

My comments are in red. Kathy Fosmark

SAC MPA subcommittee meeting 10/27/08 at CCWQP in Watsonville
Participants: Chris Harrold, Kathy Fosmark, Kaitilin Gaffney, Kirk Schmidt, Paul Michel
Mike Eng, Lisa Wooninck

1. Review meeting agenda developed by Kirk Schmidt
2. Review 7 Tasks for the SAC MPA subcommittee to focus current meeting
3. Develop categories for Science Panel (SP) expertise, Working Group (WG) representation, and criteria for application and selection process (Tasks 3 and 4)

(Task 3: Advise the Superintendent on the stakeholder membership categories to be represented on the proposed MPA Working Group.

Task 4: Advise the Superintendent on the areas of expertise to be included on the proposed Science Panel.)

Agenda item 1: Accomplishments and agreements to date completed at 8/25/08

meeting: (Task 5: Assist the Sanctuary in clarifying the roles, responsibilities, and operating procedures for the proposed MPA Working Group and the Science Panel, including how the two groups would interact and work with each other.)

- SP and WG need to work together (share information, seek clarification on points of discussion) before decisions are made or before information is disclosed to the public. (Public must have the ability to comment to SP and WG as ideas are being discussed and before ideas are “finalized”.)
- Have some SP members attend WG meetings and visa versa – or establish SP and WG liaisons. (This is a really bad idea. Communication between the SP and WG should only occur if it is with the whole SP and the whole WG – otherwise individual viewpoints can skew the process)
- SP should evaluate the WG’s MPA alternatives. (include the “No Project Alternative”)
- Schedule joint meetings with definite timelines to avoid a process that has no end. (Timelines should not be arbitrary)

Agenda item 2: Areas of Expertise on SP

Discussion:

- Kathy Fosmark developed a handout of categories for SP expertise and WG representation
- Goals for MBNMS MPAs in federal waters: (Who agreed to these goals? The fishermen have not!)
 - Unique and special places (To who? Our fishing grounds are unique and special to us!)
 - Ecosystem components protection (We thought the MBNMS was going to embrace EBM?)
 - Research MPAs to determine anthropogenic impacts (Both WG and SP must have the ability to question the MBNMS “need” assertion)
- Use the following question to guide the development of categories for SP expertise “What do we need to know to inform the design of offshore MPAs?” (No! First questions should be: Does all existing management satisfy the goals of the NMSA? And, if not, what are the best tools to reach those goals? Find experts who can answer all three questions)

- Local expertise to inform unique and special places; (“local” expertise will not know what’s unique and special – this is a West Coast question at least.)
- Workshop setting to gain scientific expertise not available through SP

General brainstorming - What do we need to know?

1. Deep-sea benthic biology/ecology
2. Marine ecology (trophic/community interactions, ecosystem dynamics)
3. Fisheries biology (a fisheries oceanographer would be better)
4. Oceanography: physical, chemical, biological (only a physical oceanographer is needed)
5. Habitat mapping
6. Ecosystem modeling - (combine with marine ecology)
7. Fisheries stock assessments (to study impacts on fisheries) (to understand what they know)
8. Marine geology (consult with, but not on panel)
9. Marine impacts of climate change (MPAs won’t matter to his. Drop)
10. Larval dispersal and adult movement expert (connectivity) (fisheries biologist will cover this)
11. Marine resource economics (market and non-market or fisheries and non-fisheries) (Current and future)
12. Social and cultural anthropology (current and future community structure) (I hope you are not social engineering future communities)
13. MPA knowledge/science (will be covered by other disciplines)
14. Experimental design (this isn’t a recognized discipline)
15. Marine pollution (offshore MPAs won’t matter to this - drop)
16. Marine population biology (isn’t this real close to Marine Ecology? Drop)

(See my comments and recommendation under “Discussion” below.)

Strike out

1. Water column biology
2. Marine population biology (genetics)
3. Climate change

Discussion:

- Some areas of expertise may be combined in one person (e.g. experimental design and marine ecology)
- Number of SP: not to exceed 12 members
- Select individuals who also have membership on the PFMC SSC and MBNMS RAP (The PFMC has limited the participation of SSC members so that they can be objective when they evaluate MBNMS proposals. Why would the MBNMS consult with the RAP now when it didn’t in deciding the “need” question? You will need to look outside the area for some of this)
- General observations about the makeup of the SP:
 1. There is obvious duplication in the Ecology class.
 2. Resource user disciplines comprise only one quarter of the team (four out of the sixteen places).
 3. Only one quarter of the biologists/ecologists slots appear to be assigned to animals that are exploited (2 out of 8).

4. Considering that the MBNMS is asserting its views on social values, and this will affect regional economics, more expertise in those areas need to be on the panel. To be rigorous in their analysis of human effects, the Science Team would need to consider current and future prospects for all human uses (fisheries, non-fishery activities, communities) with and without MPAs. It's therefore not clear to me why communities are singled out for consideration of future effects (i.e., "current and future community structure") but not other uses.

There seems to be an assumption that market methods pertain to fisheries and that non-market methods pertain to non-fisheries. Actually non-market methods are applicable to recreational uses in general (including recreational fishing).

I'm not sure of the scope of work expected of the economist. For instance, what types of human activities occur in Sanctuary waters that would need to be included in the economic analysis? Is the economist expected to consider existence values in the "non market" analysis (keeping in mind that existence values can apply to fishing communities as well as MPAs)? Also, it would be advisable for an economist (perhaps in collaboration with the anthropologist) to be involved in evaluating community effects, as such effects are economic as well as social in nature. Depending on the scope of work, doing it right may be more than can be reasonably expected of one economist.

5. The MBNMS needs to offer a stipend to those scientists who need it

Abiotic Habitat (5)

- oceanography: physical, chemical, biological
- habitat mapping
- marine geology
- marine pollution
- marine impacts of climate change

Resource use (4)

- fisheries biology
- fisheries stock assessments
- marine resource economics
- social and cultural anthropology

Ecology (6)

- deep sea benthic biology/ecology
- marine ecology (trophic/community interactions,
- ecosystem modeling
- marine population biology
- larval dispersal and adult movement expert
- MPA knowledge/science

Other (1)

- Experimental design

My SP Recommendation:

- physical oceanography
- habitat mapping
- fisheries biology or fisheries oceanographer
- fisheries stock assessments
- natural resource economics
- ecological economics
- non economic fishery social science
- coastal community social impact assessment
- marine ecology

Agenda 2: Categories of representation on WG

Discussion:

- What is a stakeholder? Individuals or organizations who stand to gain or lose from the success or failure of the system of MPAs (How are success and failure defined? How are their gains and losses measured? Are all stakeholder interests of equal value? I don't think so.)
- Application process with criteria that help select applicants, rather than nomination process
- Task 6: Assist the Sanctuary in developing the Application Process that would be used in recruiting potential members of the MPA Working Group and the Science Panel, as well as the criteria that would be used in evaluating applications and selecting members. (The ACSF in consultation with its supporting member organizations will select commercial and recreational fishing reps)

General brainstorming: WG categories

First tier

Commercial fisheries occurring in federal waters (as per Fosmark handout)

1. Commercial salmon, crab, prawn
2. Commercial HMS, albacore (hook/line), swordfish (drift gillnet), seine
3. Commercial groundfish, trawl and fixed gear

Recreational fishing

4. Charter boat
5. Individual boat (Howard Egan says that the "Charter Boat" rep can also rep the interests of individual recreational fishermen. If a separate "individual boat" rep is needed, Howard and the ACSF will choose one)
6. Harbors and Ports (includes processors) (Harbors should be under "community" reps as they contain fishing, whale watching, recreational users, law enforcement, research, and education customers)
7. Research Institution
8. Marine conservation (This needs to represent "conservation" groups and "preservation" groups separately.)

Second tier (combine into one category)

9. Tourism/Business (What tourism or business interests are there in Federal waters that would be affected by MPAs?)

- 10. Educational facilities/programs (This is not needed at this time)
- 11. Local governments (could be AMBAG, Cambria, Half Moon Bay) (AMBAG represents 750,000 people in 3 counties; AMBAG could coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions)

WG informational support needs

CDFG/MLPA interface

Expertise in the federal fisheries regulatory framework (both the WG and the SP will need this expertise represented, probably by a staff person from the PFMC)

Discussion:

We need balance on the WG, members with experience

Open application with letters of endorsement (as a selection criteria)

Suggestion: roughly half consumptive (e.g., fisheries related) and half non-consumptive (e.g., non-extractive users)

The MBNMS will need to offer a stipend for self employed WG members.

Commercial fishing	3	Conservation	3
Recreational fishing	2	Research	1
Harbors and Ports	1	Tourism/Education/Local Gov	1
TOTAL	6	TOTAL	5

There are really 3 groups

<p>Fishing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial • Recreational 	<p>Communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harbors • AMBAG 	<p>Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Conservation” rep • “Preservation” rep • Research
---	---	--

Regarding the “conservation” seats, I strongly suggest that they be represented by two large NGOs, specifically TOC and TNC, and a local NGO, SOS

Issues raised during meeting but not fully discussed:

- Geographic representation
- Other

ADJOURN

I hope you realize that this whole process is not ok with fisherman. We were promised that the new MBNMS would not be another bureaucracy that we have to deal with. This is our worst nightmare.

To have a shred of hope for a good outcome to this MPA process, we must feel like the WG and SP are fairly constituted, and the questions to be answered are legitimate.