

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

GULF OF THE FARALLONES NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
Advisory Council meeting
November 20, 2003
Lighthouse Hotel, Pacifica CA

Note: The following meeting notes are an account of discussions at the Advisory Council meeting and do not necessarily reflect the opinion or position of the Gulf of the Farallones NMS or NOAA.

ATTENDING:

Council Members (Seats and Alternates):

Bob Breen	Education Seat/Council Vice Chair
Richard Charter	Conservation Seat
Barbara Emley	Maritime Activities Seat/Council Chair
James Kelley	Research Seat
Mick Menigoz	Maritime Activities Seat
Bob Wilson	Conservation Seat
Brenda Donald	Research (Alternate)
Karen Reyna	Conservation (Alternate)

Gulf of the Farallones

National Marine Sanctuary Staff:

Maria Brown	Assistant Manager
Carol Preston	Education Coordinator
Mary Jane Schramm	Advisory Council Coordinator
Ed Ueber	Sanctuary Manager

JMPR Team

Ruth Howell	Management Plan Review Assistant
Ann Walton	Management Plan Review Coordinator

Guests:

Susan Andres	Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association
Julie Barrow	NMSP West Coast Community Outreach
Brad Damitz	Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Jessica Hamilton	Ocean Conservancy
Deborah Hirst	Supervisor Richard Gordon's office

Copies to/Absent:

Mark Dowie	Public-at-Large (Alternate)
Gwen Heistand	Education (Alternate)
Brian O'Neill	National Park Service (NPS) Representative
Don Neubacher	NPS Government (Alternate)
Karen Reyna	Conservation (Alternate)

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/AGENDA

The meeting came to order at 9:07 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

AGENDA: The revised Agenda was reviewed and a motion was made to approve it.

Motion: Richard Charter

Second: Bob Wilson

Vote: Unanimous

ITEM 2: PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment was held at 9:15 and concluded at 9:20 a.m.

Jessica Hamilton/Ocean Conservancy: Ms. Hamilton directed council s attention to the recent poll regarding California perceptions on ocean issues. (see article). She reported that 88% Californians feel ocean issues important. GFNMS work is important. 75% Californians favor marine reserves even if commercial and recreational fishing is impacted. Demographics were shown and political persuasions outlined. She attended the national Marine Protected Areas (MPA) advisory meeting. President Bush supports MPAs. The discussion of MPAs is now moving into the subcommittee stage. GFNMS should become involved in the project.

Deborah Hirst of Supervisor Rich Gordon s office stated she will attend the December 4th boundary meeting. Their office is excited about the sanctuary s good work.

ITEM 3: MINUTES

Minutes from the September 25th meeting were reviewed and approved with amendments on pages 3 and 9.

Motion to approve: Bob Wilson

Second: Bob Breen

Vote: Unanimous

ITEM 4: 2004 MEETING CALENDAR

Council took up the matter of the 2004 meeting calendar.

February 12/ Thursday

June 10/Thursday

September 9/Thursday

December 9/Thursday

Motion to accept dates: Jim Kelley

Second: Richard Charter

Vote: Unanimous

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

ITEM 5: MANAGER S REPORT

The sanctuary manager s position was advertised and is now closed. Interviews will be held on December 3rd and 4th. A panel will interview candidates, with sanctuary program director Dan Basta making the final choice. An announcement will likely be made after the December 4th boundary meeting. The incoming manger s start date will be February first at the earliest. Ed is willing to stay on beyond that date.

GFNMS is experiencing a die-off of Northern Fulmars, but it is within the range of other years. Birds were reported to be emaciated. Also, some oiled birds and marine mammals were reported at Point Reyes.

Boundary Meeting: Flyers for the December 4th boundary meeting are available to distribute. One hour is given for council member discussion. Dan Basta wants to hear everyone s thoughts. Public comment is from 4:30-5:30 p.m. Dan will facilitate the meeting.

Ed introduced Carol Preston, the new Education Coordinator, formerly of the Randall Museum in San Francisco. The sanctuary is fortunate to have her. Carol is looking forward to working with the council, learning their insights, and moving forward with education projects.

ITEM 6: OLD BUSINESS

Action items that had been taken care of were enumerated:

1. Bob Breen s letter to the Monterey council regarding a liaison did not yet receive an answer; he had requested it go on their agenda for the Dec. 5th meeting.
2. Letter to Lautenbacher is being forwarded up the chain; MJ Schramm will follow up with Brady Phillips to determine the date the Admiral received it.

Peter Grennell asked for clarification of the chain of command. Adm. Lautenbacher was highest in this chain.

Council commented that notice of the boundary meeting was not adequate, and wondered if the meeting was substantive or simply for appearances, given the lack of notice.

The Santa Rosa sewage hearing will be addressed during member reports.

Squid: The Fishing Activities Working Group met, Richard Charter reported they met with Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary (CBNMS) working group members in Bolinas due to PRBO reports of lights from the squid fishery boats impacting birds and marine mammals. Present were a California Department of Fish and Game enforcement representative, PRBO, and one Monterey squid fisherman. Summarizing the meeting, Richard indicated there have been incidents to wildlife related to northerly aggregations of squid, drawing boats out of their normal fishing areas to the south to SE Farallon Island. This season was the first time in perhaps 50 years that the area around the Farallon Islands have had a squid fishery. Boats have been seen off Point Reyes as well. The effects of boat lights included predation of seabirds by gulls, owls, and peregrine falcons being night-active and eating other seabirds young, and attraction of marine mammals due to their high concentration at the island.

Cordell Bank NMS pulled out of the meeting. GFNMS working group adopted a position and made it an action item for the full Sanctuary Advisory Council to discuss, and forward comments to the California Department of

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

Fish and Game (CDFG) Commission for decision. Squid fishers indicated they were open to discussion of different ways lights can be used.

Possible solutions, as implemented in Channel Islands NMS, included light baffles on boats, but the level of their success was not agreed upon. Fishermen could put lights under water or closer to the water. The sanctuary is not intending to address fishing issues, just wildlife disturbance due to associated lights, but can work with the fishery on solving the issues. The squid fishery is not singled out; any source of light can cause disturbance to this sensitive area. Other examples include seismic surveyors, automobile commercials being filmed on the coast with helicopter lights focused on sensitive habitats. Ecosystem protection is the sanctuary role, and it was suggested the sanctuary coordinate actions like this, since Fish and Game is strapped for funding. The sanctuary can utilize data sets from PRBO's on-island observers to help set buffer zone or light policy.

Karen Reyna has information on sustainable levels of squid harvest, and other insights on the cause of the squids' shift northward. Richard Charter noted the white shark issue seems to be resolving itself, and expressed the hope that the light issue will be similarly easy to resolve.

To address the light disturbance issue, a regulatory structure is needed, but GFNMS is not at a point now where it is able to accomplish this, no matter what the CDFG Commission decides. Two weeks are needed for submitting a proposal to Anne Walton, and a regulatory structure would still need a formal public process. It can either go in the revised management plan or be looked at as a separate regulatory issue.

Council requested the manager solicit the cooperation of the squid industry in resolving the problem.

MOTION: The sanctuary manager should initiate a timely process to address the light conflicts with seabirds and marine mammal aggregations in the GFNMS.

Motion: Richard Charter

Second: Mick Menigoz

Vote: Unanimous

ITEM 7: Decision making protocols.

Decision making protocols were clarified:

- Should an action vote taken by the council to write a letter to Vice Admiral Lautenbacher also require a motion to have Ed forward it to the Admiral? This should not be necessary.
- Alternates can sit at the table for discussion, but only vote if their principal is not present to vote. Alternates can speak freely if the council remains under fifteen seats, unlike Monterey. This council will keep operating as previously, with alternates participating in the discussion.
- All action recommendations require a vote.
- The chair will call on members before they speak, and council will be more mindful of protocols.
- Council cannot speak to or copy minutes to a member of Congress.
- Council to council communication is fine; members should review the implementation handbook for communications protocols.

Peter Grennell can facilitate getting more information to the Monterey Bay NMS Advisory Council.

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

Discussion arose concerning changes in language agreed to at previous meetings; i.e., the agreement at the Zen Center retreat around the change from Fishing Activity Working Group to Resources Protection Working Group. The September meeting powerpoint only partially reflected the discussion. A question remained whether a standing living resource/Environmental Protection Working Group would be established. Per a subsequent call to Maria Brown, this was clarified and the error was reversed. The interpretive process was to blame about what was encompassed by the agreement, not recorder error. Communication still need improvement. Actions in the formal record must reflect the truth, especially in regard to contentious issues. It is essential all elements be properly recorded without alteration, whether in the JMPR process or meeting notes. All members must pay close attention to minutes. The tape recorder cannot always be relied on to work, therefore each person should write down his or her understanding of the wording of agreements. Most problems have arisen when too many topics were being addressed.

Council noted that if Headquarters makes changes from what the council has recommended on an issue, Headquarters must let the council know about them. The council should vote on changes, if they wish to do so. In the event votes are split (though this group has generally been in agreement), there is no cause for concern. The manager needs to be aware of differences in opinion. Divided votes reflect division of opinion only.

Anne Walton recommended a mixed package of endorsements to Ed. Now that Maria has oversight on JMPR, Ed has forwarded this to her. The JMPR team met with the staff, then the recommendations went back to Maria again. The JMPR team will show the council any changes made. The JMPR team keeps a tracking system, but the draft plan will look different from the previous version.

ITEM: 8: NEW BUSINESS/EMERGING ISSUES:

Marine Protected Areas: Jim Kelley reported on the August board meeting of the California Ocean Science Trust regarding Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS), which may have implications here. The Trust wants to bridge issues between public policy and research. These include water quality, sediment transport, conservation, and fishing in MPAs. Fishermen are working hard to collect data on species counts. Fish and Game is involved, but NMFS is the primary agency. Fishermen's lives depend on MPA applications. Jim asked what research is doing to see how successful MPAs are, and found very little is being done. GFNMS must pay attention to this issue to be socially responsible. This is also a major concern in Monterey. We should find out about the learning process from Florida Keys and Channel Islands sanctuaries. It is essential to monitor the success in CINMS. The council should consider writing a letter to the CINMS council and communicate this to GFNMS's manager to conduct appropriate, rigorous monitoring of CINMS MPAs.

The CINMS marine reserves network is in state waters. No one anticipated the funding cuts at California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG). CINMS and University of California at Santa Barbara are making some efforts, and Channel Islands National Park (CINP) has been watching small reserves for some time. Jim's suggestion is a high priority to the Non Governmental Organization (NGO) community, adding that CINMS has the largest piece of marine reserves coast in the country, and should take advantages of these critical opportunities to study the results.

It was suggested to have Billy Causey from the Florida Keys NMS come here and address the council. Local fishermen want to see research in the same kind of biogeography locally, not in Barbados tropical ecosystem.

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

Ed Ueber indicated there is some limited fisherman s research going on now. CINMS, Channel Islands National Park (CINP) and NOAA are now trying, and it s good to support them, but warned against supporting them by making sacrifices here. There are MPAs (in the form of state-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance) already at Duxbury Reef, the Farallon Islands, Double Point and Chimney Rock Headland, and no research is being done there. The MPAs already here should be evaluated for success.

Anne is familiar with CINMS s results, and can be placed on the agenda for a report and overview at a future meeting. Anne observed that long term studies in FKNMS are underway, and are beginning in CINMS. Reserves in FKNMS were established in 2001, and include socioeconomic data. CINMS is adopting a similar model, collaborating with the National Park Service. They are moving ahead in CINMS.

Jim Kelly warned that the tyranny of taxonomy species counts will not suffice for this research. Investigators must target the study toward the improvement of fishing.

Data from California can be more convincing here than Florida s research. Jim will try to convince the Trust that this should be a priority item. Population dynamics studies have no climate or economic variables in the fisheries management models.

Investigators must identify key issues and what mechanisms are in place to address questions. They must define ecological health; Maria Brown is addressing this. What are fisheries impacts criteria of measurement? MPA designation must be supported by answers to above questions. Without a body which knows what research is, and knows peer review procedures, any action is not going to be productive.

Some combination of private and federal funding may be possible. NOAA and the National Science Foundation is a potential source of funding. The NGOs also agree that monitoring is needed. We should explore a consortium of foundations, large and small, and regional groups, and tailor aspects to fit foundation goals, e.g. the Coastal Conservancy. Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS) has had great success in this area. Any resolution the council makes should address funding issues.

Fish and Game has been historically underfunded and understaffed. Funding levels are less than 50% needed to do their basic work. Monterey s council asked the manager to write a letter to get Fish and Game a vessel. The letter went forward, and NOAA paid for half the vessel but never received the benefit.

It was suggested the topic of research and monitoring of marine protected areas should be dealt with at the next meeting.

DECEMBER 4 BOUNDARY MEETING:

The council discussed the nature and format of the boundary meeting. Richard Charter noted that the council already took a position on the boundary and sent it to Lautenbacher. As a silent observer with Jim Kelley at the Internal Team meetings, he objected to having their names on a report by the boundary team to add credibility to the result. It is not appropriate to make decisions in secret meetings. A GFNMS staffer had told Peter Grennel that boundary issues were not to be dealt with in a working group, being, too political.

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

The consultant's report was considered fatally flawed, and the council called for a revised, updated and open process. At the Monterey Bay council meeting, they looked at the Farallones council's recommendation as a land grab. The MBNMS advisory council said it had accepted the report by a vote of 15 to 1.

Anne outlined the meeting process: Dan will moderate, present on the decision making process. Michael Weiss will deal with legal issues associated with a boundary change, MBNMS's designation through an Administrative order, and oil/gas issues. There will be discussion on the biogeographic report, with Mitchell Tarrt and David Lott as references. Also to be discussed is the cost of changing a boundary, and the benefits. One hour is slated for public comment. Written comment will also be accepted. Dan will discuss the matters with the advisory council, a panel, and the managers.

Time for individual council discussion or meetings will be allowed. The MB Sanctuary Advisory Council may not have a quorum present. All proceedings are public, and public participation is essential to this meeting. Richard Charter mentioned that county governments and fishermen were major players when GFNMS was founded. San Francisco, Marin, San Mateo, Santa Cruz and Monterey County supervisors should be included in these meetings, at the table.

Further council discussion reiterated the deficiencies of the report (i.e., no physical, chemical or geological variables or bathymetry was included in the analysis). Mitchell Tarrt's proposed move to Pedro Point had no support from the analysis. No natural boundaries showed up on a flawed analysis.

Peter Grennell said the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors and harbor commission just passed a resolution on the issue. The consultants should now take the time needed to do the job right.

Brenda asked if the same people whose report was flawed are sitting on this panel. Anne stated the panel did look at geopolitical aspects of the change, the social and community aspects. But they did not carry out the same degree of analysis done as on biogeographic aspects. Bob Wilson objected that this was not reflected in the report.

Anne assured the council that Dan is coming with no agenda and wants to hear from the council. This meeting is an indication of Dan's sincerity.

Bob Wilson stated a wish to start with a new process, the right way, and that council be prepared to draft a position paper on this issue, and state where more data is needed. He considered that the council had sufficient cause to complain to the congressional delegation that it has been treated incorrectly. Council should critique the report, state that a full biogeographic study needs to be done, with ecological linkages to be considered. If they go ahead with current documents, the council should present its position based on geopolitical issues.

Jim Kelly expressed concerns that Dan Basta will go back to the Admiral and say he spoke with the council and it's taken care of.

A question was raised that Dan's visit would be a misuse of public funds, that the General Accounting Office or congressional budgeting office should begin an inquiry about program spending.

Elected officials or staff should get priority for hearing at the meeting. Representatives Farr, Lantos, and Pelosi may want letters read at the meeting. We've received resolutions already from several boards. We must avoid

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

public frustration at not being able to speak. Existing resolutions from elected officials can be read into the record.

The GF advisory council can vote on the issue that evening if a quorum is present.

(lunch break)

The advisory council should have two formal positions in advance, subject to modification

1. position paper on view of process to determine boundary change, including discussion of inappropriate past process.
2. Assuming they will make boundary decision as part of process, advisory council should provide a white paper as to what we feel facts should be considered and why we feel it should be at the Ano Nuevo boundary line.

Bob Wilson was recommended to be the primary author, and to email the council for comment.

There have been rumors spread that if the boundary changes, it will allow oil and gas in the north part of Monterey Bay NMS. There should be an analysis of the two sites' protections. Ed Ueber felt the Farallones regulations were stronger.

Council should avoid any illusion of gerrymandering, and make things make sense to the general public. Jim Kelly will do an analysis of the 26 page draft report, and why it doesn't meet scientific standards. Bob Breen is to organize the geopolitical information.

The Doughnut hole was separated from the boundary issue.

The group shall analyze the relative effectiveness of hydrocarbon protection, rationalize the community linkages, and take into account the reality of administration management. Jim Kelly is to do a rebuttal of the secret meeting/study. If starting from scratch, Jim would start with bathymetry, look at hydrology (chemistry and circulation); Tartt's study just says, Fish don't see the differences in the environment.

ITEM 9: NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Per Bob Wilson, Congress appropriates money in 5-year chunks, in 2005 \$40 million is appropriated. The council should review all segments, but Bob stated he can't see there needs to be major organic change to Act. He reviewed 315 regarding advisory councils which provides membership shall be no more than 15 members — there is no need to change that. The language is now broad enough to confer adequate protections.

Olympic Coast NMS Advisory Council made several recommendations:

1. The 5 year plan review should be changed to 10
2. Recommended better recognition of native American tribes
3. permitting requirement should be strengthened to remove the liability waiver due to bankruptcy
4. The council should increase from 15 to 20.

They also requested food for meetings.

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

Bob Wilson recommended against a change in existing legislation due to recent hammering of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act. Congressman Richard Pombo is not the one to look well on the protections of the existing Act. He recommends with the current NOAA administration, at the earliest time possible the council be advised of what NOAA is considering, and that NOAA consider the council's views. Nothing substantive is recommended, but if they are already contemplating change they should consult with the advisory councils.

Richard Charter cited the energy bill, when the Democratic leadership was not notified of secret meetings. There is a plan to lift the Outer Continental Shelf moratorium. Deferrals put in place by George Bush, Sr. are to be lifted, and there are plans to offer leases every five years. Three days ago Congressman Richard Pombo announced the Freedom to Fish Act, against MPAs.

RECOMMENDATION TO DAN BASTA:

Dredging: If a boundary change causes that the San Mateo County area to become part of GFNMS, the existing prohibition against new dredging should be put in place.

MOTION ON REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY ACT (NMSA):

Motion: The GFNMS advisory council believes that the risks of weakening amendments associated with any reauthorization of the NMSA may outweigh any potential benefits that may be attained through reauthorization at this time. And if NOAA is contemplating changes to Act, they should consult with the council.

Motion: Bob Wilson

Second: Richard Charter

Vote: unanimous

Money is one consideration, but beware of riders that may be appended. Ed Ueber will forward this recommendation with staff comments to Dan Basta.

ITEM 10: WORKING GROUPS

Working groups should transition from JMPR groups to being council working groups.

Discussion followed on differences between ad hoc and standing working groups. Future needs may change, but since we're in the JMPR process still, some feel disbanding groups may be premature by 3 or 4 months. Working group recommendations were specific, and will be fed back in the draft JMPR document. It was debated to continue working groups until the next meeting at least, and see if recommendations are cast in the documents. A fully empowered group could give the best review of the document. Council can also create new working groups, or disband and reconvene if needed. Institutional memory is important for continuity in dealing with periodic issues.

Standing working groups must be chaired by an advisory council member and can contain people from outside.

MOTION:

That existing JMPR working groups be sunsetted today.

Motion: Bob Breen

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

Second: Mick Menigoz.

Vote: The motion to sunset passed by a majority vote of 3/2, Richard Charter and Bob Wilson dissenting.

MOTION: A motion was put forward, that sunsetting be contingent upon final affirmation at the next council meeting.

Motion: Jim Kelley

Second: Richard Charter.

Vote: Failed to pass by majority vote.

Council members noted that one step out of the Fishing Activities Working Group called for a socioeconomic study in GFNMS as recommended to Maria Brown. It s already begun; how is it that Astrid Stoltz has already started the study, and is reporting to Fishing Activities Working Group? Maria explained that the study has started in advance of the management plan release, because the MPA Center in Santa Cruz had a contract with Ecotrust and it was a perfect fit with MPA Center work. The MPA Center is paying for the study. Ecotrust will report the results of the work to the sanctuary manager; the work will be completed in approximately three months. The sanctuary manager will then review it. Barbara noted we may need an ad hoc committee to meet with Astrid over this specific issue to meet 2 or 3 times over the next 3 months, for half-day meetings.

Richard Charter noted the recommendation of an Ecological Protection working group was agreed upon in the retreat.

MOTION: The advisory council should form an ad hoc committee to work with Astrid Stoltz to hear her proposals and provide input with the following members: Barbara Emley, Richard Charter (contingent on meetings being in Marin County), Mick Menigoz, Karen Reyna (proposed by Richard) and Maria Brown.

Motion: Richard Charter

Second: Bob Wilson

Vote: Unanimous

ITEM 11: EXPIRATION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR:

MOTION: Council will extend the terms of the chair and vice chair to March 1st

Motion: Richard Charter

Second: Bob Wilson.

Vote: Unanimous

ITEM 12: FEBRUARY CHAIR COORDINATOR MEETING PRESENTATION

Suggestions included the boundary issue and action by the council. Also proposed was the white shark issue, in which we seemed to negotiate a compromise, and to focus on the process, not the resolution.

Richard Charter warned the boundary is a lightning rod with headquarters. Instead, we can do a bullet point of issues we ve had to confront in the JMPR, and list the toughest, e.g. the procedure of boundary evaluation (working group vs. internal team); what we addressed successfully, and why (open process); contrast those that didn t work (boundary). Environmental and fisheries aspects can demonstrate one that wasn t a success vs.

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

success of fisheries and ecosystem working group coalition. Stress 90% positive/10% lessons learned aspects.

It was suggested that council members write a paragraph recommending topics for presentation at the meeting.

ITEM 13: NATIONAL POLICY

Barbara questioned if we want input on national policy, citing the letter from Dan Basta. This was moved to be an agenda of the next meeting. She noted that at the Santa Barbara meeting most sites wanted to work locally vs. nationally. Bob Wilson commented they don't have to be mutually exclusive. Headquarters can commit resources to investigate, but decisions should be made at a local level.

Bob Wilson advised that headquarters should limit council involvement to researching problem, but not in regulating.

Richard Charter suggested that the Rigs to reefs program can help sites outside Channel Islands.

In commenting on recommendation for national policy, local concerns play a great role. It is a more appropriate role for national policy makers to use local expertise and the council can provide information to local decision makers.

MOTION: National policies are appropriate at providing guidelines on an issue. Headquarters needs to ensure that expertise is available to assist local decision makers who have local familiarity with the issues their sanctuary faces.

Motion: Bob Wilson

Seconded: Richard Charter

Vote: Unanimous

ITEM 14: MEMBER REPORTS

Richard Charter:

- The Senate may be passing a secret, back room bill with no democratic involvement. It excludes seismic inventory. The bill was replaced with a study of the Outer Continental Shelf for natural gas potential to determine if impediments to development should be removed (i.e., the moratorium).
- In a turf battle between NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Interior Department, NOAA/NMFS lost. Interior is now in charge of all the offshore Exclusive Economic Zone, wind farms, strip mining methane hydrates, oil and natural gas. The result is weakened protection, with states being allowed to get pots of money as reward.
- Bristol Bay is now open to offshore drilling.
- The City of Santa Rosa has approved the estero wastewater disposal option. Richard and Mary Jane Schramm presented testimony on behalf of the GFNMS, advising Santa Rosa that they cannot do this without further study.
- The Arctic National Wildlife Reserve (ANWAR) is not included in the energy bill.

Barbara Emley:

Approved as amended at 02/04 meeting

- The crab season opened one day late; this year is not as good as last, but much better than normal. The price is lower on the wholesale level, but retail remains high.

Jim Kelley:

- The Pew Oceans Report is on the web for free.
- The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report is now available. The Academy recommended a national ocean initiative by NAS or by NOAA. The subtext is to make NOAA a cabinet rather than congressional office.

Bob Breen:

- The National Ocean Sciences Bowl will be held at Monterey Peninsula College February 7th. High school students from Central California are competing. The Bowl is run by Mary Welsh who is seeking sponsors and volunteers, scientific judges. The event will involve 100 youths.

Mick Menigoz:

- Is involved in building the new bay bridge, supplying, working on crew boats, and may be doing tug work.

Ed Ueber:

- Attended the Partners in Stewardship meeting involving nonprofits and the Interior Department. It represents an effort to get voluntary compliance via partnerships.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05p.m.

Meeting notes prepared by Mary Jane Schramm. For questions or comments, call 415/ 562-6622 ext. 205