-Points Sheraton Hotel, the owner of the fuel dock, and the operator of the boatyard. He stated that all members want to know what the economic impact will be with 30-50% fishing reductions in no-take zones. Oscar expressed a hope that in the future others can be invited to meetings of the Task Force. He would like Matt Pickett to make a presentation to their Board, and provide an update on where things are going with respect to policy decisions on this issue.

Craig Fusaro asked Oscar Pena if the Task Force had plans to conduct an independent analysis or study of potential economic impacts. Oscar replied that the goal at this point is to provide as much input as possible to the process, and that at this stage economic resources have not been allocated for those kinds of studies. Craig Fusaro suggested that it would be a good idea for the Task Force to contact Bob Leeworthy and Pete Wiley, NOAA economists in charge of providing socio-economic information to the Marine Reserves Working Group, and provide them with additional information that could help to assure a sound socio-economic analysis. Oscar commented further that it is the rippling economic effects that are of great concern to the Task Force, from the fishermen to the fuel dock to the boatyard and even the hotels.

Matt Pickett asked Oscar if there is anything else that could be done to make the management plan and marine reserves processes more open or transparent to the Task Force. Oscar replied that day time meetings, and such long meetings, are difficult for their constituents. The Task Force is meeting at night, which works better for many of them, especially fishermen. If evening meetings were held, focused on more specific topics, attendance might improve.

Dianne Meester suggested that it might be useful for the Task Force and other groups like to work with the SAC's Port and Harbors Working Group to channel comments on the management plan and marine reserves process. Oscar replied that they hope to do that, but noted that there are different interests at each port and harbor. He stated that Port Hueneme, for example, is a deepwater port with a lot of emphasis on commerce and the Department of Defense, while Channel Islands Harbor has less emphasis [than Ventura] on commercial fishing and their dredging demands are met in a different way than at Ventura. Oscar went on to say that the Task Force would try to meet with the SAC's Ports and Harbors Working Group, but that the main priority of the Task Force is to communicate to the SAC and CINMS the special needs of Ventura Harbor.

John Johnson - Boatyard owner, Ventura Harbor. Thanked the SAC for taking the time to deal with all of this. John would like to see evening meetings, such as the meeting recently held in Goleta [Marine Reserves Working Group Public Forum], which he described as an excellent exchange of information on all sides that provided a better understanding of the situation. John said that the Ventura Port District meets at night, and so does the City Council and Planning Commission. He emphasized that evening meetings insure that the process is “public,” which is one of the objectives of the SAC. He finds it personally difficult to leave his business during the week from 8am to 5pm to attend meetings, but would be glad to attend in the evening.

John sees as difficult to swallow the whole idea of more regulations. He said that fishermen are feeling threatened right now, and that there doesn't appear to be a real need to do some of the things being proposed. John also stated that some feel that this process is merely a bureaucratic exercise, or possibly an organization-building scheme that will allow some people to be paid additionally for larger staffs.

John emphasized that fishing is extremely important to Ventura Harbor. Without that industry, John feels that 1/3 to 1/2 of his business will fall away, and that his business will likely not survive. If that happens, John said, boats may have to travel all the way to San Pedro, burning fuel, polluting the air, and working crews overtime. John also mentioned that Ventura County is the 10<sup>th</sup> largest fishing area in the United States, annually contributing \$100 million to the economy.

John encouraged the SAC to keep the process public, help them understand what the needs really are, and to be very objective. He also commented that some people see a desire to experiment here at the Channel Islands, but suggested that perhaps this it is not wise to do that. He concluded by stating that fisheries regulation is not part of the charter of the marine sanctuary, so perhaps other agencies should be involved rather than the sanctuary.

Craig Fusaro commented that the task of representing the public at-large on the Council is very difficult, and that sometimes he and the other two public at-large representatives hear that they are not doing such a good job, particularly at representing the large conservation interests in the community. In that regard, Craig said he found it interesting to hear some of John's perspectives about there being “too much regulation.” Craig noted that the public at-large representatives on the SAC often receive interesting and conflicting directions from the public. He thanked John for the balance brought forth by his comments.

Richard Parsons - Ventura Port District. Richard has worked with the Port District for 18 years, and during that time has been responsible for the District's dredging program. Richard described the work as primarily involving persuading Congress each year to appropriate funds for dredging, and assuring that the Army Corps of Engineers executes the dredging. Richard explained that the federal process looks to the national economic product that is produced or results from expenditures of funds to the Corps of Engineers on navigation projects. Under this system, recreational boating has no contribution to the national economic product, but commercial fishing does. Richard stated that over the past 18 years, Congress has appropriated over \$40 million to maintain and improve the harbor entrance. He also said that over that same period, the Ventura Port District's entire budget has not equaled this amount. Richard emphasized that if the federal funds are lost, the ocean entrance will be lost, and at that point there will be no harbor. He stated that maintaining a viable commercial fishing industry in the

harbor is critical to the survival of the harbor. Richard urged SAC to find the middle ground that will allow the commercial fishermen to survive.

Matt Pickett asked Richard if he could elaborate on the relationship between contributions to national economic product and federal subsidies for dredging. Richard responded that when the Army Corps of Engineers performs a economic benefits analysis on proposed projects to be funded, they look for those with a cost-benefit ratios better than 1 to 1. He said that the Corps looks at resulting products that contribute to the national economic product, and that “recreation” is not considered a product. Therefore, he continued, the only contribution Ventura Harbor makes to national economic product as a result of dredging is from commercial fishing. He also added that, unlike Channel Islands Harbor and others, Ventura Harbor requires dredging every year.

Bruce Steele commented that in Morro Bay, the harbor was also dependent upon these federal funds for dredging. He said that their fish landings dropped to a level where they no longer qualified for the funds to support the amount of dredging they needed. The result was that they had to go “begging” for other funds to cover it, and they will have to continue to do so. Santa Barbara and Ventura have not had this problem because the catch levels have been sufficient. Matt Pickett asked if the catch was measured by value or weight. Richard responded that it is by weight. Richard also commented that squid is good in this regard because it has a high wet weight.

Marla Daily asked why this happened at Morro Bay. Craig Fusaro responded that it was a combination of dropping groundfish catches and a decline in salmonids. Bruce Steele added that a third factor had to do with tuna catch levels, and tuna processing being moved elsewhere.

Randy Short – Recreational boater. Randy spoke on behalf of recreational boaters. He mentioned that there are over 1 million recreational boats registered in the state of California, more than half of which are registered from Santa Barbara and south. Randy commented that among the SAC Working Groups, he does not see an avenue for their input. He feels that recreational boating is a very appropriate user group to be advising the SAC about the marine sanctuary. Randy stated that the recreational boating community feels that the actions being considered will negatively impact them. As an example, he noted that he is working with a small group that is trying to increase access to the Channel Islands National Park, and that they feel a good solution is the installation of small fixed piers with floating docks to accommodate small boats. Randy also noted, however, that it is his understanding that sanctuary regulations would prohibit any such construction. He said that recreational boaters are very concerned about access to the islands, and improving that access. Randy closed by stating that the recreational boating community is concerned about the fact that they are not represented by any of the SAC’s working groups.

Sandy Delano - Property Manager, Ventura Harbor Village. Sandy mentioned to Bruce Steele that she would like to follow up with him to work on bringing fishermen from Santa Barbara and Ventura together to work on sanctuary issues. Sandy asked Matt Pickett if existing closure areas around the Channel Islands would potentially be reopened in exchange for the establishment of new closure areas. Matt Pickett responded that this idea is on the table for discussion by the Marine Reserves Working Group, but no decisions have been made yet. Sandy commented that this idea would meet with approval from the fishing community. Sandy also asked if the large cow cod closure area [recently announced by the Pacific Fishery Management Council] would be

taken into consideration when reserves were proposed for the Channel Islands. Matt responded that the MRWG is trying to take into consideration this cow cod closure, and all other fishery management actions and closures, as they develop reserve options. He also said that he expects the MRWG will ask the Science Panel to consider outside closures when evaluating a MRWG reserve proposal.

Chris Miller – Vice President, California Lobster and Trap Fishermen’s Association; working with the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Associations (PCFFA); member of Marine Reserves Working Group. Chris reported that “they” received a grant to augment the NOAA socio-economic study by expanding data collection to the coast and separate fishing effort patterns by ports. This should provide a lot more information about what people are concerned about, and enhance our planning. He also reported that he recently attended a PCFFA Board of Directors meeting. The board assigned Chris to be their point man on marine protected areas.

Chris expressed that people seem to be focusing on the socio-economic issue from mostly the economic standpoint. He noted that theoretical models exist and are being used to devise strategies to protect biodiversity in the natural world, and that these same kinds of models are needed for what he and PCFFA are trying to accomplish socially (not just economically) with harbor communities. Chris added that its important to strive to maintain diversity in jobs, within local economies, and in the fresh fish catch that comes to local communities.

In the deliberations over where to draw boundary lines for marine reserves, Chris said he has pointed out to conservationists that their arguments to designate certain “square blocks” on the map as reserves have serious implications, such as ultimately leading to “ten-day old Mexican seafood” being provided to this community [rather than fresh local catch]. He also stated that social theory is institutionally neglected at UCSB, where he feels the emphasis is on looking at everything with computer models and equations.

Chris reported that PCFFA has GIS capabilities, and is looking into ways to incorporate fishermen’s ecological information into the marine reserves process. Chris also emphasized that he/PCFFA is involved with the process in a partnership role. He stated that he is/they are not here to be shuffled around to different committees and “fill in the blanks” for the process, allowing someone to simply check of the box that indicates “we talked to a fisherman.”

Zoe Taylor – CEO, Ventura Chamber of Commerce. As a recent new member of the Ventura Harbor Task Force on CINMS. Zoe reported that the Ventura Chamber has had a Coastal Task Force for two years now, and has done a number of surveys on what the community would like to see along the coastline. She mentioned that survey results indicate strong support for saving the integrity of the coastline and the ocean, high concern about the environment, and a strong interest in preservation of the Channel Islands National Park for the enjoyment of visitors.

Zoe explained that the Chamber of Commerce was involved with a two-year visioning process for the City of Ventura. She stated that the Harbor emerged from this process as one of the city’s “jewels.” Therefore, she commented, all of the comments the SAC heard today about the importance of dredging, commercial fishing, recreational fishing are all extremely important to the Chamber of Commerce. She added that the state of the economy in Ventura is very dependent upon what happens at the harbor, including tourism activities.

Zoe questioned why another level of government regulation is needed. She said the Ventura Harbor Task Force on CINMS will be encouraging decision makers to overlay all of the existing regulations to make sure that it makes sense. She added that while the business community wants to save the integrity of the ocean, they want to make sure it is done in the right manner and with good forethought.

Zoe also commented that day-long meetings are difficult to attend. She went on to emphasize how important this issue is to the business community, and stated that two additional committees of the Chamber of Commerce would also be taking up this issue and providing input the Task Force.

Zoe expressed that the Chamber of Commerce is very concerned with the decisions that will be made. She also said the Chamber of Commerce is willing and very excited about a chance to work with the SAC/CINMS so that a strong balance of interests can be achieved. She urged the SAC to not take the issue lightly, and to involve the total community.

John Wong – Owner, Four Points Sheraton Hotel, Ventura Harbor; past Chair of the Ventura Visitors Convention Bureau; Trustee of Marine Educational Center. John thanked the SAC for holding the meeting at the Hotel, and Craig thanked him in return for hosting the Council.

John commented that from a tourism standpoint, the hotel is proud to be part of a working harbor with a very strong commercial fishing component. He stated that the hotel enjoys a good relationship with partners in the Harbor. He explained that he is on trustee board that is trying to put a Marine Education Center next to the Channel Islands National Park (CINP) headquarters. He feels that the Harbor can be utilized much more than it currently is, and that the CINP center is an underutilized asset. John said the goal of the Marine Educational Center is to create an environment that can educate people about the ecosystem of the Channel Islands and the coast, help people understand why the ecosystem is important, and sensitize the community about how we have to be very careful about the way we treat it.

John noted that the dredging issue at the Harbor is very important to the tourism industry as well. John expressed hope that there be sensitivity to this issue, and the cause and effects of the decisions to be made.

Ciro Ferrigno - San Pedro purse seiner, representing the four or five purse seiners out of San Pedro. Ciro explained that he has been a San Pedro resident for 37 years, and a second generation commercial fisherman of southern California coastal waters for 19 years. He stated that the Channel Islands have produced not only squid, but also great areas for sardine, mackerel and record-breaking tuna. Ciro said that he and his father have seen many restrictions and losses in their more than 35 years in the business. As skipper of the *Ferrigno Boy*, Ciro said he is finding it very difficult to make a good living for his family of six, and the families of his eight and ten men crews. He stated that over 45 people depend on his ability to produce fish on a daily basis. Ciro also explained that his fishery is already restricted on the front side of Catalina, in Santa Monica Bay, and the along shorelines of Orange County four months out of the year. As of last year, Ciro said, the US Coast Guard and the Mexican Government have been enforcing the Lacey Act, which he said makes it virtually impossible to fish for tuna south of the border. He explained that they are forced to fish 200 miles off the coast of Mexico, leaving no reasonable areas to fish. Ciro talked about the new weekend closures for squid fisheries, noting that work weeks are down to 5 days and changes in the weather can often bring a loss of

additional working days. He stated that between area and weekend closures, his fishery is limited. To lose more of the fishable waters, he said, would be devastating. According to Ciro, a 30-50% closure around the islands would cripple his fishing community considerably, with yearly income being cut by the same percentage. Ciro also pointed out that the 1997-1998 Channel Islands squid season produced over 70% of the fishery's annual income, and that the 1998-2000 squid seasons were also very productive. He emphasized that the Channel Islands are very important for the fleet. Ciro said that most fishermen are not against reserves. However, closing more areas, he said, would not only be mismanagement, but would destroy livelihoods.

Don Brocnick - Squid fisherman. Don informed the SAC that the squid fleet is taking important steps to protect resources, such as light shading and seasonal closures. He said that squid fishermen are willing to work in partnership on this, and that he supports the process. He added that he cannot support a 30-50% closure. Don hopes that the Council is considering other regulations, and that the marine reserves process be slowed down to allow more time to learn about the resources, such as the life cycle of squid. He also stated that he does not see the benefits of the existing reserve at Anacapa Island.

Sandy Squires – Santa Barbara resident. Sandy acknowledged that she is not very knowledgeable about fisheries, but is trying to learn. She wondered why she has not heard anyone talking about the impacts of bycatch. She also said that she has heard there are too many fishermen and fishing licenses for the area. She expressed concerns about the impact of fishing as a disturbance to the sea floor. She also asked the SAC if there have been incentive programs proposed to help fishermen change careers. Bruce Steele replied that there are in fact far fewer fishermen in the area than there used to be, and added that bycatch is a concern. Craig Fusaro confirmed that the number of fishermen is declining, and that limited entry programs are being developed for some fisheries.

Gary Hitch - Ventura Harbor Fuel Dock and Channel Islands Harbor Fuel Dock. Gary said that he has watched fishermen be regulated right out of business over the years. He emphasized that a 30-50% closure at the islands would likely put the fuel docks out of business.

Eric Hooper - Ventura County Commercial Fishermen's Association (VCFFA). Eric reported that the VCFFA has decided not to support the marine reserves process, noting that they have been unable to get a seat at the MRWG table. He stated that Bruce Steele is not able to fully represent their interests. Eric said that they will still participate, and provide information if they could, but they want to go on record as not supporting the process. He said VCFFA feels that CINMS is no longer an objective party in the process, as it was stated they would be early on. Eric noted that the discussion on reserves has gone from 20% of an area one mile around the islands to 30-50% of an area extending 6 miles from island shores.

Matt Pickett asked Eric if he felt that the Marine Life Protection Act process would provide a better or more detailed process for VCFFA. Eric replied that at least for that process they have representatives directly involved.

Robert Duncan, SAC Public At-Large alternate, expressed that he was very pleased with the public turnout at the meeting, and offered to help organize and bring together community members to assure that their voice could be heard in the process.

Ed Matthews - Port of Ventura. Ed emphasized the importance of the interplay between the agencies involved in this issue, and asked about the presence of NMFS in the process. Craig Fusaro pointed out that NMFS was at the table today (Christina Fahy) and holds a seat on the MRWG as well. Craig also explained the various ways people could get comments into the MRWG process, and described the importance of getting in touch with MRWG members before the next meeting on December 14.

Andy B. – Squid fisherman from Washington state. Andy explained that without the Channel Islands squid fishery, he would not be able to stay in business. He noted that the industry’s willingness to shade their lights in order to protect seabirds shows that they are also environmentalists.

To close out the public comment period, Craig Fusaro described the ongoing avenues available for expressing comments and concerns, and made note of the upcoming MRWG meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup> and the group’s intent to hold additional public forums.

## **6. Marine Reserves Process**

Sean Hastings provided a review of the Marine Reserves process. After an introductory presentation on the process, Sean explained and fielded questions on the status of the Socio-Economic Team’s work, distributed and explained a draft document entitled “Update and Description of Socio-Economic Data Layers,” and showed some draft maps depicting specific economic values of fisheries around the Channel Islands.

Jim Shevock suggested that revision dates be added to all draft documents and handouts.

Leal Mertes asked if there is socio-economic data to show how valuable CINMS fisheries are relative to those throughout the Santa Barbara Channel. Sean responded that we have seen data showing good, broad coverage for the value of squid harvest in these areas, but not as much for other fisheries.

Drew Mayerson asked if the socio-economic impact analysis will be available to the SAC before the Council decides on the MRWG recommendation. Sean said “yes.”

Bruce Steele asked about the proposed Freedom To Fish Act, and wanted to know if CINMS will lobby or comment on this. Sean replied that CINMS cannot lobby, but will keep an eye on this and, at some point, may need to factor it in to the marine reserves process and possibly comment.

Jon Clark asked what the next layer of socio-economic data will be that the SAC can review. Craig Fusaro responded that it would likely be an impact analysis of various draft reserve scenarios, possibly in March.

Eric Hooper reminded the SAC that some fishermen only have one fishery that they can rely on to make a living.

Science Panel Chair Matt Cahn provided an opening statement about the role of the Science Panel, emphasizing that the Panel should not be attacked for the advice they have provided.

Satie Airame provided a thorough explanation of the process and rationale for the Science Panel's recent recommendation provided to the MRWG. Satie distributed and explained two documents to the SAC: 1) Science Advisory Panel Recommendation summary; 2) Locating Marine Reserves in the Channel Islands [contact CINMS office for copies of these documents].

Satie reported that a new peer-reviewed paper will come out soon that provides further support for the Science Panel's 30-50% closure recommendation.

Satie explained the factors that are being looked at by the Science Panel to recommend suggested reserve locations, including: biogeographic zones, habitat types, kelp beds, eel grass, seabird areas, marine mammal areas, etc. Habitat is being relied on as a proxy for species distribution. Satie then provided an explanation of how the "sites" computer model works to identify areas for consideration as reserves.

Drew Mayerson asked if there was any weighting to the criteria being used in the model, and Satie responded that there was not. Satie explained that this was consistent with the direction they received from the MRWG, and explained further the idea of representative habitats.

In response to questions from Melissa Miller-Henson, Satie explained how the model works to "clump" together rather than "scatter" cells (1 by 1 mile blocks within the sanctuary) of high conservation value.

Dianne Meester asked if the model could accommodate socio-economic data as well. Satie replied that it could, but explained that it had not yet been made available to the science panel.

Bruce Steele commented that fishermen got together long before any of the model results were produced, and they mapped out where potential reserves could be placed that they could live with. He said that the locations match closely with what the MRWG has found to be areas of common agreement, and also with what the Science Panel's model has suggested.

Matt Cahn explained that the final Science Panel recommendation will be sent out for peer review.

Eric Hooper asked if there was published literature to support the benefits of marine reserves. Satie referred him to a list of 76 studies that provide a range of supportive evidence.

Chris Miller explained the role of the Fishermen's Data Review Committee in assisting the Socio-Economic Panel and the MRWG. He explained the Trade Secrets Act and how it can protect fishermen from other fishermen. Chris said that the data the fishermen have will show the hot spots around the Channel Islands, and also reveal a hierarchy of habitats and reef systems. Chris emphasized that habitat quality is an important factor in reserve design, noting that if a higher quality reef system is set aside, then less overall area would be needed to protect biodiversity. Chris also said that he has a good relationship with some researchers, such as Dr. Milton Love of UCSB. Chris also asked the SAC to consider that how we choose to employ the precautionary principle with reserves is really an ethical question. He also commented that most of the fisheries in place already have limited entry plans, and many are ratcheting down on allowable catch levels.

Sean Hastings reviewed the Working Draft MRWG Recommendation Template document [previously distributed to the SAC, and available from the CINMS office]. Sean encouraged all SAC members to review the draft document and get comments to the MRWG soon. Sean also explained that the MRWG has adopted a new timeline for completing their work, and the revised schedule now sets May 2001 as a target month for delivery of a final recommendation to the SAC.

Matt Pickett stressed the importance that the Council be fully prepared for receiving the MRWG recommendation, and stated that he will be looking to the SAC for their recommendation on the MRWG's proposal on the same day it is delivered to the SAC. SAC members discussed the importance that the MRWG final report be mailed to them in advance of the SAC meeting at which a Council recommendation will be sought (some time in May).

Craig Fusaro mentioned that the MRWG in planning to have at least two more public forums. Linda added that SAC meetings are also an important forum to use for public comments. Marla Daily noted that at the last MRWG meeting, the group did allow some public comment. She suggested that more allowance of public comment should be considered.

Sean informed the SAC that the next meeting of the MRWG is scheduled for Thursday December 14, 2000, 8:30 am - 4:30 pm, at the Chase Palm Park Center, Santa Barbara CA.

Linda Krop suggested that the SAC should consider sending a letter of support and thanks to the MRWG and associated panels.

**By general acclaim, the Council decided that a letter of thanks and encouragement be sent from the SAC to the MRWG, Science Panel and Socio-Economic Team.**

## **7. Report: California Biodiversity Council Meeting, Nov. 8-9**

Melissa Miller-Henson provided a brief report on the November 8-9 meeting of the California Biodiversity Council, held in Santa Barbara. Melissa specifically noted the success of the panel discussion on the Channel Islands marine reserves process.

## **8. Draft Management Plan Review: Marine Resource Management Plan Section**

Anne Walton and Mike Murray provided a brief description of the Marine Resource Management Program section of the CINMS draft management plan (previously mailed to all SAC representatives). This is a first draft subsection of the draft management plan.

Regarding the draft document's subsection on the Sanctuary Advisory Council, Craig Fusaro commented that he was comfortable with it, noting it to be concise and comprehensive.

Marla commented that the Emergency Response Plan subsection appeared to be too narrow in its treatment of types of emergencies that CINMS will be prepared to be responded to. She suggested a more generic approach to the section. Marla also suggested that the law enforcement

section could be improved by adding/emphasizing the site's commitment to maintaining a vessel or vessels. She also suggested that it might be better to refer to "vessel" rather than "Ballena" or "Xantu."

Craig asked about the "Resource Management Team" that is mentioned early in the document, and who that is referring to. Anne responded that the "partnership" subsection describes this team, and the SAC is a component of this (along with staff and other external partners).

Concerning the emergency response plan subsection, Craig Fusaro asked if it seemed appropriate for the CINMS management plan to call on the site to "develop damage assessment guidelines" when this is already done in other parts of NOAA, with the Dept. of Fish and Game, etc. He suggested that mention of coordination on this is advisable, and should be spelled out in detail. Anne explained that the management plan will not contain the full details of the how we respond to an emergency, noting that we have extensive binders of protocols and instructions kept at the office. Craig suggested that the "partners" section should be added to.

Craig Fusaro also commented on draft document's mention of the use of volunteers for impact assessment. He commented that because emergency response incidents often end up being legal cases, he cautioned against CINMS using volunteers as a front line response unit for inventory and impact assessment.

Marla Daily asked if the damage assessment guidelines that the document suggests CINMS should develop would be over and above existing protocols. Anne replied that protocols will be developed by CINMS that are site and issue specific, but will be drawn from national program guidelines, protocols and models. She said that CINMS is essentially plugging in to what is already established.

Craig Fusaro asked if the zonal management section was making reference to additional set-aside or zoned areas beyond what will be proposed by the MRWG. Anne said that other kinds of zones (in addition to no-take) might be considered to delineate activities, protect resources, allow for research, etc. Anne said that CINMS wants to work with the SAC over time to look at zoning schemes, noting that perhaps no-take zones are all that is needed.

Gary Davis pointed out that "zoning" can be utilized for more than just adding protective areas, but also for delineating such activities as access, or placement of built structures.

Anne emphasized that the zoning section is really a place-holder section, which is awaiting the outcome of the marine reserves process. It may be that a supplemental EIS to the management plan will be needed in the future to address the implementation of marine reserves.

A **November 30** was established for submitting additional comments to Anne.

## **9. National Marine Sanctuaries Act Reauthorization**

Mike Murray distributed a strike-out copy of the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000 to the SAC and the public. Mike provided a brief description of highlights from the newly-reauthorized Act.

Mike began by reviewing some background information on the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA) and its periodic reauthorization:

- NMSA Reauthorization by Congress occurs every 3-5 years.
- Reauthorization provides NOAA and/or Congress an opportunity to review and make changes to the Act.
- Since the NMSA was enacted in 1972, it has been amended and reauthorized in 1980, 1984, 1988, 1992, and 1996.
- Work on the current NMSA reauthorization began in the summer of 1999.
- On November 13, 2000 the President signed the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000.

Mike described briefly the following highlights of changes found in the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000:

***Findings Purposes and Policies***

- “Conservation” value of areas more strongly acknowledged [301(a)(4)]
- Marine sanctuaries are to improve [301(a)(4)(A)]:
  - conservation of marine resources
  - sustainable use of marine resources
- Sanctuaries are to [301(b)(3)]:
  - Maintain natural biological communities
  - Restore and enhance natural habitats, populations and ecological processes
- The “Program” is now referred to as the National Marine Sanctuary “System”

*Limitation on Designation of New Sanctuaries*

- No new sanctuary designations (excluding northwest Hawaiian Islands and Thunder Bay NMS) unless sufficient resources are available to [304(f)]:
  - Effectively implement management plans for each sanctuary
  - Complete site characterization studies/inventory resources of each sanctuary within 10 years

*Northwest Hawaiian Islands [304(g)]*

- After consultation with Governor of Hawaii, President may designate NW Hawaiian Islands as a coral reef reserve
- If so, NOAA shall initiate designation as a National Marine Sanctuary

*Prohibited Activities*

- Unlawful to interfere with enforcement by [306(3)]:
  - refusing to permit an officer authorized to enforce NMSA to board a vessel
  - resisting, opposing, interfering, harassing, etc. an officer from enforcing NMSA
  - Knowingly and willfully submitting false information to an officer in connection with search or inspection under the NMSA

*Interpretive Facilities [309(d)]*

- Interpretive facilities may be developed near any sanctuary
- Interpretive facilities must emphasize the conservation goals and sustainable public uses of sanctuaries

*Funding Levels*

- Authorizes \$32 million in fiscal year 2001, with levels increasing by \$2 million a year through fiscal year 2005.
- Authorizes \$6 million a year in fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for construction projects.
- Non-Profit Partners and Sponsors
- Non-profit partners (i.e., sanctuary friends' groups or sanctuary foundations) may solicit others to be official sponsors of the NMSP [316(g)(1)]
- Non-profit partners may collect contributions from the sponsor, and transfer funds to the sanctuary [316(g)(1)]

*Dr. Nancy Foster Scholarship Program*

- Establishes the Dr. Nancy Foster Scholarships to award graduate education scholarships to recognize outstanding scholarship, particularly by women and minorities, in the fields of oceanography, marine biology, and maritime archeology
- Funded at 1% of NMSP annual appropriation

## **10. Review: National Marine Sanctuary Program SAC Handbook**

Mike Murray stepped the Council through a draft document recently produced by the National Marine Sanctuary Program: "Sanctuary Advisory Council Handbook." This document had been

previously mailed to all SAC representatives. Mike touched on highlights in the document related to the following:

- A draft policy statement that emphasizes the importance of Advisory Councils and the national program's commitment to support SACs at each of the sanctuary sites.
- The roles of a SAC, including the following:
  1. Liaison between Sanctuary and community
  2. Identify and enhance Sanctuary partnerships
  3. Help identify and resolve issues and conflicts
  4. Prepare annual work plans
  5. Hold Council Retreats
  6. Review and provide input on sanctuary plans, proposals and products
  7. Help support non-profit "friends" organizations
  8. Provide technical expertise and information
  9. Validate accuracy and quality of information to be used by the Sanctuary
- Bullet point descriptions of the requirements for certain common SAC seats, for use in advertising SAC vacancies.
- Suggestions for dealing with common problems on SACs.

Mike notified the Council that comments on this draft document should be submitted to CINMS no later than January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2001. A final version of the document will be made available to the SAC and the public (via CINMS web site).

## **11. Process Review: SAC Experience with Management Plan Revision**

Given time constraints, agenda item 11 was not covered at the meeting: SAC Experience with Management Plan Revision.

## **12. Future meeting dates and agenda topics**

### **A. Meeting Schedules**

To better facilitate preparing for the MRWG's final report, the SAC agreed to schedule an additional meeting on **June 19** (from 1:00 – 8:00 pm) for purposes of receiving the MRWG's recommendation. Sean Hasting reminded the SAC that the June 19 meeting date needs to be regarded as tentative, pending agreement by the MRWG.

At the end of the day, the SAC meeting schedule for 2001 stood as follows:

- January 10 – SAC Retreat
- March 14 – SAC meeting
- May 9 – SAC meeting (or possibly May 23 – SAC decision pending)
- June 19 (Tentative) – SAC meeting to receive MRWG recommendation
- July 11 – SAC meeting
- Sept. 12 – SAC meeting
- Nov. 14 – SAC meeting

## **B. SAC Retreat**

The Council decided that the January 10<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting should be changed to a SAC Retreat. Council members suggested that the retreat be located on the mainland (as opposed to at the islands), and expressed an interest in addressing the following topics:

- Getting everyone back on the same page with respect to CINMS programs (research, education, etc.) currently in place and proposed within the management plan;
- Operational issues (the role of the SAC, the role of members, working groups, etc.);
- Recapping what the SAC has done over the last two years;
- Identification of SAC priorities for 2001, and approaches for taking them on.

## **C. Future Agenda Topics**

In addition to the continuation of work on the management plan revision process and the marine reserves process, agenda topics of interest that were raised by SAC members throughout the meeting day included the following:

- Freedom to Fish Act
- CINMS Programs (education, research, resource protection, etc.) – staff presentations

**The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.**

*Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:*

Michael Murray  
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary