

SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT IN JOINT SANCTUARIES MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW

Background: During the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) and staff retreat on August 2, 2001, there was considerable discussion about the role the SAC would play during the upcoming management plan review.

The SAC Executive Committee, Superintendent Douros, and the California Coastal Commission's SAC representative Tami Grove met on September 21 to propose a set of procedures for the SAC to consider.

Goals:

1. To promote public involvement in the management plan review process,
2. To utilize the talents, resources and constituent contacts of the individual members of the SAC, and
3. To ensure that the review process include an examination of the MBNMS's issues, program, and operation.

Procedures: On October 5, the SAC will hear presentations from each of its working groups about the issues each group has prioritized for the SAC to consider. Besides issues, it is also important that the management plan process include a review of:

- Program: Program areas can broadly be split into three areas: Education, Research, and Resource Protection (regulatory oversight and resource management).
- Operations: Operational areas can be split into several areas, including staff and budget, permit procedures and enforcement, outreach activities (user group brochures, satellite office operations, events), Sanctuary Foundation activities and priorities, intergovernmental coordination.

The SAC can consider a process that runs on two tracks: encouraging public, user group and agency comments, and providing its own input based upon feedback each individual Council member has received from her/his constituent group or agency.

Encouraging public comment can involve the efforts of individual Council members to perform outreach, and a call to each Council member to formulate a list of priority areas for review. The former would result in increased public involvement through meetings and written comments. The latter would be directed towards a session, perhaps at the December 2001 SAC meeting, during which the SAC would identify these priority areas.

Instead of instituting a voting procedure through which a final list of priority issues would be chosen, a more inclusive report could be provided in which all priority areas (including issues, operation comments or program concerns) would all be listed. A procedure for weighted voting would occur, but the individual concerns would be forwarded as part of the SAC's input on the management plan. The SAC could revisit this list after public input has been received at critical points during the management plan review timeline.