Sanctuary Advisory Council
Subcommittee Meeting Summary

A Sanctuary Advisory Council Subcommittee met on July 23rd, at MBNMS, to address issues related to the proposed MPA Working Group. All members of the Subcommittee, which includes the Executive Committee of the Advisory Council and the Commercial Fishing Representative, attended:

1) Chris Harrold (Chair)
2) Kirk Schmidt (Vice Chair)
3) Kaitlin Gaffney (Secretary)
4) Kathy Fosmark (Commercial Fishing Representative)

Sanctuary staff attending the Subcommittee meeting included: Superintendent Paul Michel, Lisa Wooninck, and Mike Eng.

The motion passed by the Advisory Council at the June 20, 2008, established the following tasks for the Subcommittee:

1) Advise the Superintendent on representation (categories) of stakeholders for the proposed MPA working group members.
2) When nominations are received for potential working group members, provide recommendations to the Superintendent on nominations.

After convening, the Subcommittee initially discussed, at length, concerns about the procedural protocols that were followed by the Advisory Council in making the decision to form the Subcommittee itself. Further exploration of these concerns revealed significant discomfort for some Advisory Council members about feeling rushed and pressured into making a decision regarding the formation of an MPA Working Group without first better understanding exactly what MBNMS was actually proposing. For some members, there was still too much uncertainty about the proposed MPA Working Group process to endorse it.

Some of the questions the Subcommittee identified that need clarification include:

- What are the specific roles and responsibilities of the proposed MPA Working Group and the proposed Science Panel?
- How will the MPA Working Group and the Science Panel interact and work with each other?
- What will be the operational protocols and procedures for both the proposed MPA Working Group and the Science Panel?
- How will decisions be made regarding the ultimate recommendations of the MPA Working Group to the Sanctuary?
- What is the overall procedural roadmap and decision-making process that the Sanctuary will be using to make its decision about possible MPAs?

Other issues that were raised as questions by some members of the Subcommittee include:
• Who is a stakeholder and are all stakeholder interests of equal value?
• What is the region from which stakeholders can be selected to be part of the proposed Working Group?
• What is the role of the MBNMS in the process (leader, stakeholder, both)?
• How will the SAC provide advice on differing scientific opinions or differing MPA plans?
• What information should be provided to the Advisory Committee and the public about the MPA process?
• Are their scientific criteria for designing MPAs to protect intrinsic value?
• What is the legal authority of the MBNMS to create zones that regulate fishing?

Sanctuary staff acknowledged that they have not been sufficiently clear yet about the specifics of the proposed MPA Working Group and Science Panel (including roles, responsibilities, procedures and process) as well as the overall MPA process. Sanctuary staff asked the Subcommittee if it would be willing to consider expanding the scope of its tasks to work with and advise the Advisory Committee as the Sanctuary develops and clarifies the specifics of the proposed MPA Working Group process for consideration by the full Advisory Council.

The Subcommittee subsequently decided to recommend to the Advisory Council that it expand the scope of its tasks, as requested by the Sanctuary. The Subcommittee agreed to propose the following Motion to the full Sanctuary Advisory Council during its August 15th meeting.

**Draft Motion**

The Sanctuary Advisory Council is expanding the Scope of Work for the MPA Working Group Planning Subcommittee (Planning Subcommittee) to provide advice to Advisory Committee as the Sanctuary develops the overall design of the process for proposing Marine Protected Areas in federal waters of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Specific items to address should include, but are not limited to:

1) Assist the Sanctuary in clarifying the overall decision-making process it will use for determining the establishment of MPAs in federal waters of the Sanctuary.
2) Assist the Sanctuary in clarifying how the MPA Working Group and Science Panel processes would fit into the Sanctuary’s overall decision-making process regarding the establishment of MPAs.
3) Advise the Superintendent on the stakeholder membership categories to be represented on the proposed MPA Working Group.
4) Advise the Superintendent on the areas of expertise to be included on the proposed Science Panel.
5) Assist the Sanctuary in clarifying the roles, responsibilities, and operating procedures for the proposed MPA Working Group and the Science Panel, including how the two groups would interact and work with each other.
6) Assist the Sanctuary in developing the Application Process that would be used in recruiting potential members of the MPA Working Group and the Science Panel.
as well as the criteria that would be used in evaluating applications and selecting members.

7) Assist the Sanctuary in reviewing MPA Working Group applications and provide its recommendations on membership to the Superintendent.

The Subcommittee members unanimously agreed to recommend the proposed draft motion for adoption by the full Sanctuary Advisory Committee and to communicate this recommendation to their respective constituents. Kirk Schmidt was selected by the Subcommittee to present its recommendations to the Advisory Council at its next meeting on August 15th.