

Advisory Council retreat July 21-22, 2003
MJ Schramm
Called to order 940

Attendance: No Brian O'Neill, no Peter Grenell, no Mark Dowie

Agenda: reviewed and approved

Staff here to hear recommendations. Determine what recommendations to be forwarded to manager.

30-minute presentations, 15-20 minutes discussion

Visitors:

Sean Morton
Jan Roletto
Adrian Ross/GG exped.
Lawrence Groth
Amber Mace
Gordon Bennett
Joanne Mohr
Jessica Hamilton ocean conservancy
Judith Novak
Lewis Ames

(SEE CLIPBOARD)

Anne Walton: Overview:
Site specific for GF, cross cut

Biogeographic approach

Day 1, site-specific recommendations: 6 groups

Internal teams: 3 teams, admin., boundary mods, emerging issues.

Cross cut WG: ecosystem monitoring (all 3 sites), community outreach, maritime (only GF and MB)

Crosscut internal teams: boundary mods, admin.

Today only site specific discussion.

Meeting structure for WG:

Consensus based.

Process, problem development, issue characterization, goals, objectives.

Consensus reached on all but one issue.

June 24-5 education and outreach workshop.

July 2-3 20 researchers reviewed recommendations, prioritized issues.

Today: WG to Council, council to decide what to forward to manager.

Review recommendations, discuss, recommend forward

Handouts: New & Emerging issues PowerPoint, Workbook, Tracking matrix

Ruth to track comments in discussion period.

PRESENTATION:

WG members, topics, issue statement, goals and objectives, objectives and corresponding strategies.

10:00 Water quality working group; Brenda presenter.

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Lewis/third street light rail,
Joe Dillion NMFS water quality
Brenda Donald/Midcoastline
Jack Gregg/CCC
Dominic Gregorio

10 meetings, plus field trips.
Overview of SF public utilities
Surfrider volunteer monitoring programs
CDFG on mariculture in GFNMS
Hog Island oyster farm operations
UC Davis bivalve Mariculture
Tour of Crissy field restoration
Marine debris and ICC/Int'l coastal cleanup
Central Pacific Gyre and marine debris/Charles Moore
Overview of MBNMS water quality plan
GFNMS beach watch data
Report from Region 2 water resources authority

MCSTOPP (Marin Co. stormwater pollution prevention
STRAW: education of youths to preserve watersheds
Sta. Rosa sewage Ocean Outfall proposal
Discussion: public owned treatment plans
State water resources control board current activities
Tom Bay watershed protection plan
PRNS water quality and restoration programs
Agriculture industry BMT's
Tour Giacomini Dairy farm
Coastside Monitoring (Musselwatch, may be discontinued)
Mining and mercury contaminants (from gold mining)

Issue statement: Open dialogue among various groups,
Tomales septic tank issue, mercury,
Emerging pollutants will be of future concern, not at present a major threat.

Goal: corrective and proactive measures

Objectives: develop regionally based plan for non and point source pollution.
Propose new regulations to

Strategy: outreach to minimize impacts, reward BMP, and establish dialogue.

2. Track

3. Track and evaluate

4. Address sources of anthropogenic pathogens and pollutants from recreational and commercial boating

5. Coordinate w/agencies

Objective: Develop regionally based plan for non and point sources

Strategy WQ6 : develop ancillary monitoring through EDS to track HABs (harmful algal blooms)

Ensure continuation of water monitoring (Mussel watch).

Develop standing WQWG supported by Sanctuary staff

Develop administrative capacity to support coordinated WQ protection plan

Develop annotated bibliography of monitoring and research programs.

Educate local decision makers on water quality issues.

Revise GF discharge regulations to better address water quality

Develop regulation to address impacts from outside sanctuary (i.e., watershed activities)

Use regulatory terminology consistent with State of California

Prevent new Maricultures that are inconsistent w/GF's goals.

Karen: question about SF outfall, what changes came from issuance of new MPDS permit.

Brenda: in case of multiple event occurrence, combined system will discharge lightly treated sewage.

SF not anticipating changes in near future.

Karen: only 8-9 outflow events per year at SF plant (Oceanside).

Monitoring goes along with MPDS permit, outflow changes with varying weather conditions.

Bob Wilson questioned what Bay Area steps are being taken? Brenda noted several upgrades have been done throughout the area. It's up to the counties to address stormwater prevention programs, but they have not been effective to date. Businesses, malls, agriculture

Urban use responsible for vast majority of pollution.

"Impaired listing" making determination what falls into this classification. State is now putting out a list of impaired waters.

Jim: Develop and implement monitoring programs, coordinate with SF Estuary Institute? Intent is to work with existing agencies. Annotated bibliography will reveal areas not covered.

Mussel watch funding cut may cause program to be terminated, end 40 years of data collection.

Bob: no mussel watch points exist in GF or CB.

On 14: develop regulations to address impacts, clarify that any possible source of contamination from watershed, etc.

No. 13 is the most powerful item.

Re: 13 and 14, how comprehensive is prohibition of bilge water discharge?

Question on 14: cruise ship discharge: presentation to be given on issue, existing regs are inadequate for 5,000 passenger vessels.

Bob: landowners to be contacted re: watershed contamination. Excessive drawdown should be included as water quality issue. (e.g., Pilarcitos Creek) groundwater issue.

Monitoring of introduced species e.g. abalone, or parasites.

On no. 7, dovetails with Education, Bob knows of one high school which would be interested in monitoring, tracking phytoplankton.

Abalone farm just outside Half Moon Bay harbor, inside the jetty outside Sanctuary waters.

Richard: Committee to be commended for exhaustive work. Senate energy bill would open areas to exploration, Dart plume samples. We must assume in 5 years we'll have exploratory drilling in the moratorium areas. Current plumes from oil industry would be covered by No. 14, but Anne indicated enforcement capabilities are an issue.

Ed: correction to map, no longer dumpsite where shown. Puerto Rican, Independence is 20 miles north.

Sanctuary boundary goes to Dux ? Cove.

See page 30 map.

Dave Lott will revise map.

Karen: Mariculture needs more discussion, tracking and regulating strategies. Evaluate current activities, Sanctuary does not issue Mariculture permits.

Sanctuary wants to be able to review; bivalve Mariculture in Tomales Bay is the only current industry. Future kinds of Mariculture activity in lease areas not currently in use.

Could Sanctuary prohibit new Mariculture activities?

Ed said no new Mariculture activities since 1991. EIS is required, was due in 1997 but has not been achieved.

Draft EIR was issued by CDFG recently, "green light" for expansion of aquaculture up and down the coast. Provided guidelines to new permit applicants. The regional water quality control boards have piecemeal and inadequate standards. There is no way to learn of cumulative impacts. Programmatic Concern no new aquaculture regs are being proposed.

One purpose is to review existing permits, second is to prohibit new projects.

From water quality and invasive species this is important.

Jim: Don't discourage Mariculture, just Bivalve Mariculture in Tomas

WILDLIFE DISTURBANCE
SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Chris Abraham
Steve Durkin

Mick Menigoz
Joanne, MJ
Bob Wilson

Five meetings, some internal topics.
White shark research
Human disturbance of seabirds
Intertidal trampling
Inventory current GFNMS programs

—
Acoustic impacts, entanglements, fisheries interactions.

Lessen, eliminate and remedy impacts y encouraging responsible human behavior.
Objectives: 1. Evaluate levels and sources of impacts on wildlife and habitats
Address human

Use volunteer monitoring programs (Seals, BW). Develop intertidal impact study, using high school students. Similar to FMR program, yields high value data.

Continue to coordinate re: harbor seal census.

Second strategy is to get info on database, will use contractors.

Third strategy to develop research and monitoring on issue of aircraft disturbance (visual and noise).

Propose appropriate regulatory program. Increase enforcement, outreach to pilots clubs.

Strategy 4: vessel impacts using BW and SEALS programs to record disturbance. Distribute wildlife viewing guidelines, collaborate w/other agencies to develop long term monitoring programs. use standardized reporting system.

Strategy 6, interpretive enforcement to address human impacts.

Strategy 7: Develop wildlife viewing guidelines to reduce disturbance, partnerships.

Strategy 8: Develop K-12 wildlife disturbance education unit as part of Coastal Ecosystem Education Curriculum.

Hire permanent enforcement officer (part of Strategy 6)

Strategy 9: Greater media outreach of Sanctuary and its programs

Strategy 10: Acoustic impacts, propose regulatory action to address impacts; do literature search, determine impacts on fish, mammals, birds.

Strategy 11: Proposed new regs for interaction with white sharks. Our group identified issue, and suggest a timeframe. Presentations by Lawrence and Peter. Discussions re: conflicts between user groups. Various parties weren't as much in conflict as anticipated. The parties came up with proposed recommendations. Significant compromises made by different parties.

See page 58 for text of proposed regs. Working group and stakeholders

Regulatory issues: Interim or emergency regs (120 days only). Could do in first year; limited entry through permit process discussed. Surfboard trawl problematic especially for reproduction age females.

Joanne: Strategy 6, BW and SEALS not currently involved in enforcement.

Barbara: Page 58, proposed "A" should be clarified so that fishing vessels can continue to work in the area around SE Farallon. Proposed regs by Lawrence and Peter still are not finalized between themselves, language must be carefully crafted to permit towing a dinghy, e.g.

Bob: Number 1, FMR is using Generra as consultant to monitor visitors. Volunteers will question visitors, profile the visitors and monitor visitor activity.

FMR has own protocols in effect for 9 years, will change to comply with PISCO program.

No. 2 (3?), has same problem getting data into the computer, will make into a senior student project.

HMB airport close to seal haul outs excellent contact for channelling information to user group, pilot's association.

No 5: long term study, John Pierce doing 30 year project at Natural Bridges, take long time for recovery to occur.

No. 6, have used sheriff to write tickets in the past, establish rapport with local agencies. Sheriff must know what regs apply, which code to issue citation under.

No. 8, important to reach out to elementary and high school age students, especially re: harbor seal disturbance. Explain reason seals must rest undisturbed.

Jim: Use prophylactic approach, does wildlife programs worldwide. Important to make rules globally consistent so when our people travel, they take the message with them. Don't make site specific regulations. More generalized Responsibly watching California's marine wildlife.

Richard; Outreach to airports is essential, low flying aircraft buzzing the rocks near his home. Full scale aircraft buzzing haul out areas, planes are not being identified, CF numbers should be called in. Santa Rosa Airport, any airport in geographic area "buzzing the coast is not okay" – not being enforced, message can be channeled easily. Sunset flights.

Richard: shark regulations not easy to understand. Need vernacular version of language. During public comment, Peter or Lawrence can provide clarification.

Brenda: Guidelines should be expanded to people watching wildlife, and to people en route elsewhere for other activities e.g. at Montara where elephant seals are present still allows dogs.

Education and enforcement needed, not more regulations if they already exist.

Ed: Sanctuary does not get involved in enforcement after violation information has been turned in. Ed: there is already regulations in place, but we should coordinate with the public, and other agencies more effectively. Does overflight regulation mean altitude, or have to do with the actual disturbance?

Barbara: We're not working in a vacuum, there are jurisdictional issues.

Jan: clarify Strategy 3, overflight. Asks for research, additional observations. Bob: this language was intended as general language. Not site specific, used anecdotal info.

Karen: Sound impacts, coordinate with others on literature search. Don't foresee immediate role for Sanctuary.

Brenda question re: Decoys: use surfboards? Peter will address in his comments.

Anne: white shark issue will receive same weight as other wildlife disturbance.

Peter: these written after much thought. Shark research has been done for 22 years, learning about what scares sharks away, behavioral observation, ecology.

Peter: working since 1980 in Farallones.

A: vessel approach, boats bigger than sharks will scare away from feed event. Stumpy scared off carcass, gone since then. Sharks get one seal per year at SEFI, one seal represents three months of effort.

When feeding event, 50 meter minimum distance to be maintained. Research permit may be issued for boats less than 6 meters in length.

B: Decoys do included surfboards. Surfrider is interested in issue. Decoys use limited to less than 1 hour per day for research, not wishing to habituate sharks. 33-34 hours per year of decoy work. In last five years, has up to 7 boats working waters around the island. No regs are now in place, plywood seal lures used by other boats.

If towing decoy at "seal" speed, sharks will rush-attack. If floating decoy, sharks come up to investigate decoy, less disturbing. Cage divers need lure to bring sharks in. No chumming of any kind, but specified constructed decoys will be minimal disturbance.

Lawrence: Pretty much agreed on regs, still need to determine area of closure. Use shark-friendly decoys, rubberized. No more surfboards. Company will operate as of today according to guidelines presented.

Karen: Why not recommend limited entry? Both Lawrence and peter are in favor of limited entry. It might be beneficial to include limited entry language.

A permit would set forth the requirements.

Barbara: If Sanctuary would be issuing permit. "Underway" has specific meaning (in three paragraphs). What agency would be determining value of education or research project. Benefit must be demonstrated to justify permit issuance.

Richard: Will this set a precedent elsewhere? Anne doesn't know of any similar regs in Sanctuary system.

Monterey has anti chumming regs, this is more; ;comprehensive. Look at the intent of language.

Brenda: surfboards should be modified to be less potentially harmful.

Any vessel can be towed.

RECOMMENDATION: forward the recommendation to the manager, all agreed, non disputing. Add looking into limited entry, per karen's suggestion, or include permit issuance. Number of permits would limit number of boats.

All recommendations go to the manager. All agreed, none dissenting.

LUNCH BREAK

Karen Reyna: Introduced Species

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Shannon Lyday

Lauren Mark, Etc.

Got overview of California legislation on introduced species. 8 meetings, outreach needed.
Three types of action: detection, prevention, eradication. Current levels are not well documented, nor are the impacts.

"Introduced" is preferred term. Invasive vs. introduced terminology: Introduced = non-native; invasive means its established itself.

Causes: nearshore discharge of ballast water, debris, dredging, drydocks, live seafood. G-modified species that escaped.

Objective to learn extent: develop native and introduced species inventory for Sanctuary and adjacent areas.

First priority action to gauge abundance and distribution.

Second priority develop web based data base and share info w/other agencies.

Coordinate existing programs to detect in estuarine and rocky intertidal habitats.

Currently no programs exist

Monitoring in rocky intertidal already ongoing; either expand program, or expand areas monitored.

Strategy 4: Pelagic areas, focus on plankton. Will require partnership w/CB and NMFS.

Final strategy: develop volunteer based outreach program.

Most introduced species are found accidentally. Raise awareness of public, develop materials.

Develop list of most likely invaders.

Third objective develop management actions to control.

Develop partnerships w/other groups.

- establish ongoing technical advisory council
- sit on Cal Fed nonnative species advisory council

Rapid responses permit process to be developed. Identify, then deal with it.

Strategy 8: regulatory action to control new introductions by prohibiting species.

Outreach to inform audience and industry on prevention.

Develop targeted prevention program (shipping industry already targeted).

Target public: homeowners, boat owners, etc. Promote best management practices. Ensure boaters don't introduce species.

Barbara: spartina invasive.

Karen: Bolinas and Tomales are two sites where spartina exists.

Bob: Monitoring program needed; Elkhorn Slough may provide good model for us.

We should enlist the aid of abalone divers, used to have organization of sport divers Paul Trumbull. Also, dive clubs and dive shops to be targeted.

On item 6, partnerships include Jim Carlton from out of California. Discovered zebra mussel on east coast.

No. 7, use volunteer divers to eradicate.

Rapid response team could be made up through dive clubs.

Fish and Game code has current regs, much better to use local or state laws when possible, vs. Federal regulations.

Targeted audience dive and sport clubs, may see something unusual. >>>> Use laminated cards to show invasive species.

Anne: most monitoring is occurring in harbors and bays, not outer coast waters. Use Elkhorn as model. Karen can give training program.

Brenda: some of the recommendations overlap with wildlife disturbance and water quality.

FORWARD RECOMMENDATIONS TO MANAGER, AGREED UPON. NO DISSENTS.

Other species kelp knideria in Monterey Bay, caulerpa in San Diego area. Whelks, green crab, etc. Planktonic introduced species. Abalone parasite noted in Bodega Bay. Bacteria also.

Karen: mariculture must be monitored strictly. Nearby species can be affected by introduced species, even if host species not harmed. Fish and GAME cognizant of problems.

Fishing Activities: Richard Charter presented.

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Richard, Maria, Mick, Barbara, Karen. Combined Ecosystem Protection and fishing activities. 8 meetings, around 1,000 topics,

- essential fish habitat defined and sited,
- report of PEW Commission,
- role of PCFFA,
- report from the water,
- role of NGO's in fishing issues
- zonal management (e.g. FKNMS)
- biology of fisheries management,
- oceanographic processes
- MBNMS krill harvesting issues presentation.

If MB bans krill harvesting, could have displacement effect on GF and CB sites. We to consider a pre-emptive ban. Could have salmon population implications.

Issue statement: fishing may have impacts on living marine resources, habitats and ecosystem dynamics, we don't have good understanding.

Study impacts to trophic interactions, trampling, gear impacts, localized depletion of bait fish and region wide declines in fish populations.

Anne: Reason to include in report under Emerging Issues. She and Richard could not come to agreement.

Richard: there is a fundamental difference of opinion that this was not just fishing activities working group, relict of ecosystem working group. Not a primarily fishing issue, ecosystem protection working group. Emerging issues a "parking lot" – zonal management is already implemented in NMS Program, not emerging. It's an Ecosystem protection issues.

Other alternatives: if FA5 was objectionable, strip out title and have it become FA4. "to address impacts from fishing and other activities." This creates a process and "on ramp". Not controversial in Florida Keys. Suggests Ecosystem Protection WG be set up.

Bob: Include word, "marine reserve" in document. Half a dozen in California already exist. Ecosystem Resources Management, biomass increase, species densities, individual size increase, number of eggs laid, species diversity increases. Anacapa Island example cites for spiny lobster. Spillover benefits areas on edges of Preserve. Export larvae into nearby areas.

Mick: in theory, reserves are great. In practice, it would be difficult to work out here. Salmon closure at SEFI or Duxbury Reef, whole industry would be shut down. Point Reyes and part of Farallon Islands are already closed. Depth restrictions on rockfish areas. Why penalize salmon fishermen fishing in top 30 feet of water, if intent is to protect bottom rockfish habitat. Scale response to size of problem, MR's "make fishermen very nervous."

Anne: Zonal management applies to many types of different activities. White shark regs constitute

Bob wants to address.

Karen: blunt phrase, didn't like ecosystem protection and fishing lumped together. Zonal management is a way to manage Sanctuaries. This is a good framework. Must understand socioeconomic issues. Karen doesn't feel this is an emerging issue.

Barbara: As Bob said, deal with specific problems, taken care of by Strategy Four. Marine reserves are too broad as tools. Ecosystem protection is at bottom of all the issues. If MR's are a major tool, need different tools to address different problems.

Bob Breen: we should look at MR's as one tool in box, since State is now looking at it. Bob Wilson: at Pacifica meeting, was going to have separate WG's.

Anne: Placement is the problem,

Ed: Strategy 6, anyone opposed? Consensus achieved on standing group. Impacts from fishing activities are the only ... re-insert "AND"

Objective 2:

Bob Wilson: wants to see marine reserves addresses, since State of California has proposed them. Should be some discussion. No-take zones very few. Both esteros, salmon were excluded from pelagic areas.

Jim: confused re: the terms being used. There are reasons to protect juvenile stocks, benefits to fisheries as well as ecosystem biodiversity. Juvenile billfish should not be fished on, go deep to get adults.

Anne: not necessarily focus,

Maria: recommends to group Strategy Five, categories can change, today do you recommend that GF look at this strategy? Should it be broader than just fishing?

Richard: we already had idea to set as standalone heading, but each WG gives its own imprimatur. To take this one item and set it aside without a WG behind it.

Maria: the recommendations may be completely reformatted. Identify it not as a WG recommendation, but as a package.

Anne: if Council as a whole wants to forward this to the management.

Barbara:

Gwen: would WG mind this issue was broader than the scope of just fishing activities.

Jim: Let's change name to FA and ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION. Break out recommendations separately. Objective 2: delete "fisheries" and broaden language.

BREAK:

Created EP section, added fourth objective. (SEE NEW LANGUAGE"
>>>>>> REVISED TEXT, Created EP Strategy 1, standing working group, pulled out of fishing group.

Discussion of new category:
Seems to work for everyone.

Fishing Activities & Ecosystem protection discussion:

Gwen: question re: prioritization, FA 1 resource characterization, how are priorities being d

Anne: as we went through all options, prioritized six criteria. For this WG, didn't have many options to begin with.

Anne explained ranking criteria. Although resource characterizing rated a 3, it is needed before other issues can be dealt with.

Gwen: FA 1 is necessary for other higher numbers to be dealt with. Basic underpinning.

>>>>>> Given changes made today, should this be forwarded to Manager. Unanimous with language as it stands now.

Comments: coordinate with State marine reserves process (MLPA) since some will be in the Sanctuary. **AGREED BY COUNCIL.**

No dissenters.

VESSEL SPILLS:

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Jim Kelley: Maria Brown, George Galasso (OCNMS), Chris Hochschild USCG, Jim, Steve Thompson, Becky Smyth NOS region, Six meetings, (see previous minutes for topics).

Tankers, other vessels,

Reviewed MBNMS process establish vessel tracks (see Page 126) ... green lines run diagonally to right prior to July 15, 2000 move to 2 and 3 now. Study sought to take worst case scenario, loses power e.g. between Pt. Conception and starts to drift. How fast the vessel drifts, how soon can it be rescued by tugs up and down the coast.

Bar pilot presentation, different angle than Coast Guard. Looked at circulation model to predict spill trajectory. Some work is needed.

Primary impacts marine mammals and seabirds, but other natural resources too. Spills can occur from any transiting vessel. Rule 9 governs commercial larger vessels, less so recreational and smaller commercial boats. Greatest impacts. USCG provided information on traffic volume.

Objective: assess current level of risk, detect areas to improve. Anticipate future problems.

Develop outreach program for maritime industry, fishing and recreational boaters. Continuous evaluation and leverage opportunities for improvements, build partnerships with industry groups.

Expand drift analysis model to Point Arena.

Improve existing spill and drift model.

Evaluate vessel activities as first step in risk assessment.

Determine and evaluate potential risks from transiting vessels.

Objective: assess level of risk and determine if improvements can be made to reduce risk.

Strategy VS 5: evaluate recent vessel routing changes related to MBNMS vessel traffic study.

Strategy VS 6: track distribution and numbers of sensitive species and habitats in relation to probable spill trajectories..

Objective 2: develop long term monitoring programs to identify trends and take proactive measures to reduce risk when appropriate.

Jim: reporting near-miss requirement, not just actual collision.

Expand vessel traffic monitoring beyond pilot station "circle" .

Anne: we're interested in long term data, not real time data.

Outbound the Coast Guard only tracks inbound traffic, not outbound.

Now every vessel will be required to have an "AIS" transponder which brings up vessel identification.

Strategy 11: revise GF in house emergency plan

12: network

13: outreach to mariners to increase stewardship, including voluntary compliance with vessel traffic system and sanctuary regs.

Strategy 14: better communication with industry groups (Maritime trade Council, e.g.).

15: sanctuary representative to participate in regional forum to address issue.

16: standing vessel spills WG to advise Sanctuary on implementation of proposed action plans.

Maria: add that recommendations the Sanctuary could not implemented on its own, need assistant and encouragement from other agencies.

Richard: proposing amendment to VS 13- Notification of transiting vessel that was damaged. Sea River Long Beach transited CI GF CB MB and OC, "free exchange with the sea" – USCG cleared vessel to sail to with rubber patch, holding ship's crude from Alaska.

Sailed into port angeles

Shipper drained front tank

Transmit amendment to eliminate voluntary compliance

Mandatory notification of sanctuary managers when injured vessel transiting Sanctuary waters.

Barbara: re: vessel lane change, are shifts voluntary? Voluntary compliance, as in the past.

If west lane shifted more to the south, Southern traffic lanes moved out from the coast. Now have a broader area of traffic. No recommendation to move the west lanes. Jim is not seeing vessels near shore.

Ed: if pilot is on board,

Coast Guard in Olympic Coast has charted 99% compliance in avoiding areas in OCNMS. Lessens risk of liability, insurance is an issue. How is it going to sound at a hearing?

Maria noted that an arrangement was in place but they didn't notify GFNMS

Richard: any damaged vessel can do considerable harm.

Brenda: recommends separating from outreach. – make a separate strategy.

Recommendation to include this sp

Shall we forward to sanctuary manager?

Mandatory notice of damaged vessel potentially transiting the Sanctuary. (must indicate

All in favor of forwarding to Manager; no dissents.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

8 speakers, 3 minutes each.

Gordon Bennett Sierra Club: we're making mistake by not having input from Marin Co. environmental groups on land use and fisheries issues. Streamside setbacks. Bolinas Lagoon restoration act.

Environmental groups blew plan out of the water

No mention of streamside setback for building and septic tanks.

Redwood Creek and Big Lagoon not mentioned.

Ranchers being encourages to

Difference between salmon farming and bivalve farming in TB.

Capacity under WQ 6 re: water discharge when at capacity.

No mention of two stroke engines, significant polluters

Water diversion not emphasized enough.

Wildlife Disturbance: don't dump it all on Beach Watch, it's not a wildlife disturbance program. Seals can potentially assist with this.

Voluntary enforcement: dumb dangerous, illegal re: ticket writing.

Emphasis on wildlife vs. pets. Put up signage Dogs and seals

Paddlers etiquette should not be used by agencies.

Jessica Hamilton/TOC Pacific region ecosystem manager.

From Oregon. Consensus laudable.

Priorities of TOC not reflected in presentations. 30k members in California.

Ecosystem/Fisheries reworking is good, EP 1, determine need for zoning. We believe need for

Ecosystem biodiversity. Can provide data. Biogeographic Assessment has good back ground which can bump this up to Priority 1, eliminate some complexity.

2. Create long term working group,

Water quality: address two stroke engines, mariculture

Support WD recommendations and Introduced species recommendations.

Lawrence Groth:

Distributed handouts.

Agreed with Peter where cage diving can happen at SEFI, still need some language. Limited entry suggested guidelines for permit process. Want to make sure other groups coming in show the same respect as GGE for past five years. Shark's best interest is most important. Excited about proposed

guidelines, but will operate as if they were already law. Increase and improve public perception of Sanctuary and white sharks, and the habitat. Hope to make living at the business.

Peter Pyle:/PRBO:

See handouts.

Some loose ends still, not quite agreed on map of restriction area around Farallones for cage diving use. Five nautical mile buffer beyond island, and small "patch" around saddle rock. Crosshatched area is okay.

No vessels to tow decoy when underway. Language needs to be added and agreed upon. Drifting is underway. Hope to get regulations in place from here on out. Newcomers could become the problem. Regs and a permit process in perpetuity for the good of the ecosystem.

Paul Kelley: not here.

Lewis Ames: no comment

Karen Garrison: NRDC

Fishing group: Farallones have mythic status, extraordinary bird life and marine mammals and fish populations as connective link. Ersatz WG had challenge, important to chart course and take ecosystem approach, though would supplement, not supplant, CDFG mandate. Direction has broad support in scientific community.

Both ocean commissions endorse.

Some elements in recommendations, and burden of proof

Suggest amendment to recommendation:

1. Ecosystem based approach, appreciate ocean's limits
2. Precautionary approach
3. Develop appreciation for fish in broader ecosystem
4. look at fish values as prey and predators
5. Amend to include promoting Ecosystem based approach to management of fisheries.
6. Recommend by certain date 2005 any fisheries in GF be limited access fisheries.
7. B y 2007 fishing in GF be subject to management plan
8. Recommend establish forage factors and establish standards
9. Recommend zoning program; keep it in.
10. (and)

Kyra Mills/PRBO speaking for Greg Elliont and Bill Sydeman

32 years of data on birds and pinnipeds. Support MPA's to restore fisheries and ecosystems.

Hundreds of research studies in scientific literature. Endorse of designate of offshore GFNMS around FI and oceanic front that sweeps from Pt. Reyes toward FI.

Important for ecosystem integrity.

Use tools to conserve endangered taxa, minimize biodiversity. Buffer marine ecosystems against catastrophic events and mismanagement.

Provide measurement

Protect spawning habitat

Protect local forage habitats

Provide refugia in el nino events.

Offshore portions should be protected.

Tom Yarish: Endorses everything heard to date. Co chair friends of the esteros (landowners, TB oyster farmers, EAWM for Esteros Americano and San Antonio. Prevent Santa Rosa from using esteros for sewage disposal.

Founding member of TB Watershed Council, finally adopted infallible management plan for TB. Will forge more partnerships.

Proposals to add stronger protection for esteros for fully protected status. Only two coastal estuaries not dredged, diked or filled. Please adopt stronger protections.

Public comment ended 3:59.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT: Council agreed.

Gordon: Agree re: esteros, extend to BL and TB too. Coho restoration project (Big Lagoon) needs protection. TB has most successful restoration project. Young salmon are protected by land use and water diversion measures. Look further upstream

Vessel spill data integrated into vessel spill. GF can give GIS training to BW volunteers during a spill with special training. Include this in recommendations.

Jessica: supports general mariculture, but manager being able to review permits is critical, and preferably deny applications.

Karen Garrison: Endorse PRBO comments and include more sites. Too much focus on marine reserves. Sanctuary not to do the management, but recommend standards. Look at other kinds of MPA's. Keep marine reserves in the tool kit..

Public wants fully protected areas in Sanctuaries. Ecosystem design preserves resilience of health of ecosystem. Some places must retain high productivity.

EDUCATION:

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Bob Breen: Nancy Caplan, Christing Fontaine, MB, Jenny Saltzman., Doreen Moser, First three meeting with Cordell Bank.

Seven meetings; topics (see previous meeting minutes)

>>>>>>

local groups and direction of NMSP Education. Address multi-cultural education, very complex.

GF didn't have a long term strategy to educate visitors about Sanctuary.
Goal to use watershed approach to education.

Education is management tool, even when doing unpopular things like restricting dogs. Know community's best interests.
Complements research and monitoring efforts. Include school children in monitoring programs. May restart middle school students.

Create an informed public through outreach and volunteer programs.

Education reaches all age groups and audiences.

Objectives: 1. structure to follow environmental literacy continuum. Not just one shot.
Change behaviors based on knowledge gained, eventually become stewards.

Join GF or other volunteer program

Obj 2: partner with other groups

Obj 3: develop programs that target certain audiences. Influencers, impact groups, divided by "marketing" categories.

Literacy: education k-8 through VC and outreach
Education HS students in classroom and field trips
STR; inner city students through Explorers program
Provide stewardship opportunities
Education teachers through class activities
Outreach by trained volunteers.
Increase awareness through lecture series.
Include issues
Educational programs expanded at VC.
Increase via Ocean Fest events. Attract
Produce and distribute videos.
Engage middle and high school students in monitoring.
Increase reach of programs and products to broad audiences.
Effective media and advertising techniques.
Increase VC; now get 30k per annum, grow to one million.
Educate consumers and seafood distributors re: sustainable seafood, Empower
Interpretive signage at additional locations.
Expand reach via training other groups to deliver GFNMS messages.

OBJECT 2: programs and partners.

Incorporate Sanct message in other groups programs, and adapt their curriculum to our needs.

Obj 3: target certain audiences re: watershed connection w/Sanctuary; bring future inland.

Build existing and new programs, cannot use standard product to all audiences.

Karen: STRG 15: needs implementation timeline. (see page 148). Hot button issue, Will check on timeline.

Brenda: Suggest Save our Shores as other partner in Sustainable Seafood project.

Jim: Limpets current program for rocky intertidal and sandy beach. Cooperative developed by several central California sanctuaries. Badly needed is concept that long term monitoring is necessary. Involve students in long term monitoring. Great service to science and students. Build a workforce for future recruitment.

Bob: Needs unit in Limpets on scientific method.

Richard: Yesterday's Examiner feature story on Bay Trail. Huge story. "Sanctuary at our doorstep" kind of story.

Brenda: change entire culture, not just behavior.

Karen: Strategy 15: wants to hear discussion What is the intention? Basically, its to continue ongoing events like ocean fest to link message of sustainable seafood. Message is that food promotes locally obtained, sustainably fished, seasonal. We facilitate getting the word out. Other groups (like Aquarium) produced cards).

Barbara: Monterey will update seafood cards, give current information.

Karne: GF should tread lightly on this issue, on what gets listed. Education is a long process, don't get into the process too much.

Sanctuary should educate people to ask questions re: seafood.. Tricky to give list of okay seafood, better to train to ask than hand-feed information.

RECOMMENDED TO FORWARD TO MANAGER, ADD IN OUTREACH AS WELL. WILL LOOK AT AS A WHOLE.

Maria: this is not issue based, it's a tool driven

ALL AGREED TO FORWARD TO MQANAQGER

Anne: review six topic areas; is any additional conversation needed?

SUMMARY:

Water quality: a reason two stroke engines weren't mentioned. Simply too many contributing causes to issue. Can Sanctuary force Marshall into sanitary district? One reason for making it an ongoing working group., Will incorporate into comments.

Tertiary plant at North Beach to relieve pressure on Oceanside plant.
Water diversion, encourage water reuse.

Richard: watershed WQ 5: coordinate Estuarine, item C as discharge and item D. Other agencies need to address, improve coordination and have standing WG for this issue.

WILDLIFE DISTURBANCE:

Recommendations as Council get report issue, don't get so excited that we become skeptical observers. Have regular meeting updates on shark policy. Surfboards not good decoys. PRBO will be looking at impacts of boats. Other operators

Bob: emergency regs appropriate if things get wild out there. Maximum length 120 days. Can only stop what is going on. All or nothing deal, not selective.

FISHING ACTIVITIES/ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION::

See new language.

INTRODUCED SPECIES:

No comments

VESSEL SPILLS:

During Puerto Rican NOAA model backwards, form telephone trees to keep updates on progress of spill trajectory. Beach Watch deploys volunteers to sites.

Training BW vols for specific spill response.

EDUCATION:

No comments.

ALL RECOMMENDATIONS FORWARDED W/ADDITIONAL COMMENTS"

Karen: re: working w/Marin environmental community, public hasn't been able to digest information presented here. Review timeline for next steps.

Gwen: requestd review of input.

Anne: checked with research and education groups. Continuing effort to see all recommendations. Brought in researchers too.

Kept information separate from ongoing review. "reality check" with people who work in the field, is available to review. Designed to complement Council recommendations.

Education group work with info all the time, extracted outreach and education from other groups. See distribution of workload. What is needed for five year continuation of existing programs.

Research created matrix projecting over five years, assess needs for long term continuation.

Anne will distribute list to Council next week.

NEXT STEPS:

Maria: research and education need sense of priorities. \$1 million, staff of five. What are higher priorities?

What is within the purview of the Sanctuary?

Barbara: go back to definition of priorities? Redefine "urgent" and "irreversible"

Criteria use is complicated. Focus on relative sense, and list necessary first steps.

WG made up of diverse.

Richard: next steps: Is a NEPA process pending? Timing for draft EIS? How does this integrate into NEPA document.

After tomorrow, will compile packet of recommendation, take it to Maria in August. Meet w/staff and come out with draft Management Plan maybe at September meeting.

Council to review January 2004 draft EIR and have hearings up and down the coast. Public comment period. 90 day comment period. May be one combined document, or three separate documents.

If Council wants EIS to look just at GFNMS, can provide that input.

Richard: if GF has own EIS, cross cutting issues would appear identically and be cross referenced.

MOTION: Richard as a Sac, of GFNMS convene to powers that be above Manager, that GF would benefit from its own DEIS in management plan review process.

that GF would have a separate DEIS constitutes the management plan.

SECOND: Mick Menigoz

Brenda: what are advantages and alternatives?

Bob W: if one document, Monterey's complexities could delay our progress.

In draft EIS when regs are proposed, must go through DEIS and analysis of impacts from proposed action. Question of geographic areas impacted? Study area from bio geo is point arena to point sal.

If GF separated out, can do analysis of smaller area.

Barbara: if southern area changes,

Anne: you can separate out controversial areas from package. Studyd areas is larger than sanctuary boundary.

Maria: if all 3 combined, all sites should be dragged down if one element bogged down.

Jim: is there a down side to going independently. Can comment as Council on Monterey issues, if cross cutting issues.

Karen: Is funding the issue? Anne: won't save money doing together. Same geographic range, same regulatory actions. No substantial savings.

Ed: If CB and MB had same reg proposed, The rationale of one can be cut and pasted into the other's for same regulations.

Bob W: Only proposed regulatory issues need to be set out.

No economy by combining. Monterey and GF stand at risk of entanglement.

Cordell would benefit most.

All in favor, motion carries.

UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

//////////

adjourned 5:30 p.m.

Council Retreat
Day 2, Tuesday, July 22, 2003
At 8:40 a.m. the meeting reconvened.

Roll: Bb, Rac, Be, jK, Mm, Bw, Bd, Gh, kr
Absent: Brian O, Peter G, Brian M

Overview of Monday's priorities.
All clear, no problems voiced.

Tuesday:
See agenda (site specific IT's)
Cross cut WG's, Cross cut IT

Maria: Administration Internal Team
Strengthen infrastructure by funding and staff. Partnerships, more coordination, regulatory and enforcement issues.

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Be efficient and effective w/resources, without seeing Council's recommendations, strategy has been proposed.

STR 1, VC: Pacific VC, Crissy Field VC, expanded.

STR 2: Staff.

STR 3: partnerships, outside funding, in kind service sources

STR 4: "Mature" Council, refocus on direction for future, look at other models of SAC's, redefine rols

STR 5: interagency coordination/cooperation to complement current authority, include

STR 6: Enforcement plan

STR 7: Emergency response plan, including interagency

STR 8: Planning and evaluation success of efforts, modify existing programs, develop new (performance measurements)

STR 9: Regulations and permitting (see ppg 189-90); remove pipeline language, prohibit developing and producing minerals. Discharge: make language w/Federal WPCA language. No exception for interim dredge site (regulatory relic). Outfall exception: Mariculture exception only applies sto Tom Bay. (Clarify language). Ecological maintenance is unclear term, get rid of it.

Removing or damaging any cultural resource: beef up language, include possess or attempt to remove. Boundaries: change "area of marine waters" to "areas of submerged lands"

Proposed new regs: deposit or discharge from beyond sanctuary. Lightering in sanctuary (petroleum products and/or other materials); introducing exotic species or genetically modifying one; intentional feeding or attracting a lawful resource except for fishing.

Adopt cruise ship discharge restrictgion consistent w/Monterey Bay. Overlay MBTA and ESA with sanctuary regs.

Anne: these are IT recommendations only.

Barbara: how exotic species defined?

Ed: genetically modified are not now covered. Anne: if not native to Eastern Pacific.

Need to overlay regs because GF has very high penalty \$119k per violation), gives us a bigger hammer for enforcement.

Anne: we use regs as tools to complement resource management.

Ed: we've had many occasions where paying a fine is cheaper than correcting problems.

Jim: Submerged lands language; how defined? Anne: no depth definition for this term, but it's never been challenged. When looking at slant drilling, it gives GF the chance to address that, and extends GF's authority. Anne: it's considered within authority of GFNMS.

Jim: Global warming? Still must be within high tide mark (Anne).

Anne: in Tom Bay when Giacomini ranch dike is breached, sanctuary boundaries will change, with saltwater intrusion. Salinity is not a factor.

"Marine waters" does not encompass the land under the water.

Richard: There is legislative history on submerged lands term.

Brian Oneill arrived 09:04 a.m.

Richard: question to #89A, including developing and producing minerals, I suggest most likely scenario is methane hydrates; hydrocarbon, but is it defined as a mineral?

Add language, including methane hydrates (frozen natural gas).

Anne: can include it in definition, or mention by name.

Richard: in #C, question about "except in connection w/outfall pipeline" – if we remove exemption in A for pipelines, isn't construction of outfall already prohibited. Anne: this relates exclusively to hydrocarbon pipelines. Ed: This applies only to Tomales Bay (Anne contradicts, suggested it be removed completely).

Recommend delete pipeline altogether.

Anne: exception is for entire Sanctuary, not just Tomales Bay. Water quality WG would also want to review all permits.

Anne: routine maintenance must be within original footprint.

Brenda: no expansion or new docks allowed? Ed/Anne correct. Ed clarified that from Duck's cove to the mouth of the bay in 1/4 mile a dock is outside the Sanctuary, and a dock could be built there.

Jan: Does this include a restoration project? Distinct from maintenance? Manager would look at this on a case by case basis. Clear definition of routine maintenance needed.

Jim: #4, I support language, but is NSP the one politically contentious issue (boundary issue) I feel Council is set up for political ends, not taken seriously if it's inconvenient to do so (present company excepted). Credibility of process depends on our expressing opinions. Short comment periods are inadequate, bear presumption that the Council's voice is actually heard.

Anne: Council is taken seriously,

Bob: You injured yourself in Council process by taking "scientific" stance, not listening to what people want.

Anne: Council position will go up to highest levels and will be heard.

Jim: Long term viability of NMSP depends on Councils being heard. I wish some one meant what they said when they indicated we're the important ones in doing this work.

Jim: at your own (NMSP) peril take this recommendation seriously.

Anne: comment on action items specifically,

Jim: I believe you're sincere;

Barbara: We advise the manager, not the NMSP.

Ed: I'm the manager, Maria is assistant mgr

Barbara: There is not enough input from constituency as to who Council member is. Why someone from trawling industry not sitting in as maritime activities?

Ed: we selected from those who applied; all had equal chance to do so.

Each council member must represent their designated group even if its not their own segment of industry. Anyone can put their name forward.

Bob W: we must formalize how we deal with our consistencies. At joint Monterey meeting, factionalization was evident. We need a communication plan.

Anne: Sanctuary determines number and kind of seats, not who sits there. The at-large seat gives us a way to expand the panel.

Ed: Council can choose to expand seats, or set ongoing working group.

Richard: Jim's point is valid; we should make statement today. I don't want to appear to have endorsed a policy recommendation we did not agree to. In other sanctuary, someone went straight to the Admiral, went outside the process (boundary). This undermines confidence in Sanctuary management at the highest levels (in washington).

We must be deliberate about what we endorse and don't endorse. Not just dissenting opinion, Council as a whole should go on record with their objections. Be deliberative about whatever issue is under discussion, else the Council will be used as the "excuse."

Anne: Months ago you wrote a letter asking to be in boundary group. He was responsive .

Bob/Jim/Barbara: wanted Council working group, not staff IT with Council sitting in.

Anne: One council member on each WG.

Bob: No. There was a gag order, we had no access to documents coming out of it. We were voiceless.

Put recommendation on table? Richard: let's caucus.

Anne: let's do this now.

(Breakout for Caucus)

PROBLEM STATEMENT:

"OUR EXPERIENCE AS THE GF SAC TO DATE HAS CAUSED US TO QUESTION WHETHER THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF OUR SAC ARE BEING FULLY AND SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE NMS HEADQUARTERS' MANAGEMENT, AS SAC IS THE PRIMARY WAY THAT THE PUBLIC IS INVOLVED IN THE DESIGNATION AND OPERATION OF THE SANCTUARY. THE PUBLIC CREDIBILITY OF THE SANCTUARY PROGRAM DEPENDS ON THE SAC BEING AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY POLICY DECISIONS. IN INSTANCES WHERE THE SAC HAS NOT FORMULATED OR ENDORSED A POSITION - THIS FACT SHOULD BE ACCURATELY REFLECTED IN NMS SANCTUARY MANAGEMENT, DOCUMENTS, POLICIES, AND DECISIONS."

(CONFIRMED VERBATIM LANGUAGE)

Anne: What do you want done with this statement? Incorporate in statement fo last two days.

Brian: should be expressed in letter form as well as include in proceedings for stronger statement.

Bob W and RC: send a letter to Admiral Lautenbacher.
Maria: goes to Manager, request to forward to Lautenbacher

Emerging Issues:

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

IT of one (Anne):

Anne: need system to I-d and track new/emerging issues.

Need "filing system" to track issues and see what issues may be relevant to GF in future. Radar screen to see what other sites are doing.

Information sharing, e.g. electronic "chat room" concept should be revived. Include other resource management agencies in web based system.

Track issues not addressed in JMPR; those which didn't make the cut in scoping prioritizing. Over next five years or further out.

Gwen: Is Council implicit in info stream for new and emerging issues?

Anne: Yes; make explicit. Give us the benefit of your information. Other WG's can be created.

Ed: Does this demean or diminish the public comment period? Gwen: Public comments are not listed as sources of input for these new/emerging issues.

Karen: Objective 3 still has fishing WG language. Also, two of our issues didn't make it in: ocean energy, fiber optic cables. Anne: cables can't be put into GF with existing regulations. Ocean energy is not covered. Can delete zonal issue, e.g., this language is not meant to be all inclusive, just examples of issues.

Anne: will DELETE ZONAL MANAGEMENT example.

COUNCIL: Forward recommendation to Manager without zonal management. As is, with comments from Gwen. Add to list "public comment process and Council"

COUNCIL AGREED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOUNDARY MODS:

(Not GF/MB issue.)

Anne: Oil and gas exploration increasing reason for boundary expansion.

Goal: used MB boundary model and adapt to GF purpose. Use analytical process.

I-d and analyze options.

Incorporate technical boundary delineations of NMSP in definition of GF boundary.

Current boundaries are ill-defined, some by coordinates (not all accurate). MMS requested review of all boundaries and delineate programmatically. Physically viewed boundaries (esp. esteros). How does Park service boundaries affect ours (e.g., Hog Island transfer from Audubon to NPS).

Ed: NPS acquisition gave us overlapping jurisdiction

Anne: Not according to NMSP lawyers.

Bob W: B-1, if this was a public process, we'd recommend different strategy on boundaries. "Biogeo assessment is revenge of the Nerds." Sanctuaries not defined by clusters of resources, they manage people who affect resources. Harm to resources is not being factored in. "Tail wagging the dog" situation. Resources shift, as animals move. There are resources outside the boundaries. No huge assessment needed to recognize valuable resources. Simple conclusion. This should be the first determinant.

Anne: Sancts designated as areas of special significance. Need understanding first. Need to look at biogeo from Pt Arenas to Pt. Sal, this is a good starting point. Then, look at human activities for compelling reason why sanctuary designation would add value to the area.

Bob: agreed; but it doesn't say that here. Mostly threats have generated sanctuary designation.

Anne: See Page 199, section 1.1, add socioeconomic analysis.

Bob: wrong again. How much money they make isn't only index of activity. Look at political situation as well.

Anne: look at resources first. Take incrementally, then look at human activities as next step.

Anne: area up to Point Arenas covers areas in which interest have been expressed to date.

Bob: step by step analysis not appropriate, danger to resource may appear before actual harm is done.

Anne: I can include language, "Parallel human activities."

Jim: Does this include westward expansion? Yes.

Richard: In Action section, during scoping offshore oil and gas drilling mentioned. Let's mention, "given that in last two months US Senate adopted energy bill which would require sampling (pointed out where oil tracks which will be subjected to seismic surveys) given Appropriations bill deleted Bristol Bay moratorium, this administration is disassemble OSC moratorium. Immediately outside GF Sanctuary,

SUGGEST page 200, ACTION 1.2 add bullet, "item G: increased protection should be considered for potentially prospective oil and gas tracts that have historically been of interest in previous department of interior outer continental shelf leasing programs that lie immediately outside of present GFNMS boundaries to the North, West and Southwest of current GFNMS boundaries in waters where the Congressional Outer Continental Shelf moratorium may soon be lifted or weakened."

DOES SAC SUPPORT PROPOSAL AS COMMENT UNDER CRITERIA:
(see wording from Richard): council in agreement.

Jan: has maps showing area of high interest, available to review at lunch.

Cross-cutting issues:
Cordell not included in maritime heritage.

Brenda:
Community outreach: must be used in conjunction with other components, e.g. water quality, etc.
Overlapping constituencies all inclusive.

(see printout) Considerable confusion of unique situation of three sites, even within Council members.

Three components:

1. Initial contact
2. Learning
3. Stewardship, cycle back into outreach again.

Ocean/coastal outreach
Ocean/coastal education
Ocean/coastal stewardship

Julie: Electronic clearing house explained as webbased links, refer media for information on sanctuaries.

Comments/questions:

Brian: cycle of fundraising/universal hook. Deepen involvement through series of layers, first exposure to advocacy. Advised specific projects be designated, to test the process. Involves bringing in elements of community other than choir. Recommend more meaningful to test market segments, next level of detail.

Julie: further text spells it out more, but less succinctly.

Brenda: can use someone else's model.

Brian: identify those less inclined to be supportive, how to engage them? Brian can provide written steps.

Anne: does this complement Education plan?

RECOMMEND:

1. Bob B. feels is does, suggests a standing working group from education and community outreach be formed.

2. Gwen: given short timeline, some cross cutting projects need products coming from site specific groups to function. Establish process to get info to groups. (Anne duly noted).

COUNCIL VOTED TO FORWARD RECOMMENDATIONS TO MANAGER.

GUESTS: MITCHELL TARTT, SEAN MORTON, JULIE BARROW, DAVE LOT (GIS), DON AYOOB, ETC.

11:00 PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gordon Bennett: Sierra Club letter: Formally requests SAC provide documentation, minutes of meetings, contacts, etc. from Sierra club (see text of his letter).

GF primarily covers coastal waters.

Notification of SAC or working group meeting. No outreach was made to groups.

GF website notes council members serve as liaisons to communities. SAC cannot carry out mission if no outreach is conducted. Breach of public process.

Sierra Club wants reasonable time for public input after each agenda item. SAC letterhead options given equal time.

..... avoiding outreach, focus only on internal debate. Public input time sandwiched in.

Green gulch parking lot expanded. ...

Omission.... Omission

LET RECORD SHOW COMMENTS TERMINATED BY LACK OF TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

DON AYOOB: 1 1:09: Live in HMB, points are:

1. understand Ano Nuevo more sensible for HMB residents; in city limits. We live lives toward the Bay Area, are responsive to bay area enetiteies.
2. We're in tune w/nature of ocean community, support fishermen by buying direct and want to see local responsiveness to us. Boundary 100 miles distant in Monterey doesn't make sense, vs. 25 miles up coast in SF. Majority of HMB residents work northward, orient toward SF. Speaking on behalf of many in my neighborhood, three points to MBSAC too.
1. Stewardship vested in GF Sanctuary for that time period (1989 residence).
2. Beach Watch on our beaches live and work in HMB and SF; it's logical we not have dual masters. History of s tewardship and continuity, and efficiency of government. Efficiency of overlapping jurisdictions. If boundary comes to Pedro Point, you have two federal jurisdictions and overlapping State jurisdictions. Each major governmental boundary seems to be at Ano Nuevo.
3. Want continuity, feel greater responsiveness if matters stayed with GFNMS near where we live and work. What if meeting was in Camabria today, I could not address the Council.

Please work to have boundary at Ano Nuevo.

ED MAINLAND; 11:15 begin

Sustainability: we share common interest in sustainability. See Sierra Club statement on fishery policy. "all parties, commercial and recreational" must move to recover depleted stocks and develop sustainabel management regime."

Is sanctuary sustainable now? No. Just bans oil and gas drilling. Free from overfhsinig, no. from pollution, no. habitat degradation? Only to a degree.

Four comments:

1. GF should expand to include offshore oil tracts (nearby) to prevent exploitation.
2. Implement the Estuarine & marine reserves in san antonioand Americano with state authorities/mandatge

3. increase levels of protection where science tells us we can to make real sanctuary. Marine reserves work fine, consider no take zones, marine zoning, draw lessons.
4. restrict bottom trawling, scraping and dragging damage to fish habitat. See Magnusson Act: "minimize damage to essential fish habitat" – this upwelling area is good example of EFH.

(Anne – 6 minutes left, extra comments welcome if cut short).

11:18-20 +/- Don AYOOB: to illustrate, oil found on beaches by BW volunteers (source I-d'd as shipwreck) is example why San Mateo should be based in SF. If no BW volunteers, how soon would it be discovered? How interested would Monterey Bay be in discovering the source? Management should be localized here in the Bay area.

11:20 GORDON: Add to list, freshwater discharge lawsuit not recommended in GF's recommendations. (SEE LETTER TEXT).
End 11:24 a.m.

11:25 REVIEW OF PRIORITIES:

Anne: anything require review from this morning?
No comments, no questions?

Ecosystem Monitoring (Julie):
Improve availability of data for resource conservation and management.
(see matrix) text somewhat different in layout, but info mostly the same.

Clarify: regional technical assistance center: Jan clarified similar to National Coastal Services center as is on the east coast. Develop pool of tech-experts to assist GF; experts with west coast expertise on habitats and oceanography, e.g. at MLML.

Bob Breen: Where would admin support structure be centered?

Jan: have minimal staff on site to help w/cooperative research projects.

Julie: often contract administrator is contract person, not FTE.

Bob: could there be a centralized center for single sanctuary. GF could coordinate monitoring at Moss Beach. Need someone knowledgeable on site to do it in the area.

Jan: Gets to admin staff dilemma in working on regional programs and looking at staffing disparity between three sites. With local expertise and more equal staffing among 3 sites.

Bob B: can SiMON or PISCO take over admin. Duties if local expertise is not there?

Jan: to me data collection is technical not admin. Duty. Need regional overview, but there are site specific needs.

Limpets linked to specific teacher or high school, a substitute need to be found.

Bob: create system that provides long-term monitoring even in event of change.

Julie: "entity" needs tracking system to provide point of contact despite changes in staffing. Need Sanctuary contact to work in advance of teacher leaving to ensure continuing coverage.

Anne: Must identify who has oversight, whether site specific or cross cutting regional panel.

Jan: development of peer review would address problem of technical expert reviewing for purpose of maintaining long term data sets.

Bob W: Recommending research activities panel; Gwen concurred. Admin IT covered the "head count" aspect.

Jim: Page 221, last point 1.2.4, expansion of CalCOFY. Most data taken by NMFS, NOAA, stored in DC, not accessible in boundary mod discussion. In favor of expanding transect lines, but make the data available so it can be used.

Anne: Jan, is there a complementary relationship between two programs, or duplicative?

Gwen: has no information from internal S/S team. Must be time and venue to incorporate result of recommendations to apply to what is happening across three sites.

Jan: limited meetings ; found change occurring to initial objectives and goals, from oceanographic projects to developing framework of communication. Still need to see strong direction. It's vaguely alluded to as regional working group, but doesn't give strong guidance on where to go from here.

Need to build internal structure for GF and CB so we can work on even level with MB.

Gwen: Initial objective to bring together similar projects and find complementary. Then identify areas where monitoring is needed and not being done currently.

WITH CLARIFICATIONS, RECOMMEND TO TAKE ETO SANCTUARY MANAGER. Council so voted.

Break for lunch 11:58.

1:00 RECONVENE:

MARITIME HERITAGE

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Barbara Emley.

Name changed from submerged cultural resources. Expanded to incorporate community of vessel folks.

(see matrix)

Clarify: Identify sites of historical value and non historical but hazardous objects (e.g. Luckenbach).

Bolded items are of least interest to Cordell Bank folks.

Clarify under Site Protection heading:

Mooring system to protect a site or identify a dive site.

MH connects noncoastal communities, too.

DISCUSSION:

Brenda, not burning issue but outreach opportunity.

Richard: when we get interpretive center, this would be good link. Character of coastal towns changes so quickly this captures moments in history.

Anne: in addition to fishing community, who is meant? Coastal tribes and surfing community, diving community.

Barbara: we want to keep fishing community in mind when Sanctuaries make decisions, so they don't become "extinct" communities. Elevate in awareness of NMSP.

Brian: NPS has intense interest, opening new museum in Hazlett warehouse (Argonaut), Ed to meet with Kate Richardson/SF Maritime Superintendent. NPS can help provide exposure. Very collaborative new Superintendent.

Barbara: at Luckenbach talk, no fishing folks came; were they contacted?

Barbara: outcome not apparent. Felt shipwreck surveyors will ask for the money.

Julie: This is a new issue for all three sites. Connectoins to non coastal communities is important, and we can fold this message into existing education and outreach. Let's start getting the word out it's more than just submerged resources.

Staffing: Coordinator to be hired for program for all three sanctuaries, or each could have its own.

Julie: regional to start, then go independent.

Jim: asked Brian about resources, lots of experts/historians. Not getting new staff, bu there is a core of people with intense interest, and can work as a team. Two key people, John Martini is pro bono source; establish brain trust for next steps. Add energy from long list outlined in proposal booklet.

Julie: anytime a research mission is done e.g. w/sidescan sonar, look for sites as well.

Karen: is there discussion about touring historical sites? Wrecks to be mapped,

Julie: if submerged or landbased site of historical signifiacne, we to tell that story. Need to set up protections beforehand to protect from looters. "Catch 22" situation. Overriding theme they be consistent with National Hist. Preservation Act. Also State historical preservation act.

Barbara: landbased map of fishing communities, information kiosks, etc.

Anne: submerged site marking is a way of mapping

Richard: there are many unknown sites, unspoken rule to remain silent.

Julie: Discussed Franklin Point between Pigeon Point and Ano Nuevo, sailor's graveyard. State Parks is reburying remains and want to use interpretive signage.

Brian: Chesapeak Bay Gateway Networks of bay access, includinig museum. Use their model. Map the sites and attributes, use points of interest in Sanctuary. Collaborative effort.

Barbara: Drake's bay has working fishery community to document their history.

Karen: Important point if we identify sites, have the funding to protect them.

Brian: agree.

Paleontological sites acknoelwedge, but not much time spent. Passing references to expedition to look at sites on Cordell Bank.

Barbara: some landbased items are not in GF but relate to GF.

Julie: one 4,500 year old Ohlone midden at FMR, don't specify exact site.

Jim: paleontology most would be diatom based rocks. Connection w/Santa Cruz area.

Julie clarified literature search to include Tomales Bay all three sanctuaries.

ANNE: FORWARD TO MANAGER with additional comments?

Council so agreed, no dissents.

Cross-cut admin IT.

SEE MATRIX PROVIDED

Julie:

Background, there is already education and outreach effort done jointly w/other sites. This expands existing efforts.

COMMENTS:

Brian: Ultimately, what is the vehicle to execute these recommendations?

NPS has MOU w/State Parks, philosophical document. There was a dramatic difference when had to have annual work plan, with performance measurement capability. Need an enforceable instrument in place to deal with cross cutting issues, and individual work plans to anchor into reality. Work plan made things get accomplished, reporting to regional office. Strongly recommend SAC suggest enforceable instrument and work plan.

Anne: In course of plan recommendations, started looking at meeting frequency, communications, creating more work.

Brian: measure output, not outcomes. What is product and how to accomplish it?

We were measuring output, too.

Anne: intangibles "cooperation" hard to measure.

Brian: Performance management hard but needed to achieve product, especially across jurisdictional boundaries

Anne: Matt Brookhart coming in August to help develop measures.

Barbara: A problem is who do we report to? No one boss for three sites?

Anne: to the three SAC's.

Julie: maybe to Dan Basta, too.

Jim: Had to define to his boss annually. First define outcome you think is achievable.

Brian: agencies are agency-centric, parks park-centric, etc. Important to specify what you set out and how to set out to accomplish it. Identify net gain to all sites.

Julie: Annual operating plan would have a PLAN developed for shared vessel time (e.g.).

The plan can be the product.

Bob W: Dan Basta suggested regionalization could happen here, would that be applicable here?

Anne: no, regionalization more complicated than just this coordination.

Julie: deferred W cost regionalization concept for time being.

Brian: recommend more structured accountability be put in place.

"Wanting improved coordination should not be interpreted as support for regional management structure."

--- break: 2:05 p.m.

BOUNDARY INTERNAL TEAM: Mitchell Tartt

2:17 pm.

SEE MATRIX

Barbara: note that matrix does not contain internal team boundary issue.

National programs branch w/Charly A.

Part of national examination of boundaries.

(Nothing new presented today).

Mitch is team leader, will convey to Dan B.

tuary manager on Internal Team (had Acting manager).
Four GF Council observers attended.

Data compendium open for review but not distribution.

"Co managed since 1982; Co-management has not worked for that area."

Contamination reason for exemption from GF boundaries.

Consensus based process throughout findings report issuance.

Phase II: Council more involved at this time.

Timeline for review and comment: Anne and Sean to determine.

Then go back to Mitchell, who with team may/may not change. All three sites Council's to "include comments unedited, unchanged to Dan basta." Dan makes final decision.

"Gut check" – if boundary moved, what change would occur in both sites? If moved based on resource A, resource B may be more seriously impacted. Implications?

Conclusions:

1. consensus was achieved, amount and type of data agreed upon.
2. "no evidence to suggest major biogeographic break at Anuevo.
3. programmatic and management no benefit from shift in boundary to AN.

Move northern limit of MB to SW corner of doughnut hole. Eliminate panhandle. Public understanding improved.

Eliminate doughnut hole? No action recommended; discharge and outflows, vessels the reason.

SAC COMMENTS TO TEAM DUE AUG. 31.

Report back in September, Dan to decide September/October, part of NEPA process.

"Map not included in report. Know it's semi-internal but will go around everywhere"

Boundary point is line due west from SW corner of doughnut hole.

Brian: after review of biogeo and other factors, results aren't important enough to move off Ano Nuevo boundary line. Building community are underplayed in evolution of this area. I identify manager as an important factor to be considered in making this boundary determination. The community relationship is

The analysis missed some of the most important factors in developing the boundary, can manipulate data in any number of ways. I see no biogeo that would rebut other arguments.

Without benefit of more detailed reviews, important factors are ignored.

We continue to support position that Ano Boundary be the point.

"There's a whole lot of biology in here, must include political and community factor (not verbatim).

Compelling rationale to propose Point Ano Nuevo vs. San Pedro.

Mitchell: there is some social information buried in other data, not readily evident (invited Briana to call him).

COUNCIL COMMENTS:

Barbara: Page 1, all team members single voice of consensus: in interest of transparency. How achieved?

Mitchell: not everyone wholehearted. Compromise.

Barbara: sentence should not be as strongly put.

"A single voice of consensus"

Jim: question to Barbara, divide the question into two issues, 1) does this report belong in JMPR review, separately discuss merits of report.

MOTION: Jim: consideration of modification of GFnms/MB boundary modification (boundary mod) is appropriately preliminary to development of joint sanctuary management plans;

Whereas processes by which boundary mod was addressed was

Be it resolved that GF final report of boundary mod team be excluded from JMPR recommendations.

SECOND : Bob Wilson

Jim: it's out of order; it's out of plane, anomalous to other issues discussed here. I can endorse everything else discussed. I can't ever be so comfortable with this issue, whatever the outcome.

Bob: scoping comments didn't want clarification, they wanted boundary moved. Key issue in GF, not in MB. It was established WG would be the means for looking at it, then shifted to Internal Team by HQ. Sac wrote letter, objecting, HQ okayed, but let Sac observe. In the report they could not talk, could not distribute documents received. This is not an issue to be included in this document. We don't support the means, merits to be discussed later. I'm proud of this plan, we gave lots of free effort, and this recommendation is not a part of that.

MOTION: Bob: We'll do it in a different form.

Richard: I wholeheartedly support motion to break away from other recommendations; no resemblance to other process. Let it move as a separate piece.

ALL IN FAVOR: AYES, no dissents.

Jim: Discuss substance now. Page 10, #6, underlying premise to evaluate. Does a major biogeo exit at Rocky or Pedro point.

MITCHELL: NONE FOUND.

Jim: in whole study area?

MITCHELL: Not that we found. Assume status quo and look at changes from there.;

Jim: is there a biogeo basis for putting boundary anywhere in that area?

MITCHELL: Many different ways to analyse data, targeted the question at Ano Nuevo. Looked for the transitions in this area. Changes in distributions happen in this area.

Jim: you moved the problem (exclusion area) out of MBNMS into GF. What else was done?

MITCHELL: panhandle was cumbersome boundary delineation, de facto protection against mineral development. At 11th hour of MB designation process (1992), decided to move all the way up. Maximize protection against gas and oil development. There might not be any there. That shape precluded development.

JIM: there are no major biogeographic changes anywhere based on data analysed.

MITCHELL: Discomfort at shape of designation.

JIM: Data layers/variables, 57% are purely taxonomic; 62% of data is biogeographic. This will drive any conclusions. If we decided of 158 variables the 115 biologicals don't tell us anything about a boundary.

If no biogeographic variable, let's use common sense as variable.

MITCHELL: "Gut check" – need to make sure move doesn't affect other resources. Could seriously affect management of resources, way we manage two sanctuaries. Notion that premise is biogeographic break at Ano Nuevo.

BOB: GFG has been administering county to Ano Nuevo. Examples of resource changed "

MITCHELL: "that might not be most efficient."

Maria: we didn't make judgment if the effect would be serious.

>>>>>> SEE RECORDING

Karen: keep doughnut hole issue separate.

Council agreed to set doughnut hole after 30 minutes on MB boundary discussion.

Gwen: Reading for Bob Breen, "FMR and SM Board of Supervisors as referred in 11/2000 letter, Moss Beach is significantly different shale reef (**SEE LETTER TEXT**). Intertidal plants and animal communities are different from MB, algal communities different, range limits at Moss Beach (mostly northern limits). PISCO stated coast down to Davenport sig. Different from other areas."

ED: Francesca Cava's memo 1993: Evident that MB sanctuary bounds do not align themselves with areas of responsibility of their entities. MB position, combined with limited staff (Ed was the sole management responsibility through 1998).

Ed was signatory to shark regs in co-management from 1993-1998. Bounds recognized by NMSP as not aligned, but still co-managed. How will this new boundary help align?

MITCHELL: WE'RE not proposing that it will address that specific issue.

PETER GRENNELL ARRIVE 3:10.

Brenda: we don't live in Monterey Bay. It's not practical to belong to MB if I live in Montara, "Farallon City" per 1908 railroad track. Doesn't make sense. Move it to Ano Nuevo. Include donut hole to include all of SM county.

RICHARD: Book, "It was on fire" We knew this contentious issue, seen HQ do strange things, put unique process in place regardless of SAC process, hence we just asked to split off. Original bounds are arbitrarily, more to do w/Exxon Valdez spill. After 1.5 IT meetings, on short notice in San Jose, observed things. I believe NOAA technical staff made unbiased attempt to winnow out line of demarcation in biological data. I expected relevant, but didn't see one. I expected to see managerial

bias, didn't see it one way or another. Objective process inasfar as it went with data sets analysed. Missing or not weighted was the set of things Brian mentioned, socioeconomic /geopolitical considerations. Various members of congress involved

"engaging local communities" was not addressed in this report, just protecting sanctuary resources. We just approved two major recommendations on community outreach and education. We ah==have lack of public ov ersight in this process who have 10 years minimum evidence.

MOTION: RICHARD: This report (rec'd freiday) not posted on the web, be circulated for 60 days of public comment before being passed to headquarters.

JIM: seconded.

RICHARD: Not comfortable being public oversight of this process. This is public tgrust resource, and had proactively genherated letters from politicians. Two people part time cannot provide "consensus process" com.

RICHARD: Formal Federal Register notice requested. Let other scientists with other data sets give it technical review.

ANNE: may take 90-120 days, not 60 days.

RICHARD: Propose draft boundary assessment.

BOB: Want to see CD data before making this. Include true peer review.

PETER: Second richard's conens about lsack of public review. Would Richard d entertain amendment, "report and all comments even suggesting different alternative" be proposed. All information be submitted to public comment and sent to director.

RICHARD: We'd need to define specifically what should be passed alohng, limit them to specific materials.

Brenda: Problem publishing this report, there is some information that is incorrect.

ED: Point of order: are we discussing motion contents, or amendment?

AMENDMENT>

TIMELINE:

BOB: Council cannot comment on report as it was presented. Need data to look at.

MITCHELL: Data compendium streamlined for Council.

BOB: Get big document, put it on the web and out to the public.

PETER: Timing bothersome. Program Director said take whatever time is needed to do the job right.

2: Was commenting on MB plan, boundary section is by the board, it was pointless to comment on it. Needs to be superseded.

BARBARA: Let's refine the motion.

RICHARD: We're not comfortable with these findings being part of the JMPR.

They will be forwarded separately from JMPR recommendations.

MOTION AMENDED: Richard:

The SaC—review this PRELIMINARY docuuyment AND THEIR COMMENTS BE INCORPORATED IN A DRAFT DOCUMENT WHICH SHALL BE CIRCULATED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR A PERIOD OF NOT LESS THAN 60 DAYS.

JIM: proposed to reject the document.

BE: either biogeo is irrelevant or its not.

~~final go to NMSP manager, we have vprlininary draft to comment on. It should be modified to incorporate Council comments; that draft go out to public comments for a 60 day period as noticed in the Federal Register. Then, additional ancillary documentation to be determined by process between SAC and local sanctuary staff. That prelim draft w/SAC comments to go be circulated for public comment.~~

WE FIND THE FINDINGS REPORT FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED AND THAT IT HAS NOT RECEIVED THE ADEQUATE SAC AND PUBLIC INPUT AND REVIEW. THEREFORE, WE RECOMMEND THAT A NEW PROCESS BE INITIATED THAT DIRECTLY INVOLVES THE PUBLIC AND THE SAC, TO DETERMINE WHERE THE APPROPRIATE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION SHOULD BE.

RICHARD MOTION.

BOB SECONDED.

Amend to change "whether" to where.

ALL IN FAVOR, NONE OPPOSED.

Anne: this will have to go back to IT and NMSP /DOC approval prior to Fed Reg notice. Could take longer.

BOB comment: Fed Reg notice not required. Dan B told him they'd wait for biogeo to be done before IT makes recommendation.

BE: Clarify, would we have gotten faster action on boundary mod process,
AnNE: depending on ranking, we didn't anticipate.

BOB: we envisioned public process to look at data.

ANNE: do you want to create a WG to use data IT already used?

BOB: Whether there should be appropriate boundary modification. Part of our process should be Mitchell's process. We want a new process, not part of JMPPR process. Ad Hoc or technical dvisory committee.

KAREN: Clarify if including both donut hole and boundary.

BOB: Yes, both.

PETER: Must look at and have benefit of sciwentific peer re3view to see data and choice of what data is reviewed. Adminisiitratively, informed comment is needed from stakeholders, etc, through ad hoc group. Also, who sits on this group needs to be decided.

SAC will create ad hoc group of SAC to review biogeo and other components to make determination and recommendation on boundariy modifications.

KAREN: Two other SAC's are involved; if we ask to withdraw, without contacting MB sac, dialogue should be opened.

JIM: Motion approved earlier said consideration of obundarou should be preliminary to joint MPR; lets' talk about recommending further consideration be suspended until this is resolved. Consider breaking off from JMPR.

KAREN: concerned to continue as if this is part of JMPR document.

BREAK FROM MB/GF B OUNDARY.

BRENDA: page 16, issue 2 DONUT HOLE:

1. Potential contamination, dredging, vessels are reason for hole. Take issue with 1992 area's conditions have changed after improvements to outfall (in 1996 changed from primary to secondary)? Also, Pacifica has gone to zero discharge (use reclamation); also Daly City has gone to zero, using SF outfall.

2 Vessel traffic, traffic lanes outside the doughnut holes. SEE RUTH, GIVE NOTES.

MITCH: that language was supposed to come out.

4. Dredging is not an issue, and never was chosen as a site.

Dredging was supposed to come out of the report.

ALL THREE SHOULD HAVE COME OUT OF THE REPORT.

BRENDA: It's easy to bring boundary to SM county line given the three items above, and evaluate discharge problem, work with the MPDS permit and see if their exemption apply to the sanctuary.
KAREN: Have problem with document going out. IT'S critical on giving presentation to MB to clarify those things; they're MB's problem. Make sure the three points are absolutely clear. As commenter on MPDS permit, I know what has changed.

SAC to give Sean an amendment to take to Monterey meeting.

Karen: asking this issue be reviewed given it wasn't done before, by Internal Team.

MARIA: IT or ad hoc group?

KAREN: I want this issue to be looked at by the IT. Must have IT look at it. Cannot live with this being pulled out of the process.

BOB: what Ad Hoc committee will also look at it.

PETER: (see handout, with edit)

Represent 4 harbors, on MB SAC. Administer Pillar Pt. And others.

"have reviewed findings report re: boundary, datga appear to support three viable options one of which Ano Nuevo included. You chose San Pedro point. We support and people of SM CO support ano Nuevo. SF and Marin counties support that boundary. Rockfish and nonpelagic data are not considered. Admin and management needs support southern boundfary shift. Staff team vs. stakeholder WG. No satisfactory explanation given. (SEE TEXT OF MEMO)

Barbara: we should forward our letter re: boundaries to Monterey SAC on 7/31st meeting.

ED: I'm manager for GFNMS. Maria is handling JMPR review issues. Will hand off to Maria all related matters. Still send to Ed's attention.

PUBLIC COMMENT 4:30

Gordon Bennett regarding the Joint Boundary with Monterey Bay: He is not speaking now for the Sierra Club, just as Sanctuary volunteer who was just given the Volunteer of the Year national award. I have worked on beaches ranging from Princeton harbor, Half Moon Bay, Miramontes, San Gregorio, Bean Hollow, Gazos Creek, Waddell Ccreek. I responded during oil spills, and retrieved dead birds. If the boundary is moved from Ano Nuevo, I feel like our work is gone. So much discussion about needing volunteers and communities. We have it already; we're monitoring and protecting them. Move the boundary to Ano Nuevo.

Tim Eichenberg: Oceana group. Protecting sensitive habitat, banning cruise ship discharge.

Deep sea coral habitat a concern (see report). Oldest life form, diverse ecosystem, vulnerable to trawling. EFH for commerce and recreation, a source of pharmaceuticals. Habitats should be fully identified and protected by zones and restrictions on harmful fishing practices. Protection as in F8 and FA 11. Similar restrictions exist in other sanctuaries, we can do it here too. MLPA requires networks like these

- Cruise Ships generate the amount of waste of small cities, are exempt from municipal and industrial discharge regulations. Many are foreign flagged, some cruise ship companies pay huge fines instead of complying with laws. Crystal Harmony dumped in MB after promise not to do it. Cannot trust to do voluntarily. New SF Pier 30-32 proposeded,

All discharges to be banned in Sanct, recoment AB 121, 471 qand ?????
The language in WWQ-13 is ambiguous, I want to see it clarified.

SELA OCONNER:

BW volunteer 7 years. Echo Gordon's comments. Do own beach and taken disaster course. Boundaries should overlay existing, to Ano Nuevo. Managerd to this line many years, line should become b oundary line, reasons obvjous. Fiscally responsible, rather than short distance to San Pedro point. Ensure continuation o fBW program, which goest o ANO. Continuity to managemen already es tablished. Already firm bond with PFMC, envirohnmntal groups, schools, agencies and other entities. Locating line north to San Pedro may be problematic and a step backwards, especially with large fishing fleet in HMB. I echo what Peter Grenell said. I can't see any reason for point stopping at San Pedro. There are other issues.

ZEKE GRADER: PCFFA, four issues:

1. Boundary, we believe to stay with Ano Nuevo boundary, which the NMSP recognized when put into comanagement area with MBNMS. Fishing fleet make sense, they have point they see and know if south, in Monterey not GF. Which jurisdiction they're ijn. Makes sense biologically established by park service when dividing ocan into bioregions. Pillar point make snse as moss landing. Some want to move to ML, but what makes most sense is Ano Nuevo. Objective science will find this.

2. Mairne reserves: proper for sac to consider as in other reviews, but believe it belongs in marine protection, not fisheries management. Many fisheries don't lend themselves to be managed by MPA's whereas rockfish may. Sancts should comment on resources.
3. water quality: urge to become aggressive, but sancts don't "do" water quality. Proper for sancts to comment on recent agriculture discharge waiver, affect water quality in bay, delta and sanctuary. Take aggressive stance w/EPA and regional boards. Avoid Monterey's problems with resultant weak sham system.
4. De-sal: coming soon. Don't oppose, but look to ensure if desal is put in place, the discharges must be dealt with.

TOM ROTH/Cong. Woolsey's office.

Read statement from LW:

"as long time supporter of NMSP and rep for CB and gF, northern sancts havens. ... living, rich waters. NMS often called underwater national parks, are dissimilar.

GFNMS manages SM coast of MBNMS. Politically, geographically closer to GF; redraw boundary to San Mateo/SC line at ANuevo;

County lines, federal agencies CDFG, EPA, etc. include SM in bay area region.

GGNRA holds shoreline land in Mairn SM,

Oceanographic differences. Delta river system, AN is southern species limited for osme. Broad cont. shelf into MB submarine canyon.

Organizational efficiencies. Fishermen benefit from better relationship, as does volunteer programs. Discharges benefit from consolidated management. Not suggesting shift in funds from etiehr or in shift of personnel. GFNMS/MB should be included in JMPR.

DOUGHNUT HOLE:

In communicating w/MB, lets address this.

JIM: donut hole fundamentally flawed, demonstrate3s whole issue should be removed.

BRENDA: wants to see research that should have been done, done accurately and up to date. Not that hard.

REVISIT BOUNDARY ISSUE:

JIM: "obvious by inspection" look at shelf map, slide at waddell creek reason for moving county seat. Was allowed to ask questions at IT meeting, 114 species in analysis no biological reasons to figure into analysis. 50 years of CalCOFY data plus other institutions would have been helpful, in NOAA database; none used in this analysis. Data showed no boundaries anywhere. We should reject biogeographic variables, look at others. SST data will show GF is a hydrographically a unit. Data fundamentally flawed. Data was heavily biased against taxonomic data. Good job despite time pressure. Faulty premise, conclusion didn't support faulty premise. What to do but reject whole report out of hand?

MITCHELL; Point taken, came down to factors:

1. specific to CalCOFY, data not digitized. Newer stuff not available, or not of quality usable. Data mining wouldn't dig that data up. I didn't personally do it, cannot say why.

JIM: data taken by NOAA but not accessible to NOAA?

2. Had best could find from west coast to southern Mexico, plus verbal communication with various people. Looked in way, saw nothing "huge" no major transitions or breaks. Data layers include chlorophyll, etc.

ED: I see no use of word "major" in report. What is threshold of "major?" Also, at Naval war school, oceanographic conditions Jim speaks of, stated two separate gyres exist in GF. Water transport below AN less than above:?

MITCHELL: we did not consider it.

Anne: given, data is limited. Let's reserve for ad hoc group to make their recommendations. Let's comment on process.

BOB: If we had info earlier, we might not be here now. Trying to force the data. If you came to us earlier, we

I don't think you could say there was a break. We ask where is the greatest threat?

Method 3: includes other factors, including geopolitical. Ask the question, would moving the boundary benefit the resources. Since beginning of MB sanctuary GF has managed this area. Despite.

I submit Gordon's point: oil development one of main reasons sanctuary protected. Oil spilled here moves south to SM county. Those phone calls from SF, not Monterey. Isn't it more appropriate that SM folks be represented by Ed, vs. Monterey. Best administrative choice. GF staff should handle program. At Ano Nuevo oil slicks just start to come inshore, not into Monterey Bay. If public process went through, data analyzed could help better protect resources rather than make untested scientific boundary.

(no motion needed?)

BARBARA: SAC to send Ed a letter for forwarding to MB SAC advising the MBSAC of the GF SAC today's decisions and ask Bob to speak at MB public comment period on July 30th.

PETER: make it a motion.

SEND STRAIGHT TO SAC:

In the spirit of cooperation we move that the actions taken by this Council today be conveyed in timely fashion to Monterey and Cordell councils and that we send an emissary to the public comment period July 30th in Santa Cruz and that we urge their full and serious consideration in concurrence with these actions.

Directly to each SAC member.....per Barbara most important to MB Council members.

{Barbara wants this to go directly to each individual SAC member ASAP}

JIM: second.

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED. NONE OPPOSED< NO DISCUSSION.

RICHARD: Mitchell, this is not about you.

ANNE: closing remarks, sorry for late nature of these comments. Individuals and constituents comment period extended until AUGUST ! (extra ten days).

Send comments to Anne via email or letter by AUG 1. If more than just comment (full recommendation) may need more time to take to headquarters.

Use tracking matrix, give to Ruth, for other comments for Maria.

Ruth keeps all records of comments, MJ the minutes. For JMPR Anne/Ruth has record of SAC all comments. Will get comments to SAC next week hopefully.

ED: solicit from your constituents. Priorities are crucial; there are \$80 million of work in this document.

KAREN: In Ed's spirit of public process, want guidance or SAC to say how to conduct public meetings from here on out. Public comment at all meetings, information on web by certain date, agendas set.

BARBARA: This meeting was different, we have deadlines for regular meetings.

ANNE: we had so many changes.

ANNE: protocols can't be kept up with.

BOB: we're grateful for enormous amount of work done.

RICHARD: We should send note of appreciation on for JMPR staff,

Anne: will review w/Maria and give draft plan before

Future Agendas out one month in advance; deadline for adding

Caitlin Gaffney invite to Sept 25th meeting?

MITCHELL WILL FORWARD TO MB ABOUT AD HOC COMMITTEE
SEPT 25th NEXT MEETING.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.