DRAFT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary
175 Edward Foster Road
Scituate, Massachusetts 02066
TEL: 781.545.8026 FAX: 781.545.8036

30th SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL
16 June 2010 9:00 am – 3:00 pm Holiday Inn, Rockland, MA

MINUTES of MEETING

Present:

Jennifer Anderson:	Federal: National Marine Fisheries Service
Regina Asmutis-Sylvia:	Alternate: Conservation
Peter Auster:	Alternate: Research
Michelle Bachmann:	Federal: New England Fisheries Management Council
Priscilla Brooks:	Conservation Alternate
Dale Brown:	At-Large: Member
David Casoni:	Alternate: Fixed Gear Commercial Fishing
Deborah Cramer:	Member: At Large
Andrew (AJ) Ford:	State: MA Environmental Police
Robert Foster:	Alternate: Diving
Vito Giacolone:	Member: Mobile Gear Commercial Fishing
Melanie Griffin :	State: MA Division of Marine Fisheries
LT Ryan Hamel:	Federal: USCG
Heather Knowles:	Member: Diving
Bob McCabe:	Member: Marine Transportation
Maggie Merrill:	Alternate: At-Large
Steve Milliken:	Member: Whale Watching
Rob Moir:	Alternate: At Large
Tim Moll:	Member: Business/Industry
Frank Morton:	Alternate: Marine Transportation
Rick Murray:	Member: Research
David Robinson:	Member: Maritime Heritage
Michael Sosik:	Member: Recreational Fishing
Billy Spitzer:	Member: Education
CPT John Tulik::	State: Massachusetts Environmental Police
Lisa Volgenau:	Alternate: At-Large
John Williamson	Member: At-Large
Mason Weinrich:	Member: Research
Brad White:	Alternate: Recreational Fishing

SBNMS Staff:

Craig MacDonald	Matthew Lawrence	Nathalie Ward
Ben Cowie-Haskell	Elizabeth Stokes	Pamela Braff (BU Student Volunteer)
Brad Cabe	Michael Thompson	

Others Present:
Margo Jackson, ONMS Les Kaufman, BU Melissa Vasquez, NEFMC

I. Welcome, Review and Agenda and Approval of 29th SAC Minutes (Richard Delaney)

The agenda was reviewed and approved. The Minutes of the 30th SAC meeting were reviewed.

***MOTION*:** *Priscilla Brooks with second by John Williamson motioned to approve the minutes. Minutes approved.*

II. SBNMS Business (Craig MacDonald)

i. Budget/Continuing Resolution 2010

No change to budget since the last SAC meeting in January. Funding for FY11 is likely to be the same as FY10. There is pressure to cut costs. Sanctuary staff has been successful at obtaining additional grant support and PAC funds. The parking lot by the boathouse was purchased. The design of the operations center will be completed with engineers and architects in August. Awaiting budget for next year before renovations to the boathouse can begin.

ii. Final Management Plan (FMP)—Update

The Final Management Plan is scheduled to be formally released Thursday, 17 June. Craig MacDonald thanked everyone on SAC, particularly NOAA NMFS. They provided critical information in the form of summaries for data sets, which helped restructure the plan to make it a stronger document. A lot of significant changes have been made in particular to the sections on fishes and marine mammals. A subsection of the plan on public comments was provided to SAC members in advance of release of final plan. Over 95% of the comments received indicated that more needed to be done to protect and restore the sanctuary. A lot of comments were from letters or emails. Social networking played a large role in the input of comments. A formal press release will be on Thursday, 17 June. SAC members may be getting calls.

Comments/Discussion:

Rich Delaney congratulated the SAC and sanctuary staff on their perseverance and patience on getting out the final plan.

Regina Asmustis-Sylvia pointed out that maybe 95% of comments sent in were repetitive emails from one social networking group and should be considered as one comment rather than a separate comment from one individual, in fairness to those individuals who don't have access to social networking. She noted that there is a bias involved in some of the comments that were received, when a group of social networking comments from one particular constituency are treated as individual comments.

Craig MacDonald responded that social network comments were provided by individual members of the public in light of organization membership. Redundant comments by same individuals from all sources were screened and deleted prior to analysis. This is a national marine protected area, not just a regional marine protected area. Many people from around the country commented, who have an interest to see how the site resources are managed. Whether it is an individual comment or comments provided collectively on behalf of an organization, that comment process has to be respected, and that individual opinions are being expressed. Notice of the management plan went out nation-wide to all constituents. It

was a very broad, in-depth effort to reach as many interested parties as possible. The next revision will be in 2015.

iii. Ship Time: *R/V Nancy Foster* FY 2011

There is ship time on *R/V Nancy Foster* for FY 11. This is great news. Craig MacDonald appreciates SAC support as well as Paul Ticco's efforts at headquarters, which was instrumental in this effort. This year was the first time in 5 years that SBNMS was unable to conduct whale tagging. The SAC will be kept informed exactly when ship time on the *R/V Nancy Foster* will be made available.

iv. David Wiley, sanctuary research scientist, was awarded the Department of Commerce (DOC) Gold Medal Award for his leadership in designing and implementing innovative research projects to protect endangered whales in and around the sanctuary. This is the highest honorary award presented annually for distinguished performance in support of DOC objectives.

III. SAC Business (Nathalie Ward)

i. Election of Officers

No calls for nominations were received via email prior to the meeting. A call from the floor was solicited from members. SAC members unanimously voted to elect the following SAC members to the Executive Committee:

Richard Delaney: Chair (2 year-term)
Heather Knowles: Vice Chair (1-year term)
John Williamson: Secretary (1 year-term)

Motions: *Mason moves to nominate Richard Delaney as Chair. Deborah Cramer second its. Unanimous vote. Floor opens for nominations for Vice Chair. John Williamson nominated Heather Knowles for Vice Chair. Milliken seconds. Unanimous vote. Deborah Cramer nominates John Williamson as Secretary. Unanimous vote.*

ii. SAC New Members Welcome and Future Recruitment (Richard Delaney and Craig MacDonald)

Introductions: Craig MacDonald officially welcomed new members:

Peter Auster— now Research Alternate
Priscilla Brooks—Conservation Alternate
Susan Farady—Education Alternate
Vito Giacolone—Mobile Gear Fishing Member (was Alternate)
Bob McCabe—Marine Transportation Alternate
Frank Morton—Marine Transportation Member (was Alternate)
Rick Murray—Research Member
Michael Sosik—Recreational Fishing Member (was Alternate)
Billy Spitzer—Education Member
Lisa Volgenau-Fitzgerald—At Large Alternate
Brad White—Recreational Fishing Alternate
John Williamson—At Large Member

Resignations:

Regina Asmutis Sylvia—Conservation Alternate
Dale Brown—At Large Member
Kathryn Greene—At Large Alternate
Chip Reilly—Whale Watching Alternate
Heather Rockwell— Education Alternate

Craig MacDonald and other SAC members thanked departing SAC members for their contributions to the SAC, particularly Regina Asmutis-Sylvia who has been a long running member since 2001.

Nathalie Ward will work with the new SAC Executive Committee on the new recruitment action that is out and recommendations for vacant seats will be sent to headquarters.

iii. VOY - Evelyn Ganson

Evelyn Ganson was chosen as SBNMS Volunteer of the Year nominee for 2010. Evelyn has been working as a volunteer at the sanctuary for the past 3 years. She built a volunteer strategic plan around the draft management plan and put together a volunteer program to assist staff with the implementation of the plan, and worked on WhaleSENSE fact sheets with NMFS. She is also the sanctuary photographer on some of the research cruises. As volunteer of the year nominee, Evelyn was honored at Capitol Hill Oceans Week in Washington DC with other volunteer of the year nominees from other sites. The winner was from Flower Garden Banks Sanctuary. The sanctuary staff is very fortunate to have Evelyn on board and thrilled that she was the sanctuary nominee this year.

iv. 2010 SAC Meeting Dates

Next SAC meeting will be tentatively set for October 27, 2010. SAC meetings will go back to being held 4 times a year now that final management plan has been released.

v. SAC Youth Seat (Craig MacDonald and Nathalie Ward)

Dan Basta, ONMS Director, is encouraging all sanctuary councils to consider adding a youth seat to their SAC. Several sites have 14-17 years old working on ocean issues within their communities that parallels or complements the SAC. Ideas were solicited on how the SAC can implement this concept.

Comments and Discussion by SAC members and staff:

It is important to think about a new generation that could bring fresh and new perspectives to the table. This would be an incredible injection of enthusiasm and visibility in putting the name of the sanctuary out in a different venue. For example, Hawaii is very pleased with their youth.

It is a great idea but SBNMS staff is overtaxed so maybe this would be a good project for *Stellwagen Alive.*

Massachusetts marine educators could assist, maybe adopt their youth.

Criteria should be that they are gender varied and have recreated on SBNMS. Bring to SAC knowledge of days at sea. Bring expertise and future thinking to the SAC.

Opens up the schools in the region to cover marine issues. Word isn't out there. A lot of groups need to be aware of what's going on at the sanctuary and expand it.

Important that a youth group be established before a SAC seat is appointed. Need some group of 5 from where the leadership would come from. They earn the responsibility of being appointed to the SAC. Maybe start with USCG youth group.

A lot of students do not know that the sanctuary exists. Maybe have a cross of different kids from different schools to share knowledge about the sanctuary.

Much in favor of getting youth involved. Best advanced by forming a small group and more productive way to go.

Recommend that Anne Smrcina work with Bob Roach at the Whaling Museum and MME to work together on getting some insight and suggestions.

NMFS heads up large group of kids who get together every year. Jennifer Anderson can take a look into this.

This is a National Marine Sanctuary. By necessity we need to exclude areas and regions.

Bottom Line: There is support for some type of youth representation or access to SAC but more discussion is needed. Maybe have Anne Smrcina or Nathalie Ward draft a fact sheet to identify partners and criteria and experience, and fit it into an educational strategy that the SAC is looking for (i.e., Coast Guard cadets, Dolphin Fleet). There is an interest in setting this up.

Action Item: *Anne Smrcina is tasked to prepare brief abstract on how to have more youthful perspective and representation on the SAC and who to coordinate with. Report back at the October SAC meeting with recommendations.*

vi. SBNMS Programmatic Briefings (Nathalie Ward)

Nathalie Ward provided the SAC with a written programmatic review. Liz Pomfret, SBNMS Volunteer Coordinator, put together a wonderful volunteer program with Les Kaufman of the Boston University Marine Program. This is a pilot program that will be inaugurated in the fall to train a series of volunteers who actually go out to educate people about the sanctuary. Les Kaufman added that it was a fantastic program and his students are very enthusiastic.

vii. SAC Leadership Award (Rich Delaney)

Rich Delaney was pleased to read a letter that he wrote in April to Michael Cohen, President of the Board for *Stellwagen Alive!* in recognition for being awarded the 2010 SAC Leadership Award. The award was presented to Michael in recognition of his stewardship and outstanding leadership in support of SBNMS. Michael Cohen said that he was honored and pleased to receive the award. He added that the work he has done has been gratifying but more needs to be done to raise the level of consciousness to the problems that presently exist in the sanctuary and in the future. He stressed that we all need to be great stewards of this resource. Michael pledged to increase *Stellwagen Alive!'s* efforts and improve their work by engaging more deeply with SAC members and sanctuary staff.

viii. Leadership Award Working Group (Rich Delaney)

The SAC Leadership Award Working Group needs to be reconstituted to consider the next nomination. Porter Hoagland, Chair, is no longer a SAC member and Peter Auster stepped down. Mason Weinrich and Steve Milliken will remain, noting that more volunteers are needed.

ix. Report of Sanctuary Advisory Councils Summit Meeting (Mason Weinrich)

Mason attended the annual SAC Summit for Chairs and Coordinators held at the Olympic Peninsula NMS in Washington, 11-13 May 2010, on behalf of Rich Delaney who could not attend. Mason summarized his report, highlighting that the Summit was very interesting and it was particularly worthwhile to interact with other SACs that had similar issues. Dan Basta's theme for this year was "relevance". Mason stressed that there needs to be consistency and continuity in representation to keep the momentum and to be more effective for SAC representation. He volunteered to attend next year. Mason's written report is attached (See Appendix I).

Comments/Discussion:

Peter Auster asked if there was any response about the ocean acidification input that the SAC provided in a written letter to Dan Basta's request for sanctuary involvement that was generated from last year's SAC Summit meeting. Deborah Cramer provided background information on the correspondence and process that resulted from Dan Basta's request for sanctuary input on ocean acidification. Mason Weinrich mentioned that the topic was raised at the Summit meeting. Deborah added that what is really needed is a fisheries ecologist on the sanctuary staff. Mason got assurances that this is high on Dan Basta's radar screen. Les Kaufman added that work on ocean acidification should not be limited to Stellwagen Bank. Craig MacDonald added that there are two stove pipes where ocean acidification is being addressed throughout the sanctuary program: 1) to elevate the ocean acidification issue through the SAC process even though it hasn't resulted in modification of the final report, and 2) to build a working block with NMFS. Paul Ticco from headquarters is the sanctuary point person for ocean acidification. There has been a 6-month collaborative effort between various NOAA branches, which has resulted in a comprehensive national NOAA ocean acidification plan. One of the key points is the designation of SBNMS as a *sentinel site for the Northeast*. However, no budget is allocated for 2010; funds have been requested for 2011. Recommendations from the SAC's letter have been taken into consideration and incorporated into the regional ocean acidification plan including ocean noise on marine mammals. NOAA NMFS have been the lead—the "go-to" partner—concerning the ocean acidification issue and it has been a very productive collaboration. Mason Weinrich will continue to work with Les Kaufman and Peter Auster to strengthen documentation for the sanctuary superintendent on ocean acidification recommendations and relevant studies. This effort could be used to promote and strengthen the strategy for additional funds. Rick Murray suggested that local universities also be engaged. A conference call will be organized among those interested in participating.

Motion: *John Williamson motioned to pull together a group of SAC members and alternates to write a letter to the Sanctuary Program office describing concerns and availability of the sanctuary as a sentinel site for ocean acidification research and climate change. Mason seconded it. Passed unanimously.*

IV. Zoning Working Group and Scientific Subcommittee (John Williamson and Les Kaufman)

John Williamson gave an overview of the five-year history of the ZWG and distributed a related handout to SAC members. In his review of the last meeting he noted that NMFS had withdrawn from the following consensus statement pending a more complete cumulative impacts analysis: "*Existing zones and regulations were designed to address specific issues and to the extent that they are successful they contribute to the protection of ecological integrity; however, no single existing zone or regulation currently protects the ecological integrity of the SBNMS. Neither does the cumulative effect of these zones and regulations ensure the protection of ecological integrity. We recognize that ecological integrity is compromised by multiple stressors, and the protection of EI depends on factors inside and outside the SBNMS.*" (See attached report—Appendix II).

Les Kaufman provided his comments regarding the role of the ZWG Science Committee. There are alternative ways to meet objectives to minimize human disturbance. Kaufman described the differences between the alternatives presented and that they could be used in combination to protect the sanctuary but none is conventional or is in keeping with regional management that is in place. Alternatives 1 and 5 represent extreme decisions; alternatives 2, 3, 4 are creative ideas to make the sanctuary work better as a sanctuary. Options 2, 3 and 4 are not mutually exclusive.

Discussion ensued among SAC members regarding the definition of biological integrity and regulations that are presently in place to protect the sanctuary (e.g., Is the Sliver enough area to achieve ecological integrity in the sanctuary?). A suggestion was made that there be sanctuary representation at take-reduction team (TRT) meetings. The Sanctuary Act and Magnuson Stevens Act should be harmonized to avoid this situation.

Giacolone: Definition of biological integrity seems to be ambiguous in interpretation of the baseline.

Kaufman: As a scientist ecological integrity is not difficult to define in detail. What we are trying to get back to historically is key even if a baseline was not established. Zero disturbance is a key piece of science to acknowledge—to see what the diversity would look like. Even though the sanctuary is part of a larger system, when something is done on a smaller scale, it is not pointless to take action on a local scale. Tone of committee was very constructive generally.

Williamson: Williamson noted that the sanctuary is not in a pristine state as it was before human uses and recognizes it will not return to that. But there are things that can be done to improve what exists now.

Auster: Fishery and sanctuary divergence is what goals are. What is the human effect on development to reach these goals?

Brooks: Is modifying the Sliver enough to achieve ecological integrity in the sanctuary?

Kaufman: Provide some historical reality – the sliver is an accidental slightly protected area. Area protection is not the only approach, it is just absent and needs to be part of the equation. Essential as a piece of the puzzle.

Casoni: If the Sliver were modified would the Gulf of Maine closure remain? Percentage would have to be taken from somewhere else.

Weinrich: Primary concern, hardly any sand habitat in the Sliver. To understand what is going on in sanctuary you need to have more representative samples.

Delaney: Called order to remind the SAC that it has been given a report by the ZWG and now the SAC procedurally has to move an action forward. Do we accept the report as presented and written and decide how to move forward? Assumes that sending it back to the ZWG is not the right idea to come to a consensus. Marine spatial planning will also be another directive where these issues can be discussed. SAC has a responsibility to protect ecological integrity of the sanctuary as one of its major goals. Outlined options for the SAC regarding ZWG.

Williamson: There is an external element that is driving the process. The Fisheries Management Council (FMC) has its own very extensive fisheries management plan (Essential Fish Habitat Omnibus amendment) and is moving forward. Now is the opportunity for the sanctuary to get in sync with the FMC process. The FMC action is going forward and is a vehicle for the sanctuary to use.

Auster: Zoning is only one tool to meet objectives of ecological integrity

Giacolone: Concerning the expanding delineation of sanctuary into the Gulf of Maine—a reminder there is an opportunity that the fishing community has yet to engage in the discussion of what the sanctuary means to the fishing industry, especially in light of the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. Realizing now that it is critical to raise awareness and responsibility of when you are in the sanctuary. It is the most critical piece of ocean bottom, which was designated specifically to protect the most important fishing grounds. It is important to keep a dialog with fishermen.

Farady: Final plan contains a lot of threads. Actions are in the plan with steps for implementation. There will be line drawing going on and which processes should sanctuary take into consideration?

Weinrich: Coordination of SBNMS goals with other management group actions. Don't feel this would be sufficient. Sanctuary needs to be proactive in leading these discussions. Need to move forward in some cohesive way and keep the fishing group involved to find common goals.

Kaufman: Three great opportunities here that have value for the nation as a whole and solve our own problems. Building stewardship is not present in the present climate. Let's just do it together as a pilot at least in the sanctuary region. 1. Effect of shore based activities on the sanctuary and 2. Non-extracted uses integral to ecological health. Needs a louder voice in however process moves forward.

Rodrigues: Oral report included more than what was in the written report. These consensus statements read by ZWG need to be included in the written report. Status quo is not the consensus statement.

Delaney: Requested that oral report be circulated to SAC members.

MacDonald: NEFMC is moving very rapidly on habitat omnibus amendment. A number of committee meetings are scheduled. Timing of ZWG and the degree of work that has been conducted, to date, is essentially laying the foundation for SBNMS. Everything is converging. The Swept Area Seabed Impacts (SASI) model is remarkable but we have some concerns over inputs into the model as they relate to the sanctuary. There will be dedicated habitat research areas discussed. We may have to take initiative without the benefit of the advice from SAC because NEFMC has already begun moving ahead.

Delaney: SAC reflects a strong consensus that would appreciate if Craig takes the initiatives to be actively involved in the omnibus process to establish opportunities to implement the goals of the sanctuary. It is important to be armed with the final management plan and succinct summaries from ZWG to move us forward. Science and fishing sectors have offered to be more engaged as needed. Make this a high priority.

Williamson: SBNMS could be submitting requests to NEFMC for habitat proposals. Pull together a subgroup of SAC members.

There was agreement that the ZWG does not want to meet anymore. But keep SAC informed of any dialogue with the NEFMC.

Gaining consensus support from the SAC remains a high priority. In order to keep SAC informed of the process, a small ad hoc zoning subcommittee was formed with Rich Delaney as chair. It is premature to disband the ZWG until we understand what comes of the coordination with the Fishery Management Council on habitat zoning issues. Will be revisited at October meeting. The ad hoc group consists of:

Rich Delaney (Chair)
Priscilla Brooks
Dave Casoni
Deborah Cramer
Vito Giacolone
Melanie Griffin
Michael Sosik
John Williamson

Motion: Priscilla Brooks moves with second by John Williamson to create an ad hoc advisory Subcommittee named Ecological Integrity Advisory SubCommittee. Its mission is to be on call and ready to advise SAC Chair and staff on matters related to implementing the recommendations in both the final Management Plan and from the Zoning Working Group in achieving the overall goal in promoting the ecological integrity in the sanctuary. Amendment: This panel is in effect between now and October specifically to provide advice in this interim period that requires potentially rapid action on behalf the Sanctuary Superintendent. This will be specifically looked at during the October SAC meeting to address some of the bigger scale issues that have been raised. Passed unanimously.

V. Working Luncheon "Groundfish Commercial Fishing Sectors in 2010" (Melissa Vasquez).

Melissa Vasquez, NEFMC, presented on Groundfish Commercial Fishing Sectors in 2010 and provided the following summary for the 30th SAC Minutes:

Development of Amendment 16 to the Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) began in November 2006 to evaluate progress toward rebuilding overfished stocks, explore ways to replace or supplement effort controls, and implement Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) and Accountability Measures (AMs), as required by the Magnuson Act. Amendment 16, which became effective with the beginning of the 2010 groundfish fishing year (FY), May 1, 2010, also revised and expanded the sector allocation management program, which was originally established by Amendment 13 in 2003. Amendment 13 established the Georges Bank (GB) Cod Hook Sector as part of a much smaller sector program, which included allocation of only one stock, an allocation cap, and a geographic limit to sector fishing activity. Framework 42 in 2006 established the second groundfish sector, the GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector. Amendment 16 authorized an additional 17 sectors, allowing much greater participation in the program. A sector is a group of self-selecting limited access NE multispecies permit holders who have

elected to fish cooperatively under a hard total allowable catch (TAC). Membership in a sector is voluntary and a sector must be composed of at least 3 persons with distinct ownership interests. A sector is allocated an Annual Catch Entitlement (ACE) for up to 14 stocks and in exchange is exempt from some NE multispecies regulations. The sector is governed by an enforceable operations plan that describes sector-fishing operations, requests exemptions from regulations, and is approved annually. A sector is a legal entity and its members may be held jointly liable for some violations. The New England Fishery Management Council must authorize all new sectors through a management action. Seventeen of the 19 authorized sectors submitted operations plans and were approved to operate in FY 2010. The 2010 sectors represent 52% of the 1,477 eligible NE multispecies permit holders, holding >98% of the 2010 allocation of NE multispecies catch. The sector ACE is a hard quota, so a sector must have ACE for all stocks in an area to fish a sector trip there. The sector's manager manages the sector's ACE in real time, using dealer reports, vessel trip reports, observer data, discard rates, and ACE trades. The sector submits a report summarizing ACE status and sector fishing activity to NMFS for verification on a weekly basis. To support the real time management of sectors and ACLs, Amendment 16 also implemented monitoring and reporting requirements for sectors and the common pool (non-sector vessels). Each sector is required to submit an annual report at the end of the fishing year that describes sector activity for the year, which will be used to evaluate the sector's operations and sector allocation management program.

The Council is currently developing Framework 45 to the NE multispecies FMP, which may contain modifications to the sector management program, as well as authorize up to 4 new sectors for FY 2011.

VI. SAC Issues

i. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA) Reauthorization (Margo Jackson, HQ ONMS)

ONMS has been working on NMSA authorization for well over a year. A draft bill went to NOAA Headquarters for clearance in December and still has not been released. ONMS staff heard that it may be released this summer, but this seems optimistic. ONMS headquarters is trying to continue to push it through; likely what will happen would be a bill put forth to Congress with a lot of the elements of the NMSA. Listening sessions have taken place with various constituents, which also involved SAC chairs. Note: They were not representing the SAC, they were acting independently in an individual capacity. Some issues of concern for discussion in reauthorization are term limits for SAC. There are also requirements in the Bill to permit water dependent recreational uses—uncertain what this means and may cause concern in the future. Lastly, suggestion of establishing a sanctuary ecosystem management review board that would advise us on ecosystem based management. Our councils do this now and don't feel oversight is needed at a higher level. Told we will see a final "Bill", but don't know when or what it will look like. Definitely need the Bill because we are technically operating without authorization, but have been appropriated every year without the authorization. Solicits help in getting the Bill moved along. Will keep SAC posted.

In regard to responding to the Gulf of Mexico oil spill response. All of NOAA is being asked to contribute resources and staff to address the situation in the Gulf. We are using various resources across the various agencies and not just from the sanctuary program, setting up entire response units. This will be a long-term problem for a fairly small program to address for a long period of time. Discussion ensued regarding the oil spill in the Gulf and contingencies that are in place if the spill were to work its way up the east coast and potentially reach the Sanctuary.

ii. Humpback Whale ESA/FRN (Richard Delaney)

A biological review team (government agency employees only) is reviewing the endangered status statistics and population of humpback whales and will issue an opinion in the fall, followed by a total ecological integrity process. No one is suggesting a delisting, but rather to subspecies and come back with an assessment and recommendations re: whether the humpback species should continue to be listed as an endangered species or sub-species. There is no definitive recommendation yet. Nathalie Ward will email SAC members information on the Hawaii humpback whale sanctuary's response to this issue and Delaney will clarify process for next steps at the October SAC meeting.

VII. Partner and Constituent Reports

i. NOAA Fisheries Regional Report/Ocean Acidification Update/Atlantic Wolffish Listing (Jennifer Anderson)

Jennifer Anderson presented the NOAA Fisheries Regional Report and provided the following summary for the 30th SAC Minutes:

Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan (FMP):

- Framework 21 to the Scallop FMP should be implemented in the coming weeks (~July 1st).
- This action would modify the 2010 specifications for the scallop fishery. Notable changes are a reduction in the allocated number of DAS and a provision to allow access to the Nantucket Lightship Closed Area.

Skate FMP:

- New scientific information showing improvement in Northeast skate stock health has allowed NOAA to adjust catch limits and avoid severe catch reductions in the skate fishery in 2010.
- New management measures were adopted to establish annual catch limits for all skate species and accountability measures if catches are exceeded as well as to establish a rebuilding program for smooth skates.

Atlantic Herring FMP:

- The comment period on the proposed rule for the 2010 through 2012 Atlantic Herring Specifications closed on May 20th.
- After a deduction is made to reflect estimated Canadian catch in 2010-12 of 14,800 mt, the proposed US catch (TAC) is 91,200 mt, a reduction from the 2009 level of 145,000 mt.
- The TAC is allocated to 4 management areas, and Stellwagen Bank is located in Area 1A. It is proposed that the TAC for Area 1A be reduced from 45,000 mt in 2009 to 26,546 mt in 2010-12.
- The Council also has two other actions involving herring under development. Amendment 4 to the FMP is undergoing internal NMFS review and would set ACLs and accountability measures for the fishery. Amendment 5 to the FMP is under development and would consider a catch monitoring program, river herring bycatch measures, criteria for midwater trawl access to groundfish closed areas and Atlantic mackerel bycatch measures.

Petitions to List under the Endangered Species Act:

- In January 2010, NMFS was petitioned by the Humane Society of the United States and the Wild Earth Guardians to list the porbeagle shark (*Lamnanasus*) under the ESA. NMFS has reviewed the petition and has prepared a 90-day finding in response, which should publish shortly.

- NMFS was recently petitioned to list bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) under the ESA by the Center for Biological Diversity. The agency is currently reviewing this petition and a 90-day finding will follow.

Large Whale Disentanglement Update:

- As of June 10, 2010, there have been two new entanglement cases in New England waters:

  - On May 13, 2010, regarding entangled right whale #2470 in Great South Channel, a team from Provincetown Center for Coastal Studies (PCCS) was able to cut free tightly wrapped line around flukes.
  - May 18, 2010, regarding entangled humpback whale, 'Pinch', just east of Stellwagen Bank, unfortunately a team from PCCS was unable to grapple onto the wrap of mesh netting around the head of the whale to cut it free.
  - Successful disentanglement of right whale #1140 (originally observed entangled on March 6, 2008, in Cape Cod Bay) on May 1, 2010, east of Nauset Inlet by the PCCS rescue team.

Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan Final Rule:

- NMFS published a final rule implementing the revised Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan (HPTRP) on February 19, 2010, to address the increase in incidental mortality and serious injury of the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy stock of harbor porpoises in commercial gillnet gear. A subsequent final rule was published on March 17, 2010, that delayed the effective dates for pinger requirements in the Stellwagen Bank Management Area and Southern New England Management Area from March 22, 2010, until September 15, 2010, to allow fishermen additional time to acquire pingers.

ii. NEFMC Essential Fish Habitat Ombinus Amendment (Michelle Bachman and Ben Cowie-Haskell)

Michelle Bachman, New England Fishery Management Council Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Analyst, presented an update on the Council's Omnibus EFH Amendment. This action is being developed for two primary reasons: (1) to ensure that EFH designations for managed species are appropriate and updated to include the most recent scientific information, and (2) to evaluate and minimize to the extent practicable the impacts of Council-managed fisheries on EFH. Other items such as prey information for managed species, non-fishing impacts to EFH, and habitat-related research goals, are also part of the amendment.

The Plan Development (technical) Team has developed a tool, the Swept Area Seabed Impact (SASI) model, which allows the Council to estimate spatially-specific adverse effects of fishing on habitat attributable to various types of fishing gears. The outputs of this model will be used to guide the Council as it develops management alternatives to minimize the impacts of fishing on habitat. In addition to SASI outputs, sources of information for the SBNMS region, including multibeam and boulder reef data, are being considered by the PDT and Habitat Committee to ensure that the benthic environment of SBNMS is accurately characterized and appropriate management recommendations are developed that will adequately protect seabed habitats within the Sanctuary. The public, including stakeholders from SBNMS, are welcome to be involved in the process at the Council, Habitat Committee, and PDT levels, and Asst. Superintendant Ben Haskell serves on the Habitat Advisory Panel. Additional information can be found at http://www.nefmc.org/habitat/index.html.

Ben presented a more defined description of the scale and grid variations and differences between the SASI and USGS multibeam models. He provided an update on the Advisory Panel Habitat Committee Meeting and sanctuary staff involvement. He referred to a letter sent to John Pappalardo voicing concerns regarding the SASI model and SBNMS specific considerations. Multibeam datasets should be incorporated with SASI models. Sanctuary staff members have attended habitat meetings in Providence and Portland. Ben briefly explained the problems with the SASI model and related comments that were provided at these meetings. Committees are working together to resolve the differences in interpretation of multibeam datasets and SASI model.

iii. Humpback Whale Enforcement Case (Mason Weinrich)

Mason reported on a "landmark case" that the Whale Center of New England was involved in, which dates back to an incident back in July 2008 when an operator of a boat was photographed by NEWC observers driving into an aggregation of humpback whales. There was a collision between the boat and at least one humpback whale. The operator of the boat was later prosecuted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act as a case of harassment. The operator of the boat was fined $200, when the actual fine could have been as much as $20,000. Weinrich stated that this is a flagrant violation of the law and sends the wrong message to boaters that harassing whales can only amount to a fine of $200. The SAC needs to be aware of this and possibly elevate the issue to a higher level of concern and attention.

Rich Delaney suggested that this topic needs more focus and should be on the agenda at the next SAC meeting.

iv. New England Renewable Energy Center (Maggie Merrill)

Maggie Merrill, SAC member since (2008) provided a constituent briefing to the June 16 SAC meeting. Currently, as communications manager for New England Marine Renewable Energy Center, she briefed all on the activities of the New England Marine Renewable Energy Center located at UMass Dartmouth. The MREC was created in 2007 to bring industry, academia, government and the public together to address all aspects of bringing ocean energy technologies to New England waters. She provided an overview of the existing technologies to harness energy from ocean wind, waves and tidal resources which are being developed overseas and in the US and talked about the many opportunities and challenges in working with such a nascent industry. She invited all in attendances to learn more about these technologies, the regulatory environment and the prospects for private and public investments by attending the 2nd Annual MREC Technical Conference on November 2, 2010 in Cambridge and the Ocean Energy Industry Panels within the 6th Conference on Clean Energy in Boston on November 3-4, 2010. Please go to www.mrec.umassd.edu for more information. Feel free to contact Maggie directly at: mmerrill1@umassd.edu.

v. Dive Mooring Pilot Project (Heather Knowles and Matthew Lawrence)

This project evolved from the draft management plan commenting period. Comments submitted by Heather Knowles on the DMP outlined an innovative mooring technique that would facilitate diver access while also protecting maritime heritage resources from anchoring damage. Heather Knowles and Matthew Lawrence applied for and received a grant from Project AWARE, a not for profit organization supporting diving related conservation projects. The grant support provided funds to install a dive mooring on a sanctuary shipwreck. This project seeks to further the partnership between the sanctuary and the diving community to identify innovative and collaborative approaches to minimize disturbance to sanctuary shipwrecks and address problems of access with multiple competing uses. The mooring site

may not be optimal but is a good compromise, and is a unique and novel approach to serving all of the diving needs. The goal is to have the mooring in the water the first part of July.

VIII. New Business

Peter Auster suggested that SAC meetings be held at venues where public transportation is readily available. Craig MacDonald asked for suggestions for new venues.

IX. Public Comment

- David Dow, Sierra Club: Attended a Gulf of Maine habitat restoration and conservation initiative meeting in Portsmouth, NH. They are seeking input on open ocean habitat restoration and conservation. He recommended that SAC provide some ideas.

Staff that works for Senator Olympia Snowe of Maine approached the Sierra Club Office in DC. They are drafting a bill on marine climate change and impacts of the marine environment. The Sierra Club marine activist team suggested three issues that they might consider that seem relevant: Ocean acidification, marine spatial planning, and the combined impact of climate change on fisheries habitat on marine biota and the habitat that marine biota depends upon.

The Sierra Club marine activist team commented on the Phase I report of the Omnibus Habitat Amendment. It was suggested that in the Phase II component that they look at climate change creating a shifting baseline so that they can evaluate how the fish habitat changes over time and not just attribute all the changes from adverse human impacts. A second suggestion should consider effects of bi-catch and discard from commercial fishing on predator-prey interactions that occur.

- Regina Asmutis-Sylvia, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society: WDCS and some other groups are in the process of suing the NMFS for not responding to their petition for critical habitat for the North Atlantic right whales in the designated time frame. Regina asked the SAC to consider supporting it when it becomes publicly available as well as the Federal Registry Notice for Critical Habitat.

- The Right Whale Consortium is trying to designate 2012 as the year of the right whale as an educational program along with Canada. Please get in touch with Regina if there is any interest in being involved with the program.

X. Adjourn. 3:50 pm.

APPENDIX I

2010 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit

- Action Items and Meeting Notes -

Summary of Action Items:

- **Distribute a marine debris table to council chairs and coordinators. (Nicole Capps)**
- **Council chairs will, at their discretion, participate as individuals in a listening session hosted by Rep. Capps on NMSA reauthorization. (Council chairs)**
- **Councils will consider other ways they as individuals and councils can support moving forward with NMSA reauthorization including providing advice to Dan Basta. (Councils)**
- **Purchase and distribute 50 copies of *Don't be a Scientist* – a book intended to teach individuals how to inform the public about difficult scientific issues. (Dan Basta)**
- **Information from climate session breakouts will be consolidated in a synopsis and distributed to all council coordinators and chairs. (Kate Thompson/ Jim Sullivan)**
- **Distribute the Fagatele Bay synopsis/one-pager to all Summit participants. (Emily Gaskin)**
- **Develop and distribute a second version of the Ocean Acidification Report. (Becky Holyoke)**
- **ONMS will work to develop a sanctuary community mini-grants program to incentivize joint working between sanctuary superintendents and coastal community groups (e.g., recreational anglers). (Dan Basta)**
- **ONMS will provide better and more consistent information on national education programs such Ocean for Life and MERITO to advisory councils. Councils may be able to determine ways to help keep these programs alive. (Kate Thompson)**
- **ONMS and councils will consider developing a single day where we draw lines in blue chalk to show the possible effect sea level rise. (Kate Thompson and/or Councils)**
- **Council chairs should consider getting together with their Regional Fishery Management Council Chairs at least once a year to trade notes and discuss priorities for the coming year. (Council chairs, site staff and regional staff)**

***Notes:**
- Individuals responsible for completing the action item noted in ( ).
- Actions also noted within the Summit Notes for context.
- Specific actions coming out of regional break-outs are identified within the notes.

Tuesday, May 11, 2010

Meeting Opening
Carol Bernthal, OCNMS Superintendent

Carol Bernthal opened the meeting by asking all participants to introduce themselves, including their name, position(s), and primary responsibilities.

Welcoming Remarks from Congressional Delegation
Kristine M. Reeves, Director, Kitsap & Olympic Peninsula, Office of U.S. Senator Patty Murray

Kristine Reeves welcomed Summit participants to the Olympic Peninsula on behalf of Senator Patty Murray. In her written address, Senator Murray recognized the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries for its approach to critical issues impacting various resources. The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) and Summit participants were encouraged to further collaborations and discussions at the Summit, especially as it pertains to efforts of preservation.

Mike English, Director, South Sound and Olympic Peninsula, Office U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell

Mike English presented a written address from Senator Maria Cantwell. The address thanked Carol Bernthal, Dan Basta, and members of the coastal tribes and agencies for participating in the Summit. Additionally, the Senator commented on the role of the ONMS in protecting rich cultural and natural resources, and how she has worked on a number of issues related to sanctuaries. She also mentioned the unique role the coastal tribes and, particularly the IPC, have in protection. Senator Cantwell commented that she is our partner in the U.S. Senate, and that she hopes we enjoy the Olympic Peninsula and her home state.

Judith Morris, District Representative, Office of Congressman Norm Dicks

Judith Morris, a resident of the Peninsula, commended all for their participation and association with sanctuary advisory councils. Congressman Dicks was delighted that we were all able to gather on the Peninsula, and he specifically recognized the Olympic Coast Chair, Chip Boothe, for his role. The Congressman went on to comment on the mission/activities (e.g., ocean acidification) of the ONMS, as well as the how the Gulf Coast oil spill should encourage all to protect coastal waters and marine resources. Congressman Dicks is a strong advocate for the National Marine Sanctuary System. He strongly believes that protecting marine sanctuaries is important and will continue to fight for supporting sanctuaries (including the community-based advisory groups).

State of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Daniel J. Basta, ONMS Director

Dan Basta stated that it was particularly fantastic seeing Summit participants converse this week, as the ONMS is a family and advisory councils are integral to who we are and what we do. He

specifically thanked the congressional staffers from Senator Murray's, Senator Cantwell's and Congressman Dicks' office.

Dan opted to speak to participants about a few objectives, including ocean acidification and coastal and marine spatial planning, as well as address the current status and future directions of the ONMS. He was interested in discussing how and why sanctuaries need to be relevant.

Ocean Acidification – Dan reminded Summit participants that the ONMS had packaged all of the resolutions, motions, and letters put forth by the sanctuary advisory councils and had distributed the first version. He stated that this document let others know that sanctuary communities are concerned about ocean acidification, and was one way of presenting the unified view that could drive internal recognition that sanctuaries should be involved in ocean acidification activities. Wouldn't you want to go to a place where the community is involved and is willing to communicate and interpret? Dan mentioned that Bill Douros has already put together a West Coast Task Force for ocean acidification.

Energy and the Economy – The next issue of Sanctuary Watch, which will be released shortly, addresses jobs and the economy. Additionally, the focus of Capitol Hill Ocean Week (CHOW) this year will be ocean energy. Circumstances earlier this year have made CHOW a more major symposium, and it will be including individuals not typically in attendance. Secretary Salazar will be kicking off CHOW.

Cultural Engagement – Dan also mentioned that ONMS has to be relevant in cultural engagement, being the ones to reach out and build larger coalitions. He said that we are ultimately looking to impact hundreds of millions, and that all should be familiar with MERITO and Oceans for Life (OFL).

Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning – Dan informed participants that Michael Weiss, the Deputy Director of ONMS, is on detail with the Commission for Environmental Quality (CEQ). He informed (or reminded) all that portions of the coast were opened to oil and gas, that wind energy farms were authorized off the coast of Massachusetts, and that there was discussion of splitting up the Minerals Management Service. He went on to address why there may be great opportunities for marine protected area (MPA) coalition building, and how there likely would not have been a National Marine Sanctuary Act (NMSA) or five west coast sanctuaries without the 1968 Santa Barbara oil spill. He said there are opportunities for ONMS and advisory councils to engage, and that the way to go about what we do is through integrated marine spatial planning and public process. Within ONMS, the west coast joint management plan review (MPR) and Stellwagen Bank ship-strike are excellent example of marine spatial planning. In fact, the only graphic in the White House framework for marine spatial planning is the Stellwagen graphic.

SAC Attack – Dan Basta let all attendees know that there have historically and currently been a few voices outside of councils that have criticized the expertise and composition of sanctuary advisory councils. He said that Chairs (or representatives) should let their councils know that they are 150% supported by the ONMS.

Budget and the NMSA – Dan mentioned that unfortunately there hasn't been a positive federal budget since 2001, and that the ONMS has received no additions internally in the last six years. Any additional dollar has been through the congressional process, and unfortunately, this means that every year is a new battle. The good news, however, is that the administration is actually proposing a $4M increase in 2012.

Dan stated that our ability to achieve is dependent on developing a bigger constituent support base, and one way to build a great constituency is through new sites. He said that we need a greater geography of people, and new sites are how we will build bigger programs and the associated budgets that we need. He commented that all sites have done phenomenal with the funds spread around, and that the NMSA is still alive. National marine sanctuaries have a lot to do for marine spatial planning and sentinel sites for monitoring, and the oil spill is evidence that we need the Act reauthorized now.

In the Future – In addition to the topic driving CHOW this year, Dan informed Summit participants of the Leadership Awards Dinner that will honor volunteers of the year (VOY) and others integral to national marine sanctuaries and ocean conservation. He specifically focused on upcoming events centered on Jacques Cousteau, including the presence of his family at the Leadership Awards Dinner, the unveiling of a Cousteau portrait, and the June 11th honoring of Cousteau with red watch-caps. He stated that the Cousteau Event will continue throughout the summer and will likely peak at the Blue Ocean Film Festival in Monterey (August 2010). They hope to show the original 22 episodes of Cousteau's show at this event, and once again, red watch-caps will be used to symbolize Cousteau's contributions to ocean conservation. This year's Blue Ocean Film Festival will be the largest festival thus far. Also, at the film festival, an Oceans for Life (OFL) water bottle will be for sale. The water bottle was developed by private entrepreneurs (i.e., no ONMS logo or name on the bottle), but ten percent of the proceeds will go to youth programming.

Engagement – Dan informed us that the education coordinators will be in American Samoa in July – training approximately 120 teachers. He went on to talk about *Can Tradition Guide Us in A Time of Change: Climate Change and Indigenous Cultures*. He said that it is about place-based indigenous cultures – not just in Olympic Coast but elsewhere within sanctuaries and beyond, and indigenous cultures have a different sense of place (especially given that generations have stayed in one place for hundreds to thousands of years). Ed Johnstone and Dan Basta commented on the Quinault glacier, including a 40-year photographic record of the glacier, and Ed implied that this is developed interest in climate change. ONMS will be sending an Intergovernmental Policy Council member to American Samoa in July. Dan mentioned the 10 year anniversary of the Northwest Hawaiian Islands and the potential designation of the islands as a World Heritage Site.

In addition to cultural engagement, the ONMS will be striving to engage a lot of communities, including the University of Rhode Island. The Leadership Team (LT) will be bringing roughly 80 people to Rhode Island in September. The strategic objective is to build the University of Rhode Island as a different kind of partner, as well as engage Mystic Seaport and Mystic Aquarium in elements that came out of last year's AZA meeting. Dan also distributed a script from a 2010 listening session in Hatteras and commented on the importance of enforcement.

The Office of Law Enforcement and ONMS created a document – started approximately three to four years ago – that highlights enforcement in MPAs.

Closing – Dan Basta asked attendees if we are at a crossroads in this country, and stated that if so, we need to alter our path to move forward. He said that we want to be more relevant, and that we should have the courage to grasp at an opportunity. He encouraged participants to take advantage of this week, to build bigger consortiums of thought and contention, and define our clear path. It's about connecting to everybody, and taking advantage of the science, education, heritage, marine planning, and advisory council components of the family that we are.

Summit Overview
Karen Brubeck

Karen Brubeck announced that there has been a change to the agenda. The Council Elevation Update and Discussion on Thursday, May 13, will be replaced by a discussion by Dan Basta on sanctuary community grants/recreational fishing. Additionally, she informed Council Chairs that forms for identifying topics of discussion with Dan Basta (at Wednesday's dinner) were on the back table where name tags were picked up.

Karen thanked the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary for hosting (Andy, Carol and Lauren in particular); NMSF for assisting with the meeting and co-hosting the evening reception with OCNMS at LCL; and the Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit working group (Chris Harold, Lance Morgan, Keeley Belva, Mike Murray, Becky Shortland, Andy Palmer) for all their assistance. She then offered a heads up that she would be seeking volunteers for next year's working group.

- BREAK -

Olympic Coast NMS Presentation
Carol Bernthal, OCNMS Superintendent

This presentation is really to provide a connection to place, as well as give an overview of the issues that the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries faces, and Carol used this place – the Olympic Peninsula and OCNMS – to do this. She oriented all participants to where we came from, the National Marine Sanctuary System, and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (which shares a boundary with Canada). OCNMS was designed in 1994, and it is a 303-mile area which is far away from Puget Sound. The core in the high mountains of Olympic National Park (designated in 1923), four tribes that live on the coastal north, and the Olympic sanctuary which didn't arrive until 1994. Olympic National Park has been designated as a world heritage site, and it has three types of areas: old growth forest, coastal strip, and reservations along the coast. Two dams, from 1900 installations, will be removed this summer, and this is extremely important because they were placed illegally they blocked the passage of fish. Within OCNMS, there are three deepwater canyons that require advanced technology. It's a place where land meets the sea. The coastal tribes have lived there for thousands of year – canoes are built from cedars. Tribes from all over the U.S., Canada, and Washington will be coming over to Neah Bay this summer, and this year it will be hosted by the Makah Tribe. The area also has a very vibrant

history as far as marine trade (e.g., lighthouses). Cape Flattery is the most western point in the continental United States, and we will have an opportunity to see it tomorrow. There are dramatic coastlines, and they tend to be calmer further south. Carol illustrated the upwelling along the coast of the Olympic Peninsula, and its relevance to trophic structure, etc. One of the things they are looking at are how these are affected by climate change (e.g., inter-annual, decadal fluctuations). There are very abundant kelp forests, sea bird nesting and roosting areas, diverse intertidal areas, migrating mammals (e.g., humpback whales), deepwater habitats and corals, sea otters, and schnook and other historic uses (e.g., sailing, fishing, shipping).

Carol shifted gears slightly to address topics to be addressed during the Summit and their relationship to OCNMS (e.g., marine debris, Washington CoastSavers coastal clean-up, climate change). The benefit and purpose of coastal clean-up is to engage the volunteers, and help them make the connection to the ocean and why it should not be treated as a trash bin. Examples of climate change included Muir Glacier, ocean acidification (and the great influence it may, particularly, have on Pacific Northwest Region), significant decreases in snowpack, declining water supply, changes in winter rain events, fire and pest outbreaks, sea level rise, etc.

Research, resource protection, and education are the key components to how the OCNMS, and all sanctuaries, work. Oil spill prevention is a concern of this sanctuary and, in fact, led to the establishment of this sanctuary. No oil spills have occurred in the sanctuary since its establishment. International Maritime Organization Area to be Avoided off the Washington Coast is a voluntary program, and a joint letter from the superintendent and port captain is sent to ship captains to inform them that they are in a protected area. Currently, there is a 98% compliance rate with a voluntary program.

Olympic Coast Sanctuary Advisory Council has been key to the sanctuary, and has played a major role in a number of activities/actions. One of the current initiatives has been the draft management plan. There are a number of jurisdictional challenges for the sanctuary, and OCNMS is the only sanctuary where coastal tribes have been present and involved in sanctuary management. Carol then turned the presentation over to Ed Johnstone to discuss the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) and the differences in perspective between the tribes and ONMS.

Ed Johnstone used a topographic depiction of the Olympic Peninsula to point out a number of features, including among other things Olympic National Park, Olympic National Forest, Gray's Harbor, Makah Reservation, Hoh River, and Quinault Nation. Treaty fishing rights suggest that the coastal tribes have the right to fish out to 40 miles, but as a government entity, elect to have outwards of the EEZ. The coastline is fairly undeveloped, but there is a great interest in developing this area (e.g., golf courses). Many of the places that Carol Bernthal illustrated in her presentation are considered sacred, special places, and few have the opportunity to visit these locations (e.g., elephant rock, tunnel island). Ed mentioned that he wasn't even exactly sure how the Quinault even become involved in the sanctuary, and it wasn't until OCNMS staff came through doing an intertidal study that the differences in needs, perspective, etc. became apparent. To the Quinaults, they were lines on a map that totally disagree with how they live (e.g., no take zones in a harvestable area). It wasn't until Dan Basta visited that the tribes and OCNMS were able to determine how to proceed, collaborate, and understand each other's interests. A

document was developed that addressed the relationship between OCNMS, the coastal tribes, and the State of Washington. This was really the first step to working together, and although there are times where toes have been stubbed, the relationship has really improved. Ed mentioned that just like Dan mentioned that ONMS needs a bump that they really need a bump as well. He agrees that we need the data, so that we can work together to decide what is best. His message is that they are not museum pieces, but important in the fishing realm. He appreciates the education component of the sanctuary, because they too appreciate education and influencing the children. He is for all education and for improving education/communication for all along the coast, especially all of the coastal tribes. Being place-based, having that treaty, and having people that are committed to continuing to work together and grow is what will continue to allow us to all live together in this landscape – this seascape. Ed then went on to offer insight into his family's history, particularly telling stores of his grandmother's experiences with ocean canoeing and an overland trail and his grandfather's birth. Similar stories, ancestry, and family experience is how his fellow Quinault view the importance of and relationship with the area. It isn't the same as the perspective that so many others often have, which focuses more on the physical resources like shipwrecks and lighthouses.

Ed manages six rivers – all of which require management plans with the State of Washington, as well as participation with the Pacific Salmon Treaty, Fisheries Management Council, Northwest Fish Commission, and other organizations. Big issues for them are ocean acidification, the big eddy, hypoxia, etc. and, as such, they want to be involved in all parts (e.g., data collection, decision making process, management scheme) for all parties involved.

Marine Debris Removal – Engaging Local Communities and Users in Marine Stewardship
Ginny Broadhurst, Northwest Straits Commission Executive Director

Ginny Broadhurst presented a brief presentation on the Northwest Straits Commission and, specifically, the Commission's derelict fishing gear program. She addressed the long history of fishing in Puget Sound, its rocky habitats, and the fjord-like estuary of the Sound – all of which contribute to the high volume of derelict fishing gear in the Sound. There are two main components (i.e., crab pots, gill nets) to derelict fishing gear, and in this presentation, Ginny focused on removal operations for gill nets. Areas of focus for the Commission include locations with high historical and current fishing pressure and with underwater obstacles to snag nets. They have recently integrated high resolution side-scan sonar into the suite of methods, and with this new technology, they are finding even more nets than the 25,000 expected. Additionally, they have been focusing on depths <105 feet since they use skilled-divers, but now know of at least 61 other locations that have nets greater than this depth. As of May 07, 2010, over 2,700 nets and 1,900 derelict pots have been removed, and approximately 426 acres of habitats have been restored. The turnover rate for the net "killing cycle" has been researched at approximately 7 days, meaning that way more organisms are being impacted by the gear than what is found in the gear upon retrieval. One of the main questions asked is "Why tax dollars for this work? Will it ever end?". The Commission does expect that they will eventually remove most of the nets and be able to manage the 10-15 nets loss per year (currently). This project has attracted a great amount of media attention and she encouraged everyone to visit www.derelictgear.org and watch the NBS Nightly News video.

Nicole Capps, Monterey Bay NMS Council Coordinator –

The Monterey Bay Lost Fishing Gear Project was established and implemented with the assistance of the following partners: CBNMS, UC Davis SeaDoc Society, CA Department of Fish & Game, NMFS, The Nature Conservancy/MARe, and the F/V *Donna Kathleen*. This project was funded through a federal settlement ($3.25M, 15 containers from a cargo ship) that funded a total of six projects, all of which were intended to mitigate and protect natural resources. Lost fishing gear within this project included long lines, gills, trawl nets, etc. and would not have been possible without the support of the crew from the F/V Donna Kathleen. The Phantom HD2 ROV was used to identify the derelict fishing gear and provide live video feed to the crew onboard. The majority of the efforts were in the Carmel Bay and Portuguese Ledge State Marine Conservation Area. During the surveys, over 70 hits of abandoned fishing gear were identified (not all retrieved). Nicole then provided a brief video clip illustrating the removal of a net with the Phantom ROV, using two different methods, and discussed the total amount of net removed, organisms collected, and outreach products (e.g., web page, press release, TV segment, one-pager, cruise report) developed. Nicole mentioned that she could possibly work with Karen to email out a table (extending beyond the west coast) that addressed marine debris. Next steps for the Lost Fishing Gear Project include a 2010 cruise, refining policies/procedures for deepwater removal, refining retrieval methods, and developing further partnerships to analyze taxonomy.

Captured Questions:

- The Northwest Straits Commission has been able to remove lead from some retrieved nets, but often retrieved gear heads to the landfill. Dan Dennison commented that in Hawaii that the nets are, at times, often burned for energy.
- What is the Northwest Straits Commission's policy on removing derelict gear given that, at times, these nets are new, artificial habitat? Given that derelict nets and pots are "deadly" habitats, the Commission almost always removes the nets. The only time they tend to leave them is when they are so far embedded in the sediment/substrate and would cause more damage than good.
- The invertebrate populations take most of the hits as far as being caught in derelict nets.
- Since only one of the 15 cargo ship containers were found in Monterey Bay, and it was located at an approximate depth of 15,000 feet, none of the containers have been removed. The six projects were funded in an effort to mitigate for the effects in other areas.
- Have you engaged MBARI in assisting to try to remove the gear or identify locations? MBARI actually did locate the first container, but they don't want to do the removing.

Action Items:

- **Distribute a marine debris table to council chairs and coordinators. (Nicole Capps)**

- LUNCH –

Impromptu Discussion on the National Marine Sanctuaries Act
William Douros

William Douros informed Summit participants that there may be an opportunity for advisory council chairs to participate in one (or multiple) listening sessions on the reauthorization of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. Congresswoman Lois Capps has expressed interest in holding stakeholders meeting on the NMSA Reauthorization, and in particular including council chairs in these discussions. It is likely that there may be, in the next coming weeks, a call with staff from Congresswoman Capps' staff and the 14 sanctuary advisory council chairs. In addition to this conference call, one to two chairs would likely be asked to participate in a larger meeting in Washington, D.C.

Note: Similar type listening sessions have been conducted for aquaculture, and one meeting participant participated in a session in Hawaii.

Actions:

- **Council chairs will (at their discretion) participate as individuals (not representing their councils) in a listening session hosted by Rep. Capps on NMSA reauthorization.**
- **Council chairs will consider other ways they as individuals and councils can support moving forward with NMSA reauthorization including providing advice to Dan Basta.**

Marine Debris Removal – Engaging Local Communities and Users in Marine Stewardship *(continued)*
Dan Dennison, Papahanaumokuakea MNM Constituent Outreach & Partnership Coordinator –

Dan Dennison opened his discussion with a 15-minute video on marine debris, and then went on to offer his comments on the matter. He mentioned that in January Hawaii was the first state to encourage action on marine debris by developing a plan of action. For those interested in the plan, Dennison offered to pass along the appropriate link. An update on the status of debris removal in Hawaii was offered by a council member, who informed the group that all sites have been visited at least once. Currently, the program is in maintenance mode, but the rate of debris coming in is dependent largely on the weather (e.g., changes in the convergence). Ginny Broadhurst said that it is her understanding that Hawaii and Alaska have major difficulties with transport of international debris. Localized removal, for example in Puget Sound, seems to have a greater impact than more open water sites with more input and pressure. There have been some proactive steps by international fishing fleets. The Northwest Straits Commission developed a no fault system in order to build trust and create a healthier environment without coming off as anti-fishing (which the group is not).

Climate Change, Advisory Councils and the National Marine Sanctuary System
Jim Sullivan and Kate Sullivan, ONMS Headquarters

Jim Sullivan provided an overview of the topics that will be discussed today, and went on to address the context for climate change including observed changes, potential effects, and potential impacts. The National Marine Sanctuary System is a place-based system that has the benefit of working with the communities and, therefore, being able to incorporate a number of aspects into the program. Others feel that the ONMS should consider scaling back and focus its role in climate change in one particular area (e.g., education). It was further mentioned that the

way climate change is being approached has been location-dependent, and it is unclear which philosophy (e.g., target emissions, ocean iron seeding) is appropriate. Strategically, we should consider how much climate change will impact sanctuary resources – rather, than tackle this issue simply because it is a buzzword within NOAA. Fagatele Bay – American Samoa – acknowledged that they are already seeing the effects of climate change and that soon other areas will start seeing it too. One person mentioned that although we are all entitled to our own opinion, what we cannot choose to ignore are the facts. Climate change provides a great opportunity for sanctuaries to be utilized as sentinel sites for long-term monitoring and data gathering.

Dan Basta interjected that NOAA is creating a Climate Service that is taking roughly two-thirds of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and elements of NESDIS and the National Weather Service. Since money is not changing hands (i.e., only a change in programming), then it doesn't require congressional approval. To date, both NASA and EPA have received increases to address climate change, but NOAA has not received anything. It's a matter of being relevant.

Jim Sullivan then went on to address the resolutions, letters, and motions that were put forth regarding **ocean acidification** (compiled into an OA Report). He provided a broad overview of the recommendations, and stated that the document distributed to NOAA was really intended to illustrate the action taken by sanctuary communities. It did do just that, and a second version of the OA Report will be created to summarize the recommendations in a manner differently. Jim then invited William Dourous to talk a little about the West Coast Ocean Acidification Task Force.

The West Coast Region identified one person from each site and one person from each sanctuary component (e.g., education and outreach, research and monitoring) to serve on this task force. Staff will be expected to coordinate and discuss ocean acidification within his/her site and program unit. Thus far, this task force has had one meeting and will continue meeting mostly via conference calls. The intent is to have a draft plan by the end of September or so, and then distribute this plan to all five west coast advisory councils.

At the recent research coordinators meeting, coordinators were tasked with coming up with a definition of sentinel sites and describing what they could do for sanctuaries in terms of ocean acidification. Billy Causey mentioned that not every region (or sites within a region) are of the same mind on ocean acidification, but the SE region all agree they can be sentinel sites and have consistent monitoring protocols. Lilli Ferguson asked what the next steps or outcome will be from engaging NOAA, and Jim said that he is not aware of the specific get-backs. We can show, however, that there is a link between how advisory councils are engaged and the influence it had on the National Ocean Acidification Plan and possibly future funding.

It is the concept of collective action that made the ocean acidification resolutions so powerful; it's a force multiplier that really highlights the need for action. Jim distributed an article from the Santa Barbara Independent on ocean acidification.

Climate Smart Sanctuaries is one way that ONMS is addressing climate change. It will include a certification component that demonstrates that action can and should be taken to

protect sanctuaries from this issue. Climate change could be used as a lens during the management plan process, as well as continually be integrated into a number of projects (e.g., GFNMS Climate Summit). There are four components of Climate Smart: Climate Site Scenario (peer reviewed forecasting), Climate Action Plan (guidelines for adaptation and mitigation), Greening Operations (decreasing carbon footprint), and Certification Standards and Process. A process will likely need to be developed to train superintendents so that these components can be completed and Climate Smart Sanctuaries implemented. Kelly Higgason provided an update on the joint working group of advisory councils that assisted with the Climate Smart Sanctuaries document, and the challenges that come with asking scientists to review a topic with so much uncertainty. The public release of the northern California document is slated to be released June 03, 2010. The second biannual Climate Summit will be held this same day in order to address and answer the infamous question of "Now what". Jim encouraged everyone to talk with Emily at the reception about the funding they've received funding to initiate the climate smart process. Additionally, Jim asked the participants to engage their constituencies (and the rest of your councils) on the topic of climate change. We want you to find out what they think and let us know what you need in order to engage them on this topic.

Kate Thompson began her discussion on creating a **Climate SMART Community** and what she foresees the steps in ONMS Education are for the next five years. Climate Science Literacy is an understanding of your influence on climate, and climate's influence on you and society. The way to get there via ONMS Education is to prioritize/rank the different principles and decide which ones are the most important to get out there. Then participate in training, develop communications strategy, conduct needs assessments, and evaluate the programs implemented in the field as sanctuaries become Climate SMART. The four principles that were chose were as follows:

- Climate is regulated by complex interactions among components of the earth system.
- How life on Earth depends on, is shaped by, and affects climate
- How human activities impact climate
- Consequences of climate change for Earth and humans, as well as the actions humans can take to reduce climate change.

Volunteers and people like yourselves are the ones that really do the job getting this information out there. We need to know from you what you need in order to inform your communities and fellow constituents about climate change. Channel Islands MERITO Academy and advisory council are prime examples of what is possible to move forward on and address this issue.

Summit participants were then divided into regional breakouts, and the following five questions were posed:

- What are some of the changes you've seen in your region?
- What are some challenges for engaging the advisory councils? What are some strategies to overcome them?
- What are some challenges and strategies for connecting with the various constituencies? Access?

- What are you hearing from your peers (e.g., recreational fishermen, conservation, divers) about climate change? About climate change and resource management?
- What type of information/tools do you need?

Climate Change Breakout Reports –
Shannon Ricles, Larry McKinney, Chris Harrold, and Allen Tom provided brief report outs from the Northeast, Southeast and Gulf of Mexico, West Coast, and Pacific Islands regional breakouts, respectively. Notes were captured on mini-easels and PowerPoints.

Actions:
- **Purchase and distribute 50 copies of *Don't be a Scientist* – a book intended to teach individuals how to inform the public about difficult scientific issues. (Dan Basta)**
- **Information from climate session breakouts will be consolidated in a synopsis and distributed to all council coordinators and chairs. (Kate Thompson/ Jim Sullivan)**
- **Distribute the Fagatele Bay synopsis/one-pager to all Summit participants. (Emily Gaskin)**
- **Develop and distribute a second version of the Ocean Acidification Report. (Becky Holyoke)**

Exploring Collaborations between the Councils and the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation
Jason Patlis, NMSF President and CEO

Jason Patlis said that everything that the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) does is due to their great relationship with Dan Basta and the ONMS family. He provided a brief overview of the mission, vision, and structure of the NMSF. Jason mentioned that there are four components of the public face (i.e., advocacy, awareness, education, research and conservation) of the NMSF, as well as one private face (i.e., fiscal agent). As a fiscal agent, the NMSF provides support to NOAA by providing financial and logistical support for events like tonight's reception. Approximately 96% of the NMSF expenses is directed to the programs (ONMS, NMFS, etc.), with very little (approximately 1%) being directed towards fundraising.

Jason followed up on today's theme of the significance of place, and said that this is what sets the NMSF apart from its competitors. It is truly a sense of place, whether it is described by the book (e.g., 14 sites, square miles) or by the imagination (e.g., connecting the far to the near). He then went on to identify the Appropriation Committee members, as well as other committee members and congressional members relevant to the National Marine Sanctuary System. He mentioned the power partners with the ONMS and the NMSF – specifically highlighting zoos, aquaria, and advisory councils. Patlis then discussed the strategic priorities and collaborations for which the NMSF is hoping to address in the near future. The NMSF has circulated the ocean acidification resolutions, letters and motions passed by the councils to congressional staff, foundations, other federal agencies, and NGOs. Additionally, they have addressed marine debris via Friends Group initiatives (e.g., Stellwagen Alive).

Evening Reception co-hosted by the Olympic Coast NMS and the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation, *Lake Crescent Lodge Sunroom*

Wednesday, May 12, 2010

Summit participants took a charter bus round-trip from Lake Crescent Lodge to Neah Bay, where they participated in a tour of the Makah Cultural and Research Center Museum and a short hike to Cape Flattery overlook to view Tatoosh Island and Olympic Coast NMS. Lunch was hosted by the Makah Tribe, and included tribal dancing and singing.

Thursday, May 13, 2010

Opening
Karen Brubeck

Karen Brubeck opened today's session by reminding the participants of the day's presentations and events.

Council Case Studies

Taking Care of Business: Marketing the HIHWNMS
Joseph Paulin, HIHWNMS Council and Management Plan Coordinator and
Terry O'Halloran, HIHWNMS Council member

Joseph Paulin oriented Summit participants to the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary (HIHW) and other offices in Hawaii. He then provided a brief overview of the reasons for establishing the HIHW, its mission, and how to increase its relevance (i.e., going beyond the usual suspects). One idea that Joe had on how to increase the relevance of HIHW was to involve the Surfrider Foundation, Oahu Chapter. He described how the sanctuary also had the opportunity to work with graduate student volunteers (6 total) from the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Shidler College of Business. Joe and Christine Brammer provided an overview of the sanctuary to the marketing and MBA students so that a marketing plan could be developed. They provided information on education, outreach, field experiences, research and rescue operations, and protecting resources (e.g., monk seals), as well as on whale migrations and the International Marine Mammal Protected Areas meeting. Unfortunately, the take-away message from this presentation was that the HIHW was interested in fishing regulations associated with protecting monk seals. It was clear that the students were confused, and that the sanctuary wasn't really clear on what they were asking for. This is when they brought in their Council Chair, Terry O'Halloran, to assist with a HIHW marketing project and timeline.

It was obvious from surveys that most of the communication (or buzz) about the sanctuary was relayed via word of mouth – rather than internet, newspaper, community groups, radio, and TV news. Kate Thompson asked whether the information being communicated was positive or negative, and Terry informed her that unless you are in the midst of an immediate controversy that the information relayed is most often positive. It is a bit of an assumption, but it is likely that the buzz surrounding the sanctuary is likely positive. North Shore ocean related activities indicate that a lot of the people in Hawaii are directly connected to the water, and further questions/surveys regarding user interests identified that 67% of those connected to the water were concerned with water quality. An additional 26% were concerned with resource protection (and 7% other). A great way to illustrate the value of the sanctuary to individuals is to appeal to what connects them personally to a place.

Joe briefly discussed the quality of applicants for the HIHW Youth Seats, as well as the process by which applications were reviewed. A total of five applications were received for this seat, and of all the seats available, only two received more applications. Approximately one-third of

council members reviewed youth seat applications, and at the next council meeting, they will discuss developing a youth working group. HIHW and the advisory council is interested in keeping the interested youth engaged (i.e., don't want to turn away). The youth applicants, ages 14 to 16, were from three different islands and offered a great deal of interest and enthusiasm for marine protection.

State-wide MPR informational meetings are being held that engage the community to let them know about the sanctuary, identify important community issues, and the roles that these communities and/or individuals may have in the sanctuary. Joe addressed what HIHW has been getting out of this experience, and equally importantly, what the other sanctuaries may get out of this type of information (e.g., Net Impact). Joe mentioned that HIHW would like to work with more and/or other students in the future to develop a business plan, and Terry said that this project had both business and personal value to the students.

A question was raised with regard to the Paperwork Reduction Act, and whether this affected the students conducting surveys. Joe mentioned that he contacted Bob Leeworthy, and provided that HIHW was acting as a technical reviewer – meaning that Joe didn't dictate the survey and that no Federal money transferred hands – that they are permitted to conduct this type of survey. Although a formal survey has to go through OMB, it is appropriate to informally ask advisory council members (or have them ask the constituents they represent) their view on a series of questions. HIHW has been planning (in approximately 10 days) to discuss this further their members/working groups. Scoping meetings were cited as a type of survey method that doesn't have to be vetted.

Additional questions regarding the value of a business plan and the appropriateness of the sample size were addressed. Although Dillard's or Taylor's statistical analyses would have provided a better indication as to the appropriate sample size, this survey provided an excellent snapshot or indication of what people were thinking and wanting with very little money. The lessons learned from this experience are being validated as the information gained is being used. One way they approached the students was to ask them to develop a template methodology that could be used within other sanctuaries, and this case study illustrates how you can do this with no cost. They do have ideas as to how to expand upon this in the future. No demographic information was really collected, but they were able to tease out residency inside and outside North Shore and gender. They purposely didn't address too much regarding demographics, because have found that it is a turnoff for survey completion.

Mason Weinrich asked specifically what the sanctuary's take way message was given that HIHW is a single-species sanctuary but it's constituents were primarily interested in water quality (rather than protected resources). Joe explained how water quality may affect and has affected the species protected within the sanctuary (e.g., monk seals). Terry O'Halloran followed up by describing how this type of survey is encouraging as the sanctuary goes through its management plan review process. He said that it is important to relate the concerns of the user/community to sanctuary resources and show that the sanctuary is concerned with the issues and relevant.

Briana Goodwin was interested in the level of collaboration with Surfrider Foundation. Joe mentioned that the Chapters of this Foundation are very different, with very different interests, and that it is a relationship that they hope to continue to pursue.

Natalie Ward asked Joe how to get council members more involved with their constituents and, specifically, how to get them to identify the concerns and interests of their constituents. Terry O'Halloran described how the members might be able to do this, and that it should be considered important for members to poll the constituents they represent.

Jason Patlis said that Friends' Groups are really an untapped resource, and that councils should consider exploring a synergy with these groups. Kate Thompson said that any time people come voluntarily to a place you can do pre- and post-evaluations. Emily Gaskin said that as long as one doesn't go over a certain number of questions that they aren't considered surveys. She also encouraged people to reach out to U.S. Fish & Wildlife – student interns. Olin Joynton mentioned that he could discuss the net promoter score mentality with Joe at a later time.

Addressing Ship Strikes on Endangered Whales in the Santa Barbara Channel and Sanctuary Region: A Marine Spatial Planning Challenge
Mike Murray, CINMS Deputy Superintendent for Programs and
Eric Kett, CINMS Council Chair

Eric Kett provided a brief overview as to why the impact of ship strikes on endangered whales in Santa Barbara Channel is a marine spatial planning challenge. He then offered details on the setting within Channel Islands, including the uses and species that exist within sanctuary boundaries. Much to the dismay of the sanctuary, several whales were struck by ships in 2007, and the advisory council elected to address this issue head on. A Ship Strike Subcommittee, with agency and ship transportation representation, was established. The subcommittee developed a proposal to help organize their approach to the issue and later a document titled *Reducing the Threat of Ship Strikes on Large Cetaceans in the Santa Barbara Channel Region and CINMS: Recommendations and Case Studies*. In May 2008, a council-endorsed short-term plan of response was developed. No whale strikes were recorded in the Santa Barbara Channel in 2008-2009, but a fin whale was brought in on a bow of a container ship. A local notice was distributed to all mariners, asking for a reduction in ship speeds to <10 knots, but compliance with this voluntary measure was minimal.

Given minimal compliance with the voluntary measure, the Channel Islands Sanctuary Advisory Council – Education Team consulted with several experts (i.e., Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, MAERSK, NMFS, Cascadian Research, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District) to determine how best to address this challenge. Additionally, the Education Team reviewed the following four case studies:

- Glacier Bay and Icy Strait
- Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale NMS
- Stellwagen Bank NMS; and
- Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach: Effective Vessel Speed Reduction.

For Glacier Bay and Icy Strait, the National Park Service (NPS) addressed the influence of cruise ships and ferry service on humpback whales. The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach issues a voluntary reduction in vessel speed to 12 knots within 20 and then 40 nautical miles to control air pollution, and the ports witnessed 90% vessel compliance through incentivizing.

The following recommendations were identified in the document, *Reducing the Threat of Ship Strikes on Large Cetaceans in the Santa Barbara Channel Region and* CINMS, which was developed to set the foundation for adaptive management as the project moves forward:

- Continue and expand research and monitoring efforts (e.g., food resources, acoustic monitoring of shipping and whales)
- Consider appropriateness of changes to vessel behavior in Santa Barbara Channel
- Explore change to the Santa Barbara traffic separation scheme
- Explore incentive and mandate based options for vessel speed reductions
- Continue to engage partners, constituents, and the shipping industry
- Apply an adaptive management strategy

Some of the biggest hurdles identified, thus far, have been characterizing whether ship strikes are an anomaly or a consistent problem; using appropriate language when making recommendations since broader authority lies with the NMFS; determining whether gray whales should have been included in the study; disagreements on warning zones; and trigger points for speed reductions.

Efforts for continuing this study include working with a University of Santa Barbara graduate student conducting a feasibility study; participating in a NMFS workshop on May 19-20; developing monitoring protocols for outlying areas; continuing to seek research and monitoring funding; striving for in-house AIS data analysis capabilities; and expanding relationships with the NMFS, USCG, and Sanctuary Advisory Council – Education Team. Additionally, they are interested in sending Dan Basta a council action regarding supporting acoustic funding/opportunities.

In July 2009, the California Air Resources Board released a rule that led to a shift in the shipping lane to the southwest of San Miguel Island. Congestion has increased to the east of the sanctuary at the convergence of the channels. The Port Authority is recommending that a new convergence lane be developed. The sanctuary is concerned about oil spills, the increased response time (>1 hour) to reach tanker spills near the Islands, the occurrence of whales in this area (e.g., relatively little coverage in this area), and naval operations. The USCG has opened up a port access route study, and given their engagement with the Channel Islands council, it may likely consider the whales. Both the USCG and Navy are aware that more data is needed to assess where the greatest populations of whales exist within the vicinity of Santa Barbara Channel and San Miguel Island. An emission control designation from the International Maritime Organization has also led to shipping changes outside 24 nautical miles.

Vessel speed and size restrictions were suggested as ways of reducing ship strikes. Richard Charter asked about the behavioral response of whales to noise (i.e., that sometimes when a ship slows down a whale approaches closer). Mike Murray commented that the Santa Barbara

Channel is actually quieter now with the recent shifts in shipping lanes/traffic. Comments were made on the limitations of warning technologies, such as forward looking sonar (<20 knots).

Natalie Ward mentioned that the Sister Sanctuary system is a great way to elevate the National Marine Sanctuary System. Andy Palmer asked if Channel Islands NMS was interested in pursuing a mandatory speed reduction rule, since there is some evidence of fuel saving if vessels are run at a consistent speed (e.g., 24 knots). This is, of course, ship-dependent.

Dan Basta commented that the ONMS is making a concerted effort to protect marine mammals, and that we will continue to do just that (e.g., encourage inclusion of marine mammal protected areas in Google Ocean). Dan mentioned that acoustics is something that ONMS is trying to get more involved in, and that he would like to hear from the Chairs whether this is something that they would like to get more involved in. A comprehensive research plan – beginning with Stellwagen Bank and Channel Islands – and additional investments in AIS would allow us to understand places better than we do today. Dan also mentioned that recent discussions with the ET/Research Coordinators included a conversation on creating a center for excellence for marine mammal work, and that he and the Regional Directors would discuss this idea further.

- Break -

Cultural Engagement Informs Site Expansion in American Samoa
Emily Gaskin, FBNMS Program Analyst, and
Dean Hudson, FBNMS Council Chair

Dean Hudson informed meeting participants that Fagatele Bay doesn't necessarily address the same sort of issues as those presented. Rather, they are more centered on cultural engagement and bridging the gap between marine managers and community members in American Samoa. He provided a brief overview of the connections/relationships associated with this sanctuary and mentioned specifically the Two Samoas Initiative. After addressing the setting of the sanctuary, he went over the primary objectives and goals of Fagatele Bay, including marine protection and co-management. The advisory council has seven (7) government and eight (8) non-government seats; non-government seats include three (3) recently added seats for the community-at-large and one (1) youth seat.

Fa'asamoa refers to the traditional Samoan way of life, and it has been practiced for over 3,000 years. Many Samoans still observe the traditional ways of life on a daily basis, including the hierarchy of chiefdom and the connection to a family's place/village, and are therefore cautious of change. Tapu is an ancient concept of Fa'asamoa, which restricts use on overstressed areas and has traditionally led to resource protection.

It is important to engage local communities in management planning, as these communities help enhance the overall planning process, ensures community values are considered, takes advantage of historical/traditional knowledge, and helps encourage buy-in once strategies are identified. Communities are engaged through a participatory approach that builds trust and respect between community members and sanctuary staff. Cooperation and collaboration is furthered once the

community members begin understanding how the sanctuary aligns with their values and has interest in helping them protect their resources.

Council working groups have, at this time, focused on site selection and outreach/education. The Office of Samoan Affairs (OSA) is a government entity made up of all village Mayors and Chiefs that serve the function of the traditional Samoan government. The Mayor is a paid government official, and the sanctuary works very closely with the OSA to identify village liaisons and follow cultural protocols. Village stakeholder meetings are used to showcase marine resources, as well as identify resource uses, activities, values, and areas. Focus groups are intended to allow open-ended questions and discussions that further information exchange with participants. Participatory mapping is a facilitated process in which small groups work to identify, locate, and classify significant physical features in a community. These mapping sessions create concrete opportunities for discussion about the social, economic, and environmental resources. Village Council meetings are made up of all of the Village Chiefs, and they provide an opportunity to validate input and discuss methods to address issues and challenges. These types of meetings are very respectful, and are a good way to reach an outcome.

The advantages of establishing a sanctuary in American Samoa include national recognition, access to decision makers at the federal level, and protection of federal marine waters. Community benefits of the sanctuary include the potential to promote tourism (snorkeling, diving, hiking), employment (e.g., tour guides, enforcement officers), and educational opportunities (e.g., training, workshops). Challenges that have existed include observing traditional customs, language barriers, engaging community leaders, coordinating with other federal and territorial resource protection agencies, and uncertainties about future conditions.

Other sites can learn the following from Fagatele Bay's cultural engagement and involvement with their communities:

- Strive to meet community goals to achieve greater compliance and conservation success;
- Collect and integrate indigenous knowledge in management plans;
- Clearly identify and communicate economic and other benefits to maintain stakeholder interest;
- Provide realistic long-term options for alternative livelihoods;
- Develop pragmatic and realistic regulations; and
- Integrate knowledge gained from participatory mapping.

Ultimately, the program should aim to incorporate the values of the place with the values of the people as Fagatele Bay has.

It was asked whether these lessons learned were learned the hard way or through a present knowledge base. In general, the knowledge of sanctuary staff, supporters, and OSA ensure that the sanctuary is operating in an appropriate cultural manner. There have been times, however, where lessons are learned through experiences. This led to a further discussion on whether there is a thread of concern in American Samoa regarding non-Samoans being in leadership positions or establishing protection over land/ocean. According to some, there does seem to be a bit of concern regarding our purpose for being there and, as such, you will always have to be sensitive

to American Samoan interest, culture, timeliness, and understanding. It does seem as though ONMS staff, especially Kevin Grant, Gene Brighouse, and Nika Mortenson are very well-respected.

Dan Basta provided perspective on why we should engage and continue our work in American Samoa, and suggested folks speak with Allen Tom regarding our Pacific strategy. Dan said we need to engage communities, continue to build networks, prove the benefit to them, and obtain respect. These are all part of how you engage individuals in particular matters. There are lessons that are going back-and-forth, and one example is the use of Thunder Bay NMS as a sister community (e.g., isolated communities, medical personnel, hyperbaric chamber, community college). Additionally, ONMS will be sending a member of the IPC and Carol Bernthal to American Samoa later this summer.

Climate Program – Emily Gaskin provided a brief overview of the relevance of climate change to American Samoa, and how they have been working closely with western Samoa (who has access to abundant data). A climate change training occurred roughly two weeks ago, and this training focused largely on how to develop an adaptation plan. Policy makers from the region will be convening to try to develop a territorial policy later this year. Emily welcomed feedback and questions now and in the future.

Canyon Craft: Managing the Gully MPA in Eastern Canada
Paul McNab, Gully MPA Manager, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (Halifax, Nova Scotia)

Paul McNab provided a presentation on managing a massive canyon, known as the Gully, located near the Scotian Shelf. This feature is large enough that it actually affects mixing of the Labrador Current and Gulf Stream, and is home to the northern bottlenose whale and arm-hook squid. In 1887, the Government Fish Commission acknowledged the Gully as one of the best fishing grounds. Dan Basta interjected that Catherine Marzin (of ONMS) is working to have these types of maps/results digitized. Consultations for 3-4 potential MPA candidates (2009 MARXAN Analysis) are open until late-May.

Regulations for the marine protected area were established, such that no activities could proceed in the MPA unless exempted (i.e., requiring ministerial approval) or outside the area if they had the potential to impact the canyon. All fisheries were excluded, with the exception of hook and line. No extractive activities were permitted from top to bottom of the canyon. Three zones were defined within the 2360 km^2 area. Paul expressed concerns associated with ballast water exchange near the mouth of the Gully, and the fact that there is no real way to handle ships that don't stop at Canadian ports. Paul went on to mention a M/V Polar Star advertisement to the Sable Gully. Reference was also made to oil and gas (e.g., hydrocarbon doughtnut) and a 120-day seismic program that established a benchmark of 120 decibels before a plan needed to be established.

In terms of science, the ecosystem management framework extends from values to objectives, indicators, thresholds, monitoring, and response. In 2003, a multi-stakeholder body, known as the Gully Advisory Committee, was formed, and Paul said that response is what they are trying

to do with this committee. The committee includes federal and provincial agencies, petroleum, fishery, and academic representatives, ENGOs, and the Mik'maq Nation.

Paul also mentioned that they are currently working on management effectiveness, and that they have gone through four sub-objectives for indicators (e.g., habitat, contaminants, biodiversity). He said that research in and for an MPA is important, but there have been some challenges with research given that a lot of the research (e.g., genetics, tissues, predator/prey trophic relationships) conducted has been by his colleagues. It is expected that there will have to be some destructive sampling, but it has been recommended that trawling has been denied in places where recovery won't occur. The advisory committee has moved beyond coral and begun looking at damage to other organisms, such as soft-body organisms.

An advertisement (in Nature) by the World Wildlife Fund inaccurately showed spinner dolphins instead of northern bottlenose whales, and was provided as an example of how easy it is to lose vested entrepreneurs. Besides difficulties with constituent engagement (e.g., meeting attendance), there have been difficulties in the level of information that can be shared beyond the Department and in integrating ocean management around the whole area.

- Lunch -

Sanctuary Community Mini-Grants
Daniel J. Basta

Dan Basta provided a brief session on a recent Recreational Fishing Summit. Dan commented that recreational fishermen are the heart and soul of conservation, and went on to address problems associated with misinformation and the, at times, adversarial nature of powerful lobby groups. Dan mentioned that he is considering hosting a mini-grant program ($5-10k) for sanctuary communities.

Eric Kett asked whether spear-fishermen were included in the Recreational Fishing Summit, and Dan Basta replied that he didn't think they had participated. Eric commented that environmental groups can create the same-type of hype surrounding a respective cause, and that often the problem lies in disseminating partial truths. Dan Basta commented that the ONMS stands in the middle of the ring between extremists, and that this is often the most difficult place to stand. He said that meeting participants needed to think of clever ways to build different partnerships, because if we don't, we may miss a whole generation that could learn about oceans, coasts tides, etc. We need to think about other things that get people on the water.

There was concern about making mini-grants specific to one particular user group, as it would exclude other users. Recommendation to allow people to collaborate so multiple user groups come together to address what sanctuaries is asking of them. Dan liked this idea, and stated that maybe we could make them sanctuary community grants.

Clark Alexander suggested that funds could be funneled to sites, and that the advisory council could play a role in identifying key questions. Dan said that the sanctuary advisory councils should provide the superintendent with a set of community-based topics, and that the

superintendent would then come to a consensus as to what should be put out to the community during a staff meeting.

Olin Joynton said that it occurred to him that, perhaps, some of the recreational fishermen could provide some of their sanctuary knowledge to ONMS education programs (e.g., Oceans for Life). Chris Harrold commented on the diverse perspectives offered by members of the same user group, and encouraged finding a way to build trust. Dan Basta said that he was a fan of provisional ideas, and thinks that this may be a good way to address what is going on. He provided Florida Keys as an example of how this works (e.g., commercial fishermen came back and said set this area aside). Dan noted, however, that just because something is a success at one site doesn't mean that it will work at all sites; you must approach each site as though it is the first time.

Reed Bohne mentioned that he has found success in getting states involved, and Andy Palmer followed this up by saying that there are a lot of organizations that have people who get it. Eric Kett suggested that ONMS should consider supporting (recreational) sustainable fishing methods, and Dan mentioned that Bill Douros has knowledge of sustainable fishing gear. ONMS does think this is something important to do. Further discussions led to suggestions involving school groups, local competitions, and "fishing responsibly" videos for youth (e.g., 7th grade curriculum). Richard Charter offered to put OMS in contact with groups engaging recreational fishermen, and described the value in using tools and training to bring recreational fishermen to the table. Joseph Paulin and Dan Basta commented on the differences between recreational and sustenance fishing.

Regional Cross-Pollination between Councils
Part I: Regional Director Status Reports

John Armor introduced the Regional Directors, beginning with Allen Tom, for a status update on council accomplishments since the 2008 Newport News meeting. Allen provided a short update on the Pacific councils and, specifically referred to the overlap of members on the two Hawaiian councils.

Bill Douros informed participants that the four California sanctuaries have completed their management plans and simultaneously revised regulations. Olympic Coast NMS is approximately 30-40% there in the management plan review process, and there has been sharing of experience between West Coast personnel. West Coast advisory councils have made progress since the Newport News meeting, and some of the examples of ongoing/future work involved:

- Ocean acidification
- Groundbreakings (e.g., UC Santa Barbara, Monterey Exploration Center, office upgrades for Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank)
- Upcoming deep sea coral cruise with the NMFS
- Klamath River
- Cordell Bank / Gulf of the Farallones boundary expansion
- Blue Ocean Film Festival
- World Ocean Conference

One area that Bill mentioned that the West Coast hadn't made much progress on was in establishing a six-month conference call for all council chairs in the region.

Reed Bohne said that the Northeast and Great Lakes Region hasn't really followed through on a lot of actions that have led to joint collaborations among the councils. One of the difficulties that they have is that the sanctuaries within this region are relatively small and spread very far apart. Monitor NMS has been looking to Thunder Bay NMS as a template as how might move forward with boundary expansion and access to shipwrecks. Reed mentioned that it is important not to confine ourselves to our regions, as there are benefits to exchanges beyond the region as well. All Northeast and Great Lakes Region sites have recently or will very soon complete the management plan review process. Additionally, this region is looking into new sites, with the most prominent being in Wisconsin; a state working group has been established and encouraged to reach out to other sites. Climate change, ocean acidification, and marine spatial planning were all mentioned as topics that could involve all regions. Additionally, Reed mentioned the turnover in his region's advisory councils, and stated that this always provides opportunities for new ideas.

Billy Causey provided an orientation to the Southeast, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean Region and its three sites (i.e., Flower Garden Banks, Florida Keys, Gray's Reef). Quarterly conference calls have been established, and the following regional topics of interest have been included:

- Ocean acidification
- Lionfish invasion
- Connectivity – The Loop Current
- Sentinel sites (i.e., potential for same arrays in all sites)
- Outer continental shelf issues

All three of the SEGoM sites are engaged in coastal and marine spatial planning (MSP), and are also looking at new sites and/or boundary expansions. Additionally, they have been considering the needs and strategies for law enforcement and working towards new regulations at two sites.

Part II & III: Break-outs with Regional Directors and Regional Break-out Reports

Dan Dennison provided a report out from the **Pacific Islands Region**, which he coined as SAC RAC MA. He said the group discussed how they could coordinate regionally, including having an annual meeting of the council chairs in the region, inviting council members to events, establishing listservs and/or regional intranets, and hosting the Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit after 2011 in Savannah. He also mentioned that they would like to identify ways to engage advisory councils in media/outreach opportunities, initiate joint education projects, set up a regional executive committee, and host meetings for constituent representatives. Other ideas included coordinating the review of marine mammal endangered species, sharing best practices, and providing updates on management plan review.

Kaitlin Graiff provided a report out for the **West Coast Region**, and the following were identified as next steps for regional communication:

- All council actions are to be posted on the web.
- Chairs/representatives agreed to serve (by phone) on a support group for sharing experiences, and Nicole Capps would be the lead.
- Chairs/representatives would take the West Coast Ocean Acidification Task Force document back to respective councils for assessing next steps for addressing ocean acidification.
- Kelly Higgason will be encouraged to disseminate information on the Gulf of the Farallones climate document, so that councils have a better understanding of what the steps were to develop that document.

The **Northeast and Great Lakes Region** addressed the differences between the three northeast sites, and went further to discuss the following potential future directions:

- Quarterly conference calls among advisory council chairs;
- One-page synopses of council meetings;
- Steps to advance skill and knowledge of advisory councils;
- Purposeful recruitment of new members;
- Purposeful attendance at other advisory council meetings; and
- Support for Dan Basta as he navigates to lessen confusion.

Becky Shortland provided a brief report for the **Southeast Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Region**. Over the last year, this region has been conducting quarterly conference calls with regional staff, council coordinators, and advisory council chairs, and they would like the work plan for next year to involve the upcoming ocean acidification panel in Texas; sanctuaries as sentinel sites; and connectivity. It was suggested that establishing sentinel sites would involve pulling together research coordinators to determine what conditions and instruments are needed; getting appropriate instrumentation in place; and conducting the necessary monitoring to demonstrate that select sites are indeed sentinel sites. They would like to build upon the connectivity theme by relating it to site expansion and/or the designation of other sites. Becky specifically mentioned the region's interest in research on larval dispersal and lionfish invasion. The region also discussed reauthorization of the National Marine Sanctuary Act, oil and gas, and information dissemination via a regional intranet.

Closing Remarks
Daniel J. Basta, ONMS Director

Dan Basta's closing remarks began with the word *family* just as his opening remarks for the 2010 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit had. He commented that *family* was not only a theme that was carried throughout the Summit, but that it was what we all were. We were, to him, a family of committee – full of different perspectives and backgrounds, but all committed. A family that has evolved over 20 years, as we built, maintained, and exposed ourselves to relationships and cultures. He said that we were all indigenous in our own ways, and that we should look deep within ourselves and each other to find our indigenousness.

Dan reminded participants of the Tuesday evening dinner with the Chairs, and challenged everyone to mobilize the system by bringing advisory councils together—more connection, more

communication. He would like to see advisory councils and chairs operating with ONMS in our communities, and he encouraged more connection among and between the sites in more deliberate ways, but advised for the need to keep it simple. Council members have limited time, are all volunteers, and cannot take on everything. Dan said that the program's most important priority is the strategy and campaign building associated with reauthorization.

Councils were encouraged to foster a commitment to youth programming (e.g., Ocean for Life, MERITO) and other ONMS priorities (e.g., climate change). Dan further encouraged the councils to reconsider youth seats, as he sees real value in youth participation, and challenged them to figure out how to engage Sea Grant in sanctuary communities. Perhaps, one way to do this would be to actively seek out extension agents or consider adding the Sea Grant Director to advisory councils. The involvement of youth on councils was mentioned as a possible leverage for further engaging Sea Grant.

Dan announced that the 2011 Summit will be hosted by Gray's Reef NMS in Savannah, Georgia. Next year's Summit will not be about introducing culture but, rather, about increasing attention for Gray's Reef and ONMS in that part of the country. Gray's Reef will host a soiree or two with persons from the region and, in essence, incorporate our business at the Summit within the context of other business of a larger nature. He would like to incorporate more time (in addition to the dinner) for him and council members to interact. As a follow-on to this, however, he emphasized that he would be happy to meet anytime anywhere with any sanctuary advisory council, and that he was placing a little bit of the onus on the councils. It is up to the councils to tell ONMS their suggestions, especially with regard to how to proceed.

Through a metaphor involving Admiral Lord Nelson, Dan closed the meeting by saying that *any captain who brings his ship alongside an enemy* (engages) *cannot fail*. Creative energies are driven by a little bit of freedom, and chairs/councils are free to operate with little constraint. With the strategic priorities and directions in hand, maintain that sense of commitment and we will do great things.

Actions:

- **Council chairs will (at their discretion) participate as individuals (not representing their council) in a listening session hosted by Rep. Capps on NMSA reauthorization. (Council chairs)**
- **Councils will consider other ways they as individuals and councils can support moving forward with NMSA reauthorization including providing advice to me in writing that I can forward up the chain of command. (Councils)**
- **ONMS will work to develop a sanctuary community mini-grants program to incentivize joint working between sanctuary superintendents and coastal community groups (e.g., recreational anglers). (Dan Basta)**
- **ONMS will provide better and more consistent information on national education programs such Ocean for Life and MERITO to advisory councils. Councils may be able to determine ways to keep these programs alive. (Kate Thompson)**
- **ONMS and councils will consider developing a single day where we draw lines in blue chalk to show the possible effect sea level rise. (Kate Thompson and/or Councils)**

- **Council chairs should consider getting together with their Regional Fishery Management Council Chairs at least once a year to trade notes and discuss priorities for the coming year. (Council chairs, site staff and regional staff)**

Karen Brubeck –

Karen Brubeck reiterated that the 2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit would take place in Savannah, Georgia, and that discussions had already begun with regard to potential weeks. Clark Alexander, Dan Dennison, Olin Joynton, Jennifer Morgan, Becky Shortland, Mike Murray, Shannon Ricles, and Nathalie Ward volunteered to serve on the 2011 Agenda Working Group. Upon thanking the group for a great week, Karen requested that meeting participants complete meeting evaluation forms – paying particular attention to how to incorporate more time with Dan Basta.

APPENDIX II

ATTACHMENT - 100615 ZWG report to SAC

A quick summary of the Zoning Working Group for new SAC members.

The ZWG was convened by the SAC in 2005, with a very specific membership of represented interests, in response to the Ecosystem-Based Sanctuary Management Working Group recommendations for protecting Ecological Integrity (EI) in the Sanctuary. The EBSM Objective 4 which pertains to the ZWG can be found on page 211 of the Draft Management Plan:

EBSM.4 Objective—Protect Ecological Integrity

Background. The primary goal of EBSM is to protect the ecological integrity of the sanctuary. No single action is sufficient to protect the integrity of the system short of making the entire sanctuary a no-take wilderness area, which is not the intention. The purpose of this objective is to implement a set of complementary strategies that together will ensure the integrity of the ecosystem.
Strategy (1) To Protect Ecological Integrity (4.1) Continue to convene the zoning working group of the advisory council established in 2005 to: (1) evaluate the adequacy of existing zoning schemes in SBNMS, (2) address the scientific requirements to meet the goals of EBSM and, if needed (3) develop a modified zoning scheme including consideration of fully protected reserves. The zoning working group will review and evaluate data and information, as it becomes available through various venues (e.g., Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat process, sanctuary efforts) and will make recommendations to the advisory council. The advisory council will evaluate the recommendations and advise the sanctuary superintendent regarding the adequacy of existing zoning measures. The working group will be asked to make its recommendations within two years of the publication date of the Federal Register Notice notifying the public of the availability of the final management plan. [See Strategy EA 2.1] Appendix Q provides details on the membership and charge of the zoning marking group. Appendix R provides information on existing marine resources management zones that overlap the sanctuary.
Priority: High
Status: Ongoing

Therefore, the tasks the ZWG has been asked to address are:

1. Evaluate adequacy of existing zoning in the Sanctuary
2. Address scientific requirements to meet the goals of EBSM
3. Develop a modified zoning scheme including consideration of fully protected reserves.

The work of the EBSM and the ZWG are central to the Sanctuary Program's mission. The National Marine Sanctuary Act places high importance on preservation and restoration of EI in National Marine Sanctuaries. The SAC agreed on a vision statement

which appears on pg. 182 of DMP that states that ecological integrity is protected and fully restored. Furthermore, NOAA made a definitive statement in the DMP that a higher standard of conservation should apply to the SBNMS than may apply broadly throughout the Gulf of Maine.

The first ZWG was held in May 2005. It has done a lot of work over the period with members wrestling with difficult, fundamental issues. There was a hiatus of 2 years while staff was consumed with DMP. It was reconvened about a year ago.

In its first year the ZWG reached agreement on a working definition of EI which appears on page 209 of the DMP.

Ecological Integrity Definition (adopted July 2006)
"Ecological integrity is defined as the degree to which the system is structurally intact and functionally resilient within the context of historical baselines. Structurally intact means the native parts of the system are maintained as well as their relationships. Functional resilience is the system's ability to resist changes caused by human or environmental perturbations, or should change occur, to recover over time."

At the January 2010 SAC meeting I reported that the ZWG had been looking at existing fishing regulations affecting the Sanctuary and existing zones, and were analyzing their contribution to EI in the Sanctuary. However, I also reported that we were close to an impasse on agreeing whether and how to proceed to a next step – which was to make recommendations for additional measures to protect EI. The ZWG had agreed to the following statement as a working hypothesis:

Working Hypothesis (from January 13, 2010 ZWG)
"Existing zones and regulations were designed to address specific issues and to the extent that they are successful they contribute to the protection of ecological integrity; however, no single existing zone or regulation currently protects the ecological integrity of the SBNMS. Neither does the cumulative effect of these zones and regulations ensure the protection of ecological integrity. We recognize that ecological integrity is compromised by multiple stressors, and the protection of EI depends on factors inside and outside the SBNMS."

Here, I must state for the record, that NMFS has subsequently withdrawn from this consensus statement, pending further review of the cumulative impacts analysis. More on that later.

In advance of our April 16 meeting, the ZWG convened two sub-groups.

First sub-group was of SBNMS and NMFS staff to provide a synthesis of existing fishery management actions, sanctuary regulations, and other actions relevant to the Sanctuary. They compiled an extensive inventory of the predicted effects and benefits of these actions. The intent was that the ZWG scientists would review these materials and report on their adequacy in protecting EI. This is what has not yet been done that NMFS would like to see done.

Second. A science sub-group was convened that carried out extensive discussion by email, phone and in-person. With limited time they agreed not to conduct detailed analysis of the cumulative benefits of existing "zones" (but to visit that a later date). They chose instead to focus on what EI might look like in the Sanctuary and what measures might be developed to augment existing regulations, to achieve greater EI. They put several strategies on the table for the ZWG consideration, which Les will report on in detail. These are best summarized by three objectives and a range of five alternatives.

ZWG Science sub-group proposed objectives for additional measures to protect EI:

1. Protect the full range (or representative examples) of community types, currently based on what is known between species, composition, and particular habitat types based on grain size.

2. Protect and enhance size class composition for all species.

3. Protect key ecological patterns indicative of community and ecosystem processes.

ZWG Science sub-group proposed list of alternative ways to meet those objectives:

1. Full protection of SBNMS. (No extractive uses and managed access for tourism, observational research, etc.)

2. Sanctuary-wide actions to reduce human disturbance but allow multiple uses.

3. Modified border of the WGOM Closed Area "sliver" to ensure adequate habitat (community) representation and minimize human disturbance.

4. Minimize human disturbance in the WGOM Closed Area "sliver".

5. Status quo (management at regional scale).

The ZWG had a difficult afternoon discussion examining the science sub-group's approach. The ZWG did reach consensus on two things:

First, that Alternative 1, calling for full protection of the Sanctuary, is unrealistic. It is inconsistent with the sanctuary's mandate to facilitate uses compatible with the primary objective of resource protection. The consensus recommendation is that this alternative should not be further developed.

Second, the ZWG reached consensus that Alternative 5, the protections afforded by the status quo, which are the existing mix of fishery and other regulations overlapping the Sanctuary as well as sanctuary regulations – that these protections should not be diminished.

The ZWG was not able to reach any consensus on Alternatives 2, 3 and 4. One or a combination of these approaches would require development of new, Sanctuary-specific regulations.

The fishing industry interests in attendance clearly felt that further regulations are not called for or desirable. They made the point, repeatedly, that current restrictions on fishing effort, which have gone into place fairly recently, are enough to ensure EI in the future.

The scientists, in general, did not agree with this. They argued that there were some gaping holes in EBSM and that there are fairly simple measures that could be taken to achieve those ends. As an example, they raised the possibility of a "slot limit", a maximum size for some species of groundfish to go along with the existing minimum size, to enhance age class structure.

Some people felt that, at a minimum, an area of the Sanctuary should be set aside as a research "reserve" – an area with no fishing or other activities – to allow comparative studies of human impacts and ecosystem recovery in controlled scientific research.

The day ended with no hint of agreement in sight. The science sub-group requests that, for them to continue, the SAC must provide guidance on the extent of additional protection for EI to target.