

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Meeting Agenda
(revised September 8, 2009)**

**Wednesday, September 9, 2009 at 7:00 PM
Thursday, September 10, 2009 at 8:00 AM**

**Sheraton Gateway Los Angeles
6101 W. Century Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90045**

Public Participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or may view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet. Video and audio archives of the meeting may be accessed via the Internet approximately one day after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information.

Public Comment: The public will be invited to provide general comment on subjects related to the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) **at approximately 9:00 AM on Thursday, September 10, 2009.** Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the room. Time allotted for public comment is determined by the number of requests and can range from one to three minutes per comment; submitting written comments that can be easily summarized in one to two minutes is encouraged. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the SCRSG; comments related to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, science advisory team, or other MLPA Initiative activities should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they are available. This agenda may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp

Meeting Objectives

- *Provide an opportunity for the SCRSG to review and discuss the near final draft MPA proposals*
- *Develop final round of marine protected area (MPA) proposals to be forwarded to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) and MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF)*
- *Discuss next steps for presenting the final round of MPA proposals to the BRTF*

Meeting Agenda – Wednesday, September 9, 2009

Welcome, Agenda Review and Brief Introductions

I. Draft Final Round 3 MPA Proposals

A. Presentation of Draft Final SCRSG MPA Proposals by Work Groups

Recess

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TTY) or 800.735.2922 (voice) or contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

Meeting Agenda – Thursday, September 10, 2009

Note: The SCRSG will hear public comment at approximately 9:00 a.m. and will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 p.m.

Welcome, Agenda Review and Brief Introductions

II. Updates

B. MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.1: Draft SAT Response to Science Question Received at the August 3, 2009 Meeting of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (draft revised September 3, 2009)

C. MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

D. MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.1: Key Outcomes Memorandum from the August 3, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

E. Public Outreach and Education

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.1: Guidelines for Providing Public Comment to the Marine Life Protection Act South Coast Project (revised September 4, 2009)

III. Final SCRSG MPA Proposals for Round 3

F. Guidance for Completing Round 3 Proposals

G. Preparing for MPA Proposal Presentations to the BRTF

Recess – Work Group Breakout Sessions

IV. Final MPA Proposals

H. Presentation of Final SCRSG MPA Proposals by Work Groups

V. Closing Comments

Adjourn

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: September 22, 2009

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – September 9-10, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On September 9-10, 2009, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its eighth meeting in Los Angeles, following a full day of work sessions.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- Each of the three SCRSG work groups (Work Group 1, Work Group 2 and Work Group 3) completed their final marine protected area (MPA) proposals. With that step, the SCRSG members accomplished their designated charge. These MPA proposals were presented to the full SCRSG and will be evaluated by the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) and I-Team staff and forwarded to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) for consideration.

This outcome was preceded by the following items:

- SCRSG members met in an evening plenary on the 9th to hear presentations from each of the three work groups on their draft final MPA proposals. SCRSG members posed clarifying questions of each work groups' draft final proposal and provided written comments to each work group on suggestions for improving each proposal.
- I-Team staff provided an update of the activities of the SAT including a SAT work group update on how kelp habitat is expected to be evaluated in the final proposals.
- I-Team staff described the process and timeline for completing Round 3 MPA proposals. Staff reminded the SCRSG members of the key components necessary for a complete MPA proposal. SCRSG members will have the opportunity to perform a quick quality control check on the final proposals to identify any corrections or clarifications. This SCRSG members' quality control opportunity will occur on September 16-17.
- I-Team staff described the process for SCRSG members to provide input to the BRTF. SCRSG are invited to attend the BRTF meeting on October 20-22. The agenda will be structured to include time for SCRSG members to have a discussion with the BRTF on the content and rationales of each MPA proposal. Staff plans to provide additional information

to the BRTF by asking SCRSG members to identify their rank order preferences for the MPA proposals after the completion of the various evaluations. SCRSG members will also be asked to indicate ways of improving each of the MPA proposals.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On September 9-10, 2009, the SCRSG participated in a meeting in Los Angeles. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The September 9-10 meeting followed SCRSG work sessions that took place on September 9; these work sessions included deliberations within the work groups to continue development of their MPA proposals.

A. Objectives

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- Provide an opportunity for the SCRSG to review and discuss the draft final MPA proposals
- Complete final round of MPA proposals to be forwarded to the SAT and BRTF
- Discuss next steps for presenting the final round of MPA proposals to the BRTF

B. Participants

58 SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Members Greg Schem and Bill Anderson attended portions of the meeting. California Fish and Game Commissioners Dan Richards and Don Benninghoven also attended portions of the work sessions and SCRSG meeting.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

C. Materials

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_090909.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. SCRSG Presentation of Draft Final Proposals

The co-leads for each SCRSG work group provided a progress report on the draft final MPA proposals on the evening of September 9, 2009. The co-lead presentations focused on the backbone MPAs and identified the primary interest or overarching objective that each work group used to guide its decision making. Per guidance from the BRTF, work group 3's emphasis was to meet preferred SAT guidelines while trying to be sensitive to socioeconomic impacts and wanting to keep cross-interest support; they chose to focus their MPA design on diverse, unique and quality habitats. Work group 2, while wanting to build on previous submittals, dropped reference to the “External A” MPA proposal; the emphasis was on meeting SAT guidelines where possible while trying to minimize negative socioeconomic impacts and ensure the support of broader interests, including local entities and organizations outside of the SCRSG. Work

group 1's emphasis was to meet SAT guidelines while meeting the diverse interests of the SCRSG members. SCRSG members asked clarifying questions on each of the work group proposals and provided written comments to be distributed to the work groups the following day.

B. Updates

The SCRSG re-convened the following morning. Satie Airame, I-Team staff, summarized the recent SAT work group document describing how persistent and maximum kelp is recommended to be used in the evaluation of the final SCRSG MPA proposals. This draft document was in response to a science question raised at the SCRSG's August 3, 2009 meeting. The document is considered draft, as it has not yet been approved by the full SAT. In response to the question, the SAT Habitat Work Group defined "persistent" kelp as kelp occurring in three of seven years for which data are available and "maximum" or potential kelp as kelp occurring in only one of seven years.

In conducting the spacing evaluations for Round 3 MPA proposals, the SAT work group's recommendation is that the SAT conduct three separate spacing evaluations for kelp habitat: 1) spacing between replicates of persistent kelp, for which a replicate is a protected area of at least moderate high level of protection and sufficient size including at least 1.14 miles of persistent kelp; 2) spacing between MPAs of sufficient size and at least a moderate high level of protection, which are located between Alamitos Bay and Batiquitos lagoon and include at least 2.04 miles of maximum kelp and; 3) spacing between protected patches of at least 1.14 miles of maximum kelp. The third evaluation was recommended by MLPA I-Team staff and is intended to provide additional information about locations of potential kelp habitat and is consistent with evaluations of Round 2 proposals.

Melissa Miller-Henson of the MLPA Initiative, provided an update on the anticipated legal advice regarding possible activities proposed that may be inconsistent with a state marine reserve (SMR). She reminded SCRSG members to be as specific as possible in identifying those potentially inconsistent activities within their proposed SMRs and indicate whether they want such activities to continue (e.g. dredging). The MLPA is awaiting more definitive advice on how such potentially inconsistent uses should be addressed.

Craig Shuman, MLPA I-Team Education and Outreach Coordinator, provided an update on recent outreach activities and highlighted the "Guidelines for Providing Public Comment to the MLPA South Coast Project " that was recently distributed.

C. Guidance for Completing Round 3 Proposals and Discussion of Next Steps

I-Team staff described the process and timeline for completing Round 3 of the south coast study region's MPA proposals. Staff reminded the SCRSG members of the key components necessary for a complete MPA proposal. SCRSG members will have the opportunity to perform a quick quality control check on the final proposals to identify any corrections or clarifications. The quality control check does not, however, allow for changes to MPA boundaries, regulations, or rationales. This SCRSG members' quality control opportunity will occur on September 16-17.

I-Team staff described the process for SCRSG members to provide input to the BRTF. SCRSG members are encouraged to attend the BRTF meeting on October 20-22. There will be time set aside on the agenda for SCRSG members to have a discussion with the BRTF on the MPA proposals. Staff plans to provide additional information to the BRTF by asking SCRSG members

to identify their rank order preferences for the MPA proposals after completion of the various evaluations and to provide recommendation on how the individual proposals could be improved.

D. Public Comment

Don Benninghoven, California Fish and Game Commissioner, and Chair Emeritus of the MLPA's BRTF, opened the public comment by congratulating the SCRSG on navigating all of the many issues in this study region and expressed his pride in their achievement in developing creative and successful MPA proposals. Members of the public (including elected officials, fishermen and conservation interests) commented on the draft MPA proposals and provided detailed recommendations for how the MPA proposals could be modified to better meet their respective interests.

E Presentation of Final MPA Proposals

Upon reconvening in the afternoon, each of the three work groups presented their final MPA proposals for submittal for evaluation and consideration by the BRTF.

III. Next Steps

A. The I-Team committed to:

1. Provide an opportunity for SCRSG members to conduct a quality control of their final MPA proposals on September 16 – 17, 2009.
2. Post final MPA proposals on the MLPA website on approximately September 24, 2009.
3. Prepare final MPA proposals for SAT, DFG, State Parks and I-Team analysis. The SAT evaluations will be provided at its October 6, 2009 meeting.
4. Devise a procedure to allow each SCRSG member to identify their rank order preference for the three final MPA proposals and any key revisions that would be needed to allow the SCRSG member to support the proposals. This information will be requested after the evaluations are completed, and before the BRTF convenes in late October.

B. Objectives for Upcoming BRTF Meeting, on October 20 - 22, 2009

The SCRSG will be invited to participate in the BRTF meeting scheduled for October 20 – 22, 2009. At this meeting, evaluations of the final SCRSG MPA proposals will be provided by the SAT, State Parks, DFG, and the I-Team. The BRTF, in its review, will recommend a preferred MPA proposal for consideration by the California Fish and Game Commission.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Meeting Agenda
(revised August 2, 2009)

Monday, August 3, 2009 at 9:00 AM

Holiday Inn
850 Palomar Airport Road
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Public Participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or may view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet. Video and audio archives of the meeting may be accessed via the Internet approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information.

Public Comment: The public will be invited to provide general comment on subjects related to the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) **at approximately 3:30 pm.** Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the room. Time allotted for public comment is determined by the number of requests and can range from one to three minutes per comment; submitting written comments that can be easily summarized in one to two minutes is encouraged. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the SCRSG; comments related to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, science advisory team, or other MLPA Initiative activities should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they are available. This agenda may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive and discuss MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Parks and Recreation, staff goal 3 evaluations and MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force review of Round 2 marine protected area (MPA) proposals.*
- *Receive presentation on key themes and suggestions from MLPA South Coast Open Houses*
- *Discuss key geographies and Round 2 evaluation results across draft and revised MPA proposals to inform Round 3 MPA proposal development*
- *Receive direction on moving forward with Round 3 MPA proposals and work group process*

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

Meeting Agenda - Monday August 3, 2009

Note: The SCRSG will break for lunch at approximately 11:30 a.m. and public comment will be taken at approximately 3:30 pm.

Arrival, Refreshments and Greetings

Welcome, Introductions and Review of the Agenda

I. Updates

A. Master Plan Science Advisory Team

B. MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

C. Public Outreach and Education

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.1: Summary of Key Themes from Public Comments Received at Open Houses for the South Coast Project through July 20, 2009 (July 29, 2009) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.2: Public Comments Received at South Coast Public Open Houses through July 20, 2009 (distributed electronically)

D. SCRSG Update on Interim Discussions

Bruce Steele and Phyllis Grifman, SCRSG members

BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.1: Key Outcomes Memorandum from May 21, 2009 SCRSG Meeting (June 2, 2009)

II. Developing Draft MPA Proposals for Round 3

E. BRTF Guidance and I-Team Direction for Round 3

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.1: Staff Memo Regarding Process Guidelines for Developing Round 3 Marine Protected Area Proposals (July 31, 2009) - Handout

F. Presentation of Draft MPA Proposals of the Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) and Revised MPA Proposals Developed External to the SCRSG Process

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.1: Overview of Round 2 Draft and Revised MPA Proposals PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover for the July 28-29, 2009 BRTF meeting)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.2: Round 2 Comparison of Existing MPAs (Proposal 0), Draft SCRSG MPA Proposals, and Revised External MPA Proposals by Designation Type and Level of Protection (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.3: Side by side maps and regulations (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover for the July 28-29, 2009 BRTF meeting)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.4: Draft MPA Proposal Topaz: Overview Map, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs and Consideration of Existing MPAs (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover for the July 28-29, 2009 BRTF meeting)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.5: Draft MPA Proposal Opal: Overview Map, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs and Consideration of Existing MPAs (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover for the July 28-29, 2009 BRTF meeting)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.6: Draft MPA Proposal Lapis 1: Overview Map, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs and Consideration of Existing MPAs (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover for the July 28-29, 2009 BRTF meeting)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.7: Draft MPA Proposal Lapis 2: Overview Map, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs and Consideration of Existing MPAs (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover for the July 28-29, 2009 BRTF meeting)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.8: Revised External MPA Proposal A : Overview Map, Staff Summary, Narrative Description, Description of MPAs and Consideration of Existing MPAs (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.9:** Revised External MPA Proposal B : Overview Map, Staff Summary, Narrative Description, Description of MPAs and Consideration of Existing MPAs (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.10:** Draft MPA Proposal Lapis 1: Habitat Calculations (June 10, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.11:** Draft MPA Proposal Lapis 2: Habitat Calculations (June 10, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.12:** Draft MPA Proposal Opal: Habitat Calculations (June 10, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.13:** Draft MPA Proposal Topaz: Habitat Calculations (June 10, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.14:** Existing MPA Proposal 0: Habitat Calculations (June 16, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.15:** Revised External MPA Proposal A: Habitat Calculations (June 10, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.16:** Revised External MPA Proposal B: Habitat Calculations (June 10, 2009)

G. Summary of Draft Proposals: Key Evaluations and Geographies

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT G.1:** Key Aspects of Round 2 Marine Protected Area Proposals for Consideration in Round 3 PPT - Handout Placeholder

III. Summary of Evaluations of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals and Revised External MPA Proposals

H. Overview and Panel Discussion of SAT Methods and Analyses of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals, and Revised External MPA Proposals

Dr. Sarah Kruse, Commercial and Recreational Fishing

Dr. Will White, Bioeconomic Modeling

Members of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team:

Dr. Larry Allen, Co-chair

Dr. Pete Raimondi, Habitat Representation and Replication

Dr. Eric Bjorkstedt, MPA Size and Spacing

Dr. Susan Chivers, Marine Birds and Mammals

Mr. Dominic Gregorio, Water Quality

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.1:** Summary of SAT Evaluations of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals and Revised External MPA Proposals PPT- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.2:** Habitat Representation and Habitat Replication Evaluations of Round 2 MPA Proposals for the South Coast Study Region PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.3:** Habitat Representation and Replication and MPA Size and Spacing (Revised July 22, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.4:** MPA Size and Spacing Evaluation Results of the Round 2 Draft MPA Proposals for the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.5:** Spatial Bioeconomic Model Evaluations of Round 2 MPA Proposals PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.6:** Bioeconomic Model Evaluations of Second Round Marine Protected Area Proposals for South Coast Study Region- Revised July 13, 2009
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.7:** Marine Birds and Marine Mammals Evaluations for Round 2 MPA Proposals in the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.8:** Evaluation of Benefits to Marine Birds from Proposed MPAs and Special Closures in the South Coast Study Region (Revised June 12, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.9:** Evaluation of Benefits to Marine Mammals from Proposed MPAs in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised June 17, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.10:** Summary of Potential Impacts of the May 2009 (Round 2) South Coast MPA Proposals on Commercial and Recreational Fisheries PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.11:** Summary of Potential Impacts of Round 2 MPA Proposals on Commercial and Recreational Fisheries and in the Channel Islands in the South Coast Study Region (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.12:** SAT Evaluation of Round 2 Draft and Revised MPA Proposals: Water and Sediment Quality PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.13:** SAT Evaluation of Round 2 Draft and Revised MPA Proposals: Water and Sediment Quality (Revised July 16, 2009)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.14:** California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Draft Recommendations for Evaluating Water and Sediment Quality along the Palos Verdes Shelf (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

I. Goal 3 Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals, and Revised External MPA Proposals

BRIEFING DOCUMENT I.1: MLPA Goal 3 Evaluation of Draft SCRSG MPA Proposals and Revised External MPA Proposals PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT I.2: Evaluation of Existing MPAs, SCRSG Draft MPA Proposals and Revised External MPA Proposals Relative to MLPA Goal 3 (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

J. California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals, and Revised External MPA Proposals

BRIEFING DOCUMENT J.1: California Department of Fish and Game Overview of Feasibility Analysis of Draft MPA Arrays and Revised External MPA Proposals for the South Coast Study Region (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT J.2: California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Analysis of Draft MPA Proposals and Revised External Proposals for the South Coast Study Region PPT - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT J.3: California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Analysis of Draft MPA Arrays and Revised External MPA Proposals for the South Coast Study Region - Handout

K. California Department of Parks and Recreation Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals, and Revised External MPA Proposals

BRIEFING DOCUMENT K.1: Summary of Parks and Recreation Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Proposals and Revised External MPA Proposals PPT (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT K.2: California Department of Parks and Recreation Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays and Revised External Proposals (sent to SCRSG members under separate cover)

IV. Next Steps and Preparation for Round 3

L. Guidance for SCRSG Evening Work Sessions

M. Wrap up and Next Steps

Adjourn

SCRSG Work Session

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: August 14, 2009

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – August 3, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative contractors, California Department of Fish and Game MLPA staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation MLPA staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On August 3, 2009, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its seventh meeting in Carlsbad, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) chair Don Benninghoven thanked the SCRSG members for their hard work and participation in the MLPA process. He also gave a summary of the key BRTF guidance provided to SCRSG members for Round 3 of their marine protected area (MPA) proposal development. This summary included an emphasis on meeting the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) guidelines, where possible. In those rare exceptions where work groups chose not to meet SAT guidelines, SCRSG members should be explicit about the tradeoffs and the decisions reached on which guidelines or interests were intended to be met with the placement of a given MPA.
- I-Team staff discussed how Round 3 deliberations would proceed within the SCRSG. Three new work groups were established (with specific assignments to each work group provided in a handout). Each work group was assigned a specific proposal to use as a starting point for its deliberations and guidance to help focus efforts.
- SAT members gave a summary of the evaluations of each of the six Round 2 MPA proposals including: size and spacing, habitat representation and replication, bioeconomic modeling, marine birds and mammals, and potential socioeconomic impacts to commercial and recreational fisheries.
- SAT members also held a panel discussion to give SCRSG members the opportunity to ask key questions of the SAT analyses.
- The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) provided an evaluation of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals and how well they met DFG's feasibility guidelines for developing MPA designs, regulations and boundaries.

Key next steps are listed in Section III below.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On August 3, 2009, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in a meeting in Carlsbad, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- *Receive and discuss MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and MLPA staff evaluations of Round 2 SCRSG "draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals" and external MPA proposals*
- *Receive and discuss I-Team direction on deliberations for developing Round 3 "MPA proposals"*
- *Discuss key geographies and Round 2 evaluation results across draft MPA proposals to inform Round 3 MPA proposal development.*
- *Receive direction on moving forward with Round 3 MPA proposals and work group process.*

60 SCRSG members (primary and alternate) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) member Don Benninghoven (chair) attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members Larry Allen, Pete Raimondi, Eric Bjorkstedt, Susan Chivers and Dominic Gregorio, attended portions of the meeting. Dr. Will White and Dr. Sarah Kruse gave presentations on behalf of the SAT.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff—collectively known as the "I-Team"—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_080309.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome, Introductions, and Updates

I-Team staff provided a brief update of SAT activities including recent approval of draft recommendations for water and sediment quality, and approval of Palos Verdes supplemental guidance. It was also noted that the SAT's next meeting is scheduled for October 6, 2009.

BRTF Chair Don Benninghoven noted the big success of the recent public open houses in the south coast and thanked the SCRSG members for their participation. He also reiterated the guidance given to the SCRSG at the BRTF's last meeting, reminding SCRSG members that the intent is to provide maximum protection with minimum economic impact. In those exceptions where SAT or DFG feasibility guidelines are not met, SCRSG members are asked to provide an explanation for the

reasoning behind the MPA placement. He also indicated that special closures will continue as identified in the Channel Islands and that no new special closures are anticipated for this study region. Finally, he clarified that anchoring is not a fishing activity and, therefore, is not assigned a level of protection. Anchoring will be permitted in MPAs unless explicitly excluded from the MPA in its rationale.

I-Team staff provided a brief summary of the public open houses held in late June and early July. There were over 800 public comments provided through those open houses and a document describing the key themes was provided in a handout to the SCRSG. Staff also discussed the “Suggestions for Effective Public Comment” which includes guidelines to help the public’s input and comments be more readily available to the MLPA process. Staff announced that the final regional profile for the MLPA South Coast Study Region is completed and will be distributed.

Bruce Steele gave an update of the recent informal meetings among some SCRSG members. The primary intent of the meetings was to give SCRSG members an opportunity to hear each others concerns. At the first meeting, SCRSG members worked to flesh out what “cross-interest” and “middle-ground” meant for the MPA proposal design. At the second meeting, they discussed some of the specific MPA shapes and proposals. Bruce noted that the panel discussion at the recent BRTF meeting in July also helped continue the dialogue between SCRSG members.

B. I-Team Direction for Round 3 Deliberations

I-Team staff presented the process for SCRSG members to use in the upcoming, Round 3 deliberations. The direction is intended to help implement the BRTF guidance including: underscoring the importance of meeting the SAT guidelines, providing safe harbor to SCRSG members to focus on their interests, and reiterating the importance of following the adopted ground rules.

The SCRSG will be organized into three new work groups and each will be assigned a draft MPA proposal as the starting point (or platform) for its deliberations. The work groups and their assigned platforms include: Workgroup 1, Draft MPA Proposal Topaz; Workgroup 2, MPA Proposal External A and; Workgroup 3, Draft MPA Proposal Lapis 1. The assignments of SCRSG members to work groups (Attachment A) were largely based on the preferences expressed by SCRSG members in an on-line survey and in consultation with individual SCRSG members.

All workgroups are directed to meet SAT guidelines, where possible, and DFG’s feasibility criteria. In addition each work group had specific instructions:

- Work group 1 was instructed to continue achieving a high level of cross-interest support and improve achievement of SAT guidelines;
- Work group 2 was instructed to continue to seek efficiency of MPA design and improve achievement of SAT guidelines;
- Work group 3 was instructed to continue to address SAT guidelines and strive to achieve preferred SAT guidelines.

A few clarifying questions were raised about the process guidelines. SCRSG members asked if these groups were permanent or whether they could move between work groups. Staff responded that the primary affiliation is with the assigned work group and in an attempt to keep the groups as stable as possible, SCRSG members are encouraged to communicate with each other but stay within their assigned work groups.

A question was raised about how designation of an MPA will affect monitoring requirements, such as is required for outfall pipes. I-Team staff responded that the question of how MPA designation can affect other activities is being considered by legal counsel. In the near term, any activities that are expected (or desired) to occur in an MPA that may be considered extractive should be included in the MPA's rationale.

C. Summary of Draft MPA Proposals: Key Evaluations and Geographies

I-Team staff gave a quick summary of the MPA proposals submitted for Round 2 evaluation. Staff also provided an analysis of the opportunities the MPA proposals offered in meeting SAT guidelines in key geographies. The presentation identified key planning steps for moving forward into Round 3 deliberations and submittal of the proposals to the BRTF.

D. Overview and Panel Discussion of SAT Methods and Analyses of Round 2 MPA Proposals

SAT members provided an overview of the evaluation results for each of the proposals for: Habitat Representation and Replication, Habitat Size and Spacing, Bioeconomic Modeling, Marine Birds and Mammals, Water Quality, and Commercial and Recreational Fishing.

SAT guidelines that were difficult or impossible to meet were noted including: replication and spacing for deep rocky bottom habitats (greater than 100m) due to its patchy distribution and rarity; sandy bottom habitats greater than 200 meter depth due to gaps between patches of these habitats in the study region. It was also noted during the overview that MPA proposal design in Round 1 had much different objectives than for Round 2 and comparing the results of the two rounds may not be meaningful.

SCRSG members posed key questions and comments to the SAT members including:

- For all of the SAT evaluations, should the existing MPAs in the Channel Islands be considered part of Proposal 0 analysis? Existing Channel Islands MPAs are included in all SAT evaluations, but results from Channel Islands MPAs and pending military closures are identified separately. SAT members noted that the Channel Island MPAs have five years of monitoring data.
- For the water quality evaluations, given the significance of the contamination at Palos Verdes, should water quality be given greater consideration in this geography? SAT member Dominic Gregorio noted that water quality continues to be a secondary consideration in the south coast study region.
- For the size and spacing guidelines, would the SAT consider using different spacing guidelines for an MPA where only lobster is extracted, given lobster's longer larval period? SAT member Pete Raimondi observed that lobster has a longer larval period (9 months – 1 year) than the average species. However, the spacing guidelines are based on the larval period for the vast preponderance of species. Removing lobster would cause an impact on other species in the MPA.
- For all of the evaluations, how did the SAT evaluate slot limits? The SAT considered slot limits as take and assigned it a level of protection consistent with that gear and species. A similar approach was used for catch and release fishing.

- A question was raised about the bioeconomic modeling and conservation value assigned to two MPAs that were in close proximity and why one was afforded a higher conservation value. Will White responded that the two SMRs performed similar functions and that one had a relatively higher larval production so it received a higher score.
- A number of questions were asked about kelp measurements, the level of confidence in the survey information and surrogates for persistent kelp. SAT Member Pete Raimondi noted that 2.04 linear miles of maximum kelp would potentially encompass 90% of the associated species. It was noted that this estimate has not been approved by the full SAT. I-Team staff noted that a teleconference meeting of SAT members could potentially be scheduled, as needed, to respond to critical SAT questions.
- SCRSG members also asked for assistance in identifying those SAT guidelines that were “impossible” to meet. Staff responded that these issues, along with key gaps in each MPA proposals, would be discussed further in the work groups.
- There was also a question about the marine birds and marine mammals evaluation and how they are calculated. SAT member Susan Chivers noted that the birds and mammals evaluation results do not have a threshold to meet, but, instead, are relative to other proposals. It was also noted that MPAs do not need to be of minimum size as recommended by the SAT to be evaluated in the birds and mammals evaluation. The evaluation results for birds and mammals do depend upon the level of protection afforded in that MPA.

E. Additional Evaluations of Draft MPA Arrays

California Department of Fish and Game Evaluation

California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff provided the results of its feasibility evaluation of Round 2 proposals and included further guidance on how MPAs should be designed to meet DFG's feasibility criteria. Key suggestions to improve feasibility design include: use of land-based features for identifying boundaries, reduction in number of clusters and/or change in regulations in adjacent MPAs, simplification of take regulations, and greater clarity and simplicity in identifying goals and objectives supporting MPA placement.

Goal 3 Evaluation

I-Team staff presented the Goal 3 analysis of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. To improve achievement of Goal 3, MPAs should include public access points, long-term monitoring sites, and increased proximity to state parks.

State Parks Evaluation

The California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) also provided its evaluation of the Round 2 proposals and their consistency with State Parks guidelines and master plan. It was suggested that the state marine park classification should be used in areas where the underwater lease holders are state entities.

G. Guidance for Work Group Sessions

I-Team staff explained the objectives for the evening work session and the full work session the following day. I-Team staff had identified key opportunities for achieving SAT guidelines for each work group and intends to use this analysis to guide the initial discussion for each group. SCRSG members were also reminded to follow the adopted ground rules and pay particular attention to demonstrating respectful behavior and acting as “good-faith” negotiators.

H. Public Comment

The extensive public comment focused on the following suggestions and concerns:

- Concerns related to potentially significant, negative, economic impact of different MPA draft arrays and placement of specific MPAs.
- Concern related to access and safety for kayak fishermen and spear fishermen and the impacts to those users if an SMR is placed in La Jolla.
- Concern that placement of MPAs may restrict necessary monitoring activities associated with sanitation districts or outfalls or sand excavation or deposition activities.
- There was also a comment to support the preservation of the ecological integrity of the ocean and to integrate cultural preservation activities into the placement and designation of MPAs and consideration of future generations.

I. Objectives for September 9, 2009 Work Session and September 10, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

The SCRSG will hold its next work session in Los Angeles on September 9, 2009. The main objective for the work session is to complete development of the MPA proposals for each work group for submittal to the BRTF for final consideration.

The next SCRSG meeting will be in Los Angeles on September 10, 2009. [Note that it was determined after the August 3 SCRSG meeting that the September 10 meeting will actually start on the evening of September 9.] The key objective will be to finalize, present and discuss the final Round 3 MPA proposals.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for SCRSG members

Continue to work with assigned work group members to create a final Round 3 MPA proposal. Specific “homework” actions were identified during each work group’s work session.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

Create a list server and marine map account for each new work group. Assist SCRSG members in completing assigned homework and provide staff support for informal work sessions, as needed.

Attachment A**Work Group Assignments for
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Round 3 Deliberations**

Work Group 1	Work Group 2	Work Group 3
Starting Platform: Topaz	Starting Platform: External A	Starting Platform: Lapis 1
Abramson (Sikich), Sara Beede, Ben Bursek, Julie Cordero, Roberta Czarnecki, Lauren Daigle, Leslie Engel, Jonna Feinberg, Jenn Ferrigno, Ciro Fields, Ray Galipeau, Russ Grifman, Phyllis Hiemstra, Ray Huber, Mike Kearsley, Ken Kennedy, MJ Kett, Eric Peveler, Jack Protopapadakis, Lia Richter, Gerry Rudie, Dave Sasidaharan, Vinod Scheiwe, Brent Sepulveda, Chugey Steele, Bruce	Balotti, John Bertelli, Bob Dahl, Jim Beghul, Phil Everingham, Buck Fisher, Josh Fletcher, Robert Foley, MJ Gauger, Mike Gomes, Tommy Greenberg, Joel Griffin, Wayne Ketchum, Kevin Kronman, Mick Lebowitz, Paul Maas, Terry Maasen, Jeff Marshall, Jenny McCorkle, Mike McCrea, Merit Mills, Marc Osborn, Bob Tapp, Norris Tochihara, Wendy	Allison, Calla Benavides, Steve Dunn, Scott Engle, Jack Guassac, Louis Gutierrez, Marcela Hanley, Kate Helms, Greg Mayhugh, Carl McCoy, Mike Murphy, Garth Pister, Benjamin Spacie, Anne Teufel, Cassidy Weeshoff, David

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Meeting Agenda
(revised May 19, 2009)

Thursday, May 21, 2009 at 8:00 AM

Doubletree Hotel Santa Ana
201 East MacArthur Boulevard
Santa Ana, CA 92707

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or may view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet. Video and audio archives of the meeting may be accessed via the Internet approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information.

Public comment: The public will be invited to provide general comment on subjects related to the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) **at approximately 9:00 a.m.** Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the room. Time allotted for public comment is determined by the number of requests and can range from one to three minutes per comment; submitting written comments that can be easily summarized in one to two minutes is encouraged. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the SCRSG; comments related to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, science advisory team, or other MLPA Initiative activities should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they are available. This agenda may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive updates on the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), and public education and outreach*
- *Receive informational presentation on revised draft "external" MPA proposals*
- *Present and discuss each MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) work group's draft MPA proposal for consideration in Round 2 evaluations*
- *Select no more than six draft MPA proposals for Round 2 review and evaluations*
- *Discuss process for moving forward with work groups in developing Round 3 SCRSG MPA proposals.*

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TTY) or 800.735.2922 (voice) or contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

Meeting Agenda - Thursday May 21, 2009

Welcome, Introductions and Review of Agenda

I. Updates

A. Blue Ribbon Task Force

BRIEFING DOCUMENT A.1: Actions of MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Taken on May 19, 2009 Regarding Military Use Areas and Pending Military Closures (May 19, 2009) - Handout

B. Master Plan Science Advisory Team

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.1: Background Information on Artificial Structures in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised May 6, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.2: Background Information on Wetland and Eelgrass Restoration Activities in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised April 28, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.3: MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Approved Levels of Protection (Revised May 5, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.4: Memo Regarding Revised Evaluation Methods Document (With Revised Chapters 9 and 10 Attached)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.5: SAT Draft Recommendations for Considering Water Quality and Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised May 12, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.6: Water Quality Subregional Maps (Revised May 7, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.7: California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Analysis of Military Use Areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.8: Draft Evaluation of Ecological Contributions of Pending Military Closures and Other MPAs at San Nicolas Island, Begg Rock and San Clemente Island (Revised May 16, 2009) - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.9: Potential Impacts of Military Activities in Military Use Areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised May 16, 2009) - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.10: California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Proposed Concepts for Designing a Network of MPAs for Adaptive Management (May 18, 2009) - Handout

C. South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.1: Response to Questions from the April 28-29, 2009 SCRSG Meeting and Work Session - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.2: Key Outcomes Memo from the April 28, 2009 South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting (May 6, 2009) - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.3: Staff Memo Regarding the Use of Kelp Data in the MLPA Initiative Process (May 8, 2009) - Handout

D. Education and Outreach Activities

II. Status of Draft MPA Proposals for Round 2

E. Overview of Revised External MPA Proposals

Michael Sheehy, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper and Tom Ford, Santa Monica Baykeeper (Draft External MPA Proposal C)

Joe Exline, Fishermen's Information Network (Draft External MPA Proposal A)

Bob Osborn, Dan Fink, Steven Fukuto, United Anglers of Southern California (Draft External MPA Proposal B)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.1: Draft External MPA Proposal C: Narrative Rationale, Description of MPAs and Overview Map (May 14, 2009) - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.2: Draft External MPA Proposal A: Narrative Rationale, Description of MPAs and Overview Map (May 14, 2009) - Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.3: Draft External MPA Proposal B: Narrative Rationale, Description of MPAs and Overview Map (May 14, 2009) - Handout

F. Overview of SCRSG Work Group Efforts

Recess

[Work Group Breakout Sessions] Discuss and Finalize Draft MPA Proposals

Reconvene

III. Draft MPA Proposals for Round 2

G. Presentation of SCRSG Work Group Draft MPA Proposals

H. SCRSG Member Reflections on Draft MPA Proposals for Round 2

IV. Next Steps and Preparations for Round 3

Adjourn

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: June 19, 2009

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – May 21, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On May 21, 2009, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its sixth meeting in Santa Ana, following 1 ½ days of work sessions.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- SCRSG members received a summary of key guidance from the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force's (BRTF's) motions on pending military closures and military use areas, and how such areas should be treated in Round 2 marine protected area (MPA) proposal development.
- I-Team staff provided a summary of the revised external MPA proposals, and the authors of the proposals described any changes made to their proposals in response to the BRTF guidance on military use areas.
- Based on the BRTF's guidance to forward no more than six proposals for Round 2 evaluation, the I-Team staff reviewed the voting structure that would be used to select MPA proposals to advance for evaluation: Any gem group that could produce a single converged proposal would automatically have it moved forward for evaluation. Any gem group that could not agree to a single proposal would have their proposals put into a pool with the external proposals, and a vote would be taken from all SCRSG members.
- SCRSG members, in each of the three work groups, "Lapis," "Opal" and "Topaz," completed their Round 2 draft MPA proposals. Each gems group pursued its own proposal development process. The gems groups presented these proposals to the full SCRSG for review and discussion. Opal and Topaz each submitted a single, draft MPA proposal to be automatically moved forward for evaluation, and the Lapis workgroup submitted two proposals (Lapis 1 and Lapis 2).
- Based on the BRTF's guidance to forward no more than six proposals for Round 2 evaluation, the I-Team staff conducted a vote to select four (4) proposals from among five remaining proposals including: the three external proposals (External A, External B and External C) and the two non-converged Lapis proposals (Lapis 1 and Lapis 2). All 64

SCRSG members (including those not present at the meeting) were given the opportunity to vote and all participated. The aim was to produce a full set of six proposals; thus procedures for the vote required SCRSG to vote for four of the five proposals in order for the ballot to be counted. I-Team staff collected one ballot from each SCRSG member present and committed to contacting the absent SCRSG members over the next few days to obtain their vote. The vote results were released on May 27, 2009 and are included as an attachment to this KOM.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On May 21, 2009, the SCRSG participated in a meeting in Santa Ana. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The May 21 meeting followed SCRSG work sessions that took place on May 19-20 which included deliberations within the work groups and an evening public comment session.

A. Objectives:

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- Receive updates on the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA BRTF, and public education and outreach.
- Receive informational presentations on revised external marine protected areas MPA proposals.
- Present and discuss each SCRSG work group's draft MPA proposal for consideration in Round 2 review and evaluations.
- Select no more than six draft MPA proposals for Round 2 evaluations.

B. Participants:

56 SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA SAT member Steve Murray attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

C. Materials:

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_052109.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome and Introductions & Updates

Melissa Miller-Henson of the MLPA Initiative, provided a summary of the key guidance from the BRTF for how the military use areas in the south coast study region should be considered in the SCRSG's design of MPA proposals for Round 2. Per the direction of the BRTF, the following guidance was provided on pending military closures and military use areas:

- Area G at San Clemente Island must be included as a military closure in all MPA proposals and will be considered within SAT evaluations as contributing to the ecological goals of an MPA network;
- Wilson Cove at San Clemente Island and Area Alpha at San Nicolas Island may be included as a military closure in any MPA proposal at the discretion of the SCRSG and, if included, will be considered within SAT evaluations as contributing to the goals of an MPA network;
- MPAs or special closures at Begg Rock or on the mainland military use areas may be proposed in any MPA proposal at the discretion of the SCRSG;
- Other MPAs or special closures at San Clemente Island or San Nicolas Island are not allowed.

It was noted that the upcoming BRTF meeting on June 4, 2009, will include a discussion of south coast water quality issues and fisheries management issues.

Evan Fox, principal planner for the MLPA Initiative summarized the recent SAT guidance and documents on a variety of topics including: levels of protection, evaluation methods, water quality considerations, and analysis of military use areas.

Kelly Sayce, MLPA Initiative education and outreach coordinator, described the outreach activities underway in the study region including a series of open houses planned for the Round 2 proposals for the south coast study region expected in late June and early July 2009. Kelly also asked for any comments or feedback on the re-vamped MLPA website.

B. Status of Draft MPA Proposals for Round 2

Evan Fox summarized the revised external MPA proposals submitted for Round 2. These included: External Proposal A (Fishermen's Information Network), External Proposal B (United Anglers of Southern California) and External Proposal C (Santa Barbara Channelkeeper and Santa Monica Baykeeper). Authors were given the opportunity to note whether any changes were to be made in their MPA design in response to the BRTF's recent guidance on pending military closure and use areas.

Joe Exline, External Proposal A, indicated that no revisions had been made in the Round 2 MPA proposal.

Steven Fukuto noted that changes in External Proposal B included: removing the proposed MPA at area "Alpha" on San Nicolas Island and adding a state marine reserve (SMR) at Begg Rock. On the mainland, an SMR at Sunset Cliffs was added to adjoin the Ocean Beach State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA). At Catalina Island, an Isthmus SMCA was added to compliment the Catalina Marine Science Center SMR. Lastly, "surface gear" limitations are added for the SMCAs at Palos Verdes and Del Mar.

Changes noted to External Proposal C were to include military closure areas "Alpha" on San Nicolas Island and Area "G" on San Clemente Island. All MPAs at San Nicolas and San Clemente Island were removed in response to the BRTF's guidance that there be no MPA closures at these islands. All proposed MPAs on the mainland were retained without

modification. The SMRs on Catalina Island were modified to better protect key habitats, accommodate pelagic fisheries and provide access to harbors.

The SCRSG meeting recessed and SCRSG members continued in work sessions to develop MPA proposals for Round 2.

C. SCRSG Reflections on Round 2 Draft MPA Proposals

Upon reconvening in the afternoon, each of the three work groups, Lapis, Opal and Topaz, presented the draft Round 2 MPA proposals that had emerged from their work groups and noted the key geographies in the study region where SCRSG members had struggled with balancing the science guidelines and incorporating multiple interests.

In Topaz and Opal, this work group deliberation process involved several rounds of developing options and testing the relative support for the options with straw voting. In Lapis, the gems group worked in smaller sub-geography work groups for much of the session. Both Opal and Topaz submitted a single draft MPA proposal. A co-lead from Topaz noted that a variety of options had been deliberated and that, in many areas, reasonably broad based support had been achieved. A co-lead from Opal noted that all members had worked very hard but there was a concern that the submitted Round 2 proposal may not have balanced all interests in the work group.

The Lapis work group produced broad-based agreement in some geographies but did not converge on a single proposal for the entire study region. Thus, the Lapis group submitted two proposals, Lapis 1 and Lapis 2. The two Lapis proposals differed in their MPA design in three key geographies: La Jolla/Pt Loma area; Orange County; and the Pt. Dume to Palos Verdes area. At the end of the work session, MLPA staff explored the potential convergence of Lapis 2 with External Proposal A, but the authors of the internal and external proposals did not reach agreement on this merger.

During the meeting, as well as during the work sessions, SCRSG members expressed a series of concerns with the work group process. Key concerns included:

- Some SCRSG members had not always followed the ground rules;
- Late night public comment sessions had fatigued negotiations;
- Straw voting caused some interests to feel marginalized or may have disadvantaged minority interests;
- SCRSG members might not have given enough weight to socioeconomic consequences of potential closures;
- Some SCRSG members did not have an incentive to converge; and
- Some SCRSG members had not been flexible in considering alternatives in the internal work groups but, instead, were intent on supporting the MPA design offered in External Proposal A.

Based on prior guidance from the BRTF to forward no more than six proposals for Round 2 evaluation, the facilitation team described the selection process the SCRSG members would use to identify which draft MPA proposals would move forward. As discussed at previous

meetings, gem groups that were able to create a single proposal would be automatically advanced for evaluation. As such, the Opal and the Topaz MPA proposals, which had reached agreement on a single proposal, were automatically forwarded for evaluation.

The three external proposals (External Proposals A, B and C) along with the two proposals from Lapis (Lapis 1 and 2) were put into a pool and each SCRSG member was instructed to participate in a voting process and select the top four (4) proposals they recommended move forward for Round 2 evaluation. The draft MPA proposals receiving the most votes would be forwarded for evaluation.

I-Team staff distributed ballots to each SCRSG member and collected them upon completion. I-Team staff committed to having all SCRSG members contribute to the vote and committed to personally contact the absent SCRSG members to obtain their vote (*Note: All 64 SCRSG members did submit a ballot*). Upon collecting the votes from all SCRSG members, the I-Team staff committed to release the results of the vote in a memo to the SCRSG (estimated to be released on May 26, 2009). The results of the vote are included as an attachment to this KOM.

D. Questions and Clarifications

Throughout the meeting, SCRSG members posed a range of clarifying questions and provided comments regarding the process, science, and policy aspects of the guidelines and informational presentations. I-Team staff responded to many questions during the meeting and will provide responses to the remaining policy and science questions that were not fully answered at the meeting. Key comments and questions from SCRSG members that were noted during the meeting include the following:

1. Would a reserve with 1.14 miles of kelp be considered to meet the SAT guidelines?
2. Can a backbone of MPA shapes include high level of protection SMCAs, along with very high SMRs, and still satisfy the BRTF guidance?
3. If we put an MPA off a mainland military area (such as Camp Pendleton, for example), will the military oppose it? What would be the process for addressing that opposition?
4. How were minimums derived for habitat representation?

III. Next Steps

A. The I-Team committed to:

1. Contact SCRSG members not present at the meeting and record their vote on draft MPA proposals to move forward for Round 2 evaluations;
2. Transmit results of vote and decision on MPA proposals to be evaluated in Round 2;
3. Develop a summary of next steps for clarifying the Round 3 proposal development process;
4. Prepare responses to outstanding process, policy and science questions raised by SCRSG members;
5. Prepare Round 2 draft MPA proposals for SAT evaluations; and
6. Conduct DFG, State Parks, and staff Round 2 analyses.

B. Objectives for Next SCRSG Meeting, on August 4-5, 2009

The SCRSG will meet on August 4-5, 2009, to receive informational presentations on the review and evaluations of the Round 2 proposals. Evaluations of the Round 2 proposals will be provided by the SAT, State Parks, DFG, and the I-Team. The BRTF, in its review, may provide guidance on framing the proposals to be used as platforms for further negotiations in Round 3 of the MPA design process. The BRTF may also give guidance on potential merging of similar Round 2 proposals for Round 3.

Attachment: Results from SCRSG Vote on Round 2 Proposals Moving Forward for Evaluation

ATTACHMENT A

Vote tally from May 21, 2009 MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting

(Note: All 64 SCRSG members participated in the voting)

Opal and Topaz reached a unified proposal and will automatically move forward for evaluation in Round 2.

Lapis 1 = 63

Lapis 2 = 61

External A = 64

External B = 39

External C = 29

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Agenda for Work Sessions
(revised May 18, 2009)

Tuesday, May 19, 2009 at 1:00 PM
Wednesday, May 20, 2009 at 8:00 AM

Doubletree Hotel Santa Ana
201 East MacArthur Boulevard
Santa Ana, CA 92707

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the work session as observers. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information.

Public comment: The public will be invited to provide comment on subjects related to the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) **at approximately 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 19.** Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the room. Time allotted for public comment is determined by the number of requests and can range from one to three minutes per comment; submitting written comments that can be easily summarized in one to two minutes is encouraged. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the SCRSG; comments related to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, science advisory team, or other MLPA Initiative activities should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Work Session Objectives

- *Receive brief update on recent guidance from MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) and MLPA Initiative staff*
- *Receive brief informational presentation on revised draft external marine protected area (MPA) proposals*
- *Continue development of Round 2 draft MPA proposals*
- *Participate in “open house” presentations of gem group’s work to date*

Work Sessions’ Proposed Agenda – Tuesday, May 19, 2009

Note: SCRSG work groups will break for dinner at approximately 5:30 p.m. and public comment will be taken at approximately 7:00 p.m.

[Plenary] Updates and Relevant Guidance

[Work Groups] Further Develop Round 2 Draft MPA Proposals

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TTY) or 800.735.2922 (voice) or contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

Work Sessions' Proposed Agenda – Wednesday, May 20, 2009

Note: SCRSG work groups will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 p.m. and for dinner at approximately 6:00 p.m.

[Plenary] Presentation of Revised External Proposals

[Work Groups] Further Develop Round 2 Draft MPA Proposals

[Work Groups] Gems Open House Presentation and Discussion

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Meeting Agenda
(revised April 28, 2009)

Tuesday, April 28, 2009 at 9:30 AM

Residence Inn Marriott at River Ridge
2101 West Vineyard Avenue
Oxnard, California 93036

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or may view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet. Video and audio archives of the meeting may be accessed via the Internet approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information.

Public comment: The public may provide *general comment on subjects related to the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) at approximately 3:00 p.m.* Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the room. Note that the general comment period is for comments specific to the SCRSG; comments related to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, science advisory team or other MLPA Initiative activities should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they are available. This agenda may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp.

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive and discuss MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and MLPA staff evaluations of Round 1 SCRSG draft marine protected area (MPA) arrays and draft external MPA proposals*
- *Receive and discuss MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) feedback on SCRSG draft MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals*
- *Receive and discuss BRTF guidance on developing Round 2 “draft MPA proposals”*
- *Assess approach for convergence on draft MPA options within and across work groups*
- *Begin discussion of potential revisions to draft MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals with an eye toward finishing draft MPA proposals at the end of the May 21 SCRSG meeting*

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) or contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

Meeting Agenda - Tuesday, April 28, 2009

Note: The regional stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 11:45 a.m. and public comment will be taken at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Welcome, Agenda Review and Brief Introductions

I. Updates

A. SAT Documents, Science Questions, Regional Profile, and Announcements

- Briefing Document A.1: Key Outcomes Memo from SCRSG March 3-4, 2009 Meeting (April 20, 2009)
- Briefing Document A.2: Revised Methods Used to Evaluate MPA Proposals in the MLPA South Coast Study Region- Handout
- Briefing Document A.3: California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Draft Background Information on Beach Manipulation Activities in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (April 17, 2009)
- Briefing Document A.4: SAT Responses to January 2009 SCRSG Meeting Questions
- Briefing Document A.5: Response to SCRSG Questions from January and February 2009 Work Sessions and March 2009 Meeting - Handout Placeholder
- Briefing Document A.6: California Department of Fish and Game Memo: Special Closures as They Apply to the Marine Life Protection Act (November 1, 2007)
- Briefing Document A.7: California Department of Fish and Game Memo: Catch and Release in Marine Protected Areas - Handout Placeholder
- Briefing Document A.8: Use of Substrate Data in the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Process (April 23, 2009) - Handout
- Briefing Document A.9: Use of Levels of Protection in the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative (April 23, 2009) - Handout
- Briefing Document A.10: Future Meetings Scheduled for the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised April 24, 2009) - Handout

Note: Staff expect that Agenda Item L and Agenda Section VI will be moved from later in the day to immediately after Agenda Item A

II. Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals

B. Overview of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays Developed by SCRSG Work Groups, and Draft External MPA Proposals

- Briefing Document B.1: Overview of Round 1 Process and Key Planning Guidance for Round 2 PPT - Handout
- Briefing Document B.2: Proposal 0: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.3: Draft MPA Array Lapis A: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.4: Draft MPA Array Lapis B: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.5: Draft MPA Array Opal A: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.6: Draft MPA Array Opal B: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.7: Draft MPA Array Topaz A: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.8: Draft MPA Array Topaz B: Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.9: Draft External MPA Proposal A: Narrative Description, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.10: Draft External MPA Proposal B: Narrative Description, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.11: Draft External MPA Proposal C: Narrative Description, Staff Summary, Description of MPAs, Habitat Calculations, Overview Map and Subregional Maps
- Briefing Document B.12: Staff Summaries - Omit (See Above)

- Briefing Document B.13:** Consideration of Existing MPAs in Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals (Revised March 18, 2009)
- Briefing Document B.14:** Round 1 Comparison of Existing MPAs (Proposal 0), Draft South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group MPA Arrays, and Draft External MPA Proposals by Designation Type and Level of Protection (April 8, 2009)
- Briefing Document B.15:** Maps of Areas of Geographic Overlap for Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays and Proposals
- Briefing Document B.16:** Summary of Key Points from SAT Round 1 Evaluations of Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals (Revised April 25, 2009) - Handout

III. SAT Evaluations of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals

C. Habitat Representation and Replication Evaluation

Dr. Steven Murray, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

Briefing Document C.1: Draft Habitat Evaluations of the Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays/Proposals for the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT - Handout Placeholder

Briefing Document C.2: Draft List of Species Likely to Benefit from MPAs (February 12, 2009)

D. MPA Size and Spacing Evaluation

Dr. Larry Allen, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

Briefing Document D.1: Draft Size and Spacing Evaluations of the Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays/Proposals for the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT - Handout Placeholder

E. Bioeconomic Model Evaluation

Dr. Will White, MLPA SAT Bioeconomic Modeling Work Group and University of California, Davis

Briefing Document : Spatial Bioeconomic Modeling Evaluations of Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays/Proposals PPT

F. Marine Birds and Mammals Evaluation

Dan Robinette, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

Briefing Document F.1: Marine Birds and Mammals Evaluation Results for the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT

Briefing Document F.2: Marine Birds Evaluation Results for Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals: Draft Supplemental Information (April 13, 2009) - Handout

G. Commercial and Recreational Fisheries Evaluation

Sarah Kruse, Ecotrust

Briefing Document G.1: Summary of Potential Impacts of March 2009 Draft MPA Arrays and MPA Proposals on Commercial and Recreational Fisheries PPT

Briefing Document G.2: Summary of Potential Impacts of the March 2009 MPA Proposals on Commercial and Recreational Fisheries in the South Coast Study Region (April 17, 2009)

Briefing Document G.3: Survey Methods and Summary Statistics for Ecotrust's South Coast Study Region Fishery Uses and Values Project (Draft, 17March2009)

IV. Additional Evaluations of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals

H. California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Evaluation

Briefing Document H.1: California Department of Fish and Game Presentation of Feasibility of Round 1 Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External Proposals PPT - Handout

Briefing Document H.2: California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Evaluation for Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External Proposals - Handout

I. California Department of Parks and Recreation Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External Proposals

Briefing Document I.1: Summary of California State Parks' Evaluation of Round 1 MPA Arrays - Handout

Briefing Document I.2: California Department of Parks and Recreation Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External Proposals PPT - Handout

J. MLPA Goal 3 Analysis

Briefing Document J.1: Goal 3 Analysis of Proposal 0, Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External Proposals PPT

Briefing Document J.2: Staff Memo Regarding the Evaluation of Existing MPAs, Draft South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group MPA Arrays, and Draft External MPA Proposals Relative to MLPA Goal 3 (April 8, 2009)

V. Guidance for Developing Draft MPA Proposals in Round 2

K. Water Quality Guidance

Dominic Gregorio, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team and State Water Resources Control Board

Briefing Document K.1: Recommendations for Considering Water Quality and Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised April 20, 2009)

Briefing Document K.2: Subregional Maps for Areas of Water Quality Concern and Opportunities (Revised April 20, 2009)

Briefing Document K.3: Water Quality in the South Coast Study Region PPT - Handout

L. BRTF Guidance Regarding Developing and Evaluating Draft MPA Proposals

Briefing Document L.1: MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Memorandum Summarizing Key Guidance for Developing Round 2 Draft MPA Proposals (April 24, 2009) - Handout

VI. Discuss Work Groups' Direction for Round 2

M. Staff Direction for Round 2

Briefing Document M.1: Staff Direction to Make Operational the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Guidance PPT - Handout

VII. Next Steps and Preparations for April 29 and May 20 Work Sessions

- 1) Review objectives for upcoming work sessions
- 2) Review objectives for next SCRSG Meeting (#6)

Adjourn

Note: *On Wednesday, April 29, the SCRSG members will meet in work sessions; members of the public are invited to attend as observers. There is no public comment at work sessions.*

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: May 6, 2009

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG)

From: Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – April 28, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On April 28, 2009, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its fifth meeting in Oxnard, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- Received a presentation from BRTF member Bill Anderson on key BRTF guidance provided to SCRSG members for Round 2 of their marine protected areas (MPAs) proposal development. The presentation included an emphasis on creating cross-interest proposals in each of the gems groups and defined cross-interest as “a broad range of consumptive and non-consumptive interests as represented through the SCRSG”.
- Received a presentation from I-Team staff on how to make the BRTF guidance operational in the SCRSG gems groups. The I-Team instruction explained that external proposals were not to be fully “internalized” into the work being done by the SCRSG work groups. Instead, the SCRSG members are to develop one, single, cross-interest proposal in each work group, and SCRSG members will have the opportunity to determine which proposals, including the external proposals, will be forwarded for Round 2 evaluation at the May 21, 2009 SCRSG meeting.
- Received an overview of all ten Round 1 MPA arrays/proposals: the existing MPAs, draft external proposals A, B and C, and six SCRSG-generated draft MPA arrays, including areas of convergence and a summary of key evaluation points for each proposal.
- Received evaluations of each of the ten Round 1 MPA arrays/proposals from the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), including size and spacing, habitat representation and replication, bioeconomic modeling, marine birds and mammals, and results from the analysis of potential socioeconomic impacts to commercial and recreational fisheries.
- Discussed that the SAT methods and evaluations are guidelines for MPA placement. The SCRSG members are responsible for optimizing achievement of the six MLPA goals as best they can, and it will be impossible to achieve all goals in every instance. The SCRSG members were encouraged to be explicit about the tradeoffs and the decisions reached on which guidelines or interests were intended to be met with the placement of a given MPA.

- The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) provided an evaluation of the Round 1 MPA arrays/proposals and how well they met DFG's feasibility guidelines for developing MPA designs, regulations and boundaries.
- The California Department of State Parks and Recreation (State Parks) discussed each of the MPA proposals and how well they conformed with State Parks guidance and the Master Plan for State Parks.
- During the meeting and in a letter signed by a subset of SCRSG members, SCRSG members raised concerns about the MLPA process and urged that it would be preferable to delay development of Round 2 proposals in order to accommodate additional data and guidance from the military. BRTF Chair Don Benninghoven suggested that extra time potentially could be made available in the summer months if SCRSG members felt more time was needed. He further added that the MLPA process created a unique situation in that the SCRSG members were on the ground floor creating public policy. He also noted that more data was available earlier in the south coast study region than prior study regions. During the discussion, SCRSG members voiced their support for continuing and moving forward with Round 2 MPA proposal development.

Key next steps are listed in Section III below.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On April 28, 2009, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in a meeting in Oxnard, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- *Receive and discuss MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and MLPA staff evaluations of Round 1 SCRSG "draft marine protected area (MPA) arrays" and draft external MPA proposals*
- *Receive and discuss MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) feedback on SCRSG draft MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals*
- *Receive and discuss BRTF guidance on developing Round 2 "draft MPA proposals"*
- *Assess approach for convergence on draft MPA options within and across work groups*
- *Begin discussion of potential revisions to draft MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals with an eye toward finishing draft MPA proposals at the end of the May 21 SCRSG meeting*

60 SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) members Don Benninghoven (chair), Meg Caldwell and Bill Anderson attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members Larry Allen, Steve Murray, Dominic Gregorio, and Dan Robinette, attended portions of the meeting. Dr. Will White gave a presentation on behalf of the SAT.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_042809.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome, Introductions, and Updates

The I-Team indicated that the order of items on the agenda had been changed and that the discussion of the BRTF guidance to the SCRSG and the direction to the work groups for Round 2 had been moved to the start of the meeting. Staff highlighted key documents provided to SCRSG members in the materials. Staff informed SCRSG members that the next BRTF meeting (planned for May 18) will include further discussion and guidance for MPA placement in military use areas and also consider fisheries management and water quality issues. I-Team staff gave a status report on the revised regional profile for the MLPA South Coast Study Region which is expected to be released in May 2009. Staff also highlighted the finer scale of substrate data that is now available on MarineMap and invited SCRSG members with additional data to contribute to follow the process provided in the use of substrate data memo (Briefing Document A.8).

B. BRTF Guidance

Blue Ribbon Task Force Member (BRTF) Bill Anderson summarized the key guidance for evaluating the Round 1 proposals provided in an April 24, 2009 memo to the SCRSG members. He reiterated the BRTF’s support of previous guidance provided in the MLPA North Central Coast Study region and highlighted the BRTF’s guidance to maintain flexibility for design of MPA proposals with relation to military use areas. He discussed the meaning of cross-interest proposals (“a broad range of consumptive and non-consumptive interests as represented through the SCRSG”) and explained that “middle-ground”, in the context of the SCRSG process, means that the core needs of all SCRSG members are integrated to generate a proposal that all SCRSG members can live with.

C. Direction to Work Groups for Continuing Round 2

I-Team staff gave a presentation describing how the guidance from the BRTF on cross-interest and middle-ground proposals would be implemented. In particular, SCRSG members will continue with the gems group and are charged with creating a single, cross-interest proposal in each work group in Round 2. These proposals should not be attempts to fully integrate the external proposals into the SCRSG process, but instead, efforts to use the creativity and knowledge of the SCRSG members as well as cross-interest deliberation to create new options. It was described that SCRSG members will have the opportunity to determine which of the proposals move forward for evaluation and into Round 3; then, at the beginning of Round 3, the

intention is for SCRSG members to select which MPA proposal they wish to work on. I-Team staff also clarified that work groups that came to agreement on single Round 2 proposals would automatically have their proposals move forward as one of the five to six proposals for Round 2 evaluation. The discussion on this topic suggested that SCRSG members were skeptical of reaching agreement within the work groups but recognized the importance of following the BRTF guidance and I-Team direction.

D. Evaluations of the Draft MPA Arrays and Draft External MPA Proposals

Overview of Proposals

The I-Team staff presented the overview of the MPA arrays/proposals submitted for evaluation in Round 1 including: existing MPAs (proposal 0); external proposals A, B and C; and six proposals generated from the SCRSG work groups. This summary included maps identifying the key geographic overlaps across the proposals and the relative level of protection and percent coverage of MPAs in each proposal. The presentation identified key planning issues for moving forward into Round 2 including a shift away from information gathering and toward integration of information and the inclusion of special closures and water quality evaluation into Round 2.

Habitat Representation and Replication

SAT Member Dr. Steve Murray presented the evaluation results for habitat representation and replication, which are indicators for how well the Round 1 MPA proposals achieve Goals 1 and 4 of the MLPA. His presentation discussed the availability of different habitats across the study region (including mainland and islands) and noted that the proposals had a highly variable representation of all habitats. All proposals included habitat representation from the existing MPAs at the Northern Channel Islands. Dr. Murray confirmed that the habitat calculations used the most current data set and the data used for the evaluations is available on Marine Map. Dr. Murray clarified the use of persistent kelp for the purpose of evaluating kelp habitat representation. A habitat type that is most difficult to replicate, due to its patchy distribution and rarity, is deep rocky bottom (greater than 100m) habitats. It was also noted that all of the Round 1 MPA proposals included a broad range of habitats, but habitats in MPAs having below moderate-high protection are not included in evaluations for habitat representation and replication.

Habitat Size and Spacing

SAT member Dr. Larry Allen presented the evaluation results for MPA size and spacing, which are indicators for how well the proposals met Goals 2 and 6 of the MLPA. Dr. Allen pointed out that the SAT guidelines are not rules and may be difficult to meet in some cases. For example, it may be impossible to meet the spacing guidelines for rocky habitats greater than 30 meters depth and sandy bottom habitats greater than 200 meter depth due to gaps between patches of these habitats in the south coast study region. The number and size of MPAs varied markedly across the submitted proposals. It was noted that few of the SMCAs were included in the size and spacing analysis as they did not afford moderate-high protection.

Bioeconomic Modeling

Dr. Will White, speaking on behalf of the SAT, provided a description of the bioeconomic modeling and the relative ranking of the MPA arrays/proposals. Key points made by Dr. White were that the relative ranking of MPA arrays/proposals is not sensitive to the model used (UCD

or UCSB) or the assumption about fishery management outside MPAs (conservative, MSY, or unsuccessful). However, the assumption about fishery management does influence the total conservation value or fishery yield predicted by the models. For conservative and MSY type management, there is a trade-off between MPA size and fishery yield. While larger MPAs produce greater conservation value, fishery yield is reduced. For unsuccessful management, larger MPAs have greater conservation value and greater fishery yield. Some SCRSG members suggested that California currently has a conservative fisheries management approach. However, DFG staff indicated that no official decision on the type of fisheries management approach has been made.

Marine Birds and Mammals in the MLPA South Coast Study Region

SAT member Dan Robinette provided a presentation evaluating how each of the submitted MPA proposals fared for the marine birds and mammals in the study region. It was noted that this evaluation only included SMRs and that, for future evaluations, SMCAs will be reviewed for the level of protection they may afford. Bays and estuaries provide critical habitat for many of the marine bird species, and this habitat was limited in many of the MPA proposals.

Ecotrust Fisheries Use and Values Project

Dr. Sarah Kruse of Ecotrust summarized the results of potential impacts to commercial and recreational fisheries for each of the Round 1 arrays/proposals. In reviewing the results of the analysis for the different ports and commercial and recreational sectors, it was noted that both the percentage amount for each fishery and the total dollar amount should be considered. It was also noted that potential socioeconomic impacts were evaluated for proposed MPAs in waters surrounding St. Catalina Island. In port-level evaluations, potential impacts of MPAs around Catalina were considered for mainland ports; a separate evaluation was not conducted for ports on Catalina Island. For the evaluation of Round 2 proposals, Ecotrust will separate data from the Northern Channel Islands from other areas because no new MPAs will be established in this region.

E. Additional Evaluations of Draft MPA Arrays

California Department of Fish and Game Evaluation

California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff provided the results of their feasibility evaluation of Round 1 proposals and included further guidance on how MPAs should be designed so that they meet DFG's identified feasibility criteria. Examples of feasibility design concerns in the Round 1 arrays included hanging corners, multiple zoning, intertidal MPAs, and complex regulations. DFG reiterated that meeting the design guidelines was important to ensure adequate protection, implementation, and enforcement of the MPAs. DFG clarified that a state marine recreational management area (SMRMA) is only applicable where there is waterfowl hunting and that proposals with fisheries management regulations are not in the purview of the MLPA. In cases where MPAs were intentionally designed for specific objectives that prevented the MPA from meeting the design guidelines, SCRSG members were encouraged to be explicit about the rationale as to why design guidelines could not be met.

Goal 3 Analysis

I-Team staff presented the Goal 3 analysis of the draft proposals. The Goal 3 analysis provides a relative ranking of the proposals (there are no specific guidelines). The analysis indicated that all of the proposals were an improvement over the existing MPAs.

F. Water Quality in the MLPA South Coast Study Region

Dominic Gregorio, SAT member from the State Water Resources Control Board, gave a presentation summarizing the water quality guidance for the study region and indicated that Round 2 MPA proposals would receive an evaluation of the water quality concerns. The draft evaluation methods (intended to be finalized at the upcoming SAT meeting) are based on presence/absence of key water quality concerns: entrainment, storm water outfalls, and industrial/municipal outfalls and co-location with areas of special biological significance.

G. Discussion of Work Group Direction

During meeting discussions and in a letter signed by a subset of the stakeholder group, SCRSG members raised concerns about the MLPA process and urged that it would be preferable to delay development of Round 2 proposals in order to accommodate additional data on issues such as kelp habitat and the pending guidance from the BRTF on the military use areas. BRTF Chair Don Benninghoven suggested that extra time potentially could be made available in the summer months if SCRSG members felt more time was needed. He further added that the MLPA process created a unique situation in that the SCRSG members were on the ground floor creating public policy and that it created a challenge to get the information to people directly involved with the resource. He also noted that more data was available earlier in the south coast study region than in prior MLPA study regions. During the discussion of the timeline and data concerns, SCRSG members voiced their support for continuing and moving forward with Round 2 MPA proposal development.

H. Public Comment

The extensive public comment focused on the following suggestions and concerns:

- Concerns related to the significant, potential, negative, economic impact of different MPA draft arrays/proposals and placement of specific MPAs. Members of the public requested that SCRSG members consider alternative measures instead of full closures and avoid placing MPAs in areas of most significant impact including La Jolla, Del Mar and Point Conception.
- Concern related to access and safety for kayak fishermen and spear fishermen and the impacts to those users if an SMR is placed in La Jolla.
- Concern that the timeline is moving too fast, that data is being revised without notice, and that more definitive guidance on key issues such as military use areas is needed. It was suggested that the timeline be modified to allow more time for considering the data and generating key policy guidance.

Other comments included:

- Concern that placement of MPAs may restrict necessary monitoring activities associated with sanitation districts or outfalls. A request to conduct a special evaluation of the sediment contamination at Palos Verdes.
- There was also a comment from the Chumash tribe supporting the preservation of the ecological integrity of the ocean and integrating cultural preservation activities into the placement and designation of MPAs.
- A question was raised about how the management of areas will change with the designation of an MPA (e.g. Carpinteria Salt Marsh Reserve)

I. Questions and Clarifications

Throughout the meeting, SCRSG members posed a range of clarifying questions and provided comments regarding the process, science and policy aspects of the guidelines, and informational presentations. I-Team staff responded to most of these questions during the meeting and will provide responses to the remaining policy and science questions that were not fully answered at the meeting. Key comments and questions from SCRSG members that were identified for further review and follow-up include:

- What is the policy guidance regarding special closures in the northern Channel Islands?
- Will the habitat data used in the analysis be updated with new/outside data that becomes available?
- How is kelp coverage being evaluated by the SAT?
- Can rocky bottom habitat that does not currently support kelp growth be considered kelp habitat if it has the potential to grow kelp or has supported kelp growth in the past?
- Is aerial photographic data for surfgrass and kelp being incorporated into the data used for the habitat analysis?
- Why were only a select (7) number of years used in the estimation of persistent kelp and not 7 consecutive years?
 - a. How were the years evaluated in terms of being warm vs. cold-water years?
 - b. Do the selected years reflect the frequency of ENSO events typical to the region (one every 4 to 7yrs)?
- Has the SAT's guidance regarding the spacing guidelines changed?
- How should the level of success of fisheries management practices be considered in the process?
- Can individual MPA's be ranked for their ability/potential to provide bird and mammal protection?
- Why didn't any of the evaluations show 100% protection in estuarine habitats?
- Can the SAT do a habitat quality evaluation of the Palos Verdes Shelf in relationship to water quality/pollutant impacts?

J. Objectives for May 19-20, 2009 Work Sessions and May 21 SCRSG Meeting

The SCRSG will hold its next work sessions in Santa Ana on May 19 and 20, 2009. The main objective for the work sessions is to further develop the draft MPA proposals for Round 2 evaluations.

The next SCRSG meeting will be in Santa Ana on May 21, 2009. The key objective will be to complete the draft MPA proposals and identify which, including the external proposals, are forwarded for review and evaluation.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for SCRSG members

Continue to work with fellow gems' group members to create a single, cross-interest proposal for the end of Round 2. Specific "homework" actions were identified during the April 29 work session.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

Prepare responses to outstanding process, policy and science questions raised by SCRSG members.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Meeting Agenda
(revised March 2, 2009)**

***Tuesday, March 3, 2009 at 9:00 AM
Wednesday, March 4, 2009 at 8:00 am***

**Hilton Long Beach Executive Conference Center
701 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90831**

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to view or listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet, and may view an archived version approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information. Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they become available.

Public participation: The public will be invited to offer comments on the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) at approximately **2:45 p.m. on Tuesday, March 3, 2009 and at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 4, 2009**. Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the room. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group; comments related to other MLPA Initiative activities or groups should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting Objectives

- *Receive presentation from each work group regarding progress on developing draft marine protected area (MPA) arrays*
- *Receive an update on evaluation methods for the MLPA South Coast Study Region*
- *Receive presentation on draft external MPA proposals*
- *Receive presentations and updates on additional data available for MPA planning*
- *Recess into work group sessions to finalize draft arrays (Round 1) for evaluation purposes*
- *Receive presentation from each work group on draft MPA arrays*

Meeting Agenda - Tuesday, March 3, 2009

Note: The regional stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 11:45 am and public comment will be taken at approximately 2:45 pm.

Welcome, Agenda Review and Brief Introductions

Updates

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) or contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

A. MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

B. MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.1: SAT Responses to November 2008 SCRSG Questions (February 26, 2009) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.2: SAT Responses to January 2009 SCRSG Questions (February 26, 2009) – Handout

C. Response to SCRSG Questions

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.1: Response to Questions from the January 13-14, 2009 SCRSG Meeting (February 25, 2009) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.2: Response to Questions from the January and February 2009 work sessions (March 2, 2009) – Handout

D. Education and Outreach Activities

BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.1: California MLPA Initiative Suggestions for Effective Public Comment (February 23, 2009)

E. California Department of Fish and Game Enforcement Update

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.1: California Department of Fish and Game Memo Regarding Law Enforcement Division's Guidance on Catch and Release Fishing in MPAs (January 7, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.2: California Department of Fish and Game Memo Regarding Guidance on Bag Limits and Size Limits in MPAs (February 10, 2009)

II. Marine Protected Area Planning

F. MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Interim Guidance for MPA Planning

BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.1: Summary of Interim Guidance to the South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group with Regard to Military Use Areas and Pending Military Closures (March 2, 2009) – Handout

G. California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Guidance for MPA Planning

BRIEFING DOCUMENT G.1: CDFG Feasibility Guidance Reminders and Response to SCRSG Questions PPT – Handout

H. Draft Methods for Evaluating MPA Proposals

BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.1: Executive Summary of the Draft Methods Used to Evaluate Marine Protected Area Proposals for the MLPA South Coast Study Region (March 2, 2009) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.2: Overview of Science Advisory Team Methods for Evaluating Alternative MPA Proposals PPT – Handout

I. Update on Tribal Forum

BRIEFING DOCUMENT I.1: California Natives: Update on Involvement in the MLPA Initiative PPT – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT I.2: Frequently Asked Questions for the MLPA South Coast Tribal Forum (February 26, 2009) – Handout

J. Additional Information for the Regional Profile in the MLPA South Coast Study Region

K. Additional Information for MPA Planning

Charles Wahle, National MPA Science Center

Chris La Franchi, California Coastal Online Survey

BRIEFING DOCUMENT K.1: Ocean Uses Atlas Project PPT – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT K.2: Ocean Uses Atlas Project (December 2008) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT K.3: California Coast Online Survey PPT – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT K.4: California Coast Online Survey: California Module – Handout

L. Update on Ecotrust Data

Sarah Kruse, Ecotrust

BRIEFING DOCUMENT L.1: Update of Ecotrust Fisheries Uses and Values Project PPT – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT L.2: Ecotrust Survey Methods and Summary Statistics for the South Coast Study Region Fishery Uses and Values Project (March 1, 2009 Draft) – Handout

III. Marine Protected Area Draft Arrays

M. Presentation from Gems Work Groups on Progress in Developing Draft MPA Arrays

IV. External MPA Proposals

N. Presentation of Draft External MPA Proposals

Joe Exline, Fishermen's Information Network: Draft External Proposal A

Steven Fukuto, United Anglers of Southern California: Draft External Proposal B

*Michael Sheehy, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper and Tom Ford, Santa Monica Baykeeper:
Draft External Proposal C*

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.1: MLPA Initiative Staff Memo Regarding Proposals for Individual Marine Protected Areas Submitted by the Public (February 25, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.2: Overview of Draft External Marine Protected Area Proposals PPT – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.3: Area Chart: Comparison of Proposal 0 (Existing MPAs) and Draft External Proposals in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (by Designation - February 24, 2009) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.4: Draft External Proposal A (including staff summary, maps, and proposed regulations) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.5: Draft External Proposal B (including staff summary, maps, and proposed regulations) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.6: Draft External Proposal C (including staff summary, maps, and proposed regulations) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.7: FIC/FIN External MLPA Proposal PPT – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.8: United Anglers of Southern California Proposal PPT – Handout

V. Communication between SCRSG Members and the Public

Recess

[Work Group Breakout Sessions] Discussion of Draft MPA Arrays

Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, March 4, 2009

Note: The SCRSG will reconvene for a short period at 8:00 a.m. and then recess again into work sessions. The SCRSG work groups will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 noon.

[Work Group Breakout Sessions] Discussion of Draft MPA Arrays

Reconvene

VI. [Plenary] Work Group Draft MPA Arrays

O. Presentation of Gems' Draft MPA Arrays

VII. Next steps and preparations for next SCRSG meeting

1. Recap science and policy questions from this meeting
2. Review objectives for next meeting and work session

Adjourn

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: March 19, 2009

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – March 3-4, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On March 3-4, 2009, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its fourth meeting in Long Beach, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- Each of the three SCRSG work groups spent considerable time in work session discussions and completed two draft arrays, including MPA shapes, designations and rationales, for the south coast study region. These draft arrays will be forwarded to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Department of Parks and Recreation, and MLPA Initiative (I-Team) for evaluation.
- Three external MPA proposals were presented to the SCRSG, including one each from the Fisherman's Information Network, United Anglers of Southern California, and the Santa Barbara Channelkeeper and Santa Monica Baykeeper. These three draft external MPA proposals will have the same evaluations conducted.
- The SCRSG held a discussion about how comments from members of the public can usefully contribute to SCRSG deliberations. Acknowledging that public participation is the foundation of the MLPA Initiative's effort to design MPAs, many of the SCRSG members requested that the public provide constructive comments on specific geographies and concerns currently under discussion by the SCRSG and refrain from "adding fuel to the fire".
- I-Team staff provided guidelines for developing draft MPA arrays, including an interim decision from the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) on how to address the pending military closures in the work groups' draft arrays, answers to some key feasibility questions raised at prior SCRSG meetings, and description of the methods used in evaluating the draft arrays.
- The California Department of Fish and Game elaborated on the feasibility guidelines for developing MPA designs, regulations and boundaries.
- I-Team staff provided an update on additional datasets being gathered for the regional profile, including inclusion of substrate data and non-consumptive uses.

Key next steps are listed in Section III below.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On March 3-4, 2009, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in a meeting in Long Beach, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum (KOM) summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- Receive interim presentations from each work group regarding progress on developing draft marine protected area (MPA) arrays
- Receive an update on evaluation methods for the MLPA South Coast Study Region
- Receive presentations on draft external MPA proposals
- Recess into work group sessions to finalize draft arrays (Round 1) for evaluation purposes
- Receive presentations from each work group on draft MPA arrays.

58 SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_030309.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome and Introductions & Updates

MLPA Initiative Executive Director Ken Wiseman reaffirmed that the MLPA Initiative is expected to continue on schedule and is working through the staffing limitations associated with the state's furloughs. He noted that at the recent BRTF meeting, the BRTF considered SAT input and public comment and reached an interim decision regarding U.S. Department of Defense military use areas. The BRTF also unanimously adopted the regional goals and objectives put forward by the SCRSG.

Dr. Satie Airame provided an update on progress on key SAT activities, including completion of the SAT analysis on military use areas that was presented to the BRTF at its February 26, 2009 meeting and approval of the criteria and list for the species most likely to benefit from MPAs.

Kelly Sayce described the outreach activities underway in the study region, including distribution of the South Coast News (now available on-line) and launching of a Facebook page for the MLPA Initiative. She also discussed the “Guidelines for Effective Public Comment” that the I-

Team staff developed for assisting with public comment. She thanked SCRSG members for their continued efforts to help inform the public of upcoming events and forums.

Dan Sforza of DFG briefly discussed the guidance memos regarding catch and release, bag limits, and size limits and provided further explanation of the enforcement difficulties associated with those practices (Briefing Documents E.1 and E.2).

B. Marine Protected Area Planning

BRTF Interim Guidance for MPA Planning

Evan Fox summarized the key guidance regarding military use areas and pending military closures that the BRTF gave to the SCRSG to help it complete draft MPA arrays for Round 1. The BRTF's interim guidance for San Clemente and San Nicholas islands was to include the pending military closures in one of each work group's draft MPA arrays and to allow the work groups, if desired, to propose MPAs within military use areas on the islands in the other draft MPA array. For the mainland, work groups were allowed to propose MPAs within any of the military use areas. The BRTF acknowledged that this guidance is not final, and it will continue to discuss how to treat military use areas and pending military closures in MPA proposals. [Note that the BRTF has requested a thorough policy and legal analysis on military use areas for discussion at its next meeting.]

Overview of Draft Methods for Evaluating MPA Proposals

Dr. Satie Airame presented a summary of the SAT evaluation methods that will be used to evaluate the draft arrays, external proposals and existing MPAs for the south coast study region. Much of the evaluation methodology had already been provided to the SCRSG members. Key highlights noted in the presentation were the level of protection and activities associated with that level, guidelines for representing key habitat types in each bioregion within the study region, description of the bioeconomic models, and reiteration that the SAT considers water quality a secondary criterion for MPA design.

DFG Feasibility Guidance

Susan Ashcraft presented DFG's guidance on key feasibility questions raised by the SCRSG. In particular, she clarified that the MLPA cannot supersede otherwise lawful activities not in the California Fish and Game Commission's authority to regulate, so activities like discharge from a sewage outfall, or future activities within an MPA (like dredging) will be evaluated and regulated independently of MPA designation. SCRSG members are welcome to note any of these considerations in their MPA site-specific rationales. DFG's guidance also advises that SCRSG members not propose new fishery management regulations within MPAs as this would be difficult to enforce. DFG also provided guidance for restricting specific activities within an MPA that are not normally considered as "take" (like swimming or tide pooling). Here, DFG indicated that such activities could be restricted if the restriction was based on protection of a resource and it was within the California Fish and Game Commission's authority.

Update on the Tribal Forum

Kelly Sayce presented on the history of tribal involvement in the MLPA and the genesis for convening a tribal forum with native Americans from the south coast study region. The 20 participants in the tribal forum identified key issues and committed to establishing an intertribal

work group to improve future engagement in the MLPA process. SCRSG member Roberta Cordero stressed the critical value of early engagement of tribal interests and elaborated on the likely pathways for tribal involvement in the MLPA process.

Additional Information on MPA Planning

Charles Wahle (National MPA Center) and Chris La Franchi (California Coastal Online Survey) presented on their efforts to capture additional information about peoples' uses and habits along the California coast. The Ocean Atlas project is a public-private partnership that uses observations from knowledgeable experts and users to identify human use patterns (fishing, industrial/military, non-consumptive and other use). The mapping effort will be completed in late 2009 with the ultimate goal of helping to inform ocean management decisions. The California Coast Online Survey gathers spatially explicit trip information to the coast from randomly-selected Internet users; this information helps to identify concentration and proportion of varying activity types by defined user groups. SCRSG members raised questions about the opportunities to refine the methodology and sampling validity of the studies.

Additional Information on the Regional Profile

I-Team staff provided an update on the status of the south coast regional profile and additional data sets being added to the MPA planning information. The completed results of the detailed substrate data should be available on MarineMap by mid March. The regional profile will be revised and should be distributed to the SCRSG by the April SCRSG meeting.

Ecotrust Fisheries Uses and Values Project

Dr. Sarah Kruse of Ecotrust gave an update on the status of the Fisheries Uses and Values Project for the study region. Most of the commercial, recreational, and commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) data sets are available on MarineMap (barring any confidentiality concerns). She also provided a summary of the survey methods and how the information on commercial, recreational and CPFV fisheries is analyzed.

D. External MPA Proposals

The authors of each of the three draft external proposals gave a presentation outlining the MPAs that were submitted for evaluation. I-Team staff gave a brief overview of summary information for each proposal and explained that these external proposals can be a source of information for SCRSG members to consider.

In addition, members of the public had submitted ideas for the location of individual MPAs. The full external proposals and public comments on individual MPAs were provided to the SCRSG and will be available for review on the MLPA website.

E. Communication between SCRSG Members and the Public

Scott McCreary discussed the commitments the SCRSG members had made to the MLPA process in the adoption of their ground rules including: making sure each SCRSG member communicate his/her interests and does not to impugn the motives of others. Ken Wiseman reminded the public and the SCRSG members that the public process is the foundation of the MLPA effort and referred to the guidance document on effective public comment that the I-Team had prepared (Briefing Document D.1). He then encouraged SCRSG members to provide more

guidance to the public on the type and manner of public comment that was most useful. SCRSG responses and suggestions included the following:

- bring light and not heat to the discussion
- provide information on specific areas of interest (with identified latitude and longitude lines) and describe why these are important (e.g., important fishing hole, sensitive habitat area, etc.).

SCRSG members also encouraged the public to communicate their thoughts in writing and to send their comments to the broader MLPA audience and include elected officials. There was also a request for more comments from under-represented groups and to hear comments from existing organizations with enforcement and implementation mechanisms in place.

F. SCRSG Questions Requiring Follow-up

Throughout the meeting, SCRSG members posed a range of clarifying questions and provided comments regarding the process, science and policy aspects of the guidelines and informational presentations. I-Team staff responded to most of these questions during the meeting and will provide responses to the remaining policy and science questions at the next SCRSG meeting. Key comments and questions from SCRSG members that were identified for further review and follow-up include the following:

Will the BRTF engage with the state and regional water quality control boards and other respective agencies regarding water quality issues?
What is the impact on the operations and maintenance of existing pipelines or permitted discharges in a state marine reserve (SMR), a state marine park, or a state marine conservation area (e.g., will there be impacts on monitoring requirements such as benthic sediment and trawl surveys, etc.)?
Is there an inconsistency in the MLPA master plan language (page 54) that states that “High level of protection created by an SMR is based on the assumption that no other alterations of the ecosystem are allowed.” Does this suggest that activities that degrade water quality should be restricted in an MPA?
Would the placement of an MPA require stricter regulations by water quality monitoring agencies?

In response to a number of questions regarding water quality concerns related to MPA designations, the I-Team agreed to take a close look at the suite of issues and, as needed, recommend follow-up steps and BRTF consideration.

G. Public comment

Members of the public provided comment and asked clarifying questions during two separate public comment periods. To accommodate the many requests for public comment, individual speakers that represented a common organization or viewpoint were asked to defer their time to one speaker. Comments on siting of MPAs included the following: locate MPAs in areas with existing, functional infrastructure to support the stewardship of the area, site MPAs to provide maximum protection to intertidal areas in Laguna Beach, concerns for retaining boat access and safe exit alternatives for divers and kayakers, consider how MPA placement may cause more

intense use in certain areas and the safety issues associated with compressed uses, recommendation to keep Farnsworth Bank open for fishing and diving.

In addition, members of the public commented that many areas are already closed to lobster fishing (e.g. Santa Monica Bay) and that further closures would have significant effect, suggested the SCRSG give strong consideration to socio-economic impacts and consider smaller MPAs and catch and release restrictions as methods to avoid financial harm.

Public comments focused on water quality issues including: request to avoid NPDES outfalls and potential ocean desalinization plants locations when siting MPAs and a concern that if MPAs are only placed in the areas with clean water quality, that the public would only have access to fishing in contaminated areas.

Other public comments included: suggestion for SCRSG members to look for common ground and that protection is one of primary MLPA goals, consider creation of artificial reefs as option to create more fish, concern that Catalina Island is essential to the wet fish fleet industry, and the concern that trawl fishermen are already highly restricted and that additional restrictions would have significant, negative effects. There was also a collection of speakers from high schools in the Palos Verdes and Orange County areas encouraging protection of the natural resources.

H. Work Group Presentation of Draft MPA Arrays

Each of the work groups recessed to work sessions in the afternoon of Day 1 and during most of the day on Day 2. On the afternoon of Day 2, each work group presented its draft MPA arrays when the SCRSG reconvened. A common theme among the work groups was the intent to get direction from the SAT in the evaluations of the MPA arrays and use that information to determine how best to proceed to identify a middle ground. Other strategies considered included a minimal-maximal array, identifying areas of high ecological value and areas of minimal negative economic impact. The co-leads also discussed the “difficult” points in the work group process and how it was overcome in recognizing that this is the first phase and to not take too much ownership for an array.

I-Team staff explained that they will work during the week following the meeting to finalize the draft MPA arrays for each work group. I-Team staff will ask the work groups to verify the shapes and identify any potential errors (through their co-leads). Once the draft arrays had been reviewed and verified by the work groups, they will be forwarded for evaluation.

I. Objectives for the April 28, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

I-Team staff identified that the main objective of the next full SCRSG meeting, scheduled for April 28 in the Oxnard/Ventura area, is to receive the SAT, DFG, State Parks, and I-Team evaluations of the draft MPA arrays and the draft external MPA proposals; feedback from the public and guidance from the BRTF will also be received. The work groups will meet in work sessions on April 29 to begin Round 2 of the MPA design process with the aim to form one draft MPA proposal in each gem work group.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for SCRSG members

Verify that I-Team staff accurately captured the draft MPA arrays put forward for evaluation.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

- Work with co-leads to verify draft MPA arrays from each workgroup are accurately captured and forward to SAT, BRTF, DFG and I-Team for evaluation of Round 1.
- Transmit a copy of Briefing Documents C.1 (Response to questions from the January 13-14, 2009 SCRSG Meeting) and C.2 (Response to questions from the January and February 2009 work sessions) to SCRSG members.
- Prepare responses to outstanding process, policy and science questions raised by SCRSG members.
- Characterize key water quality issues for follow-up discussion.

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Work Session Agenda
(revised February 9, 2009)

Tuesday, February 10, 2009
9:30 AM

Hilton Waterfront Beach Resort
21100 Pacific Coast Highway
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Members of the public are invited to attend and observe the work session. This agenda and associated briefing documents (as they become available) can be found on the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp.

Meeting Objectives

- *Continue initial development of "draft marine protected area (MPA) arrays"*
 - *Continue introducing and discussing possible MPAs (preliminary MPA options) in spirit of "inventing without committing"*
 - *Identify MPA boundaries, types, allowed uses and site-specific rationales*
 - *Draw on available guidance, evaluations, regional goals and objectives, and information presented*
 - *Begin discussing draft MPA arrays (goal is one or two arrays per work group)*
- *Discuss role of work group co-leads and select co-leads*
- *Plan next steps and preparations for March 3-4, 2009 MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) meeting*

Work Session Agenda

Note: The work groups will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 PM

[Plenary] Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

I. [Plenary] Work Group Charge and Relevant Guidance

- A. Review Work Group Charge and Outline Process Flow for Work Session
 - Round 1 process flow
 - Ground rule reminders
- B. Updates
 - Key outcomes from January 23 and 27 MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team meeting
 - MarineMap and data layers
 - Status of data layers, including Ecotrust data

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) or the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

- Summary of SCRSG areas of importance
- Maps and regulations for existing MLPA South Coast Study Region MPAs
- Process for responding to questions raised during work sessions
- California Fish and Game Commission guidance on northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara
- Guidance on special closures
- Update on military use areas
- Future SCRSG meetings schedule

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.1: Compilation of SCRSG Areas of Importance -- Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.2: California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Draft January 23 and 27 Meeting Summary (revised February 9, 2009) -- Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.3: Existing State Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Special Closures in the South Coast Study Region (SCSR) (California Department of Fish and Game, revised 4 February, 2009) – Handout

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.4: Future Meetings Scheduled for the MLPA South Coast Study Region (revised February 6, 2009) -- Handout

II. [Work Groups] Draft MPA Arrays

A. Continue Development of Preliminary MPA Options

- Complete remaining bioregions
- Introduce new preliminary MPA options
- Discuss modifications to preliminary MPA options

III. [Work Groups] Recap Progress Made and Preparations for Next SCRSG Meeting

Adjourn

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Draft Work Session Agenda
(revised January 28, 2009)

Thursday, January 29, 2009
9:30 AM

Embassy Suites Hotel North*
9801 Airport Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Members of the public are invited to attend and observe the work session. This agenda and associated briefing documents (as they become available) can be found on the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp.

Work Session Objectives

- *Work groups to begin developing draft marine protected area (MPA) arrays*
 - *Start process of designing draft MPA arrays through consideration of “areas of interest” and sharing of information among South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRS) members in work group context*
 - *Consider existing MPAs in the study region and how/whether they contribute to the MLPA goals*
 - *Draw on available guidance, evaluations and information to identify possible geographies for MPAs: MPA boundaries, MPA type and potential allowed uses*
 - *Consider links to goals and regional objectives, and indicate site-specific rationales*
 - *Begin building draft MPA arrays (goal is one or two arrays per work group)*
- *Plan next steps and preparations for February 10, 2009 work session*

Work Session Agenda

Note: The stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 11:45 a.m.

9:00 AM Arrival, Refreshments and Greetings

9:30 AM [Plenary] Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

9:40 AM I. [Plenary] Work Group Objectives and Relevant Guidance

A. Review Work Group Objectives and Outline Process Flow for January 29, 2009 Work Session

BRIEFING DOCUMENT A.1: Guidance to Work Groups for Developing MPA Proposals in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (January 14, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT A.2: MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Work Session #1 Process Overview PPT -- Handout

B. Review Guidance for MPA Development

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.1: Revised Draft Regional Goals and Objectives and Design and Implementation Considerations as Adopted by the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (Adopted January 14, 2009)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.2: California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Criteria and Evaluation Components for MPA Proposals (Revised 12 November 2008)

BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.3: MLPA I-Team December 30, 2008 Memo Regarding California Fish and Game Commission Guidance About the Channel Islands

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TTY) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.4:** Summary of Marine Protected Area Planning Guidelines for the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised January 28, 2009) -- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.5:** Marine Life Protection Act (As Amended to July 2004)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.6:** Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act (As Amended to January 2006)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.7:** Update on Science Advisory Team Evaluation Methods for the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT (Presented January 13, 2009) -- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.8:** Science Guidance on MPA Network Design Excerpted from the California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas (January 2008 version)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.9:** California State Parks Guidelines for Creating Marine Managed Areas (November 18, 2008)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.10:** Summary of BRTF Policy Guidance to the Central Coast and North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Groups (December 4, 2008)
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT B.11:** Science Guidelines for Marine Protected Area Planning PPT (Presented November 19, 2008)

C. Present Updates from Recent MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team and MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Meetings

10:30 AM II. [Plenary] Existing South Coast MPAs

D. Staff Summary of Existing State MPAs

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.1:** Summary of Existing MPAs in the MLPA South Coast Study Region PPT -- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.2:** [DELETED]
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.3:** Staff Summary of Area and Habitats in Existing MPAs (Entire Study Region) (September 10, 2008)

E. Evaluation of Existing State MPAs

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.1:** California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Evaluation of Existing MPAs in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Revised January 22, 2009) -- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.2:** [DELETED] -- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.3:** State Parks Evaluation of Existing MPAs -- Handout
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.4:** SAT Evaluations of Existing Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region (PPT Slides Presented September 15, 2008)

11:30 AM Working lunch (provided on site)

11:50 AM III. [Plenary] Geographic Areas of Importance

F. SCRSG Members Present Areas of Geographic Importance

1:00 PM IV. [Work Groups] Draft MPA Arrays

G. Begin Developing Draft MPA Arrays

- Proceed bioregion by bioregion
- Identify and discuss possible draft MPAs in spirit of “inventing without committing”; specify site-specific rationales
- Capture proposed MPA boundaries, types, and allowed uses in MarineMap

BRIEFING DOCUMENT G.1: MLPA I-Team Memo Regarding SCRSG Identified Areas of Importance by Gem Groups -- Handout

4:45 PM [Work Groups] Recap Progress and Preparations for Next Work Session

5:00 PM Adjourn

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Proposed Draft Meeting Agenda
Revised January 12, 2009

Tuesday, January 13, 2009 at 9:30 a.m.
Wednesday, January 14, 2009 at 8:00 a.m.

Holiday Inn-On the Bay *
1355 North Harbor Drive
San Diego, California

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet, and may view an archived version approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information. Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they become available.

Public participation: The public will be invited to offer comments on the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) at approximately **12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 13, 2009 and at 12:45 p.m. on Wednesday, January 14, 2009**. Speaker cards are requested and may be found at the entrance to the meeting room. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group; comments related to other MLPA Initiative activities or groups should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting Objectives

- *Review, discuss and potentially adopt regional goals and objectives*
- *Continue joint fact-finding for next version of regional profile*
- *Receive informational briefings on key topics*
- *Receive presentation of south coast guidelines and evaluation methods for developing marine protected area (MPA) proposals*
- *Outline strategy for and initiate marine protected area (MPA) proposal development process*

Meeting Agenda - Tuesday, January 13, 2009

Note: The stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 11:30 a.m. and public comment will be taken immediately after lunch at approximately 12:30 p.m.

Arrival, Refreshments and Greetings

Welcome, Agenda Review and Brief Introductions

I. Updates

- A. MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team
BRIEFING DOCUMENT A.1: I-Team Response to Questions Raised at November 2008 SCRSG Meeting
- B. Tribal Forum and Other Outreach Activities
- C. MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force and California Fish and Game Commission

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.*

- BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.1:** Memo regarding action of the California Fish and Game Commission on marine protected areas at the northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island in the MLPA South Coast Study Region
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.2:** Memo regarding military use areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.3:** Summary of MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Policy Guidance to the Central Coast and North Central Coast Regional Stake Holder Groups
- BRIEFING DOCUMENT C.4:** MLPA South Coast Study Region Calendar

II. South Coast Regional Goals and Objectives

- D. Overview of Regional Goals and Objectives
BRIEFING DOCUMENT D.1 - Regional Goals & Objectives Overview - Handout
- E. Discuss, Revise and Potentially Adopt Goals and Objectives
BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.1: Memo regarding revised draft regional goals and objectives and design and implementation considerations for the MLPA South Coast Study Region
BRIEFING DOCUMENT E.2: *Revised Draft Regional Goals and Objectives and Design and Implementation Considerations for Review and Potential Adoption by the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group* (Revised December 30, 2008)

III. Guidelines and Evaluation Methods

- F. Presentation of Science Guidelines and Evaluation Methods
Mark Carr, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team
BRIEFING DOCUMENT F.1: Update on Science Guidelines and Evaluation Methods – Handout
- G. Presentation on Evaluation Method of Goal 3 of the MLPA
BRIEFING DOCUMENT G.1: Evaluations Methods of Goal 3 of the MLPA – Handout
BRIEFING DOCUMENT G.2: Memorandum regarding evaluations methods of Goal 3 of the MLPA - Memo
- H. Presentation of California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Guidelines and Evaluation Methods
BRIEFING DOCUMENT H.1: CDFG Evaluation Methods - Handout

IV. Informational Presentations on Specific Features of the MLPA South Coast Study Region

- I. Oceanographic Features in the South Coast Study Region
John Largier, MLPA Plan Science Advisory Team
BRIEFING DOCUMENT I.1: Oceanographic Features in the South Coast Study Region – Handout

V. Geographic Areas of Importance

- J. Plenary Session Addressing Two Questions: 1. What geographic areas and specific locations within the study region are important to you that you want other SCRSG members to know about, and why? 2. What geographic areas do you want considered in the MPA planning and design process?

Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, January 14, 2009

Note: The stakeholder group will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 noon and public comment will be taken immediately after lunch at approximately 12:45 p.m.

Review agenda for Day 2 and questions from Day 1

II. Part 2: South Coast Regional Goals & Objectives (continued from Day 1)

- K. Consider Final Revisions of Regional Goals and Objectives (if needed)
- L. Potentially Adopt Goals and Objectives

IV. Part 2: Informational Presentations on Specific Features of the MLPA South Coast Study Region

- M. Water Quality in the South Coast Study Region
Dominic Gregorio, MLPA Plan Science Advisory Team
BRIEFING DOCUMENT M.1: Water Quality in the South Coast Study Region - Handout
- N. Marine Birds and Marine Mammals in the South Coast Study Region
Dan Robinette and Susan Chivers, MLPA Plan Science Advisory Team
BRIEFING DOCUMENT N.1: Marine Birds and Marine Mammals in the South Coast Study Region - Handout

VI. Marine Protected Area Planning

- O. Regional Profile for the MLPA South Coast Study Region
BRIEFING DOCUMENT O.1: Regional Profile Update - Handout
- P. Additional Information for MPA Planning
BRIEFING DOCUMENT P.1: Additional Information for MLPA Planning - Handout
- Q. Ecotrust Data Collection Effort
Charles Steinback, Ecotrust
BRIEFING DOCUMENT Q.1: Ecotrust Fisheries Uses and Values Project - Handout

VII. Developing Marine Protected Area Proposals

- R. Description of Components of Draft Options for MPA Arrays
BRIEFING DOCUMENT R.1: Developing Marine Protected Area Proposals - Handout
- S. Review Iterative Process and Timeline for MPA Proposal Development
- T. Process for MPA Proposals Submitted External to the Regional Stakeholder Group
BRIEFING DOCUMENT T.1: Memo regarding marine protected area proposals submitted external to the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group process
- U. Present Work Group Charge and Assignments
BRIEFING DOCUMENT U.1: Work Group Guidance for MPA Proposal Development Process and Assignments - Handout

V. Part 2: Geographic Areas of Importance (continued from Day 1)

- V. Identifying Areas of Geographic Importance - Breakout session addressing a series of questions:
 - 1. Where are important areas for habitat representation, ecosystem protection, and sustaining marine life populations?
 - 2. Where are important areas for consumptive recreational and commercial activities?
 - 3. Where are important areas for non-consumptive recreational and commercial activities?
 - 4. Where are important areas for educational, cultural and study opportunities?

VIII. Next Steps and Preparations for Next SCRSG Meeting

- 1. Recap science and policy questions from today's meeting
- 2. Review objectives for upcoming work sessions

Adjourn

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: January 21, 2009

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG)

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – January 13-14, 2009 SCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On January 13 – 14, 2009, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its third meeting in San Diego, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- SCRSG members discussed and unanimously adopted regional goals and objectives for the MLPA South Coast Study Region. The SCRSG discussed the draft synthesis proposed by I-Team staff and suggested the goals and objectives be changed to include more specific language addressing water quality and clarification of the species likely to benefit from marine protected areas (MPAs). Additional text changes were also suggested. I-Team staff synthesized the comments and presented a revised proposal on Day 2. After more discussion and straw votes on two choices identified in the revised proposal for some objectives, the SCRSG voted to adopt the entire package of regional goals and objectives to forward to the BRTF for approval. The agreed upon package is included as an attachment to this document.
- I-Team staff provided an overview of the guidelines for developing draft MPA arrays and launched the SCRSG work groups that will be used to develop the initial round of draft proposals for MPA arrays. SCRSG primaries and alternates were assigned to one of three work groups, called “Lapis,” “Opal” and “Topaz.”
- MLPA Initiative Executive Director Ken Wiseman referred to a staff memo and map of the existing military use areas in the study region prepared for the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) discussing how such areas should be treated in the MPA planning process. SCRSG members are encouraged to comment directly to the BRTF on this topic and other policy issues.
- SCRSG members received informational briefings on topics involving the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) preliminary evaluation methods, water quality, marine birds and mammals, oceanography and an update on the Ecotrust Fisheries Uses and Values Project. SCRSG members raised thoughtful questions about these presentations and identified key questions.
- The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) provided more detailed discussion explaining the feasibility guidelines for developing MPA designs, regulations and boundaries.

- I-Team staff provided an update on additional datasets being gathered for the regional profile including inclusion of substrate data and non-consumptive uses.

Key next steps are listed in Section III below.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On January 13-14, 2009, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in a meeting in San Diego, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- Review, discuss and adopt regional goals and objectives
- Continue joint fact-finding for next version of regional profile
- Receive informational briefings on key topics
- Receive presentations on south coast guidelines and evaluation methods for developing marine protected area (MPA) proposals
- Outline strategy for and initiate MPA proposal development process

60 SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) member Don Benninghoven (Chair) attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members Larry Allen, Mark Carr, Dominic Gregorio, Dan Robinette, Susan Chivers, Paul Dayton, John Largier and Stephen Stohs attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_011309.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome and Introductions & Updates

MLPA Initiative Executive Director Ken Wiseman acknowledged the current budget cuts and he confirmed that the MLPA Initiative is not at risk. The MLPA Initiative is expected to continue on schedule. He discussed the California Fish and Game Commission's decision to retain the existing MPAs in the northern Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Island without altering boundaries or regulations. He also noted that another key policy decision now under consideration by the BRTF is staff's recommendation to avoid placing MPAs in certain U.S. Department of Defense military operating areas because placement of MPAs in such areas may

be unlikely to contribute to the goals of the MLPA. A number of SCRSG members expressed strong concerns about the staff recommendation and noted the important habitats on San Nicolas and San Clemente islands. SCRSG members were encouraged to voice their concerns on policy issues directly to the BRTF.

Evan Fox provided an update on progress on key SAT activities including progress made at the December 2008 SAT meeting on defining the level of protection for different activities, key and unique habitats in the study region and identification of the species likely to benefit. He also reiterated that the best process for the SCRSG to raise questions for SAT consideration is to voice them at SCRSG meetings.

Kelly Sayce described the outreach activities underway in the study region including a meeting with some members of the recreational fishing community in San Diego, the upcoming Tribal Forum with tribal governments, and the recently-scheduled staff tour for January 15, 2009. SCRSG members are encouraged to work with the I-Team's outreach staff to help inform the public of upcoming events or forums.

B. Goals & Objectives Discussion (Part I and II)

California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff gave a presentation reiterating the overall purpose and use of the goals and regional objectives and noted that site-specific rationales will be developed by SCRSG members and applied to individual MPAs.

The facilitation team summarized the status of SCRSG comments on the goals and objectives made during the last SCRSG meeting and the process used to incorporate those comments into the synthesis that had been distributed to the SCRSG on December 30, 2008. SCRSG members were invited to begin comment on the staff synthesis, encouraged to make specific recommendations on the proposed language and to build on interests expressed by fellow SCRSG members.

The SCRSG had a robust discussion on two major issues: how to address water quality and further defining the "species likely to benefit" text. Other SCRSG comments raised included the scope of other activities covered in Goal 2, Objective 5; clarifying the need for public support for enforcement in Goal 5, Objective 4; adding language on ocean acidification; specifying submerged sites and; including an objective in Goal 6 to promote biodiversity.

A number of SCRSG members supported a recommendation to include specific language in the Goal 1 objectives to reflect water quality impacts. Other SCRSG members, while acknowledging the importance of water quality concerns, noted that, because it was outside the authority of the MLPA and thus outside the scope of MPA planning to remedy water quality impacts, it was better left to other forums.

The SCRSG members also deliberated on the meaning of the text in the Goal 2 objectives regarding "species likely to benefit". Some SCRSG members expressed support for protecting the broadest number of species possible with MPAs and not limiting the language to only those identified by the SAT. It was also noted that, while respecting scientific expertise, there was still uncertainty in identifying specific benefits from MPAs and that it would be preferable not to limit

the potential list of species. Other SCRSG members wanted to more clearly define the species that would be targeted with MPA designation and felt more confident in relying on the SAT's recommendation. I-Team staff clarified that the SAT was no longer identifying species "most likely to benefit", but would be identifying a range of benefit expected.

The I-Team staff synthesized the SCRSG comments into a revised text and presented them to the SCRSG for review and discussion on January 14, 2009 (Day 2). The revised text had options for the SCRSG to consider on the two major topics: specific reference to water quality and clearer definition of "species likely to benefit" language. The revised text also incorporated many of the other suggestions made by SCRSG members. For any specific suggestions that had not been incorporated into the revised proposal, I-Team staff noted that they had discussed the issue with the individual SCRSG member that had made the specific recommendation and reached agreement with the individual prior to presenting text to the full SCRSG.

The SCRSG held a straw vote on text for two Goals: Goal 1, Objective 5 with support for including water quality into the objective; and Goal 2, Objectives 2 and 3, to include language that further clarified "species likely to benefit" by adding language that stated, "with emphasis on those species identified as more likely to benefit" from MPAs. The SCRSG then voted on the entire package of Goals, Objectives and Design and Implementation Considerations and unanimously adopted the document to forward to the BRTF for approval (see Attachment 1).

C. Informational Presentations on the Study Region

Update on Science Guidelines and Evaluation Methods

Dr. Mark Carr, co-chair of the SAT, gave a presentation describing the science guidelines and emerging south coast evaluation methods for assessing marine protected area (MPA) proposals. The presentation further described the bioregions in the MLPA South Coast Study Region and explained the SAT methodology for looking at ecosystem protection and diversity (representation and replication) and sustaining and restoring populations (size and spacing). His presentation explained the methodology used to identify levels of protection (LOPs) for different activities, and the key marine habitats and how their representation and replication in the MPA network is evaluated.

He noted that the SAT is still in the process of evaluating how to consider certain species and activities in the study region that were not present in the MLPA North Coast Study Region. In particular, the SAT is still considering how to evaluate representation for the unique habitats (oil seeps, hydrothermal vents, elk kelp beds and hydrocoral beds) in the study region and is also developing guidelines for soft bottom habitat. He noted that the SAT is also considering methods for evaluating cumulative impacts.

Oceanographic Features in the MLPA South Coast Study Region

Dr. John Largier gave a presentation describing the different oceanographic features in the study region including upwelling, winds, waves and currents that affect connectivity and habitat.

Marine Birds and Mammals in the MLPA South Coast Study Region

SAT members Dan Robinette and Susan Chivers provided a presentation on the marine birds and mammals in the study region. The marine mammals presentation provided an overview of

the life history characteristics of marine mammals and the types of anthropogenic disturbances likely to affect their health. Dr. Chivers described the location of many of the haul out sites and rookeries in the study region and noted that only MPAs with SAT-assigned “high” or “very high” levels of protection will be included in the marine birds and mammals evaluation. Dan Robinette described the diversity of bird species in the study region and the key foraging areas and “hot spots” for marine birds. In particular, he noted that bays and estuaries provide critical habitat for many of the marine bird species.

Water Quality in the MLPA South Coast Study Region

Dominic Gregorio, SAT member from the State Water Resources Control Board, gave a presentation describing water quality concerns and opportunities in the study region. He discussed the potential water quality impacts from power plants, public owned treatment works outfalls, and storm water runoff. He also identified the areas of special biological significance (ASBSs) in the study region as potential opportunities for MPA designation. He emphasized that the SAT is working on a guidance document for the SCRSG that will identify geographic areas in the study region where water quality concerns and opportunities exist.

Ecotrust Fisheries Use and Values Project

Charles Steinback of Ecotrust gave an update on the status of the Ecotrust Fisheries Use and Values Project for the study region. He reminded the SCRSG that at the last meeting he had provided an introduction on the information collection approach and methods. At this meeting, he provided a discussion of the current status of the data sets for each of the commercial fisheries. Ecotrust and fishing interests are currently verifying these maps with the commercial fishermen who provided the information with the goal to calculate the maximum potential adverse economic impact of different MPA proposals on the commercial fisheries; this data should be available at the January 29 work session. Ecotrust is also developing maps for each recreational user group (private boaters, kayak anglers, divers and pier/shore anglers) per county. It was noted that Ecotrust is aware of the confidentiality of this information and takes great steps to aggregate the data so that private, individual fishing areas are not disclosed.

D. Information on MPA Planning

I-Team staff provided an update on the status of the south coast regional profile and additional data sets being added to the MPA planning information. Based on contributions from the SCRSG Regional Profile Work Group, many changes were made to the regional profile incorporating local knowledge. The regional profile will also include an appendix which will incorporate much of the local knowledge provided by the SCRSG members and help to complete information for the sub regional summaries. Staff noted that additional information is still pending on tribal data, substrate data and efforts to incorporate the spatial information from the California Ocean Uses Atlas; this information is expected to be incorporated and the regional profile revised and distributed by March. A presentation on the coastal uses and information obtained from the scheduled tribal forum will be provided at the SCRSG meeting in March 2009.

E. Guidelines for Developing MPA Proposals

California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) staff provided further guidance on how MPAs should be designed so that they meet DFG's identified feasibility criteria. Issues discussed included preference for north/south and east/west boundaries with 90° corners, unless a diagonal boundary runs parallel with the geography of the coastline, boundaries that provide ease of land-based enforcement perspective, and use of uncomplicated "take" regulations.

I-Team staff provided an overview of the information used in the evaluation of Goal 3 of the MLPA. The information provided will not be used to rank different MPA arrays but rather to provide a description of what aspects are offered in the various proposals. Staff explained that the evaluation relies on existing data sources and, therefore, may provide a limited description.

Staff also gave a presentation on the process the SCRSG will follow to develop MPA proposals. In developing proposals, SCRSG members should consider the areas of interest, goals of the MLPA, approved regional goals and objectives, and BRTF and SAT guidance when siting possible MPAs. SCRSG members were encouraged to be collaborative and build upon the interests identified by their fellow members and also to consider the interests expressed in external proposals that will be submitted by members of the public. Staff defined what constitutes a full MPA proposal and explained that the overall process is iterative.

F. Geographic Areas of Interest and Initiation of Work Group Sessions

Each primary/alternate pair was asked to jointly identify three important geographic areas that they wanted the full SCRSG to know about and record them on a ½ sheet of paper that was provided during the meeting. Due to extensive public comment, there was insufficient time during the meeting to fully discuss these identified areas. I-Team staff collected the summary sheets and plan to include the geographic areas of interest discussion on the agenda for the January 29, 2009 work session.

The SCRSG was organized into three multi-interest work groups that have been named "Lapis, Opal and Topaz." The criteria used by the I-Team to select work group distribution was to seek a balance between interests, geographic distribution and a comparable distribution of primary and alternate representatives. The three work groups participated in their first work group session at the meeting, during which each SCRSG member identified a few, key geographic areas of importance and identified the reason for its importance including: habitat representation or protection, consumptive use (recreational or commercial), non-consumptive use, or key educational, cultural or study opportunities. These key areas were recorded on a GIS map for further discussion at upcoming work sessions.

G. Questions and Clarifications

Throughout the meeting, SCRSG members posed a range of clarifying questions and provided comments regarding the process, science and policy aspects of the guidelines and informational presentations. I-Team staff responded to most of these questions during the meeting and will provide responses to the remaining policy and science questions that were not fully answered at the meeting. Key comments and questions from SCRSG members that were identified for further review and follow-up include the following:

What are important ecological features of San Clemente and San Nicolas islands and how do these relate to the bioregion?
How will U.S. Department of Defense restrictions affect the MLPA planning process?
How is “marine natural heritage” defined?
What are retention zones? Can you provide the SCRSG maps and/or location information for retention zones?
What method of identifying latitude and longitude are we using?
What recreational activities can be regulated by the California Fish and Game Commission and State Parks in designated MPAs? (e.g., jet skis)
Do the established MPAs on the north shore of San Miguel, Santa Rosa and Santa Cruz Islands network with mainland MPAs of Santa Barbara and Ventura counties and count towards the size and spacing criteria?
Can you identify which threats from water quality are most likely to cause harm to species identified as most likely to benefit from MPAs?
Can you provide more information on how to use special closures in the process and how this guidance was developed?
Describe the level of pollutants from first flush rain events to subsequent rain events.
How would California Coastal Monument legislation affect and be coordinated with the MLPA?
Clarify how the SAT will treat marine mammals at the Children's Pool in its assessment.

H. Public comment

Members of the public provided comment and asked clarifying questions during two separate public comment periods. Comments included: appreciation to the SCRSG members for their hard work and reminding them of the importance of their task, specific recommendations to modify the goals and objectives to identify select species of concern and to add water quality. There was also extensive public comment during both days of the meetings discussing Children’s Pool in La Jolla, comments on handling SAT-related decisions, and highlights about the importance of beach replenishment and its relationship to MPAs. There was also a collection of speakers from a local high school that provided a video documenting the potential importance of the Palos Verdes area.

I. Objectives for January 29, 2009 Work Session

The SCRSG will hold its first work session in Los Angeles on January 29, 2009. The main objective for the work session is to begin developing “draft MPA arrays” including:

- Start process of designing draft MPAs through consideration of areas of interest and sharing of information among SCRSG members in the work group context.

- Consider existing MPAs in the study region and how/whether they contribute to MLPA goals.
- Draw on available guidance, evaluations and information to identify possible geographies for MPAs: MPA boundaries, type, and potential allowed uses.
- Consider links to regional goals and objectives to identify specific sites.
- Begin building draft MPA arrays (target is one or two arrays per work group)
- Plan next steps and preparations for the February 10, 2009 work session.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for SCRSG members

Begin using MarineMap to identify areas of geographic interest and potential MPAs.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

Transmit a copy of the adopted regional goals and objectives to the SCRSG and BRTF – see attachment.

Prepare responses to outstanding process, policy and science questions raised by SCRSG members.

Attachment 1: Regional Goals and Objectives and Implementation and Design Considerations - Adopted by the South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (January 14, 2009)

California MLPA South Coast Project
Revised Draft Regional Goals and Objectives and Design and
Implementation Considerations as Adopted by the
MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Adopted January 14, 2009

Note that these goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations will be presented to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force at its February 26, 2009 meeting for consideration and possible adoption for the MLPA South Coast Study Region.

Introduction

The members of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) agree that regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations are all very important in the development of an effective system of marine protected areas (MPAs) that has stakeholder support and meets the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) goals. MLPA goals are broad statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al. 2004)¹ and are provided in the MLPA. Regional objectives are more specific measurable statements of what MPAs may accomplish to attain a related goal (Pomeroy et al. 2004). The SCRSG recognizes that MPAs are one among a suite of tools to manage marine resources.

Design considerations are additional factors that may help fulfill provisions of the MLPA related to facilitating enforcement, encouraging public involvement, and incorporating socio-economic considerations, while meeting the MLPA's goals and guidelines. Design considerations will be applied as the location, classification (reserve, park or conservation area), size and other characteristics of potential MPAs are being developed. Design considerations are cross-cutting (they apply to all MPAs) and are not necessarily measurable. MPA alternatives developed by the SCRSG should include analysis of how the proposal addresses the MLPA goals and regional objectives and design and implementation considerations.

¹ Pomeroy R.S., J.E. Parks, and L.M. Watson. 2004. How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xvi + 216 p. (Accessed 17 January 2004). <http://effectivempa.noaa.gov/guidebook/guidebook.html>.

Regional Goals and Objectives

The marine protected area (MPA) design process begins with setting regional goals and objectives that are consistent with the MLPA, then identifying site-specific rationales for individual MPAs. Once set, regional goals and objectives influence crucial decisions regarding MPA size, location and boundaries, as well as management measures and the focus of monitoring and evaluation programs.

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance² of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. Protect and maintain species diversity and abundance consistent with natural fluctuations, including areas of high native species diversity and representative habitats.
2. Protect areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.
3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect biodiversity, natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Promote recovery of natural communities from disturbances, both natural and human induced, including water quality.

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. Help protect or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depressed, depleted, or overfished species, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.³
2. Sustain or increase reproduction by species likely to benefit from MPAs, with emphasis on those species identified as more likely to benefit from MPAs, and promote retention of large, mature individuals⁴.

² *Natural diversity* is the species richness of a community or area when protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (drawn from Allaby 1998 and Kelleher 1992). *Natural abundance* is the total number of individuals in a population protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (adapted from Department 2004 and Kelleher 1992).

³ The terms "rare," "threatened," "endangered," "depressed," "depleted," and "overfished" referenced here are designations in state and federal legislation, regulations, and fishery management plans (FMPs) - e.g., California Fish and Game Code, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, California Nearshore FMP, Federal Groundfish FMP. Rare, *endangered*, and *threatened* are designations under the California Endangered Species Act. *Depleted* is a designation under the federal Marine Mammal Protection Act. *Depressed* means the condition of a marine fishery that exhibits declining fish population abundance levels below those consistent with maximum sustainable yield (California Fish and Game Code, Section 90.7). *Overfished* means a population that does not produce maximum sustainable yield on a continuing basis (MSA) and in the California Nearshore FMP and federal Groundfish FMP also means a population that falls below the threshold of 30% or 25%, successively, of the estimated unfished biomass

3. Sustain or increase reproduction by species likely to benefit from MPAs with emphasis on those species identified as more likely to benefit from MPAs through protection of breeding, spawning, foraging, rearing or nursery areas or other areas where species congregate.
4. Protect selected species and the habitats on which they depend while allowing some commercial and/or recreational harvest of migratory, highly mobile, or other species; and other activities.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

1. Sustain or enhance cultural, recreational, and educational experiences and uses (for example, by improving catch rates, maintaining high scenic value, lowering congestion, increasing size or abundance of species, and protection of submerged sites).
2. Provide opportunities for scientifically valid studies, including studies on MPA effectiveness and other research that benefits from areas with minimal or restricted human disturbance.
3. Provide opportunities for collaborative scientific monitoring and research projects that evaluate MPAs that promote adaptive management and link with fisheries management, seabird and mammals information needs, classroom science curricula, cooperative fisheries research and volunteer efforts, and identifies participants.

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in south coast California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. Include within MPAs key and unique habitats identified by the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team for this study region.
2. Include and replicate to the extent possible [practicable], representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* across a range of depths.

Goal 5. To ensure that south coast California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users including coastal dependent entities, communities and interests, to

⁴ An increase in lifetime egg production will be an important quantitative measure of an improvement of reproduction.

the extent possible, and if consistent with the Marine Life Protection Act and its goals and guidelines.

2. Provide opportunities for interested parties to help develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic monitoring protocols, a long-term education and outreach plan, and a strategy for MPA evaluation.
3. Effectively use scientific guidelines in the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*.
4. Ensure public understanding of, compliance with, and stakeholder support for MPA boundaries and regulations.
5. Include simple, clear, and focused site-specific objectives/rationales for each MPA and ensure that site-level rationales for each MPA are linked to one or more regional objectives.

Goal 6. To ensure that the south coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. Provide opportunities to promote a process that informs adaptive management and includes stakeholder involvement for regional review and evaluation of management effectiveness to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.
2. Provide opportunities to coordinate with future MLPA regional stakeholder groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets the goals of the MLPA.
3. Ensure ecological connectivity within and between regional components of the statewide network.
4. Provide for protection and connectivity of habitat for those species that utilize different habitats over their lifetime.

Regional Design and Implementation Considerations

Design Considerations

The SCRSG recognizes several issues that should be considered in the design and evaluation of MPAs. Like the “Considerations in the Design of MPAs” that appears in the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*, these considerations may apply to all MPAs and MPA proposals regardless of the specific regional goals and objectives for that MPA and may contribute to the site-level rationales for individual MPA design and placement.

The design considerations will be incorporated with the goals and objectives and transmitted to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force for adoption and then to the California Fish and Game Commission as part of the suite of recommendations for the study region. Design considerations with long-term monitoring components will be used in developing monitoring plans and to inform the adaptive management process.

Design considerations include:

1. In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.
2. When designing or modifying MPAs, consider leveraging relevant portions of existing management activities and area-based restrictions, including state and federal fishery management areas and regulations (such as rockfish conservation areas and trawl fishery closures, or other restricted access zones).
3. Site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.
4. When crafting MPA proposals, include considerations for design found in state fishery management plans such as the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan⁵ and the Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.⁶

⁵ Design considerations from the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan:

1. Restrict take in any MPA [intended to meet the NFMP goals] so that the directed fishing or significant bycatch of the 19 NFMP species is prohibited.
2. Include some areas that have been productive fishing grounds for the 19 NFMP species in the past but are no longer heavily used by the fishery.
3. Include some areas known to enhance distribution or retain larvae of NFMP species
4. Consist of an area large enough to address biological characteristics such as movement patterns and home range. There is an expectation that some portion of NFMP stocks will spend the majority of their life cycle within the boundaries of the MPA.
5. Consist of areas that replicate various habitat types within each region including areas that exhibit representative productivity.

⁶ Design considerations from the Abalone Recovery and Management Plan:

Proposed MPA sites should satisfy at least four of the following criteria.

1. Include within MPAs suitable rocky habitat containing abundant kelp and/or foliose algae
2. Insure presence of sufficient populations to facilitate reproduction.
3. Include within MPAs suitable nursery areas, in particular crustose coralline rock habitats in shallow waters that include microhabitats of moveable rock, rock crevices, urchin spine canopy, and kelp holdfasts.
4. Include within MPAs the protected lee of major headlands that may act as collection points for water and larvae.

5. In developing MPA proposals, consider how existing state, local and federal programs address the goals and objectives of the MLPA and the south coast study region as well as how these proposals may coordinate with other programs.
6. Site MPAs adjacent to terrestrial federal, state, county, or city parks, marine laboratories, or other "eyes on the water" to facilitate management, enforcement, monitoring, education and outreach.
7. Site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.
8. Site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.
9. Design MPA boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.
10. Consider existing public coastal access points when designing MPAs.
11. MPA design should consider the benefits and drawbacks of siting MPAs near to or remote from public access.
12. Consider the potential impacts of climate change, ocean acidification, community alteration, and distributional shifts in marine species when designing MPAs.
13. Preserve the diversity of recreational, educational, commercial, and cultural uses.
14. Optimize the design of the MPA network to facilitate monitoring and research that answers resource management questions; an example is including MPAs of different protection levels in similar habitats and depths, adjacent or in otherwise comparable locations, to state marine reserves, to evaluate the effectiveness of different protection levels in meeting regional and statewide goals.
15. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers, coastal access points, and/or research and education institutions and include areas of educational, recreational, and cultural use.

Implementation Considerations

Implementation considerations arise after the design of MPAs, when the California Department of Fish and Game and any other responsible agencies implement decisions of the California Fish and Game Commission and, if appropriate, the California Park and Recreation Commission, with funding from the California State Legislature or other sources.

Implementation considerations will be incorporated with the regional goals and objectives and design considerations and transmitted to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force for adoption and, then to the California Fish and Game Commission as part of the suite of recommendations for the study region.

-
5. Include MPAs large enough to include large numbers of abalone and for research regarding population dynamics.
 6. Include MPAs that are accessible to researchers, enforcement personnel, and others with a legitimate interest in resource protection.

The MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group recommends the following implementation and management activities, as appropriate, also be included in the regional MPA management plans required under the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* (section 4.0) for designated MPAs.

1. Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for south coast MPAs.
2. When appropriate, phase the implementation of south coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.
3. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, outreach and enforcement is available for implementing new MPAs.
4. Develop coordinated regional management and enforcement plans in coordination with state, local, and federal entities, including cooperative enforcement agreements, adaptive management, and jurisdictional maps, which can be effectively used, adopted statewide, and periodically reviewed.
5. Incorporate volunteer monitoring and/or cooperative research, where appropriate.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
 South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
 PROPOSED MEETING AGENDA
 Revised November 17, 2008**

**Tuesday, November 18, 2008 (10:00 a.m.)
 Wednesday, November 19, 2008 (8:00 a.m.)**

**Crowne Plaza Ventura Beach Hotel *
 450 East Harbor Boulevard
 Ventura, CA 93001**

Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet, and may view an archived version approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the MLPA website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information. Meeting materials will not be provided at the meeting but will be posted to the MLPA website as soon as they become available.

Public participation: The public will be invited to offer comments on the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) at approximately **1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 and at 12:45 p.m. on Wednesday, November 19.** Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group; comments related to other MLPA Initiative activities or groups should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting Objectives

- Complete introductions for all MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group members
- Review comments provided on the draft regional profile and provide additional input
- Using adopted MLPA North Central Coast Study Region goals and objectives as a starting point, discuss and develop south coast goals and regional objectives
- Provide introduction to MarineMap and how to use the online tool in marine protected area (MPA) planning
- Present informational briefings, including south coast habitats, species movements and dispersal, commercial fishing, and recreational fishing
- Present guidelines for developing MPA proposals
- Present MPA proposal evaluation methodology and its application to the MLPA South Coast Study Region
- Outline preparations for third regional stakeholder group meeting

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday, November 18, 2008

Note: The regional stakeholder group will break for lunch at 12:30 p.m. and public comment will be taken at 1:30 p.m. Note that ALL times are approximate.

9:30 a.m.	Arrival, Refreshments and Greetings
1. 10:00 a.m.	Welcome, Agenda Review, and Brief Introductions [Handout A]

* This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.653.5656.

2. 10:15 a.m.	Updates and Follow-up Tasks from October Meeting [Handout B] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary/alternate nomenclature • South coast outreach activities • Blue ribbon task force meeting • Science advisory team meeting
3. 10:30 a.m.	Informational Presentation Regarding Marine Habitats and Ecosystems of the MLPA South Coast Study Region [Handout C] <i>Dr. Larry Allen, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team</i>
4. 11:15 a.m.	Informational Presentation Regarding Adult Movement and Larval Dispersal of Fish and Invertebrates in the MLPA South Coast Study Region [Handout D] <i>Dr. Jennifer Caselle, University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
5. 12:00 p.m.	Introduction to MarineMap as a Tool for MPA Planning [Attachment 1, Handout E]
12:30 p.m.	Lunch (lunch is provided onsite for SCRSG members and staff; take this opportunity to browse MarineMap)
1:30 p.m.	Public Comment
6. 2:00 p.m.	MLPA Goals and South Coast Regional Objectives, Part 1 [Attachment 2, Handouts F- H] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation regarding developing regional goals and objectives • Review MLPA goals and regional objectives adopted in other MLPA study regions; consider revisions for the south coast • Discuss relation to narrative rationales within MPA proposals
3:45 p.m.	Break
7. 4:00 p.m.	Draft Regional Profile for the MLPA South Coast Study Region [Handouts I-J] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key comments received and plan for addressing • Targeted feedback from SCRSG members • Further data collection • Next steps
5:00 p.m.	Recess
5:00 – 6:30 p.m.	MarineMap session

Meeting Agenda – Wednesday, November 19, 2008

Note: The regional stakeholder group will break for lunch at 11:45 a.m. and public comment will be taken at 12:45 p.m. Note that ALL times are approximate.

7:30 a.m.	Breakfast Refreshments
8. 8:00 a.m.	Review Agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
9. 8:15 a.m.	South Coast Regional Goals and Objectives, Part 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further discussion of regional objectives, if needed • Next steps
9:15 a.m.	Break
10. 9:30 a.m.	Guidelines for Developing Marine Protected Area Proposals [Attachments 3-4, Handouts K-Q] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLPA guidelines and terminology • California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas science guidelines • California Department of Fish and Game feasibility criteria and previous guidance • State Parks design guidelines • MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force guidance
11. 11:00 a.m.	Marine Protected Area Evaluation Methods [Handout R] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluating MPA proposals • North central coast example • Applying methods to the south coast
11:45 a.m.	Lunch (lunch is provided onsite for SCRSG members and staff)
12:45 p.m.	Public Comment
12. 1:15 p.m.	Informational Presentation Regarding Commercial Fisheries of the MLPA South Coast Study Region [Handout S] <i>Susan Ashcraft, Senior Marine Biologist Supervisor, California Department of Fish and Game and regional stakeholder group members</i>
13. 1:55 p.m.	Informational Presentation Regarding Recreational Fisheries of the MLPA South Coast Study Region [Handout T] <i>Michelle Horezcko, Associate Biologist, California Department of Fish and Game and regional stakeholder group members</i>
2:35 p.m.	Break
14. 2:50 p.m.	Informational Presentation Regarding Ecotrust Fisheries Uses and Values Project [Handout U] <i>Charles Steinback, Senior GIS Programmer/Analyst, Ecotrust</i>

15. 3:30 p.m.	Next Steps and Preparations for Next Meeting [Attachment 5] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review work plan, timeline and 2009 meetings • Objectives for meeting #3 (January 13-14, 2009) • Work group meetings • Homework
3:45 pm	Adjourn

Attachments

1. Overview and application of MarineMap
2. MLPA goals and regional objectives adopted in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region
3. Summary of guidelines and MPA Proposal Evaluation Approaches (February 1, 2008)
4. *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* (January 2008), main text only; appendices available online
5. Calendar of meetings for the MLPA South Coast Study Region (2008-2009)

Handouts

- A. Contact information for members of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (Revised November 17, 2008)
- B. MLPA I-Team memo regarding science questions from the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group to the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (revised November 14, 2008)
- C. PowerPoint presentation: *Marine Habitats and Ecosystems* (Dr. Larry Allen, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team)
- D. PowerPoint presentation: *Fish Adult Movement and Larval Dispersal: Science to inform marine protected area design* (Dr. Jennifer Caselle, University of California, Santa Barbara)
- E. PowerPoint presentation: *Introduction to MarineMap and its Use Within the MPA Planning Process* (Evan Fox, Principal Planner, MLPA Initiative)
- F. PowerPoint presentation: *MLPA Goals and Regional Objectives for the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (Susan Ashcraft, Senior Marine Biologist Supervisor, California Department of Fish and Game)
- G. *Overview of the Application of MLPA Goals, Regional Objectives and Site-Specific Rationales in Planning Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (Revised November 14, 2008)
- H. *MLPA Goals and Regional Objectives Adopted for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region with Proposed Revisions for the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (November 17, 2008 revisions proposed by MLPA staff)
- I. PowerPoint presentation: *South Coast Regional Profile - Update and Next Steps* (Evan Fox, Principal Planner, MLPA Initiative)
- J. *First Draft of Section 9 (Subregional Summaries) for the Regional Profile of the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (November 14, 2008 draft)

- K. PowerPoint presentation: *MLPA Guidelines for Marine Protected Area Planning* (Evan Fox, Principal Planner, MLPA Initiative)
- L. PowerPoint presentation: *Science Guidelines for Marine Protected Area Planning* (Dr. Satie Airamé, Science and Planning Advisor, MLPA Initiative)
- M. PowerPoint presentation regarding the California Department of Fish and Game feasibility criteria (Susan Ashcraft, Senior Marine Biologist Supervisor, California Department of Fish and Game)
- N. *California Department of Fish and Game Feasibility Criteria and Evaluation Components for Marine Protected Area Proposals* (revised November 12, 2008)
- O. PowerPoint Presentation: *State Parks Role and Guidelines* (Kevin Fleming, Senior Environmental Scientist, California Department of Parks and Recreation)
- P. *California State Parks Guidelines for Creating Marine Managed Areas* (Revised November 14, 2008)
- Q. Memo to the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group regarding the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force request for summary of policy guidance in the central coast and north central coast study regions (dated November 12, 2008)
- R. PowerPoint Presentation: *Introduction to MPA Evaluation Methods: North Central Coast Example* (Evan Fox, Principal Planner, MLPA Initiative)
- S. PowerPoint Presentation: *Commercial Fishing in the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (Susan Ashcraft, Senior Marine Biologist Supervisor, California Department of Fish and Game)
- T. PowerPoint Presentation: *Recreational Fishing in the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (Michelle Horeczko, Associate Biologist, California Department of Fish and Game)
- U. PowerPoint Presentation: *Overview of Fisheries Uses and Values Project* (Charles Steinback, Senior GIS Analyst, Ecotrust)

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: December 12, 2008

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – November 18-19, 2008 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On November 18-19, 2008 the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its second meeting in Ventura, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- MLPA Initiative Executive Director Ken Wiseman announced the newly appointed members to the SCRSG and that the SCRSG was officially complete.
- SCRSG members discussed and worked to develop draft goals and regional objectives for the south coast study region. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) gave a presentation on the goals and objectives. The SCRSG then received a proposal from the CDFG and provided comments and revisions of the text. I-Team staff synthesized the comments and presented a revised proposal on Day 2. After more discussion, the SCRSG agreed to accept, in principle, the proposed I-Team revisions to the goals and regional objectives presented on Day 2 of the meeting with the understanding that staff would recommend further changes to the document to take account of remaining SCRSG comments. I-Team staff will make suggested changes and transmit the revised goals and regional objectives document to the SCRSG before the January meeting. Then the SCRSG will consider the revised text for adoption at its January 2009 meeting.
- SCRSG members received informational briefings on topics involving marine habitats and ecosystems, adult movement and larval dispersal, Ecotrust fisheries uses and values project, and commercial and recreational fisheries in the study region. SCRSG members raised thoughtful questions about these presentations and identified areas needing additional MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) guidance and I-Team follow-up.
- I-Team staff provided an overview of the guidelines for developing draft MPA arrays and an explanation of the evaluation methodology with the north central coast as an example.
- I-Team staff introduced the MarineMap tool to the SCRSG and provided an opportunity for SCRSG members and members of the public to view the tool during an evening session. SCRSG members were encouraged to sign up for a future MarineMap training session scheduled for December.
- I-Team staff summarized the comments received on the draft *Regional Profile of the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Point Conception to the California/Mexico border)* dated

Prepared by CONCUR, Inc. (December 1, 2008)1

This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the results of the November 18-19, 2008 South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meeting. It focuses on key issues discussed, decisions made, and next steps identified. It is not intended to be a transcript of the meetings.

September 15, 2008. A number of SCRSG members volunteered to assist in prioritizing the comments and updating the subregional summaries for preparation of the final draft of the regional profile, expected in January 2009.

- I-Team staff noted that the 2009 calendar of meetings was approved by the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force and encouraged SCRSG members to update their individual calendars accordingly.

Key **next steps** are listed in section III below.

I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On November 18-19, 2008, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in a meeting in Ventura, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- 1) Complete introductions for all MLPA SCRSG members
- 2) Review comments on the draft regional profile
- 3) Discuss and develop goals and objectives for the south coast study region
- 4) Provide an introduction to MarineMap
- 5) Present informational briefings on south coast habitats, species movement and dispersal, Ecotrust fisheries uses and values, and commercial and recreational fishing
- 6) Present MPA proposal evaluation methodology and its application to the study region

Fifty-eight SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force members Don Benninghoven (Chair) and William Anderson each attended portions of the meeting.

SAT member Larry Allen attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks), and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_111708.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome and Introductions & Updates

Don Benninghoven, Chair of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), provided opening remarks at the meeting. He thanked SCRSG members for participating in the field trip with the BRTF and gave his appreciation for their hard work on the review of the regional profile and their extensive outreach activities to their respective constituents. He noted the completion of the lessons learned report for the north central coast study region.

Prepared by CONCUR, Inc. (December 1, 2008)2

This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the results of the November 18-19, 2008 South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meeting. It focuses on key issues discussed, decisions made, and next steps identified. It is not intended to be a transcript of the meetings.

MLPA Initiative Executive Director Ken Wiseman announced the appointments of five additional SCRSG members, Lauren Czarnecki (alternate for Wayne Griffin), Josh Fisher (alternate to Philip Beguhl), Wayne Griffin, Kevin Ketchum, and Chugey Sepulveda. The appointments of Marc Mills as alternate for Chugey Sepulveda and Dave Rudie, as alternate for Kevin Ketchum, were also confirmed.

Kelly Sayce described the outreach activities underway in the study region including the recent completion of the MLPA brochure, ongoing bilingual outreach efforts and the preparations underway for a tribal forum. SCRSG members are encouraged to work with the I-Team's outreach staff to help inform the public of upcoming events or forums.

Evan Fox provided an update on the items discussed at the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) meeting including discussions underway on identifying the list of key and unique habitats, completion of the size and spacing guidelines, and criteria used to develop the species most likely to benefit.

Rebecca Tuden indicated the SCRSG list server is up and running and now has an I-Team member reviewing the messages before they are distributed to the entire SCRSG. Members are encouraged to reply to individuals rather than to the entire listserv membership where ever possible.

B. Informational Presentations on the MLPA South Coast Study Region

Marine Habitats and Ecosystems

Dr. Larry Allen, co-chair of the SAT, gave a presentation on the fish assemblages by biogeographical regions and key marine habitats in the study region. He noted that while this study region shared many of the same habitat types as the north central coast, the south coast study region had warmer water temperatures and a higher percentage of sandy bottom than the north central coast. Unique habitats currently under consideration by the SAT are surfgrass beds, eelgrass beds, oil seeps and shallow hydrothermal vents, and elk kelp beds.

SCRSG members raised questions about the cluster analysis used to define the size and extent of the habitat assemblages.

Adult Movement and Larval Dispersal of Fish and Invertebrates. Dr. Jenn Caselle gave a presentation explaining the basis of the size and spacing guidelines that the SAT uses to evaluate MPA proposals. She noted that the size of an MPA is a major determinant for how much of the adult's home range movement is protected. Scientists determine these adult movements by tracking adult fish. The larval dispersal assumptions are harder to calculate and are based upon assumptions about particle distribution in the water. The distance between MPAs determines whether the larvae can move from one MPA to the next. Dr. Caselle noted that there is considerable variation in the home range size of the fish in the study region and that one MPA will offer different levels of protection to the various species.

SCRSG members asked about the expected benefits of an MPA completely covering an adult's home range (or no spillover) versus the benefits of less protection, increased fishing yield, and density-dependent effects on reproduction and growth. A related question was posed asking about the opportunities for increased spillover leading to decreased habitat fragmentation.

Prepared by CONCUR, Inc. (December 1, 2008)3

Another member noted that the placement of an MPA can be more critical than the size of the MPA. It was suggested that the pros and cons of spillover effects be referred to the SAT for further review.

C. Introduction to MarineMap

I-Team staff gave an overview of the MarineMap tool and how it can be used in MPA planning. SCRSG members were asked to sign up for a training session in December that will provide greater detail on the use of MarineMap. All of the data layers in the draft regional profile are provided in MarineMap.

The SCRSG discussed that an individual MarineMap account is confidential. However, future use of MarineMap can include sending an MPA design to other individuals, in which case that information would then be available to be forwarded to other MarineMap users.

D. Draft Regional Profile

I-Team staff provided an overview of the comments received on the draft regional profile. Comments were received from over 70 multiple people, groups and organizations including comments from 27 SCRSG members. The comments/corrections focused on water quality, ecological setting, special status species and consumptive and non-consumptive uses. I-Team staff reiterated that the regional profile is a “living document” and that the goal is to complete revisions to the document by the January SCRSG meeting in time to support the SCRSG’s development of MPA proposals. An eight-member SCRSG work group was formed to guide revisions to the regional profile. Staff noted that the final draft of the regional profile will be completed in January 2009 and will include more discussion on the species likely to benefit from MPAs, sub regional summaries and additional information on substrate types, commercial and recreational fishing, and other human uses in the study region.

E. Regional Goals & Objectives (Part I and II)

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) staff gave a presentation describing the overall purpose and use of the regional objectives. SCRSG members received a draft of the goals and regional objectives that were based on those adopted in the north central coast (NCC) study region. The proposal included edits intended to make the objectives more measurable, remove the explanation of “how” the objective would be met, remove redundancy, and clarify terminology.

The SCRSG discussed each of the MLPA goals and their regional objectives and provided comments and suggestions to the proposal. I-Team staff synthesized the comments and presented a revised proposal to the SCRSG on Day 2 of the meeting. After more discussion, the SCRSG agreed to accept, in principle, the proposed I-Team revisions to the goals and regional objectives presented on Day 2 of the meeting with the understanding that staff would recommend further changes to the document to take account of remaining SCRSG comments. I-Team staff will make suggested changes and transmit the revised goals and regional

objectives document to the SCRSG before the January meeting. The SCRSG will then consider the revised text for adoption at its January 2009 meeting.

F. Guidelines for Developing MPA Proposals

I-Team staff provided an overview of the guidance provided by the SAT, CDFG, and State Parks to consider when designing MPA proposals. These guidelines, along with policy guidance from the BRTF and public input, will be used to guide the SCRSG in crafting MPA proposals. For the SAT guidelines, it was noted that the SAT is still clarifying how size and spacing guidelines will be applied in the study region. The intent of the SAT guidelines is to meet MLPA goals 1, 2, 4 and 6. These SAT guidelines include recommended size guidelines (roughly 5-10 kilometers of alongshore span of coastline, 3 miles of offshore extent, and minimum area of 9 square miles) and spacing guidelines (approximately 30-60 miles). The spacing guidelines will be evaluated for each habitat type, rather than for each MPA location.

CDFG staff gave a presentation outlining the three categories of advice they will provide on MPA design including: feasibility of MPAs, how the MPAs meet the regional goals and objectives and site-specific rationales, and how they meet the overall goals of the MLPA. More specificity on these categories will be forthcoming at the next SCRSG meeting.

Kevin Fleming of California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) discussed the Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act (MMAIA) and its relationship to the MLPA. Key guidelines provided by State Parks relate to cultural resources and opportunities for public experience and learning opportunities.

Ken Wiseman reiterated the key policy issues that the BRTF had provided guidance on in previous study regions; it is likely that the BRTF will provide similar guidance in the south coast study region.

G. Marine Protected Area Evaluation Methods

Evan Fox provided a presentation describing how the draft proposals will be evaluated by the SAT. All the draft proposals will be evaluated in relation to the existing MPAs (proposal 0) using the SAT evaluation methods. These evaluation methods for the south coast study region are currently under review.

H. Informational Presentations on the Study Region

Susan Ashcraft and Michelle Horeczko of CDFG provided informational briefings describing the commercial and recreational fisheries in the study region. The commercial fishing presentation described the major commercial fisheries in the study region, gear types, and depth and habitat used in the fishery. The commercial fisheries described were: red sea urchin, coastal pelagic (or wetfish), California halibut, lobster and crab, nearshore rockfish, and sea cucumber. The recreational fishing presentation focused on recreational fishing in state waters and discussed the modes of fishing (boat or shore) and the major recreational fish and bait used in the study region. The SCRSG members were complimentary of the presentations and provided clarifying comments to the presentations.

Charles Steinbeck of Ecotrust provided an overview of the methodology used to address maximum potential negative socioeconomic impacts of MPA designations in the study region. He described the methodology for collecting data from the fishermen, the quality assurance/quality control process for verifying the data with the fishermen, and aggregation of the data that will be used to calculate the maximum potential negative economic impact per MPA proposal. SCRSG members were generally appreciative of the study and including results into the MPA design process and acknowledged the Ecotrust research would be more useful and accurate than existing data sources. SCRSG members also noted concerns about the technical barriers encountered during the online survey and that the research efforts should go further to calculate economic impacts of recreational fishing and to capture the industry-wide impacts from MPA designations.

I. Questions and Clarifications

Throughout the meeting, SCRSG members posed a range of clarifying questions and provided comments regarding the process, science and policy aspects of the guidelines and informational presentations. I-Team staff responded to most of these issues during the meeting and will provide responses to the remaining policy and science questions that were not fully answered at the meeting. Key comments and questions from SCRSG members included the following:

- Will there be guidelines for protecting bird and mammals?
- How is the coastline measured (linear miles or actual coastline) and what are the units of measurement (nautical miles or statute miles)?
- For the size/spacing analysis, what is the logic behind the decision to focus on "sustaining and rebuilding" populations for goal 2?
- How is the condition of the habitat type (e.g. degraded) considered in the SAT guidelines? That is, are degraded habitats eligible for MPA designation?
- Where do key species of interest (such as California halibut) fall on the scale of dispersal distance?
- Is the survivorship of larvae within an MPA reduced due to increased biomass and therefore increased numbers of predators?
- How will spacing guidelines be applied between the Channel Islands?
- Should the level of protection for urchin harvest be higher, since this activity helps to maintain kelp forests which are important ecologically?
- How much scientific collection or "take" happens within the study region and what are the effects on marine ecosystems?
- A request was made to definitively clarify whether State Parks, as part of its planning process, could effectively overturn or revise MPA designations made as part of the MLPA implementation effort.
- How will the impacts of sea otters be included in the evaluation?
- Suggestion that salmon, striped bass, marlin and tuna be noted as southern California fisheries
- Include areas of grunion fishing in MPA planning
- Add information on cow cod conservation areas and note that all rockfish are protected in these areas
- How will catch and release fishing be addressed in evaluations, goals and objectives, etc.?
- Is it possible to expand the socioeconomic survey to cover ports/harbors?
- Is it possible to expand the socioeconomic survey to cover non-consumptive uses?
- How will cultural use areas (tribal and otherwise) be included in the process?

Prepared by CONCUR, Inc. (December 1, 2008)6

This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the results of the November 18-19, 2008 South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group meeting. It focuses on key issues discussed, decisions made, and next steps identified. It is not intended to be a transcript of the meetings.

- How were subsistence fishermen captured in the Ecotrust survey?
- How were recreational fishermen in marinas captured in the Ecotrust survey?

J. Public comment

Members of the public provided comment and asked clarifying questions during two separate public comment periods. Comments on Day 1 included: appreciation to the SCRSG members for their hard work and reminding them of the importance of their task, concerns that the need for closures is only speculative and that more definitive studies are needed before action is taken that may negatively affect the fishing industry, and the importance of beach nourishment concerns in coastal planning. On Day 2 comments from the public included: recommendation to focus attention on protecting the squid population and noting its importance as a forage fish, and clarification that the legislation uses “improve”, not “expand” the use of MPAs. One speaker offered the recommendation to pay close attention to BRTF’s guidance in designing MPAs for optimal results, to follow SAT proceedings as they are the “user manual” for MPA design and to use state marine reserves as the core of their MPA design. Further comments discussed concerns that MPA designs consider accessibility for kayak fisherman and shore-based anglers, incorporate global climate change considerations into the MPA design, and comments that sea urchin fishery should be viewed as a successful, self-regulated and green industry and that excessive restrictions on urchin fishing will negatively affect the kelp forests and related fishing grounds.

K. Objectives for SCRSG Meeting #2

The next SCRSG meeting is scheduled for January 13 – 14, 2009 in the San Diego area (place to be determined). The main objectives for the meeting are to:

- Finalize and adopt goals and regional objectives for the south coast study region.
- Continue joint fact-finding and informational presentations on key issues in study region
- Continue to brief the SCRSG on CDFG feasibility criteria and design guidelines for MPA development
- Review and discuss the SAT’s evaluation of existing MPAs
- Assign SCRSG work groups and begin process for creating draft options for MPA arrays

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for SCRSG members

Review and consider proposed revisions to the regional goals and objectives for discussion at the January 13 – 14, 2009 SCRSG meeting.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Transmit a copy of the proposed regional goals and objectives to the SCRSG before the next (January 2009) meeting.

2. Work with the SCRSG members to coordinate completion of the final draft of the regional profile.
3. Work with SCRSG members to provide training and support for understanding of MarineMap.
4. Prepare responses to outstanding process, policy and science questions raised by SCRSG members.

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
 South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
 Proposed Draft Meeting Agenda
 (revised September 30, 2008)**

**October 6, 2008 (9:30 a.m.)
 October 7, 2008 (8:30 a.m.)**

**Embassy Suites *
 1440 East Imperial Avenue
 El Segundo, CA 90245**

Public participation: Members of the public are invited to attend the meeting in person or view and listen to the meeting via simultaneous webcasting on the Internet; an archived version will be available approximately two days after the meeting. Please visit the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) website at www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings_sc.asp for more information.

The public will be invited to offer comments on the work of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) at approximately **1:15 p.m. on Monday, October 6 and at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 7**. Note that the public comment period is for comments specific to the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group; comments related to other MLPA Initiative activities or groups should be directed to those bodies or MLPA staff.

Meeting Objectives

- Review project goals, charge of the SCRSG, and work plan
- Review and adopt proposed SCRSG ground rules
- Review key findings of stakeholder assessment and implications for south coast process
- Initiate review of draft regional profile
- Initiate discussion of draft regional goals and objectives
- Outline preparations for second SCRSG meeting

Meeting Agenda – Monday, October 6, 2008

Note: The SCRSG will break for lunch at approximately 12:15 p.m. and public comment will be taken at approximately 1:15 p.m.

1.	Welcome, agenda review, and brief introductions (Attachment 1)
2.	Project goals, roles, responsibilities and timeline (Attachments 2-7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLPA and MLPA Initiative • What are MPAs? • MLPA Initiative participants -- roles and responsibilities • South Coast RSG charter – project goals and RSG charge • Project deliverables and overview of work plan and timeline • Roles and responsibilities including outreach to constituents • Logistics (communications, travel reimbursement)

** This facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. To request reasonable accommodations for a disability, please contact California Relay Service (at least two days prior to the meeting) at 800.735.2929 (TT) or 800.735.2922 (voice) and ask them to contact the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative at 916.654.1885.*

3.	Lessons learned from past marine protected area (MPA) processes (Attachment 9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past MLPA processes and study regions • Channel Islands MPA process • Commitment to fold in lessons learned
4.	SCRSG charge, ground rules and decision process
5.	Stakeholder assessment and implications for the MLPA South Coast Study Region
6.	Stakeholder interests, areas of expertise, affiliations and collaborative efforts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakout activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region? - What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold? - What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with? • Summary of SCRSG member interests, affiliations and collaborative efforts
<i>Recess to Tuesday, October 7</i>	

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday, October 7, 2008

Note: The SCRSG will break for lunch at approximately 12:00 noon and public comment will be taken at approximately 1:00 p.m.

7.	Revisions to ground rules (review selected revisions, if needed, and adopt)
8.	Draft regional profile for the MLPA South Coast Study Region <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of draft regional profile • Overview of process for joint fact-finding by SCRSG members, MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team, and other experts • Focused feedback on regional profile – comments due by October 31, 2008 • Other planning tools – Doris / Marinemap
9.	Evaluating existing MPAs and the iterative MPA planning process
10.	SCRSG role in creating alternative MPA proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectations of final work products • Iterative process and input of other groups in developing products
11.	Aspirations, hopes, and challenges <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakout activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are your greatest hopes regarding the project? What potential challenges do you see? - What will you do to address the challenges and make the project a success? - What can MLPA staff do to make the project a success? • Summary of SCRSG member aspirations, hopes and challenges
12.	Initiate consideration of regional goals and objectives

13.	Next steps and preparations for the second SCRSG meeting (November 18-19, 2008 in the Santa Barbara area)
	<i>Adjourn</i>

Attachments

1. MLPA news release announcing members of the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
2. California Marine Life Protection Act
3. California Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act
4. MOU for the California MLPA Initiative
5. Overview of the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative (workshop/open house materials)
6. Charters for the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, Master Plan Science Advisory Team, and South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
7. MLPA group rosters (MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, Master Plan Science Advisory Team, South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group, and MLPA staff)
8. *Strategy for Stakeholder and Interested Public Participation in the MLPA South Coast Study Region* (revised September 4, 2008)
9. PowerPoint presentation: *Lessons Learned for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region* (J. Michael Harty presentation to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force, September 2008)
10. *Draft Charge, Ground Rules & Decision Process for the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group* (September 29, 2008)
11. Definition of key working terms (Appendix J of the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*, January 2008)
12. Outline of information required for proposals for networks of MPAs (Appendix F of the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*, January 2008)

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: October 15, 2008

To: Members, MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

From: Scott McCreary and Rebecca Tuden, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – October 6 - 7, 2008 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game
MLPA Staff, California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On October 6 – 7, 2008 the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in its kick-off meeting in El Segundo, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- After thoughtful discussion, SCRSG members unanimously adopted a revised set of ground rules. SCRSG members modified four draft ground rules addressing media contact, decision rules, coordination between primary and alternate members and commitment to ground rules were modified during the meeting. One ground rule on e-mail communications was added.
- MLPA Initiative staff (I-Team) provided an overview of the SCRSG's roles, charge, and workplan.
- I-Team staff provided a comparison of the Marine Protected Area (MPA) planning efforts for the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, and the MLPA central coast, north central coast and south coast processes. SCRSG members expressed appreciation for the lessons learned from the earlier processes and that the MLPA South Coast Study Region would have an improved transparent, robust and collaborative process.
- I-Team staff introduced the draft *Regional Profile of the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Point Conception to the California/Mexico border) dated September 15, 2008*. SCRSG members were asked to provide input and comment on the document to the MLPA Initiative Team (I-Team) by October 31. I-Team members clarified that this document strives to convey the best readily available science and information about the study region and is expected to be the basis for joint fact-finding between the SCRSG, staff, and the Science Advisory Team (SAT). Significant portions of the next two SCRSG meetings will be devoted to continued "joint fact-finding" to improve baseline information that will inform the SCRSG's deliberations.
- I-Team staff provided an introduction to the SCRSG on regional goals and objectives for the study region. Development of south coast regional goals and objectives will be a key focus for the next SCRSG meeting
- SCRSG members participated in two breakout session activities to become better acquainted with each other's interests, hopes, concerns, and knowledge of the region.

Key **next steps** are listed in section III below.

Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials

On October 6 – 7, 2008, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) participated in a meeting in El Segundo, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

- 1) Review project goals, SCRSG charge, and work plan
- 2) Review and adopt proposed SCRSG ground rules
- 3) Review key findings of the stakeholder assessment and implications for the south coast process
- 4) Initiate review of the draft regional profile
- 5) Initiate discussion of the draft regional goals and objectives and
- 6) Outline preparations for the second SCRSG meeting

Fifty-three SCRSG members (primary and alternates) participated in the meeting.

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) members Don Benninghoven (Chair), Gregory Schem, and William Anderson each attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Master Plan SAT members Dan Robinette and Larry Allen attended portions of the meeting.

MLPA Initiative, California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks), and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) staff—collectively known as the “I-Team”—staffed the meeting.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_100608.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. Welcome and Introductions

Ken Wiseman, executive director of the MLPA Initiative and Becky Ota, acting manager of CDFG's Marine Region Habitat Conservation Program, welcomed the SCRSG members to the MPA evaluation and redesign process. They described the public-private partnership between the CDFG, California Resources Agency and Resources Legacy Fund Foundation and how the goal is to have a transparent, robust, respectful process with extensive public involvement. It was also noted that the SCRSG appointment process is not yet completed and the chair of the BRTF and the director of CDFG will announce other appointments as they are made.

B. Project Background: Review of SCRSG Roles, Responsibilities and Work Plan

SCRSG Roles and Responsibilities and Participants

I-Team staff presented an overview of the roles, responsibilities, and charge of the SCRSG. This included an overview of the other participants involved in the process including the MLPA Initiative, CDFG, the BRTF, the SAT, the California Fish and Game Commission and the public. I-Team staff also reiterated that the SCRSG is not to debate the merits of the MLPA or Marine Protected Areas as a tool and is not required to meet specific targets for area or percent coverage for MPAs in the study region.

I-Team members outlined the work plan and schedule by which the SCRSG will accomplish its charge. Key upcoming MLPA meeting dates include the following:

Dates	Meeting
November 4, 2008	BRTF (Los Angeles)
November 12, 2008	South Coast SAT (Los Angeles)
November 18 – 19, 2008	SCRSG (Ventura)
December 10, 2008	BRTF (Sacramento, in conjunction with the California Fish and Game Commission)
December 17, 2008	SAT (location TBD)
January 13 – 14, 2009	SCRSG (San Diego area)

Reimbursement Procedures

I-Team staff reminded SCRSG members that they will be reimbursed for travel and lodging associated with SCRSG meetings. SCRSG members are to keep their receipts and submit the formal reimbursements forms directly to the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation. I-Team staff noted that the reimbursement amount is a fixed budget and that it assumes travel by car or rail and lodging at the identified locations. If SCRSG members wish to use more expensive travel arrangements then that is done at their own expense. It was also noted that a small stipend will be available for those SCRSG members who are not compensated in some other way for their attendance at the publicly noticed SCRSG meetings and work sessions.

Dissemination of Meeting Materials

I-Team staff noted that meeting materials are available in multiple formats (i.e., hard copy, emailed electronic files, electronic files on CDs). Meeting materials will be sent in Fed-Ex packages unless SCRSG members indicate otherwise.

All SCRSG members (primaries and alternates) will be added to the SCRSG listserv. This listserv is a primary communications tool for the SCRSG.

C. Review and Discuss Findings from Past MLPA Study Regions and Channel Island MPA Process

I-Team staff gave a presentation comparing past planning efforts, process choices and results of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary MPA planning process and the central and north central coast study regions of the MLPA Initiative effort. SCRSG members noted that effort in the SCRSG already felt balanced and collaborative with improved interaction with the SAT members.

There was also a question regarding the existing Channel Islands MPAs and whether they were “on the table” for the SCRSG to evaluate and potentially revise. I-Team staff indicated that the BRTF and California Fish and Game Commission will be providing guidance to the SCRSG on how the Channel Islands MPAs will be considered in the MLPA South Coast Study Region effort. It was noted that the Channel Islands MPAs and associated monitoring data are being reviewed by the California Fish and Game Commission at its December meeting. The Channel Islands MPAs are currently being evaluated by the MLPA SAT to determine how they meet the goals of the MLPA.

D. Ground Rules Reviewed, Revised, and Adopted

SCRSG members reviewed, discussed, revised, and adopted a set of ground rules to guide SCRSG interaction and meetings. The adopted ground rules are included as Attachment 1.

This discussion built on a presentation by CONCUR of the main findings and cross-cutting themes from the interviews held with stakeholders over the summer.

SCRSG members commented on the contributions, participation and coordination between alternates and primary members. Several members suggested that the ground rules be changed to clarify that alternates are expected to participate fully in developing MPA proposals but that for time management of plenary sessions, discussions may be limited. Some members suggested that the term “alternates” does not accurately reflect the more cooperative relationship envisioned between primary and alternate members and that the term be changed to “partners”. Staff will discuss this issue with the director of the CDFG and chair of the BRTF.

Another focus of discussion was the consequence associated with breaking the ground rules and what was the ultimate standard and process for an SCRSG member to lose his or her appointment. The ground rules were modified to clarify grounds for dismissal and to indicate that a meeting with the offending SCRSG member would be held to discuss the consequences.

SCRSG members also considered the decision rules and clarified that they are based on striving for “broad-based agreement” on MPA proposals and not unanimity. The ground rules were modified to reflect this decision rule.

In addition, the SCRSG modified the language on media contact to reflect that the burden for following up on a story will rest with the reporter, not the SCRSG member. Lastly, a ground rule was added to clarify and provide guidance on listserv and e-mail communication among SCRSG members.

E. Stakeholder Assessment

The facilitation team gave a presentation on the information gleaned from the interviews with stakeholders. Shared interests included a desire to strike a balance between utilization and protection of the resources, a desire to minimize negative socio-economic impacts and a long-term goal of preserving a healthy marine ecosystem for future generations.

These shared interests help to form the basis for creating a collaborative and integrative process for redesigning MPAs in the study region.

Questions and clarifications

Throughout the meeting, SCRSG members asked clarifying questions and provided comments regarding the SCRSG's role and charge. Key comments from SCRSG members included the following:

- The intrinsic value and positive economic benefits of non-consumptive uses should be considered in the MLPA effort. I-Team staff noted that there is a socio-economic evaluation but it is limited and does not include an economic estimation of the value of non-consumptive uses.
- One SCRSG member noted that the use of the term “depleted” within the draft regional profile is incorrect and would apply to all species in the study region.
- Concerns about management, enforceability and long-term monitoring of MPAs were raised as important issues. It was noted that enforcement is an essential tool and should have adequate resources devoted to this piece of MPA implementation. CDFG staff noted that its feasibility guidance and evaluation of the MPA proposals will consider longer term issues of management and enforcement.
- Sustained public outreach is needed to involve and educate the coastal users.
- Concerns about protection of human artifacts and multi-cultural values of the ocean environment should be considered in the MPA design process.

F. Introduction to Draft Regional Profile for the South Coast Study Region

I-Team staff presented the draft *Regional Profile for the MLPA South Coast Study Region (Point Conception to the California/Mexico border) dated September 15, 2008*.

SCRSG members asked whether this document was to be considered the final word on the study region. I-Team staff clarified that the regional profile is a “living document.” Initial public comments have been requested by October 31, 2008. It is expected that the SCRSG will continue to review and propose revisions to the regional profile in a “joint fact-finding” capacity at its November 18-19, 2008 meeting. I-Team staff noted that there would likely be a SCRSG work group formed to spearhead revisions to the regional profile. The goal is to complete revisions to the document to support initial SCRSG work to develop MPA proposals. The regional profile is posted to the MLPA website and copies on CD are available by request

Staff noted that species likely to benefit from MPAs and subregional summaries are not yet completed, but will be incorporated in the next draft of the regional profile. In addition, additional information is currently being collected, including data regarding substrate types, commercial and recreational fishing, and other human uses in the study region. Draft products conveying these additional data sources will be presented at the next SCRSG meeting. I-Team staff requested that SCRSG members review the draft regional profile with an eye toward providing the following types of information:

- What information needs to be added to the regional profile?
- What additional sources of information or data sets are available?
- Review, comment, and make corrections
- Provide additional information to complete the sub regional summaries

To the extent possible, SCRSG members were asked to key their suggested edits to specific sections of the draft regional profile.

G. Evaluation of Existing MPAs and the MPA Planning Process

I-Team staff provided a description of the 43 marine protected areas that currently exist within the south coast study region and an overview of the iterative process that will be used to evaluate and develop MPA proposals. Staff also provided a description of how the SCRSG receives input from the SAT on evaluation of proposed MPAs and in responding to science questions. Detailed evaluation guidance is being developed by the SAT, CDFG, I-Team and State Parks staff and will be presented at the next SCRSG meeting. These evaluation tools, along with policy guidance from the BRTF and public input will be used to guide the SCRSG in crafting MPA proposals. I-Team staff also provided an overview of how science questions are presented and reviewed by the SAT.

H. Introduction to Regional Goals and Objectives

I-Team staff presented a brief overview regional goals and objectives and reminded the SCRSG members that one major task of the group is to recommend regional goals and objectives for the south coast study region. Examples of the goals and objectives adopted in the north central and central coast study regions are available on the MLPA website. CDFG staff will provide additional guidance on developing regional goals and objectives at the November 18 – 19 SCRSG meeting.

I. Breakout Sessions

SCRSG members participated in two breakout sessions. The first session focused on sharing interests and expertise in the south coast study region. The second focused on sharing hopes and challenges for the south coast process as well as possible ways to meet those challenges. The discussion of individual breakout groups was reported back to the full plenary.

Collectively, SCRSG members bring an exceptional base of knowledge and experience that extends throughout the study region, spans generations of use, and includes both consumptive and non-consumptive activities. There was also significant overlap in the

interests, hopes, and concerns expressed by SCRSG members. Major interests focused on ensuring an open-minded and collaborative process and all SCRSG members hoped for a process that provided a balance for all interests in the study region and provided long-term sustainability for the ocean resources. In addition, there was much discussion about future efforts to ensure effective implementation and the importance of recognizing, appreciating the diversity and multicultural uses within the study region.

Among the contributions SCRSG members offered to make are: conveying their uses of ocean resources clearly and honestly to fellow SCRSG members, sharing their experience, helping to shape relevant information, and negotiating in good faith. SCRSG members identified several strategies for the I-Team, including supporting them in including their constituents, providing information in a timely way, and responding effectively to questions posed by SCRSG members.

J. Public comment

Members of the public provided comment and asked clarifying questions during two separate public comment periods. Comments included: a request to make the MLPA website more public friendly and to translate information into multiple languages, concerns about the MLPA effort and impact on commercial fisheries, identification of beach replenishment as a major issue in San Diego and Orange counties and information on a volunteer citizen-scientist research program (ReefCheck). A member from the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group also encouraged the SCRSG in its efforts for cross-interest deliberation.

K. Objectives for SCRSG Meeting #2

The next SCRSG meeting is scheduled for November 18 – 19, 2008 in the Santa Barbara area (Crowne Plaza Hotel in Ventura, CA). The main objectives for the meeting are to:

- Introduce any newly appointed SCRSG members
- Summarize the key comments received on the draft regional profile and conduct joint fact-finding to further strengthen the document
- Draft and consider adoption of south coast regional goals and objectives.
- Receive informational presentations from staff and SAT members (e.g., habitats, general fisheries information, etc.)
- Present guidelines for developing MPA proposals (e.g., MLPA SAT guidelines, CDFG feasibility guidelines) and preliminary evaluations of the existing south coast MPAs
- Review other information needs and the applicability of additional support tools

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for SCRSG members

1. SCRSG members wishing to receive meeting materials in a format other than FedEx packages should contact Kathie.Magnuson@resources.ca.gov with their request.
2. Review and propose revisions to the draft regional profile for the south coast study region by October 31, 2008. SCRSG members are asked to consider the following:

- What information needs to be added to the regional profile?
- What additional sources of information or data sets are available?
- Make corrections
- Provide additional information to complete the sub regional summaries

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Transmit a copy of the adopted ground rules to the SCRSG (attached).
2. Work with the director of CDFG and the chair of the BRTF to appoint the remaining SCRSG members and discuss use of the term “partners” in lieu of primary and alternate members.

Attachments

1. Adopted SCRSG ground rules (adopted October 7, 2008)
2. Summary matrix of SCRSG members’ interests and expertise

Charge, Ground Rules & Decision Process **MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group** *(Adopted on October 7, 2008)*

The following document outlines the operating ground rules for the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG), including an overview of the SCRSG charge, responsibilities and decision-making process. The ground rules have been informed by confidential interviews conducted with a cross section of the nominees for the SCRSG, including nearly all of the appointed south coast members, as well as CONCUR's professional experience. These ground rules are intended to foster and reinforce constructive interaction and deliberation among SCRSG members; the rules emphasize clear communication, trust building, respect for divergent views, creative thinking, collaborative problem solving, and the pursuit of mutual gains. The SCRSG may decide to reconsider and revise these ground rules if they appear not to be serving the SCRSG process.

CHARGE OF THE SOUTH COAST REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Charge of the South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG)

- **Charge of the SCRSG.** The charge of the SCRSG is to develop multiple marine protected area (MPA) proposals for consideration by the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). In meeting that charge, the SCRSG members have three primary goals to achieve for the south coast study region including: 1) Review and refine the regional profile; 2) Draft and adopt regional goals and objectives and; 3) Draft and refine alternative MPA arrays.

Responsibilities

- **SCRSG recruitment and selection.** SCRSG members have been appointed by the director of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the chair of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative BRTF. Taken together, appointments were made to achieve a diversity of stakeholder perspectives, expertise, and geography. SCRSG members were appointed based on their match with, and commitment to fulfilling, the following selection criteria:
 - Able to bring first hand knowledge and perspective to bear on the marine resources of the MLPA South Coast Study Region
 - Able to balance a regional perspective with localized knowledge
 - Willing to express fundamental interests (as opposed to fixed positions) and to clearly convey the interests of one or more important stakeholder groups
 - Capable of working collaboratively, seeking to integrate the interests of a broad range of constituencies
 - Able to access and use an effective communication network to reach stakeholders not attending the public meetings
 - Committed to completing all aspects of the charge of the SCRSG

- **Checking back with constituencies.** SCRSG members have been recruited based upon their ability to ably represent the views of one or more important constituencies. SCRSG members commit to: making themselves available to communicate with interested stakeholder constituents, keeping their constituencies informed of the SCRSG's efforts, and reporting relevant feedback to the SCRSG. In reporting back, SCRSG members will strive to integrate the views of their constituency rather than resorting to a "lowest common denominator" approach. In checking back with their constituencies, SCRSG members will seek to avoid prejudging preliminary proposals still in development by the SCRSG.

Identifying and Considering Alternative MPA Proposals

- **Iterative Process.** The MLPA South Coast Project has been structured to allow time for developing and deliberating on multiple, alternative MPA proposals. This process will be an iterative one, with time allocated for MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), BRTF and public review.
- **Proposals.** SCRSG members will be open to proposals from other SCRSG members or from others outside the SCRSG.
- **Goals and Objectives.** As part of their work, SCRSG members will strive to identify and consider alternative MPA proposals. SCRSG members will consider, using best readily available science and information, how each alternative proposal satisfies the goals and objectives established for the MLPA South Coast Study Region. The result of this deliberation is intended to allow the BRTF, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and the California Fish and Game Commission to understand how the alternative proposals identified will satisfy the MLPA.
- **Preliminary Proposals.** SCRSG work teams may develop preliminary MPA proposals, which should be regarded as tentative and not subject to broad distribution until they have been presented to the SCRSG.

Information Sharing and Joint Fact-Finding

- **Information Gathering and Sharing.** MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff intend to create multiple opportunities for data sharing and joint fact-finding within the SCRSG. Joint fact-finding refers to a process where stakeholders are able to help identify information needs and questions for analysis, deliberations of scientific advisors are transparent, data are pooled to support better informed recommendations, and a serious effort is made to identify and narrow sources of scientific disagreement. SCRSG members are encouraged to be as specific as possible in identifying types of information they believe will support the development of work products, including alternative proposals of MPAs. This information may include a mix of peer-reviewed studies, other scientific studies, field notes from researchers, and first hand knowledge from resource users. Accordingly, SCRSG members are encouraged to contribute their own first hand knowledge to support the work of the SCRSG.
- **Best Readily Available information.** SCRSG members recognize that the MLPA South Coast Project relies on using the best readily available information. Tentative information will be treated as such. Development of MPA arrays will not be delayed in order to fill any perceived data gaps.

- **Handling Apparently Conflicting Data or Analysis.** In the event that two or more data sets or interpretations appear to conflict, participants will work collaboratively with members of the SAT Sub-Team to the South Coast Project to narrow or clarify the basis of disagreement. The BRTF may also offer policy guidance on how to address and resolve disagreements over data or analysis.

GROUND RULES

Participation and Collaboration

- **Active, focused participation.** Every participant is responsible for communicating his/her perspectives and interests on the issues under consideration. Voicing these perspectives is essential to enable meaningful dialogue. Everyone will participate; no one will dominate. Only one person will speak at a time. Everyone will come to the meetings prepared, and help keep the meetings on track.
- **Respectful interaction.** Participants will respect each other's personal integrity, divergent viewpoints, values and legitimacy of interests. Participants will listen courteously while others are speaking. Participants will refrain from using deliberate misinformation, any personal attacks or stereotyping.
- **Integration and creative thinking.** In developing, reviewing and revising work products, participants will strive to be open-minded and to integrate each other's ideas, perspectives and interests. Disagreements will be regarded as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won. Participants will attempt to reframe contentious issues and offer creative solutions to enable constructive dialogue. Where participants do not support a specific solution or proposal they are encouraged to offer their own solution
- **Effective communication.** Participants acknowledge the importance of communicating with other SCRSG members regarding MPA proposal development ideas and issues including e-mail and discussions outside of formal SCRSG meetings. Participants commit to bringing concerns about adherence of individual SCRSG members to the ground rules, MPA proposals or process for discussion to the facilitation team rather than expressing such concerns in a manner that undermines the respect of any individuals or the process.
- **Satisfy Mutual Interests.** Participants will work to satisfy not only their own interests but also those of other SCRSG members. Participants are encouraged to be clear about their own interests and to recognize the important distinction between underlying interests and fixed positions.
- **Commitment to ground rules.** SCRSG members commit to adhere to these ground rules, as a set of mutual obligations, once they are ratified. SCRSG members are encouraged to help uphold and enforce these ground rules. If an SCRSG member consistently deviates from these ground rules, that member may be replaced by another person upon confirmation by the director of CDFG and the chair of the BRTF. Prior to an SCRSG member being dismissed, the SCRSG member will meet with the facilitation team and the MLPA Initiative executive director to discuss the reasons for the dismissal. Flagrant personal attacks or repeated violations of the ground rules may be cause for immediate removal.

Commitment to process

- **Good faith effort.** Participants will make a good faith effort to achieve the goals of the project within the identified schedule.
- **Come prepared.** Participants will review meeting materials in advance of the meetings and come prepared to address the meeting objectives.
- **Meeting attendance.** Meetings will start on time. Participants who know that they will be absent, late, or have to leave early will inform project staff in advance and coordinate with their alternates as needed.
- **Cell phones on silent.** Cell phones, pagers and other electronic devices will be turned off or set to “silent” mode.

Media Contact

- **Webcast.** SCRS meetings are public and will be simultaneously webcast. Audio and video archives of the meetings will be available on the MLPA website a few days after each meeting.
- **MLPA media contacts.** Media contacts regarding the project from a “big picture” perspective will be handled by MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff. First contacts should go to Annie Reisewitz, MLPA Initiative Media Relations Liaison at 858-228-0526 or Jordan Traverso, CDFG Deputy Director of Communications, Education and Outreach at 916-654-9937.
- **SCRS media contact.** On occasion, reporters may contact individual SCRS members for comment about a particular issue. Members who are contacted by the media will speak only on behalf of their group or constituency. After commenting, the stakeholder will provide the media entity with contact information for the MLPA Initiative communications staff person and request that the media entity contact that person for further information.
- **Representation to media.** SCRS members recognize the need to maintain a balance between providing timely information to constituents and making statements to the media that could undermine the success of the MLPA Initiative process. SCRS members agree to avoid: a) Making statements to the media that may prejudice the project’s outcome, b) Representing another group’s point of view or characterizing others’ motives, or c) Stating positions on preliminary proposals while they are still being developed or refined by work teams or the SCRS.
- **Media subcommittee.** SCRS members will refer requests for additional contacts to MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff listed above or the SCRS contact list. If needed, the SCRS may convene a multi-interest media subcommittee to work with MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff to develop briefings for the media.

- **Use of key outcomes memoranda.** In briefing constituents, SCRSG members are encouraged to rely primarily on key outcomes memoranda to be produced for the meetings.

SCRSG DECISION PROCESSES

Decision Rules

- **Strive for broad based support for proposals.** SCRSG members will strive to achieve a high level of agreement in developing and advancing alternative proposals for MPAs. The intent here is to strive for MPA proposals that earn broad-based support across SCRSG members' interests.
- **Use of “straw votes”.** SCRSG members recognize the need to make simple process agreements to move the effort forward. SCRSG facilitators may use “straw votes” to track progress and help the group arrive at short-term decisions to propel the process forward in an efficient fashion. A straw vote is a method used for polling the SCRSG on a particular issue and typically involves asking each primary SCRSG seat to indicate a preference on a particular issue.

Cooperation with BRTF & SAT Sub-Team to the South Coast Project (Science Sub-Team)

- **Cooperation with science sub-team.** SCRSG members will work cooperatively with the Science Sub-Team in developing options and work products. The Science Sub-Team will assist the SCRSG by reviewing draft documents, addressing scientific issues and information provided by the SCRSG, and helping to frame and refer policy challenges to the BRTF. At their discretion, MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff may plan for joint meetings or work sessions of the SAT or Science Sub-Team and the SCRSG.
- **Briefings to BRTF.** The BRTF is expected to provide policy guidance to the SCRSG on each iterative round of MPA proposals. SCRSG members will have an opportunity to present focused briefings on the progress of MPA proposal development to the BRTF.

Primary and Alternate SCRSG members

- **Attendance.** All SCRSG members, both primary and alternate, will make every effort to attend all of the SCRSG meetings.
- **Seating.** During SCRSG meetings, the following participants will be seated at the main table: primary SCRSG members (or alternates when primary members are not in attendance), the BRTF liaison, Science Sub-Team members in attendance, lead MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff, and project facilitators. SCRSG alternates, other staff, and members of the public will be seated nearby.
- **Coordination.** Primary SCRSG members will work with their alternates to ensure that they are informed regarding SCRSG deliberations. This will enable alternates to step in effectively as needed and keep the project from “backsliding.” Primary and alternate members are encouraged to confer in advance of the meetings, and prior to straw votes

when possible or during meeting breaks. They are also encouraged to confer with their broader constituencies at these times.

- **Meetings.** SCRSG meetings will involve both primary and alternate SCRSG members, members of the Science Sub-Team, and MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff. For purposes of timely meeting management, facilitators may, at their discretion, focus a plenary discussion on primary members. Both primary and alternate members are expected to actively participate in breakout sessions, work teams, and the development of draft and final MPA proposals.
- **Voting.** One vote per seat (primary/alternate) will be used during plenary sessions and primaries will confer with their alternate in advance of the straw vote, when possible.
- **Creation and use of list servers.** The MLPA Initiative team will create list servers to support the development and refinement of draft MPA proposals. The focus of the list servers will be to support work on individual MPAs or full MPA proposals. The intent of list servers is not to serve as a more general communication function about other marine resource issues.

Multi-interest Work Teams

- MLPA Initiative staff expect to form SCRSG cross-interest group work teams to develop constructive, integrative work products during and between SCRSG plenary meetings. The aim of such work teams is to encourage integrative options and work products rather than work products put forward by a single bloc or interest group.

Public Comment

- **Public comment at SCRSG meetings.** Designated times at SCRSG meetings will be agendaized for public comment. Efforts will be made to schedule public comment at consistent time slots and keyed to important SCRSG work product discussions, and to be held at the time agendaized. At all other times of the meeting, comments and discussion will be only among SCRSG members and alternates, Science Sub-Team members, and MLPA Initiative and CDFG staff.
- **Focus on work products.** To the extent possible, public comments will be directed toward the work effort, products, or process of the SCRSG. Comments on subjects external to the MLPA should be directed to other forums.
- **Other opportunities.** Members of the public are encouraged to convey their comments to relevant colleagues who serve as SCRSG members or alternates. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit comments in writing (via email to MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov). Written comments will be distributed to SCRSG members.
- **Speaking time.** Public comments may be limited to up to three minutes per individual speaker. The SCRSG facilitation team will exercise flexibility in allocation of speaking time depending on the number of individuals wishing to address the SCRSG.

- **MLPA response.** The MLPA Initiative Team will respond as appropriate to questions and suggestions posed in public comment portions of SCRS meetings.

Participation of Federal, State and Local Agencies

- Given the significant portion of the south coast study region that is under the jurisdiction of federal, state, and local agencies, the active participation of these agencies is welcome and encouraged in the south coast process.

Role of Facilitation Team

- **Neutral facilitators.** The SCRS facilitation team is non-partisan; the members have no stake in any particular set of alternative MPA proposals and they will not act as advocates for particular outcomes. The facilitators will strive to ensure that all SCRS members clearly articulate their respective interests and to assist members to complete their work in a well-informed, efficient and timely fashion.
- **Foster alternatives with mutual benefit.** The facilitation team will seek to foster approaches to meeting management, and to the identification and consideration of alternative MPA proposals, which maximize joint gains and mutual benefit.
- **Efficient use of time.** The facilitators will strive to structure meetings and discussion so as to make efficient use of members' time. This includes providing materials in advance of meetings, assisting with keeping the discussion focused and monitoring discussions so that no individual or idea dominates.
- **Facilitators' discretion.** The facilitation team will use its discretion in guiding meetings and may propose agenda adjustments. The facilitation team may also use straw voting to track a range of preferences on emerging issues and gauge the level of support for alternative options.
- **Key outcomes memoranda.** The SCRS facilitation team will prepare key outcomes memoranda to summarize the main results of the SCRS meetings. These key outcomes memoranda will summarize key decisions made, issues discussed, and the next steps identified for moving the project forward and does not strive to serve as a meeting transcript. The facilitators will strive to prepare key outcomes memoranda within 10 days of the meetings.

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Abramson	Sarah	Heal the Bay	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coastal resources director for Heal the Bay (Primarily on Santa Monica Bay) 2. Past involvement in CaLobster 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marine education 2. Conservation 3. Diving 4. Surfing 5. Avid Sailor 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mainland LA County 2. Catalina Island 3. Santa Barbara County 4. Northern Channel Islands 5. Surfing Santa Monica Bay up to Santa Barbara
Allison	Calla	City of Laguna Beach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City of Laguna Beach 2. Orange County MPA Committee 3. LOF/Laguna Bluebelt 4. Marine safety department/lifeguards CSLSA (16 yr lifeguard) 5. CTA - educators 6. Others- surfers, free divers, state parks 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public outreach, education and enforcement 2. Intertidal area in Orange County 3. Abalone diving. 4. Surf/body surf, freedive/snorkle 5. Lagoon trail runner (back bay, bataquitos, etc) 6. Tipepooling 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Huntington beach 2. San Clemente 3. Del mar 4. Orange county intertidal 5. North County San Diego 6. Santa Barbara (UCSB/state parks)
Ballotti	John	Los Angeles Rod and Reel Club	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Member of LA Rod and Reel Club (recreational fishermen) 2. UASC, RFA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational fishing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Santa Monica Bay down to Long Beach
Beede	Benjamin	The Cultured Abalone	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aquaculture <p>General manager at The Cultured Abalone, an aquaculture firm growing abalone and aquaculture experimental halibut production</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abalone. Farming abalone. 2. California halibut. 3. Kelp harvest. 4. Water quality, sustainable aquaculture. 5. Kelp, water quality/sustainable aquaculture 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Santa Barbara Channel (specifically for kelp) 2. Orange county. (Campus Point to Coal Oil Point). 3. Grew up body surfing at orange county state beaches.
Beguhl	Philip	Santa Barbara County Fish and Game Commission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Santa Barbara County Fish and Game Commission - 25 years 2. Crab and lobster commercial fisher 3. Founder of joint oil fisheries group 4. Historian of sport fishing in SoCal 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representing crab/lobster fishery 2. Holistic modeling of ocean environment - try to build most complementary, complete model of what's going on 3. Reduce socioeconomic impact 4. Pleistocene marine record 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pt. Conception to Santa Monica Bay including Channel Islands
Benavides	Steve	Kelp Forest Coalition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nonconsumptive diver rep 2. Recreational Advisory Abalone Committee (11-year member) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational Scuba Diver 2. Lifetime recreational sportfisher 3. Underwater photography 4. Coastal piloting (40 years) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Southern offshore islands (Catalina and St Clemente) and rocky intertidal reefs in SoCal coastal areas

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Bertelli	Bob	California Sea Urchin Commission	1. Urchin divers/processors (12 processors, 300 divers) 2. California Sea Urchin Commission	1. Diving 2. Abalone, Urchin 3. Healthy ecosystems. 4. Shellfish harvest and conservation	1. Channel Islands in general (San Nicolas, Santa Barbara Island, Catalina, Clemente) 2. Rancho Palos Verdes 3. LA and Orange counties coast
Bursek	Julie	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary	1. Marine science and educational programs (22 years of experience) 2. Education and Outreach Coordinator, NOAA CINMS	1. Sailing 2. MS Biology- focused on marine ecology of rocky intertidal 3. Scuba- kelp forest and rocky reef exploration and monitoring 5. Rocky intertidal and soft bottom 6. Floating lab educational programs	1. Palos Verdes- Whites Pt, Cabarillo Beach 2. Laguana Beach, Dana Pt.- intertidal and nearshore systems 3. Familiar with 7 of 8 islands- Catalina, San Clemente, Santa Barbara, Anacapa, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, San Miguel
Cordero	Roberta	Chumash Maritime Association	1. Chumash Maritime Association board member 2. Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation 3. Association for Conflict Resolution 4. Native Network (Environmental conflict management)	1. Interested about anything can do in the ocean 2. Helping my people to come back into relationship of reciprocity with the environment 3. Teaching culture - indigenous revitalization	1. Pt. Conception/Jalama to Carpenteria 2. Santa Barbara Channel and Islands (some)
Dahl	Jim	City of San Clemente	1. City of San Clemente City Council member (past mayor) 2. Dana Point Yacht Club 3. Surfer	1. Water quality, new mps permit - dry weather diversion 2. Sand replenishment	1. Pt. Conception to Mexican border 2. Catalina Island 3. Nearshore areas
Daigle	Leslie	Mayor Pro Tem, City of Newport Beach	1. City government 2. regional government	1. Outreach to public 2. Sound policy- Be an honest broker to process 3. Carrying out the MLPA Initiative 4. Background- studied geography, been in City government (started out as a staff city planning for 5 years), last 5 years for County Planning 5. Regional government board	1. Orange County

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Dunn	W. Scott	Independent kayak guide and instructor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kayaker (17 yr kayak guide/instructor) 2. Naturalist (NPS/CINMS naturalist) 3. CINMS-SAC member representing non-consumptive recreational users 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-consumptive recreational users 2. To think more about non-consumptive uses and their economic value 3. Recognition of the non-consumptive value of these to MPAs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pt Conception to Palos Verdes 2. Santa Barbara to ventura county 3. Channel islands
Engel	Joanna	California Coastal Commission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff Ecologist for CCC and member of many working groups/committees within CCC 2. SCWRP 3. CINMS Research working group 4. Western Society of Naturalists 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainability 2. Resiliency, making ocean more resilient as face climate change, concerned about climate change 3. Diversity hotspots, biogeography 4. Resource protection 5. Educational opportunities 6. Enjoyment: diver, captain (at one point), etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Channel Islands 2. Pt. Conception to Pt. Mugu 3. Southern California Bight
Engle	Jack	Marine Science Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Associate research biologist - UC Santa Barbara 2. Head of Channel Islands research program 3. Coordinator, multi-agency rocky intertidal network (MARINE) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catalina island 2. Spiny lobster (growth and ecology) 3. Surfgrass 4. CI research program- research and kelp 5. Long term perspective and monitoring 6. Climatic changes 7. Science, education, and monitoring (Rocky intertidal monitoring) 8. Careful balance of marine life protection and human uses 9. Long term-management of marine life for everyone 10. In general, marine life (e.g. plants, invertebrate, fishes, kelp, sea gravies, lobster, urchins, abalone, etc) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All Channel Islands (subtidal and intertidal) 2. Santa Barbara area (Intertidal on mainland) 3. Point Loma, San Diego area 4. Intertidal sites throughout southern california (455 sites, rocky)
Everingham	Buck	Everingham Brothers Bait Company	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Live bait supply 2. Private and commerical sport fishermen 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial 2. Fly coast to spot boats 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pt. Conception to Mexican border, focus between Newport and Mexican border, fish soft bottom

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Feinberg	Jenn	Natural Resources Defense Council	1. Marine policy consultant for NRDC 2. Ocean Conservancy 3. Worked for CCC in Ventura	1. Ecosystem protection 2. Sustainability 3. Conservation and preservation 4. Public Access 5. Wildlife viewing 6. Diving 7. Surfing	1. Pt. Conception to northern LA County
Ferrigno	Ciro	Member of the Board, California Wetfish Producer's Association	1. Commercial- sardine, squid, mackerel, tuna 2. Processors	1. Protect fishing grounds that historically produce.	1. Catalina, 2. Clemente, and 3. anywhere within 2 hours of LA. But do not know Pt. Conception down to San Diego Fish out of San Pedro (LA Harbor)
Fletcher	Bob	Sportfishing Association of California	1. Sport fishing, Sport Fishing Association of California (president) 2. Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute (Trustee) 3. White Seabass Hatchery Advisory Committee (chairman)	1. Fishing 2. Diving 3. Sailing 4. Sport Fishing 5. Interest in bait and sportfishing species and access to traditional fishing grounds-near ports very important	1. San Diego 2. San Clemente Island 3. Northern Channel Islands
Forster Foley	Mary Jane	MJF Consulting Inc.	1. Public agencies (essential services) 2. Major ocean dischargers 3. Coastal water agencies	1. She facilitates 2. Worked for 3 Governors 3. State Waterboard (SD Regional, State Board, liason for LA Regional Board) 4. Water quality policy and plans, nonpoint source program, stormwater program, inland, bays, and estuaries plan 5. Working with Desal research 6. Started state watershed initiative	1. Los Angeles to Mexico 2. general knowledge of Santa Barbara and Ventura.
Galipeau	Russell	Channel Islands National Park	1. National Park Service (Channel Islands National Park) 2. Cabrillo National Monument, 3. Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area	1. Setting areas aside as baselines. 2. Kelp forests. 3. Filtering out at least one stressor on the ecosystem	1. Northern Channel Islands. 2. Other Channel Islands (some) 3. Point Loma (some)

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Gauger	Michael	Seaforth Sportfishing, Inc.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seaforth Sportfishing Corp. 2. Kids' fishing programs 3. Injured veterans programs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational fishing 2. Whale watching 3. Trying to reach populations that don't have lot of opportunity or access to fishing 4. Snorkeling 5. Recreational fishing promotion via Seaforth for underprivileged youth groups 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Del Mar to Mexican border
Gomes	Tommy	Owner, Uni Goop Bait Company	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial Fisherman (5th generation), sea urchin 2. Owner small bait company 3. Kids' recreational fishery 4. Sportfisher 5. Works with ESPN and Versus 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial sea urchin fishing 2. Recreational fishing with kids 3. Sportfishing 4. Trying to reduce carbon footprint 5. Sustainability 6. Recipient golden porpoise award 7. Sponsors saltwater bass tournaments and donates proceeds to kids programs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Diego to Mexican Line out 90 miles 2. Dana Pt. southwest
Greenberg	Joel	Recreational Fishing Alliance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational Fishing Alliance (RFA), SoCal 2. Recreational fishing 3. Los Angeles Rod and Reel Club 4. CDFG Groundfish Task Force 5. Various federal stakeholder panels 6. Volunteer to sustainably manage and conserve marine resources 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational fishing 2. Being out on water 3. Seafood 4. Kelp/urchins 5. Channel Islands 6. Conservation/sustainability 7. CCA 8. Whale and bird watching 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Point conception to Mexico border (specifically Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties) 2. Los Angeles 3. Channel Islands (Northern and Southern Channel Islands and offshore banks) 4. Santa Monica Bay
Grifman	Phyllis	Sea Grant, USC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University of Southern California Sea Grant Program 2. Sanctuary Advisory Council (CINMS) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generalist- interested in establishing MPAs considering issues of access and fairness 2. Public policy, translating complex information 3. Long-time boater and research administrator 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the California coast from Pt. Conception and Catalina Island south to Baja.

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Guassac	Louie	Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy	1. Native American 2. Member of various tribes organizations and committees (Member of Kumeyaay cultural repatriation committee (KCRC), Kumeyaay border task force (KBTF), Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy (KDLC))	1. Native american use of marine resources. 2. Protect and preserve cultural resources and through this process don't remove other designations 3. Preserve and protect cultural resources and species	1. Santa Barbara to San Diego 2. San Diego to Santo Tomas (south of Ensenada)
Gutiérrez	Marcela	Wild Coast- San Diego	1. Conservation- Wild Coast 2. Commercial fisheries and aquaculture industry	1. Non-english population is represented 2. Recreational and commercial uses	1. San Diego County 2. LA County
Hanley	Kate	San Diego Coastkeeper	1. San Diego Coastkeeper 2. From a family of fishers	1. Marine conservation 2. Water quality (ASBS) 3. Kelp resrotration 4. Diver 5. Education outreach	1. San Diego County (Pt. Loma south)
Helms	Greg	Ocean Conservancy	1. Conservation (Ocean Conservancy) 2. Nonconsumptive recreation	1. Fishing, surfing, diving, sailing 2. Coastal pollution and energy	1. Point Conception to Point Mugu, with special emphasis on Santa Barbara and Channel Islands. Went to school in LA area (Marina Del Rey)
Hiemstra	Ray	Orange County Coastkeeper	1. Orange County Coastkeeper - Associate Director 2. Recreational Fisherman	1. asthetic interests 2. enjoying atmoshpere and resources 3. concerned about pop. size and modern tech. and how affects ocean resources 4. Kayaking 5. Shorefishing 6. Swimming 7. Surfing 8. Scientific Study	1. Primarily Orange County, specifically Newport and Huntington harbors, Newport and Laguna ASBSs 2. San Diego County, LA County

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Huber	Michael	U.S. Department of Defense Region IX	1. Department of Defense (DoD) 2. Navy region southwest	1. DoD has a critical interest in the sustainment and management of California's Ocean Resources as DoD relies on coastal ocean resources to prepare for the national security mission. 2. Long-term sustainment of the DoD mission in the study region, while striking a balance. 3. Testing and training of soldiers. Air/ground/subsurface/inland operations. 4. Sustainable management of resources.	1. Entire study region 2. Areas with military operations..
Kearsley	Ken	City of Malibu	1. City of Malibu - former mayor 2. Surfer (since 1954)	1. Water quality 2. Recreation, swimming, surfing, etc. 3. Coastal area home owners 4. Visitor services in marine areas 5. How to reconcile all interests in Malibu and municipal problems with interfacing with other agencies	1. [Grew up in] Santa Monica Beach 2. Tijuana slough up to Rincon - most coastal areas in Southern CA
Kennedy	MJ	Kayak Fishing Association of California	1. Deputy Director KFACA	1. Protect launch sites/access points 2. Raised in bait and tackle shop and on boats 3. Surfer. 4. Kayak fishing 5. Sport fishing, everything from surf to party boats 6. Main interest in protecting launch sites for kayak fishing, which is sensitive to closure.	1. Santa Barbara County to northern LA county 2. Ventura County coastline, primarily Ventura/Malibu
Kett	Eric	Recreational Diving (public)-scuba/snorkle	1. Recreational diving- scuba or snorkle 2. CINMS Advisory Council	1. Dive boat captain for many years (diving tourism), 2. Scuba instructor, 3. Spearfishing, and 4. Ocean recreation	1. Eight offshore islands (from 100 ft to shoreline) 2. Pt. Conception to Pt Mugu, Pt Loma

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Kronman	Mick	Harbor Operations Manager, Santa Barbara	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ports and Harbors 2. City of Santa Barbara and working waterfront 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Balance between communities (socioeconomics) and conservation 2. Protect harbor infrastructures and interest of coastal communities 3. Graduated UCSB political science 4. Commercial fisherman and fisheries consultant 5. Culture of coastal communities (attachment to fishing and the sea) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pt Conception to Pt Mugu
Lebowitz	Paul	Kayak Fishing Association of California	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kayak fishing association of California - I paddle to fish. 2. Private and sportboat recreational angler, affiliated with numerous kayak fishing clubs and communities and businesses from manufacturers to shop owners 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paddlesports. 2. Sport fishing. 3. Fishing 4. Beach-going, 5. General recreation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regional point-of-view 2. Most familiar with San Diego 3. Orange County (south) 4. Palos verdes 5. Malibu 6. Catalina (west end) 7. San Clemente (south end)
Maas	Terry	Underwater Society of America, Sea Watch	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breath hold diver 2. Underwater Society of America 3. California Council of Dive Clubs 4. Affiliated w/most of dive clubs in SoCal 5. Sea Watch 6. Abalone advisory committee 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consumptive, spearfishing 2. Nonconsumptive, video and photography 3. Breath hold diving 4. Showing people underwater world here, and respecting it 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All
Maassen	Jeff	Commercial Fishermen of Santa Barbara, Inc.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vice President of Commercial Fisherman of Santa Barbara Inc. 2. Commercial Fisherman 3. Heal the Ocean 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintaining access for commercial and recreational fisherman 2. Water quality, nonpoint and point source pollution 3. Sustainability within access and ocean ecosystems as a whole 4. Recreation, both consumptive and non-consumptive 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Southern and Northern Channel Islands (except San Nicolas) 2. Coastal areas from Palos Verdes to Point Conception
Marshall	Jenny	U.S. Navy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultant to Navy - Commander, Pacific Fleet 2. Used to work at Monterey Bay Aquarium 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Underwater acoustics, marine mammals 2. Ensuring sustained use by Navy; sustainable training for Navy Fleet Forces 3. Long-term health of marine ecosystems in Southern California Bight 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Clemente Island Range Complex 2. Naval Amphibious Base, NAS North Island

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
McCorkle	Mike	Southern California Trawlers Association	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial fisherman 2. Southern California Trawlers Association (President) 3. PCFFA (director) 4. Commercial Fishermen of America (advisor) 5. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) 6. White Seabass Management Advisory Committee 7. Other- Santa Barbara Hatchery, SCTA, CFSB Inc, UFDA, IFR Director 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fished many kinds of gear- Bait fishing, Lobster diving, Trawl for halibut, sea cucumber 2. Marine mammals/fisheries (seals) 3. Preserving fisheries 4. Make sure all user-groups get treated fairly 5. Make sure people who make a living on the ocean are not displaced 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Point Arguello to Mexican border including all the islands 2. Redondo Beach
McCoy	Mike	Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve Management Authority	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve 2. Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association (cooperating with the State Parks) 3. Appointed by San Diego board of supervisors to oversee all parks in the county 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coastal salt marsh ecosystem restoration 2. Connection between marsh and ocean systems. 3. Sand transport. 4. Parks and recreation 5. Estuarine ecology and interface between riparian, estuarine, and maritime systems. 6. Health and welfare of marine mammals 7. Education and outreach 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Diego 2. Saltmarsh ecosystems from San Quentin, Mexico to Point Conception, California. 3. Tijuana Estuary, San Diego Bay, and the estuaries in San Diego County
Mills	Marc	Okuma Fishing Tackle Corporation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recreational Fishing 2. Recreational Boating 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issues to support fishing 2. Swimming and diving 3. Recreational fishing, kayak angler 4. Sportfishing 5. Fishing tackle manufacturing 6. Kids' programs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Palos Verdes Point - Point Loma 2. Dana Point - San Clemente Island/Catalina Island
Murphy	Garth	Surfers Party	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surfers and surfing industry 2. Aquaculture, mariculture (shellfish, invertebrates, etc) 3. Marine science 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surf and swim 2. Fishing and Pier fisherman 3. Aquaculture 4. Marine science 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Diego County up to Seal Beach (surfing) and fished about half of it (shoreline fisherman) and subsistence fishermen, and Santa River coastline

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Peveler	Jack	California Association of Port Captains and Harbormasters	1. California Association of Harbor Masters and Port Captains 2. County of Ventura	1. Fishing and consumptive uses, as well as non-consumptive uses (i.e. diving, kayaking, surfing, water quality, economic issues) 2. Dredging, coastal erosion, restrictions to dredging. 3. Vessel navigation	1. Santa Barbara to Malibu, 2. Channel Islands (Anacapa, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa)
Pister	Benjamin	Cabrillo National Monument	1. National Park Service 2. San Diego recreational divers 3. Vice President of San Diego Shell Club	1. Interest in fishing, likes eating seafood 2. Diving 3. Sailing and boating activities 4. Interested in invertebrates, intertidal and benthic ecology 5. Professionally - manage resource, preserve for future and allow use now, public education	1. Point Fermin south to Mexican border 2. Lesser extent CINP
Protopapadakis	Lia	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Foundation	1. Santa Monica Bay Restoration Foundation/Commission (resource management) 2. SMBRC Board members (cities, local elected, discharges, and state/fed government) 3. EPA	1. Surfing 2. Scuba diving 3. Kayaking 4. Free diving 5. Federal perspective (Congress staff, ocean policy) 6. Research diving	1. South Bay, Los Angeles, South LA County, 2. Orange County, and San Diego County
Richter	Gerry	Point Conception Groundfishermen's Association	1. Pt Conception Groundfish Association (vice president) 2. Groundfish Advisory to the Pacific Fishery Management Council 3. CDFG Groundfish Task Force 4. South Bay Cable Committee (director)	1. Groundfish- CCA/RCA 2. Fixed gear commercial fishermen (longlines, fish pots, nets, rod/reel, etc). HMS, halibut. We represent all sorts of fixed gears for commercial fisheries in the study zone, including groundfish, halibut, highly migratory species, etc.	1. Catalina Island 2. Santa Barbara 3. Ventura 4. Point Conception to Oceanside 5. Santa Monica Bay 7. San Clemente
Rudie	Dave	Catalina Offshore Products	1. Sea Urchin Advisory Committee 2. Seafood processing (Owner) 3. Catalina Offshore products (seafood supplier) 4. California Sea Urchin Commission 5. San Diego Underwater Photography Society	1. Local fish 2. Balance between kelp and sea urchins. 3. Sport diving (consumptive and non-consumptive) 4. Underwater photography. 5. Commercial sea urchin and lobster fisheries 6. Kelp bed ecology and balance	1. Catalina Island, San Clemente Island and San Nicolas 2. Orange County 3. Newport Beach to San Diego

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Sasidharan	Vinod	San Diego State University	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Researcher and educator for Sustainable Tourism and Recreation 2. Community representative for parks, recreation, and tourism planning 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable policies and scientific measurement of outcomes 2. Collaborative planning and policy-making 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Diego area and surrounding areas (south of Oceanside)
Scheiwe	Brent	SEA Lab	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Director of Sea Lab 2. Youth development and education 3. Public aquariums 4. Abalone population enhancement and recovery 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Youth education, getting young people involved 2. Diving, snorkeling 3. Abalone 4. Kayaking 5. Conservation, habitat restoration 6. Water quality 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Palos Verdes/Redondo Beach 2. Long Beach/LA harbor area 3. Santa Monica Bay
Spacie	Anne	Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science advisory for Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation 2. All MPAs in Carlsbad (City of Carlsbad and Encinitas, Carlsbad Watershed Network, San Elijo Foundation, San Diego Conservation Network) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation 2. Outreach and education, 3. General background in science, fisheries, and marine issues 4. Recreation- diver 5. Public access 6. Sustainability of coastal estuaries and other wetland systems. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. San Diego, especially north county (up to Orange County)
Steele	Bruce	Captain, F/V Halcyon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternative California sea urchin association 2. Alternative commercial fisheries representation 3. Sanctuary advisory committee (CINMS) 4. Member of water quality monitoring committee - advice to regional water quality control board. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marine Mammals, otters and fishes. 2. Farmer 3. Water quality. Good transect data for water quality. Also the water quality for Region 3 (Salinas to Carpinteria). 4. Ocean acidification (CO2) 5. Commercial fishing - Santa Barbara 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Santa Barbara to Malibu 2. Channel islands
Tapp	Norris	Captain, F/V Freelance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sportfishing Association of California (Sport fishing boat captain - 3/4 day out of Newport Harbor) 2. Ex officio member SAC 3. General Manager Davie's Locker 4. Newport Landing Sportfishing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kids' programs 2. Sustainability 3. Water quality and effects on ecosystem (i.e. migration pattern of whales; very concerned about water quality around outfalls and powerplants) 4. Sportfishing and indirect commercial fishing 5. Whalewatching 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oceanside to Pt. Fermin and out to San Clemente Island

California MLPA South Coast Project
South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group: Summary of Interests and Areas of Expertise
Revised November 10, 2008

Last Name	First Name	Organization	What primary and secondary affiliations do you hold?	What are your interests in and uses of the ocean in the study region?	What geographic areas of the study region are you most familiar with?
Teufel	Cassidy	California Coastal Commission	1. California Coastal Commission (on aquaculture development committee)(energy ocean resources) 2. NCCRSG member	1. Representing CA Coastal Commission 2. Surfing 3. Diving 4. Fishing	1. Northern half of study region 2. Point Conception area
Tochihara	Wendy	Izorline International (fishing line company)	1. Fishing gear company (Izorline International) 2. Rod and Reel Radio 3. American Sportfishing Association 4. United Anglers Representative 5. Concerned citizens that want to maintain consumptive/ nonconsumptive users	1. Recreational anglers 2. Radio show- Rod and Reel radio 3. Visit tackle stores 4. Tournament angler	1. Long beach to San Diego bay, mostly inshore
Weeshoff	Dave	International Bird Rescue Research Center	1. International Bird Rescue Center (IBRRC), board member 2. Audubon societies, board member SFVAS, 3. Heal the Bay - speakers bureau 4. Algrity Marine Research Foundation - speakers bureau	1. Seabirds (bird habitat, nesting, foraging, migrating, coastal and pelagic) 2. Responding to oil spills 3. Audubon Society 4. Heal the Bay 5. Plastics on the ocean. 6. Fishermen	1. Santa Barbara to Orange County.