

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE  
STATEWIDE INTERESTS GROUP  
APRIL 21, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY  
(1:30 – 3:30 p.m. via conference call)**

**Acronyms used:** California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA Statewide Interests Group (SIG), marine protected area (MPA)

**Welcome, Roll Call, and Logistics for Conference Call**

The meeting began with a brief welcome by Phil Isenberg, chair of the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force. He thanked everyone who participated in the Pasadena and Monterey meetings, and he looks forward to building upon the work that was accomplished. The facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE, called the roll before the meeting began. Among the attendees on the call were, MLPA Initiative staff John Kirlin and Melissa Miller-Henson. Also present was DFG staff John Ugoretz.

**Central Coast Project**

MLPA Initiative Executive Director John Kirlin introduced Michael DeLapa as the new Central Coast Project Manager for the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative. John Kirlin emphasized the good management skills and personal relationships that Mike DeLapa brings to the MLPA Initiative. John Kirlin mentioned that the MLPA Master Plan Framework is a better document due to the edits completed by BRTF members, and that staff are ready to launch the MLPA Central Coast Project (CCP). Mike DeLapa added that the CCP will involve stakeholders in a meaningful way once a team is established.

***Timeline***

Mike DeLapa spoke about the CCP and the challenges the project will face. The ambitious work plan was discussed, which involves an intense seven month period with a January 2006 due date to submit findings to the BRTF. This January due date forces regional work to be done during December 2005. The commitment was made to engage with the stakeholders involving workshops, meetings with video and audio, and documents on the web. This will lead to an open process, with the variety of stakeholders to share information with everyone.

***Size & Makeup of Regional Stakeholder Group***

John Kirlin asked Mike DeLapa what he was specifically looking for in the regional stakeholder groups. Mike DeLapa, noting the short time frame, responded that he wants the stakeholder groups to examine the region as a whole. He further explained that he is gravitating towards having two groups: consumptive and non-consumptive, incorporating people with knowledge of fisheries. Tentatively meetings would take place once a month with communication between meetings. This communication between meetings would also include workshops for people in outlying areas to participate.

Mike DeLapa went on to further explain why having two subgroups working with the consumptive and non-consumptive groups would slow down the process. Having subgroups would double the workload for staff with twice as many meetings to cover all the information. He further explained that with trying to complete regional project work by August 2005, there simply was not enough time.

When the CCP regional stakeholder groups are in place, a question arose regarding frequency of meetings with the stakeholder groups. Chair Isenberg and Mike DeLapa stated that their understanding was two meetings a month for the stakeholder groups with workshops. MLPA Initiative staff, John Kirlin and Melissa Miller-Henson both suggested that one meeting a month with alternating cites might be more affective. Melissa Miller-Henson added that one meeting per month of the regional subgroups for regional idea sharing would also be conducive.

More specifically, the topic of dual north and south representatives in the stakeholder group was brought up for discussion along with the frequency of their meetings. With dual north and south representatives, there will be one person representing two or three fisheries, and in addition there would also be three or four people generally involved representing Morro Bay and Monterey.

Regarding the number of meetings of the north and south representatives, many options were discussed. The meeting models discussed were:

- One group meeting once a month which would equal to 6 meetings, either one or two days in length.
- One group meeting plus subgroup meetings regionally.
- Two groups meetings with workshops to work closely with the consumptive and non-consumptive groups.

Comments were made on the two groups meeting model stating that two groups work better in zeroing in on specific areas, and the melding of the information of the two groups would be a straightforward process. A hybrid of the meetings was also suggested where melding of information would be done at the beginning, when both groups get together to discuss, and then later the big groups would break up into regional subgroups. Chairman Isenberg stated that a single group makes sense, but in order for them to be affective, the representatives must be scattered across the region. Additional comments made by SIG members suggested that one group will place emphasis on continuity where goals and objectives are emphasized and established.

Chair Isenberg emphasized the need to do a community profile, set goals, how to meet the goals of community profiling, and find a way to see what the alternate networks will look like. He wet on to state that a group that is familiar with the process and the California state law needs to be organized.

John Kirlin shared that the number of meetings of the stakeholder groups has not been finally decided, and that everyone will need to come to some decision that will work for all parties involved.

Facilitator, Gail Bingham from RESOLVE summarized a list of concerns:

1. Time devoted to meetings
2. Time between meetings to work on areas/problems
3. Ways to phase process

John Kirlin acknowledged the aforementioned three as the main concerns, and added the need for more regional participation and that resources be made available to the different stakeholders. As members are considered for the CCP stakeholder group, test and look at nominees to examine their history of participation, and what their knowledge is via their involvement. The timeline for nominees will end Monday, April 25, 2005. After the nominations are collected there will be a conference call scheduled to make decisions on the prospective nominees.

### **Future Task Force Meetings**

- May 23 - Sacramento
- July 11-12 – location TBA
- September 28-29 – location TBA
- November 29-30 – location TBA
- January task force meeting – location TBA

General comments on the meetings: For the July meeting, a socio-economist was asked to speak as well as a speaker on marine reserves and diver information. A SIG member expressed a need for two panels, one on diver observations in MPAs, and a second expert panel on predator-prey relations.

### **Open Discussion**

Maps: Suggested to be done with nautical charts with overlays so everyone better understands what is being discussed regionally.

September's BBRTF meeting is scheduled to take place in Morro Bay.

Stakeholder groups versus the SIG: The stakeholder groups are more involved with developing MPA's whereas the SIG is more specifically to assist the BRTF with process.

MPF: An evolving process, and there are concerns regarding the document. John Kirlin made suggestions on how the changes will be handled. There will be two meetings with public input, and then the BRTF will revisit the issues regarding the MPF.

### **Stakeholder Involvement at April BRTF Meeting**

Melissa Miller-Henson stated that the Cal Poly offsite videoconferencing did not work well at all. The room was reported as being too small, and the discussions could not be heard. The videoconferencing won't be considered again until staff is convinced it will work.

### **Wrap up**

The MLPA website will be redesigned for easier navigation of documents. The new BRTF meeting dates will be up on the website by the end of the week as well as upcoming SIG meeting dates. Possible conference dates for SIG are: July 20, October 7 and December 7. A SAT meeting was also announced for May 11 in Oakland. Confirmation was made of the May 23 and June 3 conference calls.

The conference call adjourned at 3:23 p.m.