

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

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 17, 2000

11:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Chase Palm Park Center • Santa Barbara, CA

In Attendance:

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Alternate Korie Johnson

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Member Jim Shevock

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Member Drew Mayerson

US NAVY

Member Alex Stone

US COAST GUARD

Alternate Mike Hamerski

CA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Member Patty Wolf

Alternate Lt. Jorge Gross

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

Member Gary Timm

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Member Dianne Meester

Alternate Jackie Campbell

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY

Alternate Melissa Miller-Henson

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

TOURISM

Member Michael Finucan

Alternate Alex Brodie

BUSINESS

Member Rudy Scott

RECREATION

Member Jim Brye

FISHING

Member Bruce Steele

Alternate Chris Williams

CONSERVATION

Member Linda Krop

Alternate Greg Helms

EDUCATION

Member Dave Long

RESEARCH

Member Leal Mertes, Ph.D.

Alternate Matthew Cahn

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Member Marla Daily

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Alternate Mick Kronman

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE
SANCTUARY**

LCDR Matthew Pickett, Manager

Not attending:

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Member Mark Helvey

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Alternate Gary Davis

US COAST GUARD

Member Lt. Yuri Graves

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

US NAVY

Alternate Ron Dow

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY

Member Brian Baird

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

Alternate Jack Ainsworth

COUNTY OF VENTURA

Member Lyn Krieger

Alternate Jack Peveler

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE
SANCTUARY**

William Douros, Superintendent

**GULF OF THE FARALLONES/CORDELL BANK
NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY**

Ed Ueber, Manager

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

BUSINESS

Alternate Dr. Dan Secord

RECREATION

Alternate Tony Gibbs

EDUCATION

Member Dave Long

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Member Jean-Michel Cousteau

Alternate Barry Schuyler

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Member Dr. Craig Fusaro

1. Administrative Items and Announcements

A. Call To Order and Roll Call

Vice-Chair Dianne Meester opened the meeting with an announcement that the agenda had been restructured. SAC Coordinator Mike Murray called the roll. A quorum of voting members was present (13 seats represented at roll call). Additional four seats were subsequently represented as members arrived later in the day.

B. Introductory Remarks

Greg Helms of the Center for Marine Conservation introduced himself to the SAC as the new Conservation Alternate representative. Matt Pickett announced Robert Duncan as the new Public At-Large Alternate representative. Robert is a longtime sailor of the Channel Islands and a certified financial planner in Santa Barbara.

C. Meeting Minutes

Draft minutes for the April 19th SAC meeting were approved by unanimous vote, and will be posted on the Sanctuary's web site.

D. SAC Vacant Seats

Matt announced that Tony Gibbs, Recreation Alternate, has stepped down. Matt suggested that the Council's executive committee (Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary) serve as a standing subcommittee tasked with reviewing SAC applications. Bruce Steele emphasized the importance of a balanced subcommittee. Since two of the executive members are government representatives, Linda Krop suggested that members of the SAC could provide input to the executive committee to achieve a fair decision. The Council approved Linda's suggestion.

Matt presented Mike Hamerski, US Coast Guard Alternate, with a plaque for outstanding service on the SAC. Mike will be transferring to Portland, Oregon at the end of the month. Matt also announced that Mick Kronman has stepped down as Public At-Large Alternate. The decision was based on the outcome of a meeting between Matt and John Bridley, Santa Barbara Waterfront Director and Mick's new supervisor. Mick expressed that he was supportive of the decision, and thanked both Matt and the SAC. Matt presented Mick with a plaque for outstanding service on the SAC.

There are currently two open seats on the Council: Public At-Large Alternate and Recreation Alternate.

E. SAC Announcements

- Linda Krop:** The Environmental Defense Center's Annual Auction will be held on June 11. The California Coastal Commission is meeting in Santa Barbara on June 13-16. The EDC will be hosting a reception for them on June 14.
- Mike Hamerski:** The Coast Guard is currently working with Tetra Tech on the DEIS.
- Melissa Miller-Henson:** The Governor's budget was recently released. Melissa will try to update the SAC on the budget at the next SAC meeting.
- Michael Finucan:** Currently working with Bob Leeworthy of the Socioeconomic Panel regarding safety at sea. He emphasized the need of consistent and competent employees; however, adequate training is difficult when most of the crewmembers are part-time. He believes that transport to the Channel Islands is going to increase over the years. As a result, it will become more difficult for boat owners to meet the requirements of the Department of Transportation as training of the crew is at the vessel-owner's expense.
- Dianne Meester:** Announced that the County Planning Department is having difficulties recruiting new employees.
- Jim Brye:** Concerned that a recent L.A. Times article on marine reserves focussed on the Florida Keys Sanctuary and not the Channel Islands Sanctuary. Jim is also concerned that Ed Cassano, former CINMS Manager, was a strong advocate of marine reserves and that the tone of the LA Times article suggested that the NMSP is taking an advocacy position on the reserves issue.

- Jorge Gross:** DFG just got a new skiff, the Gordan-Lynn. They are trying to get more seaworthy vessels and are trying to do a better job of enforcement around the Channel Islands.
- Gary Timm:** Announced that the California Coastal Commission is having a meeting in Santa Barbara in June.
- Drew Mayerson:** Announced that all project descriptions for development of undeveloped leases have been submitted to MMS and are currently being commented on.
- James Shevock:** The National Park Service is currently filling three field biologist positions and one science advisor position. The jobs will be posted on their web page.

2. Management Plan Revision Process

A. Progress Report and Timeline

Anne Walton provided a progress report on development of the draft management plan and draft EIS. Alex Stone gave an update on the last Military and Coast Guard Public Information Forum. Alex reported that 30-40 people attended the Forum and that the notes from the event will be posted on the Sanctuary's web site shortly. Anne felt that the forum was interesting and informative. Text from the overheads used for the Management Plan Revision Process presentation follow:

Public Process Overview (April 2000 – FEIS):

- √ Public Information Forum on Military and Coast Guard Activities (April 19)
- Public Information Forum on Status of Marine Resources
- SAC Meeting/workshop on boundaries (May 30, 2000)
- SAC Meeting/workshop on regulations (June 14, 2000)
- DEIS/DMP released for public comment – *Summer 2000*
- Final EIS/management plan – *Winter 2000*

Draft Management Plan (DMP)

Status of Program Area Sections:

- Research – **drafted/distributed to SAC**
- Education and Outreach – **drafted**
- Resource Protection – **outlined**
 - **Policy**
 - **Enforcement**
 - **SAC**
- Cultural & Historical Resources
- Administration

Draft Management Plan (DMP)

Program Area Sections – Expected schedule for review drafts:

- Mid-April X End of June

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

- Description of the Affected Environment on CINMS web site:
www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov

- Send comments to Anne Walton:
anne.walton@noaa.gov
- Please send comments by **May 26, 2000**

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

- Status of the Resources Report
 - Working draft received by CINMS
 - Provides framework for development of boundary and regulatory alternatives
 - Status of Resources Public Information Forum:
May 17, 2000 6:30 – 9:30 p.m. UCSB, Buchanan 1910

Draft Management Plan: Research Program

- First draft complete
- Mailed to SAC on May 9
- Based on current Sanctuary boundary scenario
- Each research project addresses resource management issues (i.e. water quality, visitor use, emergency response, etc.)
- SAC comments by **May 30, 2000**

Draft Management Plan: Education & Outreach Program

- First draft complete
- Council to receive before June 1
- SAC Education Working Group/MERA to review

Management Plan SAC Workshops:

- May 30: Sanctuary Boundary DEIS alternatives – working session
 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
 - Oxnard Community Center
800 Hobson Way, Oxnard, CA
- June 14: Sanctuary Regulations DEIS alternatives – working session
 - 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
 - Goleta Valley Community Center
5679 Hollister Ave., Goleta, CA

Management Plan SAC Workshops:

- Purpose:
 - SAC/community involvement and support for the process used to develop DEIS alternatives
 - SAC input on boundary alternatives and regulations
- Approach
 - SAC to receive materials in advance
 - Facilitation/focus on working together
 - Worksheets
 - Public involvement opportunities

Discussion on Management Plan Update:

Drew was unsure if the Sanctuary was seeking guidance on the DEIS. Anne clarified that the Sanctuary was seeking guidance from the SAC. Jim Shevock suggested that the web would be an ideal forum for public input on the DEIS. Anne stated that she has received hundreds of e-mails regarding the management plan. Linda was unsure of the difference between the Affected Environment section of the DEIS and the Status of Resources Report. Anne emphasized that the Affected Environment section describes the setting; it's basically an inventory of the study area. The Status of Resources Report compares the inventory today to the inventory 20 years ago; it's a statement of change over time. Anne also stated that the DEIS and Management Plan covers proposed regulations and boundary alternatives.

Discussion of boundary alternatives ensued. Bruce wanted to know how one determines what the preferred boundary alternative is. Anne replied by stating that CINMS staff will establish certain criteria, and based on that criteria will establish alternatives. At the next SAC meeting, the SAC will be asked to evaluate those criteria. Linda emphasized that everyone needs to communicate that these are all proposals. She recommended that the SAC not go into the workshop expecting consensus. Matt Cahn stated that the function of a DEIS is to draw public comment. He hopes that the Sanctuary will make their mandates clear. Matt stated that the primary mandate is conservation and the secondary mandate is wise-use. Matt Pickett reminded the SAC that Anne is going beyond NEPA requirements by asking for input before the release of the DEIS.

Anne stated that she will send packets to the SAC with alternatives and asked the SAC not to come to the May 30th meeting with agendas. She reminded everyone that Boundary Redefinition was the number one issue from the public scoping meetings.

Mick announced that the Ports and Harbors Working Group met on May 12th, and after considerable discussion, the group voted to request the preferred alternative not come to shore and that the boundaries remain status quo. Some of the concerns that they had regarding boundary expansion included regulations, dredging, rebuilding, and jurisdictional confusion.

Anne, Linda, and Dianne all emphasized that both the SAC and CINMS are still waiting for analysis, and that making a recommendation on boundary alternatives would have been more suitable after all of the alternatives were heard.

Gordon Cota asked if boundaries were expanded, how it would be funded. Matt stated that the funding cycle is every October, and that CINMS would know the budget before choosing an alternative. He emphasized that the Sanctuary Program is in a good climate now with the budget.

3. Manager's Report

Due to time constraints, Matt quickly summarized the Manager's Report. He mentioned the following points:

- *FY 2001 NMSP Appropriation:* As incorporated in the President's Land Legacy Initiative, NOAA is requesting \$35 million (a \$10 million increase) in FY 2001 for the National Marine Sanctuary Program.

- *Sanctuary Advisory Council Coordinators Workshop*: Mike Murray attended this workshop in Port Angeles, Washington. CINMS has the second largest SAC. They are currently completing a SAC handbook for Sanctuaries.
- *Resource Protection, Policy and Permit Activities*: CINMS is currently reviewing a USGS Seismic Survey cruise schedule for June. USGS will be searching for underwater faults and potential areas for saltwater intrusion into the freshwater basins of the Santa Barbara Channel.
- *Sustainable Seas Expedition*: The Deepworker is currently at Cabrillo High School Aquarium. The Mission will take place June 5-24.
- *Fishermen, Agency and Scientist Team Research Project*: The Steering Committee for this project has had one meeting. They will be selecting representatives from the fishing and research communities to serve on a Planning Committee to help design and implement this project.
- *Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Update*: Ben Waltenberger (CINMS Physical Scientist) attended a meeting with staff from Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA Special Projects Office (SPO), Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), and various state agencies on the possible creation of an ocean modeling GIS prototype.
- *Cultural Resources Activities*: There has been a first ever multi-agency artifact recovery project at the site of the Gold Rush steamer “Winfield Scott.” The project was conducted on May 3rd, and was represented by CINMS, Channel Islands National Park, CINMS manager’s permit and a California State Lands Commission permit, artifacts at risk were recovered and are now going through conservation at the maritime museum.

4. Committee Reports

A. Marine Reserves Working Group (update given later in the meeting)

B. Education Working Group/MERA (Dave Long)

Dave reported that MERA met at Cabrillo High School Aquarium and provided input on the aquarium. He also stated that SSE is a strong program and thanked NOAA for bringing it to Lompoc. He suggested that the SAC let the media know about SSE.

C. Fishing Working Group (Bruce Steele)

Bruce reported that this Working Group has not met yet, but will soon.

D. Conservation Working Group (Linda Krop)

Linda reported that the conservation community will hold a forum on July 13th at 7:00 p.m. at the SB Natural History Museum. The focus will be on the interconnectedness of the mountains to the sea. They will also focus on the CINMS Management Plan process.

E. Military Working Group (Alex Stone)

Alex reported that this Working Group has not met since the Military forum. He emphasized that the notes from the forum answered a lot of good questions.

F. Ports and Harbors Working Group (Lyn Krieger)

Lyn was not available to give a report at this time.

5. Public Comment Period

Scott Warwick, a local boat captain, stated that he is concerned that the Management Plan process is leap-frogging. He emphasized the importance of the decisions that the SAC makes and asked the SAC to be cautious and respect the rights of the citizens.

Sandy Delano was curious if the Sanctuary will receive more money in the future. Matt responded by stating that the Management Plan Revision Process is not financially driven; however, finances will be considered before Sanctuary boundaries are finalized.

Chris Miller stated that he was one of the first people to instigate the formation of the SAC. He believes that the SAC should focus on community involvement and not on the dichotomy between conservationists and users.

6. Regulation of Fisheries in the Channel Islands Area

A. Presentation on Regulation of Fisheries in the Channel Islands Area (Eric Hooper, Chris Miller, Bruce Steele, Chuck Janisse, Fran McClain, and Chris Williams)

State Regulations of Fisheries (Eric Hooper)

Eric summarized state laws (Keeley Bill, Shelly Bill) and described the types of state regulations set for various fisheries (rock crab, prawn trap, kelp, sea cucumber, near shore rockfish, squid, and gill net fisheries). The following is a summary of Eric's presentation:

In California, fisheries are regulated by the Department of Fish and Game and the Fish and Game Commission. They generally adopt regulations by legislative action (bills) or administrative action. DFG is always in place, but every time you have a new governor, you have a new Commission.

The Keeley Bill or Marine Life Management Act was passed three years ago. The general objectives of the Act are to ensure conservation and facilitate long-term protection of California's marine living resources, achieve sustainable use of fisheries resources by preventing overfishing before it occurs, rebuild fish stocks determined to be depressed, limit by-catch to acceptable types and amounts, maintain a healthy habitat, restore it where feasible, and enhance it when appropriate. Fisheries will now develop management plans that will take up the diversity as a whole of a particular marine environment.

Realization of these goals and objectives will be accomplished by establishing and administrating conservation and management programs for all commercial and recreational fisheries to the extent practical that are proactive, employ collaborative and cooperative management processes, are based on the best available scientific or other relevant information, and are adaptive.

A management plan will be developed for each fishery. Management plans for long-term fisheries are currently being adopted. The Marine Life Management Act gives the Commission more power to make decisions. As it was advertised, it was to quit micromanaging fisheries in

the legislature and make management more cohesive. It also calls for a state of the resources report by Fish and Game.

The Marine Life Management Act deals with Management Plans for every single fishery. The second was called the Shelley Bill or Marine Life Protection Act. This was passed to organize and redefine the State's management of marine reserves. The Marine Life Protection Act's goals and objectives are to redesign and improve the management of California's marine managed areas system, to increase its coherence and effectiveness. Presently, there are over a hundred marine reserves in the state, but up until a couple of months ago when they redefined them, there was over a dozen different classifications. Every reserve had a different level of protection and a different purpose. Now with the Marine Life Protection Act, they will be integrated into one system. To accomplish this, the Commission has been directed to adopt a sea life conservation program with the following goals: to protect the diversity and abundance of sea life and the integrity of marine ecosystems, to ensure that marine managed areas have clearly defined objectives, effective management and adequate enforcement, to ensure that MMA's are designed and managed as a network, to help rebuild depleted sea life populations when appropriate, to improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities that are subject to minimal human disturbance.

A comprehensive study report is being drafted to analyze the sighting of these reserves within three biogeographical regions. They've defined that as Southern California, Point Conception to the south, Mendocino to Point Conception, and Mendocino to the north. The comprehensive study will be drafted with scientists and researchers who will work with stakeholder groups to discuss issues such as practical information on the marine environment and the relevant history of fishing, other resources issues, and water pollution, socioeconomic and environmental impact of various options, design and monitoring of evaluation activities, and methods to encourage public participation in the MMA process.

The Marine Life Protection Act says that we must have no-take reserves in each of these three biogeographical regions. In each region, there will be no-take reserves established. Also, there will be more no-take reserves established according to distinct habitats.

In the Keeley Bill, the prawn, nearshore rock, and squid fisheries are all having their management plans built.

Nearshore fisheries.

Crab-trap fishery

This is a valuable fishery that has proven itself to be sustainable. Market forces are what dictate this fishery. Most fishermen that Eric knows have a limit of 1000 lbs. This isn't a lucrative fishery. This utilizes the whole Sanctuary area and is the only open-access fishery in CA that would be considered sustainable for the fishermen.

Prawn-trap fishery

There are about a dozen prawn-trap fishermen in the Sanctuary. It has a season, gear restrictions, and limited entry.

Kelp Harvesting

With only half a dozen boats in this area, it might be the most lucrative and the most sustaining. There's no limited entry or seasons, but your capital investment keeps the number of harvesters down. They have lease options on kelp beds, and they can't cut kelp deeper than four feet. Kelp in optimal conditions can grow faster than it can get cut.

Sea Cucumbers

You can either dive for sea cucumbers or trawl for sea cucumbers. This fishery has limited entry, gear restrictions, and various area closures.

Nearshore rockfish

Finishing up a management plan. The market is for livefish. It has limited entry, area closures, gear restrictions, minimum size limits on the fish, and seasons will be enacted next year.

Squid

Squid is classified as a coastal pelagic species and therefore, falls under a management plan run by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. The fishery has limited entry, weekend closures, gear modifications to reduce perceived disturbances to nesting seabirds, and increase of license fees of \$2500 annually to fund the study on the resource.

Gill nets

There are primary gear types for halibut, white sea bass, angel shark, barracuda, and king fish. For each species, there's a minimum size limit. There are specific gear restrictions for each particular fish. White sea bass has three month closures, the others do not have seasonal closures. All the species have size limits with the exception of kingfish. Presently, 90% of the halibut and sea bass habitat is closed to harvest for net fishing. Observer programs have been very frequent with this fishery.

Status of the Lobster Fishery (Chris Miller)

Chris discussed the changes over time in the lobster fishery, as well as data recording procedures and their importance. He also passed out a regulatory events chart. Main fisheries tactics were size limit, trap escape port, destruct clip, and limited entry for the fishery. Lobsters have a lot of fluctuation from the catch. This is based on recruitment due to water temperatures.

Lobster fishermen have participated in what is called precautionary management for some time. When they closed the fishery three years ago, they had 470 permits. They then placed a target of 225 permits and are now at that target number. Because they are now managed under the Commission, management has been more responsive. There is now a limited access policy that was recently instituted by the Commission. Their next step is to look at capacity goals of the fishery and reevaluate their fishery and see if the 225 permits is working effectively as a capacity goal relative to their landings and trends.

Chris carries a daily fishing log that is coordinated with a fish landing ticket. He hopes that there will be a better-coordinated system in the future.

Status of the Sea Urchin Fishery (Bruce Steele)

Bruce began by giving a brief history of urchin regulations. The urchin industry tried to get a limited entry bill through the legislature, but it died in committee. By the time they got limited

entry and controls on the fishery, they were up to 900 permits in California. From that point, they have been trying to reduce catch and set a target to reduce their permits to 300.

Bruce believes that in fisheries management, it is important to know not only what the fisherman catches, but also what is on the bottom of the ocean and what the resource looks like. The urchin fishery collected over a million dollars to study their own fishery. With this money, they have been performing larval settlement studies every week for the last 10 years. They found that the mortality rate is high for urchins that are less than 5 millimeters. The study also shows that all urchins spawn within a 3-4 month period.

They have also been able to correlate satellite images with recruitment events. This provides them with a tool to determine where urchins are likely to settle, and a tool into deciding where sources are and sinks are. Bruce believes that the study shows that the overall resource is fairly healthy; however the fishery itself is dependent on fairly old animals that are still in decline. Urchins may live over a hundred years.

The only other independent data that is available is from the Park Service. That data shows that within the areas that are closed, there are roughly 3.5 urchins per square meter. In the areas that are fished, there are 3.6 urchins per square meter. The difference is that there are larger animals in the closed areas.

Federally Regulated Fisheries (Chuck Janisse)

Chuck summarized the types of rules governing various federally regulated fisheries, including pink shrimp trawl, prawn trawl, and swordfish/shark drift gill net. Chuck also discussed the fishery implications of the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Additionally, Chuck talked about the Pacific Fisheries Management Council.

Pink shrimp trawl - The maximum count limit is 160 per pound, the mesh size has to be a minimum size, there are limits to the amount of fish you can land, time closures, and area closures. A limited access program is being considered.

Prawn trawl – Minimum mesh size, limit to the amount of fish you can land, time closures, area closures, regulation requiring the use of fish excluders in the net, observer program, and limited access program.

Swordfish/Shark Drift Gillnet – Minimum mesh size, limited net length, time closures, time-area closures, limited entry, and requires logs.

The Endangered Species Act requires that the regulatory body, NMFS, identify any interactions that this fishery may have with listed marine mammals and conduct a Section 7 consultation to review the likelihood of the impact leading to jeopardy on these species and then determining mitigation measures. This Act dovetails with the Marine Life Management Act.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act is much more detailed in how it addresses fisheries that interact with stocks of marine mammals. The drift gillnet fishery has a historic interaction with various species of marine mammals. The MMPA has set up a system where they determine the status of stocks for each of the marine mammals that occur in US waters. All of the factors known about the stocks are put together in a volume called the Stock Assessment Report which is annually reviewed by scientific review groups that make recommendations to NMFS. One of

the specific purposes of the Stock Assessment Report is to establish a permissible level of take called the potential biological removal level (PBR). When takes are above that level, the MMPA gives NMFS the authority to establish take reduction teams to make a recommendation to NMFS regarding methods to reduce takes below the PBR. The teams goals are to: reduce takes to below PBR in six months and to reduce takes to approach a zero rate mortality goal within five years. That second goal is yet to be defined, but the original proposal set it at ten percent of the PBR.

There were takes of seven whales and cetaceans that were above PBR in 1996. The team developed a take reduction plan, which included four principle strategies: 1. Conduct an experiment of putting electronic devices on nets which make a high-frequency noise to warn marine mammals, 2. Conduct mandatory skipper workshops, 3. Set the top of the net at a minimum of 36 feet below the surface of the water, and 4. Recommend to DFG and/or Department of Fish and Wildlife Service to retire permits that lapse. Currently there are 139 gillnet permits.

The Pacific Fisheries Management Council under the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, requires that fishery management plans are developed. They currently have fisheries management plans for salmon, Pacific halibut, coastal pelagics, and groundfish. They are in the process of developing management plans for highly migratory species, including swordfish and tunas.

Chuck believes that the establishment of federal fisheries management plans is a step in managing at an international level.

US Coast Guard Regulations on Fishing Vessel Safety (Fran McClain)

Fran's job is to convince fishermen that they are supposed to have federally required safety equipment on their vessels. The biggest cost item is a survival raft. Repacking the raft every year can run \$700 -\$1000. Other items include the 406 signal frequency, flares, and emergency suits.

B. Agency Response to Fisheries Regulation presentation

Patty Wolf of the Department of Fish and Game stated that the fishermen hit on the major processes. The legislature maintains control and delegates bills to the Commission. All Marine Life Management Act Plans are yet to be finished. Patty reported that the master team of advisors for the Shelley Bill met for the first time this week. She also emphasized that the restricted access policy is a difficult issue. To avoid confusion, Patty clarified that fishery management plans are different than limited access.

C. Council Discussion on the Fisheries Regulation presentation

Dave Long asked what the effects are from the moratorium on abalone. Bruce stated that abalone stocks have collapsed due to the withering foot syndrome. According to Bruce, black abalone is virtually non-existent now. Patty stated that the abalone issue will be addressed in the abalone management plan. Realistically, Patty believes there will no longer be fishing for abalone in Southern California.

Sandy Delano asked if fishing permits are non-transferable. Patty stated that there is a lot of variability when it comes to permits. For the most part, the Fish and Game Commission looks favorably on the transfer of permits. According to Patty, permits are transferable for coastal pelagic species. Gordon Cota believes that the fishing industry lacks avenues for fishermen to get

out of the business. He also believes that California should look to Alaska's system of buying and selling permits.

Leal Mertes asked for clarification on whether or not there was a requirement for no-take zones in the legislative bills. Eric Hooper stated that CINMS does not have a fishery management role; however, the Sea-Life Conservation Act requires that these reserves be established in three biogeographical regions. Melissa Miller-Henson clarified that there is a requirement that a classification of no-take exists, but the reserve establishment requirement was taken out of the Marine Life Protection Act, which superseded the Marine Life Protection Act.

Rod Fujita of Environmental Defense noted that there are over 100 marine managed areas in California, but that only 10-12 are no-take.

Michael Finucan asked Patty if the CA Department of Fish and Game is worried about the loss of revenue from restricted permits. Patty said that CDFG is concerned. She also stated that the revenue goes to research. CDFG is currently in the process of developing a report on the status of fisheries in CA. It is expected to be complete by June.

Dave Long asked if there are any studies that show an increase in fish stock with a decline in fishing. Patty stated that there are many factors at work, including general oceanic conditions. Chris agreed with Patty in that there are many variables. He believes that a decline in landings could be due to many factors. Rod Fujita noted that one of the only ways to assess this is by performing a controlled experiment through the establishment of marine reserves and control sites.

5. Update: Marine Reserves Process

A. Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG) activities (Patty Wolf)

Patty Wolf went over the draft schedule of the MRWG for the next few months. The June 8th meeting will be focussed on the Status of Resources, the June 22 will be focussed on socioeconomic data, and on August 22-23 the MRWG will put lines on the map.

B. Marine Reserves Science Panel (Matt Cahn)

Matt Cahn reported that the Science Panel met and went over the MRWG's Goals and Objectives. They are currently developing a methodological process to design reserve alternatives that are spatially explicit and linked to each objective. The next Science Panel meeting will be on May 25th.

C. Socio-Economic Study (Sean Hastings)

Sean Hastings reported that the Socio-Economic Panel is working with various local contractors. Mick Kronman recently finished collecting the anecdotal data. The Socioeconomic Panel will update the MRWG at the June 22 MRWG meeting. After August 23, the Socioeconomic Panel will develop a cost-benefit analysis of the reserve options. Sean also introduced Dr. Carrie Pomeroy, who will start collecting data on squid fisheries. Dr. Pomeroy is an Assistant Research Scientist at the Institute of Marine Sciences, UC Santa Cruz.

8. Future meeting dates, locations and agenda topics

A. Meeting Dates/Locations

The SAC reviewed and accepted (by general acclaim) the following meeting schedule:

- May 30** SAC Meeting/workshop on Sanctuary boundary redefinition (Ventura)
- June 14** SAC Meeting/workshop on Sanctuary regulations for DEIS alternatives (Santa Barbara)
- July 19** SAC Meeting (Ventura)
- Sept. 20** SAC Meeting (Lompoc)
- Nov. 16** SAC Meeting (Santa Barbara)

B. Future Agenda Topics

Future agenda topics will be addressed after the June 14th SAC workshop.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:

Mettja Hong
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary