

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
JUNE 3, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(1:30 - 3:30 p.m. via conference call)**

**SIG members present:** Carol Abella, Dan Berman, Don Canestro, Tom Capen, James Colston, Karen Garrison, Vern Goehring, Joel Greenberg, Zeke Grader, Nancy Hastings, Bill James, Corrine Monroe, Tom Raftican, Jesús Ruiz, Steve Scheiblauber, David Whittington, Dan Wolford

**Others present:** Phil Isenberg (Chair, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force), Gail Bingham (facilitator, RESOLVE, Inc.), John Kirlin (MLPA Initiative staff), Maura Leos (notetaker, DFG staff), Melissa Miller-Henson (MLPA Initiative staff), Dave Parker, (DFG staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff), April Wakeman (as an observer for United Anglers of Southern California), Michael Weber (MLPA Initiative staff)

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA Statewide Interests Group (SIG), marine protected area (MPA)

### **Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

Melissa Miller-Henson apologized to everyone for a correction to the MLPA master calendar. The December 13 conference call will actually be held on December 15.

Gail Bingham, the facilitator, asked for any additions to the agenda. One SIG member asked for discussion of the socio-economic aspects of the MLPA. Bill James stated his dissatisfaction with the lack of timeliness of the agenda; three days was not enough time to discuss the issues with his constituents. John Kirlin requested that Tom Raftican's proposal be added to agenda item 3.

### **Update on the Central Coast Process**

The membership of the regional stakeholder group, draft agenda for the June 8-9, 2005 meeting in Monterey, and meeting packet (excluding charter and ground rule) have all been sent to SIG members and posted on the MLPA website.

A SIG member asked how agreement will be reached. The answer was that the charter speaks to this question. Staff is not expecting the group to come to a single alternative, nor are there expectations of consensus right away.

Another SIG member asked whether alternatives will be weighted and whether there will be a minimum number of votes that are needed for an alternative to move forward. The answer was "no" to both questions: *any* alternative will be considered. The stakeholder group will figure out the focus.

One SIG member expressed the opinion that it is imperative to list the weighting of each alternative and who is putting forth each alternative. This SIG member would also like to see the number of votes that each alternative receives. MLPA Initiative staff responded that there is no mechanical vehicle for creating alternatives. Alternatives will be fully recorded and the group will be able to carry forth any proposal.

One SIG member wanted to get a quick reaction of those who are on both the SIG and the CCRSG regarding the facilitation contractor, CONCUR. The three duplicate members were all favorably impressed with how bright, skilled, sincere, open-minded, and knowledgeable in fishery topics were the CONCUR contractors.

Another SIG member asked, since they hadn't seen the ground rules, about "dinging" alternative suggestions and requiring that an alternative be put on the table to meet objectives. The answer to this question was that the ground rules are not phrased in this way, though the effect will be the same. Staff is hoping for interaction of unanimity and positive attitude from the stakeholders.

### **Focus of Future Science Presentations**

Since Chair Isenberg was not yet in the meeting, John Ugoretz requested that the portion of the discussion regarding the focus of future science presentations be delayed. He realized the agenda had been distributed late and understood the need to have time to digest the accompanying science team information before a lengthy discussion could happen. He suggested that SIG members discuss Tom Raftican's proposal for a joint science team and stakeholder workshop and the May BRTF meeting while waiting for Chair Isenberg to join the call.

### **Stakeholder Sponsored Workshop**

Tom Raftican put forth a proposal for a workshop where the science team and stakeholders would meet and work out some of the concerns regarding the science team's advice on ideas such as the network concept, larval transfer, and the goals and objectives for the MLPA Central Coast Study Region. This would be a two-day workshop in the Monterey/Watsonville area consisting of anywhere from 50 to 100 attendees that would break out into study groups. Tom Raftican stated that he would like suggestions on who should be on the panels. The BRTF supports this concept and will offer funds to assist. An outline and possible facilitator is expected to be ready in two weeks. This proposal is mainly for SIG members' information at this time; United Anglers will be contacting everyone later concerning their involvement.

Extensive discussion followed Tom Raftican's proposal.

One member stated that there needs to be stakeholder involvement in the proposed workshop; it cannot be one sided. Is this proposed workshop going to replace the hearings the F&GC is planning or is it an addition to the hearings? Will this information go to the BRTF as well as the F&GC? Is there going to be a single presentation or more? The answer to these questions was

that United Anglers would like to schedule this workshop between meetings and hearings in an attempt to get more well-rounded dialogue. The timing is crucial and Tom Raftican will be in contact with the F&GC. The document produced from the workshop will go to both the BRTF and the F&GC.

There was some general concern about the practicality of getting people involved with yet more meetings. Do people have to come twice? John Kirlin stated that the MLPA staff would be willing to join efforts. There will be single events or a reduced number of events as well as the use of other methods, such as the website and the AGP videotaping, to reduce demands on time.

A SIG member asked what the timing for the workshop would be. Don't be in a rush; an adequate amount of time is extremely important. The entire process needs to be done well, not fast. This stakeholder would like to see the process slow down. MLPA staff answered that likely the workshop would have to be either somewhere between July 19 and July 25 (actually too early) or between July 26 and Aug 9.

A SIG member expressed concern that the proposed workshop would be an open meeting. There was also concern over constraints of space and timing. The current meeting dates in July are pretty intense. MLPA staff answered that the meeting would be open for observation and that, regarding timing, AGP Video would be involved so there would be a video and audio record to review.

Another SIG member wanted to know who the target audience for the workshop information is. How does the workshop fit into what is already going on? Would there be one set from the BRTF and another from the F&GC? They have different perspectives. Also, how would the workshop fit with the F&GC hearings? Would there be duplication? MLPA staff answered that the F&GC is holding three hearings to discuss the MPF which will be in the later half of July. These hearings are designed for the F&GC to hear strictly from the public.

A SIG member suggested that the MLPA staff make sure there is someone from "the other side of the fence." There needs to be good strong voices from each segment of the stakeholders.

A SIG member wondered if it makes sense for stakeholders to be putting together these workshops. The SAT should be the main presenters to all groups, which creates a common ground. The scientists should be advising not advocating.

There was another question regarding who is the target audience and whether the topics are already set. Are we spreading this out over months or doing it all in a couple of days? Are we looking at general information or specific science?

At this point, Tom Raftican and April Wakeman responded, "Neither." Scientists should give input; they are not policy makers. Policy derived from science flows and takes into

consideration stakeholders' needs. This is a worthy topic of discussion after the SAT input and the stakeholder forum. The indicated a hope to illuminate the network concept.

A SIG member stated that a majority of the SAT members are not necessarily balanced; they are very busy doing other things. There still needs to be a vetting of science in a balanced forum and this process may need to be delayed in order to get the right people. The science really needs to come out. Bob Treanor really needs to be included in all of these meetings.

At this point there was a reiteration of the purpose of this proposal. Tom Raftican wants to make sure all the questions are on the table. This workshop is expected to fill a need made apparent at the F&GC/BRTF meeting in May. The workshop would not be doing the science, but measuring science and policy. The science panel needs to be a part of this process as well as the BRTF and F&GC. The timelines are short, but the F&GC will be voting on this process in August, and that is too soon. We need to bring in a different perspective. There needs to be discussion about networks so the F&GC can vote.

### **Focus of Future Science Presentations**

There was concern over the lateness of receiving the agenda. There is a need to get questions about science addressed by the scientists. Get these questions to a working group, then to the BRTF and F&GC now.

Some members felt the SAT should not be in charge of the presentations. The presentations should be produced by a team that can flesh out what's right and fair, and can present a point-counterpoint presentation. Another member was concerned about the way the presentations will be structured. This process needs to be open and transparent. Especially with regard to financing since there will be contracting involved.

John Ugoretz commented that he realized the list of possible topics provided by the SAT for these workshop presentations came to SIG members late. He would like input on the list of topics, but urged members to give themselves time to digest the information before commenting. Any recommendations and comments can be posted to the SIG listserv. However, please do not participate in back and forth discussion with each other on the listserv as this is not a debate.

Chair Isenberg reminded SIG members that the BRTF has its own timetable based on its mandates and the F&GC schedule. The BRTF is indeed interested in hearing what the SIG members have to say.

A member expressed concern there is not enough socio-economic study in the process. There are questions on what species need to be identified. There needs to be different points of view presented. There also should be point-counterpoint discussions in order to hear dissenting scientific opinions.

A member commented the socio-economic study done for the Channel Islands process was flawed. There is concern this process will repeat those flaws.

A concern about the scientists acting as advocates was repeated.

Another member expressed concerns over the socio-economic impacts of MPAs and was disappointed that economics was not in the list of topics provided by the SAT for possible presentations. This SIG member would like to see some pro-business scientists.

**Action Item:** Members of the SIG are to take a closer look at the SAT proposed topics and then reflect on Chair Isenberg's questions. Are they the right questions and in the right order? The SIG members are asked to use the listserv for comments and recommendations with NO debate. This is to be completed no later than Friday, June 10, 2005. In addition, SIG members should include other names for potential presenters.

Chair Isenberg adjourned the call.