

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: December 12, 2005

To: Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

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

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – December 6-7, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On December 6-7, 2005, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Monterey, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) report on Science Advisory Team (SAT) guidance, Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) review, and staff analysis on candidate Marine Protected Area (MPA) packages, 2) invite presentation and discussion on revised candidate MPA packages, 3) assess CCRSG support for respective candidate MPA packages, 4) outline the presentation for the January 29 – February 1, 2006 BRTF meeting, and 5) conclude plenary CCRSG work with thanks and appreciation.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- CCRSG members responded to BRTF request to winnow and evaluate candidate MPA packages. Specifically, the CCRSG winnowed the number of packages under their active consideration from 8 packages to 3.
- CCRSG members ranked the candidate MPA packages and listed specific revisions to improve those packages that were not their preferred ones.
- CCRSG members continued the process of seeking to increase the areas of convergence and decrease areas of divergence among remaining packages.
- CCRSG members identified “point persons” for each of the three active candidate MPA packages to assist future coordination and consultation between stakeholders and staff.
- CCRSG members received guidance from Initiative staff on how to complete their candidate MPA packages, including the development of objectives for individual MPAs, by the December 15, 2005 deadline.
- CCRSG members received a briefing on next steps in the Central Coast process.
- The CCRSG concluded its work as a formal body.

Key next steps are as follows:

- CCRSG members are to submit final candidate MPA packages, and associated objectives for individual MPAs, to Initiative staff by 8:00 AM on December 15, 2005. Materials should be sent via email to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.
- Other key next steps are indicated in section IV below.

I. Introduction and Outline

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

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Review and discussion of SAT and BRTF guidance on candidate MPA packages
 - B. Presentation of revised candidate MPA packages
 - C. Assessment of CCRSG support for the candidate MPA packages – Straw voting and interim caucusing
 - D. Designation of “point persons” for continuing correspondences and consultations
 - E. Request for submittal of final candidate MPA packages (by December 15, 2005)
 - F. Guidance on preparing final candidate MPA packages
 - G. Information to report back to the BRTF
 - H. Public comment
 - I. Closing remarks
- IV. Recap of Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

- 1) Report on SAT guidance, BRTF review, and staff analysis on candidate MPA packages
- 2) Invite presentation and discussion on revised candidate MPA packages
- 3) Assess CCRSG support for respective candidate MPA packages
- 4) Outline presentation for January BRTF meeting
- 5) Conclude plenary CCRSG work with thanks and appreciation

Forty-five CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Meg Caldwell participated on behalf of the BRTF. Rick Starr, Dean Wendt, Mary Yoklavich, and Mark Carr participated as SAT members.

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

III. Key Outcomes

A. Review and discussion of SAT and BRTF guidance on candidate MPA packages

Initiative staff and SAT members summarized the results of the SAT and BRTF reviews of candidate MPA packages (versions submitted by November 18, 2005). This included 5 packages advanced by CCRSG members and 3 packages produced by external stakeholders.

1. SAT review

Dr. Rick Starr (SAT member) reviewed the SAT's preliminary evaluation of the candidate MPA packages. The SAT's analysis focused on the biological and ecological dimensions of the packages and included evaluations of MPA size and spacing and habitat coverage. Dr. Starr also discussed the implications of habitat availability and existing data gaps on the analysis.

Dr. Starr emphasized that this analysis was an important first step in an ongoing scientific review process. Additional SAT review will follow completion of final CCRSG candidate MPA packages on December 15, 2005. [See section IV below for other next steps.]

CCRSG members requested that improved information be provided as soon as possible on the location of hard bottom habitat in the southern portion of the central coast study region. Some members noted that this information may most easily be derived by analyzing commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV) data or talking with local fishermen who fish in that area.

2. BRTF guidance

John Kirlin and Scott McCreary (Initiative staff) discussed some of the outcomes of the November 29-30, 2005 BRTF meeting. While the BTRF did not pass any formal motions regarding revision of the candidate MPA packages, Task Force members offered several pieces of advice and guidance in their deliberations.

- BRTF members encouraged CCRSG members, in revising their packages, to give considerable weight to the advice of the SAT.
- BRTF members urged candidate MPA package proponents to look seriously at areas of overlap and work to develop more unified approaches for some geographic areas.
- BRTF members urged package proponents to reduce the number of geographic areas for which alternate packages contain competing proposals.
- BRTF members expressed a preference to see the CCRSG advance a bounded number of packages (closer to 3 or 4 rather than 7 or 8) to the BRTF at its January 31 – February 1, 2006 meeting.

- BRTF members expressed the view that the CCRSG has a strong incentive to keep working and move closer to a convergence at its December meeting. After the December CCRSG meeting, the focus of policy advising and consultation will shift more to the BRTF, the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), and the Fish and Game Commission.
- BRTF members recognized that the MLPA process is dynamic and ongoing. They expressed interest to know the relative support for the respective candidate MPA packages as they stand at the December CCRSG meeting.
- As well, BRTF members expressed interest in learning about the distribution of support for different MPA packages. That is, they were interested in knowing not just CCRSG members' first choices but their second and third choices as well.

3. Areas of strong convergence among candidate MPA packages

Initiative staff listed areas of strong overlap among the candidate MPA packages (versions submitted November 18, 2005). These occurred in the following candidate MPAs:

- Ano Nuevo intertidal State Marine Reserve (SMR)
- Sandhill Bluff/Natural Bridges Intertidal SMR
- Elkhorn Slough and Morro Cojo Slough SMR
- Pacific Grove Intertidal SMR
- Soquel Canyon State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA)
- Carmel Pinnacles SMR
- Point Lobos Nearshore SMR and off-shore SMCA
- Cambria SMP and SMCA
- Morro Bay SMCA

Key issues to resolve include specific MPA boundaries, allowable take in SMCAs, and “no take” components in some SMCAs.

B. Initial presentation of revised candidate MPA packages

Proponents of candidate MPA packages #1, #2, and #3 presented revisions to their packages and described how these revisions addressed SAT comments and recommendations. Initiative staff provided CCRSG members with summaries of the updated packages (Handout #2).

Key features of the updated packages included the following:

- Package 1 included two variants on the configuration of an MPA in the Julia Pfeiffer Burns area (option 1 and 1b), with identical outer boundaries. Package 1 proponents asked to carry both variants forward and seek the advice of the SAT before selecting between them.
- Package 2 and 2b were identical except for the boundaries and use restrictions in MPAs in the Monterey Peninsula area. Revisions to package 2 only concerned MPAs outside of the Monterey Peninsula area. (Note: a unified package 2 was announced on Day 2 that included a revision on the Monterey Peninsula.)

- Package 3 had received the most revisions since the November meeting. Package 3 revisions were informed by general SAT guidance as well as SAT package-specific comments provided for the other packages.
- Packages 4, A, B, and C had received no revisions since the SAT review.

CCRSG members reiterated their intentions to continue revising their packages to meet future SAT guidance.

C. Assessment of CCRSG support for the candidate MPA packages – Straw voting and interim caucusing

1. Purpose of straw voting

Initiative staff led CCRSG members through a series of straw votes. Only primary CCRSG members, or their designated alternates, participated in the voting. The primary purpose of the straw voting was to:

- Respond to BRTF guidance
- Winnow the number of packages to a more manageable number that best reflects regional goals and objectives, design and implementation considerations, and CCRSG interests
- Create an opportunity for CCRSG members to express relative preferences on an array of evolving packages (for this particular moment in time)
- Provide an opportunity for CCRSG members to reflect on potential revisions that could make specific packages more acceptable

2. Structure and organization of straw voting (including interim caucusing)

The straw voting proceeded in three rounds plus an interim caucus period:

a. Round 1 straw voting

The purpose of round 1 (Day 1) was to winnow the number of packages to be moved on to round 2 and ultimately forwarded to the BRTF. Participants voted on the versions of the packages presented earlier on Day 1.

b. Round 2 straw voting

The purpose of round 2 (Day 1) was to rank the packages as a means of encouraging further convergence among the packages and informing future possible revisions.

c. Interim caucus period

Round 2 was followed by a caucus period that extended from late afternoon on Day 1 through lunch on Day 2. CCRSG members were invited to meet both within and across interest groups to discuss possible refinements to the candidate MPA packages and to look for ways to narrow areas of divergence.

Key outcomes of the caucus period include the following:

- Proponents of package 1 developed a list of possible future revisions based on discussions with proponents of package 3.
- Proponents of packages 2 and 2b consolidated their packages into a single revised “package 2” with a new MPA complex in the Monterey Peninsula area.
- Proponents of package 3 indicated their intent to revise their package based on discussions with proponents of packages 1 and 2.

d. Round 3 straw voting

The purpose of round 3 (Day 2) was to: 1) rank the current packages in terms of preference, 2) score the current packages in terms of level of acceptability, and 3) provide CCRSG members with the opportunity, for each candidate MPA package that was not their preferred package, to identify up to three critical changes to specific MPAs that would make the package more acceptable.

CCRSG primary members who did not participate in a particular straw vote, and whose alternates did not participate in their stead, are invited to convey their views on the issues addressed in round 3 of the straw voting to Initiative staff (at MLPAcomments@resource.ca.gov). Staff will forward these comments, along with the straw voting results, to the BRTF. Note: unlike the straw voting results, these supplemental comments will not be confidential.

3. Results of straw voting

a. Round 1 Straw Vote (Day 1)

In Round 1, participants were asked to indicate their single-most preferred package. The results of round 1 are shown below. Packages needed to receive at least 3 votes (approximately 10% of the CCRSG primary members) to move on to the next round.

Package	Received more 3 or more votes
CCRSG package #1 – 1b	yes
CCRSG package #2	yes
CCRSG package #2b	yes
CCRSG package #3	yes
CCRSG package #4	no
External package A	no
External package B	no
External package C	no

Five CCRSG members were absent or chose to abstain on this straw voting round.

b. Round 2 (Day 1)

In Round 2, participants were asked to rank the four packages that moved on from round 1 (packages 1, 2, 2b, and 3). Participants were invited to designate up to one package as “unacceptable” (marked with a “U”). The results of round 2 are shown below.

Package	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Number of Unacceptable rankings
CCRSG package #1 – 1b	13	2	1	11	9
CCRSG package #2	5	6	14	2	2
CCRSG package #2b	4	5	4	14	12
CCRSG package #3	5	14	8	0	0

Five CCRSG members were absent or chose to abstain on this straw voting round.

Initiative staff presented this summary and asked the CCRSG to use the results of this voting to inform their caucusing during the late afternoon and evening of Day 1 and morning of day 2.

c. Round 3 (Day 2)

Prior to round 3, CCRSG members reported back on the results of the caucusing. The only change to the packages was that package 2 and 2b had been consolidated into a new “package 2.”

In round 3, participants were asked to do the following:

- 1) Rank order their preferences for all of the current packages (1 = first choice, 2 = second choice, 3 = third choice)
- 2) Score each the three current packages in terms of level of acceptability (A = acceptable, B = needs minor changes, C = needs moderate changes, D = needs major changes)
- 3) For each candidate MPA package that was not their preferred package, identify up to three critical changes to specific MPAs that would make the package more acceptable

The quantitative results of round 3 are as follows:

Package	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	No. of A's	No. of B's	No. of C's	No. of D's
Package 1	15	2	10	12	4	1	10
Package 2	10	1	16	9	1	3	14
Package 3	2	24	1	2	4	15	6

Five CCRSG members were absent or chose to abstain on this straw voting round.

Staff committed to compile the comments made regarding improvements to specific MPAs and forward these to CCRSG members within the next 2 days.

D. Designation of “point persons” for continuing correspondence and consultations

The following individuals were designated as “point persons” for packages 1-3 respectively:

- Package 1: Steve Scheiblauser and Howard Egan
- Package 2: Kaitilin Gaffney and Ron Massengill
- Package 3: John Pearse and Michelle Knight

E. Request for submittal of final candidate MPA packages (by 8:00 AM December 15, 2005)

Initiative staff invited CCRSG members to make additional revisions to their candidate MPA packages and to inform them with BRTF guidance, SAT guidance, CCRSG caucusing, and the straw voting results from the December CCRSG meeting. Initiative staff reconfirmed the deadline as 8:00 AM on December 15, 2005 for submittal of final candidate MPA packages. Final packages should be emailed to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.

F. Guidance on preparing final candidate MPA packages

1. General guidance on formulating regulations for MPAs

John Ugoretz (DFG staff) provided guidance to help package proponents refine potential restrictions for MPAs along the central coast. In particular, John provided guidance for establishing consistency of language and structure across packages.

2. Guidance on developing objectives for individual MPAs

Paul Reilly (DFG staff) presented guidance for preparing the objectives for individual MPAs in the packages being carried forward in the MLPA process. Paul presented the following guidance for assuring internal consistency within an MPA objective package:

- Link each MPA objective to a regional goal and objective using a letter and number symbol, e.g. G1O1 = regional goal 1, regional objective 1.
- To the extent possible, use the corresponding language in the linked regional objective for an MPA objective, with modifications as appropriate.
- Ensure that any habitats specifically identified in an MPA objective do in fact occur within the MPA.
- Ensure that any species likely to benefit that are identified in an MPA do in fact occur within the MPA. Consult with staff, SAT, fishermen, or divers, for advice.

Paul reiterated that staff is available to provide additional assistance upon request.

Final objectives for individual MPAs are due on December 15, 2005, along with final versions of candidate MPA packages. Staff will then review the MPA objectives for internal consistency, accuracy, and appropriateness, will provide suggested revisions, and will return them to the package contact designee for review. Staff will also provide the packages of MPA objectives to the SAT for their review.

G. Information to report back to the BRTF

CCRSG members recommended that the report back to the BRTF for its January 2006 meeting include the following information:

- Review the entire process by which CCRSG members developed the candidate MPA packages.
- Describe the process by which CCRSG assessment of the candidate MPA packages (i.e., the straw voting) took place. Be explicit about the version of each package that was the subject of each respective round of straw voting.
- Report that CCRSG members have indicated their willingness to make additional changes to increase convergence of the candidate MPA packages and to meet SAT guidance.
- Emphasize that all of the candidate packages, regardless of the sponsors, are the results of intense negotiations among constituencies and across all of the interest groups represented at the CCRSG.
- Recognize that all of the candidate MPA packages are very different from the “wish lists” that stakeholders might have had in mind at the onset of the CCRSG process. As such, they reflect many discussions and compromises.
- Acknowledge the immense amount of learning that has taken place during the MLPA process for all CCRSG members.

H. Public comment

Eight members of the public provided comments. In general, they offered support for specific candidate MPA packages.

I. Closing remarks

Several CCRSG members and Initiative staff make closing remarks. Among the recurring themes were; the high quality of engagement, the quality of discourse, and the level and professionalism of the work products and process. John Kirlin (Initiative staff) specifically praised the CCRSG's contributions to public democracy. Scott McCreary complimented the CCRSG on their willingness to educate each other about their respective interests, their hard work and willingness to work with the aggressive timeline, their willingness to reach across traditional interest “boundaries”, and their capacity for reflection.

John Kirlin noted that the MLPA Initiative will engage in a robust “Lessons Learned” effort, and expects to be in touch with CCRSG members in the coming months to reflect on the CCRSG process and outcomes.

John Kirlin and Michael DeLapa (Initiative staff) then presented certificates of participation, signed by Mike Chrisman (Secretary, California Resources Agency), Ryan Broddrick (Director, California Department of Fish and Game), and Phil Isenberg (Chair, Blue Ribbon Task Force). The certificates thanked each primary member and alternate for their tremendous dedication and invaluable service in helping the State of California implement the Marine Life Protection Act along the central coast.

IV. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for CCRSG members

- CCRSG members to submit final candidate MPA packages, and associated objectives for individual MPAs, to Initiative staff by 8:00 AM on December 15, 2005. Send via email to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov.
- Package proponents will be given the opportunity to revise their packages following the January 31 - February 1, 2006 BRTF meeting.
- Key opportunities for CCRSG members to continue providing input in the MLPA process include:
 - Send written comments to MLPAcomments@resources.ca.gov
 - Provide public comment at January and March BRTF meetings
 - Provide public comment at Fish and Game Commission hearings

B. Other next steps

1. Immediate

- Staff to compile the straw voting round 3 comments made regarding improvements to specific MPAs by December 9, 2005.

2. December 2005

- Staff to post final candidate MPA packages to website for review (mid-late December)
- Staff and SAT to analyze candidate MPA packages (late December/early January)

3. January-February, 2006

- SAT to meet January 20, 2006 to review final packages
- Staff to incorporate SAT evaluations into its analyses and post information to the MLPA website (late January)
- BRTF to meet January 31 – February 1, 2006 to consider packages and evaluations, and hear public comment
- Staff to post BRTF guidance to MLPA website and invite public comment (early February)

- As directed by BRTF, staff to work with stakeholders and SAT to refine candidate MPA packages (February)

4. March 2006

- SAT to meet March 2, 2006 for further evaluations
- Staff to incorporate SAT evaluations, public comment, and other information into options for BRTF action (early March)
- BRTF to meet March 14-15, 2006 to make its recommendation to DFG
- Staff to post BRTF decision to MLPA website (mid/late March)

5. April 2006 and thereafter

- DFG to consider recommendation from BRTF, make a decision on a preferred alternative, and forward a recommendation to the Fish and Game Commission (May 2006). [Note: All packages that have been considered throughout the MLPA process (internal to the CCRSG as well as external) will be forwarded to the Fish and Game Commission for consideration.]
- DFG to begin CEQA analysis (May 2006)
- Fish and Game Commission to receive the DFG recommendation and begin public hearings
- Fish and Game Commission to take action as early as late 2006

6. Other next steps

- Staff to follow up with selected CCRSG members to discuss “lessons learned” from the CCRSG process.