

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**DRAFT
June 26, 2003
The Beach Resort
Monterey, CA**

The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Advisory Council met on Thursday, June 26 and Friday, June 27, 2003, at the Monterey Beach Resort, California. Public categories and government agencies were present as indicated:

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Agriculture: Richard Nutter | CA State Parks: Dave Vincent |
| AMBAG: Stephanie Harlan | Conservation: Vicki Nichols |
| At Large: Ron Massengill-ABSENT | Diving: Frank Degnan |
| At Large: Mike Laffen | Education: Pat Clark-Gray |
| At Large: Deborah Streeter | Fishing: Thomas Canale |
| Business & Industry: Dave Ebert-ABSENT | Ports & Harbors: Peter Grenell |
| CA Coastal Commission: Charles Lester | Recreation: Dan Haifley |
| CA Dept. of Fish and Game: Paul Reilly | Research: Chris Harrold |
| CA EPA: Craig J. Wilson-ABSENT | Tourism: Ted Balestreri |
| CA Resources Agency: Brian Baird | U.S. Coast Guard: LT Tom Stuhlreyer |

The following non-voting members were present as indicated:

Channel Islands NMS: Chris Mobley-ABSENT
Gulf of the Farallones NMS: Ed Ueber-ABSENT
Cordell Bank NMS: Dan Howard-ABSENT
Elkhorn Slough NERR: Becky Christensen-ABSENT
Monterey Bay NMS: William J. Douros

Alternates present:

Michael Bekker-Tourism
Kaitilin Gaffney-Conservation
Heidi Tiura-Recreation
Ruth Vreeland-AMBAG
Dave Danbom-Fishing
Meg Delano-At-Large

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, SWEAR-IN OF NEW MEMBERS

SWEAR-IN OF NEW MEMBERS

Bill Douros swore in the two new numbers, Dave Vincent, CA State Parks, and Michael Bekker, Tourism alternate. Both members gave a brief account of the work they do and how that relates to their position on the council.

APPROVAL OF 4/4/03 DRAFT MEETING NOTES

MOTION: (Passed)

The SAC adopted the minutes from the April 4, 2002 Sanctuary Advisory Council meeting, with the following changes:

- page 5 first bullet change legislative to legislation.
- page 5 first bullet change report to congressionally required report on future approaches to national ocean policy
- page 3 Section III: Operation of Standing Working Groups: strike the word shall
- page 5, second paragraph, line 3 change Pacific Fisheries Management Council to Pacific Fishery Management Council
- page 5, second paragraph, line 5 change sentence to read as follows, "Assembly bill 1296 would ban harvesting and fishing permanently and would apply to waters 200 miles out from shore."
- page 6, section IX, last sentence change trapping to trawling
- page 3, first paragraph, last sentence change than to then

Motion introduced by Dan Haifley, seconded by Charles Lester
(Vote: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions (unanimous))

PUBLIC COMMENTS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Public comment consisted of: 1) a resident of Aptos expressing his concern about the possible placement of a MBNMS Visitor Center at Seacliff State Beach; 2) a member of the CWG and the Desalination working group expressing satisfaction about his involvement in the JMPR process; and 3) a board member of the Coastal Watershed Council commenting that there are a number of volunteer water quality monitoring opportunities available.

Bill Douros informed the SAC of the new policy regarding food for the SAC meetings. Unfortunately the MBNMS will no longer be permitted to pay for SAC members unless they are on travel.

II. JOINT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW

Sean spoke about the purpose of the upcoming meetings and what is expected of the SAC members. He also reminded them of the decision making process that they agreed upon at the December 2002 meeting.

SAC member Brian Baird expressed a concern that almost every action plan envisions the participation of state agencies in some way. Staffing these action plans maybe an issue. Brian indicated that a letter from the state with comments on the JMPR may be forthcoming. Bill reminded those commenting that these are action plans proposed by the working groups, not the sanctuary. Any letter written should be addressed to the SAC not the MBNMS.

It was decided that the staff would post any letters on the proposed action plans from constituents on the website and send reminders out to the SAC to view them before the meeting. The SAC agreed that for the public comment workshop on July 30th they would stay as late as midnight, if need be, to hear all comments. The SAC agreed that no public comments would be taken on July 31st or August 1st.

The proposed action plans discussed below are available at the following address
<http://sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/jointplan/reptoad.html>.

III. WILDLIFE DISTURBANCE ACTION PLAN PRESENTATIONS

- MOTORIZED PERSONAL WATERCRAFT

Scott Kathey gave a brief presentation on the Motorized Personal Watercraft proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO MPWC'S

The SAC had several questions and comments regarding motorized personal watercraft. Some of the issues raised included: whether the work group was planning on keeping the zones the way they are currently and changing the definition of motorized personal watercraft or whether there might be a change in the zones; a charge that consensus could not be reached due to the ground rules set up by MBNMS staff; whether there was going to be a ban on tow-in surfing at Mavericks; whether or not the working group had discussed establishing a special use permitting policy; what national marine sanctuaries had already banned MPWC's and why; whether there is a marine mammal haul-out or rookery at Fitzgerald; whether enforcement, training and search and rescue are exceptions for use of MPWC's; and are the areas where the working group reached close consensus a part of the action plan.

Staff responses included: if the MBNMS was to change the definition of MPWC than all of the craft would be required to use the into zones; while exceptions would have to be made for other uses of MPWC such as emergency response; modification of the current zones was not considered because the current zones are in areas where impacts to marine mammals, seabirds and turtles can be avoided; if a special use permitting policy was used at Mavericks there would only be a certain amount of permits issued; the Gulf of the Farallones NMS has banned all MPWC because they were concerned with wildlife disturbance; there is a harbor seal rookery immediately next to Mavericks; search and rescue activities do have a legitimate use for MPWC, but there is no need to use MPWC in enforcement because it can be done with other vessels; the action plans contain consensus actions, as well as actions that the group came close to reaching consensus on.

- TIDEPOOLS

Holly Price gave a brief presentation on the Tidepools proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO TIDEPOOLS

Issues raised by the SAC included a suggestion that the title of the action plan be changed from Tidepools to Rocky Intertidal since this is the area that is really being discussed.

Staff responses included: a decision by the working group to go with the title of tidepools because that is a word that the general public understands. A definition is footnoted in the draft action plan indicating that the plan applies to all rocky intertidal areas.

- MARINE MAMMALS, SEABIRDS, TURTLES

Deirdre Hall gave a brief presentation on the Marine Mammal, Seabird, and Turtle Disturbance proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO MARINE MAMMALS, SEABIRDS, TURTLES

Issues raised by the SAC included: a question about how the sanctuary is going to enforce wildlife disturbance laws if there is only one enforcement officer; what is the height restriction

for aircraft within the sanctuary; and why there was not a representative from the commercial fishing industry on this working group.

Staff responses included: an indication that outreach materials will be developed that can be handed out to customers on commercial boats so that they are aware of wildlife disturbance issues and how they can help; a note that the MBNMS will look into possible joint funding of enforcement with state and federal agencies; a statement that there are four zones within the sanctuary where aircraft are restricted to fly below 1000 feet. It was also noted that there is some discrepancy between the sanctuaries regulation and aeronautical charts. Staff also indicated that a commercial fisherman was not suggested for the working group because fishery interactions were not anticipated to be an issue. As a result of this working group, staff did have a meeting with fishermen and agreed that a lot of education needs to be done.

12:30-1:15 LUNCH

IV. COASTAL DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN PRESENTATIONS

- HARBORS & DREDGE DISPOSAL

Deirdre Hall gave a brief presentation on the Harbors & Dredge Disposal proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO HARBORS & DREDGE DISPOSAL

Issues raised by the SAC included: a question about whether in Dredging, Activity 5.1, Beneficial uses, there was a discussion about cost associated with that versus beach nourishment or offshore disposal; a comment that there is a practical linkage between harbors and the MBNMS in dredge disposal and coastal armoring action plans and that this linkage needs to be better articulated in this action plan. There were also general concerns expressed about the tone of the document regarding regulation, and a question regarding the scope of the sediment reduction strategy.

Staff responses included: an indication that the working group discussed that the least expensive form of disposal may be to deposit it into the MBNMS, but that there was an interest in looking at other ways to dispose of the dredged material; a note that there are existing approved beach disposal sites and that the plan outlines consideration of a new beach site at Pillar Point; and an indication that the working group primarily looked at sediment reduction via linking with on-going efforts of the MBNMS agricultural and urban runoff plans.

- DESALINATION

Brad Damitz gave a brief presentation on the Desalination proposed action plan

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO DESALINATION

Issues raised by the SAC included: a comment that growth issues associated with desalination are too far reaching an issue for the MBNMS to take on.

Staff responses included: an indication that the sanctuary's concerns are with the water quality impacts of the discharge and damage to marine life from the intake. MBNMS is also concerned with potential effects on the Sanctuary from increased growth, such as more urban runoff, additional coastal armoring, etc, but recognized in the plan that considering the potential

growth-inducing factor of desalination is an effort which should be lead by local government and the Coastal Commission which have direct jurisdiction on this issue, with the Sanctuary participating to share its perspective.

- COASTAL ARMORING

Brad Damitz gave a brief presentation on the Coastal Armoring proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO COASTAL ARMORING

Issues raised by the SAC included: questions about how staff will reduce the need for emergency permits and how many permits a year are being issued for coastal armoring. A comment was also made that the document should better clarify who is the lead on certain issues.

Staff responses included: an indication that staff will approach reducing emergency permits by working with other agencies to look at an early stage at stretches of the coast which are likely sites of future armoring requests. It was also stated that the MBNMS does not currently receive information on all of the coastal armoring that is occurring. The MBNMS works closely with the California Coastal Commission, who looks at far more permits than the MBNMS does. There will continue to be a joint effort between the sanctuary and many other agencies to streamline and strengthen the process and improve preventive measures.

- SUBMERGED CABLES

Jenny Hauser gave a brief presentation on the Submerged Cables proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO SUBMERGED CABLES

Issues raised by the SAC included: questions about what stored cables are; if the elements that the SAC agreed upon a few years ago were incorporated into this plan, and what is the specific life of a cable and how does the special use permit apply.

Staff responses included: an indication that cables are built to be under water, so replacement pieces have to be stored under water so they don't get damaged. When they are needed, they are picked up from the ocean floor with a grappling hook or a submersible. A comment was also made that there is an effort under way to evaluate what would be the fair market value of the seabed related to the issuance of a special use permit. Staff agreed to check to make sure that the elements that the SAC had brought up years ago were included in the action plan.

V. BIG SUR COASTAL ECOSYSTEM COORDINATION ACTION PLAN PRESENTATION

Sean Morton gave a brief presentation on the Big Sur Ecosystem Coordination proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS

Issues raised by the SAC included: a concern that landslides be a substantive issue in the management plan, and that it be clear what exactly is excess offshore landslide debris, and what exactly happens to landslides today.

Staff responses included: an indication that staff will continue to work with Caltrans on the coastal highway plan and that another main priority is a plan to deal with oil spills off Big Sur because of its location and lack of resources. Staff indicated that offshore landslide debris is debris that comes off the roadside, traditionally it was overcast into the ocean. There are also roads that have given out and need to be rebuilt versus a natural occurrence of a landslide. If it was exacerbated by blasting done by Caltrans then we have previously ask them to truck that out. Currently, it is against the regulations to dump within the Sanctuary's boundaries. MBNMS has a grant to identify areas of the coast which are highly sensitive to landslide damage and other areas where the organisms may be adapted to slides, to help guide future decisions re landslide disposal locations which could be addressed via permit authorizations.

VI. OPERATIONS/ADMINISTRATION ACTION PLAN PRESENTATION

Jenny Hauser gave a brief presentation on the Operations/Administration proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS

Issues raised by the SAC included: a question regarding what would be the use of the new boat and the airplane, and why the MBNMS needs their own plane. A question was also raised about whether it would be beneficial to partner with other organizations to fund or co fund volunteer programs and if the goal is to create new volunteer programs or to maintain the current ones.

Staff responses included: an indication that a boat and airplane would be used for education and outreach, monitoring, research, and enforcement; most of the time the MBNMS needs a plane on a moment's notice, the plane the MBNMS currently uses is kept in Santa Barbara. NOAA has it's own light aircraft program, but the MBNMS has to demonstrate a need to use a charter service instead of the program. Regarding volunteer programs, the goal of the staff is to try and get all the existing programs under the umbrella of TEAM Ocean so that we could pool resources and money at the same time.

VII. INTERPRETIVE FACILITIES ACTION PLAN PRESENTATION

Dawn Hayes gave a brief presentation on the Interpretive Facilities proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS

Issues raised by the SAC included: a question about the average cost is to produce and install a sign, and whether the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail is connected with the Coastal Trail. A comment was also made that staff should produce an hour-long film about the sanctuary to give to public access television and ask them to run it.

Staff responses included: an indication that it costs \$1000-\$1500 for a small sized sign with no installation. Staff is currently looking at another type of sign that would be more cost effective. Once the Coastal Commission's coastal trail is further developed, the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail will be the Central California portion of that trail. The sanctuary looks to be involved once they are ready for interpretative signs to go up. Bill also indicated that they recently traveled to Mystic, Connecticut to view the Monterey Bay telepresence. From what he could see it seems to have outstanding potential. People are eager to get that kind of technology in their area.

VIII. MERITO ACTION PLAN PRESENTATION

Michelle Templeton gave a brief presentation on the MERITO proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS

Issues raised by the SAC included: a comment that it is hard to find qualified staff to educate the public who are bilingual, and a question regarding linking with the agricultural community.

Staff responses included: staff agreed that there is a great need for bilingual educators and that the NOAA diversity council is trying to get more Hispanics to continue their education. Internships can be a great tool. Staff has done some work with farmworkers via adult education programs, but is open to other avenues with the agricultural community.

4:30-6:30 DINNER BREAK

IX. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

X. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE PRESENTATIONS

Julie Barrow gave brief presentations on Community Outreach, Ecosystem Monitoring and Maritime Heritage.

- COMMUNITY OUTREACH

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Issues raised by the SAC included: a question about whether the working group has identified specific materials that can be used when sharing resources with each site, whether the staff has any plans for public opinion surveys to see what the public knows, and how Team OCEAN will be expanded.

Staff responses included: the working group looked at sharing education efforts that are currently underway. LiMPETS is a good example of sharing between the three sites, the working group looked at specific target audiences that we have worked with less often. Needs assessments will be conducted as we implement the action plan, and hopefully next year we will expand Team OCEAN into Santa Cruz and possibly in Cambria sometime in the future. The Gulf of the Farallones has the Seals program that also has kayakers to caution people on marine mammal disturbances. Hopefully we can will meet in the middle and expand out further.

- ECOSYSTEM MONITORING

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO ECOSYSTEM MONITORING

Issues raised by the SAC included: questions about how research needs relating to fisheries were dealt with in this group, what staff can do to help expand, or utilize the CALCOFI program.

Staff responses included: an indication that the monitoring efforts here can be linked with the recommendations of the working group which was focused on finding ways the sanctuary and the fishing community can work together better on joint programs. The only one the group dealt with directly regarding fish was CALCOFI, in an effort to expand CALCOFI, MBNMS sits on a small working group similar to CALCOFI called PACOS. They run research cruises with CALCOFI lines. Through SIMoN we will be analyzing historical CALCOFI data for this region.

- MARITIME HERITAGE**SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO MARITIME HERITAGE**

Issues raised by the SAC included: questions about what the thought process was behind the last sentence under strategy five, would practices that were not sustainable not be highlighted in the action plan; of the 430 wrecks mentioned in the plan, how many are documented and how many are airplanes; what are the criteria to become a historical shipwreck; can any of these shipwrecks be an environmental threat; and can links between past heritage and the present be included as an important part of the action plan. Questions also arose whether part of this plan gets to the question of all the different kinds of commerce, legal or illegal, does this include all the different kinds of commercial shipping whether they sunk or not, what does the group mean by traditional users, what would be excluded from that group by using the word traditional; when talking about sites, once you identify what is in those wrecks how do you protect and educate what you found.

Staff responses included: a statement that in regards to clarification of the last sentence in strategy five, the working group wanted to acknowledge the history that all these groups have with respect to the ocean, but did not want to be seen as supporting a particular activity that may have had significant impacts, the language of the action plan was trying to get at today's activities, not those that were unsustainable in the past. All 430 wrecks are documented, but not all of the locations are known. Very few of the wrecks are aircraft, in order for a wreck to be a historical wreck it has to be older than 50 years or be the first one of something. It is possible for any of these shipwrecks to be an environmental threat. Under strategy five from a historical perspective, it is trying to address all different kinds of commerce whether they were legal or not; with traditional users, the group was trying to capture those who have had long standing relationships with the ocean i.e. surfing and fishing. There may be some sites that you may not want to make known because of their rich historic values or a delicate state that you don't want recreational divers down there. Mainly the best way would be to talk to all of the dive shops and dive magazines and let them know that these sites are there and we want to enjoy them and leave them for the next person.

XI. ADJOURN

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**DRAFT
June 27, 2003
The Beach Resort
Monterey, CA**

The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Advisory Council met on Thursday, June 26 and Friday, June 27, 2003, at the Beach Resort, California. Public categories and government agencies were present as indicated:

| | |
|--|--|
| Agriculture: Richard Nutter | CA State Parks: Dave Vincent |
| AMBAG: Stephanie Harlan | Conservation: Vicki Nichols |
| At Large: Ron Massengill | Diving: Frank Degnan |
| At Large: Mike Laffen | Education: Pat Clark-Gray |
| At Large: Deborah Streeter | Fishing: Thomas Canale |
| Business & Industry: Dave Ebert-ABSENT | Ports & Harbors: Peter Grenell |
| CA Coastal Commission: Charles Lester | Recreation: Dan Haifley |
| CA Dept. of Fish and Game: Paul Reilly | Research: Chris Harrold |
| CA EPA: Craig J. Wilson-ABSENT | Tourism: Ted Balestreri |
| CA Resources Agency: Brian Baird | U.S. Coast Guard: LT Tom Stuhlreyer- ABSENT |

The following non-voting members were present as indicated:

Channel Islands NMS: Chris Mobley-ABSENT
Gulf of the Farallones NMS: Ed Ueber-ABSENT
Cordell Bank NMS: Dan Howard-ABSENT
Elkhorn Slough NERR: Becky Christensen-ABSENT
Monterey Bay NMS: William J. Douros

Alternates present:

Tami Grove-CA Coastal Commission
Michael Bekker-Tourism
Kaitilin Gaffney-Conservation
Meg Delano-Citizen At-Large
Dave Danbom-Fishing
Ruth Vreeland-AMBAG
Heidi Tiura-Recreation

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

II. WATER QUALITY PROGRAM ACTION PLAN PRESENTATIONS

- WQPP IMPLEMENTATION

Chris Coburn gave a brief presentation on the WQPP Implementation proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO WQPP IMPLEMENTATION

Issues raised by the SAC included: it was requested that staff not forget partners within local government, what will long-term funding sources be from NOAA; it was commented that the

sanctuary will ever be able to get off the grant treadmill. Staff might want to look at more grant funding and follow what the Florida Keys NMS model has been for funding.

Staff responses included: Noted throughout this action plan are partnerships with cities and counties; congressional allocation would be nice for long-term funding, but we would also like to incorporate language that reflects our documents and our programs in RFP's so it encourages people to work with us on the program; the sanctuary will definitely not stop seeking grant funding, but would like to see more stable funding; we would like to use the model of the Florida Keys NMS, we have been successful in raising funds with the agriculture plan, in collaboration with the industry. Bill added that with the Florida Keys the Ocean Conservancy and the state were the two organizations that went to the federal government to get the funding for the water quality plan.

- BEACH CLOSURES

Chris Coburn gave a brief presentation on the Beach Closures proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO BEACH CLOSURES

Issues raised by the SAC included: a question of how will the notification of beach closures be received by out of county visitors; what part of the problem is marine life and birds in terms of contamination; how do chemicals that have not been tested play a role in water quality and beach closures.

Staff responses included: MBNMS would raise awareness of existing systems used to notify public of beach closures. We could potentially expand the program to include notices to dive shops; along with many human sources, we think that birds are the significant contributor of contamination in some areas of Santa Cruz and in Monterey it may be marine mammals. The answer to that really needs to still be determined. There are methods out there to determine the source of contamination; with beach closures, we are looking beyond monitoring traditional chemicals. The issue of new types of chemicals is also flagged under emerging issues as well.

- CRUISE SHIPS

Brad Damitz gave a brief presentation on the Cruise Ships proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO CRUISE SHIPS

Issues raised by the SAC included: it was commented that education would play a very large role with cruise ships; have education staff, or volunteers get on the boat and talk to the passengers as well as give presentations; staff could possibly look into putting a video/commercial on the ships televisions; is there no solid waste allowed within sanctuary boundaries; is dumping of garbage allowed; after the sewage is treated and the sludge is separated, what happens to the sludge;

Staff responses included: Dawn Hayes informed the SAC that she was approached by Crystal Cruises to make a publication that highlights the 3 sanctuaries and what they offer, and that this could be expanded with other companies. As part of Strategy CS-2, the development and implementation of a plan to educate cruise ship passengers is mentioned; dumping of garbage is prohibited in the sanctuary by any ship with our current regulations; discharge of sludge will not be allowed. Right now ships are incinerating that waste, disposing of it on land, or dumping it much further out.

III. ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION ACTION PLAN PRESENTATIONS

- EDUCATION/RESEARCH ON FISHING ISSUES

Erica Burton gave a brief presentation on the Education/Research on Fishing Issues proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO EDUCATION/RESEARCH ON FISHING ISSUES

Issues raised by the SAC included: could there be more articulation in the initial strategy of the research need to assess or evaluate the conditions of habitats in fisheries and ecosystems? There is obviously a link between this group and its subject and the MPA action plan. Is it possible to get into the question of what has been found to date and what more research would make sense in terms of assessing ecosystem and habitat and fishery health on one hand and problems on the other?

Staff responses included: this working group was trying to find ways that the sanctuary, other agencies and the fishing community could work together on research, and this plan should also be linked with the research and monitoring needs identified in the MPA plan.

- MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

Holly Price gave a brief presentation on the Marine Protected Areas proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

Issues raised by the SAC included: did this working group reach consensus; it was expressed by one working group member that there were several members of the working group that were against it from the beginning. One member indicated that the working group was never asked if they agreed to the whole document; it was expressed by another working group member that a fundamental problem was that there wasn't a clear problem statement and it was unclear if the purpose of the working group was to assess the need for an MPA or where to put one that has already been determined? Other working group members on the SAC indicated that consensus was reached on each segment of the document as the group went along and that they were surprised with the letter from the fishing community indicating significant disagreement with the plan. Other SAC members indicated it was inappropriate that the fishermen's letter was sent to Vice Admiral Lautenbacher, Congressman Sam Farr and others who were not involved in the process when the SAC is still evaluating the issue. It was responded that those who wrote the letter wanted to keep them abreast of what was going on and were afraid the process would fall into the same problem that the Channel Islands NMS encountered.

Staff responses included: the process for this working group was the same as every other working group, with the workgroup revising and reaching agreement on each section of the plan. Before they moved on to the next strategy they would agree upon the last one, iteratively at each meeting. Certain people preferred other language, but no one blocked consensus at any point in the final meeting on the strategies. Agreement was reached on the work that needs to be done by the multistakeholder group in the future to determine if there should be a MPA or not. Holly stated that on page 145 of the action plan, it identifies the scientific work needed ahead to identify the habitats, ecological resources and assess the threats to them. Holly mentioned that on page 144 of the action plan it states that the working group was asked to develop the framework to address the need for and if necessary the criteria and types of MPAs in federal waters, and to coordinate with the existing CDFG effort underway in state waters.

- DAVIDSON SEAMOUNT

Andrew DeVogelaere gave a brief presentation on the Davidson Seamount proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO DAVIDSON SEAMOUNT

Issues raised by the SAC included: was there another way to protect the seamount without a sanctuary designation, did the group look at making Davidson Seamount a MPA instead of a sanctuary; was there overwhelming view on which boundary changes were preferred?

Staff responses included: There is not another agency that can offer seamount protection except the sanctuary program; if it was established as a sanctuary, it won't affect fishing currently as there is no fishing on the bottom. The workgroup asked the staff to come up with different options for boundary changes and the group discussed the pros and cons of each option but did not offer a preferred alternative.

- BENTHIC HABITATS

Huff McGonigal gave a brief presentation on the Benthic Habitats proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO BENTHIC HABITATS

Issues raised by the SAC included: how much success do you expect to have in engaging fishermen in identifying areas that might be vulnerable to trawling; it was suggested that this action plan be changed to trawling instead of Benthic Habitats.

Staff responses included: the working group would like to gradually build a trust with the trawlers and draw on relationships initiated in the JMPR.

12:15-1:00 LUNCH

IV. ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION ACTION PLAN PRESENTATIONS (CONTINUED)

- KRILL HARVESTING

Huff McGonigal gave a brief presentation on the Krill Harvesting proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO KRILL HARVESTING

Issues raised by the SAC included: is the Channel Islands NMS interested in krill harvesting; is the Pacific Fishery Management Council actually buying into a proactive ban on the krill fishery.

Staff responses included: Channel Islands NMS is interested in krill harvesting, but they are engulfed with their MPA process right now. Staff feels that all of the sites on the west coast may be interested in krill harvesting. The Pacific Fishery Management Council is interested in this issue and initial conversations have occurred with their staff and committees.

- INVASIVE SPECIES

Holly Price gave a brief presentation on the Invasive Species proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO INVASIVE SPECIES

Issues raised by the SAC included: the question of whether these recommendations are including potential opportunities through coordination with a federal aquatic nuisance species task force and three bills at federal level dealing with this issue?

Staff responses included: there is an evaluation in the action plan that looks at what kind of existing programs and legislation is out there. The idea is to get it off the ground at the regional level and potentially return to some of these larger sources for more funding and assistance.

- EMERGING ISSUES

Holly Price gave a brief presentation on the Emerging Issues proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO EMERGING ISSUES

A suggestion by a SAC member was that aquaculture may need to be listed in the emerging issues plan.

V. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE: BOUNDARY/ADMIN ACTION PLAN

Dave Lott gave a brief presentation on the Boundary/Admin proposed action plan.

SAC QUESTIONS RELATED TO BOUNDARY/ADMIN

Issues raised by the SAC included: in the goal statement it mentions that there is a resolution to two boundary issues. What are the two boundary issues; did the southern boundary come up in this working group?

Staff responses included: the second issue mentioned in the goal statement includes the donut hole off San Francisco, which the working group addressed briefly. This group did not address the southern boundary, there is a separate group down south which is not on the same timeline as the JMPR. Bill explained that staff would like a recommendation from the SAC so he could take that back to Dan Basta.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON JOINT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW

The SAC heard from ten public speakers that spoke about a variety of different issues. Some of those issues include opponents of MPWC, opponents and proponents of desalination, proponents for the Davidson Seamount to be included within the sanctuary, the tactics of some of the working group members regarding going around the process, the letter writing policy for SAC and standing working groups and clarification of the language regarding fishing issues and the sanctuary's relationship with fishing management and other agencies.

VII. NEXT STEPS FOR JOINT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW

Sean reiterated his opening remarks about the upcoming meeting. He clarified that if a constituent group would like to write a letter to the SAC, they need to send it to the office care of Stephanie Harlan. All of the communication received will be posted on the website and a reminder will be sent out to remind the SAC to view that before the meeting. The SAC agreed to visit the three Santa Cruz sites on July 30th and visit the Monterey site at another time.

The SAC also decided to plan another potential meeting on August 22nd in the event that time does not allow discussion of all of the action plans during the July/August meeting.

VIII. SAC ANNOUNCEMENTS

Stephanie Harlan thanked Phyllis Davis, from Public Access Television, for spending two days videotaping the Advisory Council.

Stephanie offered to host a dinner on Thursday, July 30th for any SAC members who are interested.

Heidi Tiura commented that Sanctuary Cruises was announced by the Monterey Bay Aquarium as the most preferred whale-watching tour. They are currently giving members of MBA a 20% discount.

Vicki Nichols will be leaving for Virginia and will be resigning after the July/August meeting.

The Capitola History Museum will open a new exhibit on July 12th titled "Women in the water; women in the waves".

IX. ADJOURN at 4:14