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North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSRG) has accomplished all elements of its charge:

- Contributed to development of regional profile
- Adopted north central coast regional goals and objectives
- Developed and revised draft marine protected area proposals
- Closely considered science advisory team, task force, and California Department of Fish and Game advice at each step
- Consistent with task force guidance, NCCRSRG arrived at three complete MPA proposals
  - Tremendous work ethic, personal commitment, and good humor
Evolution of MPA Proposals

Round 1 (Oct 2007)  
10 arrays

- Proposal 0 (Existing MPAs)
- Draft Array Option Emerald A
- Draft Array Option Emerald B
- Draft Array Option Jade A
- Draft Array Option Jade B
- Draft Array Option Turquoise A
- Draft Array Option Turquoise B
- Draft External Proposal A
- Draft External Proposal B
- Draft External Proposal C
- Draft External Proposal D

Round 2 (Dec 2007)  
5 arrays

- Proposal 0 (Existing MPAs)
- Draft Proposal 1 (Emerald C)
- Draft Proposal 2 (Jade D)
- Draft Proposal 3 (Turquoise C)
- Draft Proposal 4 (Jade C)
- Revised Draft External Proposal A
Evolution of MPA Proposals

Round 2 (Dec 2007)  
5 arrays
• Proposal 0 (Existing MPAs)
• Draft Proposal 1 (Emerald C)
• Draft Proposal 3 (Turquoise C)
• Draft Proposal 2 (Jade D)
• Revised draft Ext. Proposal A
• Draft Proposal 4 (Jade C)

Round 3 (March 2008)  
3 arrays
• Proposal 1-3
• Proposal 2-XA
• Proposal 4

Proposals developed by self-selected “work teams”
## Proposal Work Team Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Team 1-3</th>
<th>Work Team 2-XA</th>
<th>Work Team 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Baty</td>
<td>Patty King</td>
<td>Dirk Ammerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Becker</td>
<td>Francesca Koe</td>
<td>Tom Estes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bernard</td>
<td>Irina Kogan</td>
<td>Aaron Golbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Breen</td>
<td>Samantha Murray</td>
<td>Tom Mattusch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Charter</td>
<td>Kellyx Nelson</td>
<td>Mike McHenry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Churchman</td>
<td>Karen Reyna</td>
<td>John Mellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Desai</td>
<td>Santi Roberts</td>
<td>Craig Merrilees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Fastenau</td>
<td>Phil Sanders</td>
<td>Paul Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Faurot-Dainels</td>
<td>Dave Schaub</td>
<td>Nelson Pinola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Herring</td>
<td>Craig Swolgaard</td>
<td>Ben Sleeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hobbs</td>
<td>Sean White</td>
<td>Ed Tavasieff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Johnson</td>
<td>Bob Wilson</td>
<td>Dave Yarger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Jones</td>
<td>Jay Yokomizo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lance Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Neubacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cassidy Teufel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Tipon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relations to MPA Proposals

Recognize the ways NCCRSG members relate to MPA proposals:

- Principal work team affiliation
- Contributed ideas
- “Can live with” proposal as a recommendation to the BRTF?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Could you &quot;live with&quot; his proposal as a recommendation to the BRTF?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal 1-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal 2-XA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Preferred proposals
Characteristics include:

- Close attention to size/spacing and replication guidelines
- Careful consideration of DFG feasibility guidance
- Consideration of socioeconomic findings
- Extensive “hybridization” of MPA shapes, or adoption of shapes from other proposals
- Honing regulations to address more precise conservation objectives and avoid socioeconomic impacts
- Extensive work team deliberations
- Many iterations of proposal-making, deliberation, and straw voting
Integration of Stakeholder Views

NCCRSG members considered and integrated the views of multiple stakeholders

- Extensive NCCRSG deliberations (inside and outside of meetings)
- Cross-pollenization across proposal work teams
- Extensive NCCRSG communication with local stakeholders and broader constituencies
- NCCRSG members listened carefully to public comments
NCCRSG members considered and integrated the interests of peer agencies

- NCCRSG members worked hard to take account of the interests of agency representatives
- Extensive discussion of bird and mammal resources, and special closures
- Extensive discussion of tradeoffs around abalone dive sites and State Parks interests
- Weighing and balancing of coastal access issues relative to resource protection and maintaining shore-based fishing
Integrated Packages

Each Round 3 proposal represents an integrated package

- Building a complete proposal amounts to “solving a puzzle”
- Each proposal work team actively weighed task force guidance, science guidance, and DFG feasibility criteria in building proposals
- Work team members made tradeoffs within geographies and discussed ecological and socioeconomic linkages across geographies
- Site-by-site considerations of conservation benefits, feasibility considerations, and socioeconomic impacts
- Particular attention paid to impacts on small communities and viability issues
NCCRSG Charge Completed

- NCCRSG members look forward to briefing the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force and responding to questions
- MLPA Initiative staff greatly appreciates the outstanding efforts of NCCRSG members