

DRAFT MINUTES
Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee
June 2-4, 2015
Tacoma, Washington

Tuesday, June 2, 2015

Proceedings

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. PDT. All presentations from the meeting are posted [here](#).

Meeting Opening and Committee Business

The meeting was called to order by Designated Federal Official Lauren Wenzel. George Geiger, MPA FAC Chair, made the opening remarks. George noted that everyone is a volunteer, and that the questions posed to the FAC by NOAA and the Department of the Interior are extremely important. He emphasized the importance of the opportunity to meet in person, as well as the importance of members participating in virtual meetings and conference calls, where the bulk of work is done. George commented that it is critical to have everyone's input to build products that reflect the diversity and expertise of the entire FAC.

Members in attendance introduced themselves, followed by an introduction of ex-officio members and public participants.

Lauren Wenzel reviewed the FAC agenda. She noted that much time is spent in subcommittee where the substantive work is done, and then all actions come back to the full committee for discussion and final action.

Committee Chair George Geiger asked if there were any changes, additions, or deletions to the minutes from the June 2014 meeting. Hearing none, those minutes were approved by the committee.

MPA Center Update

Lauren provided an update on the MPA Center. She reviewed Executive Order 13158 and the Center's mandates. The Center's areas of expertise for building and strengthening MPAs and networks include capacity building; communication and engagement; information and tools; policy and strategy; and engaging internationally. Recent efforts on communications and stakeholder engagement include a new e-newsletter, expanded social media use, and a significant website update planned for fall 2015, which will address many of the recommendations the FAC made on communications in 2014. The FAC continues to have a key role in advising NOAA and DOI on recreation and tourism, communications, and cultural resources.

A primary MPA Center function of providing information and tools includes the MPA Inventory and analysis, developing visualization tools, developing classification systems and common terminology, and ocean use mapping. Additionally, the Center is analyzing MPA representativeness by ecoregion, conducting a survey of recreational uses at MPAs (in progress), analyzing ocean use conflicts and compatibilities (in progress), and developing a methodology for characterizing Tribal Cultural Landscapes (in progress).

On the policy and strategy front, the Center published the updated *Framework for the National System of Marine Protected Areas* in March 2015, and is developing key messages and approaches on MPAs'

role in climate change mitigation and adaptation. International activities include participation in, and follow up to the 2014 World Parks Congress; North American collaboration with Canada and Mexico on blue carbon mapping, science and MPA management; developing a Framework for a Pan-Arctic MPA Network (through the Arctic Council); and supporting U.S. commitments under the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA) Protocol for the Wider Caribbean. The current MPA Center roster is: Lauren Wenzel (Acting Director), Dr. Charles Wahle (Senior Scientist), Dr. Robert Brock (Climate Change and Monitoring lead), Dr. Mimi D'Iorio (GIS and Analysis lead), Dr. Valerie Grussing (Cultural Resources Coordinator) and Gonzalo Cid (Capacity Development lead) with Joanne Flanders on a part-time detail providing staff support on communications and stakeholder engagement.

Brian Baird recalled that the MPA Center message used to focus on what it did not do, and noted the positive change of messaging about what it does.

Joe Schumacker asked about the current status of the MPA Center budget. Lauren replied that it had been typically between \$1.5-3 million a year until the separate budget line for the MPA Center was eliminated in 2013, and the Center was moved to the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) based on a directive from the Office of Management and Budget. No increase was provided to the ONMS budget to provide for the new responsibilities and staff of the MPA Center. The current budget for the MPA Center covers federal staff and a small amount of travel, and most of the contractors have been let go. The MPA Center continues to rely on partnerships and leveraging existing funds. Joe asked whether the MPA Center was currently meeting all of the goals of the Executive Order, and Lauren responded that the Center is addressing many, but not all of the Executive Order goals. Margaret Williams commented that there may be opportunities to secure additional resources to work in the Arctic as a result of the Arctic Executive Order and the current high priority of that region for the Administration.

Instructions to Subcommittees

George provided direction to the Subcommittees, explaining that the FAC must produce recommendations that address the charge by the end of 2016. The Subcommittees should use this meeting to develop work plans, understanding that Committee members have busier schedules during certain times of year. Subcommittees can invite subject matter experts to participate via webinars and conference calls. Participation during conference calls and webinars is critical to keep products moving forward. Lauren added that the MPA Center is setting up a [Google site](#) as a work space for internal drafts and reference materials. The two Subcommittees on MPA Connectivity and External Financing will be the focus of this meeting. The Arctic MPA Working Group will meet separately, but all of its products will be vetted, discussed and ultimately acted on by the full FAC. Recreation and tourism continues to be a high priority, but there has not been a Subcommittee formed on this issue because there is not a specific deliverable needed at this time. Members can reference past products on the MPA Center [website](#) to see previous FAC [work products](#).

There was a question about how the MPA Center is now working with the larger ONMS. Lauren responded that the MPA Center maintains its own mission, but the Center and ONMS are more integrated, and working closely on issues such as international collaboration, climate change and capacity development. She also commented that the MPA Center may be able to provide some tools and information to support the Sanctuary Nomination Process.

The Committee then broke into Subcommittee meetings on External Financing and MPA Connectivity.

The Committee reconvened at 4:30 for public comment. No public comment was provided. The Committee adjourned for the day at 4:35.

Wednesday, June 3, 2015

Lauren called the Committee to order at 8:35.

Subcommittee Reports

The Subcommittees reported on their discussions from the previous day. Brian Baird reported on the work of the External Financing Subcommittee. He noted that the Subcommittee discussed what the final product would look like, including definitions, and the need for MPAs to have a business plan. The Subcommittee has developed a list of categories of external financing, and is providing descriptions and pros/cons for each.

Samantha Murray suggested adding state/local bonds as a category. Bonds are being used for MPA monitoring in California. Gary Davis commented that the National Park Service developed business plans for about 50 parks about 10 years ago – the Subcommittee should look into how this is working. Another Committee member suggested that university students could be recruited to develop business plans for MPAs and MPA programs. Joe Schumacker suggested that an “adopt an MPA” program could be explored. Charlie Wahle suggested that along with the current analysis, the Subcommittee could look at “real life” factors such as upfront investment, management and staff costs (to leverage funds), controversy, etc.

Regarding funds for recovering funds due to environmental damage, Steve Tucker suggested looking at state and federal laws to see if recovery funds can be sought for damages other than oil spills. For example, the state of Massachusetts has state authority to assess damages for other types of impacts.

Sarah Robinson raised the issue that the Subcommittee should address concerns about undue influence when private funds are used for public purposes. How can MPA programs ensure that this does not occur (or be perceived to be occurring)?

Mark Carr reported on the work of the MPA Connectivity Subcommittee. The group developed a broad framework for understanding connectivity at different scales: within an MPA; across MPA boundaries; and between MPAs. The group is also discussing issues such as how connectivity can be measured. The goal is to identify potential actions that managers or policy makers can take to enhance connectivity, either through network design and expansion or via targeted changes to management measures that affect linkages to other areas. The group also plans to develop some simple graphics to illustrate connectivity principles.

Brian Baird noted that the group should address the human element, including how MPA programs can operate to enhance connectivity.

MPAs as Conservation Tools in a Changing Arctic

Doug Helton from NOAA's Office of Response and Restoration, and Margaret Williams from World Wildlife Fund - Arctic program, each gave a presentation on the Arctic to provide general background about the region and the challenges it faces. This was followed by Lauren's presentation on the Arctic MPA Working Group. Lauren opened a phone line so that some members who could not attend could listen to this session. On the phone were Stephanie Madsen (MPA FAC), Brian Melzian (EPA) and Chris Darnell (FWS).

Key Points from Doug Helton's Presentation:

- Alaska is remote, and has a strong subsistence and native culture, with over 220 tribes.
- Climate change is occurring in the Arctic at twice the global rate.
- Regional corporations are important -- private entities with shareholders who are tribal members. They are invested in diverse activities, and their economic basis varies: oil revenues, fishing, logging. Some are much more prosperous than others.
- "Arctic" has been defined by the Arctic Research and Policy Act to include not only the area above the Arctic Circle, but also the Bering Sea, Aleutian Chain, and the waters of Bristol Bay.
- Rapid warming is causing increasingly melting sea ice -- a trend that will continue and probably increase. This varies seasonally, although the variation is increasingly dramatic.
- Fisheries are a big employer. Half of U.S. seafood comes from Alaska. Dutch Harbor is largest port in the U.S., and three more of the top five are in Alaska.
- Oil spills and shipping accidents are a major concern. What are the risks of oil exploration? There are current oil leases in Beaufort and Chukchi Seas. Oil in ice is a problem, much more difficult to deal with.
- Shrinking sea ice is already allowing increased shipping in the Arctic. Currently, most shipping is to and from the Arctic (not trans-Arctic), but this may change. Unimak Pass in the Aleutians is the most heavily trafficked. A deep draft port is planned for Nome.
- Recent protection measures include the closure of Chukchi Sea's Hanna Shoal to oil leasing (a well-known as biological hot spot), and the Administration's protection of Bristol Bay from oil and gas drilling.

Key Points from Margaret Williams' presentation:

- The Arctic has strong ecological and cultural values.
- Area of huge biological richness including the largest population of nesting waterfowl in U.S.; multiple species of whales that live in and migrate through the region; 30-40 million sockeye salmon spawn in rivers every year; many other species.
- Sea ice is a major ecosystem driver: plankton bloom each spring.
- Native communities are highly dependent on and connected to the incredible bounty of nature. Four million people live in the Arctic, and are connected to the ecosystem in many ways.
- Vulnerabilities include climate change, and growing interest in oil exploration. Technology for exploration and exploitation has outstripped current technology and capacity for spill response and cleanup.
- Conservation efforts are focused on building climate resilience; habitat protection; preparing for new industry and Arctic governance
- WWF'S Rapid Assessment of Circum-Arctic Ecosystem Resilience (RACER) is a new tool for identifying and mapping places of conservation importance.
- Arctic Council: new opportunity in U.S. chairmanship

- US priorities for council:
 - Climate change
 - Ocean stewardship
 - Improving economic and living conditions

Discussion:

Stephanie Madsen (participating by phone) introduced herself and noted that the State of Alaska established an Arctic Policy Commission which developed recommendations regarding state priorities for the Arctic. Joe Schumacker noted that there is a Shell exploration rig currently docked in Seattle and that Shell brought some Inuit representatives to testify that they support oil drilling. He asked whether Inuit people support oil drilling. Margaret responded that whaling is a huge food and cultural resource for native people there, and that she can't speak for native communities, but many are very concerned. North Slope Borough leadership is currently supportive. There are not a lot of other economic activities in the North Slope now, but this may change as sea ice disappears. Doug Helton added that there is an excellent book, *The Eskimo and the Oil Man* on this subject.

A question was raised about protected areas on the high seas. Is there interest in declaring protected areas in the Arctic? Margaret replied that the U.S. State Department is currently close to an agreement among five Arctic nations on a moratorium on fishing in the Arctic high seas.

Mark Carr asked about whether the opening of sea ice is expected to allow for expansion of range of new species – either through larval transport or large animals. Doug responded that orcas are moving further north and can prey on other whales with a more limited range.

John Jensen asked about how organizations are working with the International Maritime Organization. Margaret responded that first phase of Polar Code (IMO) has passed, which focuses on safety and environmental protection for shipping. IMO is also working on delineating a shipping route through the Arctic, and recently approved an Area To Be Avoided in the Aleutians.

Lauren provided background on the MPA FAC's Arctic MPA Working Group. She noted that the purpose of this group will be to develop recommendations for consideration by the MPA FAC on working toward an effective MPA network in the Arctic. Most members will be from Alaska to have strong, diverse representation of regional interests. Three FAC members will serve on the Working Group: Stephanie Madsen (co-chair, with Lauren), Margaret Williams and John Jensen.

Committee members had some questions and comments. Kehau Watson noted that while it is important to have Alaska representation, there are also benefits to having a national perspective on the working group. Others asked about fishing and science representation on the Committee. Lauren noted that some additional members may still be selected to fill gaps, but that some expertise can be addressed through guest speakers.

MPA Issues in the Pacific Northwest

The FAC then heard from a panel made up of the following speakers: Jennifer Hennessey, Ocean Policy Lead, Washington State Department of Ecology; Cristen Don, Marine Reserves Program Leader, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife; Terry Williams, Commission of Fisheries and Natural Resources, Tulalip Tribe; Carol Bernthal, Superintendent, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary; and Leslie Dierauf, SeaDoc Society.

Key points from Jennifer Hennessey's presentation:

- Washington's Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning effort came from a desire for a framework to stitch existing things together – jurisdictions, planning, etc. Marine spatial plan being developed addresses locations of potential new uses. Goals/objectives: protect existing uses, cultural uses/resources, preserve environment, integrate decision-making, provide new economic opportunities. It is a non-regulatory plan.
- Challenges and opportunities: data gaps; predictability vs. adaptability, many authorities = very complex landscape, tribal involvement and capacity, stakeholder expectation and fears, high interest and engagement, variable and changing ocean conditions.
- Where are we now? Wrapping up data collection and analyses. Improved ecological info (several examples of studies).
- Seafloor mapping inventory and prioritization: working with state, feds, tribes – where are areas that we need new info? Offshore wind energy: which areas are more or less interesting to developers? Creating suitability data layers.
- Successes: new and improved data; strong interagency team approach, as required by the state law; leveraging wide array of expertise; stakeholder and scientific input; governmental coordination.
- Lessons learned: more data (prioritize) and data analysis; partnerships are key; funding and staff capacity = essential; processes for input are multiple and varied; need governmental coordination and communication across all authorities.

Key points from Cristen Don's presentation:

- Oregon's Marine Reserve System: 5 sites, 4 state agencies. Why? Multi-uses, uncertainty, research. Goals: conservation, research, communities.
- 2008 Governor's Executive Order: public discourse leading to marine reserve designations. Conversation by stakeholders, scientists provided information, state agencies provided analysis and support. Recommendations had strong support from state legislature, passed easily, state agencies could move forward with establishment. Added staff to Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife in the face of cuts everywhere else. Implementing and learning until 2023, then evaluation. Reserves have a small conservation footprint (3 mi² each). They will all be no-take, but implementation is taking a phased approach because of staffing, and to collect data prior to closure.
- Each site is unique. A challenge is managing public expectations of outcomes and ecological changes; it's important to remind people of site goals. Reserve design and placement matter.
- Staff capacity: policy and administration (1 staff member); ecological monitoring (3), human dimensions research (1), outreach and engagement (1).
- How do we do it?
 - Synergy (leveraging, prioritization), relationships, results.
 - Ecological monitoring: what do we do well, and where do we need additional expertise from research partners?
 - Realized need for communication plan after a few years, brought in outside help.
- Take-away message: MPAs as vehicles to get us to better ocean stewardship down the road.

Discussion:

Brian Baird said that California provides a model of county-level MPA collaboratives that bring multiple partners together. A Committee member asked, What do you think will happen in 2023? How will you manage expectations (since the MPAs are quite small)? Cristen responded that legislators understand that the time frame is too short for major change. Communication and outreach is focused on narrowing

messages down to a few themes that will be relayed to the public. They are still developing the program, and not yet evaluating whether MPAs are working or not.

Kehau Watson commented that she was involved in a large study on public perception and community involvement in Pacific MPAs. There is a significant positive impact of even small MPAs on public perception.

Key points from Terry Williams' presentation:

- Tribes have been participating collectively in planning processes for a while: Tulalip conducted its first climate plan 10 years ago. Tribe has worked with Pacific Salmon Commission using landscape approaches for 25 years. Worked with EPA to help form first Indian office in DC. In Puget Sound, created estuary. Worked on the Convention for Biological Diversity, with World Intellectual Property Organization. Also works with NW Indian Fisheries Commission.
- There are tribal concerns with MPAs because of the history of tribal/U.S. relations. Tulalip Tribe came up with its own policy reiterating their rights in response to creation of the first MPAs, and also conducts its own fisheries management with jurisdiction and enforcement. Drafted document on traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) document for Secretary of Interior. Resources are trust resources: fish, wildlife, plants, water – U.S. has an obligation to protect them. Tulalip helped design ocean acidification study, also looking at species that support life. Trying to understand system ecologically and structurally.
- Joe Uravitch (formerly with NOAA) is working with the tribe. Why is the federal process so dysfunctional? All 14 agencies with jurisdiction in Puget Sound don't each meet federal standards themselves, and operate without coordination (stovepipes). Billy Frank (then NWIFC President) met with President Obama who agreed that the U.S. had failed to protect resources, set up a meeting with Council on Environmental Quality, who took that information to agency heads. Fourteen agencies are conducting a harmonization process. The agencies asked for tribal input on which laws they're not meeting (this is problematic since they should know).
- Tribe is working through Puget Sound Partnership on compatibilities, land use rules and regulations and making sure they're being met. MPA FAC, as an advisor to NOAA, particularly needs to understand these shortcomings. There is no guidance on how to deal with climate change impacts.
- MPAs are good things but must keep in mind tribes' subsistence needs and rights. How do we take the knowledge and framework we have and get it to work? How do we get agencies to abide by their own regulations and meet their existing obligations?

Key points from Carol Bernthal's presentation:

- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) established 1994 in response to concern about oil spills (there was a spill in 1991). Olympic Coast is remote and inaccessible; appropriate management addresses prevention rather than cleanup. Northern Washington coast is an important part of the larger ecosystem including Vancouver Island.
- OCNMS is within the usual and accustomed area of four treaty tribes (Makah, Hoh, Quileute, Quinault). It is a World Heritage site, and a Man and the Biosphere Reserve. It experiences one million visitors year-round, and consists mainly of small rural communities.
- MPAs established for cultural resource protection. Tribes have inhabited the area for thousands of years, and are very engaged in processes and decisions that affect the coast. Non-native maritime heritage spans the past 300 years. The area also contains some of the richest intertidal areas on West Coast, productive bird nesting areas, deep water corals, and three offshore canyons.

- Challenges and successes: climate change adaptation; current management plan is from 2011; maximizing ecosystem health and resilience (must have global solutions to issues such as climate change and ocean acidification); integrated research in the sanctuary; balancing use and protection (worked with IMO to create Area to be Avoided for vessel traffic).
- Intergovernmental Policy Council formed in 2008 to discuss ocean governance with treaty tribes and develop strategies and approaches for management. First Stewards Symposium in 2012 (in Washington, DC) focused on how indigenous people have responded and are adapting to climate change.
- Lessons learned: people have to be considered part of the ecosystem, and can be part of solutions to challenges. OCNMS works hard to listen to peoples' perspectives through Sanctuary Advisory Council and Intergovernmental Policy Council.
- Be opportunistic and flexible in your approach. MPAs aren't one size fits all. Link MPAs for success. Take long-term perspective. Relationship-building is critical. Have an integrated approach: research, regulatory and non-regulatory approach for resource protection, research and outreach are required to be effective.

Key points from Leslie Dierauf's presentation:

- Salish Sea is an inland sea including Puget Sound through the Straits of Georgia and Juan de Fuca. Designated in 2009 to honor coastal tribal entities.
- SeaDoc Society: established in 2000, is a conservation organization, not an advocacy group.
- A sampling of MPA-related science was conducted and funded by SeaDoc. There is an annual RFP, along with targeted requests. Some examples of studies include MPAs' ability to safeguard native species from invasives; rockfish larval dispersions, seafloor habitat mapping for MSP; tribal perspectives on MPAs, etc.
- SeaDoc also conducts MPA-related science translation to improve decision-making.
- Organized 2011 Transboundary Rockfish Recovery Workshop: found that some tribal perspectives, social scientific data, and natural scientific data are known and some are still needed.
- Parting thoughts:
 - Tribal perspective, involvement, support is critical
 - Social science knowledge is not as far advanced as natural resource science
 - Rockfish and abalone recovery present a pressing opportunity
 - Washington does have preserve and reserve areas, they are just not well coordinated

Discussion:

Terry Williams commented that tribes are doing their own similar work in the Salish Sea. Raised ~\$8 million to look at acidification, plankton.

Kehau Watson commented that she is running a workshop on integrating TEK into IUCN Red List (international version of ESA). She is interested in the rockfish studies.

The Committee broke for lunch and continued the conversation.

Mark Carr commented that California is engaged in monitoring efforts, and interested in trends. He asked how tribes approach that kind of work. Terry Williams responded that there are extensive efforts involving science and TEK. He has worked on North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative because he is frustrated with the lack of forecasting and predictions. The past and present can only tell us so much now because future weather will be different. Current work is trying to incorporate TEK. U.S. filed

for ownership of TEK under patent and trade, and Terry is currently fighting them in Geneva. TEK is difficult work when there is sensitive information.

Steve Kroll asked Terry Williams what this body can do to help. Terry responded: advise! Agencies aren't following their own rules, but they know what they need to do. CEQ has selected Snohomish as one of four rivers to use as a model for resilience and climate planning, but the problem is that they don't allow use of funds to do what's needed. National Marine Fisheries Service doesn't work with NOAA's Office of Coastal Management. We need agencies to follow their own rules, harmonize, have consistency; also need funding and ability to use it. If we can't meet current objectives because of "silos," how will we ever begin to address climate change? Brian Baird responded that harmonization is not going to happen; it's critical to articulate your questions and roll up your sleeves.

Following lunch, the Committee broke into Subcommittee meetings.

Subcommittee Reports and Discussion

At 4:10, the Committee reconvened for Subcommittee reports.

Mark Carr provided an update from the Connectivity Subcommittee. He reviewed the framework that the Subcommittee has developed for thinking about connectivity at different geographic scales and across different habitat types. The group discussed the importance of connectivity in fostering climate resilience, and one member expressed interest in the potential of mobile MPAs. The goal is to produce practical guidance for managers, drawing on some real world examples.

Brian Baird provided an update from the External Financing Subcommittee. The group will initially focus on two examples of categories of financing: philanthropy and tourism. They will develop a standard template that can then be used for all of the categories.

Other Business

Joe Schumacker proposed writing a letter from the MPA FAC to NOAA and the Department of the Interior expressing the need for additional support to the FAC so it can truly fulfil its goal of effectively representing diverse perspectives on MPA design and management. It would note the need for additional staff support and funding for additional in-person meetings (2 each year), and the desirability of restoring funds for the MPA Center to previous levels so it can more effectively conduct its work to strengthen and connect MPA programs. The group agreed that such a letter should be sent.

George and Lauren thanked all of the members for their hard work and for making the effort to attend. Lauren reminded members of the field trip logistics for the next day.

Other members commented that the meeting was very productive and informative and represented a great start on the issues to be addressed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

AttendeesMPA FAC:

Brian Baird
Mark Carr
Gary Davis
George Geiger, Chair
Martha Honey
John Jensen
Steve Kroll
Stephanie Madsen (on phone)
Samantha Murray
Sarah Robinson
Joe Schumacker
Della Scott-Ireton, Vice Chair
Pete Stauffer
Trisha Watson
Margaret Williams

Ex-Officio Members:

Tracy Ziegler NPS
Chris Darnell (FWS, on phone)
Brian Melzian (EPA, on phone)
Heather Sagar (NOAA NMFS)

MPA Center Staff:

Joanne Flanders
Valerie Grussing
Charlie Wahle
Lauren Wenzel

Guests:

Carol Bernthal, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
Leslie Dierauf, SeaDoc Society
Cristen Don, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jennifer Hennessey, Washington State Department of Ecology
Terry Williams, Tulalip Tribe