

MINUTES & MEETING SUMMARY
Joint Meeting of Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee and
National Marine Protected Areas System Partners
June 12-14, 2012
Silver Spring, MD

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 2012

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. Powerpoint presentations provided during the meeting are posted at www.mpa.gov/fac.

Meeting Opening and Icebreaker

The meeting was called to order by Designated Federal Official Kara Yeager. Lauren Wenzel, Acting Director of the National Marine Protected Areas Center welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of the meeting was to better align the Committee with the federal and state MPA programs that participate in the national system of MPAs (national system partners). Lauren clarified that for the first day of the meeting, the Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee (MPA FAC) and national system partners meet would meet jointly, and the the FAC Chair and Vice Chair asked the MPA Center to facilitate. Lauren asked everyone in attendance to briefly introduce themselves, and state his/her affiliation.

Kara provided instructions for an icebreaker exercise. Each meeting participant was instructed to write down an answer to the question: "From the perspective of your MPA program or role on the MPA FAC, what do you value most about MPAs?" Participants were then instructed to share their answer with their neighbor and Kara then asked for volunteers to share their answer with the whole group. As answers were collected, Kara noted that even though meeting participants represent different interests and perspectives, there were several "values" that were repeated multiple times by different people.

Guest Speakers: Value of National MPA Center and MPA Programs

Lauren introduced Dr. Holly Bamford, Deputy Assistant Administrator for NOAA's National Ocean Service, and Eileen Sobeck, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks at the Department of the Interior (DOI). Dr. Bamford and Ms. Sobeck spoke briefly on the value of the National MPA Center and MPA programs within NOAA and the Department of Interior. Dr. Bamford noted that this is an important meeting, as it is the first gathering of the MPA FAC with the national system partners. She mentioned that in 2012, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act, both key authorities for the creation and management of MPAs, turned 40. Fiscal constraints are creating difficult times for many of NOAA's ocean programs, as well as states and universities. Dr. Bamford noted the President's Budget for fiscal year 2013, which calls for the integration of the MPA Center with the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, as well as the merging of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (home office of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System) and the Coastal Services Center. She stressed that the integration offers great potential for expanding the impact of and support for the MPA Center and the National System of MPAs. The MPA Center plays a unique role in fostering place-based management in U.S. waters, and will continue to focus on all MPA programs. Dr. Bamford asked the meeting participants to consider how the MPA Center, and

being part of a national system of MPAs, can add value to their own goals. She stressed the need for the MPA Center to continue to evolve, and truly define the value of being part of a system.

Eileen Sobeck reiterated that although these are tough budget times, there are some bright spots. The National Ocean Policy implementation plan will be rolled out soon. This administration has been thinking more holistically about ocean policy, recognizing that many federal agencies, states and private organizations play important roles in ocean management. Ocean planning can't be done just at a federal level, it has to involve private partners, stakeholders and regional planning bodies. DOI has a vested interest in the National System of MPAs as it manages over half of the MPAs in the national system. Several of the themes in the new charge to the MPA FAC reflect initiatives important to DOI, including America's Great Outdoors and the President's Travel and Tourism Strategy. A major focus of America's Great Outdoors is connecting youth to the great outdoors to foster the next generation of environmental stewards. In this budget climate, we need to highlight the ways in which MPAs help support jobs and the economy. MPAs are identified in several places within the National Ocean Policy implementation plan. DOI appreciates the efforts and tools that the MPA FAC and the MPA Center have taken, particularly the spatial data decision support tools. Ms. Sobeck also noted that she serves as the Senior Preservation Officer at DOI, and, through her role, will work to make sure coastal resources get appropriate recognition.

Discussion

Joe Schumacker asked Eileen Sobeck how tribes and indigenous cultures can work together to establish MPAs. Eileen answered she was interested in discussing the issue further. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has helped agencies address land-based cultural resource and tribal issues; Eileen would welcome the opportunity to talk about how to address these issues for the marine environment. Michelle Ridgway asked Holly Bamford whether the failure of Congress to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act would have an impact, and how NOAA has been addressing reauthorizations. Holly answered that it is unlikely that the law will be reauthorized this year, but that NOAA is still working internally on potential changes. Eileen added that a lack of action does not reflect a lack of interest from agencies. She stressed that we need to find areas of common ground – resilience to climate change impacts, recreational opportunities -- and think about how to implement those. Michelle Ridgway noted that there are concerns from some on the Hill with terminology from the National Ocean Policy such as Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning. Felicia Coleman added that a bottom up approach with support from commercial and recreational fishing groups to protecting habitat has been successful.

Gary Kania asked if there was any update on the possible absorption of NOAA into DOI. Holly responded that this proposal appeared to be driven by DOC looking for ways to simplify and streamline government, and that they haven't yet done a full analysis. She stressed that we likely won't see any changes in the immediate future.

Steve Kroll commented that we really need to address the youth of this country, and get parents and grandparents on board.

There was a question about NOAA's involvement in the Federal Interagency Committee on Outdoor Recreation. Holly responded that NOS Assistant Administrator David Kennedy is on the Committee.

Role of MPA FAC

George Geiger, Chair, gave a brief description of the purpose and background of the MPA FAC and their role at this meeting. George explained that the MPA FAC was established by Executive Order 13158 to provide advice to the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior on implementing a National System of MPAs. The Committee functions solely as an advisory body, complying fully with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This meeting is the 21st meeting of the Committee. The Committee typically meets in coastal locations throughout the U.S., but likes to have a meeting in D.C. at least every other year. George noted that this is the first time the Committee has met as a 20 member Committee. When the Committee was initially formed, the topic of MPAs was more controversial, so the Secretaries wanted to wider stakeholder representation through a larger Committee. Since then, MPAs have become much more widely used and accepted.

Although the current MPA FAC membership is smaller, it still reflects diversity in both stakeholder and geographic representation. George applauded the Committee, noting that it has done some amazing things since its inception. He added that the Committee is collegial and collaborative, and strives to operate by consensus. He explained that the Committee is here today to listen to National System partners about their needs and priorities, and discuss ways in which the MPA FAC can support partners. When the Committee was asked at its last meeting to provide input on the future charge, the need to be more aligned with the diverse MPA programs comprising the national system partners was a major theme. George closed by saying he's happy to see this joint meeting come to fruition, and he looks forward to working together towards identifying some ways in which the FAC and partners can work together.

Sarah Robinson inquired about the status of the Committee's recommendations from November 2011. Lauren Wenzel indicated that the recommendations were formally transmitted to NOAA and DOI in November, and that a response letter from NOAA will be coming soon. George noted that a response will be important and appreciated, since the FAC worked so hard on the recommendations.

Presentations/Remarks

Lauren Wenzel gave an overview of the past decade of the MPA Center. In her presentation, Lauren provided some background on Executive Order 13158, the purpose of the MPA Center, and key accomplishments over the past decade. She noted that the budget for the MPA Center has been highly variable over the past decade, but that the Center has laid the foundation for the national system through key accomplishments during this period. These include the MPA Inventory, the Framework document (policy document describing the goals and objectives of the national system), the establishment of the national system, interaction with the MPA FAC on a variety of issues, and outreach on MPA issues with a wide range of audiences. Today, the niche of the MPA Center is focused on capacity building (technical assistance and training); stakeholder engagement through Federal Advisory Committee and other mechanisms; and information and tools to inform MPA management.

Dr. Charles Wahle, Senior Scientist for the MPA Center, gave an overview of current place-based management context and opportunities facing US MPAs. He noted four major issues: climate change; operational challenges (including budget constraints and changing stakeholder demographics); expanding ocean uses; and comprehensive spatial planning. Dr. Wahle noted that traditional connections between people and the oceans have focused on food security, recreation, and other tangible benefits, but that intangible benefits, such as cultural, educational and spiritual connections are increasingly recognized. Priscilla Brooks asked about the forthcoming Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning Handbook, and whether it addressed the connections between MPAs and communities. Eileen Sobeck responded that the National Ocean Council wanted the handbook to provide guidance, but not to be too prescriptive in order to encourage regional solutions. Priscilla suggested sharing the MPA FAC's recommendations on CMSP with the regional planning bodies when they are established.

John Jensen noted that "regional scale" has become the default view of place-based management, but it is not necessarily meaningful for all types of issues (e.g., biological, cultural, etc.). A more appropriate approach would look at commonalities between sites. For example, there are surprising similarities between Fagatele Bay in American Samoa and Alpena, Michigan, and therefore similarities in the management of their respective National Marine Sanctuaries.

Sarah Robinson asked if all of the MPA FAC recommendations were sent to the National Ocean Council, in addition to CMSP recommendations. She noted that if the other three Subcommittees' recommendations were not sent, that they should be.

Lauren introduced Daniel J. Basta, Director of NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. Dan showed a short video highlighting the National Marine Sanctuary System and then spoke about how MPAs can support our collective marine conservation efforts. Dan described his commitment to the vision of the MPA Center, and his aim to use MPAs and the national system to engage the public in ocean conservation at the community level. However, he cautioned that generating support for MPAs is hard when there's currently so little public and political support for the ocean. The recent Capitol Hill Oceans Week (CHOW) is one way to focus attention on this issue. During CHOW, former President Clinton accepted an award from the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation and spoke about the need to re-engage our ocean leadership efforts. One way to increase support is to get youth involved. Most Sanctuary Advisory Councils now have a "youth" seat. "Oceans" are too large for people to understand and support. By contrast, MPAs as special places are tangible and important to visitors and local communities, and can help build coalitions for ocean conservation from the bottom up. Dan noted the challenge of the expected \$1M budget for the MPA Center in FY13, but challenged the MPA FAC and the national system partners to think about the Center as a catalyst for action, and their role in it those actions.

Lauren thanked Dan and introduced Lori Arguelles, Executive Director for the Alice Ferguson Foundation, and MPA Center External Review Panelist. Lori presented the findings from the 2012 external review of the MPA Center, including input from diverse stakeholders. Lori summarized the findings of the External Review, which focused on setting priorities given limited resources; evaluating the current context for ocean management; providing leadership on

ocean issues; operationalizing the broad language contained in Executive Order 13158; providing substantial and stable resources to the MPA Center, including DOI support and engagement; increasing outreach and engagement with stakeholders; and maintaining a focus on all MPA programs, neutrality and autonomy.

11:45-12:30 Lunch

After lunch, Jason Patlis, President and CEO of the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (NMSF) and new MPA FAC member, played a video of President Clinton accepting the 2012 Leadership Award, presented by the NMSF.

Future Directions for the MPA Center

Lauren Wenzel presented MPA Center future directions, including focus areas based on the recommendations of the external review, pre-meeting survey results and internal planning. She noted that there was broad agreement from survey respondents with the findings of the External Review, particularly recognizing the importance of the MPA Center role in capacity building, communication, and building a network of MPA managers. Lauren then asked for additional feedback from MPA programs on their needs and opportunities. She explained that this is an opportunity to ground truth the initial future directions identified by the Center, and assess whether or not these are in line with individual MPA program needs and priorities. The group was asked to refer to the handout “MPA Center Future Directions & Input from National System Partners” in their meeting packet.

Felicia Coleman asked if the MPA Center has worked with Fishery Management Councils on MPA management issues. She added that scientific models favored by scientists aren't necessarily effective at showing trends in fishery management, and that it would be beneficial to train scientists to communicate better. The MPA Center can provide assistance here. Gary Davis asked if there are communications plans for the MPA Center and for MPAs. Lauren responded that the Center can develop common messages that can be used by National System partners. Hans Radtke commented that it would be useful for the MPA FAC to give guidance on how to describe the social and economic aspects of MPAs, as methodologies are frequently misunderstood. Lauren responded that the MPA Center does not have an economist on staff, but that we can enlist help from the MPA FAC and ONMS' economists. Paige Rothenberger added that it would be beneficial to receive guidance from the MPA Center and MPA FAC on how best to communicate values in order to gain political support. She emphasized that a better understanding of the nonmarket values of MPAs, particularly the economic value of corals in the Virgin Islands, is needed in order to get people to care about “why we do what we do.” Becky Ota stressed that in California, not everyone is convinced there is an economic benefit to MPAs. She noted that it would be helpful to have messages about MPAs that are focused on the economic benefits. Michelle Ridgway suggested that it may be helpful to leverage support from other organizations and to use someone else's messaging example in a manner that resonates with your constituents. For example, Kodiak is the king crab capital of the world, but they have been dramatically overfished. Gary Kania stressed the importance of not using biased terms. He added that it's important to be as objective as possible, and not assume that MPAs always create economic benefits. Sarah Robinson reminded the group of the past work the MPA FAC has done on connecting MPAs to healthy coastal communities, and suggested the creation of a social

sciences working group. She added that she knows the formation of a working group may seem difficult in the current fiscal environment, but the group could meet virtually (as the Cultural Heritage Resources Working Group did with much success), and assist with vision and coordination. Karen Garrison suggested the MPA FAC could compile economic success stories. Priscilla Brooks added that it's important to consider the ecosystem services of the ocean and marine spatial planning. She agreed that case-studies would be helpful, and added that we should look internationally as well as nationally. Carmen Gonzales said statistics would be helpful, and noted that they shouldn't be solely focused on fisheries. Dan noted that the non-market and social values of special places are a key benefit of MPAs, but also one of the biggest challenges to demonstrate.

For additional notes, see notes from "Plenary Discussion: Additional Feedback from MPA Programs on Needs and Opportunities" in Appendix 1.

Breakout Groups: Opportunities for Collaboration

The meeting participants were asked to divide into the following three breakout groups: 1) Communications and Stakeholder Engagement; 2) Capacity Building; and 3) Science and Analysis. While in breakout groups, participants were invited to identify opportunities for collaboration among programs, and discuss potential support from the MPA FAC, and role of the MPA Center. They were also instructed to discuss considerations for setting priorities.

For notes from each breakout session, please see notes from "Breakout Groups: Opportunities for Collaboration" in Appendix II.

After the breakout sessions, participants reconvened in plenary and reported out on breakout group discussions.

Lauren Wenzel gave a quick recap of the day and thanked participants for their feedback.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 4:45 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, June 13, 2012

The meeting convened at 9:00am.

Lauren Wenzel welcomed everyone and gave a quick recap of the previous day. Lauren then gave directions to participants for the separate meetings of the MPA FAC and the National System Partners. The two groups separated.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13 – MPA FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Opening and Committee Business

Chair George Geiger called the meeting to order and welcomed the six new members. He asked each new member to introduce him/herself and give a brief summary of their background and experience. The existing 14 members were then given a chance to provide a brief background.

Committee Chair George Geiger moved to approve past meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved for November 2011 with minimal changes to text.

George introduced Eric Schwaab, NOAA Acting Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Management/Deputy Administrator, and explained that he'd be delivering the new charge to the Committee. Mr. Schwaab thanked the MPA FAC for their commitment, noting that he had served on NOAA's Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee so he has an appreciation for what Committee membership entails. He asked the Committee what their most significant recent accomplishment was. Priscilla Brooks responded that this was the recommendations of the role of MPAs in CMSP, noting that they took about a year to complete and reflect a consensus. Joe Schumacker described the formation and work of the Cultural Heritage Resources Working Group. Michelle Ridgway stated she was most proud of the networking the MPA FAC has done among agencies, noting that the exchange has helped build the social and natural science foundation for MPA management. Sarah Robinson added that she's particularly proud of the work the Committee had done in response to their charge on healthy communities and MPAs. Mr. Schwaab then presented the charge, explaining that it was developed based on priorities identified by NOAA and DOI, feedback from the MPA Center's external review and comments from the MPA Federal Advisory Committee. The Committee will be charged with working on the following issues over the coming two years: shaping a vision for the national system of MPAs; connecting people to the oceans through MPAs; understanding the social and economic aspects of MPAs; and the role of MPAs for enhancing recreation and tourism.

Discussion

Catherine Reheis-Boyd asked how to make sure we're sensitive to fishing communities' concerns. Eric replied it would be helpful to find ways to sustain connections made with those user groups over time, and identify how to more effectively formalize those engagements. Michelle Ridgway asked what the Committee could do to be more specific and helpful to fisheries that may be squeezed. Specifically, can we do a better job of providing empirical data or contrast as to how a spatial management plan can provide protection to fisheries? Eric replied that developing those examples would be of great value, and added that it can be challenging to incorporate data into management. Developing a long-term vision (i.e., 100 years) may also help overcome short-term conflicts. Sarah Robinson noted that three of the six new charges relate to the human dimension, and that the FAC had spent 18 months developing recommendations that consider this important factor; an agency response to this work would be appreciated. Jason Patlis asked Eric if he had any recommendations on a format or vehicle for the Committee recommendations besides white papers. Eric suggested that the Committee be creative and not limit themselves to detailed reports on these subjects. Karen Garrison suggested that the Committee focus more on sharing expertise and perhaps create short, compelling pieces. Felicia Coleman agreed that lengthy white papers may not be the most effective means of communicating with NOAA leadership and the public, and that it may be useful to turn previous white papers into policy pieces and publish them. Joe Schumacker asked Eric if he had any thoughts on ways the MPA FAC could better engage with Fishery Management Councils. Eric responded that there are certainly opportunities to work more effectively with other stakeholders, and that there might be some value to increase exchange with this Committee and other Committees and Councils.

Presentation and Discussion: Vision for the National System of MPAs

Kara Yeager explained that the external review panel noted that the MPA FAC could play a pivotal role in the evaluation of the list of requirements in E.O. 13158 by helping to shape a long-term vision for the national system. Kara provided a few summary slides on previous recommendations the MPA FAC made on national system goals and objectives, but explained that they are very broad and somewhat bureaucratic and aren't helpful in determining whether or not the national system is succeeding. She noted that she'd like input from the whole Committee, and then suggested the creation of an ad hoc subgroup to craft the input into a vision statement. The Committee discussed ideas and concepts that a new national system vision statement should encompass, and volunteers for the workgroup were solicited. They include: Gary Davis, Sarah Robinson, Priscilla Brooks, Michelle Ridgway, John Jensen and Steve Kroll. Charlie Wahle served as the MPAC liaison. The workgroup agreed to meet over lunch and then report back to the full Committee at the conclusion of the meeting.

Subcommittee Assignments

Kara handed out Subcommittee assignments to each FAC member and asked if anyone had any comments or concerns. She then explained that each subcommittee would have from 1:00-3:15 p.m. to meet, vote on subcommittee leadership and develop workplans.

Subcommittee assignments are as follows:

Subcommittee 1: Stakeholder Engagement

Gary Davis (Chair)
Joe Schumacker (Vice Chair)
Dave Blazer
Felicia Coleman
John Frampton
David Hyrenbach
Jason Patlis
Catherine Reheis-Boyd
Della Scott-Ireton

Subcommittee 2: Jobs, Recreation and Tourism

John Jensen (Chair)
Priscilla Brooks (Vice-Chair)
William Aila
Karen Garrison
George Geiger
Gary Kania
Steve Kroll
Hans Radtke
Michelle Ridgway
Sarah Robinson
Stephen Welch

11:45-1:00 Lunch

1:00 – 3:15 Subcommittees Meet

Public Comment

Pat Pletnikoff, Mayor of St. George Island (part of the Pribilof Islands in Alaska), thanked the Committee for allowing him to observe the meeting. He stated that the St. George Traditional Council, had submitted a request to nominate the Pribilof Domain Cultural Heritage Zone to the National System of MPAs. He is having difficulty in getting that nomination accepted, and has been working with the MPA Center to augment and resubmit the nomination. He stated that the Bering Sea is a highly productive area, and that most fisheries in the U.S. come from the Bering Sea. Mr. Pletnikoff said that the North Pacific Fishery Management Council is loath to include protected zones in Alaska, but native populations have been proactive in protecting marine habitats. The Pribilof Canyon is a very lucrative fishing area and northern fur seal populations also depend on that area. The St. George Traditional Council has written emails, letters and met with the Governor to seek support for protecting this area and sustaining livelihoods. If fur seal populations decline and the area is not protected, natives will begin to migrate off the Island. Mr. Pletnikoff ended by saying he has thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to meet the Committee, and he hopes the FAC will help influence the acceptance of the Pribilof Island nomination.

Michelle Ridgway announced that, in light of Eric Schwaab's presentation and his support for the MPA FAC, the Committee should communicate their relevance and be cognizant of other entities who have similar missions. As a group focused on MPAs, the FAC needs to be aware of synergistic opportunities. She stated that Federal fisheries law includes powerful and clear language. For example, terms like "Essential Fish Habitat" and "Habitat Areas of Particular Concern" may encompass areas like spawning and nursery grounds, and other special places. She encouraged other FAC members to familiarize themselves with these terms. Gary Kania referenced Eric Schwaab's point about talking to other MPA FACs, and suggested that it may be worthwhile for the Marine Fisheries Advisory Council to do a presentation for the MPA FAC. Joe Schumacker added that as a member of the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat review team, he seconds Michelle's suggestions.

Committee Business

Kara stated that the next meeting is tentatively being planned for the first week in December, at the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Exploration Center in Santa Cruz. The Sanctuary Advisory Council Chairs will also be having their meeting that same week in the same location, and we're hoping to have a joint session or reception with them. The dates will be confirmed with MPA FAC members as soon as possible.

Reconvene with National System Partners and Report Out on Next Steps

Gary Davis and John Jensen summarized what was discussed in the stakeholder engagement and jobs, recreation and tourism subcommittees, respectively. Lauren Wenzel and Cirse Gonzalez, meeting facilitator and external affairs specialist with ONMS, reported out on the discussions and presentations from the separate partners meeting. The partners focused on two issues: building common messages and communication strategies for MPA programs, and developing

regional MPA networks. For more information about the partners meeting, see notes from “National System Partners Meeting” below.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 4:30pm.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13 – NATIONAL SYSTEM PARTNERS

Introductions and Key Issues for MPA Programs

Following the brief joint session with the MPA FAC, the MPA agency partners met separately. Lauren Wenzel facilitated the meeting, and began by asking each participant to introduce themselves, talk about a major priority for their MPA program, and an opportunity for collaboration through the MPA Center and the National System.

Michael Migliori, Program Liaison, Estuarine Reserves Division (manages National Estuarine Research Reserves [NERRS]), (NOAA)

Priorities include NERRS climate change initiative, which focuses on understanding climate change impacts, mitigation and adaptation. A potential role for the MPA Center could be convening MPA systems and programs working on similar issues such as climate change.

Laurie McGilvray, Chief Estuarine Reserves Division, NOAA

Noted top three priorities in ERD’s Strategic Plan: climate change, habitat (focus on restoration science) and water quality. An overall focus is linking science to management and improving estuarine literacy. A role for the Center could be helping build a team of advocates for MPA programs.

Mike DeLuca, Manager, Jacques Cousteau NERR

Working on a variety of issues, including the impacts of nutrients on coastal systems, preparing for sea level rise and understanding the range of human impacts on watersheds. The MPA Center could help advance and leverage MPA partnerships.

Paige Rothenberger, Coral Reef Initiative Coordinator and Acting Manager for St. Croix Reserve, US Virgin Islands

Working to leverage support on a variety of issues. At St. Croix Reserve, there is an increasing focus on communications and a focus on watershed issues. Within the USVI, programs are collaborating on an MPA network. The MPA Center could help support programs through peer to peer exchanges and sharing lessons learned.

Anne Marine Hoffman, Coordinator for the St. Thomas East End Marine Reserve, USVI

Working on implementation of a management plan.

Becky Ota, Habitat Conservation Manager, California Fish and Game

Responsible for the management and enforcement of a system of MPAs. California has just completed an extensive statewide planning process for regional networks of MPAs along the entire coast. Key issues include how to implement this system fully in an uncertain budget environment. The state is working on public private partnerships, long term monitoring, and

public communication. The MPA Center can assist by sharing information on key issues such as examples of management plans, best practices on watershed management, climate change, etc.

Michael Grilliot, Aquatic Reserves Program, Washington

The Aquatic Reserves Program has seven sites in Puget Sound, and strong community support. Each reserve is different have different management plans to meet individual objectives. They are also working on a program-wide monitoring approach. The MPA Center could assist with messaging.

Matt Stout, Communications Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and Co-Chair of Thank You Ocean Campaign

The California Communicators Alliance works with NGOs, agencies and others on common messages and outlets. From the ONMS perspective, Sanctuaries need to work more closely with other MPA programs. The MPA Center can help build one voice to advocate for MPA programs.

Jim Spirek, Deputy State Archeologist, University of South Carolina

Responsible for managing state bottomlands and conducting research on shipwrecks. The office recently established two maritime heritage trails, which are now part of the national system of MPAs. They hope interaction with the National System will help the program plug into the broader picture of MPAs and assist with communications.

Vic Mastone, Chief Archeologist, Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archeology

Vic's office manages a system of 40 shipwrecks that are popular recreational diving sites. Their priority issue is monitoring. The MPA Center can serve as a hub for working with other experts on the cultural heritage value of MPAs, from ongoing human uses back to prehistory. MPAs provide an opportunity to interpret this human history.

Ryan Young, Gulf of Mexico MPA Network Coordinators, Rookery Bay NERR

The Gulf of Mexico MPA network links over 250 sites in the Gulf, with a focus on increasing communication and collaboration among MPAs. The primary focus has been developing strategies for efficient communication, including a webinar series. The MPA Center can help support increased collaboration nationally.

Lou Cafiero, Communications Coordinator, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, NOAA

OCRM's main communication focus is on the value of coastal management and NERRS. A recent focus is on the integration of OCRM with the Coastal Services Center, and the 40th anniversary of the Coastal Zone Management Act. Future efforts will focus on branding NOAA's coastal management efforts. The MPA Center can continue to foster collaboration with states, including coastal programs.

Jim Armstrong, Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council

The Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council focuses on management of federal waters to sustain fisheries. The concept has evolved beyond single-species management to an ecosystem approach. Have closed canyons to protect Habitats of Particular Concern for tilefish – these

areas are now part of the national system of MPAs. The Council is involved in valuing ecosystem functions, developing recommendations for future MPAs, and Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning. See role for MPA Center in supporting designation of future MPAs and integration among MPA programs.

Carmen Gonzales, Manager, Jobos Bay NERR

Puerto Rico has 14 MPAs, and the commonwealth is working to develop an MPA network. Key issues include user conflicts and jurisdictional conflicts. From the MPA Center, Puerto Rico would like to leverage expertise, learn ways to make MPAs more relevant, strengthen networks, and communicate MPA science to make it more useful to managers.

Bret Wolfe, Coordinator of Marine Refuges, US FWS

Bret noted that many of the nation's National Wildlife Refuges are marine or coastal, and that the national system offers an opportunity to help the agency and managers embrace their marine role and enhance communication.

Others who participated in the meeting included Cirse Gonzalez (ONMS) who assisted with facilitation, and Robert Brock (MPA Center).

Breaking through the Noise – Lessons on Ocean Communication

Lauren provided an overview of the context of challenges to ocean communication. These include public opinion polls that indicate that economic concerns are primary, and environmental concerns are a much lower priority. She also summarized research by the Ocean Project on public attitudes about the ocean. The Ocean Project found that, while oceans are not a high priority compared to more immediate concerns, people are concerned about ocean health. They also found that zoos, aquariums and museums are trusted messengers for information about the oceans. The full presentation is posted on mpa.gov/fac/meetings/

Ocean Communication Priorities: Examples from MPA Programs

The MPA Center invited several MPA programs to report on their ocean communication activities as background for a discussion about broader collaboration on communication.

Matt Stout, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

Matt noted that ONMS hosted/supported two recent meetings on MPA communications. In February, a meeting of international MPA programs was held to develop a joint campaign on MPA awareness. The workshop included a situational analysis of public understanding of MPA issues, and collaboration to identify MPA values, audiences and messages. Top values include food security, economic security and legacy. The group began to identify opportunities for collaboration around common messages. In April 2012, the California Communicators Alliance held a meeting for ocean communicators in Southern California to develop common messages and strategies. This builds on the "Thank You Ocean" campaign in California, a successful media campaign featuring public service announcements and a website. In terms of successes in MPA communication, Matt noted the local, sustained communication at Thunder Bay NMS and Florida Keys NMS around their management plan changes, which succeeded (over many years) in garnering widespread community support.

<http://www.thankyouocean.org/>

Participants applauded the appeal of Thank You Ocean, and discussed the challenges of paying for air time. Mike DeLuca mentioned a similar effort for Delaware Bay. Matt Stout noted that the aim of Thank You Ocean was general ocean awareness, not specific actions.

Laurie McGilvray, Estuarine Reserves Division

Laurie noted the different audiences NERRS seeks to reach, and the different messages that are tailored to these audiences. For NOAA, DOC, OMB and Congress, the aims are to increase visibility, recognize the value of the NERRS, and provide funding and policy support. For Educators, scientists, coastal decision makers and NGO partners, the messages focus on NERRS' role in enhancing coastal literacy, improving decision-making, research and strengthening partnerships. Laurie noted the challenges of messaging about estuaries, including that it's difficult to love "mud, worms and mosquitoes." Laurie suggested that the group think about shared messages around issues relevant to MPAs, rather than on MPAs per se. She noted climate change communication as an example, which has been a focus for the NERRS. There may be opportunities to hold shared communications training.

Mike DeLuca agreed on the importance of developing messages around important issues, and suggested that the MPA Center could serve as a venue for message development. Carmen also noted the importance of food security as an issue, and the opportunity of reaching the public through NERRS visitors centers.

Cliff McCreedy, National Park Service

Cliff discussed the Pacific Ocean Education Team (POET), which is focused on increasing the understanding of, connections between, and value of ocean parks and other protected areas. Cliff noted the importance of providing hopeful messages about overall ocean health. NPS has established a National Oceans Month webpage to focus attention on oceans during June 2012. He also noted the importance of connecting with urban areas and diverse and underserved populations. America's Great Outdoors is emphasizing these themes, including connecting young people to the outdoors. Channel Islands LIVE is an example of a successful communications effort – a live connection to an underwater interpreter that reaches classrooms locally and nationally. (see nps.gov/chis) Cliff also noted that Woods Hole partners with the NPS Submerged Resources Center, which is producing underwater 3D videos. They are seeking partnerships to distribute these broadly. Need to think about communications as a component of all projects, and it should be done early on.

Bret Wolfe, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Bret noted that the USFWS main challenge to communication is their unique mission which puts wildlife first. They have diverse constituencies, ranging from hunters and fishers to nature lovers. CARE is an umbrella support organization that brings these constituencies together. Last year, the National Wildlife Refuges had a major conference to develop the vision for the NWRs over the coming decade. Communications is a major component. User groups are changing, and include youth and retirees (especially as a source of volunteers). They use many "friends of"

groups (over 220), and are working to help these groups embrace the marine mission of the NWRs.

The group then broke into breakout groups to discuss key audiences, messages and strategies for communication. Key audiences include federal, state and tribal government agencies; zoos, aquariums and research institutions (as ways to reach the general public); and youth. Key messages focus on explaining that MPAs are special places, and noting the economic, recreational and cultural values of these places. Other messages should focus on how MPAs can play a role in issues of concern (e.g. climate change adaptation). Strategies include working together with other MPA programs on common messages, and working with other key partners such as zoos and aquariums, NGOs and recreational/tourism organizations.

MPA Networks

Two speakers gave presentations on work to develop regional MPA networks that were supported by the MPA Center through grants from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. They were followed by Becky Ota, who spoke about California's multi-year effort to develop regional MPA networks.

Ryan Young, Gulf of Mexico MPA Network

Ryan described the Gulf of Mexico network, which focuses on linking the ~150 MPAs in the region. The network grew out of a small grant from the MPA Center and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, which funded a regional workshop of MPA managers and the coordinator position. Participants at the 2011 workshop identified priority issues, including climate change, education and outreach, disaster response, and communication. The first target audience is MPA managers, but ultimately the network will also involve academics and educators. Ryan demonstrated the MPA social networking website, which has many features that will allow MPA managers to share information and tap resources across the region. This is now in beta testing, and Ryan invited managers to test the website and provide feedback. The website is independent, and will rely on individual members to update their content.

Paige Rothenberger, US Virgin Islands MPA Network

Paige described the USVI MPA network, which is geographically smaller than the Gulf of Mexico network, and is focused on addressing constraints to working across agencies. The aim is to work more effectively across the four federal and two state MPAs in USVI. The group held a workshop and developed a draft vision and mission statement. Their priorities include communications; enforcement; policy, planning and fundraising; and biophysical and social monitoring. The group is working on a formal mechanism to share resources, such as dive reciprocity. The network may expand to include the British Virgin Islands and other nearby areas in the future.

Becky Ota, Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

Becky noted that the California MLPA focused on the creation of ecological MPA networks. The 1999 law mandated the re-evaluation of existing MPAs, which were not ecologically connected and had been created through a piecemeal approach over many years. This law was

ultimately implemented through a public/private partnership with significant resources provided by the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation.

The process had extensive scientific advice, including science guidelines on the size and spacing of MPAs for connectivity. They also provided for replication of all major habitat types. The planning process took eight years, and involved stakeholders across the state.

The Department of Fish and Game is responsible for management, enforcement and public outreach, and is working with other agencies. California is facing a budget crisis, and potential impacts of this are uncertain. The Ocean Protection Council is working on a monitoring plan for the new MPA networks, and has baseline monitoring for 2-3 years. Reporting on the regional networks is required every five years. Public outreach has been essential, and the State has benefited from the “Thank You Ocean” campaign. Outreach work is also focused on familiarizing the public with specific rules. The state is also engaging more with tribes to address concerns about traditional tribal uses.

Discussion

The following issues were raised in discussion of MPA networks:

- Networks provide a structure to help people solve problems and develop communities of practice.
- Should explore linkages to Landscape Conservation Cooperatives. These are funded through USFWS, but are independently organized and led by different agencies depending on the priority issues for each region. Some LCCs are more focused on marine issues than others.
- Potential to work with Regional Planning Bodies responsible for marine planning (CMSP).
- Would like more information on connectivity between MPA sites. Would need to identify what types of connectivity are being looked at (what species, habitats, etc).
- The Mid Atlantic Seamless Network workshop a few years ago helped different MPA programs collaborate on a common habitat map. They also worked on common messaging about climate change for New England.
- With limited resources, consider piggybacking on other meetings to allow for face to face discussion.
- Webinars are a useful tool – being used well by the Gulf of Mexico MPA Network.
- Would like to see connections not just among MPA managers, but among MPA users and other constituents.
- Would an MPA blog be useful? Would programs contribute?
- Would like to see assistance on technical topics (e.g. training that can be integrated into professional development
- WA interested in monitoring MPA networks, including citizen science and volunteer monitoring.
- Jacques Cousteau NERR interested in data compatibility across programs

The National System Partners rejoined the MPA FAC for a joint report out session.

THURSDAY, JUNE 14 – MPA FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND NATIONAL SYSTEM PARTNERS

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m.

Dr. Charles Wahle gave an update on the work of the Vision Statement *Ad Hoc* Workgroup, saying that the group met over lunch on June 12th, as well as on the morning of the 14th. He stated that although the group is close to having a formal vision statement to present to the whole Committee for voting, there's still some work that needs to be done. He added that the workgroup will meet via telephone in the coming months to prepare something that will be ready for voting at the next MPA FAC meeting.

Panel Presentation and Discussion: MPAs, Recreation and Tourism

George Geiger gave an overview of the panel, explaining that the Committee would be hearing from a diverse group of panelists on MPAs and their relationship to recreation and tourism.

Lauren Wenzel and Charles Wahle provided an overview of ocean uses; MPAs as a tool for sustainable ocean use; the national picture of MPAs, and thoughts on moving forward. Most US MPAs have goals to enhance ocean uses and the coastal communities that depend on them; allow a wide variety of recreational use, including fishing; and are coastal and accessible to human visitation, providing often-untapped opportunities for gateway communities and economies. The MPA Center has worked with partners to map diverse ocean uses for the California coast, as well as several other locations in the U.S. This project provides detailed spatial information on recreational uses that can help inform ocean management decisions. The MPA Inventory is a comprehensive database of U.S. MPAs that includes spatial information, as well as details on management agency, restrictions, etc. For example, there are over 1,700 MPAs in U.S. waters, and approximately 3% of U.S. waters are closed to fishing. MPAs provide an opportunity to support the new National Travel and Tourism Strategy, which aims to increase both international and domestic tourism.

Steve Kroll spoke about the creation of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and how economic growth and sustainable tourism were key drivers in the designation of the sanctuary. He also spoke about how collaboration among the Sanctuary and the citizens and businesses of Alpena has been important to the designation, development and growth of the Sanctuary. The community was very skeptical initially, but has now embraced the Sanctuary as an engine for local economic growth, education and community support.

Michael Nussman, President and CEO of the American Sportfishing Association, spoke about MPAs and recreational fishing. Mr. Nussman noted that recreational fishing is big business. He explained that recreational fishing and boating are the only recreational activity where users are required to pay for licenses, permits and taxes. Manufacturers of fishing equipment help pay for fisheries management through excise taxes. He noted that MPA advocates often overstate their benefits. MPAs are not "silver bullets", and traditional fisheries management is largely responsible for the rebuilding of fish stocks. He added that a key concern with no take MPAs is when they deny access to a public resource without a clearly defined objective.

Pete Stauffer from the Surfrider Foundation spoke about the role of MPAs in sustaining non-consumptive uses. Mr. Stauffer shared the Surfrider Foundation's position statement on MPAs, noting that they support MPAs that are goal driven, science-based, balance preservation with access, involve communities in the siting and designation, address socioeconomics and are enforced. He shared an example of a recreational use study conducted in MPAs in Oregon. In Rincon, Puerto Rico, for example, a community-based MPA included surf protection as part of its goal, helping to support local jobs. Other opportunities for MPAs in supporting recreational uses include protecting sensitive resources, educating users, promoting citizen science and stewardship, and demonstrating the value of MPAs as a management tool.

Dr. James P. Delgado, Director of Maritime Heritage for NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, spoke about cultural resources and MPAs. He explained that MPAs represent "the greatest museum" of human history – they represent the known, unknown, and forgotten. MPAs are useful in explaining humans' relationship with the sea, as they are a reminder of stories and linkages. He added that a way to connect people to MPAs is to assess the entire maritime cultural landscape and use it to project understanding, awareness, and engagement. To connect and show relevance, you must focus on people – take the human dimension and expand it so it's more inclusive.

Paige Rothenberger from the U.S. Virgin Islands Department of Planning and Natural Resources spoke on addressing tourism and recreational uses through an MPA manager's perspective. She spoke about the importance of MPAs to the USVI as places for recreation and tourism destinations. She mentioned some of the challenges with MPAs in the USVI, including: user conflicts; traditional/cultural uses vs. tourism uses; insufficient enforcement; lack of data on values, and assumptions; communication needs; managing public expectations; and potential additional coral Endangered Species Act listings, which has the potential to dramatically affect businesses in USVI MPAs. She also spoke briefly about opportunities with MPAs in the USVI, focusing on the development and expansion of recreational opportunities and the utility of MPAs to support recreational opportunities and the operators that provide them. She ended her presentation by listing several ways the MPA Center and the MPA FAC can support MPAs in the USVI, including bringing community members together to work on issues, and providing a place for education and engagement of youth and others.

George Geiger then opened up the floor for questions to the panelists.

Wrap-Up

Dan Basta noted that this was the first MPA FAC meeting he had attended. He explained that the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries has a similar group of constituent stakeholders – the Sanctuary Advisory Councils – so he's familiar with how groups like this work. He was impressed with the engagement, commitment and creativity of the members and agency partners, and commended the participants on a very successful meeting. The next question is: What do we do now? He noted that the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and the MPA Center will support the MPA FAC 100%, and will find ways to follow up on some of the great ideas generated during this discussion. He ended by saying he was inspired by the Committee's deliberations, and willingness to think differently.

The meeting adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

Committee members present:

Mr. William Aila
Mr. David Blazer
Dr. Pricilla Brooks
Dr. Felicia Coleman
Dr. Gary Davis
Ms. Karen Garrison
Mr. George Geiger (Chair)
Dr. John Jensen*
Mr. Gary Kania
Mr. Stephen Kroll*
Mr. Jason Patlis
Dr. Hans Radtke
Ms. Catherine Reheis-Boyd*
Ms. Michelle Ridgway
Dr. Sarah Robinson
Mr. Joe Schumacker
Dr. Della Scott-Ireton (Vice Chair)
Mr. Stephen Welch
*Not yet formally appointed

Ex Officio members/ representatives present:

Dr. Stephen Jameson, Department of Commerce
Ms. Robin Fitch, Department of Defense/Navy
Ms. Eileen Sobeck, Department of the Interior
Mr. Bret Wolfe, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Mr. Steven Tucker, US Coast Guard/ Department of Homeland Security
Mr. Cliff McCreedy, US Parks Service
Ms. Laura Wittman, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Mr. Rick Swanson, USDA/US Forest Service

National System of MPAs partners present:

Ms. Laura Wittman, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Ms. Terry Holman, Department of the Interior
Mr. John Armor, NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Mr. Matt Brookhart, NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Mr. Matt Stout, NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Ms. Laurie McGilvray, NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management
Mr. Michael Migliori, NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management
Mr. Louis Cafiero, NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management
Ms. Becky Ota, California Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Ryan Young, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Dr. Susan Langley, Maryland Historic Trust
Mr. Victor Mastone, Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Program

Ms. Jessica Coakley, Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Mr. James Armstrong, Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Mr. Mike DeLuca, Jacques Cousteau National Estuarine Research Reserve
Ms. Carmen Gonzales, Jobos Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve
Mr. Jim Spirek, University of South Carolina
Ms. Paige Rothenberger, USVI Coastal Zone Management Program
Ms. Anne Marine Hoffman, The Nature Conservancy, USVI
Mr. Michael Grillot, WA Department of Natural Resources

NOAA National Marine Protected Areas Center/Office of National Marine Sanctuaries staff:

Mr. Daniel J. Basta, Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Ms. Lauren Wenzel, Acting Director, MPA Center
Dr. Charles Wahle, Senior Scientist, MPA Center
Dr. Valerie Grussing, Cultural Resources Coordinator, MPA Center
Ms. Kara Yeager, Communications Coordinator and Designated Federal Official, MPA Center
Ms. Jackie Sommers, Administrative Assistant, MPA Center
Dr. Robert Brock, Senior Marine Biologist, MPA Center
Dr. James Delgado, Director of Maritime Heritage, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Ms. Cirse Gonzalez, External Affairs Specialist, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Ms. Abigail Jaffe, Intern, MPA Center

APPENDIX I: Notes from Plenary Discussion: Additional Feedback from MPA Programs on Needs and Opportunities (June 12, 2012)

Awareness and Support for MPAs:

- Expand those involved
- Social media – learn what we're missing
 - Listen in on blogs
 - What's the talk?
- Share & amplify messages (e.g. ONMS whale app at Stellwagen)
 - Can we provide technical assistance to create apps?
- Peer-to-peer constituency building
- Engage youth
- Need to coordinate to avoid confusion with stakeholders
- Want people to solve their problems, not direct them

Science

- Include MPA topics within larger RFPs
- For syntheses- use everyday language
- Gap analysis – huge job, MPA Center role maybe in synthesizing ongoing work, pointing to other work
- Can we do something quick and dirty on gap analysis? First cut?

Social and Economic Values

- Consider social science workgroup for FAC, NS partners
- Non-market values – important; tell stories
- Guidance on how to do studies
- Case-studies

Capacity Building

- NMSF doing capacity building for “friends”
- Role of “friends” groups in sustainable financing
- MPA Center cannot create plans for individual MPAs – not cost effective
- Leverage funding connected to education for MPAs (e.g., Include MPA topics within larger RFPs)
- Benefit of belonging to a network – interaction with peers
- Benefit of MPA fund – policy framework; linkages across regions
- Facilitate peer-to-peer exchanges
- Think about key functions for MPA Center
- Positive example of Cultural Heritage Resources Workgroup: a new way to build consensus, think in an applied way, and elevate ideas into capacity building. Also a good example of how the MPA Center can coordinate effectively.
- Expand awareness of and interest in MPAs to broader audience
- Analysis of MPA laws and regulations as tools
- Develop principles/evaluation criteria on MPAs effectiveness

APPENDIX II: Notes from Breakout Groups: Opportunities for Collaboration (June 12, 2012)

Note: highlighted items are highest priorities.

Breakout group: Capacity Building

MPA Center Opportunities/Areas for Collaboration:

- MPA Center as a facilitator:
 - Clearinghouse
 - Matchmaker
 - Peer-to-peer info exchange
 - Products/lessons learned
- MPA Center to facilitate training
 - Incorporate MPA elements into existing curricula, programs
 - One-stop shop: identify training needs, coordinate development, advocate

General discussion: How can the MPA Center help MPA Programs?

- Facilitator role – identifying sources of expertise
- Clearinghouse/matchmaker
- Enable peer-to-peer info exchange
- Communities of practice
- Leverage funding
- Informal need-based training
- Leads to product – MPA Center keeps track
- Programs/sites can build MPA Center technical assistance into grants
- Follow-up from human uses mapping – connect program with necessary experts to share lessons learned
- User-to-user exchanges
- Role play exchanges among users, managers, policy-makers
- Facilitate training development (when there's no money to do training)
- Incorporate MPA elements into existing curricula, programs, etc.
- Leverage other programs to do work in your MPA – promote work that can be done
- “Tip of the Month” on www.mpa.gov
- Beware of the flipside of outside work
 - Monitor level of work, track permits
- I.D. priority research areas/gaps
- Strategy for partners who have received benefits to actively promote the national system
 - Programs to help MPA Center
- Communicating science
- Transfer lessons from NFWF grants: online tools
- Facilitate when interagency/cross-jurisdictional conflicts arise

Breakout Group: Communications/Stakeholder Engagement/Policy

Opportunities for Collaboration:

- MPA Center serves as a clearinghouse (would need to define clear role, limits since this could potentially be something that would require a lot of staff time)
- Take advantage of virtual connections
- Partner with CELCs (for example, could show a “circle” around the learning center showing local MPAs)
- Leverage/tap resources of ONMS comms/outreach team (but not necessarily use the same messages)
- Collect/identify analogies to places on land – what was effective?
- Help agencies communicate messages to each other (not just to external stakeholders)
- Conduct connectivity analyses
- Utilize existing communication networks or create one for NS (inter-agency coordination)
- MPA Center can be a resource to local communities on MPA tools that are available

Obstacles/Factors to Consider:

- Autonomy of MPA Center
- Lack of resources
- Pushback on NOP (Policy)

General comments:

- We need to agree on WHAT to communicate
- MPA Center could be a clearinghouse for information
- Who is our target audience?
- We’re lacking in communication efforts with people in non-coastal locations
- Should we go back to E.O. 13158 – is there utility in a communications plan (esp. in light of current budget?)
- We need to define parameters going forward due to budget
- Best practices for communicating (and engaging)
- “We are more than Sanctuaries”
- May be beneficial to make comparisons to special places on land
- MPA Center should be a neutral source of info
- Need to develop appropriate messages for “insiders” and “outsiders”
- MPA Center can inform decision makers (NOP) (POLICY)
- MPA Center can meet with NOC staff (POLICY)

Target Audiences:

- Fed/state MPA agencies, tribal governments
- Existing communication networks
- Zoos/aquaria/museums/heritage sites
- General public (includes coastal and non-coastal residents)
 - Local
 - Non-local

- Educators
- Fishing organizations/consumptive users
- Non-consumptive users
- Academia
- Media
- Youth (tweens to teens)
- Conservation organizations
- Elected officials
- Working waterfronts
- Tourists

Breakout Group: Science & Analysis

Capabilities:

- Synthesize and disseminate MPA science results
- Galvanize and coordinate MPA scientists & messages
- Leverage but focus

Opportunities:

- Continue & solicit ideas/topics
- Articulate the benefits of MPAs
- Use of webinars?
- Start with small groups of MPA scientists
- Engage “local” citizen scientists
- Assessment and maintenance of biodiversity (indices)

General comments

- Telling the story is more important than building lists/catalogues
- Who is the audience?
 - National system partners (put mpa.gov link on each system website)
- Tell MPA stories in their entirety (e.g., what worked, what didn't, mistakes made)
- Utility of MPA species inventory? (list of species per MPA)
- Use of social media?
- What stories can we develop through the Inventory?
- Leverage existing monitoring programs “together”
- Use of webinars to speak to each other (how can the MPA Center lead NS partners?)
- Go to places where MPA managers and young people show up (e.g. George Wright Society)
- MPAs as sentinel sites for climate change stories (together with IOOS?)
- Clearly define goals & purpose (e.g. makes elaborate enforcement and/or monitoring less important)

APPENDIX III: Breakout Session Notes from National System Partners Meeting: Building Common Messages and Communication Strategies (June 13, 2012)

Breakout Group 1 (Lauren Wenzel, Facilitator)

Target Audiences

- Ocean users
- Federal, state, tribal ocean and coastal agencies
- Zoos, aquaria, museums
- Youth
- Funding, decision makers

Messages

- General MPA message: what are they? Why should we care? What are the benefits?
- MPAs and...
 - Economy, jobs (users, decision makers)
 - Climate change (coastal hazards), sea level rise, MPAs as insurance policy
 - Recreation – personal memories
 - Culture (traditions, way of life, legacy) - we are an ocean nation

Terminology

- Some users don't like the term "underwater parks"
- MPAs are... special (important) coastal and ocean places... (would use "special" for messages to general public; "important" for messages to decision makers)

Content of Messages

- Public awareness, pride, heritage (people protect what they love)
- FOFF (fat old female fish) – "bigger is better"
- More about sustaining economies (how and why)
- Insurance policy (flooding, nurseries, etc.)
- Visuals

Collaboration

- Effective messages that programs can tailor, including general and issue specific messages
- Share effective communication mechanisms (e.g. webinars)
- Seek advice from marketing experts (e.g. Ocean Project) – pro bono

Breakout Group 1 (Cirse Gonzales, Facilitator)

Why Does It Matter?

The Value:

- Multiple, overlapping values (legacy, economic values)
- Economy and quality of life depend on quality of our coasts
- MPAs are where people go for recreation, relaxation, remote value
- The ocean provides us services
- MPAs give us geographic focus
- You can make a difference

Audiences – Who?

- Start with state, tribal, federal (internal to external)
- Congress
- Ocean industries
- General public (via zoos, aquaria, museums)

Messages – What?

- What is the national system?
- What isn't the national system?
- What's in it for us?
- Economy (for Congress)
- Commonalities
- System of special places
- Natural heritage areas
- Build on existing messages (tourism)
- Integration/information sharing
- Power in unity – share capabilities/resources
- Empowering movement of agendas/economy
- Why are MPAs special?
- Sustainability, economic security
- Aesthetic, emotional value in special places

Opportunities for Collaboration

- CHOW
- Partner with zoos, aquaria, museums
- Build on existing messages (tourism)
- Chamber of Commerce/tourism
- Recreational groups
- Sympathetic/adversarial/indifferent

SPECIFIC AUDIENCE: State, Federal and Tribal MPA Programs

Messages (delivered by MPA community*):

- What's in it for us?

- A support network of MPA managers, partners, special places, connective resources, capacity

*vet comms strategy internally

Opportunities for Collaboration:

- Third party advocates
 - Universities
 - “Friends Of..” groups
- Workshops/conferences
- Leveraging opportunities
- Make use of fact sheets

SPECIFIC AUDIENCE: General Public (youth, recreation, underserved communities)

Messages

- Evidence of benefits
- System of existing special places
- MPAs are good for you
- MPAs are fun
- MPAs are in your background
- Cultural heritage stories
- MPAs allow you to experience and enjoy, learn, expand your scientific knowledge
- Engagement/empowerment

Opportunities for Collaboration:

- Apps
- Virtual learning
- Facebook/Twitter
- Video
- Ambassadors