


Marine Life Protection Act Initiative



Conclusion of the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Process

Presentation to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force


Scott McCreary, CONCUR, Inc.
April 22, 2008 • San Rafael, CA

NCCRSR Accomplishments


North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSR) 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, NCCRSR arrived at three complete MPA proposals
 - Tremendous work ethic, personal commitment, and good humor

Evolution of MPA Proposals

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Round 1 (Oct 2007) <u>10 arrays</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |  | <p style="text-align: center;">Round 2 (Dec 2007) <u>5 arrays</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Round 2 (Dec 2007) <u>5 arrays</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) |  | <p style="text-align: center;">Round 3 (March 2008) <u>3 arrays</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 1-3 • Proposal 2-XA • Proposal 4 <p style="text-align: right; font-size: small;">Proposals developed by self-selected "work teams"</p> |
|---|---|---|

Proposal Work Team Affiliation

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

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?

| | Could you live with this proposal as a recommendation to the BRTF? | |
|---------------|--|----|
| | Yes | No |
| Proposal 1-3 | 16 | 7 |
| Proposal 2-XA | 14 | 9 |
| Proposal 4 | 11 | 12 |

- Preferred proposals

Round 3 Proposal Drafting Process

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-pollination across proposal work teams
- Extensive NCCRSG communication with local stakeholders and broader constituencies
- NCCRSG members listened carefully to public comments



Integration of Peer Agency Interests

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