

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: December 21, 2007

To: Members, MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG)

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

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Staff and California Department of Fish and Game MLPA Staff

Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On December 11-12, 2007, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) participated in its sixth meeting, in Pacifica, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- NCCRSG members succeeded in arriving at four draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals, using a mixed work group and plenary (“poster session”) format. All four products will be referred to as “draft MPA proposals” and will proceed to the next round of evaluation. Two of the four draft MPA proposals reflected convergence within two of the NCCRSG work groups. The other two draft MPA proposals reflected convergence between work group draft options and revised draft external MPA arrays (“B” and “C”).
- NCCRSG members identified leads for each of the draft MPA proposals to help coordinate future work on those proposals.
- Proponents of draft external MPA proposal “A” had an opportunity to meet with all work groups and suggest ways to integrate their interests.
- MLPA Initiative staff recognized extenuating circumstances related to the San Francisco Bay oil spill and associated impacts on fishing, which proponents of draft external MPA proposal “A” said had compromised their ability to submit a revised draft proposal that responded to 1st evaluation round feedback by the December 5, 2007 due date. Draft proposal “A” proponents were given a time extension until January 2, 2008 for their next step. They may choose to either: (a) make substantial revisions to their external MPA proposal to take into account the goals of the MLPA and various forms of guidance, or (b) withdraw their draft external proposal in light of the many ideas already integrated in the four draft MPA proposals developed at the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting.
- NCCRSG members received informational briefings to inform their deliberations on draft MPA proposals. Key information presented included MLPA staff’s MLPA Goal 3 evaluation, preliminary tribal use data, preliminary results from an “exploratory” Marxan analysis, and presentations on the revised draft external MPA proposals.
- NCCRSG members established a process to address “special closures” as they relate to MPA proposals. An NCCRSG subgroup will convene on January 9, 2008 to address specific special closures identified by the work groups.
- NCCRSG members discussed and adopted a new ground rule on email communications and use of list servers (see attached).
- The NCCRSG received comments from members of the public.

I. Meeting Participants and Materials

Twenty-four NCCRSG primary members and eighteen alternate members participated in the December 11-12, 2007 meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members participating in the meeting included Sarah Allen. Meg Caldwell participated on behalf of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF).

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

Meeting materials, including copies of the PowerPoint presentations, may be found on the MLPA website at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_121107.asp

II. Key Outcomes

A. NCCRSG members worked in work group and plenary (“poster session”) formats to create four “draft MPA proposals” for the second round of evaluation

1. I-Team staff outlined a process to reduce the number of MPA arrays for the second round of evaluation.

In response to the BRTF’s request that the NCCRSG forward no more than five draft proposals for the second round of evaluation, I-Team staff outlined three main ways by which work groups could “converge”:

- Work groups could unify their “draft options for MPA arrays” (i.e., arrays A and B)
- Draft options from different work groups could be combined into a unified proposal
- Work group draft options and external MPA proposals could be combined.

In addition, the I-Team noted that the number of draft arrays could be winnowed if a proponent of an external proposal opted to treat their proposal as a source of ideas for other proposals, but not develop it as a full draft proposal.

I-Team staff indicated that if work groups were not able to converge as described above, any non-converged arrays would enter a pool along with the revised draft external MPA proposals (A, B, and C). If needed, straw voting would be used to determine which of the arrays from the pool would accompany the “converged” arrays to the next round of evaluation.

2. NCCRSG work groups achieved convergence in a variety of ways

All three “gem” work groups achieved convergence, albeit in different ways. All of the work group deliberations were informed by SAT/BRTF/DFG feedback on work group draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals, recent revisions to all of these arrays, and public comment.

- a. Emerald: The emerald work group developed a single MPA array (entitled emerald C) that was supported by the entire work group for analysis in the next round of evaluation.
- b. Jade: The jade work group divided into two subgroups, which each converged around an array. Jade draft option for MPA array A was combined with revised external proposal C (now entitled jade C), and jade draft option for MPA array B was combined with revised external proposal B (now entitled jade D). Jade work group members received approval from the authors of external proposals B and C to converge with the jade draft options.
- c. Turquoise: The turquoise work group developed a single MPA array (entitled turquoise C) that was supported by the entire work group for analysis in the next round of evaluation.

Each of these four arrays will be called a “draft MPA proposal” and assigned a new number by the I-Team for use in future evaluations.

3. NCCRSG members identified leads for each of the converged “draft MPA proposals” to help coordinate future work

Draft MPA proposal leads are as follows:

- Emerald C: Rick Johnson, Paul Pierce, Samantha Murray
- Jade C: Karen Garrison, Lance Morgan, Jim Hobbs
- Jade D: Ben Sleeter, Russell Herring
- Turquoise C: Ed Tavasieff, Sean White

Key responsibilities for the draft proposal leads may include: coordinate completion of the goals and objectives for the current round of proposals, provide quality control review of the next round of maps being developed by the I-Team, and participate in panel discussions at future SAT and BRTF meetings.

B. Draft external MPA proposal “A” given additional time for revision

NCCRSG members discussed whether draft external MPA proposal A should also be forwarded for the next round of review. Some members pointed out that, unlike the four converged proposals, draft external proposal A had not been revised since it was first submitted in early October and, as such, did not take into account recent SAT, BRTF, and DFG feedback. Others pointed out that the revision period had coincided with a very busy period for fishermen (crab especially), especially given the impacts of the San Francisco Bay oil spill. Still others noted that proponents of external proposal A had been given extensive opportunities during the December 11-12 NCCRSG meeting to present and discuss the interests and ideas reflected in draft external proposal A.

Dave Yarger, one of the authors of draft external proposal A, requested that his stakeholder constituents be given additional time to revise external proposal A so it could be analyzed along with the four “draft MPA proposals” in the next round of evaluation. He indicated that his constituents had intended to revise the proposal in advance of the December 5, 2007 cutoff date, but that they ran out of time due to the extenuating circumstances affecting the entire commercial fishing fleet in Bodega Bay.

I-Team staff deliberated on NCCRSG comments and requested that Dave Yarger meet with his constituents to either:

- Modify external proposal A significantly to respond to the goals of the MLPA and SAT and DFG feasibility guidelines. The due date for the revised external MPA proposal A would be January 2, 2008. This would leave enough time for I-Team staff to prepare the revised proposal for SAT evaluation. Unlike the draft MPA proposals described above, this proposal would be forwarded as a “revised external MPA proposal”; or
- Withdraw external proposal A, in light of the substantial integration of concepts into the other draft MPA proposals.

I-Team staff offered to provide support in the revision effort. I-Team staff also advised the authors of external proposal A to further inform their revisions by reviewing the four “draft MPA proposals” produced at the December 11-12, 2007 NCCRSG meeting and consulting with other NCCRSG members from all interest groups.

C. NCCRSG members received informational briefings to inform their deliberations on draft MPA proposals

I-Team staff provided NCCRSG members with briefings to inform NCCRSG deliberations on draft MPA proposals. Key information presented included the following:

- Staff MLPA Goal #3 evaluation (of round 1 draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals)
- Preliminary data on tribal uses (note: the maps contained only non-confidential data)
- Preliminary results of an “exploratory” Marxan analysis (note: this analysis was focused only on optimization of habitat conservation and commercial fishing goals; later analyses may include additional goals, such as commercial fishing, tribal uses, minimizing seabird and marine mammal disturbances, etc.).
- Presentation of revised draft external MPA proposals B and C. These external proposals had been revised to address feedback from recent SAT, BRTF, and DFG feasibility evaluations as well as other public input.

D. NCCRSG members established a process to address special closures

NCCRSG members discussed possible approaches for addressing the use of special closures as a supplement to MPAs. NCCRSG members agreed with I-Team staff that the best approach would be to convene a NCCRSG subgroup that would meet in person following the December 11-12, 2007 meeting. The goal of the meeting is to develop a specific suite of recommendations/options to provide to the SAT working group to analyze in time for the January 23, 2008 SAT meeting. To do this, the subgroup will look at the recommendations coming from the Sanctuary/interagency group for bird protection and other bird/mammal areas that work groups had identified in their draft arrays. The outcomes of this subgroup meeting would inform ongoing NCCRSG efforts to develop “final MPA proposals” by the end of the March 18-19, 2008 NCCRSG meeting.

The following NCCRSG members volunteered to participate in the special closures subgroup: Ed Tavasieff, Francesca Koe, Bob Wilson, Irina Kogan, Karen Reyna, John Mellor, Jay Yokomizo, Santi Roberts, Tom Baty, Tom Mattusch, and Cassidy Teufel. Note:

Two CPFV captains who are experienced in the topic will also be consulted with, and Farallon National Wildlife Refuge Manager Joelle Buffa and California Coastal Monument Manager Rick Hanks have also been invited to attend. SAT members Sarah Allen and Gerry McChesney will participate as well.

NCCRSG members offered the following additional guidance to the special closures subgroup:

- The special closures subgroup should address the feasibility and applicability of special closures at designated areas identified by the new “draft MPA proposals.”
- The subgroup should coordinate closely with the SAT working group focused on seabird and marine mammal disturbances. Potential special closures should be evaluated by the SAT for their contribution to the protection of seabird and marine mammal colonies/rookeries. The SAT will analyze the proportion of each species captured within MPAs and proposed special closures for each proposal. Proposed MPAs will be reviewed for which ones contribute to the protection of seabirds and marine mammals and those will be included in the analysis. This evaluation will be based on a subregional scale.
- The subgroup should involve other implicated agencies in the discussions (e.g., U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, CA Coastal Commission)

E. NCCRSG members adopted revised ground rules

NCCRSG members reviewed, discussed, and adopted a new ground rule on email communications. The adopted ground rule highlights the aim of keeping messages concise and related to the core charge of the NCCRSG. The full text of the adopted ground rule appears under the header “Email Communications and the Use of List Servers” in the attached revised ground rules, dated December 11, 2007 (Attachment 1).

F. Public comment

The meeting included two designated public comment periods. Over 50 members of the public attended the meeting, about 30 of whom provided comments. Key comments included the following advice to NCCRSG members:

- Several members of the public requested that the NCCRSG closely examine the possible socioeconomic impacts associated with proposed MPAs throughout the study region. Comments included:
 - The NCCRSG should consider leaving some of the area north of Anchor Bay open to fishing, as fishing is important to the economy of the area.
 - MPAs around the Farallon Islands may have a negative impact on ecotourism focused on the Islands (along with associated educational benefits). Special permits may be a way to manage impacts without restricting access.
 - NCCRSG members should consider existing restoration activities and the importance of fishing in Pescadero Creek before siting it as a no-take state marine reserve.
 - Commercial fishing is already depressed along the north central coast. Further restrictions caused by MPAs could further diminish the viability of the industry.

- NCCRSG members should consider existing preservation and restoration efforts in the MPA planning process.
- Discussions on special closures should include input from other interested organizations, such as the Audubon Society and the California Waterfowl Association.
- Logbook records from some boats show that incidental catch associated with salmon trolling has been low over the past 4-6 years.
- When considering siting MPAs near the Farallon Islands, NCCRSG members should recognize that the State's Abalone Recovery and Management Plan identifies the Farallon Islands as a possible area for reopening an experimental commercial abalone fishery.
- MPAs should not be used to address issues better dealt with through existing fishery management measures. Additionally, MPAs will not protect against water quality threats.
- NCCRSG members should consider the interests of coastal private property owners.
- There is strong local support for expanding the existing Fitzgerald Marine Reserve.
- State marine reserves are an important tool for protecting marine ecosystems.

Members of the public also recognized and expressed gratitude that some earlier public comments have been incorporated into the revised versions of external MPA proposals B and C.

G. Next NCCRSG meeting

The next NCCRSG meeting is scheduled for March 18-19, 2007. The I-Team will likely schedule work sessions in February and/or early March for NCCRSG members to: receive feedback from the upcoming round of SAT, BRTF and DFG evaluations, discuss possible revisions to the draft MPA proposals, and continue working toward convergence. Key objectives for the March meeting will be to:

- Revise the draft MPA proposals to incorporate SAT, BRTF and DFG feedback from the second round of evaluation
- Develop "final MPA proposals" to forward to the SAT, BRTF and DFG for the third and final round of review and evaluation.

III. Recap of Next Steps

A. Key next steps for NCCRSG members

1. Work group leads to further develop goals and objectives for each of the four draft MPA proposals and forward these to I-Team staff by COB, December 19, 2007.
2. Authors of draft external MPA proposal A to determine their next step, which could be either (a) submission of a substantially revised proposal to I-Team staff by January 2, 2008, or (b) withdrawal of their proposal.
3. Special closures subgroup to meet in person on January 9, 2008 from 2-4 PM to address special closure issues. This meeting will take place at the SF offices of the Gulf of the Farallons National Marine Sanctuary.

B. Key next steps for I-Team staff

1. Update the existing ground rules accordingly and transmit the revised version to NCCRSO members (see attached).
2. Work with special closures subgroup to convene an in-person meeting on January 9, 2008 from 12-4 PM. This meeting will take place at the SF offices of the Gulf of the Farallons National Marine Sanctuary.
3. Prepare the four draft MPA proposals (and the revised external proposal A, if submitted) for SAT evaluation.

C. Other upcoming meeting dates

January 8, 2008:	SAT meeting to discuss parallel processes (modeling)
January 23, 2008:	SAT meeting to evaluate current round of MPA proposals
February 4-6, 2008:	Public workshops
February 13-14, 2008:	BRTF meeting to evaluate current round of MPA proposals
March 18-19, 2008	NCCRSO meeting to develop “final MPA proposals”
April 3, 2008:	SAT meeting to evaluate “final MPA proposals”
April 22-23, 2008:	BRTF meeting to evaluate “final MPA proposals” and prepare a recommended alternative

ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Ground Rules (dated December 11, 2007)

Revised Ground Rules

North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

(Adopted by MLPA NCCRSG, May 22, 2007; Revised December 11, 2007)

The following ground rules have been informed by confidential interviews conducted with a cross section of the nominees for the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG), including nearly all of the appointed north central coast (NCC) primary members, as well as CONCUR's professional experience. These ground rules are intended to foster and reinforce constructive interaction and deliberation among NCCRSG members; they emphasize clear communication, trust building, respect for divergent views, creative thinking, collaborative problem solving, and the pursuit of mutual gains. The NCCRSG may decide to reconsider and revise these ground rules if they appear not to be serving the NCCRSG process.

Representation

- **NCCRSG recruitment and selection.** NCCRSG members have been appointed by the director of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the chair of the MLPA Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). Taken together, appointments were made to achieve a diversity of stakeholder perspectives, expertise, and geography. NCCRSG members were appointed based on their match with the following selection criteria:
 - Able to bring first hand knowledge and perspective to bear on the marine resources of the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region
 - Able to balance a north central coast 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 NCCRSG
- **Checking back with constituencies.** NCCRSG members have been recruited based upon their ability to ably represent the views of one or more important constituencies. NCCRSG members commit to: making themselves available to communicate with interested stakeholder constituents, keeping their constituencies informed of the NCCRSG's efforts, and reporting relevant feedback to the NCCRSG. In reporting back, NCCRSG members will strive to integrate the views of their constituency rather than resorting to a "lowest common denominator" portrayal. In checking back with their constituencies, NCCRSG members will seek to avoid prejudging preliminary proposals still in development by the NCCRSG.
- **Seating of primary participants.** During NCCRSG meetings, the following participants will be seated at the main table: primary NCCRSG members, the BRTF liaison, NCC Science Sub-Team members in attendance, lead MLPA Initiative and DFG staff, and project facilitators. NCCRSG alternates, other staff, and members of the public will be seated nearby.

Participation and Collaboration

- **Primary and alternate NCCRS members.**
 - Primary NCCRS members will make every effort to attend all of the NCCRS meetings. Alternate members are also strongly encouraged to attend all meetings.
 - Primary NCCRS members will work with their alternates to ensure that they are informed regarding NCCRS 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 or during meeting breaks. They are also encouraged to confer with their broader constituencies at these times.
 - Discussion at NCCRS meetings will principally involve primary NCCRS members, members of the NCC Science Sub-Team, and MLPA Initiative and DFG staff. Primary members may call upon their alternates to address issues outside of their areas of expertise. At their discretion, meeting facilitators may call upon alternate members. Alternate members are encouraged to actively participate in breakout sessions.
- **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 help keep the meetings on track.
- **Respectful interaction.** Participants will respect each other’s personal integrity, values and legitimacy of interests. Participants will avoid personal attacks and 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.
- **Mutual gains approach.** Participants will work to satisfy not only their own interests but also those of other NCCRS 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.** As a set of mutual obligations, NCCRS members will commit to adhere to these ground rules once they are ratified. NCCRS members are encouraged to help uphold and enforce these ground rules. If an NCCRS member consistently deviates from these ground rules, that member may be replaced by another person upon confirmation by the director of DFG and the chair of the BRTF.

Participation of Federal, State and Local Agencies

- Given the significant portion of the north central 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 north central coast process.

Commitment to process

- Participants will make a good faith effort to achieving the goals of the project on the schedule proposed.
- Participants will review meeting materials in advance of the meetings and come prepared to address the meeting objectives.
- 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, pagers and other electronic devices will be turned off or set to “silent” mode.

Identifying and Considering Alternative MPA Proposals

- The North Central Coast Project has been structured to allow time for developing and deliberating multiple alternative MPA proposals. This process will be an iterative one, with time allocated for SAT, BRTF and public review.
- NCCRSG members will be open to proposals from other NCCRSG members or from others outside the NCCRSG.
- As part of their work, NCCRSG members will strive to identify and consider alternative MPA proposals. NCCRSG members will consider, using best readily available science and information, how each alternative proposal satisfies the goals and objectives established for the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region. The result of this deliberation is intended to allow the BRTF, DFG, and the California Fish and Game Commission to understand how the alternative proposals identified will satisfy the Marine Life Protection Act.
- The NCCRSG 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, and also optimize efficiency.

NCCRSG Decision Rules

- NCCRSG members recognize the need to make simple process agreements to move the effort forward. NCCRSG 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.
- NCCRSG members will strive to achieve a high level of consensus (i.e., broad based agreement) in developing and advancing alternative proposals for MPAs. The intent here is to strive for MPA proposals that earn broad support across NCCRSG members’

interests, not to accord NCCRSG members a “de facto” veto on substantive issues. The objection of a few NCCRSG members will not be grounds to impede movement.

Cooperation with North Central Coast Science Sub-Team (Science Sub-Team)

- NCCRSG members will work cooperatively with the Science Sub-Team in developing options and work products. The Science Sub-Team will assist the NCCRSG by reviewing draft documents, addressing scientific issues and information provided by the NCCRSG, and helping to frame and refer policy challenges to the BRTF. At their discretion, MLPA Initiative and DFG staff may plan for joint meetings or work sessions of the SAT or Science Sub-Team and the NCCRSG.

Briefings to the BRTF

- NCCRSG members will have an opportunity to present focused briefings on the progress of MPA proposal development to the BRTF. The BRTF is expected to provide feedback on draft MPA proposals for consideration by the NCCRSG.

Multi-interest Work Teams

- DFG and MLPA Initiative staff expect that cross-interest group work teams will be an essential way to develop constructive, integrative work products during and between NCCRSG meetings. The aim of such work teams is to encourage multi-interest options and work products rather than work products put forward by a single bloc or interest group. It is anticipated that work teams will meet primarily by teleconference, although in-person meetings are encouraged.
- Work teams will be composed to include appropriate expertise and balance of interests. To the extent possible, work teams will be composed of primary representatives. When a primary representative is unavailable or lacks suitable expertise, an alternate representative may be selected to serve.

Media Contact

- NCCRSG 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.
- Media contacts regarding the project from a “big picture” perspective will be handled by MLPA Initiative and DFG staff. First contacts should go to Steve Martarano, DFG information officer at (916) 654-5866, (916) 804-1714, cell; or Melissa Miller-Henson, MLPA Initiative operations and communications manager at (916) 654-2506, cell (530) 400-2545.
- On occasion, reporters may call individual NCCRSG members for comment about a particular issue. Members who are contacted by the media will speak only on behalf of their group or constituency, or concerning the NCCRSG’s progress in the MLPA process. After commenting, please contact an MLPA communications person listed above to give them a “heads up” that a media entity is working on a story.
- NCCRSG 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 process. NCCRSG 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 their motives, or c) stating positions on preliminary proposals while they are still in development or refinement by work teams or by the NCCRSG.

- NCCRSG members will refer requests for additional contacts to MLPA and DFG staff listed above or the NCCRSG contact list. If needed, the NCCRSG may convene a multi-interest media subcommittee to work with MLPA Initiative and DFG staff to develop briefings for the media.
- In briefing constituents, NCCRSG members are encouraged to rely primarily on key outcomes memoranda to be produced for the meetings.

Public Comment

- Designated times at NCCRSG meetings will be agendized for public comment. Efforts will be made to hold public comment at consistent time slots and keyed to important NCCRSG work product discussions. At all other times of the meeting, comments and discussion will be only among NCCRSG members and alternates, Science Sub-Team members, and MLPA Initiative and DFG staff.
- To the extent possible, public comments will be directed toward the work effort, products, or process of the NCCRSG. Comments on subjects external to the MLPA should be directed to other forums.
- Members of the public are encouraged to convey their comments to relevant colleagues who serve as NCCRSG 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 NCCRSG members.
- Public comments may be limited to up to 3 minutes per individual speaker. The NCCRSG facilitation team will exercise flexibility in allocation of speaking time depending on the number of comments.
- The MLPA Initiative Team will respond as appropriate to questions and suggestions posed in public comment portions of NCCRSG meetings.

Information Sharing and Joint Fact Finding

- NCCRSG members recognize that the MLPA North Central Coast Project relies on using the best readily available information.
- MLPA Initiative and DFG staff intend to create multiple opportunities for data sharing and joint fact finding within the NCCRSG.
- NCCRSG 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 marine protected areas. NCCRSG members commit to share, and not withhold, relevant information to inform the revision of the *Regional Profile of the*

North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena to Pigeon Point, California) and the identification of candidate MPAs.

- NCCRSG 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 NCCRSG. Tentative information will be treated as such.
- In the event that two or more data sets or interpretations appear to conflict, participants will work collaboratively with members of the Science Sub-Team to narrow or clarify the basis of disagreement.

Email Communications and the Use of List Servers

- Email list servers have been created to help facilitate communication among NCCRSG members about the MLPA process and, specifically, the NCCRSG's task at hand (helping the State of California redesign the array of MPAs along the north central coast). The lists are intended primarily for asking or answering factual questions related to the MLPA Initiative, exchanging ideas about specific MPAs, requesting or providing specific studies to help inform decision-making, etc.
- NCCRSG members agree that messages to these lists should remain on point to the core charge of the NCCRSG.
- To that end, NCCSG members agree to keep messages relatively short (no more than a paragraph or two unless more is really necessary to answer a question), and include a statement of what you expect recipients to do with the information (i.e., what is your question, whose question are you answering, how could the information being provided be used in the decision-making process).
- NCCRSG members agree that messages intended for only one person, or a handful of people, be directed to those individuals and not the entire list.
- MLPA Initiative staff does not intend to moderate the list servers. Staff also recognizes that information overload is a real concern to many of the stakeholders. Staff will periodically assess use of the list servers.
- NCCRSG members agree to self-moderate use of the list servers and, when necessary, to gently remind one another of this ground rule.

Role of Facilitation Team

- The NCCRSG facilitation team is non-partisan; they have no stake in any particular set of alternative MPA proposals. They will not act as an advocate for particular outcomes. The facilitators will strive to ensure that all NCCRSG members clearly articulate their respective interests and to assist members to complete their work in a well-informed and efficient fashion.
- 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.

- The NCCRSG facilitation team will prepare key outcomes memoranda to summarize the main results of the NCCRSG meetings. These key outcomes memoranda will not strive to serve as a transcript of the meetings; rather, they will endeavor to summarize key decisions made, issues discussed, and the next steps identified for moving the project forward. The facilitators will prepare key outcomes memoranda within 7-10 days of the meetings.