

PROPOSED AGENDA
Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Kick-Off Meeting
June 8-9, 2005

The Beach Resort Monterey
2600 Sand Dunes Drive, Monterey, CA 93940

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Introduce CCRSG members and project support staff
2. Review and adopt ground rules
3. Review project goals and work plan
4. Review key findings of stakeholder interviews
5. Review background information and information needs
6. Begin preparations for July CCRSG meeting

MEETING AGENDA

Day 1 – June 8, 2005	
<i>9:30 AM</i>	<i>Arrival, Refreshments, Greetings</i>
10:00 AM	Welcome, Agenda Review, and Brief Introductions (CCRSG members and staff)
10:30 AM	Review, Discuss, and Approve Ground Rules (Handout 1)
11:00 AM	Review Project Goals and Roles—presentations and discussion (Attachments 1-6, Handouts 2-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MLPA and MLPA Initiative goals and requirements • CCRSG Charter • MLPA Initiative participants -- Roles and Responsibilities • Project deliverables and overview of work plan • Adaptive management approach
<i>12:15 PM</i>	<i>Lunch</i>
1:30 PM	Review and Discuss Results of Stakeholder Interviews (Handout 4)
2:15 PM	Interactive Activity: Discuss Stakeholder Interests, Issues, and Areas of Expertise (with reference map)
<i>3:30 PM</i>	<i>Break</i>
3:45 PM	Continue Activity: Discuss Stakeholder Interests, Issues, and Areas of Expertise (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap up: Synthesis of key points, areas of convergence and divergence
4:15 PM	Review Context and Background Information—presentations and discussion (Handout 5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing California MPAs (Handout 6) • Other marine resource use restrictions • Overview of central coast planning area - geographic boundaries, key features • Existing regulatory context
<i>5:30 PM</i>	<i>Recess to June 9</i>
<i>6:30 PM</i>	<i>CCRSG Dinner</i>

Day 2 – June 9, 2005	
8:30 AM	Review Agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1
8:45 AM	Review Context and Background Information (cont.)—presentations and discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of concurrent collaborative efforts • Summary of past MLPA efforts (Attachment 7) • Overview of status of existing/available data and data collection • Overview of socioeconomic survey of selected regional fisheries • Overview of research on non-consumptive use patterns
10:00 AM	Review CCRSG role in identifying and valuing alternative MPA proposals, information required, and look/feel of final work product (Handouts 7-9)
10:30 AM	<i>Break</i>
10:45 AM	Activity: Breakout group discussion and report back Focal questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you define success for the project? • What are your greatest fears for the project? How can it be derailed? • What will you do to make the project a success?
12:15 PM	<i>Lunch</i>
1:00 PM	Logistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed meeting schedule for July–December (Attachment 8) • CCRSG communications and distribution of meeting materials • Travel reimbursement
1:30 PM	Next steps and Preparations for July CCRSG Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review objectives of July meeting (Morro Bay) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Introduce regional goals/objectives activity (Handout 10) ○ Introduce regional profiles activity (Handout 11) • Establish work teams to prepare for July meeting
3:00 PM	<i>Adjourn</i>

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1. California Marine Life Protection Act
2. Conceptual Overview of the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
3. Membership rosters (Blue Ribbon Task Force, Master Plan Science Advisory Team, Statewide Interests Group, Staff and Contract Team)
4. Web links to key documents
5. Definition of key working terms (Appendix J of the draft Master Plan Framework)
6. Marine protected area references
7. Process summary of efforts to implement the MLPA
8. Draft schedule of CCRSG meetings

LIST OF HANDOUTS

1. Ground Rules
2. CCRSG Charter
3. List of deliverables and timeline
4. Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum
5. Summary of stakeholder information requests
6. Existing California MPA maps and descriptions
7. Outline of information required for MPA proposals
8. Regional process chart
9. General description of the work product from the Central Coast Project
10. Introduction to regional goals/objectives activity
11. Introduction to regional profiles activity

Key Outcomes Memorandum

Date: June 17, 2005

To: MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Members

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

Re: Key Outcomes Memorandum – June 8-9, 2005 Meeting

cc: MLPA Initiative Team

Summary – Key Outcomes and Next Steps

On June 8-9, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) participated in a kick-off meeting in Monterey, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) introduce RSG members and project support staff, 2) review and adopt ground rules, 3) review project goals and work plan, 4) review key findings of stakeholder interviews, 5) review background information and information needs, and 6) begin preparations for July RSG meeting.

Key outcomes from the meeting are as follows:

- Adopted ground rules for the RSG (see Attachment 1)
- Presented briefings on project goals and roles
- Formed three work teams to assist preparations for July RSG meeting. The focal areas for the work teams are as follows:
 - 1) *Goals and objectives.* The primary purpose of this work team is to provide input to staff regarding the preparation of preliminary regional Goals and Objectives. The entire RSG will discuss the topic of regional Goals and Objectives at the July RSG meeting.
 - 2) *Data presentation.* The primary purpose of this work team is to which information needs should be prepared as maps for RSG members.
 - 3) *Information scoping.* The primary purpose of this work team is to determine the scope of remaining information needs (with a key focus on pending socioeconomic information) and a timeline for generating this information. This work team will evaluate the need for additional information needs against the specific goals of the project.

The next RSG meeting will take place on July 7 and 8 in Morro Bay.

I. Introduction and Outline

On June 8-9, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (RSG) participated in a kick-off meeting in Monterey, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the main results of the meeting. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
 - A. Introductions
 - B. Status of Appointment of Alternates
 - C. Ground Rules Introduced, Revised, and Adopted
 - D. Findings from Stakeholder Interviews
 - E. RSG Interests and Areas of Expertise
 - F. RSG Views on Successes and Pitfalls/Hopes and Fears
 - G. Presentation of Contextual and Background Information
 - H. Presentation: Status of Socioeconomic and Non-Consumptive Use Studies
 - I. Linking MPA Planning with Revision in Other Fishery Regulation
 - J. Central Coast Region Goals and Objectives
 - K. Regional Profiles Introduced
 - L. Work Teams Identified and Potential Members Recruited
 - M. Meeting Logistics
 - N. Turnaround and Use of Key Outcomes Memoranda Discussed
 - O. Communication Node for the Central Coast Project
- IV. Next Steps

II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

1. Introduce CCRSG members and project support staff
2. Review and adopt ground rules
3. Review project goals and work plan
4. Review key findings of stakeholder interviews
5. Review background information and information needs
6. Begin preparations for July CCRSG meeting

Thirty primary RSG members and eight alternate members attended the meeting. [D. Albers, S. Shimeck, and B. Sleeter were not able to attend.] The complete list of RSG members may be found at:

http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/pdfs/agenda_060805_handout14.pdf

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:

<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

III. Key Outcomes

A. Introductions

Scott McCreary (CONCUR) and Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative) welcomed the members of the RSG. Phil Isenberg offered his perspective as chair of the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). Gary Stacy, California Department of Fish & Game (DFG) Marine Region Manager, also greeted the participants and members of the public. As well, Michael DeLapa introduced key MLPA Initiative support staff.

All of the primary and alternate RSG members made brief self-introductions.

B. Status of Appointment of Alternates

MLPA Initiative staff reported that the process for soliciting nominations for potential additional RSG alternates had closed on June 3, 2005. MLPA Initiative (MLPAI) staff will forward the nominations to the Director of DFG and the Chair of the BRTF. Final decision on alternates is expected by the end of June.

C. Ground Rules Introduced, Revised, and Adopted

On day one, CONCUR introduced a draft set of proposed ground rules, which had been heavily informed by the stakeholder interview process. CONCUR characterized the ground rules as both a set of mutual commitments and a first opportunity for the RSG to make an agreement. Ground rules pertaining to the role of alternates and relations with the media, in particular, drew heavy attention.

Following the day one discussion, MLPA Initiative staff prepared a series of revisions, and walked the RSG through the logic of the revised ground rules.

Key revisions included:

- RSG members may have contact with the media but are asked to avoid making statements that may prejudice the project's outcome or speaking on behalf of another group's point of view.
- Discussion at RSG meetings will principally involve RSG members, Central Coast Science Sub-Team Science Advisory Team (SST) members, and staff. Primary RSG 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.
- 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.

The RSG then adopted these ground rules. The revised version as adopted is enclosed as Attachment 1.

D. Findings from Stakeholder Interviews

CONCUR reviewed key results of the stakeholder interview process. In particular, CONCUR:

- highlighted several interests shared by many of the RSG members
- presented a series of potential challenges identified by respondents as well as stakeholder insights on how to address these challenges
- noted key information and meeting preparation needs identified by stakeholders and summarized how these were being addressed by project staff.

E. RSG Interests and Areas of Expertise

Using large GIS-based maps for reference, RSG members and alternates and SST representatives conveyed a wide range of interests and areas of expertise with regard to the Central Coast Region. Key interests included: species and habitat protection, continued commercial and recreational fishing and fishing culture, research and scientific study, and access. Participants indicated having knowledge of areas throughout the geographic range of the Central Coast, the regulatory context, and multiple species and habitats.

F. RSG Views on Successes and Pitfalls/Hopes and Fears

Participants were organized into breakout groups to discuss their views on: a) how to define success for the project, b) their fears for the project, and c) things they can do to make the project a success.

Some recurring definitions for success included: completing the task this time, arrive an outcome with broad-based agreement, having the process be perceived as fair, implementing the MLPA without adverse effects, completing a thorough review of existing MPAs.

Recurring concerns and fears included: the project's aggressive timeline, gaps in information, not being able to trust others around the table, RSG members not understanding and incorporating each other's interests, detriments of new MPAs outweighing the benefits, disproportionate effects on particular interest groups (in particular, hardships placed on commercial fishing).

Recurring comments on how stakeholders could contribute to the success of the project included commitments to: participate with an open mind, prepare for meetings ahead of time, be respectful of others' views.

G. Presentation of Contextual and Background Information

- **Role and goals of RSG.** Mike DeLapa outlined the goals of the MLPA and the MLPA Initiative. He summarized the project work plan, timeline and deliverables. He also described the role of the RSG relative to the BRTF, DFG staff, and the Fish and Game Commission.
- **Existing MPAs and other marine resource use restrictions.** John Ugoretz walked RSG members through a briefing on existing MPAs in the Central Coast region. He noted that existing MPAs had been largely created via an ad hoc, piecemeal process, often in response to political initiatives, and often with narrow purposes or unclear goals. He noted that the current ad hoc pattern illustrates the need for a more coherent network, as envisioned by the MLPA.

John Ugoretz also described the variety of other marine resource restrictions (e.g., fisheries regulations, marine sanctuaries, natural refuges) providing the context for the development and evaluation of MPAs. Staff committed to preparing a handout on additional marine resource use restrictions for the July RSG meeting.

- **Briefing on Past MPA Designation Process.** John Ugoretz (DFG) presented a briefing on past efforts to implement the MLPA. Several questions arose about how best to handle or take account of draft maps prepared during Round 1.
- **Briefing on Regulatory Context.** Michael Weber (MLPAI staff) presented a briefing on the existing regulatory context (land side and sea side) for the MLPA Initiative.
- **Role of Central Coast Science Sub-Team (SST) members.** Steve Barrager (SAT Chair) described the role of the SST, reiterating the intent of SST members to participate actively in the RSG meetings and to work alongside RSG members in preparing work products. Participants discussed the importance of RSG members having confidence in the advice of the SAT. Staff committed to work with the SAT to establish a process by which appropriate RSG questions could be “funneled” to the SAT.
- **Overview of status of existing/available data and data collection.** Mary Gleason (MLPAI staff) gave a presentation on the readily available data that the MLPA and DFG staff are assembling for this planning process. Data and information requests should be directed to her. An internet map service site has been set up to allow the RSG and general public to review data layers as they become available. That site can be accessed with a web browser at: <http://maps.msi.ucsb.edu/mlpa>. RSG members also requested that staff provide them with a list of all available maps.

H. Presentation: Status of Socioeconomic and Non-Consumptive Use Studies

Science Advisory Team members Astrid Scholz and Linwood Pendleton reported on two pending study efforts that are intended to bring more up-to-date and definitive data in the areas of socioeconomics and non-consumptive use to inform this project. Several RSG members offered comments and suggestions. There were several specific suggestions to expand the scope and coverage of the currently planned studies. Several participants also expressed the desire to review the quality of socioeconomic data available on recreational fishing. Participants discussed convening an information scoping work team to identify these issues.

I. Linking MPA Planning with Revision in Other Fishery Regulation

RSG members and BRTF Chair Isenberg exchanged views on the potential for the RSG to recommend revisions to existing fishery regulations as part of a package of recommendations that might be put forward by the group. Several RSG members welcomed this potential; others cautioned that the Pacific Fishery Management Council has an important role here, in addition to the State of California.

J. Central Coast Region Goals and Objectives

Mary Gleason introduced the topic of regional “goals and objectives” that will be a major focus for the July RSG meeting. She described the six goals from the MLPA that bound the development of regional goals. She explained the distinction between goals and objectives by describing goals as more on the level of a “vision” and objectives as steps to achieving the vision. She used the mnemonic device “SMART” to indicate that objectives should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely. RSG members completed work sheets listing 1-2 goals with associated objectives and discussed some of these in plenary.

RSG members queried whether goals ought to be modified from the existing statewide goals expressed in the MLPA. They also queried as to whether each statewide goal need apply to every area along the Central Coast. Staff committed to provide additional clarification on these issues. [Note: Guidance from legal staff is as follows: The goals are the overarching guidance that the whole network must strive to achieve, while individual areas may work toward only some of the goals.]

CONCUR proposed formation of a Work Team to develop a draft set of goals and objectives to bring to the July meeting.

K. Regional Profiles Introduced

Paul Reilly outlined the intended contents of regional profiles, which he characterized as currently a “work in progress.” Providing comment on the Regional Profile will be a major goal of the RSG at its July meeting.

L. Work Teams Identified and Potential Members Recruited

Three work teams were identified to help advance work before the July RSG meeting. The work teams will focus on the following topics:

1) *Goals and Objectives*

The primary purpose of this work team is to provide input to staff regarding the preparation of preliminary regional Goals and Objectives. The entire RSG will discuss the topic of regional Goals and Objectives at the July RSG meeting.

2) *Data Presentation*

The primary purpose of this work team is to which information needs should be prepared as maps for RSG members.

3) *Information scoping*

The primary purpose of this work team is to determine the scope of remaining information needs (with a key focus on pending socioeconomic information) and a timeline for generating this information. This work team will evaluate the need for additional information against the specific goals of the project.

The following RSG members volunteered to participate in the work teams:

Goals and Objectives	Data Presentation	Information scoping
RSG and SST participants		
Darby Neil	John Wolfe	Steve Scheiblaue
Howard Egan	Walter Schobel	Jesus Ruiz
Ellen Faurot-Daniels	Marla Morrissey	Tom Mattusch
Kaitlin Gaffney	Tom Hafer	Marc Shargel
Michelle Knight	Ron Massengill	Gordon Hensley
Holly Price	Neil Guglielmo	Rick Algert
Jesus Ruiz	Eric Endersby	Astrid Scholz (SAT)
Steve Scheiblaue	Dave Edlund	Linwood Pendleton (SAT)
Staff		
Mary Gleason	Mary Gleason	John Kirlin
Paul Reilly		
CONCUR		

CONCUR explained that Work Teams ought to draw from multiple interest groups, draw from North and South perspectives, and strive to integrate the initial input of the full

RSG (to the extent it has been expressed), as well as the perspectives of the RSG members serving on the team. CONCUR explained that based on experience, a Work Team size of four to eight members works well, recognizing that Work Team efforts produce only preliminary drafts that will be brought back to the full RSG.

In other words, the intent is to cause people to “work across the aisle”. Project Manager Mike DeLapa will assign work groups based on the individuals who expressed interest. In each case, about eight RSG members volunteered to participate.

M. Meeting Logistics

Several topics were discussed under the heading of logistics. RSG members expressed a strong preference to receive materials well in advance of scheduled meetings. Staff stated their intent to strive for a one week lead time, but noted that this will not be possible in all cases. The meeting schedule was reviewed. In general, it was anticipated that primary members or their alternates would be able to attend all of the RSG meetings. Reimbursement procedures were also discussed.

N. Turnaround and Use of Key Outcomes Memoranda Discussed

RSG members made a strong request that Key Outcomes Memoranda be produced as soon as possible after RSG meetings. CONCUR reiterated their intent to turn these around within 7-10 days of RSG meetings, as noted in the ground rules.

O. Communication Node for the Central Coast Project

RSG members were requested to address general inquiries regarding the Central Coast Project (e.g., regarding agenda items for future meetings) to Michael DeLapa, the Central Coast Project Manager.

IV. Next Steps and Schedule

Key next steps for the RSG include:

1. Convene interim Work Teams
 - The Goals/Objectives Work Team proposed possible teleconferences for June 16 and 22
 - Meeting dates/times for the Data Presentation and Information Scoping work teams to be determined.
2. Staff to prepare meeting materials for July RSG meeting
3. The next meeting will take place on July 7 and 8 in Morro Bay