



2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit Meeting Notes

May 3-4, 2011
Savannah, Georgia

About This Document

This document provides a detailed summary of session presentations and subsequent discussions that occurred during the 2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit in Savannah, Georgia on May 3 and 4, 2011. A brief recap of discussions occurring during the council chair dinners on May 2 and 3, 2011 has also been included via the *Highlights and Major Action Items* and *Closing Remarks/Wrap-Up*.

Comments or questions on these meeting notes
or the 2011 Summit should be directed to:

Rebecca Holyoke
National Sanctuary Advisory Council Coordinator
NOAA/Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
(301) 713-3125 x264
rebecca.holyoke@noaa.gov

Special thanks go out to the following individuals for sharing in the task of taking notes and providing summaries for the 2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit:

*Leslie Abramson, Wesley Byers, Lilli Ferguson, Emily Gaskin, Rebecca Holyoke,
John McGovern, Michael Murray, Becky Shortland and Nathalie Ward.*

Table of Contents

Highlights and Major Action Items	4
Tuesday, May 3rd, 2011	9
Meeting Opening	9
Summit Overview	9
State of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries	9
Gray's Reef NMS Presentation	12
NOAA Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office	14
New Sites Discussion	17
America's Underwater Museums: Connecting Americans to the Amazing History Found in National Marine Sanctuaries	19
Sentinel Sites: Monitoring Change in our National Marine Sanctuaries	20
Advancing Sanctuary Priorities through Federal Policy: The Work of the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation	28
Savannah Ocean Exchange (SAVOX)	29
Wednesday, May 4th, 2011	32
Savannah Riverwalk Project	32
Introduction	32
Panel A: Sustaining Our Sanctuary Communities: Opportunities for NMS Resources and Know How	32
Panel B: The SEL and CMSP: Considering New Sanctuaries in the World of Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning	39
Closing Remarks/Wrap-Up	42

Highlights and Major Action Items

2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit

Introduction

- On Monday, May 2nd, the council chairs/representatives attending the 2011 SAC Summit participated in a Council Chair Only Dinner. The purpose of the meeting was to allow the council chairs to discuss topics of interest and share experiences and information.
- ONMS recommended, at the request of Dan Basta, that a portion of the time during this dinner be dedicated to discussing the possibility of organizing a council chair executive body that would lead and help facilitate information exchange and interaction among all council chairs across the country.
- ONMS provided a short description of the development of the Council Cross-Cut and the Council Executive Committee (CEC) as an example of an executive body and to illustrate the potential parallel between the CEC and a council chair executive body.
- The council chair executive body discussion morphed into one regarding a National Advisory Council, and the chairs/representatives agreed that Chris Harrold (MBNMS) and Bruce Popham (FKNMS) should speak with Dan Basta during lunch on Tuesday, May 3rd, regarding this matter.
- At the opening of the Council Chair Dinner with ONMS leadership, Dan Basta asked Chris Harrold (MBNMS) and Bruce Popham (FKNMS) to provide an overview of the topics discussed at their lunch meeting.
- Chris Harrold provided an overview of the various perspectives discussed with regard to establishing a National Advisory Council, as well as the request to consider restructuring the annual SAC meeting to help resolve and/or discuss specific council-related issues/concerns.

National Advisory Council

- Council chairs/representatives in attendance expressed interest in establishing a National Advisory Council.
- Council chairs/representatives were interested in knowing whether Dan Basta supports establishing a National Advisory Council. Dan commented that he does; however, he reminded the council chairs that their primary responsibility is to their respective sites and councils.
- There was some discussion whether a formal body/council was necessary at the national level and, if so, who from each council would participate on this national council.
- Additional discussions pursued as to the value of having participation by the current chairs, former chairs, and/or other experienced council members – with some supporting a single (chair) representative. Others suggested including non-officer council members or the entire executive committee (chair, vice chair, secretary if applicable) from each site-specific council or seeking further input from full councils regarding who should serve on this national council.
- Discussions pursued as to potential differences in the experience, term limits, and succession of council chairs.
- ONMS agreed to review current national policy on council officer term limits, how it would mesh with a national council, and concerns about continuity, institutional memory and succession.

- ONMS agreed to begin drafting a charter for a National Advisory Council and to gather input/feedback from council chairs along the way.
- There was consensus by the group that a National Advisory Council would need to meet more than once a year (e.g., 3-4 months between calls/meetings).
- Potential topics that a National Advisory Council could address may include:
 - Site evaluation list
 - Engaging “not the usual partners”
 - Revamping our “programming”
 - Other topics TBD based on what ONMS would like input on

Restructure Summit/Annual Meeting

- Council chairs/representatives asked ONMS to consider restructuring the annual SAC Summit in such a way to better assist them in resolving and/or discussing specific council-related issues/concerns.
- Council chairs/representatives expressed interest in having at least a 2-hour open session on future SAC Summit agendas to allow them to work together to develop solutions.
- Some expressed concern regarding the development of top-down, national-centric agendas.
- There was some discussion that ONMS could hold meetings occasionally that model more concept/paper-focused meetings by the National Park Service. There seemed to be an openness to participate in this type of conference (every couple of years) provided the SAC Summit was included as part of it.
- Dan Basta supported additional and more direct involvement of superintendents with council chairs and possibly in future SAC Summits. The level of participation by the superintendents still needs to be resolved/evaluated, but one suggestion was that ONMS could consider co-locating the SAC Summit with a Leadership Team meeting or holding it in DC again.

Information Exchange beyond the SAC Summit

- Council chairs/representatives would like to see a repository, such as a higher-level database or website, to facilitate the sharing of advice, experience, and council products.
- A Wiki-type database housing minutes, letters, resolutions, etc. was recommended, as was a website identifying contacts for all council-related issues (e.g, water quality, youth seats, sister sanctuaries).
- All agreed that this type of information exchange would allow councils to learn from other sites/councils and, more specifically, how they have dealt with similar issues.
- It was noted that the Council Executive Committee (new executive body composed of council coordinators) is currently working on this issue and that HQ sees this as a priority. This issue was first proposed to the council coordinators at the 2010 Council Coordinator Meeting.
- It was suggested that a group email would be another good way to facilitate communication, and ONMS agreed to send out a reminder with the existing group email addresses (e.g., council chairs, council coordinators) and appropriate use of these emails.
- Additionally, council chairs/representatives requested more open and frequent communication, and they specifically asked to work with Dan Basta and others in ONMS

to setup conference calls, webinars, or some other means (via Doodle polls) to facilitate this exchange.

- Create a list of what each council wants to learn about or use national coordinator to exchange information and arrange relevant calls (3-4 months between calls).
- Each chair/representative could be provided an opportunity to discuss what his/her respective council has accomplished between calls/meetings.
- Dan Basta mentioned the importance of superintendents engaging directly with council chairs, and the need for them to meet regularly (rather than haphazardly) with council chairs. Some council chairs/representatives expressed a desire to have greater access to their superintendents; others commented that they have open access already.
- Others recognized a need for ONMS to do a better job of getting information to council members (especially chairs).
- Dan Basta mentioned that he asked the ONMS education coordinators to consider developing training modules to assist during new council member orientation and that they would be discussing this at their upcoming meeting in Scituate, Massachusetts.
- There was interest in having council members attend meetings for other advisory councils and in ONMS helping fund these exchanges.
- Bruce Popham (FKNMS) mentioned the succession plan that his council has to ensure continuity within his executive committee. It was suggested that ONMS could review this as a possible model/option for councils to utilize – paying particular attention to the impact of this option on “free and open” elections and the need to have some “fresh blood” in certain situations.

Projection

- ONMS will redistribute Dan Basta’s “Our Challenge” piece to all council chairs/representatives. There is a section in this document that speaks to “how to project” and how projecting in special places has more meaning than anywhere else.
- One place in particular that this was discussed at the 2011 SAC Summit was with regard to better projecting or telling the story of jobs, economies, etc.

Sanctuary Designation and Expansion

- ONMS will provide the council chairs/representatives with the number of land (e.g., MPA, national parks) versus sanctuary designations over the last 10 years or so.
- Council chairs/representatives suggested that ONMS should work to increase its GIS capabilities and continue to work with partners, communities, etc. to identify and evaluate potential new sanctuaries and address boundary expansions.
- There was a general recognition that it was time to look at potential new sanctuaries and reactivate the Site Evaluation List (SEL).

Socioeconomics/Sustaining Our Sanctuary Communities

- ONMS will provide the council chairs/representatives with quantitative information regarding the value of national marine sanctuaries to local economies once the final outreach products are complete.

- It was suggested that ONMS work with council members to develop products (e.g., videos, testimony questionnaire, statements from each council member expressing the connection between his/her seat and local economy) or setup appointments with key officials, leadership, etc. to support the qualitative aspects as well.
- Council chairs/representatives recommended that superintendents work with their respective councils to facilitate community-based discussions on gathering local socioeconomic data to develop a more complete “story” of the ONMS (and individual sanctuary’s) impact on the sustainability of coastal communities.
- Council chairs/representatives recommended that superintendents and council members work with local academic institutions to leverage resources and capacities in support of gathering and analyzing additional local socioeconomic information.

Additional Highlights, Actions and Suggestions

- ***International Partnerships***
ONMS will provide the council chairs/representatives information on the international training programs facilitated by Anne Walton through the ONMS. ONMS would like to see each sanctuary, where applicable, explore international connections to further resource protection.
- ***Involvement of Community Colleges***
ONMS will provide (upon the return of Brad Barr from sabbatical) a list of contacts and ideas on how to further site involvement with community colleges to councils chairs.
- ***National Marine Sanctuaries Act***
All council members should re-read the NMSA.
- ***National Marine Sanctuary Foundation***
NMSF offered to make appropriate introductions between Executive Directors of local Friends’ Groups (8 total) and council members.

ONMS reminded council members on several occasions (e.g., during discussions regarding a potential D.C. meeting) that they are prohibited from contacting Congress on behalf of or as an advisory council member. Council members may contact members of Congress as private citizens on their own concerns as private citizens.

- ***ONMS Image within Fishing Communities***
A suggestion was made that ONMS should work to improve its image within the fishing community (especially within the recreational fishing community).
- ***Savannah Ocean Exchange***
Council chairs/representatives were asked to consider distributing the SAVOX Call for Solutions (deadline May 31, 2011) to their respective councils and others within their community, professional, etc. networks. The original email was distributed by Karen Brubeck on April 4, 2011 and additional information can be found at: <http://savannahoceanexchange.com/>.

- ***Science***
ONMS agreed to provide the West Coast Ocean Acidification Plan (which all superintendents have) to the council chairs/representatives. ONMS would also like to provide additional information to council chairs/representatives that better highlights the intent, purpose and potential financial benefit to pursuing sentinel site science in ONMS.
- ***Volunteerism***
Council members expressed the need for increased resources and staff to further support volunteer programs, as well as all programs (e.g., monitoring) at the site-level.
- ***Youth Seat***
All councils that have not already done so should consider discussing and possibly including a youth seat or working group as part of their council.

Meeting Notes: May 3, 2011
2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit

Meeting Opening

George Sedberry, Gray's Reef NMS Superintendent

This session served as an introduction to the meeting and to the staff and council chair from Gray's Reef NMS. George facilitated around the room introductions (name, title) and provided a brief welcome.

Summit Overview

Karen Brubeck, ONMS National Advisory Council Coordinator

Karen welcomed everyone to the meeting and mentioned the very productive kick-off dinner for the council chairs last night at Belford's Savannah Seafood and Steaks. Karen noted numerous changes to the agenda since the meeting participants had last seen the agenda: (1) Dean Hudson, FBNMS chair, unable to attend; (2) Emily Gaskin and Mike Murray presenting as panelists; (3) Lauren Garske unable to attend and will present her findings at next year's Summit; (4) Jack McGovern is on the agenda; (5) A Savannah Riverwalk Presentation was added to the agenda; and (6) Senator Isakson's field representative will attend the meeting on Wednesday.

Karen also provided a reminder of the logistics, the meeting courtesies (including time cards and a cowbell to keep sessions moving) and the meeting evaluations. She thanked Becky Shortland and Jody Patterson for their hard work in helping to plan the meeting, and Becky Shortland provided a thank you for Jody (gift). Karen also thanked the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation for their continued support in hosting the meeting.

State of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

Daniel J. Basta, ONMS Director

Dan began by providing perspective about this meeting and how it changed in the planning process. He noted there were significantly fewer meeting participants and the field activities (tours, reception, field trip) were eliminated in order to reduce the budget enough to allow the meeting to occur. He discussed the tough decisions made in these tight budget times, but the focus of keeping alive the things that help ONMS project. Dan refused to let this meeting go by the wayside -- refused not to find money to support it. This meeting was an absolute must -- hands down. This is the one time to talk as a group about our advisory bodies and how we can work together. It is the continuity in this group that allows us to be who we are and roar loudly. ONMS also made similar decisions for other crosscutting program meetings (science, education, protected resources, maritime heritage).

Dan mentioned that Osama Bin Laden was killed -- a decade since 9/11. He connected the Ocean for Life (OFL) field event at Channel Islands with the children on the plane that hit the Pentagon

during 9/11 and with his “Our Challenge” piece – making ONMS relevant to the nation. He noted OFL is totally funded from outside the program and works on the idea of projecting not protecting -- we can change 300M Americans and OFL will touch people around the world. Discussed the need to have sanctuaries, vibrant communities, and intelligent, dedicated staff or it would not happen. It is about those special places. He discussed the idea of having big names like Clinton and General Petraeus supporting the concept.

Dan discussed the tight budget and implications at length. ONMS has had to pare down (laid off contractors, closed satellite facilities, slowed up boats), but we will be okay. ONMS is passing through a phase in how our country is going through its life cycle. He assured everyone that we have enough solid support that no one wants to damage the successes that we have created in ONMS, but pointed out that “not damaging” doesn’t mean supporting whole hearted. We are getting less money each year – overheads go up and operating dollars go down. To accept and constrain, is not the way to do this. The way is for us to be projecting more intelligently. How these unique places can be unique catalysts.

In February during Black History Month, Voyage to Discovery was on the President’s website because it was about his priority --- jobs. It was not just about representing the under-represented African American population, but it was retooled to project it to empower African American youth in education, science and career opportunities. He emphasized the importance of projecting positive things and the need for us to improve on this.

Dan provided examples. Stellwagen Bank NMS -- \$30M whale watching and connection to other locations (demonstrates multiplier effect of what these sorts of revenues create). Adds up to jobs, jobs, jobs. \$20M in vessel fishing out of SBNMS . \$2.5M in charter boat fishing in SBNMS. Boats like this keep shipyards running – like down in FKNMS. Lots of great stories about things like this. FKNMS is the easiest. TBNMS has a great story about the community. Councils should speak to this. It’s about jobs, jobs, jobs. It’s about projecting ideas about new jobs. This is something that we think has direct bearing on the budget picture. One of our goals here is to try to speak with you about this projection of value! Dan requested that meeting participants look again at Dan’s Challenge – there is a section about how to project and how projecting in special places has more meaning than anywhere else.

Dan discussed comprehensive place-based stewardship and, specifically, highlighted that there has been minimal progress with regard to the establishment of new protected ocean areas. Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary is the only sanctuary designated in the last 11 years. In contrast, during a similar timeframe (i.e., over the last decade or so), there have been 34 National Parks, nearly 30 National Wildlife Refuges, and 87 Wild Rivers established. At the state-level, California, Maryland and Washington have also established 42, 31 and 10 marine protected areas, respectively. Outside the U.S., Australia has established 17 additional marine protected areas during a similar timeframe, and the U.K. and France have created eight and four, respectively. Questions were raised with regard to: “Where is place-based ocean stewardship in the U.S. government? Where is the ocean steward? Is it a money question? Is it possible to look at the budgets of these places versus that of the NMSS. It almost seems like to some that oceans don’t count in the central view of America.

We believe in stewardship and place-based management to help the success of the U.S. and ecosystem health. This year, Capitol Hill Ocean Week is about how having a secure ocean actually is essential to the security of the planet and global economy—we have to own this. How do we deliver? We have to be really strategic, take calculated risks, and maintain the urgency of action. Matching up to what people care about is a really good starting point and making the message clear in how you project. Sanctuaries are about cultural landscapes.

Blue ocean film festival has been fairly successful, but there would not be a film festival without ONMS. We do this because we are special places and can motivate things to occur.

Can tradition inform the future? We will bring the indigenous communities along the coast to Washington D.C. under a different perspective. ONMS will have something to offer in a time of change. The Smithsonian is a full partner. It will totally occupy the Indian Museum in part of 2012. How do indigenous cultures think about the world? How have they always adapted to change? The Makah have lived there for over 4,000 years. Ecosystem is changing, subsistence patterns are changing – and they can't move because treaty boundaries are in place. We project this to the U.S. because we have indigenous tribes that are our colleagues. We can do this because we are NMS and we find ways to project.

America's Cup is attempting to be something more than a boat race. They want to be connected to ocean conservation to create a different branding of who they are. They want MPAs around the world to be part of the highlight. Final race will be in San Francisco Bay – GF office is an ideal place to view the race. We may be able project it in a way to create jobs and bring special attention to special places. America's Cup can be a vehicle for ocean and change. It's another one of those things that's around the corner. How you create a different buzz.

Innovation does not just come from within. Get the public involved and it will get the issue going. For example, in the 1970's American culture makes the greatest investment in the environment; it was an absolute apex in human investment. It occurred because of public concern and will. Something was wrong in America. We were poisoning ourselves (PCBs, DDT, etc.). Human health and longevity was at stake.

We need to do something like this again. We can't own this everywhere, but we can own it for special ocean places. Special ocean places do a lot more than save pretty creatures and ocean spaces. They are going to give us well-being and jobs. We need a bunch of special ocean places in the Gulf of Mexico. We need to establish paradigms about how we can extract energy and protect the ocean at the same time. We can't just plan and plan. **We need action and urgency.**

We are crucial elements in the bellies of the beast, so have to give this our best effort. For staff, every single individual counts and has to be on this page. For council chairs, you are sitting on the top. When you do something, others blink. You have to stand up and say you are on this side of the equation.

Discussion Bulleted Below:

- How do we bridge this because some of our regulations prevent us from projecting certain things?

- Dan mentioned that this is changing -- special use permits is one example. If something meets these criteria, propose it. Let us decide if we can authorize it. Dan also mentioned the Vanderberg and adding habitat (even though artificial/unnatural on the bottom). So why is this a bad idea? ONMS has the battle internally, but we have to find that common ground to make it all work. We don't want to stand in the way of things that are actually critical. We may say don't look to a sanctuary first, but we will consider it. Science can create ways to assist us with this.
- We have not had any new sanctuaries.
- In terms of new sanctuaries – the Site Evaluation List (SEL) was deactivated in 1995. Dan has the authority to reactivate the list by putting a FRN in the FR. There are lots of people who want sanctuaries.
- Site expansion is another thing – bills in Congress go nowhere so we need to help ourselves. Bill Douros proved it can be done with Davidson Seamount. We are able to add smaller pieces under our own authority as part of MPR process. We could consider adding Bodega Canyon, for example, at CBNMS. We could expand sites through MPR and we may likely take this kind of action. This type of action emanates from councils and the MPR process. We actually have the best people and nobody has what we have – a system of advisory councils. Councils are filled with an impressive collection of individuals and credentials.

Gray's Reef NMS Presentation

George Sedberry, Gray's Reef NMS Superintendent

George provided an overview of Gray's Reef NMS, including where it is located, when it was designated (1986), and what it protects. The management plan was revised in 2006 and is currently in review again. One of greatest contributors of biomass are the live-bottom areas (particularly productive). There are 201 species of fish at GRNMS and 1,000 of species of algae/invertebrates. Species under ESA and MMPA include right whales, loggerhead turtles and others. George noted the assets that help GR manage – vessels and facilities (R/V Joe Ferguson, R/V Sam Gray, SRVx). GRNMNS offices are located on the campus of Skidaway Institute of Oceanography. Randy Rudd selected as NMSs Volunteer of the Year and GR Volunteer of the Year. The GRNMS advisory council is another asset for the site.

Condition Report released in 2008. Some low levels of pollutants, spotted invasive lion fish on one occasion, and have a need for additional long-term research and monitoring. GRNMS is a sentinel site (will hear more later) – long history of research conducted there since 1960s by Milton "Sam" Gray (collections on record at GA something museum). George also described previous site characterizations, Gray's Reef inclusion in the NOAA Fisheries MARMAP program (sample fish populations throughout the regional for annual index of abundance) and the census of marine life completed last year. A data buoy records temperature, CO2 (seafloor, surface, and temperature), etc. which can be used to assess changes in pH. He illustrated the connectivity via drifters through gyres (connection between offshore protected area and onshore spawning area) and noted that a system of MPAs help retain larvae in the system. Deepwater, deepwater coral, etc. connected to GRNMS because of the large gyre (larvae and water masses) – a great fish producing system that takes advantage of movement of water, etc. Believe there is

overfishing (reef fish stocks, signs of overfishing) or possibly climate change or lionfish invasion that impact fish stocks.

GRNMS includes a lot of fishing and no places where there is no fishing; therefore, as part of the 2006 MPR, they were asked to consider a research area (no natural live bottoms set aside for research in SAB). After extensive work with their council, a research area has been proposed that is about one-third the size of the sanctuary. The research area would minimize impact on recreational fishermen; include representative habitats; and prohibit fishing and diving. It would allow transient vessels only (no stopping). Can no fishing zones enhance fishing? This has been shown to be true in other areas of the world but not sure it is necessarily true for these live bottom areas. Currently, synthesizing research information on the sanctuary; have developed a science advisory group; figuring out how to enforce; discussing permitting; and outreach to public so they understand.

GRNMS looked at transport mechanism to see if oil in Gulf Stream would be transported to area (collected specimens north of GRNMS in sponges). Samples consistent with highly weathered oils and want to collect additional samples. Other studies at GR include linking within food chain; fish movements to see if fish come back after spawning (seasonal movement and habitat utilization; short term site fidelity; related to ledge height; detections positively related to prey); monitoring and removing marine debris in sanctuary (mainly fishing tackle, soda cans); habitat preferences of bottom fish; and successional stages of invertebrate colonization.

There has been a lot of interest in site expansion in northeastern Florida. Reasons for expansion include right whale calving grounds, shipwrecks, state archaeological reserves; and a number of threats in the area to whales and shipwrecks. Also, some have been interested in expanding or creating a sanctuary to include the SAFMC Deepwater Area of Habitat of Particular Concern. President Bush actually considered deep coral conservation off GA and adjacent states. (SAFMC supports the idea but doesn't like the idea of monuments would prefer sanctuary. FMC doesn't support it without additional public process.) Other challenges include reaching the community – we use our sanctuary advisory council, education groups, film festival, exhibits in museums/aquariums, etc. A lot of people don't go to Gray's Reef but do come to Savannah so we are trying to increase GR outreach by possibly establishing a NOAA facility of GRNMS exhibits.

Billy Casey noted that GR has staff of 8-9 people (with one loaner from the Region). GR is a prime research site, and George has a lot of research/fish experience. Site-based pictures brought to the forefront via sanctuaries and George has been setting the stage for Carolina Bight region.

Discussion Bulleted Below:

- What is the research area and community sentiment about the research area?
- There is general support for it because of the long scoping process (30,000 alternatives as to where it could go – scaled down to 6 scenarios and decided largely by public input because everyone wanted something easy to enforce). Only 3 individuals attended the public meetings, plus council members.
- Why was the area selected low in fishing?

- Concerned that the fishing levels were already low in the area selected for the research area but should be possible to compare from inside/outside closed area (aerial comparison and over time). Why? Fishermen behavior – the location of the data buoy and fishing for pelagic species; bottom fishermen are more evenly dispersed. Highest ledges and easiest to find are in the northern area.
- Are the 70 scientific publications mentioned earlier sanctuary sponsored or researchers coming in as an opportunity?
- Both but often they come in with a grant and GR provides support.

BREAK

NOAA Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office

John C. McGovern, South Atlantic Branch Leader, Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS Southeast Regional Office

Summary of Recent Amendments to Fishery Management Plans in the South Atlantic

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 14: Amendment 14 became effective on February 12, 2009. Amendment 14 established eight Type II marine protected areas (MPAs) where fishing for and retention of snapper-grouper species would be prohibited (as would the use of shark bottom longlines) but trolling for pelagic species such as tuna, dolphin, and billfish would be allowed. The intent is to achieve a more natural sex ratio, age, and size structure within the proposed MPAs, while minimizing adverse social and economic effects.

Comprehensive Ecosystem Based Amendment 1 (CE-BA 1): CE-BA 1 was implemented on July 22, 2010. Actions in CE-BA 1 include: Establishment of deepwater coral habitat of particular concern to protect what is believed to be the largest distribution (>23,000 square miles) of pristine deepwater coral ecosystems in the world (Figure 1). The CE-BA 1 created allowable gear areas for the golden crab fishery and shrimp fishery access areas for the deepwater shrimp fishery. The establishment of these areas allow for the continuation of these fisheries in their historical fishing grounds with little or no negative impacts to protected deepwater coral habitat.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 16: Amendment 16 was implemented on July 29, 2009, and established a: January-April spawning season closure for gag and shallow water groupers; quota for gag that shuts down shallow water groupers when quota is met; reduction of 5 grouper aggregate to 3 fish per person per day; reduction of 2 gag or black grouper combined to 1 gag or black grouper combined; reduction in vermilion snapper quota; November-March recreational closure for vermilion snapper; and a reduction in vermilion snapper bag limit from 10 to 5 fish per person per day.

Summary of Annual Catch Limit (ACLs) Amendments in the South Atlantic

Revisions to the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act in 2006 required that by 2010, Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) for fisheries determined by the Secretary to be subject to overfishing establish a mechanism for specifying annual catch limits (ACLs) at a level that prevents

overfishing and does not exceed the recommendations of the respective Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) or other established peer review processes. These FMPs also established, within this timeframe, measures to ensure accountability. By 2011, FMPs for all other fisheries, except fisheries for species with annual life cycles, must meet these requirements. Amendments 17A (SAFMC 2010a) and 17B (SAFMC 2010b) specified ACLs for species subject to overfishing. The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council is addressing ACLs for the remaining species in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 2 (CE-BA 2), Spiny Lobster Amendment 10, and Mackerel Amendment 18.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 17A: Amendment 17A was approved by NMFS in October 2010. Effective December 3, 2011, Amendment 17A continued the closure of red snapper in the South Atlantic (ACL=0) that was put in place on December 5, 2009, through an interim rule, and established a rebuilding plan for red snapper. An emergency rule was published on December 20, 2011, that delayed the effective date of the snapper-grouper area closure off Georgia and northern Florida to June 1, 2011, which was approved in Amendment 17A. The delay was due to the results of a new benchmark assessment completed after Amendment 17A was approved indicating a harvest prohibition alone was sufficient to end overfishing of red snapper.

Regulatory Amendment 10: would eliminate the area closure for snapper-grouper species approved in Amendment 17A, was developed in response to the new red snapper assessment findings and approved for Secretarial review at the December 2010 South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) meeting. Final rule published April 27, 2011.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 17B: Amendment 17B, which was implemented on January 31, 2011, includes action that: Establish annual catch limits (ACLs), annual catch targets and accountability measures for 8 species experiencing overfishing; modify management measures to limit total mortality to the ACL; and update the framework procedure for specification of total allowable catch. One of the management measures being considered would prohibit the harvest and possession of deep water snapper-grouper species (snowy grouper, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper) at depths greater than 240 feet (Figure 1). The intent is to reduce bycatch of speckled hind and warsaw grouper. Another measure in Amendment 17B includes a recreational ACL for black sea bass. Since black sea bass is overfished an accountability measure (AM) would close the recreational fishery with the ACL for black sea bass is met. The recreational ACL for black sea bass was be met, and the recreational fishery for black sea bass closed in February 2011. Black sea bass would open up again in June 2011, which is the beginning of the black sea bass fishing year.

Regulatory Amendment 11: Regulatory Amendment 11 was requested by the South Atlantic Council in December 2010 in response to the deepwater snapper-grouper closure approved in Amendment 17B. The request was made in response to industry input suggesting the closed area could be further reduced in size to minimize the negative economic and social effects on fishery entities without compromising conservation objectives for speckled hind and warsaw grouper. The South Atlantic Council reviewed options for Regulatory Amendment 11 at their March 2011 meeting.

Comprehensive ACL Amendment: The Comprehensive ACL Amendment is being developed to specify ACLs and AMs for species in the FMPs for Snapper-Grouper, Dolphin-Wahoo, *Sargassum*, and Golden Crab that are not undergoing overfishing. The Comprehensive ACL Amendment would also remove some species from South Atlantic snapper-grouper fishery management unit, consider multi-species groupings, establish ABC control rules, specify allocations among the commercial, recreational, and for-hire sectors for species not undergoing overfishing, and modify management measures to limit total mortality to the ACL. The document went out for public hearings in January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council reviewed actions and alternatives at their March 2011 meeting. The South Atlantic Council's SSC developed new ABC control rules at their April 2011 meeting. A new version of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment will be reviewed by the South Atlantic Council in June 2011, which contains the updated ABC control rule and associated analysis. The South Atlantic Council is scheduled to approve the Comprehensive ACL Amendment for review by the Secretary of Commerce in September 2011 and a final rule is expected to be published before the end of 2011.

Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 2 (CE-BA 2): CE-BA 2 contains actions to establish ACLs and AMs for octocorals, transfer management of octocorals to the state of Florida, modify regulations in special management zones, and amend FMPs to designate new essential fish habitat-habitat areas of particular concern. The document went out for public hearings in January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council is scheduled to approve CE-BA 2 for review by the Secretary at their June 2011 meeting.

Spiny Lobster Amendment 10: Spiny Lobster Amendment 10 is being developed by the South Atlantic Council and the Gulf Council to establish ACLs and AMs as well as management actions for spiny lobster including tailing permits, the use of undersized lobster as an attractant, and gear markings on trap lines. The Council could approve Spiny Lobster 10 for review by the Secretary of Commerce at their June 2011 meeting.

Mackerel Amendment 10: Mackerel Amendment 10 is being developed by the South Atlantic Council and the Gulf Council to establish ACLs and AMs for species in the FMP for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. The Council could approve Mackerel Amendment 10 for review by the Secretary of Commerce at their September 2011 meeting.

Upcoming Actions in the South Atlantic

Regulatory Amendment 9: Regulatory Amendment 9 considers trip limits for black sea bass, vermilion snapper, gag, and greater amberjack. Regulatory Amendment 9 also includes alternatives that could reduce the recreational bag limit, change the fishing year, and establish a spawning season closure for black sea bass. The document went out for public hearings in January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council approved Regulatory Amendment 9 for review by the Secretary at their March 2011 meeting. The intent of Regulatory Amendment 9 is to ease derby-like effects that are occurring in snapper-grouper fisheries.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 18A: Amendment 18A is being developed to: Change the golden tilefish fishing year; limit effort in the black sea bass pot and golden tilefish fisheries; and

improve data reporting. The South Atlantic Council approved Amendment 18A for public hearings at their September 2010 meeting. The South Atlantic Council will review actions and alternatives in Amendment 18A at their June 2011 meeting.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 20: Amendment 20 is being developed to bring the wreckfish individual transferable quota system into compliance with the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The South Atlantic Council reviewed an options paper at their June 2010 and an early draft of Amendment 20 at their September 2010 meeting. The South Atlantic Council will review an updated draft of Amendment 20 at their June 2011 meeting.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 21: Amendment 21 considers catch shares for species in the snapper-grouper FMP. Scoping was conducted for Amendment 21 during January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council voted to postpone development of Amendment 21 at their March 2011 meeting.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 22: Amendment 22 could consider a number of different management measures for red snapper as the stock rebuilds including but not limited to: Catch shares, endorsements, bag limits, size limits, fish tags, spawning season closures, special management zones, and gear restrictions. Scoping of Amendment 22 was conducted during January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council will review an options paper at their September 2011 meeting.

Snapper-Grouper Amendment 24: Amendment 24 considers a rebuilding plan for red grouper, which is overfished and undergoing overfishing. Scoping was conducted for Amendment 24 during January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council reviewed the scoping document at their March 2011 meeting. The South Atlantic Council will review an updated draft of Amendment 24 at their June 2011 meeting.

Golden Crab Amendment 5: Amendment 5 considers catch shares for golden crab. Scoping was conducted during January and February 2011. The South Atlantic Council reviewed the scoping document at their March 2011 meeting. The South Atlantic Council will review an updated draft of Golden Crab 5 at their June 2011 meeting.

Summaries, FAQs, and links to all amendments are available on the Web at <http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/>.

New Sites Discussion

John Armor, ONMS Conservation Policy and Planning Division Chief

John reviewed some statistics of how many protected areas had been established over the last approximately ten years, following up on some remarks Dan made during the “State of the ONMS” session. For example, California established 42 protected areas, the National Park Service added 34 units to its system, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service added nearly 30 to its system; many of these have marine components. Some of these areas are probably tiny, he said,

but the take home message is about what these other agencies are doing and what the sanctuary program has not been able to do. He said that ONMS had not even initiated a new NMS designation since 1995, except that we had been working on sanctuary designation for Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, but this was cut short when it was designated a Marine National Monument by President George Bush.

In that same time period, there has been a lot of interest in expanding existing sanctuaries and in new sanctuaries. He provided a list of community-based proposals for new and expanded National Marine Sanctuaries, noting they have been proposed by a number of different parties. In some cases, people at the SAC Summit have been promoting these sites and the value of sanctuaries.

The sites on the list were: Lake Michigan Shipwrecks (Wisconsin), Thunder Bay (Michigan) site expansion, East Coast Canyons (Northeastern U.S.), Mallow's Bay (Maryland), Cape Hatteras (North Carolina), Northeastern Florida (Florida), Blake Plateau (Southeastern U.S.), Flower Garden Banks (Gulf of Mexico) site expansion, Mosquito Bay (Puerto Rico), Bering Strait and Unimak Pass (Alaska), Oregon Coast (Oregon), Klamath River (California), Cape Mendocino (California), Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank (California) site expansion, Santa Lucia Bank (location not listed), Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (the Commonwealth), and Rose Atoll/Fagatele Bay (American Samoa) site expansion.

John provided context about the proposals. Just a few example are that three bills have been introduced into successive Congresses to expand Thunder Bay that have not passed; nine new reefs and banks have been proposed to be added to Flower Garden Banks, which has been supported by that site's SAC; five years ago the Governor of Oregon proposed the entire area off the state's coast be a National Marine Sanctuary; and some folks in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are pushing for a sanctuary as some of their needs are not being met by a monument.

In another Summit session on Wednesday, John stated he wanted to talk about the roles sanctuary advisory councils play in designation of new sanctuaries and how that can be fostered.

Dan said that John had been modest in describing "talk about a sanctuary" in various areas. He said, for example at Gray's Reef, it is an organized group of citizens which are propagating and acting on the effort. Some of these efforts have led to draft legislation, and almost all have resulted in correspondence into the system, he said. It is about a campaign, motivating those people to stay motivated, and determining how existing communities help them.

Dan added that an area far away from a community does not add to community enrichment – nobody is listening, except a small group of nongovernmental organizations, he felt. Need to think about areas close to where people live and care about. He asked, "Do you stay within your neighborhoods, or do you make time when people come to talk to you?"

There was a brief discussion. Richard Charter made the point that campaigns can vary, and that initially, the Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary was promoted by one guy with a car and a 35 mm slideshow who showed it to various individuals and people until the sanctuary became a

reality. He also said there had to be a threat to the site, and that the more imminent and tangible it is, the more likely this will attract public attention. In the case of the Florida Keys, ships were grounding on the reef. Richard felt the threat was back this year, as the House picks up a bill on sacrifice areas for oil drilling. He was glad to hear about ONMS efforts to open up Site Evaluation List again.

Bill Douros said that it was problem on a lot of council chairs' minds about not having enough money to go around to sanctuaries now, and if some new sites were added, how ONMS would have the money to support those. He said John had some financial analysis on this, which showed in times past when sites were added, the small budget went up. He asked John to present it to the group on Thursday.

America's Underwater Museums: Connecting Americans to the Amazing History Found in National Marine Sanctuaries

James P. Delgado, ONMS Maritime Heritage Program Director

The sanctuary system is probably the greatest maritime museum the nation can have: the great museum beneath the sea. Over the last decade we have made impressive discoveries. Shipwrecks with powerful human stories are compelling and provide an opportunity to link people back to the ocean. In large part we've been on a quest to find ancient ships around the world. In America, ships are not as old. The earliest are in Pensacola Bay. These connect us back to the point of cultural contact in our country. At GFNMS the [San Agustin](#) wrecked. Here we have the oldest wreck on the west coast. The cargo was gathered by Native Americans. They made beads and arrowheads. This speaks powerfully not just to the wreck, but to how people interacted with it.

So many direct human connections come from stories of sailors lost. Many FKNMS wrecks, from Spain, carry treasures (1622-1715, 1733). This has been the subject of many people's dreams (salvagers). These provide stories of survivors, of slaves that dove for treasure, of those that didn't survive. In the Great Lakes, the *HMS Ontario* is perfectly preserved from 1780, a mighty British warship. This is the stuff of novels and movies, and it's real and tangible and there for us. These types of ghost ships are time capsules. What can we learn about the people of these ships, what are their stories? NOAA just this year announced the discovery of a whaling ship off the French Frigate Shoals. This is significant for the story of the captain George Pollard of the *Essex* and the struggle to survive for him and his crew. This inspired Melville to write *Moby Dick*. The power of this story is strong. This is the only tangible physical link we have to this incredible story. The Gold Rush was a maritime event. The rush by sea built up California to statehood. Gold flowed out by steam ships. Many of these were lost. The *Winfield Scott* was lost when it struck Anacapa Island on a foggy morning. Survivors spent long days camped until rescued. The remains are still there and have been mapped. More important is the stories told from the artifacts themselves.

We have studied the story of the USS *Monitor* very closely and rescued portions of it, like the turret. But more significantly is what came out of the turret – two of the men of the 16 crew lost in 1862. It is the people we study that give us insights, not just the things. We get a sense for

what it was like, what the sailors had to endure, and what it might have been like. This again links people back to ships and the ocean, understanding these wrecks as repositories of American history. The civil war has many such stories. *Hunley* was the first submarine to sink another ship. This craft defied the expectations of historians. The technology of this craft was truly impressive. When you see *Hunley* you see how brave the men had to be and how smart they were. George Dixon's lucky charm was found aboard the sub – a powerful personal artifact.

TBNMS has over a hundred known wrecks (from the 1840s to modern day) that have been preserved perfectly by the cold fresh water. The *Defiance* was important for the commerce it supported, connecting Canada and US. It, like others, was a floating community of people who lived on board. The *Goldenhorn* at CINMS carried all sorts of goods and commodities, like grain and cobblestones. Stories of her crew are part of this wreck and our work to interpret it. The *Titanic*, perhaps the most famous, was the greatest maritime disaster of the 20th century – 1507 souls lost (1912). The discovery was a link to these losses. 3D map of the ship, and a visit to the site in 2000, led Delgado to learn so much more. The tragic rescue attempt stories are poignant and powerful in the ongoing dialog of whom we are and why people strive to come to America. There's nothing like the flying aircraft carrier, the *Macon*, in MBNMS. Next month MNMS will head out to study more wrecks from the graveyard of the Atlantic. The wrecks of the Battle of the Atlantic hold the bodies of soldiers exactly where they died. This is all powerful stuff that connects to living people, especially those whose ancestors were aboard.

Maritime Heritage within ONMS is taking a new step now to focus on the maritime cultural landscape. This includes the life saving stations, the historic charts, shipping lanes, fishing grounds, place names, channel markers, lists of names, etc. We will do this for all sanctuaries. We will also participate in taking a look at prehistoric evidence of civilization. This is powerful stuff that rewrites the history books. The sea has never been a barrier, but a highway. We still fish and interact with the oceans in many ways. Native peoples are still there on the water (Hawaiians, Chumash, many others). These people are not dead – they live on and have much to teach the rest of us. Maritime Heritage provides another link to the ocean that can get people to connect and care. Human stories of the sea are one way to hook them. Maritime Heritage can do this – it reminds us of the stories of people connected to these wrecks. It's an American story, a human story, and a powerful story.

Discussion Bulleted Below:

- Great talk. How can we do that in our sanctuary communities?
- We have visitors center and bringing in the people connected to these human stories is a great way to energize this. Bit by bit, getting people who care about their family history and other people, start spreading the word about experiencing these stories.

Sentinel Sites: Monitoring Change in our National Marine Sanctuaries

Greg McFall, GRNMS Deputy Superintendent and Research Coordinator

Greg McFall opened the presentation by mentioning how marine ecosystems around the world are in peril and how, with some drivers of change now operating at global scales, national marine sanctuaries need to redouble efforts to ensure we are doing our part to protect the ecosystems and

resources of these national treasures. He said that if we do our job well, we can use what we learn in sanctuaries to help protect other ocean places as well. For natural resources, it's all about ecosystem integrity. We define this as "a condition that enables ecosystems to support and maintain a community of organisms that works together and adapts to changing conditions in ways that are determined by the ecosystem's natural evolutionary history." Effective management requires constant tracking of ecosystem condition, as well as early detection of changes, giving us a chance to respond to and moderate human impacts.

Greg's presentation was designed to describe a *Sentinel Monitoring Program* for national marine sanctuaries that would provide a framework for organizing current monitoring efforts and building future capacity to track both ecosystem integrity and early warning indicators. The word "sentinel" is used to describe a new way of looking at environmental monitoring in the National Marine Sanctuary System. A "sentinel" keeps guard and protects a place. It reflects the principal reason we have monitoring in sanctuaries, and we're proposing to build the entire monitoring framework around it.

Greg explained the sentinel monitoring concept; showed some hypothetical examples; talked about ways to implement the concept, as well as some initial and longer-term efforts that would need to happen; and then discussed a few challenges and opportunities that need to be considered. He was interested in getting feedback from the council chairs/representatives so that they can improve their plans and ultimately any implementation efforts.

The three main points he said that they wanted everyone to get from this presentation were: (1) **Sentinel sites** are intensely studied and monitored areas within marine sanctuaries. (2) **Sentinel monitoring** informs management by increasing understanding of ecosystems and by providing early warnings of ecosystem change. (3) The **sentinel program** attracts and supports collaboration and advances sanctuary science.

Sentinel monitoring is the general term used to describe the approach of making observations to track environmental status and trends as they relate to ecosystem condition. Sentinel sites are areas within the sanctuaries in which these observations are made and in which the most intensive monitoring and other studies are conducted. Greg then provided a series of examples regarding sentinel sites, including an example of a single sentinel site within a single sanctuary, a network of sentinel sites, a regional network of sentinel sites, and a national network of sentinel sites and monitoring activities.

Greg mentioned that some issues are big enough that they apply to all marine sanctuaries and that biodiversity conservation is one of those issues. It's something we care about in a fundamental way, albeit in different ways for different sanctuaries, but generally speaking as the foundation of ecological integrity. Nationally, it is one way we can assess our success in meeting our program responsibilities to maintain or improve living resource quality in the marine sanctuary system.

Sentinel monitoring and networks in marine sanctuaries can also be included in larger networks, even those operated by other programs, in order to adequately populate an area with measurements to address particular issues of interest. Two hypothetical regional sentinel site

networks, one for ocean acidification and another for sea level change, were presented. Although they would require different sampling regimes, both included sentinel stations in sanctuaries in the region.

A sentinel program does more than just establish places to observe and monitor. One of NOAA's foundational principles is to connect science, service, and stewardship. Sentinel sites start with regular observing, but are places where observations lead to greater understanding that allows us to predict the consequences of different phenomena, transfer that data and information to managers in sanctuaries and elsewhere, and apply that knowledge to decision-making. These are a few of the reasons that ONMS feels this effort strengthens the program. If sentinel sites bring the attention ONMS hopes they will, and focus it in these intensely studied places, sanctuaries will be able to gain a much fuller understanding of ecosystems and how they work, what controls them, and what managers can do to ensure long term integrity. A very important outcome could be increasing the involvement of communities around marine sanctuaries, as well as bringing the science of marine sanctuaries to the classrooms, potentially all over the country.

Sentinel sites, and networks of sentinel sites, will help us understand and respond to issues related to many aspects of ecosystem integrity. There are several components of climate change that we need to track and understand far better than we do, including ocean acidification and temperature stress. We also need to understand how changing pollutant loads and primary production alter ecosystem food webs, how habitat changes affect species diversity, how changes in diversity itself, or invasive species, or keystone species affect the ability of ecosystems to resist change, and more and more, understand how changing patterns of noise in the ocean affect species that vocalize to communicate. In addition, we expect there will be numerous opportunities to apply the concept to the marine sanctuaries that protect maritime heritage resources. Examples might include tracking the impacts of ocean acidification or invasive species on deterioration rates or shipwrecks or other artifacts. Other examples provided were specific to Gulf of the Farallones, Florida Keys, Gray's Reef, Monterey Bay, and Olympic Coast.

Greg mentioned that in order to build a sentinel program in the National Marine Sanctuary System, we need to identify locations that have ecological attributes that make them suitable and valuable for long-term observations. Appropriate questions about ecosystem status, resource qualities, and issues of concern need to be formulated and used to build monitoring plans. We'd then assess whether existing capabilities can serve the observing needs or whether new ones need to be implemented. Data management needs and information flow to management also need to be determined, as well as ensuring long term operations and maintenance. And complementary research should consistently be facilitated to supplement the information being gathered.

These are a few criteria that can be used to select appropriate sentinel sites. Ecological significance is most important, but the locations also need to be practical, in that they have existing capabilities or data, and are relevant to the management issues sanctuaries care about. More specific decisions at the local level need to take into consideration specific concerns, minimizing impacts to users to the extent possible, the nature of the resources themselves, appropriate size and shape, and probably a number of other operational questions.

All sanctuaries already have some capabilities in place to support sentinel sites. Many have research and monitoring, science staff, facilities, research partners who are already involved in coordinated activities, some infrastructure, and the ability to track and to an extent control research activities. And sanctuaries are places where NOAA has primary protection responsibility, where scientists can see the application of knowledge gained through their work. This all should add up to both an ability to facilitate sentinel monitoring and incentivize partnerships.

These are some activities that ONMS believes will move this from concept to reality. We've already conducted an inventory of monitoring activity in the sanctuaries. The rest of the steps involve site selection, building the web presence - a critical step that will make sentinel sites real to the rest of the world - working with some key partners on activities that may be or may soon be underway (such as an NOS effort to develop sea level change sentinel sites, and ocean acidification studies), and as resources become available, promoting use of our sentinel sites, filling gaps to address unmet monitoring needs, and supporting sentinel monitoring that extends beyond sanctuary boundaries, including that of other programs.

The sentinel website needs capabilities that support users, whether sanctuary staff, research partners, or educators using sanctuary information. Initially, the basic components will include program information, maps of places and infrastructure, information about ongoing monitoring, and basic search capabilities. In the future, we hope to provide direct access to data and links to other programs, support the preparation of reports using sentinel site data, and allow interactivity to support education and training.

The hope is to eventually enhance education about science and resource management by making sentinel sites information accessible to educators and students in formal settings like schools and a variety of informal settings. Data and information would also be useful to people interested in working in sanctuaries as volunteers.

The question of standardization always comes up when you talk about system-wide approaches to monitoring. It was mentioned that it would be nice if it were possible to use the same instruments, indicators, and methods in all sanctuaries, but it's not. Greg said that you want consistency only where it makes scientific sense or increases efficiency. What's more important is that sanctuaries are doing whatever it takes to best address their priority concerns. These types of priorities can be found in a science needs assessment that ONMS completed in 2010. But, on the other hand, there is a certain level of comparability that is needed between sanctuaries. Therefore, ONMS aims to ask the same *high level* questions of all sanctuaries. You can find these questions in any of the condition reports. Among other things, they ask about ecosystem-related indicators of biodiversity, keystone species, water quality stressors, and human activities that could affect these things. Each sanctuary answers the questions using the results of their own, site-tailored monitoring efforts. Lastly, some feel that ONMS may be sending a mixed message by inviting research at sentinel sites, then applying restrictions through our permitting process. What ONMS can say on this is that you'll certainly need to be clear that all the criteria for conducting research in marine sanctuaries still apply. You can't compromise on that. At the same time, ONMS wants to facilitate access, where it makes sense, so as to attract partners who conduct high quality, relevant science.

Over the next couple years, ONMS efforts on sentinel sites will be better characterized by the words “repackaging” and “marketing” than “new investment.” ONMS considers it a priority to build a framework for the future by putting sanctuary monitoring and research on ecosystem integrity and early warning under a single umbrella, and putting a spotlight on it through basic infrastructure, like the website, for example. As time goes on, ONMS expects that the attraction of these places will help leverage resources and fill observing and science gaps with funding, investments by partners, and citizen and volunteer participation. The initial investment will be in the form of time needed to identify sentinel sites, accumulating existing information, and building the web capability that will make this program accessible to the science and resource management communities, educators, and others.

There is much to be gained by building strategic partnerships inside and outside NOAA in support of the sentinel monitoring program. ONMS will benefit, but it will also support programs operating at different scales and for different purposes. It will give ONMS access to resources that help us acquire data, engage others to the point where they become part of our program, and ultimately extend the purpose of sentinel monitoring beyond our original vision.

This brings us back to three of the key messages of this presentation. These messages describe what sentinel sites are, how they can be used to provide managers with essential information that will help them make and support their decisions, and how they can attract others to help ONMS protect the special places that marine sanctuaries are.

One reason ONMS wanted to present this to the council chairs/representatives early on is because they are well positioned as program advisors to help ONMS build this idea through their recommendations, partnerships, and support. Greg said that ONMS would like to hear the reactions of the council chairs/ reps to the sentinel site concept. He offered a few questions that the chairs/ reps could consider, but said that all should feel free to offer other comments or concerns.

Discussion Bulleted Below:

- There was concern voiced about implementing the sentinel sites concept in tight budgets and that current long-term monitoring programs were being ended due to lack of funding.
- Dan Basta noted that every council passed a resolution on Ocean Acidification (an unprecedented action), but that it has not resulted in anything since – that detecting change in OA is lost in the science sphere. Sentinel sites is a concept we have had for a decade and it is coming back around. Issues that are important to people today are based on real questions & real interest. We are seeing real interest now because people are seeing changes. Sentinel sites offer opportunity to tell our story; we have authority and access to geographical areas. Sentinel sites are places that people in the communities can use to articulate change. How do we do that without resources? We can take a different approach. We are going to designate places in our sanctuaries for the purpose of long term measurement for the interpretation of change. Sanctuaries are to protect and project knowledge and understanding. We have the resources to take measurements and integrate them to tell a story about change in North America.

- We probably have the longest coral reef monitoring program. This program will disappear due to funding cuts in EPA. We have no control over diminishing budgets. Where is our ability to provide sentinel sites in this concept?
- I see the Keys as a sentinel site. This is the frustration we have. We talk about all of these ocean systems but the ongoing projects are being forgotten. We have patched money together to keep a program going and now it is going by the wayside because we can't keep the funding and that is a shame. The more we build each sanctuary as a sentinel site hopefully we will begin attracting the investment. We need to clearly articulate why our sites are sentinel sites -- because they are receiving the best management in unique areas.
- These IOOS groups are only going to make investments in sanctuaries if it fits them.
- Does every site have specific things that they will be looking at? Do we have that understanding of the system?
- No we don't have that information on the invertebrates at our site. We know that there are PCBs, etc. that are very persistent in the environment.
- At Stellwagen recently UNEP came to look at trans-boundary and migratory species and they realized that they couldn't do it without NOAA's help. I think there will be increasing collaboration as there are matches.
- IOOS has had a soft start since they were formed and a lot of the money hasn't trickled down yet. When the money does come out we can tie in by promoting our sanctuaries as places for them to conduct their investigations.
- What resources do you have to protect this place and support this type of thing? Once you figure that out you can begin to build this type of thing.
- I think we can do a much better job figuring out who is working in what arena.
- We should invite the partners in and have them do the work.
- This morning we talked about communities and programs. There is a science community that brings certain things. But then there is also the education component. ONMS is a partnership network. There is a lot of synergy when you do that. I would love for these people to start coming to the sanctuary advisory council meetings and explaining what they do and why they are doing it.
- I like the structure but it sounds like a different approach than what I heard – that the sanctuaries were going to be monitoring change. Now I am hearing that others are going to be monitoring change. If it is both it is going to take staff time because we don't have any quality control.
- You want to bring others in initially to help set things up.
- I am trying to wrap my mind around what a national program is and linking that to what our program is. I don't know if I can link national goals to the on the ground stuff that my constituents want. Is the concept that it is a few parameters measured at all sites or different parameters at different sites? You should identify 1-3 key parameters that we want to know, and here are the sites which include a broad variety of habitats. If you want the program to be something, it should be a few things done very well and marketed clearly.
- I think it is both depending on where it makes sense.

- This whole point about making yourself relevant – we all just signed off on ocean acidification. OA should be monitored at all sites as a follow-up to what the all councils started. Take the initiative and do not wait until others come in. I think that a couple of other issues like this will put the sanctuary on the map for things that the communities themselves have all signed off on.
- We are already marketing OA as something we should do. But there is also the idea that we want to be coalescing in that space or place. We have to be nimble and adapt into what we are doing.
- Yes there are things that are going to change that haven't changed yet. What we are seeing in the different geographical areas is that change is happening first in the sponges.
- We can't monitor everything so we need to have something we can watch that we can monitor throughout the US.
- One piece that might help market this idea is improving the handling of existing data. If we have data you are more attractive to other scientists. Increasing the presentation and availability of existing data will help us become sentinel sites. Olympic Coast council wrote a letter awhile back about regarding data. (There was a request to Becky Holyoke from council coordinators for this letter.)
- That is the purpose of the web portal to make this data available. Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory (PMEL) could provide instruments wherever buoys exist and are able to communicate data. It is initial investment that is needed.
- A challenge for the buoy platform is how to get information back to shore from the buoy – there are power and bandwidth issues. National Data Buoy Center (NDBC) could potentially build a sanctuary buoy that could be standardized.
- Has there been a canvassing to find out what buoys are available?
- Yes, but the issue is power and bandwidth to get that information back to where it needs to go. The same thing that you brought to light I would turn that back around to you and say have that conversation with your councils. I think we could spend all day trying to figure out what those things should be.
- Does NOAA have a Science Coordinator?
- NOAA has not had a Chief Scientist in a long time. Someone just got confirmed last week.
- I'm looking for action items to take back to my council. I could ask them on a national level, "What are the three issues they think are most critical for monitoring?"
- Yes, that would be useful. Take this back to your councils and ask what the top 3 parameters should be. Help us figure out what that should be. On a national and global level -- what are parameters are most important to track for 14 sites?
- We are wasting our time discussing this rather than trying to find solutions. We have limited time and funds and must focus our priorities. We have 20 years of monitoring data that is going away and I don't see where else we are going to get that money. Our number one issue is zoning and this doesn't even make the list. I understand and appreciate where you are trying to go but, at this time, we need to focus on our priorities. We can't pay for the programs we have. Show me the money.

- This is the type of argument I hear all the time and it doesn't motivate anyone because there is no money.
- Would this process finish the same course as ocean acidification or are funds going to be reallocated to do this? Pushing this upstairs doesn't mean anything, because they are cutting funds not adding.
- We already are allocating funds to this. We are all in this because we are all passionate about this. We did not choose to create a collapsed economy. That just happens to be the conditions while we are on watch. Where we have difficulties is that we are all upset that it is not working well enough. I have been in this field for 40 years and it is not looking good. Our successes are ephemeral. In Chesapeake Bay more money is being spent than anywhere.
- Would you be more specific about your theory of political change?
- The types of changes that we talk about are long term changes. You cannot expect that investments that you make in the near term will have dramatic effects on the way this system will operate. We affect systems very rapidly. We trash places quickly. However, our science has continued to work in the same way it always has. Decision making has become a complex anachronistic process.
- One of the things that we probably should have mentioned is that there are probably 30 or 40 topics that we could have planned to talk about. The ones that we have chosen are things that, in our estimation, were important to talk to the chairs about; it doesn't mean that the council chairs have to endorse and embrace one or all of these issues. If this is not the issue then we will continue to work on it and talk about it. We are trying to stand out and be relevant. We are sharing issues with you that we think are important because we are struggling with the same things that you are. We see these new management plans and there aren't nearly enough resources to go around and do everything. I think it is important to note that OA took a little more life on the west coast. There is now a report that has been written that included members of the advisory councils. There may be something there to look at as a way to take a broad issue and bring it to the local level.
- At this point, we are not asking for a decision. We are just letting you know that this is being developed.
- I find it impossible to believe that there is not a parameter that is being measured at all 14 sites. Has a synthesis been done to outline the similarities in programs that you could already take? Are we trying to prove man is the cause of climate change or are we trying to monitor for adaptability?
- We do have a lot of data, and there is a background for change detection. We are forming the pieces and deciding how to sell this game within NOAA. It is about how we can bring attention to our sites.
- To whom do you have to sell this?
- Examples include NOS, NCCOS, etc. NOS likes sure-line changes (e.,g., sea level rise).
- Should we go to our councils and ask for recommendations for top issues or a resolution?

- For now, I would suggest that you ask for recommendations for top issues that require national consideration.
- Are we hearing that this is a programmatic decision to focus on sentinel sites, and that we are committed to following through with what is needed to make it happen (like consistent vessel support)? No question that we have “the places”. Now, we need to get our science group to wrap themselves around this and own it.

BREAK

Advancing Sanctuary Priorities through Federal Policy: The Work of the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation

Jason Patlis, President and CEO

Jay Elliott Berman, Government Relations Manager

The NMSF identified four themes: (1) The strength of ONMS is consistency and the fact that it attracts the best and brightest in marine community; (2) The importance of keystone species stands out -- ONMS is also keystone program for NOAA policy; (3) BUDGET is a priority; and (4) Projecting- NMSF supports what ONMS does.

Jason then provided a brief overview of the foundation’s program priorities: (1) Policy and advocacy and connecting with policymakers; (2) Public awareness and outreach- connecting with the public. For example, they have raised 2.7 million dollars so far for the Santa Cruz Exploration Center. Telepresence for Oceans Live and Aquarius mission is another example; (3) Education- connecting with students and teachers. Oceans for Life- hard cash has been raised externally by NMSF. It is not a NOAA priority, so the program survives only by virtue of the NMSF working it; (3) Research and Conservation- NMSF has worked with the Department of Justice connecting scientists, academics and NGOs. A good example of this is in the Antarctic resource restoration work; (4) Fiscal Agency- support meetings, events, etc – like this SAC Summit. The foundation also supports Capitol Hill Ocean Week, Leadership Awards Dinner (recognition of ocean champions and volunteers), and the Ernest F Hollings Ocean Awareness Trust Fund; (5) Friends Groups – 7 (almost 8) of 14 sites have friends groups. NMSF now coordinates standing conference calls, policy engagement and communications, and is seeking ways to financially support friends groups; and (6) Ocean Acidification (OA) - Support of Sanctuary Advisory Council Resolutions on OA. NMSF circulated these resolutions to Congress, and other foundations, agencies, and NGOs. NMSF connected with NRC and ONMS on a new OA report and recommendations and has addressed OA at CHOW. The NMSF is working with a new foundation interested in funding OA awareness. For example, there was a recent grant from the Moore Foundation to research public funding for OA and the NMSF awarded a Hollings Grant for OA- developing a public service announcement in concert with Channel Islands NMS.

Jeb Berman highlighted Capitol Hill Ocean Week (CHOW). 2010 CHOW was a big success. This year, global security and prosperity is the theme. The politics in 2011 is “people”!! To

encourage favorable public attitudes towards sanctuaries, we must build organizational relationships, coordinate campaigns and participate in the political process.

Priorities include: maintain money for FY 11 and FY 12; increase FY 13 money; enlarge, expand and strengthen NMSS; expansion bills; key elements of a stronger sanctuary system (funding, authority over monuments, removal of the limitation on the designation of new sites); sanctuary education (briefings and report series); legislation directly affecting sanctuaries and CHOW. The two main tactics to approach these priorities include working on building trust among user groups, friends, SACs and non profits and educating and advocating (letters, meetings, briefings, public comment)

The session ended with discussion on: coordination between friends groups/councils/NMSF; how effective the Foundation perceives itself to be; and clarification on lobbying restrictions on councils and how that differs from the individual and friends groups.

Savannah Ocean Exchange (SAVOX)

M. Cort H. Atkinson, SAVOX Co-Founder and CEO

Cathy J. Sakas, Gray's Reef NMS Education Coordinator

SAVOX is about creating a worldwide hub for today's solution creators. Each year a new theme is selected. 2011 Theme: *Shaping the Future of Our Coasts*. We share solutions inspiring action to drive sustainable change; improve ecological, economic, and global connectivity; while respecting and celebrating the unique cultural sense of place of coastal communities. Who we are: Savannah - The host city where Ocean, land and rivers meet. Ocean - The main driver of the world's economies, ecosystems and health. Exchange - the multidisciplinary sharing of solutions and learned insights. What we do: solutions - showcasing solutions and their creators - the true heroes of tomorrow. Inspiring - creating immediate measurable impact across multiple needs. Action - building networks to accelerate the worldwide adoption of Solutions. Our Leadership has first-hand experience in the creation, identification and application of cutting edge, sustainable practices in their organizations. On February 1, 2011, SAVOX issued a global call for the submission of Solutions Inspiring Action that will shape the future of our coasts. These submissions are the best global solutions that will drive sustainable change; improve ecological, economic, and global connectivity; and respect the unique cultural sense of place of coastal communities. SAVOX is forming a new global call for action.

Our board of 27 thought-leaders from around the globe represents diverse backgrounds. Each board member is inviting ten individuals from their global networks to Savannah, Georgia in September 2011 to help form a new global network of relationship leaders. Dr. Nancy Knowlton, Sant Chair of Marine Science with the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of Natural History, will assemble a global team of experts to review the Solution Inspiring Action submissions. The top solutions will be shared at the Solutions Exchange in Savannah. Forming a new showcase of today's tools that will shape tomorrow. Our new global network of 300 will work informally to accelerate the introduction and adoption of Solutions Inspiring Action, forming a new global solutions supply-chain.

Our four public exchanges allow the general public to experience the wonder, joy and unique quality of life available in coastal communities - through culture & cuisine; presentations & performances; events & excursions; and vessels & viewings. SAVOX is forming a new cultural experience engaging individuals with our coasts and ocean.

Culture & Cuisine Exchange: events that celebrate the lifestyles of people from coastal communities around the globe and their connection to our ocean—through food, behaviors, traditions, beliefs, values, art objects and symbols that are passed along by communication and imitation from one generation to the next.

Presentations & Performances Exchange: presents new discoveries and thought provoking perspectives that will impact the future of our coasts. The works of artists inspired by our coastal regions' relationship with our ocean (Film, literature, history, science, music, drama, magic, spoken word, dance...) are explored.

Events & Excursions Exchange: offers water activities (sports, tours and competitions) unique to coastal communities around the globe. Programs represent historical, current and future ways people connect physically with water (in, under and on) to immerse themselves in our waterways and coastal shores.

Vessels & Viewings Exchange: showcases ships and exhibits from around the globe celebrating and educating audiences on the important and diverse role all maritime industries have in creating coastal prosperity and protecting our coasts. Providing an in-depth look into the exciting new maritime technologies that are transforming today's ship building industry.

Solutions Exchange: brings together 300 international leaders from diverse fields and backgrounds to meet and learn about the top world-class solutions inspiring action. Exchange attendees provide insight and guidance to solution presenters, select the best solution to receive the \$100,000 Gulfstream Navigator Award, and work together for 12 months to advance the adoption of the solutions presented at the exchange around the globe. Working a multidisciplinary network eighty-eight internship positions cross all functions.

Our Five Exchanges: solutions, culture & cuisine, events & excursions, presentations & performances and vessels & viewings. Our core infrastructure functions: global reach and networks, investor development and relations, information, resources, marketing, public relations and education programs. Our world-class internship program - global reach and work with solutions inspiring action on cutting edge issues: new challenge, spanning eight colleges, multidisciplinary teams, build industry connections, work directly for executives, work in today's networked environment and receive individualized coaching to drive success. Our sponsors are organizations committed to: celebrating and encouraging the creators of solutions inspiring action; the positive impact created through the exchange of practices across disciplines; connecting people across concepts/cultures through our ocean; creating an action oriented continuously expanding worldwide network crossing economies and cultures to promote the adoption of sustainable solutions; and the influential power the arts, athletics, technology and information have and their ability to shape our tomorrow.

Discussion Bulleted Below:

- What is the overall budget?
- Around \$300,000.

MEETING ADJOURNS

Meeting Notes: May 3, 2011
2011 Sanctuary Advisory Council Summit

Savannah Riverwalk Project

Christian Sottile, Firm Principal, Sottile & Sottile Urban Analysis and Design

Urban Design Concept. Savannah gets 23 million visitors a year, and they are coming for an educational experience. Savannah is unique because of our squares. The riverwalk runs perpendicular to the squares and we looked at where the riverwalk and the squares meet. Everything in the historic district must be done with care. What if we went back in time to act like these markers have been here since the beginning? So we proposed six bronze markers. Walking along the waterfront you can read these markers in sequence. We surveyed carefully what was already there and surgically cut into the riverwalk to give the feeling that the markers have been there forever -- adding a forever edition to a forever city. The markers are 2 feet squares cast in bronze, a circular motif that creates a nautical reference. The markers tell the whole story in pieces, but is a timeless message. They are right at the water's edge so you can read the marker and then pan up and see the water. There are really three levels of hierarchy on each marker of text. Next time you come to Savannah you will see the markers in place as we will be casting the markers in the early summer. We are very excited about this addition to Savannah and the connection with NOAA.

Discussion Bulleted Below:

- Was there a historic maritime heritage theme? Is it limited to six?
- We have plans to put six or seven more markers on the other side of the river. On the other side of the river, however, we will be putting up actual signs (rather than bronze markers). We won't have to go through the approval process, because this side is more focused on technology and maritime history.

Introduction

George Sedberry, GRNMS Superintendent

Introduction of Frank Redmond, Field Representative for Senator Johnny Isakson (R-GA). Frank thanked us for allowing him to attend. The Senator sends his regards. Frank thinks we are doing a great thing to keep our program visible and in the eyes of the public.

Panel A:

Sustaining Our Sanctuary Communities: Opportunities for NMS Resources and Know How

Matt Brookhart, ONMS Senior Policy Advisor

Steve Kroll, TBNMS Council Diving Seat

Bruce Popham, FKNMS Council Chair

Chris Harrold, MBNMS Council Chair

Mike Murray, CINMS Deputy Superintendent of Programs

Matt Brookhart noted that this topic was tied in with the socioeconomic health of communities, which was getting a lot of attention from NOAA, others in the government, Congress and others. The idea of sustainability can take on many definitions, and it was not the job of the panel to define what it means. For the purposes of the panel we could assume community sustainability means creating and maintaining its economic and environmental health, promoting social equity, or fostering broad-based citizen participation. This is a foundation for how ONMS operates.

Steve Kroll, Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary (TBNMS) Advisory Council Diving Seat presented first, on “Protecting the Great Lakes and their Rich History through Strong Communities.” He mentioned his site is driven by the management plan, which he showed the group was concise. The management plan was originally driven by people protecting their interests from the federal government, who showed their opposition by wearing “Say No to NOAA” buttons. Steve was originally one of these people, but was invited to be on the sanctuary advisory council along with others, and they became supportive -- a lot of the interests they wanted to protect were economic.

Steve emphasized the cooperative work and partnerships to accomplish things like signage and a maritime heritage center – it is all about collaboration with the community. TBNMS is working on an expansion and this has created a sense of ownership among the three counties the sanctuary is adjacent to. Steve emphasized that all the council seats are tied to the economy except the citizen at large seats, but even then there are economic ties. He owns two businesses, one of which is a dive business. The sanctuary is used to actively recruiting new businesses to the area. An example of this is a glass bottom kayak business. People visit the sanctuary’s Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Center and hike along the maritime heritage trail along the waterfront, and there are plans to extend it farther, which invites further cooperation.

Regarding research, they work on more than just shipwrecks – there is a buoy in the sanctuary [collecting data], research is being conducted in sinkholes, and they created a reef. Projects that come to the sanctuary dump dollars into the community, and the economic impact has been huge. He concluded by showing a Pure Michigan video travel advertisement, which showcases Alpena, the Maritime Heritage Center, the shipwrecks, and the sanctuary – again, the production of the video was a collaboration.

Bruce Popham, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Advisory (FKNMS) Council Chair spoke next, on the “Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.” He described how FKNMS is co-managed with the state of Florida, and that 60 % of the sanctuary was in state water. The state Department of Environmental Protection and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) are the main state partners. “Our environment is our economy,” and noted that people come to the Keys to see the natural areas, to fish and enjoy the water. There are almost 3.3 million visitors to the Keys a year, and only 72,000 residents, he said. Another 4 million people are in two adjacent counties, and many of them come to the Keys for recreation.

Bruce reviewed the voting seats and non-voting agency representatives on the council, and described how he tries to get the alternates to every meeting, so they are kept up to speed,

engaged, and can then engage the community. He agreed with Steve's comment that every seat is an economic driver, including the citizens at large.

In 2005, the FKNMS council held a strategic planning session, and came up with strategic objectives to improve water quality, to work on ecological restoration, and to enhance education and outreach. He described how these were related to the main roles of the council, to advise sanctuary management and to communicate with the community.

The sanctuary coming to the Keys meant sewers came to the Keys, as only small portions of the Keys had sewers before, and the rest of the people were on failing septic systems. Now residents are helping to pay for the installation sewers [which is also paid for by government money], and they are 60% completed. He provided other statistics on economic benefits, which came from the studies done by Bob Leeworthy. For example, there are 2.7 million user days spent on recreational opportunities related to wildlife viewing and nature study. He also said forty thousand visitors a year visit the Eco-Discovery Center. Bruce said that the community also had a "No to NOAA" response when the sanctuary wanted to come in, due to the fear of negative economic impacts. However, just the opposite happened -- the resources support the economics. Bruce explained how he became involved with the sanctuary through Billy Causey around 2000.

Bruce noted the commercial fishing industry (lobster and stone crab as the main catch) and its economic impact. Stock Island is the third largest seafood port in the country. These industries in turn impact the marine industry, including his boatyard. He mentioned his involvement in the Clean Marina Program, and that his boatyard was the first Clean Boatyard.

Numerous FKNMS programs involve the community, including Dolphin SMART, Team O.C.E.A.N., lionfish derbies and the shipwreck trail. The mooring buoy program keeps people from impacting the reefs, but keeping the buoys there and servicing them is a challenge. Enforcement is done cooperatively among the municipalities, the county, parks, refuges, the Coast Guard, FWC and NOAA. However, only half the level of enforcement officers exist now compared to five years ago. The majority of violations are from people who live outside of the Keys.

Current and future challenges include artificial lobster habitats [used for poaching], groundings, derelict vessels, marine debris, a proposal to deep dredge Key West Harbor, global warming, coral bleaching and coral disease. Changing baselines are a problem. People who visit now and see the coral think it is beautiful, as they do not know what it used to look like 20 years ago when it was less degraded.

Another challenge are budget constraints. Council Working Groups take a lot of staff time, and pull people off of other duties, so the council decided to do the work formerly done by the Working Groups within regular council meetings. The council's priorities for the year are marine zoning, ecological restoration, and supporting the needs of the staff to keep the doors open and keep the economic engine driving. He emphasized the sanctuary is trying to keep the doors open and continue basic operation and maintenance -- new ONMS initiatives are not needed. The suggestion was made to restructure ONMS, as the FKNMS has done with its' staff/structure.

Bruce concluded with a quote council member Ken Nedimyer, who gave up a fish collecting business to do coral restoration: “Sustaining our sanctuary, I am all in; failure is not an option.”

Chris Harrold, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) Advisory Council Chair then spoke on “Sustaining Our Sanctuary Communities: Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.” Chris said that the MBNMS sustains the local economy through immediate economic benefits and longer term benefits. An example of an immediate benefits is The Blue Ocean film festival which brings a lot of income from film delegates along with hotel rooms and meals in restaurants. There are also business participation programs, such as having an in-room video of the sanctuary in hotel rooms or a looping display at the local airport. These things lead to word of mouth among visitors and people they know back home. Permitting and supporting local events are also connected, such as the Maverick’s big wave surfing competition, fireworks display, and Caltrans permits for “side casting” materials from Highway 1 slides into the sanctuary. It is about balancing environmental protection with the economy.

More important are the long term economic benefits of the sanctuary. It has benefits for current and future generations, and instills a sense of stewardship, which will lead to long term sustainability. There is one visitor center, and another is under construction. NOAA and the sanctuary also supports other types of educational efforts. Some are linked to the fishing community, such as “fishermen in the classroom” and “Voices in the Bay.” Also, hundreds of volunteers sign up for a variety of sanctuary projects.

The sanctuary’s resource protection programs are designed to help maintain a healthy ecosystem, he said. Their ecosystem-based management initiative aims to maintain and restore, recognize unique and rare areas, understand human vs. natural influences, and promote sustainable uses. One partnership promoting sustainable resource use is a study being conducted by students on a sustainable local fishery (Local Catch Monterey), which, if implemented, would be supported by cooperative fees. Such a cooperative would provide fishermen with a more stable income, and the consumer would have source of sustainable seafood. There are also long term benefits from research, and Chris noted there are over 50 research organizations, with many faculty and students, in the area. The sanctuary supplies research platforms for local research communities, has Beach COMBERS, maintains an integrated monitoring network, and holds an annual research symposium, among other activities.

Regarding challenges and shortcomings, the sanctuary still has a lot of work to still do with the fishing community. It needs to establish relationships with stakeholders before programs are launched, and needs to identify a genuine “win” for all stakeholders. To better sustain the local economy, Chris felt it would be best for the sanctuary to minimize regulations and maximize voluntary participation in win-win initiatives, and better play facilitation and outreach roles. To implement things given the current budget reality, he said the sanctuary should focus on doing a few things well and partner, partner, partner.

Mike Murray, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) Deputy Superintendent of Program, wrapped up the panel presentations, speaking on “Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Perspectives.” He described the socioeconomic setting of the community, which is influenced by tourism, marine recreation, fishing, maritime shipping, ocean

energy, Navy operations, marine protected areas, education, and marine sciences. The sanctuary was quite a ways offshore, and the Channel Islands are managed by the National Park Service (NPS). The NPS also manage the businesses (authorized concessions) that bring visitors to the sanctuary. Tourism is a big part of the economic sector year-round, and few people make it out to the islands. Whale watching, SCUBA diving, kayaking, boating and fishing are also components of marine tourism. In addition, the top state fisheries are largely based around the Channel Islands. There are about 7,000 ship transits through the sanctuary each year, with ships going to and from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The Santa Barbara Channel has oil rigs and oil leases, which surround the sanctuary. The Navy does sea testing in 80% of the sanctuary area, and has a lot of people stationed in the region. There are also marine protected areas in the area and throughout the state, many of which are newly designated through a state process. The Channel waters are well studied by scientists, and the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) is nearby.

Regarding the role of the sanctuary in sustaining the economy, there are short term and long term roles, and direct and indirect effects. He said they were in the resource protection business, and agreed with Bruce -- "The environment is our economy." Industrial development is prohibited in CINMS, which helps preserve fishing and the seafloor. CINMS has invested in zoning of marine reserves, and they are starting to see some positive responses of the living marine resources in those reserves. The sanctuary does its part in water quality protection, including working to prevent pollution from oil rigs and vessels.

CINMS also gets directly involved in the community's needs with education and outreach; they influence the career ambitions of youth, help schools with curriculum development, have a multicultural education program, have a partnership with UCSB, and have other initiatives. One important education component is a construction project for a new building at UCSB, which will include an Outreach Center for Teaching Ocean Science. CINMS also works directly with local governments and businesses where possible. For example, there is a Channel Islands Naturalist Corps, which is provided free of charge to whale watch operators. They are also working on exhibits in a new Ventura County boating center, which will be good for the harbor and will attract visitors. They also put sanctuary exhibits in other locations, which get the sanctuary message out and help those places with their businesses. CINMS has a role in science which is important for the local economy. Such research includes ocean acidification, monitoring marine reserves, and on stopping ships from hitting whales.

CINMS is also facing challenges, including securing sustainable funding for multi-year projects and programs, pursuing and leveraging partnerships (difficult when Congress does not pass a budget until halfway into the year), stakeholder resistance based on past battles (such as on marine reserves), and discontinuing programs such as the CINMS Collaborative Marine Research Program due to lack of resources. To address these challenges, Mike felt CINMS could broaden its sphere of partners and build a community focused on partnerships, work with the sanctuary advisory council and help bring the greater NOAA to the community (e.g., helping fishermen find information on buoys, or helping people to learn about grants).

Matt Brookhart provided some summary remarks. He commented that ONMS wanted to pay attention to identifying the socioeconomic benefits to the local communities, and wanted to

sustain them into the future. He said that fiscal constraints were expected for some time, but that it was an unprecedented time now for communicating positive impacts of sanctuaries to people in the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Commerce, NOAA, etc. Matt wants to explore how the councils could help ONMS better articulate the impact of sanctuaries on the economy, for the whole sanctuary system.

Panel Discussion Bulleted Below:

- At our last council meeting we asked our council if they would provide a photograph from every council member and a brief statement about the economic driver of their particular seat. We are hoping to get this information from each council member.
- The chairs have offered to go with Dan to the hill. We need people that are directly connected to express their passion about the site and the economic benefits need to come through on a personal level. (Note: The prohibition of councils and council members lobbying was provided as a reminder.)
- All of this will require you to allocate the resources to make this happen.
- Can the advisory councils help play a role in identifying potential resources?
- We have to get out and do an extra sales pitch. I haven't sat down with the superintendent to discuss economic benefits. We have lost that sitting down time. I'm going to reinstall that when I return. The marketing plans have been great. For example having a dinner plate that is connected to the sanctuary and raises awareness about the sanctuary. The sanctuary program needs to become the facilitator not the funder.
- There has to be more attention on this as a priority. Dan is starting to look at the world a little differently. The time now is more conducive for issues to be elevated. There is a commonality that is shared by all the councils to tell this story.
- What is happening with the Thunder Bay expansion?
- The challenge is not the will of the people. There is a mechanism in place in a management plan for expansion. However, we are trying to get past the process by having a bill passed. Part of this facilitation thing we are talking about. Our sanctuary now has a great deal of trust. We are recognized because of what we have done. Our staff from NOAA has integrated back into the community so tightly that we are recognized as being a facilitator for collaborative effort.
- I was involved for 6-7 years in the Thunder Bay designation process. I would argue that it was the existence of the sanctuary advisory council – the building of trust and community involvement – that allowed the sanctuary designation to occur.
- I agree.
- Going back to facilitation. We played a role in facilitation with Everglades because of the public process we put in place from the council. Facilitation is a critical part of what we do and that builds trust. I think every advisory council should be involved in the facilitation process to help build trust.
- To add to that, I visited Bruce and was amazed to see what they have in place. The negative part of that is that it takes time.

- How do we prioritize?
- Partnering with academic institutions.
- That is a really good idea. Almost every MBA program is looking for something like this.

- Want to underline the importance of facilitation. We have been focused on posting individual comments on the web. I'm not sure how we fit in. We have very limited access, research and native Hawaiian. How do we construct that story within a national narrative?
- The non-use/passive value is difficult to calculate.
- There is probably benefit to the main Hawaiian islands and other sanctuaries.
- I think a tool could be a simple survey. My question is though, what's the value of outreach to school children? Or the qualitative versus the quantitative value.
- We are not able to craft a socio-economic value for PMNM. What's really getting attention are the jobs. There are a range of approaches in which the socio-economic are won.

- What would these areas look like if the sanctuaries were not there? What are the jobs that are created?
- It's tougher to tell opportunity costs. We provide jobs for whale watchers.
- Many of those existed before the designation of the sanctuaries.
- What you are trying to do is sell a national program. There is value because it exists.
- The thing we bring with sanctuaries is all the tools.
- The point is that people care about these places because of where they are and what they mean to the communities.
- We need to be able to articulate how these tools have an impact and help people to care about these places.

- The sanctuary, through the management plan process, sees a way to perpetuate the values of the native Hawaiian community. That's important.
- With public testimony, all it takes is one compelling story to change the way people think (and this can't be done with data alone).
- On my computer, I have a photo of my great-grandfather which shows a depth and connection to the place.

- The currency of DC is people -- the voters. The stories will work for us. Connecting the stories and people to our programs. The tribes have a connection to the place that many people don't have. Let's find a way to fund our monitoring and research to last a lifetime.

- I don't want to forget Larry's point about how you value the long term impact. We need to start gathering information now for the long term. Our partners for instance in academic institutions can help provide this information.
- We need to resist the temptation to just tell the stories in numbers.
- I look at this as a business issue. What has ONMS done to cut cost and deliver more? You guys need to prove that you can manage these resources efficiently. We only have so much time and resources.

Panel B:

The SEL and CMSP: Considering New Sanctuaries in the World of Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning

John Armor, Acting Conservation Policy and Planning Division Chief

Larry McKinney, FGBNMS Council Chair

Richard Charter, GFNMS Council Chair

Richard Delaney, SBNMS Council Chair

Emily Gaskin, FBNMS Special Projects Coordinator

John Armor provided a brief introduction to the panel. CMSP is moving along, but we do not consider sanctuary designation CMSP.

Larry Mc Kinney, Flower Garden Banks NMS Council Chair provided the first presentation, noting that CMSP is the latest thing. We are long past the cowboy days of not planning for using the ocean; we need it, but it is getting caught in a lot of politics. CMSP can be done and can do a lot of great things, can be a bridge between conservation and economic interests. ONMS has been doing CMSP for years and councils represent a core of experienced practitioners. Sanctuaries can be sentinel sites for evaluating the effectiveness of CMSP and can act as pilot sights and share lessons learned. The perception at FGBNMS is that they don't want the 'California experience' or the 'National Monument Experience'. NOAA should give industry some certainty in CMSP- streamlining and simplification of permitting processes as incentives to do CMSP.

Richard Charter, Gulf of the Farallones NMS Council Chair noted that sanctuaries have life cycles that begin even before they are designated. He then provided a historical perspective. He said that the reason why USA enables environmental protection that goes way back, starting in 1773, when William Barton came to Georgia and documented the natural ecosystems. In 1793, George Washington and Ben Franklin started to create the USA and then in 1872 the first national park designated by Ulysses S. Grant; this was Yellowstone National Park. In 1890, Yosemite was designated. If you are going to protect a place, you need to establish a consciousness that it is WORTH protecting. It must have resonance with the public.

In terms of frozen budgets, we will get through this. We need to have an orderly approach to the list of candidates which should include some of the emerging industrial issues. There is real need for boundary expansions, but we must build the case for expansions for GFNMS, CBNMS, TBNMS, FKNMS, and Gulf of Mexico. Deepwater Horizon oil spill has created some opportunities – the National Commission on BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill recommends using MPAs as mitigation banks. We should protect California Current and upwelling hotspots for predators as there are gaps along the coast of CA. Some bills on the house floor tomorrow will expedite permitting process for drilling. Richard ended by providing an announcement about the Hands Across the Sand event.

Richard Delaney, Stellwagen Bank NMS Council Chair spoke on “A Case Study to Support Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning in Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary.” He highlighted the role of wind farm development in prompting the sanctuary to prepare for

comprehensive planning. Richard made reference to the January 4, 2010 Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan, which was in response to proposed developments linked to the renewable energy industry, and defined the specific goals for SBNMS. He discussed the traffic patterns for vessels transiting through the sanctuary, as well as the data (e.g., AIS point density, baleen whale distribution) used and partners necessary for redirecting the shipping lane. Richard then touched on entanglement risks associated with pots and groundline and the connection between national marine sanctuaries and other places in the ocean (e.g., sister sanctuary associated with humpback whale migration). Richard concluded his presentation by identifying integral components when considering how ONMS/SBNMS and advisory councils can integrate within the regional processes. Examples included: contributing scientific and technical data to common databases to support CMSP; coordinating and integrating with States with adjoining jurisdictions; promoting trans-boundary, ecosystem-based sanctuary management approaches; and supporting and facilitating the integration of Citizen Advisory Committees with other CMSP activities.

Emily Gaskin, Fagaetele Bay NMS (FBNMS) Special Projects Coordinator provided an overview of FB NMS, specifically highlighting the role of ONMS in American Samoa and how marine spatial planning has helped inform the management plan review process. Emily mentioned that FBNMS is co-administered by the ONMS and the American Samoa Department of Commerce and described how the sanctuary fit within the historical context of marine protected areas in American Samoa. She stated that her region believes that sanctuaries can play a unique role in overall resource conservation and management and, thereby, advocate for a higher level of conservation in these “special places”. Although spatial planning is a bit of a “buzz word” these days, in American Samoa, the ancient concept of Tapu has been restricting use in areas to minimize stress and protect resources for centuries.

FBNMS is currently working to review their management plan and, through the support of the Governor, Office of Samoan Affairs, villages, and the Sanctuary Advisory Council, are looking to propose five additional units for inclusion within the sanctuary. The five proposed units could increase the overall size of the sanctuary from 0.25mi² to approximately 13,568.5mi², with the majority of this expansion resulting from the incorporation of the marine areas of Rose Atoll Marine National Monument. Emily went on to highlight the overlap between goals of FBNMS and those identified within the Framework for CMSP and noted the cooperative decision making (i.e., participatory planning) that has been ongoing at this site. She noted the role of the sanctuary advisory council and the potential social, economic, and ecological benefits of FBNMS.

Panel Discussion Bulleted Below:

Reminders regarding protocols (e.g., lobbying) were continuously provided as discussions and suggestions made by council members and other invited guests related to visits and interactions with Congressional members, The President, etc.

- John Armor and Bill Douros outlined and explained the graph of increased funding with increased number of sites. Emphasis on the correlation between the two. The planning for new sites begins 3-4+ years prior to the need for funds to support new sites.
- New sites cost less than mature sites.
- Congress will know that the planning will result in more funding needs.

- Congressional members are in support of sanctuaries in their districts- another argument to making more sanctuaries.
- It takes a couple million \$ for a new site.
- What funds come to a community when a sanctuary is designated; grants, tourism, etc. Emphasis on need for data on what we lose if sanctuary goes away.
- Emphasis on making the case for leveraging benefits with sanctuaries through partners.
- Consider having council members visit appropriations committee members. (Note: Reminder provided about parameters on prohibition on lobbying by councils and council members.)
- Council chairs could help with ONMS support by talking with NOAA leaders; may help with split of NOAA for ONMS and what NOAA requests.
- The NMSF will get council chairs a list of staff in local offices to make contact with. (Note: Reminders about the parameters on the prohibition on councils and council members lobbying provided.)
- Take your representative out to the sanctuary! What will we lose if the sanctuary is not there? Show them. Site staff bring in grant funds that support lots of other jobs and tourism, etc.
- Conversely, this is what we may be able to bring in with a new site and how that waves out/trickles down into the community.
- That message is more powerful when it comes from communities and not from staff in program.
- Perhaps some repackaging would be effective. Repeat of that sales pitch may work down the road, but we need to keep pushing.
- Suggestion to consider taking Obama out in Hawaii to sanctuary and possibly having a member of Congress invite him.
- It is important to emphasize international programs. It is a challenge to get councils and the public to understand the importance of transboundary protection for species. Discussed SBNMS sister sanctuary program that has MOUs in place to create conservation stepping stones for species. It is important to protect resources when they are outside of sanctuary boundaries and provided additional example of NE and SE regions connecting over right whales.
- Sister sanctuaries are a type of system expansion without an SEL through affiliated sites instead of traditionally looking at site management.
- Why would there not be council support for this?
- It is more of an issue with fish species such as tuna and ONMS having enough funding issues. Council members are asking why these funds should go to international programs and expansion when we cannot fund programs we have.
- We lend out staff resources to other locations where resources are important like entanglements of whales in Alaska or Japan. We can work with other partners such as UNESCO, etc.
- What can council members say and not say that would make a difference?

- Lubchenco travels around the country, attends meetings. IF you do have opportunity to meet her or know her, take advantage of it to reinforce the importance of sanctuaries to others outside of NOAA.
- It was noted that while working in a previous job on the Senate Commerce Committee – it is effective when citizens come in with their opinions. Oftentimes only the people that are against something come in and make themselves heard. It would be powerful to see or hear the support.
- Can NMSF help support travel for council members to DC?
- There is a great need to have those voices on the Hill which are usually overshadowed by negative opinions about MPAs. Not sure there is funding available, but could bring in folks. (Note: Reminders about the parameters on the prohibition on councils and council members lobbying provided.)
- Coral reef conservation hearings are an example of reprioritization which got attention because it was a visible open process. It is possible to say the same things but say it in a different way.
- We may have socioeconomic analyses of whale migration routes.
- Council chairs should visit American Samoa. (Note: Blue Vision Summit for learning about ocean support mechanisms in DC.)
- Emphasis on taking NMSF offer to help facilitate communication with Hill folks. (Note: Reminders about the parameters on the prohibition on councils and council members lobbying provided.)

Closing Remarks/Wrap-up

William Douros, Acting ONMS Deputy Director

This has been a fantastic meeting. As Dan alluded to, it would have been nice to have the field trip, but having the meeting was a priority for ONMS. Bill proceeded to highlight some key actions coming out of the dinner with the council chairs.

There was general agreement by the group to create a National Advisory Council. ONMS will prepare a draft charter and get it out to council chairs. ONMS will continue to hold the SAC Summit (perhaps an additional meeting as well) and a series of conference calls with the council chairs every 3-4 months. The national council charter will be one of the discussion topics. Some topics this national group may tackle: the site evaluation list, helping revamp our programming (get our priorities set), and engaging “not the usual suspects.” Relative to annual meeting there’s an interest to include more time to talk (2 hours or perhaps an entire afternoon dedicated to discussion). There was an openness to consider participation in some sort of Sanctuary Conference (every couple of years), as long as the SAC Summit is included as part of that. Participation by the superintendents at the Summit will be evaluated and solutions discussed.

There is a desire by the council chairs to have a greater and more frequent exchange of information beyond the Summit. Council chairs proposed the idea of a higher level repository or database to house council actions and documents. ONMS HQ agrees this is a priority and began discussions of this nature with the council coordinators at the 2010 SAC Summit. Council chairs would like to see more open and more frequent communication (e.g., consistent use of 3-4 calls per year and, perhaps, the use of webinars). There is an interest in council member exchanges -- where council members travel to attend other council meetings. Dan sees a need for superintendents to meet regularly with their council chairs. ONMS will review the policy on council officer term limits and how that might mesh with a national council. The suggestion was made for everyone to read the NMSA (or re-read it if it has been awhile). If your council does not have a youth seat or youth working group, it is recommended that your council make some time to discuss the concept (if haven't already).

Discussion pursued as to the problems with term limits for all non-governmental council members, and it was suggested that this be put on the list for the things that the national council might address. ONMS will provide a list of the contacts for working with community colleges, as well as some information on international connections/trainings. ONMS will also provide the West Coast OA action plan (once complete).

From socioeconomic discussion, ONMS needs to improve the quantitative aspects of our story, and figure out how to tell qualitative stories via videos, etc. ONMS will provide the council chairs/representatives with all of the socioeconomic stories once final. Although the SEL discussion did not generate any actions, there was some discussion, at this time, as to the value of sending resolutions, letters, etc. regarding new sites and expanding existing sites to NOAA leadership.

The National Marine Sanctuary Foundation offered to think how they could address council interest to engage further on the Hill – within legal parameters. Council members were encouraged to work with their respective local friends' groups as well.

Final Discussion Bulleted Below:

- Any ideas from HQ on how to standardize measurements or approaches?
- We could justify increasing GIS capabilities.
- I recommend not sitting on our hands. We need to draw circles around new potential sites/sanctuaries. All pieces will end up on the table and other agencies are already doing this. We want to get the SEL out there. We want to be formally out there doing the work.
- Discussion about MPLA in CA (public GIS software). Suggested that ONMS check this out. National MPA Committee is selecting MPA sites that don't exist anywhere else.

- What was the relevance of the sentinel sites discussion? Was the discussion about ONMS needing to have capabilities to monitor similar parameters at each site? There was no consensus but consider continuing to discuss.

- What has ONMS learned from SAC chairs that didn't know before? That you wanted a National Advisory Council. More out there about the socioeconomic storytelling than I knew

existed. Learned from the site-based panel discussions. How councils can continue to learn and expand based on each others' experiences. Acute challenges about what budget constraints mean to you and that you were willing to embrace new ideas and provide feedback. In terms of engaging communities/connectivity ONMS needs to get more plugged in and stay better connected to communities who are the heart and soul of the sanctuaries. Inspired by the council community. Don't forget your council coordinators – they are your biggest advocates and want to strategize with you and leverage your input to improve and grow with you. It shouldn't take 2 weeks to get in front of your superintendent. Council members are respected. The superintendents may be busy, but they do value you and could not do it without you.

- Council members represent the waterfront and the passion that we are all looking to address. Councils are the conduit. What you are doing is truly important! Thank you for coming to SE Region. You are much appreciated. Thank you for all you do!

Bill Douros adjourned the meeting with a series of thank you's, which included his sincere appreciation for participation by and involvement of the council chairs and representatives, Gray's Reef and the SEGoM Region, Headquarters staff, and the various council coordinators and invited guests in attendance.

ADJOURN MEETING