

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Master Plan Science Advisory Team  
November 13, 2007 Meeting Summary  
(revised January 3, 2008)**

**Best Western Lighthouse Hotel  
105 Rockaway Beach Avenue  
Pacifica, CA 94044**

*Note: Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available on the Internet at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/>. Please contact AGP Video Services at (805) 772-2715 to obtain DVD copies of these recordings.*

**SAT members attending:** Sarah Allen, Eric Bjorkstedt, Mark Carr, Chris Costello, Steve Gaines, Dominic Gregorio, Caroline Hermans, Ray Hilborn, John Largier, Gerry McChesney, Steven Morgan, Karina Nielsen, Pete Raimondi, Astrid Scholz, John Ugoretz

**SAT members absent:** Carl Walters

**MLPA staff present:** Allison Arnold, Susan Ashcraft, Mary Gleason, Seth Miller, Melissa Miller-Henson, Rebecca Studebaker, Jason Vasques, Ken Wiseman

### **Meeting Objectives**

- Review, discuss, and potentially approve responses to science questions
- Review and potentially approve evaluations of draft options for marine protected area (MPA) arrays by work groups of the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group and draft external MPA proposals submitted external to the work group process
- Determine how and who to present evaluations
- Review and discuss next steps for parallel processes assessments of draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **1. Welcome, introductions, and review of agenda**

Meeting was convened at 9:40 a.m. No changes were made to the agenda; however, there was insufficient time during the meeting to discuss parallel processes, so an additional SAT meeting was scheduled to cover this topic.

#### **2. Updates (Attachments 1-3)**

Updates included a review of the meeting attachments and handouts.

#### **3. Science questions (Attachments 4-5 and Handouts A-B)**

The SAT reviewed science questions posed at the October 16-17, 2007 meeting of the

NCCRSG, and identified certain SAT members to assist in drafting responses to the questions. The SAT reviewed outstanding draft responses to questions posed at previous NCCRSG meetings and adopted all responses, pending minor revisions to certain questions.

#### **4. Evaluation process for draft options for MPA arrays and draft external MPA proposals (Attachment 6 and Handouts C-D)**

- A. Mary Gleason presented an overview of draft options for MPA arrays (developed by regional stakeholder work groups) and draft external MPA proposals (developed external to the work group process). The SAT evaluated ten proposals in this first round of the iterative evaluation process, and presented preliminary evaluations concerning levels of protection, habitat representation, size and spacing, and potential socioeconomic impacts.
- B. Mark Carr presented the levels of protection used in the evaluation of the draft MPA arrays and proposals. Protection levels were divided into six categories ranging from “very high” protection (state marine reserves) to “low” protection (areas permitting fishing methods with high ecosystem impacts). The protection level designations initially had a numeric naming, but the SAT voted to remove the numbers to avoid confusion since they were only being used for naming purposes rather than for any numerical evaluation.

Each level of protection has permitted activities, and SAT members discussed the appropriate placement for the various activities. Most of the discussion focused on whether or not salmon trolling should remain divided into two categories, with trolling in water deeper than 50 meters falling in the “high” protection category and trolling in water shallower than 50 meters falling in the “moderately high” protection category. The SAT voted to maintain the separation between the two trolling depths and to discuss this topic further at a future SAT meeting, but will add a statement for the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force indicating that this distinction is based on the best available data, which is limited.

The SAT discussed levels of protection for other fishing activities, and voted to leave crab fishing at its current level of protection and move salmon mooching from moderately high protection to moderate protection. The SAT unanimously approved the levels of protection methods pending splitting the herring fishery between nearshore and pelagic fisheries and several minor changes (such as specifying differences in the take of various kelp species and clarifying the rationale behind certain decisions).

- C. Pete Raimondi and Mark Carr presented the evaluation of habitat representation with a discussion of the habitat determination methodology and a graphical representation of the percentage of available habitats protected in each MPA array. The SAT approved the habitat representation methodology.
- D. Steve Gaines presented the evaluation of size and spacing for each MPA array. Reserve spacing was evaluated by habitat type, since species assemblages depend on specific habitat types. The SAT approved the size and spacing methodology.
- E. The evaluation of foraging, breeding, and rearing areas discussion was tabled to a future

SAT meeting.

- F. Astrid Scholz presented the evaluation of socioeconomic factors for each MPA array, describing the maximum possible financial impacts each array could incur. The SAT approved the socioeconomic evaluation methodology.
- G. Members from each stakeholder work group (jade, emerald and turquoise) and each draft external proposal (A, B, C and D) held a panel discussion with members of the SAT to discuss each draft MPA array/proposal and answer specific questions. Panel members described the rationale behind their arrays and asked the SAT questions about future evaluations. Panel members were Karen Garrison, Rick Johnson, Patricia King, Paul Pierce, Santi Roberts, Ben Sleeter (left early with the flu), Ed Tavasieff, Kate Wing, Dan Wolford, Dave Yarger

#### **5. Parallel processes assessment (Handouts E-F)**

There was insufficient time to discuss parallel processes, so an additional SAT meeting was scheduled for November 29, 2007 specifically for this topic.

#### **6. Presenting evaluations to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force and North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group**

SAT members discussed the procedure for presenting SAT evaluations to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). Members involved in the MLPA Central Coast Project discussed how evaluations were presented, which included standardized presentations given by SAT members; it was agreed that this format would be used to present evaluations during the NCCSR as well. SAT members who presented evaluations during this meeting volunteered to present the same evaluations to the BRTF at their next meeting.

#### **7. Public comments**

Public comment primarily focused on fishing regulations and the levels of protection evaluation presented by Mark Carr. Members of the public commented on the use of the term “bycatch” and requested that it be more clearly defined when the SAT uses the term (the term has formal definition in fisheries management that may not be appropriate for this context). The public also discussed various fishing techniques and the possible impacts each technique could have on the ecosystem. Other topics included the recent oil spill in San Francisco Bay and the need to set up a statewide interests group for the MLPA process.

#### **8. Next steps**

Future meetings will be scheduled to discuss the findings of the parallel approaches workgroup, which was an agenda item that the SAT did complete at this meeting.

## Documents provided at or in preparation for the meeting

### Attachments

1. SAT October 1, 2007 meeting summary
2. *List of Species Likely to Benefit from Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region (adopted October 1, 2007)*
3. November 1, 2007 memo from the California Department of Fish and Game regarding special closures as they apply to the Marine Life Protection Act
4. *Draft Responses to Science Questions Posed by the NCCRSG at its July 10-11, 2007 Meeting (revised November 5, 2007)*
5. *Draft Responses to Science Questions Posed by Santi Roberts/Oceana in a Letter Dated September 10, 2007 (revised November 5, 2007)*
6. Descriptions of draft options for MPA arrays EA, EB, JA, JB, TA and TB, and draft external MPA proposals A, B, C and D
7. PowerPoint presentation: *Ocean Patterns (John Largier, Bodega Marine Laboratory)*

### Handouts

- A. *Draft Responses to Questions Posed at the October 16-17, 2007 Meeting of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (revised November 9, 2007)*
- B. *Draft Work Group Responses to Science Questions Posed by the NCCRSG at its August 22-23, 2007 Meeting (revised November 9, 2007)*
- C. PowerPoint presentation: *Overview of Draft Options for MPA Arrays and First Draft Proposals (Mary Gleason, MLPA Initiative)*
- D. *Draft MLPA Evaluation Methods for MPA Proposals*
- E. Overview of modeling approaches for parallel approaches work group