

# OLYMPIC COAST NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

Meeting Minutes

Sanctuary Advisory Council Meeting  
March 20, 2009  
Port of Grays Harbor Meeting Room  
Aberdeen, Washington

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary  
NOAA, National Marine Sanctuary Program  
115 E. Railroad Avenue, Suite 301  
Port Angeles, WA 98362-2925  
FAX # 360-457-8496

Reviewed by SAC Secretary

---

Reviewed by OCNMS Superintendent

---

Approved by SAC

---

## Attendees

### **Members**

Teresa Scott -- WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Diane Butorac -- WA Dept. of Ecology, alternate  
Rebecca Post -- WA Dept. of Ecology, alternate  
Fan Tsao – Conservation  
Jody Kennedy – Conservation alternate  
Frank Holmes – Marine Industry alternate  
Mike Gurling – Tourism/Chamber of Commerce alternate  
Brady Scott – WA Dept. of Natural Resources  
Katie Krueger – Quileute Tribe alternate  
Ed Johnstone, Quinault Nation  
Joe Schumacker, Quinault Nation alternate  
Capt. Bill Deveraux – U.S. Coast Guard, alt.  
Doug Fricke – Commercial Fishing alternate  
Terrie Klinger – Research  
John Calambokidis, Research alternate  
Ellen Matheny – Education  
Gene Woodwick – Education alternate  
Roy Morris – Citizen at Large  
Steve Copps – National Marine Fisheries Service  
Al Carter – Local Government

### **Staff**

Carol Bernthal  
George Galasso  
Liam Antrim  
Lauren Bennett  
Andy Palmer

### **Public**

Jennifer Hagen, Quileute  
Kathy Weed, SurfRider Foundation  
Robin Leraas  
Anneke von Doorninck

### **Introductions, agenda review, previous meeting notes correction and adoption**

Terrie Klinger convened the meeting at 10:00am. Following the introductions, she asked for any modifications to the agenda. There were none and the agenda was adopted as presented. The minutes of the March meeting were adopted with minor editing changes.

### **Internal affairs**

Andy Palmer announced that the new member and alternates approvals had been approved by NOAA. Returning members and alternates include Fan Tsao and Jody Kennedy, Bob Bohlman and Frank Holmes, Terrie Klinger and John Calambokidis. Joel Kawahara will represent the Commercial Fishing seat and Doug Fricke remains the alternate.

Terrie Klinger reminded members that the SAC Summit meeting, previously known as the Chairs/Coordinators annual meeting, will be convening May 5-7 at the Thunder Bay NMS in Alpena, Michigan. Terrie, Andy, and Micah McCarty, representing the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC), will be attending.

There will be a discussion again about whether to form a national council of chairs. Its exact format and purpose is still under discussion. Andy Palmer reported that this meeting will discuss what such a group would do, but he has been told by headquarters staff that no decision regarding such a council would be made at the meeting. Andy reviewed the previous efforts to create a national council and some of the difficulties that were experienced. A range of other ideas have been proposed and will be discussed at this meeting.

Terrie Klinger asked that members give her some thoughts either now or via e-mail regarding a national council of chairs. Terrie stated that the idea behind it was to give some guidance to the sanctuary program from the councils, but just how to do this in a manner that was comfortable to individual members from each council has not yet been determined. Members were concerned about the additional time commitment required for chairs and whether the program could afford to support a national council at this time.

Katie Krueger requested moving items around on the agenda so there would be adequate time for discussion of some of the controversial items. It was agreed to move the consideration of the ocean acidification resolution toward the end of the agenda.

Ed Johnstone of the Quinault Nation introduced himself. In his capacity as fisheries policy spokesperson for the Quinault, he speaks for the tribe. He welcomed the advisory council to this meeting, noting that this location is in the usual and accustomed area of the Quinault Nation. The treaty rights extend from the Chehalis River to Destruction Island to the western slopes of the Olympic Mountains. He related his family history and his connection to the coast. He observed that the ocean has changed a lot, even since he was a child. Much of the abundance of organisms in the intertidal area has declined.

Some of this may be caused by climate change. He described the tribe's history with the sanctuary and the problems that they have had with keeping up with changes that the sanctuary wants to enact. One of the items (Priority Management Need #6) in the management plan review draft work plan has the tribes grouped with other agencies, which concerns him. The tribes are not "others"; they have treaty rights and need to be treated separately from other agencies. In addition, tribal staff needs adequate time to go over these documents so that he can evaluate and develop the appropriate response to items that are proposed.

### **Coastal MRC briefing**

Brie Van Cleve, Coastal Coordinator for the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, provided a status update on efforts to establish coastal marine resources committees (MRC). The authority to create these committees was enacted in the last legislative session, modeled on the seven marine resource committees created under the Northwest Straits Conservation Initiative. Grays Harbor County has just completed forming their MRC. The appointments for the seats are still to be made.

Brie reported that there is a lot of flexibility in creating each of the MRCs. Jefferson and Clallam counties are moving ahead in creating either two MRCs or a combined MRC. Pacific County is in process of creating a committee while Wahkiacum is not opting in at this point, but may elect to do so in the future. She directed members to a summary of the projects completed to date.

Steve Cops asked how the advisory council could assist this initiative or serve as a liaison between the advisory council and MRCs. Brie responded that there are a couple of ways. The sanctuary or the advisory council may want to participate in the local planning process. The initiative may also form a body consisting of the four or five county MRCs and others to help with deciding how to spend money on projects, and this may be another area of possible participation.

Fan Tsao asked what these MRCs might take on at this stage. Brie stated some of the counties have already talked about a range of activities. For example Grays Harbor County is interested in water quality surveys and research and perhaps a state of the resources kick-off workshop. Each of the counties has developed a list of potential activities.

Carol Bernthal stated that the sanctuary has been sensitive to the purpose of the MRCs, that they are really forums for the local citizens to have a voice and it is unclear if it's appropriate for a federal agency such as OCNMS to participate. Nevertheless, there is a lot of overlap on certain issues. The sanctuary is willing to support MRCs in a manner that respects the local nature of the process as they develop their programs, especially where there are areas of mutual interest. (The briefing paper prepared by Brie Van Cleve is attached to these minutes: Attachment A)

### **Adoption of the Issue Prioritization Workshop Report**

Lauren Bennett explained that the first draft of the January workshop report was based on Triangle Associates notes. It was sent out to members for comment; five members commented. The revised report incorporated comments received and was sent out again to all members on March 13.

She highlighted three major changes. First, in the workshop results section, a description of the discussion about the condition report has been added. Second, Table 2 in the report was modified and expanded to include a synopsis of why some topics changed title and why groupings were done and why some topics were not chosen as priority topics. A description of the topics that came from the topics analysis document was also added. Third, a section that gave rationales for individual scores was moved to an Appendix C. This allows readers to look at a topic score and then go to Appendix C and see if there were any reasons given for that particular score.

One member asked whether everyone's comments were included in Appendix C and how close those comments are to what was said at the workshop. Lauren replied that participants' comments were included where and when those comments provided a justification for a particular score on a topic. In addition to reviewing Triangle Associates notes, which were very accurate and close to verbatim, she also listened to the entire recording of the two days and made word-for-word transcripts of the comments.

Members discussed the degree to which the sanctuary staff was going to take their recommendations. It was noted that the cover letter for the workshop report stated that the council advice notwithstanding, the sanctuary was going to make its own best judgment based on all input, including staff's, and various program requirements. One member reiterated that he has always understood that their advice was just that, advice only, and that the advisory council did not function as a corporate board.

Staff said that the comments on the workshop report were very helpful and in the end helped make it a stronger document. Staff also reiterated that the sanctuary has heard loud and clear that the MPR process must be transparent and they are making every effort to ensure that it is.

Terrie asked for a delay in voting on the workshop report until later in the meeting.

### **Discussion of the process for handling future MPR documents**

Terrie Klinger started the discussion by relating that the participants she talked to after the workshop had a different idea how the results document was to be handled. Everyone understood that the priority topics would be forwarded to the superintendent and the IPC and that there would be a cover letter. Several members did not understand that the group's "homework" ranking sheets would be part of that document. We need to make sure that for future documents there is a common understanding on the information to be included in resolutions or formal recommendations. Fan Tsao said that her understanding is that all advisory council meetings are public. Because the individual scores were projected and discussed at the meeting in front of the public, she was not surprised when

they were posted on the website. Because some members were surprised, she feels that we need to clarify the process for handling documents and materials generated by the advisory council.

Some members expressed surprise that the individual scores were included in the letter and posted to the web site. Staff replied that the advisory council passed a resolution that authorized the release of the documents to the IPC. Because of this, the sanctuary was obligated to relay the documents to the IPC, as they were discussed and agreed to at the workshop.

Terrie Klinger stated that it really is her responsibility as chair and the responsibility of the individual members to clarify what is or is not going to be in a final document reflecting the views of the advisory council.

One member said that the advisory council is a statutory part of the marine sanctuary program and that even though the council is “advisory”, this doesn’t give the sanctuary the right to significantly differ from what the advisory council recommends.

Another member stated that what he is hearing is that there will be an effort in the future to make clearer what will be included as documentation. He noted that all members come here with constituencies behind them and if there are some actions that seem counter-intuitive to these constituencies, it’s important that the justification for that score is provided, so others won’t misinterpret this position. The time spent revising the workshop report resulted in a clearer justification for the scoring. Terrie Klinger added that this underscored the importance of speaking to the record. **Terrie Klinger asked for a motion to adopt the workshop report as revised. Teresa Scott moved the adoption. Joe Schumacker seconded. The motion was adopted unanimously with no abstentions.**

Carol Bernthal proposed that staff work with the executive committee and any other interested council members to develop clear guidelines for decision-making in terms of documenting those decisions. Recommendations would be brought back to the full advisory council at the May meeting. Brady Scott and Steve Copps volunteered to work with the executive committee on this task.

### **IPC comments on the advisory council priority topics**

Joe Schumacker explained that the IPC met following the advisory council workshop and that the members were pleased that the priority topics identified by the advisory council meshed well with the preliminary priority topics previously identified by the IPC. The IPC tasked its technical committee to look at the topics that the advisory council recommended and distill them under the headings of the IPC topics. The technical committee included Katie Krueger, Jennifer Hagen, Steve Joner and himself. (Copies of the IPC review were distributed and are attached to these minutes: Attachment B).

He went over the document and explained how the AC priority topics fit under the broader categories of the preliminary IPC priority topics. They also added an additional

category entitled “administrative operations” and an additional topic entitled “public and private resource use”. Living marine resource conservation was put under IPC’s “marine debris” priority topic as well as habitat protection and water quality. Water quality issues and maritime safety issues were put under the IPC priority topic of spill prevention

Joe Schumacker distributed a document prepared by the IPC on recommended work groups under the IPC priority management needs (Attachment C). It is based on the draft work plan that the sanctuary prepared. He highlighted several of the work groups. Under “Collaborative and Coordinated Management” is Treaty Trust Responsibility and Tribal, State and Federal Co-manager Coordination”. The IPC also requested review of the work under “Achieve Effective Administrative Operations” in order to understand and follow what is developed here in terms of action plans. A number of work groups were lumped under “Collaborative Ecosystem-based Research and Monitoring” including monitoring activities. Under “Ocean Literacy” the IPC recommended the addition of work groups on living cultures and modern marine resource management. Under Priority Management Need #6- “Living Resource Conservation”- was troubling to the IPC in that it emerged in the sanctuary draft work plan as a major category while the AC recommendations had it as a lower priority.

Some of what was in the IPC document were from earlier sanctuary staff drafts. Carol Bernthal explained that the sanctuary staff and the IPC are exchanging documents early so as to promote an iterative process.

Carol clarified the intent was for the staff to present the Draft Work Plan at this meeting to help council members understand the structure and explain how the advisory council and the IPC recommendations are incorporated and to take any initial comments.

### **Public Comment**

Anneka von Doorninck of Copalis Beach spoke about her concerns about the human activities on the beach, including cars, airplanes and gold panning, among other things. She wondered how the sanctuary could continue to be considered a sanctuary if all these types of activities were occurring.

Doug Fricke mentioned that members of his industry were very curious about the national system of marine protected areas that the National MPA Center was proposing and if there was interest in having a presentation at a future advisory council meeting. Carol Bernthal responded that we could consider including a presentation at the May meeting.

### **Draft Priority Issue Work Plan (work plan) presentation and discussion**

Staff explained that the purpose of the work plan is to help OCNMS and the advisory council get organized for the next step of the management plan review process. Staff explained that the primary priority topic areas identified by the advisory council at the January workshop are now called priority management needs to reflect a more action-oriented process. The document recommends the establishment of one advisory council subcommittee, six working groups and three workshops. These groups are not meant to

solve each of the issues, but rather outline strategies for the work OCNMS will do in the next 5 to 10 years. Staff pointed out that this is a very ambitious proposal. Given the uncertainties in the OCNMS budget, the exact scope of work that can be supported has not yet been determined. Staff is requesting feedback from advisory council members on the work plan by April 3.

Members gave initial comments. They were concerned about how priority topics were rolled into the priority management needs. Some expressed concern that there wasn't yet agreement on some of the priority management needs and that it was crucial that everyone started on the same page. Others thought that the timeline was too optimistic, given the disagreements that still existed, the size of some of the topic areas, and the need to develop goals and objectives.

Staff responded that there is a tendency to make the process more complicated than it needs to be and they are hesitant to leave the schedule too open-ended. The current OCNMS goals and objectives and the goals and objectives in the National Marine Sanctuaries Act are adequate to proceed with management plan review. The decision to include a subcommittee on reviewing the goals and objectives was based upon what staff heard from the advisory council members at the workshop and elsewhere and was not originally contemplated to be taken up as part of the MPR process.

Staff said one area in the draft work plan where they could use some help is identifying the key issues under each proposed working group/workshop. Staff wanted to narrow the focus but didn't want to be too prescriptive until they heard from the advisory council.

Other member comments included 1) the need to consult early with tribes if a regulation is being contemplated, 2) questions about why workshops were chosen over work groups for a particular issue, and 3) concerns about how much time the IPC staff had to review and comment on this document.

Staff explained that a lot of factors were considered in choosing workshops versus working groups, including participants and staff workload. For instance in the case of ocean literacy, staff envisioned bringing a large group of people together for a one time meeting, rather than a smaller group of people over a longer time-period.

Staff provided a brief overview of the work plan priority management needs and the various subtopics that were grouped under each of these. After the presentation, some members commented that it was difficult to understand where some of the topic areas came from. Staff responded that for some areas, like climate change, NOAA was emphasizing this and it would be a driver for years to come.

Several members suggested that, for some topic areas, it might be good to have a large group meeting initially to give the working groups the benefit of knowledge that is already out there prior to commencing work.

Several members commented on the ecosystem-based management goal (EBM). There

was concern that the research emphasis to support EBM had been lost in the draft work plan, that the advisory council would benefit from a presentation on what constitutes EBM, and that trying to tease a concept like EBM out of a number of different work groups was not likely to yield a satisfactory result.

Staff agreed that having a presentation on EBM would be helpful and that there is no precisely correct framework for doing MPR. They stated that the work groups could move forward and make adjustments along the way.

One member repeated the concern that it was hard to find the source of some of the topics and the priority management needs - that some of the draft work plan topics weren't in outcome of the issue priority workshop.

Carol Bernthal wanted to assure members that all of the top priority topics that the advisory council identified at the January workshop are still there. In addition, the staff looked at some of the second level topics and made recommendations to elevate several of them based on mandates that the sanctuary has and the work that it now does. These included: military activities, maritime heritage, and conservation. Some of the titles are slightly altered to be more action oriented. Other than those additions, everything the advisory council had identified is in the work plan.

Staff described the two work groups under Management Need # 4 Assess and Review Threats to Sanctuary Resources. The focus of the first work group is to take a look at some of the issues that were identified including marine debris, benthic habitat, cruise ship discharges, and underwater noise and determine if the sanctuary has a role in addressing these threats. The goal is to get some recommendations about what steps the sanctuary should take, if any, to address these threats or continue to assess the threats over the next five years. The goal of the second working group is to take a look at the threats of oil spills and explore what role the sanctuary has in this.

Several members noted that the threats identified seem to focus almost exclusively on fishing. They asked that OCNMS consider the impacts of all human activities on the sanctuary, not just fishing.

Staff expressed the view that the key issue is to ask the right questions of the right people to gain an understanding of what fisheries managers think the role of the sanctuary is in fishing activities. Staff doesn't think they can meet the goal of ecosystem-based management unless they understand the impacts of fishing activities. That doesn't mean that the sanctuary is going to manage fisheries

Several members felt that looking at fishing issues is going beyond what the advisory council had decided at the January workshop. Joe Schumacker reminded everyone that the tribes have spoken to this on many occasions and that they do not want to see any additional management authorities beyond those that currently exist. He stated that we should assess and characterize what is out there before we start making any assumptions about impacts. He also noted that other sanctuaries were working effectively with

PFMC. He assumed that if the sanctuary felt there was a problem with fisheries that it would be taken to the PFMC first before proceeding with regulations. The tribes want to see a collaborative process.

Some members agreed that there are a number of threats and they don't want to see the issue of conservation overly dominated by fishing issues. They feel that OCNMS shouldn't get bogged down by fishery issues to the point where it fails to deal with threats like marine debris, oil spills, climate change, or any other human activities that impact sanctuary resources. In the area of fishing, there are actions that could be taken such as continuing to improve the relationship of the sanctuary with PFMC and NMFS. These are positive actions and a work group should support continued collaboration in this area.

Another member felt that what the advisory council had said was that the sanctuary should look at the threats, look at the impacts, at the current state of the ecosystem, and then decide where to go from there. The decision to reduce threats must be science-driven and the sanctuary doesn't have the science yet, so there is nothing driving that decision at this time.

Several other members agreed adding that they came away from the workshop with the impression that the advisory council had recommended de-emphasizing conservation, staying away from regulating fishing, and focus on treaty trust rights.

Staff responded that we included all the priority items that the advisory council identified. In a few cases, staff elevated an item that was identified by the advisory council as a second tier issue because of certain mandates of the program and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. One example was maritime heritage. This was given a low priority by the advisory council, but there is a program mandate for the sanctuary to characterize maritime heritage. As established by the charter, the advisory council is advisory only. At some point in the process, after hearing from the advisory council, the sanctuary has to decide what the content of the work plan is and what topics are going to move forward.

Members and staff discussed the option of putting together a subcommittee of the advisory council to handle comments from the members and assemble them into a document to be forwarded to the superintendent and the IPC ahead of its April 22 meeting. While a number of members said that they would also provide their own comments to be circulated to all the members, there was general agreement that creating a subcommittee to prepare a document to be forwarded to the IPC was a good way to go. Members were urged not to go back and revise or change the priority topics previously identified at the January workshop.

In response to a query from a member, staff said that the subcommittee product would be forwarded to the IPC and would be used to revise the existing draft Work Plan.

**Rebecca Post moved that the advisory council establish a subcommittee to receive input from advisory council members and to assemble this input in a document that would be forwarded to the IPC in time for their next meeting. Teresa Scott**

**seconded the motion. The motion passed with one person voting against it and one abstention. Terrie asked Brady Scott to chair the subcommittee. After explaining the responsibilities, he agreed to chair the subcommittee. Fan Tsao, Jody Kennedy and Diane Butorac agreed to be on the subcommittee. Carol Bernthal asked that the sanctuary be copied on any comments. Comments will be due by April 3<sup>rd</sup> with a conference call of the subcommittee in the following week.**

Carol Bernthal reminded people to take a look at this holistically and not who said what. The goal is to get a workable work plan that we can move us towards a revised management plan. Comments developed by the subcommittee can be sent out to the sanctuary and the members simultaneously, rather than sequentially.

Terrie Klinger would like to see the establishment of some working groups at the next meeting, if possible.

There was no public comment.

Terrie Klinger announced that the agenda item on the discussion of a field hearing on the National Marine Sanctuary Act was going to be tabled at this time because there was no new information from the Makah Tribe to present.

**In her capacity as Research representative, Terrie Klinger moved a resolution on research on ocean acidification.** Ocean acidification is a priority issue within NOAA right now, with an administrative directive for agencies to work together on the issue. Three west coast sanctuaries have passed resolutions on ocean acidification. There is an interest in identifying sentinel sites for ocean acidification research. Oregon and Washington are prime candidates for a site. Rebecca Post asked for clarification about the role of the west coast regional office – whether it was to coordinate research or coordinate the activities of the five west coast sanctuaries. Terrie clarified that it was to coordinate the five sanctuaries. This language represents the fact that the other sanctuaries have already passed similar resolutions. Joe Schumacker reminded members that the coastal tribes already have laboratories looking at harmful algal blooms and there was an opportunity to collaborate on this initiative. Terrie Klinger explained that this resolution does not specifically ask for funding at this time, but it prioritizes and elevates the need for this type of research, giving us more traction for federal funding opportunities. **Katie Krueger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.**

Carol Bernthal gave a brief superintendent's report. She is scheduled to provide an informational briefing to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council in April on the status of the management plan review. She will be presenting to the Habitat Committee and the Science and Statistical Committee and before the full PFMC as well. She announced that Dr. Jane Lubchenco has been confirmed by the Senate as the new NOAA administrator. Frank Holmes also announced that the state senate has just approved the tug amendments (year-around funding) for Neah Bay rescue tug and now goes to the governor for

signature. Carol Bernthal said that OCNMS still hasn't received the final budget numbers for this year, and she will update the Advisory Council at the next meeting.

### **Public comment/announcements**

Jennifer Hagen stated that it would be helpful if there was something in writing that clarified the origin of items in the draft work plan, because it was difficult to tell what came from the workshop and what was added in later. This should include things that are mandated by the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and nation program priorities.

Roy Morris reminded members to recycle their cans and paper on the way out. He acknowledged Carol's leadership in helping create Washington Clean Coast Alliance to oversee the annual coastal cleanup. He expects a large turnout for the event on April 18. They are also working with International Coastal Conservation Association who has a refined debris collection sheet that will help put pressure on manufacturers whose debris is showing up on beaches around the world. Joe Schumacker announced that they are seeking federal funds that will help them clean up areas of the Quinalt's shoreline that they never have been able to do until now. Jennifer Hagen said that the Quileute Resort was putting together a special package for people coming out to participate in the cleanup, so check the website.

Fan Tsao announced that she had distributed a special publication on ocean acidification produced by the National Marine Educators Association and edited by Marine Conservation Biology Institute (MCBI).

Terrie Klinger thanked everyone for attending and urged them to read the draft work plan carefully and send comments to Lauren. The meeting was then adjourned.

Future agenda items:

Next meeting: May 15, 2009, to be held at Dept. of Ecology in Lacey, WA.

Recommendations on the Draft Work Plan

Recommendations on documenting AC deliberations for MPR

Presentation on the National inventory/network of marine protected areas.

## Attachment A

---

### Briefing Memo

---

**To:** the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Committee

**From:** Brie Van Cleve, Outer Coast MRC Program Coordinator

**Subject:** MRC activity update

**Date:** November 21, 2008

Activities: To date, the Coastal Marine Resource Committee (MRC) Program Work Group, an ad hoc advisory group tasked with developing the MRC program structure, has met twice. Lauren Bennett with the OCNMS has attended both meetings. At their September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, a group of 28 people learned about MRCs and WDFW's MRC program, and began to develop program priorities and benchmarks. At their October 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, the work group discussed emerging opportunities and challenges, agreed on a set of priority statements (see below), and agreed to meet a third time to finalize draft benchmarks. The next work group meeting – open to anyone – is Wednesday, December 3 from 1 – 4 pm at Montesano City Hall.

Concurrently, Grays Harbor County has initiated a set of 6 exploratory MRC (E-MRC) meetings. A recommendation to the Grays Harbor County Commissioners from this group regarding whether or not to form an MRC is expected in February 2009. Grays Harbor County's recently launched MRC website is:

[http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub\\_svcs/MRC/index.html](http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/MRC/index.html)

Following outreach efforts in all five counties, Clallam, and Pacific Counties are in the process of entering into a contract agreement with WDFW to obtain MRC "exploratory" funding. Jefferson County recently entered into a contract and began MRC exploratory work. This funding can be used by counties to investigate the opportunity before a decision is made to form an MRC.

At its annual MRC training conference (Nov 7-8 in Port Angeles), the Northwest Straits Commission dedicated a session to the application of the MRC model to the outer coast. Several members of the ad hoc MRC advisory committee were in attendance. A panel addressed associated challenges and opportunities during a question and answer period.

Emerging issues, concerns, opportunities include challenges associated with using Lead Entities as MRCs, aversion to MPAs, derelict gear in the north coast, collaboration with federal partners (Sanctuary, Park), MRCs as a link to the State Ocean Caucus, the continuation of funding, MRCs as a vehicle for community visioning and consensus-building, keeping MRCs focused on marine resources (not salmon), organization and the possibility of merging into one MRC, supporting coastal, resource-based communities

and improving access to resources, filling science gaps, education, and preventing future species listings.

#### *DRAFT* Outer Coast MRC Program Priorities

The purpose of the Outer Coast MRC Program is to provide support for the development, administration, and coordination of outer coast MRCs and their projects. The program will provide each coastal MRC with a coordinator to support the administration and work of the MRC and will distribute grant funds to coastal MRCs for projects that benefit coastal marine resources.

A stated priority of the legislature is to continue state and local efforts - such as those of the Ocean Policy Work Group and existing MRCs - to preserve and enhance coastal and ocean resources. Program priorities should be consistent with priority recommendations of the Ocean Action Plan and should include ways in which the MRC Program can implement recommendations of the Ocean Action Plan. Outer coast MRC program priorities agreed to at the October 10 Outer Coast MRC Program Working Group meeting include:

- Establish coastal MRCs in order to provide a non-regulatory mechanism to discuss and develop solutions for issues facing coastal resources and communities
- Complement and support ongoing efforts to improve scientific knowledge, public understanding, conservation and restoration, and management of marine resources
- Coordinate and communicate with MRCs, the Northwest Straits Commission, tribal, local, regional, and other governmental entities and organizations about local and regional projects and issues
- Communicate coastal issues to the Governor's office and the State Ocean Caucus
- Ensure MRC and program accountability and alignment to regional priorities by measuring performance against program benchmarks
- Promote coastal hazards awareness and community preparedness through education and outreach programs
- Promote healthy coastal communities through improved infrastructure and sustainable practices relating to marine resources
- Monitor and assess impacts of coastal and marine development
- Support the conservation and restoration of coastal habitats, and marine populations to healthy and sustainable levels and prevent future state and federal species listings
- Conduct scientific investigations and monitoring efforts to fill key gaps in knowledge about valuable coastal species and habitats
- Promote marine resource stewardship through community volunteer opportunities and public education efforts
- Assess sources of and reduce marine and estuarine pollution and debris

## Attachment B

IPC Preliminary Priority Issues	AC Ranked Priority Issues that Apply	Comments
Improved Partnerships (IPC)	Treaty Trust Responsibility	Sanctuary should develop Treaty Trust Responsibility Policy that would guide all aspects of OCNMS activities; carries the common thread of treaty trust responsibility throughout all programs .
	Collaborative and Coordinated Management	Need to collaborate and coordinate with Tribal, State and Federal agencies when jurisdictions overlap; and IPC and AC.
	Tribal, State and Federal co-manager coordination	Incorporate the IPC into the Sanctuary plan administrative framework including a mechanism to coordinate program planning and data sharing.
Administrative Operations (Suggested Additional Topic)	Sanctuary Goals and Objectives	Budgets, Planning, Infrastructure, staffing etc.
	Regulations, Permitting and Enforcement	EO 13175 requires preliminary consultation w/ tribes.
	Emerging Issues / Flexibility	
Characterization and Monitoring (IPC)	Research for Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management	Should come out of Collaborative and Coordinated Management of the OCNMS
	Habitat Characterization	Mapping!!
	Living Resources Monitoring	Long-term needed
	Water Quality Monitoring	Long-term needed
	Climate Change	Monitoring needed to detect change. Collaborate with other agency efforts.
	Assessing Ecosystem Impacts of Fishing	Should be assessing impacts of all human usage
	Non-point Source Pollution	Oil spill, terrestrially generated.
	Research to Support Fisheries Stock Assessments	Expertise exists for stock assessments, OCNMS programs can provide valuable data to these processes.
	Local and Customary Knowledge	Value local knowledge of marine resources
	Maritime Heritage - Living Cultures	
Ocean Literacy (IPC)	Ocean Literacy	
	Local and Customary Knowledge	Value local knowledge of marine resources
	Maritime Heritage - Living Cultures	Tribes are modern marine resource managers.
	Community Based outreach	Priority for outreach should be communities adjacent to sanctuary.
	Visitor Services	Needs to be local to the Sanctuary vs. Port Angeles
Public and Private Resource Use - Socio-economic Needs (Suggested Additional Topic)	Public and Private Resource Use - Socio-economic Needs	
	Public and Private Resource Use - Commercial Development	
	Public and Private Resource Use - Compatibility Analysis	
	Recreational opportunities	

## Attachment B

Marine Debris (IPC)	Living Resource Conservation	Collaborate
	Marine Debris	Military, commercial and other sources.
	Habitat Conservation / Protection	Monitor / Inventory first to determine needs.
	Water Quality Protection	Includes more than Marine Debris.
Spill Prevention and Response (IPC)	Maritime and Environmental Safety	
	Maritime and Environmental Safety - Weather	
	Maritime and Environmental Safety - Navigation	
	Spill Prevention, Planning & Response	
	Water Quality Protection	Obvious part of spill prevention and response
Climate Change (IPC)	Climate Change	<i>Note: This becomes lumped under Characterization and Monitoring below.</i>
	Research for Collaborative Ecosystem-Based Management	<i>Note: This becomes lumped under Characterization and Monitoring below.</i>

*2-20-2009 IPC DRAFT***OCNMS MPR Draft Priority Issue Ideas**

Based upon the AC workshop ranking results, the IPC preliminary priority topic descriptions, the public comments and internal staff discussion, six Priority Management Needs were developed for the Sanctuary. Under the six Priority Management Needs is a draft list of potential work groups that would be formed to describe work plans for current and future staff work. This version reflects the review and input of the IPC.

1. Achieve Effective Collaborative and Coordinated Management
  - a. Treaty Trust Responsibility
  - b. IPC Partnership (workgroup with IPC)
  - c. Internal NOAA Coordination (internal NOAA workshop)
  - d. Military Coordination (workshop with Navy?)
  - e. Tribal, State and Federal Co-Manager Coordination
2. Achieve Effective Administrative Operations (internal team with IPC review)
  - a. Program Planning and Budget
  - b. Infrastructure
  - c. Permitting
  - d. Enforcement
  - e. Regulatory Consistency
  - f. Infrastructure and Staffing
3. Collaborative Ecosystem-based Research and Monitoring (working groups)
  - a. Climate Change Monitoring
  - b. Habitat Characterization
  - c. Living Resource Monitoring
  - d. Water Quality Monitoring
  - e. Research to support fish stock assessments
  - f. Local and Customary knowledge
  - g. Assessing impacts of human uses
  - h. Hypothesis-based research

3. Ocean Literacy
  - a. Community-Based Educational Programs (communities adjacent to sanctuary)
  - b. Maritime Heritage
  - c. Community Outreach Visitor Services
  - d. Living Cultures
  - e. Modern Marine Resource Management
4. Maritime and Environmental Safety
  - a. Weather
  - b. Navigation
  - c. Spill response and prevention planning
5. Socioeconomic Needs
  - a. Resource use/commercial development
  - b. Recreational opportunities
  - c. Compatibility analysis
6. Living Resource conservation
  - a. Habitat conservation and protection
  - b. Water Quality conservation and protection
  - c. Marine debris