

**REVISED AGENDA**  
**Marine Life Protection Act Initiative**  
**Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Meeting**  
September 7-8, 2005  
Cambria Pines Lodge  
2905 Burton Drive, Cambria, CA

**MEETING OBJECTIVES**

1. Review process for completing CCRSG work
2. Begin addressing outstanding issues of concern with a “TBD Bin” approach
3. Review, discuss, revise, and adopt provisional Regional Objectives
4. Begin evaluation of existing MPAs
5. Present final Regional Profile

**MEETING AGENDA**

**Day 1 – September 7, 2005**

| Time     | Agenda Item   |
|----------|---|
| 9:30 AM  | <i>Arrival, refreshments, greetings</i>   |
| 10:00 AM | Welcome, introductions, membership update, and agenda review  |
| 10:15 AM | Review process for completing CCRSG work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefing on guidance from BRTF</li> <li>• Ground rules reminder</li> <li>• Display boards</li> </ul>  |
| 10:30 AM | Discuss key issues remaining from August CCRSG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “TBD Bin” for addressing outstanding issues (Attachment 2, Handout 3)</li> <li>• Staff Analysis: Goals, Objectives and Design Considerations (Attachment 3)</li> </ul>  |
| 11:30 AM | Public Comment  |
| 11:50 AM | <i>Lunch (on site)</i>  |
| 12:50 PM | Update on Final Regional Profile  |
| 1:00 PM  | Review, discuss and revise draft provisional Regional Objectives (Attachment 4,5,6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review process approach to this item; discuss timing of review process</li> <li>• Review guidance from DFG and MLPA Initiative team</li> <li>• Briefing on results of work team deliberations</li> <li>• Review, discuss, and revise provisional Regional Objectives</li> <li>• Take stock of next steps, as needed</li> </ul> |
| 3:15 PM  | <i>Break</i>  |
| 3:30 PM  | Review, discuss and revise draft provisional Regional Objectives Continued  |
| 5:00 PM  | Updates and briefings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefing on communications issues – use of CCRSG list serve</li> <li>• Status of responses to science questions (Attachment 7)</li> <li>• Status of Socioeconomic work team</li> <li>• Status of fishers values project</li> </ul>   |
| 5:30 PM  | Conclude adoption of provisional Regional Objectives  |
| 6:00 PM  | <i>Adjourn</i>  |
| 6:30 PM  | <i>CCRSG Dinner at Brambles Dinner House</i>  |

**Day 2 – September 8, 2005**

| Time     | Agenda Item  |
|----------|--|
| 8:00 AM  | Continental breakfast  |
| 8:30 AM  | Review agenda for Day 2 and Questions from Day 1   |
| 8:45 AM  | Spatial data layers and MPA Decision Support Tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide overview of data layers</li> <li>• Demonstrate the tool</li> </ul>  |
| 9:45 AM  | DFG presentation on groundfish hotspots  |
| 10:00 AM | <i>Break</i>   |
| 10:15 AM | Present and discuss approach to preliminary analysis of existing MPAs (Handout 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review evaluation matrix of physical characteristics and objectives</li> <li>• Discuss data gaps and need for additional input</li> <li>• CCRSG member comments on potential measures/benchmarks</li> </ul> |
| 12:00 PM | <i>Lunch (on site)</i>   |
| 1:00 PM  | Collect CCRSG member information on individual MPAs (breakout by North and South)  |
| 2:15 PM  | <i>Break</i>   |
| 2:30 PM  | Collect CCRSG member information on individual MPAs (breakout by North and South)  |
| 4:00 PM  | <i>Adjourn</i>   |

**LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

1. Revised Agenda
2. Process for addressing outstanding concerns – “TBD bin”
3. Staff analysis: goals, objectives and design considerations
4. Revised Draft Provisional Regional Objectives
5. Design considerations and implementation memo
6. Coordination of MLPA objectives and other management plans
7. Response to CCRSG science questions

**LIST OF HANDOUTS**

1. Meeting materials binder
2. Guidance-preliminary analysis of MPAs
3. MLPA staff recommendations regarding “TBD bin”

# Key Outcomes Memorandum

**Date:** September 20, 2005

**To:** Members, MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

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

**Re:** Key Outcomes Memorandum – September 7-8, 2005 Meeting

**cc:** MLPA Initiative Staff

---

## Executive Summary – Key Outcomes and Next Steps

On September 7-8, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. The primary objectives for the meeting were to: 1) review process for completing CCRSG work, 2) begin addressing outstanding issues of concern with a “To be decided (TBD) Bin” approach, 3) review, discuss, revise, and adopt provisional Regional Objectives and Design and Implementation Considerations, 4) begin evaluation of existing MPAs, and 5) provide an update on the final Regional Profile.

**Key outcomes** from the meeting are as follows:

- Initiative staff reviewed for the CCRSG the process for completing CCRSG work.
- Initiative staff presented guidance on the relationship between regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations. Staff will present this approach to the BRTF in late September.
- Initiative staff presented an approach for dealing with “TBD bin” issues. Staff also presented its recommendations regarding how to address such TBD issues as water quality, top end predators, safety, Pismo clams, and desalination plants.
- CCRSG members discussed, revised, and unanimously adopted a package for provisional regional goals, objectives and design and implementation considerations. MLPA Initiative staff will present this package to the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) at its September meeting and request BRTF review and guidance.
- Staff will present a staff recommendation and also request guidance on two key issues resulting from the CCRSG deliberations on the package: socioeconomic considerations, and the inclusion of larval retention areas as a habitat type.
- Several new issues were added to the TBD bin, including the appropriate level for assessing MPA networks, the appropriate level for replicating marine habitats, and funding assurances.
- Initiative staff provided an update on spatial data layers and a decision support tool.
- Initiative staff presented a draft framework containing criteria for evaluating existing central coast MPAs. Stakeholders provided preliminary feedback.
- Participants split into northern and southern central coast breakout groups and provided both information and preliminary assessments of existing MPAs. Evaluation of existing MPAs will be a major topic of discussion at the October CCRSG meeting.

Key next steps are indicated in section IV below. The next CCRSG meeting will take place on October 5-6, 2005 in Monterey, CA.

## I. Introduction and Outline

On September 7-8, 2005, the MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) participated in a meeting in Cambria, CA. This Key Outcomes Memorandum summarizes the meeting's main results. The memorandum is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction and Outline
- II. Workshop Objectives, Participants, and Materials
- III. Key Outcomes
  - A. Process for completing CCRSG work
  - B. Relationship between goals, objectives, and design considerations in MLPA planning
  - C. Creation of a "to be decided (TBD) bin" for addressing outstanding issues
  - D. Adoption of Provisional Regional Objectives and Design/Implementation Considerations
  - E. Science questions and information requests
  - F. Update on Regional Profile
  - G. Status of Work Teams and ongoing data gathering efforts
  - H. Update on Groundfish Hotspots and the MLPA Process
  - I. Update on Spatial Data Layers and the Decision Support Tool
  - J. Draft Framework for Evaluating Existing MPAs
  - K. Breakout Sessions – Preliminary feedback of Existing MPAs
  - L. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members Public Comment
  - M. Public Comment
- IV. Next Steps

## II. Meeting Objectives, Participants, and Materials

The primary objectives for the meeting were as follows:

1. Review process for completing CCRSG work
2. Begin addressing outstanding issues of concern with a "TBD Bin" approach
3. Review, discuss, revise, and adopt provisional Regional Objectives
4. Begin evaluation of existing MPAs
5. Provide update on final Regional Profile

Forty CCRSG primary and alternate members attended the meeting. Meg Caldwell participated as a representative of the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Doyle Hanan and Dean Wendt participated as Science Sub-Team (SST) members. Steve Barrager, SAT chair, also participated.

Meeting materials may be found on the MLPA website at:  
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#centralcoast>.

### **III. Key Outcomes**

#### **A. Process for completing CCRSG work**

John Kirlin and Michael DeLapa (MLPA Initiative staff) reviewed the CCRSG's overarching goals and main products as well as the anticipated process for completing the CCRSG's work. Staff presented display boards intended to help remind CCRSG members of this important information.

#### **B. Relationship between goals, objectives, and design considerations in MLPA planning**

Michael DeLapa presented a memorandum providing MLPA Initiative staff guidance on the relationship between goals, objectives, and design considerations in MLPA planning as mandated by the MLPA. Staff described the linkage of design and implementation considerations to the MLPA and provided illustrations for how particular issues (e.g., socio-economic considerations) would be handled as design considerations.

In discussions with the CCRSG, staff emphasized that both regional objectives and design and implementation considerations are to be considered in the evaluation and design of MPAs. Staff clarified that all design and implementation considerations need not apply to all objectives. Staff also stressed that while design considerations are especially important in the design phase of MPAs, some design considerations (e.g., socio-economic impacts) will also be considered throughout the monitoring and evaluation.

Staff will present this approach to the BRTF at their September 28-29, 2005 meeting. Initiative staff invited CCRSG members to send additional written comments on this proposed approach to [CCRSG\\_Comments@resources.ca.gov](mailto:CCRSG_Comments@resources.ca.gov) by COB, September 14, 2005.

#### **C. Creation of a “To be decided (TBD) bin” for addressing outstanding issues**

Michael Weber (MLPA Initiative staff) described the approach by which outstanding (i.e., “to be decided”) issues will be addressed in the CCRSG process.

##### **1. Approach for dealing with TBD bin issues**

Initiative staff proposed the following approach for dealing with TBD issues:

- a. During CCRSG meetings, Initiative staff will strive to capture and record concerns and issues appropriate inclusion in the TBD bin as they are raised during CCRSG deliberations.
- b. Initiative staff will then determine those items that are appropriately addressed by MLPA Initiative staff and, as necessary, the SAT, and those that need to be forwarded to the BRTF for their consideration and guidance.

- c. For those issues that can most appropriately be addressed by staff, Initiative staff will provide recommendations regarding how the CCRSG may most effectively address the TBD issues.
- d. For appropriate issues, Initiative staff will agendaize BRTF review and deliberation. The BRTF will offer its guidance on these issues, which staff will report to the CCRSG.
- e. Initiative staff and the CCRSG will take this guidance into account in completing the various tasks of CCRSG.

## 2. TBD issues addressed

Initiative staff presented a memo providing staff recommendations for addressing the following TBD issues: 1) addressing the effect of impaired water quality on MPAs, 2) addressing the risks to public safety from MPA design proposals, 3) addressing the impacts of top end predators on MPAs (including the effects on the size, abundance, and biodiversity of marine life caused by pinniped predation), 4) restoring Pismo clam populations, and 5) considering the potential impact of desalination plants as related to the design of MPAs.

For each item, Initiative staff described the issue; related it to the MLPA, the Master Plan Framework (MPF), or other relevant law or documents; and provided a recommendation for how the particular issues should be addressed within the context of CCRSG efforts.

Initiative staff will present this proposed approach for addressing TBD bin issues to the BRTF at their September 28-29, 2005 meeting. Initiative staff invited CCRSG members to send additional written comments on this proposed approach to [CCRSG\\_Comments@resources.ca.gov](mailto:CCRSG_Comments@resources.ca.gov) by COB, September 14, 2005.

## 3. New TBD issues to be addressed

During the discussion of provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations, CCRSG members raised several issues that were added to the TBD bin. These include:

- Should replication as defined in the MLPA be applied and achieved within the Central Coast study region or at the level of a biogeographical region, across several study regions?
- Should nursery areas be included as a habitat type?
- How should implementation of new MPAs be tied to available funding for monitoring, management and enforcement?
- Should the CCRSG pursue alternatives of MPAs within the central coast study region that function as a network or as a component of a statewide network?

Initiative staff will address these TBD issues per the process outlined in section III.C.1 above.

## **D. Adoption of Provisional Regional Objectives and Design/Implementation Considerations**

CCRSG members engaged in intensive and comprehensive review and discussion of draft provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations. On Day 2, CCRSG members unanimously adopted a package of provisional regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations to guide future development of proposals of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the central coast study region.

Appendix 1 of the Goals, Objectives, and Design and Implementation Considerations Report presents the options considered and the results of straw voting conducted at the September CCRSG meeting. For each straw vote (there were approximately 40 in all), this document indicates both the options considered and the results of the voting (in italics). This report is available at: <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/meetings.html#brtf>.

### **1. Process for assessing CCRSG support of provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations**

In developing the text of the final package, CCRSG members and Initiative staff proceeded through the following steps:

- CCRSG members reviewed the current version of draft text.
- CCRSG members reviewed the derivation and rationale for the text.
- CCRSG members received commentary from policy advisors and SAT members.
- Staff invited comment from CCRSG members.
- CCRSG arrived at stable text configurations.
- Staff framed straw votes.

MLPA Initiative facilitators used several straw voting techniques to help gauge CCRSG member support for both individual draft regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations and the complete package. Participants eligible to take part in the straw voting included primary CCRSG members or, in cases where primary members were not present, their designated alternates.

To help gauge support for individual objectives or design/implementation considerations or to help choose between two options, facilitators recapped key text formulations in progress and then most often framed the voting choices in one of the following main ways:

- “Who cannot live with” the proposed text? or
- “Who prefers option A? Who prefers option B?”

In the September CCRSG meeting, staff relied most heavily on the “who cannot live with this text” formulation to frame straw votes. Staff made this wording choice as a practical application of the CCRSG’s ground rule on decision rules. For three highly contested objectives under goal 3, the facilitators composed a straw ballot and asked participants to rank the options under each objective in order of preference (“1” for most preferred, “2” for second most preferred, etc.). This produced a distribution of “points” in which the option with the lowest total number of “points” was considered as the most preferred, while that with the largest sum represented the choice least preferred for each objective.

To adopt the suite of objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations, the facilitators asked CCRSG members whether or not they could support the entire package. In this case, 28 members indicated that they “could support the package”; zero indicated that they could not.

## **2. Key issues addressed; guidance sought from BRTF**

CCRSG members addressed all of the draft provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations and had far ranging discussions on several in particular. In the straw voting, the CCRSG members showed strong support for most of the proposed provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations. The CCRSG was split, however, on two issues in particular:

- Whether socioeconomic considerations should be included as a design consideration or an objective under goal 2.
- Whether larval retention areas should be included as a habitat type in goal 4, objective 1.

CCRSG members requested specific guidance from the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) on these two issues.

## **E. Science questions and information requests**

Initiative staff will produce a list of science questions coming out of the September CCRSG meeting for CCRSG member confirmation. Initiative staff will then work with the Science Advisory Team (SAT) to prepare responses. These will be presented at the October CCRSG meeting.

## **F. Update on Regional Profile**

Initiative staff reported that a final version of the Regional Profile will be posted on September 16, 2005. Staff will present the Regional Profile to the BRTF as an informational item at the BRTF’s September 28-29 meeting.

Initiative staff reiterated that the Regional Profile is a “living document” and will continue to be revised as additional information is received.

## **G. Status of Work Teams and ongoing data gathering efforts**

### **1. Socioeconomic information scoping**

John Kirlin and Michael DaLapa approved the Stakeholder generated Scope of Work for the Community Profile data collection effort. A draft Community Profile Report is scheduled to be provided to the Socio-Economic Work Team in early October with the Final Report due mid-October.

## **H. Update on Groundfish Hotspots and the MLPA Process**

John Ugoretz (California Department of Fish and Game) described a potential new approach to groundfish management being pursued by the Pacific Fishery Management Council. He described a recent data collection effort aimed at identifying areas with high or low probability of catching species of concern. One aim of this effort is to permit some additional fishing for groundfish in the present Rockfish Conservation Area in low probability areas. This process may integrate well with the MLPA process, as it defines specific areas of concern to council management. John used canary rockfish as an example of the type of data being collected, noting that what was shown was draft and that this method could be applied to other species as well. John indicated that a draft analysis will be available to the CCRSG for consideration in the October timeframe.

Several CCRSG members expressed the view that this study, and the potential refinement of the regulatory regime that could result from it, was welcome news. Other CCRSG members noted that there are additional species of interest for which such a fine-grained analysis would be very constructive step in crafting better informed resource management. John reiterated that what was being shown at this meeting was a preliminary draft and that a more full description of the data and applicability to the MLPA process would be available in October.

## **I. Update on Spatial Data Layers and the Decision Support Tool**

### **1. Spatial data layers**

Staff provided a list of the 130 spatial data layers compiled by MLPA, CDFG, and MBNMS staff that are available for MPA planning. The data layers vary in quality and suitability for planning. Staff is developing a data review process w/ the SAT to provide guidance to stakeholders on how best to use the data. This information will appear on revised versions of the data layer list. CCRSG members provided preliminary feedback on the data layers. Several stakeholders, for instance, requested that a latitude/longitude layer be added. These data layers may be viewed by the public at the Internet Mapping Service site.

## 2. Decision Support Tool

Mary Gleason reported that staff has been working with a contractor to develop a web-based MPA decision support tool. A preview of the tool was provided. The tool allows users to view data layers, draw candidate MPAs, and generate a report on specific data layers in candidate MPA(s). Staff and stakeholders requested that a standard means of creating filenames for proposed MPAs be established and that a “point of contact” for addressing questions from stakeholders be identified.

At the October CCRSG meeting, stakeholders will receive a tutorial for the tool and then split up into workstations with the assistance of support staff. Staff will develop a process by which “lines on the map” will be drawn. Mary requested that CCRSG members prepare for the October meeting by taking the following steps:

- a. Visit the Internet Mapping Site (IMS) to become familiar with the regional geography and the strengths and limitations of the data sets. The site address is: <http://maps.msi.ucsb.edu/mlpa>.
- b. Come to the next meeting prepared to interact with spatial data and maps.
- c. Consider issues of data quality when using spatial data to inform identification of MPA alternatives.

## J. Draft Framework for Evaluating Existing MPAs

Initiative staff presented a draft framework containing criteria for evaluating existing central coast MPAs. CCRSG and SAT members provided initial feedback on the framework. Some stakeholders commented on the need for improved indicators. Others commented that better data are needed in order to make the draft criteria effective. A few suggested that the framework be expanded to include examination of other closures (e.g., Diablo Canyon, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and those due to fishery laws and regulations). CCRSG members Steve Scheiblauser and Rick Algert agreed to provide staff with a list of such closures by September 14, 2005.

Participants also briefly considered the pros and cons of evaluating existing MPAs from the ground up (i.e., tied to each of the criteria) versus evaluating them from the top-down (where evaluation proposals are made and then the criteria are examined to see if they support the proposal or not). The general conclusion from this discussion was that drawing upon both approaches and reviewing existing MPAs sooner rather than later would be a constructive step and a way to make good use of CCRSG members’ time at the meeting.

Initiative staff indicated that a key next step in this effort is to get stakeholder feedback on the draft indicators (listed in the matrix as “proposed benchmark/metric”). Staff requested that CCRSG members provide written comment on the criteria and the indicators in particular by September 14, 2005. Participants noted that different indicators may be needed depending on whether the intent is to: 1) evaluate existing MPAs and other management, 2) analyze new MPA proposals,

or 3) assess long term monitoring. Staff noted that the current emphasis is on the first two purposes.

## **K. Breakout Sessions – Preliminary feedback of Existing MPAs**

Initiative staff organized participants into two breakout sessions: one focused on the northern central coast study region, and the other focused on the southern central coast study region. The southern group had a broad representation of stakeholder interests. The northern group lacked representation from commercial fishing interests.

The breakout sessions had two main purposes. The first was to solicit additional stakeholder information regarding existing MPAs. Staff asked stakeholders to provide input on data sheets. This information concerns familiarity with particular habitat types, species of concerns, other species of interest, and human use patterns. The second was to provide preliminary feedback on the existing central coast MPAs.

### **1. Northern breakout group**

John Ugoretz and Kirk Sturm led the northern Stakeholders in a break out session to begin evaluating the six existing MPAs and one special closure between Pigeon Point and Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. Fifteen CCRSG members participated.

- a. Scan of stakeholder knowledge/input: The Stakeholders were provided a one page information sheet that could be used to evaluate an MPA. The Stakeholders provided 26 information sheets regarding the 6 MPAs and one special closure in the north.
- b. Preliminary stakeholder evaluation. The Stakeholders used a Green (contributes to achieving regional objectives/consideration), Yellow (with modifications, may contribute), Red (does not appear to contribute) evaluation tool regarding the six northern MPAs and one special closure. Nearly all of the areas were rated Green or Yellow. One area in which stakeholders did not provide feedback was Julia Pfeifer Burns State Marine Conservation Area. Stakeholders indicated that they did not know enough about this MPA to evaluate it. Stakeholders also provided their thoughts on what it would take to make the Yellow MPAs Green. Key changes suggested included: increase in size of MPA, regulations, increase in protection of some finfish, and access to the ocean.

### **2. Southern breakout group**

Mary Gleason, Don Maruska, and Paul Reilly led the southern Stakeholders in a break out session to begin evaluating the six existing MPAs between Jullia Pfeiffer Burns State Park and Point Conception. Ten CCRSG members participated.

- a. Scan of stakeholder knowledge/input: At least a couple of stakeholders could provide input on habitats or species present for every southern MPA.
- b. Preliminary stakeholder evaluation. Stakeholders viewed the Pismo SMCA as too small to be effective and could potentially be deleted. Of the three other SMCAs focused on the protection of Pismo clams, Morro Beach was considered the best to retain because of the adjacent Montana de Oro State Park and the lack of sewage or power plant outfalls; Pismo-Oceano and Atascadero SMCAs were considered less effective. Both Big Creek and Vandenberg SMRs were viewed as being potentially improved by boundary changes that incorporated more representative habitats.

#### **L. Status of Appointment of CCRSG Alternate Members**

MLPA Initiative staff reported that Trudi O'Brien was named as a new alternate for Jeremiah O'Brien. Trudi takes the place of Bill Diller.

#### **M. Public Comment**

Two members of the public provided comments. In general, these comments supported the purpose of the MLPA, the role of public involvement in the process, and the progress and efforts of the CCRSG.

### **IV. Next Steps and Schedule**

Key next steps for the CCRSG include:

#### **A. CCRSG tasks**

1. CCRSG members to provide additional written comments on the following documents by COB on September 14, 2005. Please send comments to Initiative staff at [ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov](mailto:ccrsgcomment@resources.ca.gov).
  - Adopted provisional regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations.
  - Staff guidance on the relationship between regional goals and design and implementation considerations.
  - Staff analysis of TBD bin issues (e.g., water quality, top end predators, safety, Pismo clams, desalination plants).
  - Science questions related to the Central Coast project.
  - Draft framework for evaluating MPAs, including preliminary evaluation criteria, indicators, evaluation matrix, and other information relevant to the evaluation of existing MPAs.
  - CCRSG members Steve Scheiblauser and Rick Algert agreed to provide staff with a list of other types of closures (e.g., Diablo Canyon, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and those due to fishery laws and regulations) that could be added to the framework.

- Information on existing MPAs.
2. CCRSG members will prepare to use the Decision Support Tool at the October CCRSG meeting by taking the following steps:
    - Visit the Internet Mapping Site (IMS) to become familiar with the regional geography and the strengths and limitations of the data sets. The address is: <http://maps.msi.ucsb.edu/mlpa>.
    - Come to the next meeting prepared to interact with spatial data and maps.
    - Consider issues of data quality when using spatial data to inform identification of MPA alternatives.

## **B. MLPA Initiative staff tasks**

1. Initiative staff to present the adopted package of provisional regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations to the BRTF. Initiative staff to also seek guidance from the BRTF on the following issues:
  - Whether socioeconomic considerations should be included as a design consideration or an objective under goal 2.
  - Whether larval retention areas should be included as a habitat type in goal 4, objective 1.
2. Initiative staff to coordinate with the SAT and the BRTF, as appropriate, to provide guidance on the following new TBD bin issues:
  - Should replication of habitats be achieved at the level of the biogeographical region or the study region?
  - Should nursery areas be included as a habitat type?
  - How should implementation of new MPAs be tied to available funding for monitoring, management and enforcement?
  - Should the CCRSG pursue achieving a “network” of MPAs at the level of the region or at the level of the state?
3. Initiative staff to prepare key meeting materials for October CCRSG meeting. This will include the final Regional Profile, updated spatial data layers, a completed decision analysis tool, and a process to guide the development of draft CCRSG member MPA proposals.

The next meeting will be convened on October 5-6, 2005 in Monterey.