

# Key Outcomes Memorandum

**Date:** August 18, 2010

**To:** Members, MLPA North Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCRSG)

**From:** Eric Poncelet and Ben Gettleman, Kearns & West

**Re:** Key Outcomes Memorandum – July 29-30, 2010 NCRSG Meeting

**cc:** MLPA Initiative staff and contractors, California Department of Fish and Game staff, and California Department of Parks and Recreation staff (collectively known as the I-Team)

---

## Executive Summary – Key Outcomes

On July 29-30, 2010, the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) North Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCRSG) participated in its sixth meeting, in Fort Bragg, CA. **Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- The NCRSG received a presentation on BRTF and I-Team guidance for Round 3 process design.
- The NCRSG received staff overview presentations of the Round 2 draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals and draft proposed special closures.
- The NCRSG received presentations on MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluation results of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, including habitat representation and replication, MPA size and spacing, potential impacts to commercial and recreational fisheries, bioeconomic models, marine birds and mammals, and water quality.
- The NCRSG received a presentation of California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) evaluation results of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals.
- The NCRSG received a presentation of California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) evaluation results of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals.
- The NCRSG received a presentation on the MLPA Goal 3 evaluation results of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals.
- The NCRSG began developing its Round 3 MPA proposal(s) as a full group and specifically identified potential MPA options for the homework groups to build from during their efforts in between the NCRSG's July and August meeting.
- The NCRSG selected its Round 3 co-leads: Brandi Easter, Zack Larson, Bill Lemos, Jennifer Savage, Tom Trumper, and Adam Wagschal.
- Four homework groups (southern bioregion, northern bioregion, estuaries, and special closures) were created and participants were identified to continue developing ideas to be incorporated into the Round 3 MPA proposal(s).

Key **next steps** are listed in section III below.

## **I. Meeting Objectives, Participants and Materials**

On July 29-30, 2010, the NCRSG participated in a meeting in Fort Bragg, CA. This *Key Outcomes Memorandum* summarizes the meeting's main results.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Present and discuss evaluation results for the NCRSG Round 2 draft MPA proposals
2. Outline strategy and work plan for developing NCRSG Round 3 MPA proposal(s), including key process guidance
3. Begin development of NCRSG Round 3 MPA proposal(s)
4. Select Round 3 co-leads

Thirty-one NCRSG members participated in the meeting.

MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members Eric Bjorkstedt, Ron LeValley, and Karina Nielsen participated in the meeting.

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

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:

[http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting\\_072910.asp](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meeting_072910.asp)

Materials relating to the Round 2 NCRSG MPA proposals can be found at:

[http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/mpaproposals\\_nc.asp](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/mpaproposals_nc.asp)

## **II. Key Outcomes**

### **A. Welcome, Agenda Review and Brief Introductions**

MLPA Initiative Executive Director Ken Wiseman provided opening remarks.

Eric Poncelet from the facilitation team welcomed the NCRSG members and reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives.

### **B. Updates – NCRSG, BRTF, SAT, POE, MPA Planning Tools**

I-Team staff presented on the status of efforts related to the NCRSG, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), SAT, responses to science questions, outreach to California tribes and tribal communities, and MLPA public outreach and education (POE).

During the NCRSG update, I-Team staff noted that two NCRSG members would not be attending the meeting: Pete Nichols and Skip Wollenberg.

During the SAT update, it was noted that the SAT had met twice since the May 19-20, 2010, NCRSG meeting. During its June 29-30 meeting, the SAT reviewed and approved updates to the evaluation methods document and draft evaluations for the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. The SAT also approved revised methods of developing the proxy line for nearshore habitat, building off of methods used in previous MLPA study regions. Staff noted that this change in the proxy line affected some results in the Round 2 evaluations. The SAT also approved draft responses to science questions. The

SAT participated in a teleconference/webinar on July 28, during which the SAT discussed BRTF guidance for Round 3, approved a complete draft of the evaluation methods document, reviewed and approved science questions and approved the summary of Round 2 evaluations of habitat representation and replication and MPA size and spacing. The SAT tribal work group met with individuals from California tribes and tribal communities on June 29 to receive additional input about how additional information could be gathered and integrated to account for traditional tribal uses in planning and evaluation of proposed MPAs.

During the update on outreach to California tribes and tribal communities, I-Team staff reported that there has been a significant effort to bring California tribes and tribal communities further into the MLPA process and to invite input on the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, allowed uses and proposed special closures. Key information from the update included:

- A letter had been sent by US mail and the MLPA listserv inviting members of California tribes and tribal communities to meet with DFG and MLPA Initiative staff. The letter included a statement of confidentiality to protect the identities of individuals who shared information.
- At the time of the NCRSG meeting, DFG and MLPA Initiative staff met with individuals from 18 California tribes and tribal communities.
- Information about the proposed uses for Round 2 draft MPAs from California tribes and tribal communities is incomplete, and the outreach effort will continue in the coming months. The information provided to the NCRSG, SAT and BRTF will be updated as new input is submitted.
- The information about proposed tribal uses is aggregated to protect confidentiality, and all proposed uses and gear types are included. The data set captures both oral and written information.
- Additional information should be submitted before August 23 to be shared with the NCRSG at their next meeting on August 30-31. MLPA Initiative staff will continue to incorporate information as long as possible. Information must be submitted by the October 25-27, 2010 joint NCRSG-BRTF meeting to be taken into consideration.
- Information shared during NCRSG meetings regarding proposed uses for MPAs will not be included in the data set. Information only is incorporated into the aggregated data set if the person who submits the information requests that it be included with other input from tribes and tribal communities.

Comments from NCRSG members included:

- Some tribal councils may lack a complete understanding of the traditional uses. Others have very extensive knowledge of aboriginal territories.
- There should be a characterization that information from certain California tribes and tribal communities was not provided, and an explanation of why they did not participate.
- An additional outreach effort to capture oral testimony should be made. Any tribal elders, leaders or members should be able to testify at the Oct. 13-14, 2010 SAT meeting.

During the POE update, I-Team staff reported that a series of public open houses were conducted from July 6-8, 2010. The open houses were designed to provide members of the public with an opportunity to review the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, discuss them with I-Team staff and NCRSG members, and share comments for the full NCRSG to consider. Several products were developed based on the public comments received including a summary of public comments on the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, a summary of public comments on special closures and a compilation of all the public comments submitted through July 19. It was noted that all comments from the workshops had been aggregated into a summary document, and that, while a small number of comments inadvertently did not appear in the initial version, they would be included in the revised version.

### C. Round 3 Process Design

I-Team staff presented the process design for developing Round 3 MPA proposal(s), noting that it drew upon BRTF guidance to date, interests and preferences expressed by the NCRSG, and I-Team staff experience and professional judgment in developing the Round 3 process design. Key elements of the Round 3 process design include:

- The NCRSG will work primarily in a full group setting toward developing a cross-interest proposal
- The proposal must meet the minimum science guidelines to the extent possible, with a specific focus on habitat replication and MPA spacing to account for gaps in Round 2 draft MPA proposals
- If the NCRSG cannot come to agreement on a single proposal, it should work to identify key areas where the group cannot come to agreement on a single design and create multiple proposals to address those differences
- All NCRSG members should be able to live with at least one Round 3 MPA proposal
- NCRSG members will have the opportunity to express support for Round 3 MPA proposal(s) at the Oct.25-27 joint BRTF-NCRSG meeting
- The Round 3 process design is contingent upon the NCRSG making sufficient progress, and the I-Team may modify the Round 3 process to ensure the NCRSG's completion of its charge
- There will be two sets of SAT evaluations for Round 3. For the first evaluation, the SAT will perform its evaluation according to the evaluation methods. The SAT also will conduct a supplementary evaluation to include all levels of protection for MPAs that are proposed for exclusive tribal use, specifically for Round 3 evaluations of habitat replication and MPA size and spacing.

I-Team staff also reviewed guidance that was provided by the BRTF during its July 22, 2010 meeting, including guidance on how the NCRSG should consider the uses of California tribes and tribal communities in developing Round 3 MPA proposals. Key elements of this tribal-related guidance include:

- The NCRSG should adhere to previous BRTF guidance to avoid areas of tribal, traditional, non-commercial use, to the extent possible
- Where avoidance is not possible, the use of state marine conservation areas (SMCAs) may be considered as shoreline ribbons to acknowledge and accommodate tribal uses that are protective of the marine environment, recognizing that the BRTF has been advised by DFG that such uses will be available for all non-commercial users until relevant legislative action is taken
- The NCRSG should state its intent regarding how traditional tribal uses should be acknowledged and accommodated within specific SMCAs
- The NCRSG is encouraged to take into consideration tribal proposals to implement avoidance with regard to specific areas of tribal use

Following the I-Team presentation, NCRSG members and I-Team staff discussed the Round 3 process design and BRTF guidance. Key points raised included the following:

- An NCRSG member expressed concern that allowing all recreational uses that accommodate traditional, non-commercial tribal use in an MPA could reduce its level of protection (LOP).
- An NCRSG member expressed concern that following the BRTF guidance to avoid tribal use areas was not realistic.
- Several NCRSG members raised the point that not all north coast tribes and tribal communities participated in the information collection effort and therefore, those lists may not be complete.

- An NCRSG member stated that members of California tribes and tribal communities should not be considered local people; they should be given a unique status.
- An NCRSG member expressed concern with using a uniform approach to addressing tribal uses, as different California tribes and tribal communities gather marine resource in different ways.
- An NCRSG member expressed concern that the guidance coming from the BRTF, DFG, and I-Team can at times be in conflict. In response, I-Team staff stated that the NCRSG was not expected to resolve potential conflicts in guidance and should instead weigh the tradeoffs involved. If the NCRSG makes a decision that runs contrary to guidance, it should provide a strong rationale for why guidance was not followed or certain guidelines were not met. This information would be important for the BRTF to consider when reviewing the Round 3 proposal(s).

#### **D. Overview of Round 2 North Coast Draft MPA Proposals**

MLPA Initiative Science and Planning Advisor Dr. Satie Airamé provided an overview of the Round 2 North Coast Draft MPA Proposals (referred to as Ruby 1, Ruby 2, Sapphire 1 and Sapphire 2). Dr. Airamé noted several key considerations for the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, including:

- To accommodate tribal uses in some areas, nearshore ribbon SMCAs were created and clustered with an offshore state marine reserve (SMR). No SMRs proposed tribal uses.
- The revised nearshore habitat (0-30 m) proxy line was refined after the Round 2 draft MPA proposals were submitted.
- The Stewarts Point SMR in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region was amended during the June 24, 2010 California Fish and Game Commission meeting to accommodate tribal uses. The new SMR/SMCA cluster caused a reduction of total area for each protected habitat at a very high level of protection, and the area of beaches was reduced to below minimum replicate size. This will have implications for the spacing of the beach habitat for the north coast study region.

Dr. Airamé provided an overview of the geographic placement of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, and provided summary information from the Round 2 evaluations. Dr. Airamé also identified key gaps in habitat replication and MPA spacing.

#### **E. Overview of Round 2 Draft Recommendations for Special Closures**

I-Team staff member and MLPA Initiative Marine Planner Dominique Monié provided an overview of the Round 2 draft recommendations for special closures. Ms. Monié noted that a special closures work group made up of NCRSG members and interested members of the public was convened during Round 2, and that the work group developed ten special closure options for the NCRSG to consider. A draft list of proposed special closures was developed to accompany each Round 2 draft MPA proposal; these special closures are separate from the draft MPA proposals but linked in design. Ms. Monié identified which draft special closures accompanied each of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, and whether the special closures were intended to be year-round or seasonal, and the justification for doing so. Finally, Ms. Monié invited NCRSG members to participate in the special closures homework group that will be convened during Round 3.

#### **F. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – Habitat Representation and Replication**

SAT member Karina Nielsen presented the methods for and evaluations of habitat representation and replication for the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. Her presentation outlined key habitat protection

guidelines and key habitat questions that were considered in evaluating the Round 2 draft MPA proposals.

Dr. Nielsen noted that, with respect to habitat availability and spacing, nearshore rocky habitats and kelp are less abundant in the northern bioregion; habitats greater than 100 meters depth are relatively rare across the region; and soft bottom habitats are abundant in the northern bioregion. Dr. Nielsen pointed out that low percentages of shoreline, nearshore, and estuarine habitats were included at very high protection across all the Round 2 draft MPA proposals.

Regarding habitat replication, Dr. Nielsen noted that none of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals replicated kelp or 0-30 meter rock in the northern bioregion at or above moderate-high protection. Dr. Nielsen also reported that the SAT decided not to consider the MPAs near Punta Gorda as a cluster, but the SAT noted the concentration of MPAs in this region and the habitats they encompass.

### **G. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – MPA Size and MPA Spacing**

SAT member Eric Bjorkstedt presented the evaluation of MPA size and spacing for Round 2 draft MPA proposals. Dr. Bjorkstedt outlined the MPA size guidelines and methods for evaluating MPA size and gave an overview of the Round 2 MPA size evaluation results. Dr. Bjorkstedt then reviewed the MPA spacing guidelines and methods for evaluation, and presented the Round 2 spacing evaluation results.

With respect to MPA size, Dr. Bjorkstedt noted the following about the Round 2 proposals: all MPAs across all proposals meeting minimum size guidelines at moderate-high protection; no proposals include preferred cluster size at high or very high protection; and the Ruby 1 and Sapphire 1 proposals include two preferred size clusters at moderate-high protection. Regarding MPA spacing, Dr. Bjorkstedt noted the following: no Round 2 draft MPA proposal meets spacing guidelines for any habitat at any level of protection, with especially large gaps for 0-30m rock and kelp; at moderate-high protection, Ruby 1, Sapphire 1 and Sapphire 2 approach the guidelines for minimum spacing for 30-100m and 100-3000m rock and soft bottom; at undetermined protection, Ruby 1 has the fewest gaps that greatly exceed the guideline or minimum possible spacing; and Ruby 1 and Sapphire 1 most closely approach the spacing guidelines for estuarine habitats at undetermined protection.

### **H. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – Marine Birds and Marine Mammals**

SAT member Ron LeValley presented the evaluation of marine birds and marine mammals for the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. His presentation included an overview of the species that inhabit the north coast study region, and the threats to their survival. Mr. LeValley clarified that three categories were considered in evaluating how the external proposed MPA arrays would benefit marine bird and mammal populations: breeding, resting and foraging. Mr. LeValley stated that, while harbor seal haulouts and foraging areas were underrepresented in all of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals, this is not significant since there are abundant rocks off the coast they can use. Mr. LeValley noted the following: Ruby 1 provided the most benefit to breeding seabirds partially due to the inclusion of Green Rock and Flatiron Rock special closures; Ruby 1 and Sapphire 1 benefited the highest number of pinnipeds and included both Steller sea lion rookeries found in the study region in special closures.

### **I. Presentation of SAT Evaluation Methods and Round 2 Evaluation Results – Bioeconomic Modeling**

SAT member Eric Bjorkstedt presented the bioeconomic modeling evaluation methods and results for Round 2 draft MPA proposals. His presentation included how and why bioeconomic models are used,

and an overview of the inputs and outputs that relate to the bioeconomic modeling process. Dr. Bjorkstedt then provided an overview of how the Round 2 draft MPA proposals performed in the evaluations with regard to bioeconomic modeling. Dr. Bjorkstedt noted that, assuming no uses were permitted in MPAs unless described by species and gear type: Sapphire 1, Ruby 1, and Sapphire 2 consistently had highest relative biomass. Sapphire 1 and Sapphire 2 had highest relative fishery yield under unsuccessful management, while the existing MPAs (Proposal 0) and Ruby 2 had the highest relative fishery yield under maximum sustainable yield (MSY)-type or conservative management.

#### **J. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – Potential Impacts to Commercial and Recreational Fisheries**

On behalf of Ecotrust, MLPA Initiative Science and Planning Advisor Satie Airamé presented the results of evaluations of potential impacts of Round 2 draft MPA proposals to commercial and recreational fisheries. Dr. Airamé also noted that the focus of the data collected and economic impact evaluations was on the fisheries themselves, not on the regional multipliers of potential economic impact. Dr. Airamé pointed out that the socioeconomic impacts associated with the NCRSG's Round 2 proposals were generally less than the Round 2 proposals in the other study regions. The estimated average net economic impact across all Round 2 draft MPA proposals varied between commercial (2.3%) and commercial passenger fishing vessel (CPFV; 5.4%). Sapphire 1 generally had higher potential impacts than other proposals for commercial and CPFV fisheries. The rockfish fishery generally had the highest potential impact among recreational fisheries.

#### **K. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – Water Quality**

MLPA Initiative Marine Planner Dominique Monié presented the SAT evaluation of water and sediment quality for the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. Her presentation summarized water quality guidance and identified areas of water quality concern and opportunity. Ms. Monié outlined the evaluation scoring methods for water quality, and compared the scores of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. In general, all of the Round 2 proposals were relatively successful in avoiding areas of water impairment. Ms. Monié also noted that water quality evaluations are not mandated by the master plan and should be considered secondary to other science guidelines.

#### **L. Presentation of DFG Guidance, Evaluations Methods, Evaluation of Existing North Coast Study Region MPAs, and Round 1 Evaluation Results**

DFG Marine Biologist Rebecca Studebaker presented on DFG guidance, evaluation methods, and the results of DFG's evaluation of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. Ms. Studebaker outlined DFG's feasibility criteria, which are intended to create MPAs that are easy for the public to understand, are enforceable, and to avoid MPAs that either have poor design qualities or create a management burden. These criteria are MPA names, boundaries, take regulations, design considerations, and other guidance, including special closures. Ms. Studebaker then reviewed the results of DFG's evaluation of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals. Ms. Studebaker noted that the Round 2 proposals did relatively well in meeting the DFG feasibility guidelines relative to previous study regions, although additional improvements are still needed.

#### **M. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – California Department of Parks and Recreation**

State Parks Senior Environmental Scientist Kevin Fleming presented on State Parks guidance, evaluation methods, and the results of State Parks' evaluation of the Round 2 draft MPA proposals.

Mr. Fleming shared that, overall, the Round 2 draft MPA proposals performed well in State Parks' evaluation, with some exceptions that can be modified in the future.

## **N. Presentation of Round 2 Evaluation Results – Goal 3 of the MLPA**

MLPA Initiative Marine Planner Darci Connor presented on the MLPA Goal 3 evaluation results, which focused on improvements to recreational, educational, and study opportunities for marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance. Ms. Connor noted that the Round 2 draft MPA proposals performed well with respect to Goal 3. Sapphire 1 met the Goal 3 criteria and the other proposals only needed to address educational opportunities in the northern bioregion. It was identified that the NCRSG could improve upon Goal 3 in Round 3 by better stating when and why MPAs address Goal 3 and its key elements.

## **O. Initial Development of Round 3 MPA Proposals**

On July 30, the NCRSG began its development of Round 3 MPA proposals. Below is a summary of the key outcomes during the day:

1. Meeting Overview. Facilitator Eric Poncelet reviewed the meeting's process flow and keys to success, many of which derived from the NCRSG's adopted ground rules.
2. Discussion of Key Round 3 Issues. The NCRSG deliberated and collectively decided how to move forward regarding the following two issues:
  - a. Recent California Fish and Game Commission changes to the Stewarts Point MPA. Since the newly amended Stewarts Point SMR/SMCA resulted in the loss of a replicate of beach habitat, the NCRSG discussed whether it should aim to capture this habitat in its Round 3 MPA proposal(s) to compensate for the loss. Ultimately the group decided not to address this loss of beach habitat since the change occurred after the completion of Round 2 draft MPA proposals.
  - b. Addressing tribal use of marine resources. The NCRSG discussed how best to consider California tribes and tribal communities in developing Round 3 MPA proposal(s). The group decided to proceed as follows:
    - i. All nearshore SMCAs and SMPs should allow for recreational uses that accommodate all traditional, non-commercial tribal uses.
    - ii. For these nearshore SMCAs and SMPs, additional allowed recreational and commercial uses should be called out on a case-by-case basis. It was noted that allowing additional uses may have implications for SAT evaluation of Round 3.
    - iii. For offshore SMCAs, the NCRSG should specify whether non-commercial tribal uses will be allowed.
3. Key Gaps. I-Team staff provided a summary of key gaps in habitat replication and MPA spacing from the Round 2 draft MPA proposals for the NCRSG to consider in developing its Round 3 proposal(s).
4. Areas of Emerging Agreement. The NCRSG identified four key geographies where agreement within the group was beginning to emerge in terms of draft MPAs' boundaries, designations and allowed uses: Vizcaino, Reading Rock, and Punta Gorda.
5. Discussion of North Coast Backbone MPAs. The NCRSG discussed and identified the backbone MPA options – from Round 1, Round 2, and stakeholder ideas generated since the completion of Round 2 (commonly referred to as Emerald options) – they would like to move forward for future NCRSG discussion. These options will be captured in MarineMap and homework groups are expected to review those options and put forth a recommendation for MPA designs in the key geographies; the homework groups should aim for single designs



where possible and narrow down the range of options where the group cannot come to agreement.

## **P. Process Check-in and Next Steps**

During the July 30 meeting, NCRSG members were invited to share their responses to two questions regarding the Round 3 process:

1. Is sufficient progress being made in the full group setting?
2. Are your interests and/or those of your constituents' being achieved through the current proposal(s)?

Responses from NCRSG members included:

- Disappointment and concern that the NCRSG is not further along in developing its Round 3 MPA proposal(s).
- Progress was being made earlier in the day, and it was compromised when the format was changed. The group wants to discuss Round 3 MPAs in more detail, not on a surface level.
- Frustration with the rigid structure of the meeting; the group dialogue should be more engaging and less controlled.
- I-Team staff should be more flexible and responsive to the needs of the group. The NCRSG was ready to get to work and it wasn't allowed to.
- The I-Team is putting too much emphasis on the process, and not enough on the product.
- Concern that today's meeting will end without concrete ideas to share with constituents.
- Frustration with changes occurring (i.e., increased beaches spacing gap, refined 0-30 m proxy line, estuaries included in spacing analysis).
- The SAT presentations during the first day were not an effective use of time; most NCRSG members already knew the information that was presented.
- Concern that the MPA spacing guidelines are not being met, and that the group is not working to address this.
- Concern that how the gaps in replication and MPA spacing will be addressed has not yet been discussed. Estuaries have not been discussed yet.
- Too much time was spent discussing the issue of accommodating tribal uses.
- Appreciation for NCRSG members supporting tribal gathering rights.
- Convergence among the NCRSG is beginning to happen.
- Appreciation of working in the full group setting.
- Homework groups will be necessary and important.
- Homework groups should be divided geographically, perhaps by counties.
- Tribal NCRSG members should be included in homework groups.
- Interests are generally being met.
- Unclear whether interests are being met, the group hasn't yet gotten to the areas where my interests lie.

## **Q. Summary of Science Questions**

Throughout the July 29-30, 2010 meeting, NCRSG members asked a number of clarifying questions regarding science aspects of the presentations they received. MLPA Initiative staff and SAT members responded to a majority of these questions during the meeting. The remaining questions that were not fully answered during the meeting will go through the protocol for submitting science questions to the SAT, and may be answered by MLPA Initiative staff or the SAT. Key outstanding questions included the following:

- Is it possible for the minimum threshold for a replicate of hard substrate 0-30m proxy to be less rigid than the thresholds for other habitats since there is some uncertainty associated with the proxy line?
- What is the spacing between key habitats across the north coast study region?
- If spacing between habitats exceeds the spacing guideline, what is gained by placing an MPA closer versus farther away from the next adjacent MPA that protects that habitat?
- For seabird protection in special closures, is it more important to capture greater species diversity and abundance, or special status species?
- What is the confidence associated with the bioeconomic models and do the models predict within 10% what the model species and fishery will look like in 50 years?
- What will be the level of protection (LOP) for take of urchin under adaptive management?

## R. Public Comment

Members of the public provided comment on July 29, including members of the public who participated via teleconference from Eureka and Crescent City. Key themes from public comment included:

- Support for increasing the percentage of the north coast study region that will be protected.
- Concern that tribal interests were not adequately considered in the creation of the MLPA.
- Concern that information is not available in advance of MLPA meetings, and that this limits the public's ability to provide thoughtful input.
- Support for the NCRSG developing a unified proposal for Round 3.
- Support for incorporating the local knowledge of fishermen.
- Support for Proposal 0.
- Concern that the SAT is not taking advantage of opportunities to obtain more accurate data.
- Support for including language in Round 3 proposals that would recommend against offshore drilling, and for creating an SMCA in Mendocino County to prevent wave energy projects.
- Support for the state adopting a special category for tribal use.
- Concern that the MLPA process does not address water quality or industrialization.
- Concern that the state will not have sufficient resources to enforce the MPAs that will be created.
- Support for meeting the science guidelines while taking into account socioeconomic concerns.
- Concerns over economic impacts to local communities.

### III. Recap of Next Steps

#### A. Key Next Steps for NCRSG Members

1. NCRSG members were asked to complete the following work prior to the next meeting on August 30-31, 2010.
  - a. Meet in homework groups to review MPA options identified at the July NCRSG meeting and develop recommendations for MPA designs in key geographies for the full NCRSG to consider for the Round 3 MPA proposal(s). NCRSG members volunteered to participate in the homework groups and a lead was identified for each group. Group leads are:
    - i. Northern bioregion: Zack Larson
    - ii. Southern bioregion: Dave Wright
    - iii. Estuaries: Greg Dale
    - iv. Special closures: Dominique Monié (I-team staff identified as lead since work group was already established in Round 2)

#### B. Key Next Steps for I-Team Staff

- I-Team staff will capture the MPA options discussed during the July 29-30 NCRSG meeting in MarineMap and share those MPA options with the NCRSG (both in one array and in geographically-specific sub arrays)
- I-Team staff will coordinate with homework group leads to ensure they have adequate support for running their meetings effectively.
- I-Team staff will provide the following documents to the NCRSG:
  - Responses to science questions that were approved by the SAT at its June 29-30, 2010 meeting
  - Geographic availability of open coast habitat replicates in the north coast study region
  - Spacing between estuarine habitats in the north coast study region

#### C. Upcoming NCRSG meetings

The next NCRSG meeting will take place August 30-31, 2010 in Fortuna.

Key objectives for the August 30-31, 2010 NCRSG meeting include:

- Develop the final round of MPA proposals to be forwarded to the SAT and BRTF
- Discuss next steps for presenting the final round of MPA proposals to the BRTF
- Ensure the accuracy of MPA boundaries and allowed uses