

# Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Research Activity Panel Meeting Minutes

Ocean View Conference Room,  
Monterey Bay Aquarium,  
Friday, August 19, 1994 - 0830 to 1200 hrs  
Minutes taken and transcribed by:  
Aaron King, Monterey Bay NMS-RAP Executive Coordinator

## Member Attendees

Greg Cailliet, Moss Landing Marine Labs, RAP Chairman  
Andrew DeVogelaere, ESNERR and Foundation  
Deborah Johnston, CA Dept. of Fish and Game/Monterey Bill Schramm, OAR  
Rick Starr, Univ. of CA, Sea Grant Advisory Program  
Mark Stephenson, CDFG/Marine Pollution Studies Lab  
Mary Yoklavich, NOAA/NMFS/PFEG  
Chris Harrold, Monterey Bay Aquarium  
Bruce Robison, MBARI  
Jim Rote, NOAA/OCRM  
Jim Harvey, Moss Landing Marine Labs

## Members Not Able to Attend:

Terry Jackson, Manager, Monterey Bay NMS  
Don Potts of UCSC  
Dennis Powers, Hopkins Marine Station  
Steve Eittreim, USGS  
Cliff Hoskins, Department of the Interior  
Les Strnad, California Coastal Commission  
Laura Ehret, Naval Postgraduate School  
Stephen Mueller, Morro Bay Foundation  
Jan Roletto, GFNMS  
Gary Sharp, CIRIOS

## Guest Attendees:

Donna Meyers, AMBAG  
Sean Van Sommeran, Pelagic Shark Research Foundation  
Dorris Welch-Burman, Long Marine Lab, EAP Chair

Greg Cailliet, RAP Chair, introduced the meeting.

## Quick discussion items:

**Introductions** - Introductions were made around the table and RAP membership substitutions announced.

**Minutes** - Chris Harrold pointed out one typo to the minutes from the July 15, 1994, meeting, under the MBNMS Foundation topic. This generated a short discussion for some members, who weren't present at the last meeting, as to the purpose of a MBNMS Foundation. The minutes were then unanimously approved. Also, after several trials and

errors with fax and electronic distribution of the minutes, Aaron described how he would like to distribute minutes and agendas for future meetings. This will include:

1. A Broadcast Fax to each member of the minutes and agenda when they are completed.
2. A upload of the minutes and agenda to the Econet Bulletin Board.
3. An Internet e-mail to each member, a couple of days before the meeting, stating when and where the meeting was to take place, and soliciting input for the agenda.

#### **Report of the Chair on the Last SAC Meeting (Cailliet) -**

The Chair described the topics and the discussion that had taken place at the recent SAC meeting held on July 29, 1994. These topics included: A public comment period (effect of the Water Quality Protection Program on local tourism, and concerns on the fireworks policy development were brought up); A report by the Sanctuary Manager on the Status of the Sanctuary; A status report by Frank DeLappa on the MBNMS Cooperating Agreement; A discussion on Jade Cove and possible resolution of that problem. The afternoon was taken up by a workshop on vessel traffic safety within the Sanctuary. There were several government bureaucrats, industry and academics that gave talks on vessel safety, potential impacts and potential solutions to visible problems. The next SAC meeting will be held in Cambria on August 24. Jack Wickum mentioned that there were upsides to moving vessel traffic further offshore. Bill Schramm brought up the topic of CODR and its use to keep track offshore vessel traffic and a currents (in the event of an oil spill). It was suggested and supported that Jeff Paduan should be invited from the NPS to give the RAP a presentation on the use of such technology.

**Site Characterization RFP (King) -** No new word, but Aaron stated that the paperwork was with the Budget Office in Washington, DC., and that the Sanctuary was waiting for the check to be cut.

**Permit Report (King) -** Aaron reported that due to a reshuffling and streamlining of office workloads, he would not be handing out an updated permit report at RAP meetings. From now on, only one permit report would be made per month, just before the SAC meeting. Therefore, Aaron stated that he would fax that report around to everyone when it was available, and give a verbal update to it when the RAP met again. Aaron then mentioned a few new permits that had come under review, or had been issued since the last meeting, including: An overflight permit to survey seabirds by Cascadia Research, an overflight permit to survey marine mammals and a permit to collect a number of rocks for displays at Steinhart Aquarium. Finally, Aaron discussed the issues and options to the Sanctuary program with respect to the Pelagic Shark Research Foundation's request for a permit for its shark tagging activities. After a discussion, a motion was made by Bill Schramm, and passed by the RAP, that it sees the PSRF's as a traditional fishing method (and directed the Chair to write a letter as such), and that as such, it should not be required to obtain a permit.

Jim Harvey expressed concern that the MBNMS was not seeking input from the RAP on any of these permits, but seemed to be just telling the RAP about permit activity. Aaron explained that the permit report was just an abstract of permit activity, and that there was an unwritten request for input on any permit that the RAP saw necessary to comment on. Occasionally, the RAP may be specifically requested to comment on a particularly permit. Andrew DeVogelaere and Chris Harrold suggested that Aaron should be sending around, by fax and e-mail, announcements of permit requests that may need input from the RAP, prior to the RAP meeting. Concern was also expressed that the Sanctuary program may be drifting down the road of over-regulation, and concerning itself with issues it should has no jurisdiction over, or mandate for. Finally, Rick Starr suggested getting together with other permitting agencies and coming up with permit checklists and/or permit clearinghouses.

**EcoNet Update (King) -** More discussion ensued here of what

Aaron would do for the next mailing of the RAP's minutes and mailings (please see above).

**Institutional Permits (Cailliet) -** A handout from Charlie

Wahle was passed out discussing the status of plans to create institutional permits. Plans are now to not only develop an

institutional permit, but also to create and streamline a new permit form for those projects that would be required to obtain separate permits. The institutional permit system is intended to be set up at MLML as a pilot project by the Fall, 1994, semester. The individual permit form would be set up at MLML as a pilot project for the Spring, 1995, semester. Some concern was expressed in that the name for the Institutional Permits were stated in the handout as "General Educational Permit". How about other institutions, like MBARI, that could use an institutional permit, but do not primarily do research? It was also encouraged that the MBNMS Research Coordinator consolidate/update/create a NOAA Guide to MBNMS Marine Researchers.

**MBNMS Research Budget (King)** - Nothing new to report.

**RAP Binder (King)** - In progress along with the Council and other working group binders.

**Research Symposium (Yoklavich)** - Nothing new to report.

**Future of R/V Point Sur (Cailliet)** - With fewer and fewer days of ship time being sought by the NPS, some concern has been expressed as to the future of the R/V Point Sur. Greg said that he had talked with Mike Prince, who says there is nothing to be concerned with yet, but that he would keep Greg abreast of developments. Greg also mentioned that MLML, through the help of the MBA, was being donated a 57' ex-Partyboat for research.

Aaron also took this time to inform the RAP that Terry had made the decision that the Sanctuary vessel was available for research projects upon prior arrangements with the staff. This offer was enthusiastically embraced by the RAP, with Greg offered the idea that other institutions could help operate and service the vessel. It was strongly encouraged that the Sanctuary Research Coordinator should be checked out on the vessel as soon as possible to be available for potential projects.

**BREAK**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Regional Marine Research Board (Connor)** - Dr. Judith Connor of MBARI gave a presentation on the draft plan for the California Marine Research Board that was established by the Mitchell Bill signed in 1990. Judith first discussed the mandates under the Mitchell Bill, including the required composition of the nine research boards, including the fact that the Chair of each board would be the local Sea grant director. Another of the bill's mandates was that each board would develop a regional research plan that would include: environmental quality and trends in the area, an inventory of all relevant ongoing research, and a statement of research needs and priorities. The Southwest Board first meet in Feb. of 1993, and has held several workshops and meetings since. Judith noted that there was a preponderance of participation on the SW Board of Southern California representatives, even though the SW Region was from Pt. Reyes to the Mexican border, and beyond (there is noted interchange with Mexican researchers). Judith was encouraged by the RAP to emphasize to the Board a need to concentrate research within the Sanctuaries in the Board's region. There was concern expressed that any research funding that came from this report would be concentrated south of Pt. Conception. The Chair asked Judith if she would carry a review to the board from the RAP if a member of the RAP would review it for them. Judith agreed, and Jim Rote would give input for her to take to the Board. Judith was also encouraged to contact Sea Grant and emphasize the RAP's Research Plan for the MBNMS. It was also encouraged that Terry Jackson attempt to make it known through the official NOAA channels that the Sanctuary program should be highlighted within each of the Regional Plans, especially MBNMS since it had already developed a Research Plan of its own.

**OSPREE Review (Potts)** - Don Potts sent a report on the OSPREE Review in by fax from his research location in Papua, New Guinea. The Education Working Group (SEP) had also done a review of the Report. Dorris Welch-Burman gave a summary of the SEP review.

The SEP felt that the Report significantly ignored education in general, especially education at the pre-graduate student level. Linkage was emphasized as needed, particularly between researchers and K-12 students and teachers. For

example, grants should have an educational component to them, Informal education centers should be funded (such as aquariums), and discussions (such as symposia and electronic conferencing) should be encouraged between researchers and educators. This generally requires funding for an education coordinator for the larger projects. Bruce Robison stated that the OSPREE Committee recognized the weakness of the Report with regards to education, and thanked Dorris for her input. Andrew said he would take Don's comments and add comments from the discussion, plus other comments that he collects from Les Strnad and Jim Rote, and present it at the next meeting.

**General Considerations Regarding Research Proposal Review** - A general discussion followed on the RAP's role and potential process with regard to reviewing/endorsing research proposals that were presented to it. The discussion centered on three proposals that were being submitted to the RAP for review/endorse: one being the NURP proposal by Starr/Yoklavich, the Monterey Bay Regional Research proposal submitted by Loral Fox and the Youngbluth/Robison proposal. This discussion led to a proposal by Bill Schramm that the RAP select a committee to do the following:

1. Develop Criteria for Reviewing/Endorsing Proposals Presented to the RAP; While also considering the possibility of requiring a short abstract for the RAP to conduct a review from.
2. Draft Letter
3. Develop Procedure
4. For the three requests before the RAP, we act expeditiously.

The proposal was passed with one no vote (Bruce Robison). A committee was formed with Aaron King, Mary Yoklavich or George Boehlert and Bill Schramm. Chris Harrold volunteered to fasttrack the Starr/Yoklavich Proposal.

Jim Rote did likewise for the Youngbluth/Robison proposal, and Bill Schramm volunteered to review the UCSC proposal.

**Fort Ord Assessment (Cailliet)** - Greg formed a committee on the authority that he received at the last meeting of himself Mark Stephenson, Bill Broenkow, Steve Eittreim and Jim Oakden and meet with MBNMS/NOAA, Army representatives and the environmental consultants for the Army (Harding/Lawson). Greg reports that a two-page outline of what the committee saw as necessary environmental assessment that was necessary for the offshore area of Fort Ord. Greg reported that the Army and Harding/Lawson received the recommendations well. Greg says there will be further meetings, which he will keep the RAP abreast of.

**AMBAG Outstanding Scientist Award (Harrold)** - Chris noted that he and the other committee members (Potts and Harvey) were biased in favor of biologists, a bias that must be considered by the RAP both for this recommendation and future recommendations. In any event, John Pearse was the person that this committee came up with. Chris went on to explain why the committee felt this was a good recommendation. The RAP considered this recommendation, especially in light of the committee's noted bias, and finally unanimously approved the recommendation that John Pearse be recommended to AMBAG. Chris was asked to relay this to AMBAG.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

**Other Old Business** - Jim Rote brought up the issue of EPA's EMAP program that is ongoing in the nation and the local area, and that the RAP should try and get some sort of briefing on this.

**New Business** - None