

REVISED AGENDA
California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting
 November 9-10, 2005
 Cambria Pines Lodge
 2905 Burton Drive, Cambria, CA

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
2. Provide CCRSG members with opportunities to caucus (both within and across interest groups) to discuss and refine candidate MPA packages
3. Outline CCRSG presentation to BRTF on candidate MPA packages and next steps for the December CCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – November 9, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
9:30 AM	<i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
10:15 AM	Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundfish “hotspots” • Other updates (Attachments 1-4)
11:00 AM	Review process approach for presenting, discussing, and evaluating candidate MPA packages (Handout 4)
11:20 AM	Module 1: Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages (Handouts 1, 2, 3)
12:00 PM	Public Comment
12:20 PM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i> <i>MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) member presentation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Ecological Networks of Marine Protected Areas”. Dr. Steven Gaines, Marine Science Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara
1:20 PM	Module 1 (cont.): Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
2:50 PM	<i>Break</i>
3:05 PM	Module 1 (cont.): Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
5:00 PM	Module 2: Caucusing – Consider new candidate MPA packages or possible revisions to initial candidate MPA packages
5:45 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>
6:30 PM	<i>Group dinner (The Black Cat Bistro, 1602 Main Street, Cambria, CA 93428, 805/927-1600)</i> <i>[Note: No evening presentations are scheduled. Continued caucusing/developing of candidate MPA packages is encouraged.]</i>

Day 2 – November 10, 2005

Time	Agenda Item
7:30 AM	<i>Continental breakfast</i>
8:00 AM	Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:10 AM	Module 2 (cont.): Caucusing – Consider new candidate MPA packages or possible revisions to initial candidate MPA packages
10:00 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:30 AM	Module 3: Present and discuss revised or new candidate MPA packages
11:45 AM	<i>Lunch (on site)</i>
12:45 PM	Module 3 (cont.): Present and discuss revised or new candidate MPA packages
2:00 PM	<i>Break</i>
2:30 PM	Module 4: Recap progress and plan next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review list of candidate MPA packages• Outline presentation to the BRTF• Identify preparation steps for December CCRSG meeting
4:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. Meeting summaries -- Interim work sessions
2. Evaluation of existing central coast MPAs (11/4/05 version)
3. Response to CCRSG science questions
4. Memorandum – Pismo Clams

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Master list of candidate MPA concepts (as of November 9, 2005)
2. Summary and evaluation of initial candidate MPA packages
3. Central Coast MPA proposals received from sources external to the CCRSG by Oct. 15, 2005
4. Summary of process approach – CCRSG November meeting
5. SAT Presentation handout: Ecological Networks of Marine Protected Areas

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: November 21, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – November 9-10, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On November 9-10, 2005, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) present and discuss initial candidate marine protected area (MPA) packages; 2) provide CCRSG members with opportunities to caucus and refine or create new candidate MPA packages; 3) outline the CCRSG's presentation to the MLPA Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) on candidate MPA packages; and 4) plan next steps for the December CCRSG meeting.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- CCRSG members presented and discussed candidate MPA packages. Initially, two packages were introduced: one by commercial and recreational fishing interests, and the other by conservation interests.
- CCRSG deliberations on candidate MPA packages was supported by a series of staff documents and analyses:
 - MLPA Initiative staff distributed the updated Evaluation of Existing Central Coast MPAs (dated November 4, 2005).
 - Ecotrust presented an overview of its research methods and results. Maps containing key microblock information were made available to the CCRSG.
 - Initiative staff provided an overview of the “external” candidate MPA package proposals, assessing the sufficiency of each proposal in meeting the terms of the MLPA Initiative Master Plan Framework (MPF).
- CCRSG members caucused to discuss possible modifications to the initial candidate MPA packages. Confirming these changes will require further checking back with stakeholder constituencies.
- A group of CCRSG members began developing a hybrid candidate package built on emerging areas of convergence between the two initial internal packages.
- CCRSG members discussed preparing for upcoming MLPA Initiative Science Advisory Team (SAT), BRTF, and CCRSG meetings.

Key next steps are indicated in section IV below. The next CCRSG meeting will take place on December 6-7, 2005 in Monterey, CA.

I. Introduction and Outline

On November 9-10, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Distribution of updated evaluation of existing central coast MPAs
 - B. Presentation of Ecotrust research
 - C. Overview of "external" candidate MPA package proposals
 - D. Presentation and discussion of initial candidate MPA packages (Module 1)
 - E. Caucusing (Module 2)
 - F. Presentation of revised or new candidate MPA packages (Module 3)
 - G. Preparations for upcoming MLPA meetings (Module 4)
 - H. Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations
 - I. Public comment
- IV. Near Term Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

1. Present and discuss initial candidate MPA packages
2. Provide CCRSG members with opportunities to caucus and refine or create new candidate MPA packages
3. Outline the CCRSG's presentation to the BRTF on candidate MPA packages
4. Plan next steps for the December CCRSG meeting.

Forty-three CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Chairman Phil Isenberg participated on behalf of the BRTF. Doyle Hanan, Steven Gaines, and Rick Starr participated as Central Coast Science Sub-Team (SST) members. Steve Barrager, SAT chair, also participated.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Distribution of updated evaluation of existing central coast MPAs

Initiative staff distributed to CCRSG members copies of the updated staff Evaluation of Existing Central Coast MPAs (dated November 4, 2005). The updated version addresses comments made by approximately a half dozen CCRSG members and two SAT members.

B. Presentation of Ecotrust research

Mike Mertens (Ecotrust) made a brief presentation of Ecotrust's research aimed at documenting commercial fishing use of specific portions of the central coast study area. He described the data collection methodology and the approach to data processing and analysis. He also provided guidance to CCRSG members for interpreting the results.

Maps containing key results of the research were made available for CCRSG members. These maps showed microblock data on number of fishermen fishing in each microblock, the number of fisheries that occur in particular microblocks, and the relative importance to fisheries of particular microblocks. Mike Mertens stressed that the individual maps could best be understood within the context of the full suite of maps.

John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff) noted that these maps were only being made available for the CCRSG meeting and that the research results have not been published on the MPA decision support tool. To ensure confidentiality, these data currently reside only in DFG staff computers.

Further questions and comments on the Ecotrust research may be directed to Mike Mertens at mikem@ecotrust.org.

C. Overview of “external” candidate MPA package proposals

Mary Gleason (MLPA Initiative staff) provided a brief overview of staff's preliminary analysis of six complete and partial “external” candidate MPA package proposals submitted by members of the public. The analysis focused on characterizing the sufficiency of the “external” proposals in meeting the guidelines for submitting MPA proposals as established in Appendix F of the MLPA Initiative Master Plan Framework (MPF).

External candidate MPA package proposals were submitted by NRDC, Oceana, the Point Reyes Bird Observatory (PRBO), and Helping our Peninsula's Environment (HOPE). Individual CCRSG members also submitted the Initial Draft Concept and Revised Draft Concept proposals from the 2001 MLPA effort.

CCRSG members seeking to contact the authors of the “external” candidate MPA package proposals may obtain contact information from Mike DeLapa (MLPA Initiative staff).

D. Presentation and discussion of initial candidate MPA packages (Module 1)

CCRSG members presented a suite of completed and partial initial candidate MPA packages that had been prepared in advance of the meeting. Mary Gleason summarized staff's preliminary analysis of the initial candidate MPA packages. Following the presentations, CCRSG members asked clarifying questions and commented on the strengths and weaknesses of the initial candidate packages.

1. Initial presentation—CCRSG package #1

A group of CCRSG members representing primarily commercial and recreational fishing interests presented a first candidate MPA package (package #1). The package was also based on consultations with other CCRSG members and scientists. Maps showing the candidate package were distributed to CCRSG members.

a. Key features of package #1 include:

- The package is based on 7 core MPA areas targeted toward large adults and larva: North Monterey Bay, Monterey deep – Pacific Grove, Carmel – Pt. Lobos, Julia Pfeiffer Burns – Big Creek, San Simeon – Morro Bay, Diablo Canyon – Pismo/Oceano, and Vandenberg.
- The package consists of 29 individual MPAs: 13 State Marine Reserves (SMRs), 16 State Marine Conservation Areas (SMCAs), and 0 State Marine Parks (SMPs).
- The package is based on the concept of four basic levels of protection:
 - 1) The entire network
 - 2) The network subset where groundfish take is not allowed
 - 3) The network subset of MPAs referred to as “full protection” MPAs (i.e., there are MPAs where only Salmon/HMS, or possibly Spot Prawn trap fisheries are allowed which offer protection on a similar level as that of reserves)
 - 4) The network subset that is reserves
- SMCAs were designated in lieu of SMPs in several instances to simplifying the administration and enforcement of the MPAs.

b. Key clarifying and evaluative comments included the following:

- Initiative staff noted that a few of the individual MPAs in package #1 had been inadvertently omitted from the MPA list and not included in the habitat calculations. Staff will update the staff analysis accordingly.
- Several of the SMRs are smaller than that recommended by the SAT in the MPF.
- A relatively large gap exists between Big Creek and Leffingwell. Participants asked that the rationales for the gaps in the package be better explained.

- Package #1 builds strongly on existing regulatory measures. Participants asked for greater clarification of how the package differs from the status quo.
- Several stakeholders asked for more information regarding the ecosystem benefits of the MPAs in the Monterey peninsula area.
- Participants discussed the habitat in the proposed Diablo MPA can adequately serve as “representative” habitat, given the warmer water temperatures.

2. Initial presentation—CCRSG package #2

A group of CCRSG members representing primarily conservationist interests presented a second initial candidate MPA package (package #2). The package was also based on consultations with other CCRSG interest groups and examination of the “external” MPA proposals and the Initial and Revised Draft Concepts. Maps showing the candidate package were distributed to CCRSG members.

a. Key features of package #2 included the following:

- The package consists of 28 individual MPAs (17 SMRs, 9 SMCAs, and 2 SMPs)
- Ecological anchor sites include: Ano Nuevo, Monterey Canyon, Pt. Lobos, Pt. Sur, Piedras Blancas, and Pt. Conception.
- Deliberate gaps exist around harbors to allow for multiple uses in those areas.
- Package #2 did not include MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area. The package’s sponsors expected this gap to be filled by a sub-package being developed by non-consumptive diver interests as well as other interests.
- Package #2 focuses primarily on meeting the ecosystem-based goals and objectives of the central coast region. The package also includes MPAs designed to achieve other MLPA goals and objectives, such as those involving monitoring/evaluation and education.
- Package #2 included the elimination of 4 existing MPAs.

b. Key clarifying and evaluative comments included the following:

- Several participants requested more information on the rationale behind the size and spacing of the candidate MPAs (e.g., with relation to larval transport).
- Some concerns were expressed with regard to the potential for displaced fishing effort.
- Several participants asked that the candidate MPAs be re-evaluated relative to socioeconomic data (e.g., in the Pigeon Pt. area).
- Several participants expressed a desire for more discussions on the Buchon SMR and the implications of the trans-continental communications cable.

- Participants expressed a desire to further discuss access to remaining kelp bed leases.

3. Options for candidate MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area

A group of CCRSG members presented options for potential MPAs in the Monterey-Carmel area. These candidate MPAs were developed primarily by non-consumptive diver representatives in consultation with other CCRSG interest groups.

a. Key features of the sub-package included the following:

- Two optional arrays of MPAs were presented to the group.
- Both optional arrays employ the strategy of segmenting likely reserves into parts as a means of accommodating the region's multiple users.
- The two options differed most significantly in the areas of Cannery Row, Pacific Grove, Carmel Bay, and Pt. Lobos.
- The presenters were interested in exploring CCRSG preferences of the possible options.

b. Key clarifying and evaluative comments included the following:

- Several participants commented that the candidate MPAs did not fairly balance the interests of all of the users in the area.
- Several participants suggested moving the break between the SMR and SMCA in Pacific Grove northward to Pt. Pinos.

4. Initial draft concept

A CCRSG member requested that the 2001 Initial Draft Concept (IDC) be forwarded to the SAT for scientific review. This stakeholder suggested that the IDC may serve the CCRSG as an example of a complete MPA package based on the best scientific information at the time. Participants acknowledged that some of the data upon which the IDC was based (including socioeconomic data) was now somewhat outdated.

E. Caucusing (Module 2)

CCRSG members organized themselves into three separate caucus groups to re-evaluate the initial candidate MPA packages based on comments received.

- One group, consisting primarily of sponsors of package #1, discussed possible improvements to the package.
- A second group, consisting primarily sponsors of package #2, concentrated on completing package #2.
- A third group met to: 1) better delineate the areas of overlap between the two packages, and 2) explore the possibility of developing a new package of candidate MPAs that builds on these areas of agreement.

F. Presentation of revised or new candidate MPA packages (Module 3)

Following the caucus sessions, CCRSG members reported back on the results of their sessions and invited further comments and suggestions. CCRSG members requested that hard copy showing revisions to the initial candidate MPA packages be provided to the CCRSG as soon as possible.

1. Caucus session focused on package #1.
 - a. Key outcomes include:
 - The caucus discussed possible modifications and improvements to package #1.
 - Caucus members acknowledged that any changes to the package would be contingent on checking back with the broader constituents supporting the package.
 - This caucus received guidance from DFG on enforcement considerations.
 - b. CCRSG comments and recommended improvements included:
 - Explore utilizing temporal regulations to address the issue of fishing off of the breakwater in Monterey.
 - The package needs to better address concerns over diver safety at the breakwater.
 - The package would be strengthened by capturing some canyon habitat in the proposed Pt. Lobos SMR.
 - There appears to be a large gap between Big Creek and Leffingwell that may need to be filled to meet SAT spacing recommendations for MPAs.
2. Caucus session focused on package #2.
 - a. Key outcomes include:
 - The main goal of this caucus session was to delineate candidate MPAs in the Monterey/Carmel area in order to complete package #2.
 - Participants reached agreement on a suite of eight MPAs in the Monterey/Pacific Grove/Carmel areas. This suite was based on one of the main options presented in module 1 for this area, with slight modifications to several of the MPAs.
 - Caucus members decided to carry forward the other optional suite of MPAs in the Monterey/Carmel area forward as an element of a possible separate package.
 - b. CCRSG comments and recommended improvements included:

- Several CCRSG members commented that the proposed package was overly restrictive to fishing interests. They suggested several improvements:
 - Shift the southern boundary of the Pt. Lobos SMR north to allow for more fishing in the Yankee Point area.
 - Take the weather break into account in Pacific Grove.
 - Move the SMR/SMCA boundary in the Pacific Grove area to Pt. Pinos to allow for more fishing.
 - Reduce the size of the pinnacles SMR MPA to allow for more spear fishing in the Stillwater cove area.
 - In general, make some of the SMRs into SMCAs to allow for more fishing.
- Persistent kelp beds exist in the northern part of the proposed Pacific Grove SMCA that are of interest to kelp harvesters.
- Participants questioned the enforceability of some of the proposed 60 foot MPA boundaries.
- A concern was raised over the potential impact of large numbers of non-consumptive divers in SMRs in near Cannery Row.
- Participants discussed tradeoffs between preserving rod and reel fishing off of the breakwater and ensuring diver safety in that area.
- Several participants raised the concern of restricted access for free divers.

3. Caucus session to focus on areas of overlap.

Approximately ten CCRSG members met during the caucus period with the stated purpose of: 1) better delineating the areas of overlap between packages #1 and #2, and 2) exploring the possibility of developing a new package of candidate MPAs that builds on these areas of agreement. Caucus members also used the Initial Draft Concept as a science-focused model.

a. Key outcomes included:

- Caucus members discussed their efforts to develop a new candidate MPA package for the central coast study region. They developed the following criteria for the new package:
 - Build on areas of overlap between packages #1 and #2
 - Integrates stakeholder interests
 - Address perceived gaps in packages #1 and #2
 - Emphasize candidate MPAs having the most impact on habitat protection.
- Caucus members presented a substantial but still incomplete package of candidate MPAs. The package did not include candidate MPAs for the Monterey/Carmel area. Furthermore, in other parties of the study area, group members at times recommended the need for an MPA without indicating a specific location or MPA type.
- Caucus members emphasized that their package was still preliminary. They indicated their desire to reconvene as a group to complete the package (package #3).

- b. CCRSG members offered several comments on the preliminary third package, including:
- Several participants commended the efforts of this group to further integrate packages #1 and #2. Some requested that this caucus group extend their efforts to attempt to further integrate MPA concepts and stakeholder interests in the Monterey/Carmel area.
 - Participants offered preliminary feedback on how the proposed new package met or did not meet their particular interests.
 - Some others questioned whether the timing for such a new package was ripe given that packages #1 and #2 were still evolving.

G. Preparations for upcoming MLPA meetings (Module 4)

1. Revisions to candidate MPA packages

Sponsors of packages #1, #2, and #3 all indicated their intentions to further discuss the candidate packages amongst themselves and with their broader constituencies. Sponsors of packages #1 and #2 also indicated their intention to submit revised candidate packages prior to the November 15, 2005 SAT meeting.

Sponsors of package #3 indicated their intent to meet again and to consult with other CCRSG members for the purpose of developing a full package for consideration by the SAT and the BRTF.

Participants acknowledged that each of the three main candidate MPA packages followed the strategy of designating larger numbers of smaller-sized MPAs relative to the guidance provided by the SAT. Initiative staff recommended that the sponsors of each package provide additional rationale for the size and spacing of the candidate MPAs.

Initiative staff indicated that the different candidate packages may proceed toward SAT and BRTF review along different timelines. Staff also noted that CCRSG members and other interested parties will have opportunities to comment upon and participate in discussions supporting evolution of these packages as they move to the BRTF, then to the DFG and finally to the Fish and Game Commission, the policy maker.

Initiative staff reminded CCRSG members that candidate packages #1, #2, and #3 were still “works in process” and should be represented to the general public as such.

2. Request for information

- Participants requested that the SAT or Initiative staff provide additional guidance on the trade-offs between size and spacing of MPAs.

Participants also acknowledged that spacing between MPAs is complicated by the use of two methods for measuring distance in the MPA decision support tool (i.e., as crow flies, and every nook and cranny).

- Participants requested that the SAT provide additional guidance as to whether highly restrictive, deep-water SMCAs may be viewed as the functional equivalent of SMRs.

3. Preparations for upcoming MLPA meetings

a. SAT meeting

At the November 15, 2005 SAT meeting, SAT members will provide scientific review on packages #1-3. The focus will be on the degree to which the candidate packages achieve the scientific guidelines established by the SAT in the MPF.

SAT members will also provide scientific review on the Initial Draft Concept as well as the complete “external” proposals.

CCRSG members are requested to provide updated versions of packages #1-3 to Initiative staff by 9:00 AM on November 14, 2005. Initiative staff will prepare a summary analysis for SAT review.

b. BRTF meeting

The BRTF will meet on November 29-30, 2005 to provide preliminary guidance on the candidate MPA packages and to respond to CCRSG questions. Initiative staff requested that two CCRSG sponsors of each of the candidate packages be available to interact with BRTF members.

BRTF Chair Phil Isenberg encouraged CCRSG members to strive to achieve as much convergence among the candidate MPA packages as possible.

CCRSG members requested that the BRTF address the following question:

- Are there ways that the BRTF can incentivize the CCRSG to move their candidate MPA packages as far along as possible?

c. December CCRSG meeting

To prepare for the December CCRSG meeting:

- Initiative staff will summarize the outcomes of SAT review and BRTF guidance on the candidate MPA packages and external proposals discussed and provide this to the CCRSG in advance of the December CCRSG meeting.
- Staff will conduct an assessment across the candidate packages.
- CCRSG members will provide descriptions of individual MPA objectives.

During the December CCRSG meeting:

- CCRSG members will assess all of the candidate MPA packages being proposed.
- Staff plans to use straw voting to assess levels of support for the candidate MPA packages and “external” MPA proposals.

H. Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) presentations

MLPA Initiative SAT member Dr. Steven Gaines (Marine Science Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara) made a presentation on Ecological Networks of MPAs during lunch on Day 1.

I. Public comment

Six members of the public provided comments. Some represented organizations that had submitted external MPA proposals. These individuals indicated their organizations’ intent to send revised proposals to Initiative staff by November 14, 2005 for SAT review. Others offered support for specific MPA concepts. One individual described some of the constraints place by MPAs on fishing.

IV. Near Term Next Steps

A. Key next steps for CCRSG members

- CCRSG members to discuss potential additional modifications to their packages with constituents “back home.”
- CCRSG to transmit revised versions of their candidate MPA packages to Initiative staff by 9:00 AM on November 14, 2005 to have them considered by the SAT. The SAT will consider the most up-to-date versions of the candidate packages available.
- CCRSG to provide descriptions of individual MPA objectives for the December CCRSG meeting.

B. Key next steps for Initiative staff

- Initiative staff to prepare a summary analysis of completed candidate MPA packages and “external” MPA proposals for SAT review.
- Initiative staff to prepare hard copy maps showing updated versions of packages #1-3 and transmit these to CCRSG.
- Initiative staff to request that two CCRSG sponsors of each of the candidate packages be available to interact with BRTF members at the November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting.