

Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
OCEAN POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL
March 23, 2007 Meeting Summary

After attending a Mapping Workshop from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon, on March 23, 2007, and meeting briefly with OPAC's Executive Committee, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) held their regular meeting from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in the Barry Fisher Room, Guin Library, at the Hatfield Marine Science Center in Newport, Oregon.

Members in attendance were Jack Barth, Ralph Brown, Selina Heppell, Jay Rasmussen (Chair), David Sampson, and Craig Young. Members unable to attend were Susan Hanna and Dick Hildreth. Also attending were Julie Barr (Oregon Sea Grant), and Arlene Merems (ODFW), Paul Engelmeyer (OPAC), and for the early portion of the meeting, Frank Warrens (MRWG chair), Scott McMullen (OPAC chair), Jim Good (OPAC vice-chair), and Greg McMurray (OPAC staff).

OPAC Executive Committee. The Ocean Policy Advisory Council's Executive Committee (as well as Frank Warrens, MRWG chair) met with members of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee over lunch. Discussion included the general operation of the STAC and the nature of the process by which it will interact with OPAC, OPAC's working groups, and its own recommended experts to OPAC's working groups. The process will ultimately need to balance the need for vetting and translation of scientific information and advice with direct and efficient access and discussion among scientists and policy makers. STAC agreed to provide a list of expertise and individuals they would recommend to provide that expertise to the MRWG.

Members of the STAC indicated that clarification of the goal(s) of marine reserves is needed. In addition to the written response STAC will bring to the next MRWG, it was agreed that STAC would meet with the MRWG at the April meeting to gain a better sense of needs, issues, and definitions. On their own, STAC members may participate with the MRWG. For STAC, clarification of goals and objectives as well as funding for participation and travel, currently not available, are key issues on how and when to move ahead.

Mapping Workshop Debriefing. It was agreed that the morning's mapping workshop illustrated the breadth of the mapping enterprises, the improved data, the better availability of data, and a better sense of data ownership. It was observed that a number of datasets related to fisheries regulations, which would be valuable for a fuller mapping picture, are not in a GIS form and perhaps not easily established. Likewise, regulation changes frequently and maintaining such datasets in a timely fashion would require constant monitoring and updating. Confidentiality of information—for example, logbooks—is also a concern. Spatial fisheries management illustrates the challenges of the interplay between static information and dynamic realities. It was recognized that extensive mapping of the seafloor is obviously an early high priority, that a mapping inventory is needed, that opportunities for integration of existing information is very

much warranted, and that assessing data quality is critical. And there is a distinction between data acquisition and consolidation and using data for decisions.

STAC concluded the workshop supported the integration and explanation, determining what gaps there are (social and economic, tools, management of fisheries), and determining what the limitations are (describing what maps do not adequately describe). ACTION: Jack will develop a concept proposal for the STAC at its April meeting with the MRWG.

California Marine Life Protection Act. Jack shared a summary of Satie Airame's PowerPoint presentation with the committee: The Role of Science in California's Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA). (Note: Airame is with PISCO at the Marine Science Institute, University of California. The presentation was made at OSU on December 8, 2006. GreenFire Productions videotaped the presentation. ACTION: Jack will get a copy to Jay, who will make copies and mail out to the committee for viewing prior to the Reedsport meeting).

This prompted considerable discussion on what the CMLPA sought to protect, where and how, and the opportunities to improve—in Oregon—on their approach. The task of their Science Advisory Team is to provide scientific knowledge; define scientific terms in goals; develop guidelines for MPA design (mapped back to goals); and evaluate proposed MPAs. They put together nine lectures on ocean science, with each lecture given 40-50 times, addressing marine ecosystems; marine habitats; species of interest; population replenishment; larval movement; adult movement; water quality; socioeconomic impacts; and MPA networks. (Craig noted that a larger review based in Oregon has since been written which he will share with STAC)

A set of alternatives resulted. Proposed MPAs were evaluated. There was an evaluation of habitats, with a percentage of mapped habitat in proposed MPA designations in the study region as well as an evaluation of MPA size, replicates of habitat protections, spacing between MPAs, and maximum potential impact to commercial fishermen. It was an iterative process to develop packages, which were put forward, evaluated, put forward again, etc., over a nine-month period. A link to the MLPA Web site is at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/>.

Response to OPAC's MRWG. Selina distributed a written draft response to the letter STAC received from OPAC's Marine Reserves Working Group, noting that it needed to be changed to reflect today's workshop and the STAC conversation and to better clarify our understanding of our roles. In addition to the need for revisiting Goal 19 language, the STAC conversation worked through the draft response, inclusion of information from the Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) effort and Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC), and clarifying goals around possible options. Additional help with the socio-economic elements of the letter will be sought from Susan.

ACTION: Selina will revise the draft and share with STAC members by April 7. The goal would be to have the letter ready for the April 18 STAC meeting.

Concluding Items. STAC's interactions with the OPAC and its working groups is evolving. This is STAC's second regular meeting and to help both the STAC and the OPAC MRWG: ACTION: STAC will meet with the MRWG during its April 18 afternoon meeting in Reedsport. Working with Frank Warrens, Jay will provide the STAC members with more information on the location. It is not assumed, however, that STAC will regularly meet with OPAC or its working groups.

STAC began the development of a list of expertise areas and potential representatives of those areas that the STAC may wish to recommend to the MRWG for inclusion in their process. ACTION: Based on the discussion, Jay will develop an initial list of areas and individuals and circulate to the STAC for additions, revisions, or refinements.

Please hold April 18 open for our meeting with the MRWG in Reedsport. The STAC will gather over lunch and then with the MRWG in the early afternoon. Selina will join Jay for the following day's OPAC meeting (in Reedsport)—including joining in during the STAC report. If other STAC members are available for the OPAC meeting, please let Jay know. Members specifically expressed thanks to Jack for his work on developing a very informative workshop and to Selina for leadership on the response letter. A special thanks goes to Julie Howard, Oregon Sea Grant Extension, for her support.