

Appendices

What would have made the composition of stakeholder organizations represented on the NCCRSG more balanced? (n=20)
The inclusion of more generalists and fewer single issue/single fishery interests --- these voices were very strong on their particular interests and just extra baggage when the discussion turned to other fisheries. It also seemed like there should have been more voices from the north part of the study region.
more fishing representation from north of Bolinas.
Additional diver representation. More consumptive user representation
Too many stakeholders were not truly stakeholders
more members from the North Coast consumptive user group
Better background checks. Some stakeholders miss represented their affiliations
conservation interests equal in number to extractive users
less preservation based paid representatives
Too many stakeholders came from government entities
needed another representative for non-consumptive divers
More General Public Members
Less marine mammal, less psuedo-environmental groups
more coastal residents, more science teachers and more marine biologists and local businesses other than recreational fisherman and their industry lobbyists
I think that the government agencies involved should have been there only as advisory bodies not as voting members
More background investigation should be done for the nominees so that their undisclosed associations with influential groups can be fully realized. When the creation of MPA's is ultimately dependant on a "straw vote", it becomes questionable as to where is the science, and is there an agenda at hand. Weighting of consumptive, non-consumptive and professional protectionists should be equally balanced with knowledgable people with something to bring to the table that is useful in the creation of working MPA's and is not agenda based.
A truly representative cross-section of marine users. "Balance" appeared to be achieved by having the same number of "fishermen" and "environmentalists" when in fact this is not representative of marine use at all. The paid environmental organizations had a huge advantage in the process due to their overwhelming participation on the RSG.
More agency reps with expert knowledge
Every individual fishing interest had a stakeholder but non-consumptive users were lumped as "enviros". Also, recreational fishers had way too much representation
It was pretty easy for the consumptive users to vote as a block and since they had - I think it was - one more vote than every other interest combined, it felt a bit lopsided.
Professional conservation representatives are not true stakeholders

What would have been a better overall group size for the NCCRSG (i.e., number of Primaries and Alternates)? (n=13)
15 primaries and alternates
fewer NGO people. twenty is enough for any group
A lot of people to manage, but not sure how else to do it
just about right as it was
nothing wrong with the size of the group
I feel that to have balanced members was good size.
i thought it was fine size-wise, but i would say that there was not parity in user group representation as I was not afforded an alternate and so in big straw polling the other side always had an advantage - which is not fair
The size of RSG is not as important as the knowledge base that it ultimately comprises. This particular RSG had reasonable representation but there could have been better representation for the North sub region. Some of this lack of direct representation was taken to task by several of us from the South and this void is further filled with the all important, public comment. In public comment we are able to hear from other stakeholders that are not on the RSG.
20 primaries; alternates served as real alternates, not as full members that were only limited by voting at the end of the process. Alternates participation should have been severely limited.
I do not think I could have been smaller and still have sufficient coverage of constituencies
About 1/2 the people. Then they would have more impetus to represent their interests
Good stuff. You need organizational capacity for people do have time to work outside the plenary and gem format.
One representative for each fishery concerned and a scientist/fishery expert for each fishery.

What, if any, would have been a better timeframe in which to complete the work of the entire NCCRSG process? (n=16)
longer would be better to get additional ideas into the process. Special Closures for example were sidelined due (at least in part) to time constraints, and could easily have been lost at several points.
We got the job done but most of us felt rushed.
The very end seemed a bit rushed and staff were scrambling to get us timely information. Additional time before the last meeting or splitting the last meeting into two meetings would have been helpful
Go slower in the end game
I think there were times we didn't have enough time to research the material presented to us. The fact that many extra meetings were thrown in the mix was not stated when we started the process
about right, rushed at times, but was necessary to push forward
A longer period was needed so that sufficient time could be given to analyze updated SAT information and "new" information as it was presented. Things seemed to go fairly well, and good progress seemed to occur, until December when the process became disjointed. After the Pacifica meeting there was a large gap in time with little information followed by a plethora of meetings and documents that were given insufficient time for digestion. The director's hands until December seemed benevolent; the final months seemed to reflect hurried-up, top-down direction most interested in a quick resolution of differences. It was, in my opinion one reason why the proposals splintered into three groups at the end.
I can't picture it going any longer or any shorter.
Needed to get more work done earlier so not rushed in end.
i really do want it to be shorter - but it always felt like we needed more time. perhaps it isn't more time per se but better use of the time we have, and more strict adherence to deadlines and attendance - if you snooze you lose
probably to allow more time to develop proposals in the "Gems" groups

I believe we often said that there was not enough time or money to do the best job we could have. If all elements needed for the creation of MPA's were available to the RSG, and, most importantly, the RSG had a full understanding of how to use the tools early in the process, a lot of time could be used in the development process. There is a steep learning curve at first and many of the RSG were not up to the task early enough. Even now there are RSG that are not aware of the workings.
It was adequate but the proposed timeline was much shorter. Staff was told repeatedly by RSG members that more time would be needed and each time they refused until finally allowing the process the time it needs. This should be planned for up front.
with people's schedules and the amount of work required it would have been hard to shorten the process. One suggestion is to lengthen the meeting days rather than number of meetings.
slightly more time towards the end to refine proposals for the BRTF and develop more consensus
Hey, it looks as if the CFG commission final voting date is up in the air. The RSG could have used a few more months of flexibility too.

From your perspective, what, if any, structure would have been potentially more effective than the "Gems" cross-interest working group structure? (n=15)
The cross interest working groups were an extremely helpful way of getting divergent interests to work together---there was just not quite enough time in the schedule to effectively merge the cross-interest proposals (1 & 3) which should have made the final cross interest proposal much tighter than it was.
I think the gems groups worked well. I was skeptical at first because it seemed that fracturing the RSG would mean that not everyone was getting the same information. I think however that the benefits gained from working in the smaller groups (easier to jump in with info, less focus on the louder voices, trust building) outweighed the downsides. Better capture and dissemination of the information discussed in the workgroups to the whole RSG would probably help resolve the major downside.
With such a large group, had we not broken into smaller working units I feel significant time would have been spent to develop our proposals. It was easy to engage all the panel members in the smaller groups however three groups representing commercial, recreational and ecological interest may have been able to move the process along more easily.
More research needs to go into the organization of the groups. It may have helped to have more interaction. I know personally that the time you gave me to address the other groups in explaining the commercial fisheries may have made some good impact on the final options (Pt Reyes)
good as it was, needed more discipline from mediation team to keep each cross-interest process fair and equitable, avoid intimidation tactics used by some stakeholders
I would have said 6 at one point since there seemed to be a true willingness by many people on both sides to work toward resolution of the differences in an amicable fashion. However, ultimately the process proved to be power driven and the baby was cut in half.
The work groups were the most productive part of the process
At first I did not understand the 3 different groups but should have having seen final outcome we should have joined sooner than end to have a better convergence plan. I am still very proud of what the 1-3 group accomplished though.
I thought this structure was very helpful because it forced people to work together, in accordance with BRTF guidance. Did become somewhat difficult towards end because people felt allegiance to particular work group and had hard time leaving their groups, whether or not it was the best thing for the process. But did foster camaraderie and goodwill overall and was effective in sussing out potential conflicts and solutions early on in the process.
i think cross-interest is very important - it makes everyone work together - i think how and when you mandate this is the key and i am sorry to say i don't think i have the specific answer of at what junctures to use it, but it is critical to success in my opinion
Full plenary with the RSG, SAT, and BRTF either monthly or semi monthly with maybe a smaller focus group with these representatives meeting in between.

RSG members had virtually no time to caucus within interest groups. Of course, paid staff from environmental organizations are able to do this outside of the RSG process but members of the fishing community that volunteer their time do not have this luxury. This is another example of how the fishing community was put at an extreme disadvantage within this process. The cross-interest workgroups provided nothing of value to the process and only served as political vehicles from some RSG members (professional lobbyists). It also would have been helpful to have an opportunity to caucus between geographic interest groups.
it's the only way the process could work. And, for those who entered into it in good faith, it worked well.
This is the smartest idea of the whole process organizationally
A working group of highly knowledgeable representative in each fishery representative of the study area both commercial and recreational, presented with a clear understanding of the MLPA requirements and goals

What, if anything, would you recommend doing differently in future MLPA study regions regarding the work products for the NCCRSR and the processes for developing them? (e.g. Groundrules, Regional Profile, Regional Goals, Options for Special Closures) (n=22)
The Regional Profile seemed a vacuous exercise in how the Department would like the state of the fisheries to be, rather than a critical and honest evaluation of the state of things. While an impartial evaluation by a third party is probably impractical and prohibitively expensive, perhaps there could be a greater effort to provide a more neutral position or one that begins to recognize that the impaired state of our fisheries is why the MLPA came to pass in the first place. Special closures should be considered within the development of MPAs rather than in the bubble of a parallel universe. The way these were handled seemed to be on an uneven playing field that favored agencies and NGOs over fishermen....
allow/provide for a synthesized version of the ecological and/or economic data from the regional profile. It's a solid, comprehensive document but suffers from too much info. Synthesis would help the RSG take into account all the info. This should form the foundation of the line-drawing exercise so would need to be done before line drawing starts. If such a synthesis is impossible from the MLPAI team itself, opportunities should be given for outside work products in this regard.
be sure that there is more precise bathymetric data in all study areas. special closures seemed ad hoc and didn't fit into schema of the mlpa so are vague and thus subject to abuse. the email ground rules seem unnecessarily draconian given the spirit of collaboration needed
The 1 team was helpful to all teams, but the cross interest teams need more help just by the nature of what they are doing. Next time, give them that extra support. This would have applied after round one, when 2 and 4 diverged from broad cross interest involvement.
The process was laborious. I feel the represented groups could have each developed a proposal and then forwarded them to the BRTF. They picked and chose what they wanted anyway.
go slower at the end and faster in the beginning
Do more research in selecting study groups. Jade was not able to come out with an option
constrain all user groups to actually submit proposals: The sportfishing community was allowed to not submit a meaningful proposal throughout the process, then come in belatedly with an external proposal, which was unfair to those who played by the rules
The ability to split off two proposals, a "fisherman's proposal" and an "environmental proposal," almost assured acquiescence to political pressure by the BRTF. Far better would have been a willingness to achieve and accept a unified proposal that might have prevented some of the politics that will taint the final proposal. (2) If the SAT is likely to disenfranchise a user group/stakeholder group (as with the on-shore anglers) then that information should be given early on in the process so that alternate strategies can be used.
a more comprehensive economic loss study which includes the economic multiplier.

<p>Round 3: The last minute merging of groups created too large a change in what we'd worked for during the whole process without any recourse other than approaching the BRTF ourselves. We basically lost everything important to our constituents in a matter of the last hour of the last meeting</p>
<p>Have available vocational considerations for SHIFTS needed to occur with changes from MLPA placement. Have data from modeling data available before draft and final proposals go to SAT!!!!</p>
<p>I felt the special closures discussions were a distraction that should not been pursued under the NCC process. Additionally, I felt they were pursued poorly. Having them discussed as a parallel process for 6 months is good because it keeps the discussions from distracting from MPA discussions early on. However, when the public and fellow RSG members lose their opportunity to give input early on, they ultimately feel blindsided when the special closures are shoehorned into the MPA proposals at the 11th hour. The product in our case was wide variation in size and location of special closures across proposals, which distracted from the meat of the MLPA, which is MPAs.</p>
<p>Some objectives don't seem to fully capture goals (e.g. those for goal 6). DFG should clarify at the start, not in the round 3 feasibility analysis, how they intend to interpret the objectives. In round 3, recommend having staff as informed as possible about what steps would help each proposal better meet goals and objectives. what worked re RSG proposals: allowing differences to be fully expressed at the start, and creating incentives to merge/collaborate as process moved forward.</p>
<p>Special closures is a sham for setting up additional closed areas with no benefit to the general public.</p>
<p>first, i had an unpleasant experience where another stakeholder did not behave according to ground rules, and i felt the i-staff did not act stringently enough to reprimand this person. ground rules are ground rules - if you break them you should be out - period end of story. and then during the final clustering of work-groups, one work group was afforded a private/closed session that the others were not and this again is unfair. all teams must be given the same preference and optys.</p>
<p>Groundrules: I can't remember ever referring to the groundrules but I guess there is some need for them as a rule of thumb. Regional Profile: This is an extremely important tool to get right and be used by the less informed in order to understand the complexities of the particular study region involved. My first look at the Regional Profile was somewhat shocking and puzzling at the same time. There were many inaccuracies that warranted immediate correction and I found myself on the Team to do just that. Unfortunately, there was just not enough time or resources to entirely "fix" the Profile but, what resulted was for the most part useful. I want to acknowledge the extremely difficult task that was given to folks that compiled all that data and made it into such a beautiful piece of art. It was not the fault of the creators but rather the data that was presented to them that gave all the problems and misunderstanding. Thanks Guys. Regional Goals/Objectives/and Design Considerations: These elements of the Process are were very important in completeing our overall task. Without them we would not be able to measure or quantify what our intentions were in creating specific MPA's. I dinked Objectives and Design Considerations because we could have done a better job of crafting them in the beginning and could have used the Design Considerations a bit more seriously. Draft Proposals: These were useless since we never had all the guidance that we were supposed to have until the last iteration. RSG were just putting down anything they felt like thinking it would be evaluated on a piecemeal basis and they would just have to plug in the ones that the SAT said were able to pass. What a waste of time. NCCRSG Proposals: The final proposals were useful to reflect a particular groups makeup. With the division of the RSG throughout the Process we were never able to realize the broad knowledge base of the entire RSG applied to creating an array or arrays. If you can create arrays with only a portion of the whole RSG, what did you need all the other RSG for? Special Closures: This element came on late in the Process and only complicated and already frenzied RSG. I was on the Team to look at Special Closures and from the evidence that was being given by the proponents it was hard to give their claims much weight. I think that the RSG was the inappropriate avenue to persue this interest. If it weren't for the wonderful personality of Irina Kogan, I would have not even given any support at all. I</p>

believed in Irina and so I supported her.
Have a real BRTF policy analysis done. The first round was a total waste of time and very little useful information was provided. The SAT evaluation does not provide any mechanism to provide suggestions about how to improve proposals; that is left to guess at. Special closures took WAY too much time away from the process of creating MPAs.
rely more on EDOM , :UC Davis or other models. Ecotrust data should assume redistribution or effort. Acknowledge that fishers have conflict of interest (financial) while gov't agencies and others don't. have stakeholder representation be proportional to CA population. Not just split 50/50 between pro use and conservation.
Demand participation. Coastside rec fishers drew up their proposals as outside proposals and got them inserted as "group proposals". Then they refused to compromise or participate further. Just stayed in the hallways protecting their proposals and sending in people to other working groups to lobby for their outside proposal.
I will re-iterate that I felt deceived by the process of developing proposals. We were asked to make some very difficult compromises with competing interests. I felt, on the whole, we did a good job of this. Considering that we were asked to do this, it was deceitful for CFGD staff to be in the room while we developed these proposals considering John Ugoretz's letter to the BRTF saying that all mpas under the moderate high level should be thrown out of consideration. CFGD staff must have known John's direction yet they did not dissuade us from making these compromises. They had no problem telling us when our mpas did not meet their design guidelines - but they didn't tell us that having a moderate high protection level was, in itself, a design guideline. If we had known this was the case, we would never have compromised to the degree that we did to reach consensus. I must say I have felt cheated since John's letter and nothing is going to take that bitter taste out of my mouth. I can assure you I will contact the RSG members in the south coast to warn them not to compromise like we did. I will send them all a copy of John's letter so they know what to expect.
Not break the group into "Gems" The group should stay as full group and keep everything open and disclosed. No work allowed or private meeting outside of stakeholder meeting.

What, if anything, would you recommend to improve the value of technical information and analysis in future MLPA study regions? (n=19)
The Department's feasibility guidance was less than helpful.
more science with more direct participation by members of the sat
We received an opinionated, poorly worded document, DFG_Memo_FinalProps_Guidance_080311.pdf on March 15, two days before the last RSG meetings. Instead of helping, especially the cross interest 1-3 group, DFG with that document became an advocate and damaged 1-3. 1-3 made some mistakes in the March meeting that could have been aided by the staff in the room. Everyone needs to understand how difficult it is to form a cross interest proposal and do everything possible to help them succeed. DFG could have written the same critique at round 2 which would give policy makers and RSG more time to digest it and question it.
Receiving it in a more timely maner.
Call a guess a guess and acknowledge that facts are not so easy to identify
I had asked on several occasssions if there had been astudy on crab movements in and out of study areas was told that there had been and Susan Ashcraft had some memerory of such studies. Instead the SAT used a study that was done somewhere up in Alaska where conditions are not even close to the conditions we have here. It would have been very helpful to know how much crab would get in closed areas.
Best available information at the present time was provided
More accurate information on inshore areas
since these MPA s are just " no fishing by human zones," the data should have included the amount of take humans are responsible for as a % of total mortality for the species present in these mpa s .

<p>Some of the stakeholders may need to be enlightened on the value of information that has been scientifically and statistically verified, as well as the meaning of uncertainty in the context of making statements that affect the placement and designation of MPAs. Perhaps explaining the whole scientific process in layman's terms may assuage some of the backlash. Some of the SAT seem better at communicating to laymen than others. In terms of Fish & Game's assessment of the SMP, perhaps communicating a little earlier in the process, rather than the last minute (two days before the BRTF meeting), would give us time to respond in a constructive way</p>
<p>Have social economic data for support businesses when MLPA's would shut down small communities like found in Northern Sonoma County. I do understand that environmental impact studies were too grand for MLPA issues but this still should have been an issue addressed with some type of support data!</p>
<p>see above. 100 penny maps that can be shared. Earlier DFG guidance re their interpretation of objectives and other feasibility concerns. Spatial data on non-consumptive uses in form comparable to recreational fishing data (e.g. analysis of alternatives showing % benefit to non consumptive use from MPA network alternatives. Change instruction to identify important places based on whole career (results in value given to places that haven't been fished for relevant species in years so makes it difficult to capture benefit of protecting potential restoration site). Changes to basic SAT levels of protection should be avoided or kept to a minimum once process begins, to avoid politicizing the SAT process (with exception of addition of species accidentally omitted)</p>
<p>Composition of the SAT must include more scientists who understand the value of traditional fishery management tools. Bird lovers and folks seeking to advance their positions by future grants can stay home.</p>
<p>ecotrust data should be provided in advance, and both commercial and recreational financial information should have been shared up front - the recreational data in this NCC process was not only submitted last minute, it wasn't available for all stakeholders to review, and there was no transparency into the viability or sourcing of the data</p>
<p>Get started early in the process and compile as much information that you can from as many reliable sources as possible. Use the input from the RSG. There was a lot of valuable information that was expressed in the process that was not used by the SAT. When the SAT is looking for information that is scarce or not available they should refer to the experience of the RSG members who are knowledgeable in that particular area.</p>
<p>A real commitment to educating RSG members regarding SAT guidelines. No training at all was provided. Furthermore, no informative information was provided regarding way in which to improve MPA arrays - this was left upon stakeholders to figure out. More times than not staff did not have any answers (or correct ones).</p>
<p>Try to have most of the technical studies and reports done either before or early on in the process. At our last meeting after all the proposals were in final we were still getting talks on such things as water quality.</p>
<p>I must say, the technical info was amazing. I have never been involved with something where so much info was available. The main drawback was the lack of non-consumptive socio-economic figures to offset the bias towards the consumptive socio-econ figures. If you look at the Regional Profile, for example, it shows that non-consumptive recreation/tourism produced alot more revenue than the consumptive side for local communities, but we had no place based maps highlighting the socio-economic benefit of certain areas for these purposes.</p>
<p>Ensure to include all representative fishery of the region with the social-economics.</p>

I felt that the following documents that were provided during the course of the NCCRSG process were particularly helpful (n = 18)
SAT responses to questions, and SAT documents in general
eco trust economic data
SAT guidelines, feasibility guidelines, SAT evaluation methods. Books on MPA design. Regional profile.
The habitat representation analyses of (goals 1,2,3,4 and 6). The SAT evaluations of the draft proposals.
Maps
All science panel documents were helpful, seafloor bathymetric mapping was essential.
The list of science references was excellent. The SAT's presentations were all clear and helpful.
All though time consuming I found that verbal explanations of SAT data very helpful. I also found that when Fish & Game attended work sessions and verbalized concerns (like enforcement issues and such) this was helpful to help focus work better during this stage!
SAT analysis very helpful, though presentations could be shorter, especially at final BRTF meeting, where BRTF should have been briefed before the meeting. Unfair to public to put them through 8 hours of presentations when they came to speak.
spread sheets for economic analysis (allowed us to identify options that preserved habitat values while minimizing costs). maps of landings/effort data habitat maps that showed relief, as opposed to just hard vs soft substrate maps of public access points, abalone take, etc design tool
Updated maps and descriptions
i thought the i-team did a great (even while sometimes thankless) of trying to pull data together into useful analysis. it would seem to me they need to be afforded more time to do this as the next phases are planned.
The most used documents for me were the Goals and Objectives, Master Plan, Levels of Protection, Socioeconomic analysis, and the many Memo's that followed throughout the Process. Thank Gang. You Guys Rock!
DFG Feasability criteria. Very clear and relatively easy to understand.
The on line mapping tools
regional profile, SAT answers to RSG questions, SAT and EcoTrust evaluations of proposals
The SAT guidelines and design suitability guidelines really helped alot. It required alot more work but it was worth it.
Abalone impact information Abalone Report Card Landings F&G Staff

I felt that the following documents that were provided during the course of the NCCRSG process were particularly unhelpful (n = 14)
the final feasibility analysis memo from the DFG. This information should have been provided long before it was as it could then have been taken into account in the real RSG deliberations. Also appears subjective. That some members of the RSG should see SAT guidelines at a ceiling is not surprising, but the DFG should not make those type of policy calls. Recommendations to actually delete hard thought out MPA proposals in inappropriate and should be left to the BRTF/COMmission.
The reports of modeling results for NCCRS were inappropriately detailed about possible MPA arrays effects. The models might be useful for testing effects of mpa concepts under a variety of assumptions. (e.g. concepts such as no MPAs, insurance value of MPAs , MPAs at min size and max spacing, and vice versa.) But, without validation of the model the detail results are way ahead of what can be supported with data. Every model layer is uncertain: habitat mapping, habitat quality (relief, rugosity, edges), species habitat associations, unfished biomass, population parameters, useful species mix to consider, distribution of fishing effort, and ability to manage fishing effort. The Ecotrust reports were unwieldy and there was insufficient time to look at the Ecotrust maps to make use of the information. The Ecotrust rec data was not real useful. I am skeptical of any survey data gathered from consumptive users during the project when the users have a stake in the outcome and know something of the choices.
There were several. It seems that we were inundated with technical information much of which had very limited impact on our study area.
misleading information called " best available science"
If we lived in a ticky-tacky world, and if the ocean were a neat ticky-tacky environment, the direction provided by the SAT and DF&G might make sense. However, that isn't the case. The SAT conclusions (and assigned scores) make absolutely no sense in regards to the affect of onshore angling versus commercial or commercial-recreational (partyboat) fishing. As for the DF&G, we had the wardens report that monitoring onshore anglers via a "ribbon" approach was possible yet people sitting at desks in the bowels of the DF&G said no. It's akin to people sitting at headquarter desks in any organization telling the people in the "field" how things "really are." It's led to the demise of many corporations.
We still have an unresolved problem with Fish & Game's assessment of Salt Point Marine Park.
Some of the Eco-trust graphs were too complicated to be used during work sessions and was given too late during work sessions. This was a shame because this was very important information and should have been used as much as possible.
DFG's memo at the end of the process was very biased and extremely unhelpful. They gave helpful comments on feasibility all along and that was very useful, but to give feedback inconsistent with what we'd been hearing (in terms of feasibility) AFTER our final proposals were done is to be incredibly unconstructive. The DFG was not directed to provide their own alternative in this round (as they did in the last round), but circumvented this direction in the biased, unhelpful, unfounded after-the-fact memo. Modealing results also not super helpful.
100-penny maps that stakeholders were not allowed to have. This is worse than useless, as some people have more access to information than others, and RSG members other than fishermen cannot use these data for design purposes. Willingness to let the aggregated maps be shared should be a precondition of participating in a survey. As previously stated, DFG interpretation of objectives should have been shared earlier.
SAT articles and positions meant to advance a cause not supported by folks with time and experience on the water. People who reality comes from observations, not theory to advance a on-consumptive point of view.
Evaluations, and Levels of Protection. The socioeconomic impact documents
SAT guidelines: Not clear at all. How to achieve such goals even less clear
DFGs guidelins on MPA siting, shape etc were rediculus. Some rules are warranted, but there were too many and they were not uniformly applied.
The lack of a document informing us that moderate rated mpas don't meet design guidelines for CFGD

What, if anything, would you recommend doing differently in future MLPA study regions regarding the gathering and use of socioeconomic information? (n=22)
In a more perfect world, the socioeconomic analysis would include a forward projection of the economic benefits to fisheries enhanced by working MPAs---rather than a singular down-side (cost) analysis.
commercial fishing data useful because was provided much earlier this round, however the 100 pennies exercise was not so useful because we were not able to look at the maps for more than 20 minutes in Gualala in October. Recreational fishing data was less useful than it could have been because it was provided so late in the game. Non-consumptive user data was helpful, but the sample size was quite small--equal effort/time/money should be put into gathering these data as are put forth for gathering fishing data.
Having the information available sooner in the process.
see comments to ecotrust survey
It did not appear to me that economic factors had carried any weight with the enviromental community.
Ensure that the socioeconomic information includes all important species. e.g. , the Abalone information for the NCC was nonexistent
Port history should go back further than five years
weigh non-consumptive uses an their socio-economic benefits on an equal footing with consumptive users
There absolutely has to be information relating to the economic impact of the proposed MPAs to the nearby towns. The economic impact to the commercial boats was a start but many people felt that the MLPA powers to be purposely avoided information on the overall impact that will occur to areas like Gualala and Point Arena.
always use the multiplier.
As long as we understand how some of the estimates were made and what the confidence level is, we will understand how literally we should take some of the statistics. I think this was communicated pretty well for the most part.
A bigger environmental impact study done and support from vocational agencys to help with shifts needed for changes by MLPA placement.
sample size on non-consumptive users a bit small, despite great effort by MCBI. Ecotust data very helpful this round because saw info early on, but could be even more helpful if got to actually see maps for mor ethan 20 minutes. Recreational data interesting, but got info pretty late.
See previous answer. Regional Profile was great for context and trends! Nonconsumptive use survey was a decent start, but analysis comparable to that for rec fishing would make it much more helpful. Share maps of 100 penny exercise with all stakeholders (and not for 10 minutes only). Change instructions for commercial and rec data, perhaps to include last 5 to 8 years, not whole career. Recreational fishing data is more difficult to use given that there's no way to compare the absolute value of say pier fishing and party boat fishing, but any such estimate would probably cause more problems than would solve.
Fishermen, commerical and recreational, including divers and kayakers are the only groups to take a hit with MPA's. Find a way to compensate these groups for thier loss of areas. When 'conservation groups' celebrate in creation of reserves, make sure there is adequate compensation from the conservations groups going directly to support the fishermen and consumptives they have hurt.
oopsy i answered this in the previous question ;) but you could have more data on aggregate landings and more data on how MPA's can ebenfit - the projected financials were never focused on but are equally significant
It is very important to encourage as many individuals as possible to participate in the surveys (Ecotrust or others) in order to get the most accurate account of the impacts of specific MPA's. Of all the socioeconomic data used in the formulation of proposals, the most relied upon was the Ecotrust data and direct input from effected individuals. It is also important to have industry experts review the data for accuracy. I don't know where MARXAN came from but there is some

serious work that needs to be done there.
Provide this information earlier in the process and make it available in the public domain so RSG members had full access. Being limited to access during official meetings only is absurd. These are excellent products that need to see the light of day.
Ecotrust should estimate redistribution of effort from other fisheries around the world and report those actual losses from MPAs.
Only present and consider it if it meets scientific quality standards. The data on rec fishers never should have been presented because it had no validity. It was worse than nothing.
First, the non-consumptive study did have revenue/dollar amounts so if you compared it to the consumptive sides it was looking at apples and oranges. There was no comparative format to weigh different uses. This weighed it in favor, for instance, of a few commercial fisherman in Bolinas versus, for example, the millions of visitors to the Point Reyes National Seashore and all the local revenue this brings in. Also the fishing pressure study should focus its mapping on overall commercial fishing pressure, no port by port. It makes it hard to compare impacts. If two urhcin fisherman get the same clout as the entire Bodega salmon fleet, in their use areas, it throws off the matrix.
ensure to include it all!!!!

What, if anything, could have been done to improve the assistance provided to the NCCRSg throughout its process by the I-Team overall, Planning/GIS staff, Facilitation staff, or Dept. of Fish & Game staff? (n=13)
real time GIS analysis of socioeconomic and ecological info would be a great next step. Clearer guidance from DFG on what is feasible and what is not (turquoise discussions re SE Farallones comes to mind) would cut down the time spent on pointless discussions.
less paperwork, fewer computers, fewer power points with glossy MPA's and fat pregnant fish
F@G may have been helpful in finding some old reasearch studies
Facilitation staff, in spite of their high reputation and good intentions, did not enforce fair and even-handed processes at key junctures in the proceedings. The facilitation staff, at one critical point, called for a re-vote on a straw-vote on Salt Point State Park, resulting in loss of consideration of this keystone asset and leading to an entirely undemocratic voting process. One example of about four situations of this type that were not only allowed by the facilitators, but were led by the facilitators. In my opinion, facilitators should not impose their own preferences on the team for which they are charged with providing guidance.
Too broad of a question and probably too broad of a process to see efficiency. We were buried amidst the myriad reports, studies, and recommendations that might have been useful if we had a little more time. Unfortunately, most stakeholders also have somewhat of a real life and so the demands on time were severe. As for a resolution to questions or problems with the answers, probably nothing could be done. Too many agendas were at play to resolve and please all the people.
the dfg was not consistent in their "feasabiltiy guidelines"
Again add Dept of Employment and a Vocational Counselor to help with concerns by stakeholders whom make there living using resouces that will be changed by MLPA placement.
Concur could have stepped in more forcefully for the last BRTF meeting (it was a mess), but I know they tried and were shot down. DFG was very helpful until their final memo, in which they heavily overstepped their bounds.
Good to have all of the above as involved as they were. Staff were remarkably accessible and responsive, and that really made a difference in the process. On some issues, there was a conflict or inconsistency between what we heard from wardens/on-the-ground DFG staff about feasibility and what we heard later from DFG, particularly in round 3 when it was too late to make changes. It's unreasonable to expect perfect consistency, but if, e.g., DFG plans to oppose MPAs that allow too many uses, they should say that firmly to stakeholders at the start of the process, not a week before final RSG proposals are due.
the reason i am grading fish and game staff low is for two reasons - the first being in most of the

work sessions we would ask them about specific circumstances and they would approve or say okay - and then later they would say its not okay. and then secondly and perhaps most critically after the final proposals were submitted to the BRTF, dept of fish and game sent out a memo that was neither constructive nor inclusive of acknowledging why some choices were intentionally made with respect to local socio-economics or safety or other choices- instead it just bashed alot of the work and this memo was interpreted as mean spirited.
I believe that all members of the I-Team were very supportive and always available to provide assistance.
Nothing. Thanks to all of you.
You have heard it all before. I only have my one sticking point with CFGD. Otherwise they were steller like the rest of you. The staff of all teams was top notch

What, if anything, would you recommend doing differently in future MLPA study regions regarding understanding and use of scientific information? (n=13)
more direct interaction with sat members, in work groups for instance
the SAT only answered selected questions, discarding the touchy ones. very elite attitude as well. We were their students, not their equals
SAT was invaluable, the BRTF should have been more tuned in to the SAT process, so that science could have guided the BRTF consideration of the RSG options as they were submitted, instead of political pressures.
The entire process, to a degree, is supposed to be based on the best available science. However, the science for some areas, i.e., inshore areas, seems minimal. In addition, it still comes down to how you interpret the data and human biases plays a part. Do you see the forest for the trees, or fish for the kelp? I was once told by a DF&G marine biologist that ocean science is a guessing game and that the guesses are as often wrong as they are correct. Given that the biologist was finishing up a long-time career, it wasn't exactly encouraging information. I'm not sure if any of the fishermen on the stakeholder group agreed with the conclusions of the SAT or the recommended "protection values" assigned to types of fishing. Lacking agreement on that most basic aspect of the process, there is little reason to wonder why there wasn't greater support.
The sat should argue things out at their meetings and not use voting and motions to form thier collective viewpoints.
I need to be more involved in attending their meetings
Have modeling data on hand while drawing squares or understanding this formula while drawing mlpas zones. Have more SAT member attend worksession groups for immed feedback. Understanding SAT goals for stakeholders so do not take evaluations personally.
Uniformly high marks for the SAT, with a couple of suggestions: Make sure the caveats on the socio-economic analysis are crystal clear. There should be a clear statement that the percentages for recreational impact can't be averaged (and why) or used to develop dollar estimates (and why). Could error bars or uncertainty estimates be provided, or does lack of statistical significance of the sample make that impossible? Re Science evaluation: If the quality of the habitat, in addition to its type, influences the effectiveness of an MPA, is there any way to capture that characteristic in the analysis? This was an issue in both regions so far, and one that RSG members need to use their judgment (and local knowledge) about. If it's not practical or possible to provide quantitative info on habitat quality, perhaps SAT members could just acknowledge that it's a factor not captured in the analysis now.
The SAT repeatedly demonstrated a lack of knnowledge about sustainable fishing and how to accomplish that. The reserves agenda came thorough loud and clear. References to adaptive management were MIA.
getting our rsg science questions answered more expeditiously; having the SAT formed before the RSG so there would be no lag time
I only wish there were interaction from the SAT and that questions asked of the SAT didn't take 2 months to get an answer to from a sub SAT group that had to answer to the full SAT and then make a formal reply. What is with that. I would also like to see the SAT have a measure of accountability in some of the statements that they make along with their decisions. The use of

best readily available science is a poor excuse for what is best for California and is often not realistic for the study region. One instance is using Dungeness Crab mobility studies done in Glacier Bay Alaska to determine mobility of local crab to set levels of protection. I really enjoyed John Largier's oceanography briefing.
Final guidance was given at the LAST RSG meeting! This was symptomatic of the entire process. Questions would go left unanswered for months at a time. The SAT members that participated on the RSG were largely unavailable and/or not helpful. The evaluation was fine but nothing was included to help RSG members improve proposals. Clear communication of goals and objectives needed to make sure RSG members understand how they can meet SAT guidelines.
The SAT wasted time on answering questions that had no bearing on the process just because somebody wanted to know. There should be a better screen for the SAT activities. The evaluations were good but the standards were being discussed even at the last SAT meeting. It is time to put modeling in it's grave. It was not helpful to anybody except people who make money doing models. The science is just not there yet for decision making for large ecosystems. While modeling may have some relevance for a single species in a small geographic area it was just a waste of time and energy in this process.

What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the decision-support tools in future MLPA study regions? (n=16)
GIS support and DFG planning staff help was critical in this process. Doris sounded like a good idea, but did not seem to be friendly even to the tech savvy members of the RSG. Not a new idea, but an entirely standardized feet/fathoms delineation of all issues would be extremely helpful.
didn't really use DORIS, have own GIS software.
Doris is slow
The use of Doris needs more support. I found it difficult to use.
consider that many of us are not computer savvy. and do not aspire to ever be so.
Doris, while very useful, was a little slow and "clunky" to actually utilize in the real world, even with fast computers and fast internet connections, however this is understandable, since this is an emerging technology now first seeing application in the marine environment, and is likely to be fine-tuned as it is used more in the future.
Keep it short and simple; do not assume that everyone at the table has the hardware or is technologically as sophisticated as the I-Team staff. However, to be fair, they tried their best to educate us!
less doris
I never resolved my problems in getting access to Doris in the beginning and ended up using our own GIS.
A picture is worth a 1000 words. Maps very helpful for the public to understand and the faster we could publish the better to explain to interested and effective parties for better feedback.
GIS staff was amazing. Period.
1. Different GIS teams used different base maps during meetings, making it harder to compare among groups. Suggest you determine a single format for all teams to use during meetings. 2. Not being electronically inclined, I depended heavily in the design process on a set of hard copy maps by region of interest that I printed out at the start. They contained: substrate, lat/long 1 min graticule screened back), fathoms (and meter contours) and buoys from the nautical chart, towns and land features. They were helpful in situations where I was talking to locals folks without a computer.
Set up more work sessions with groups that include GIS to help with maps and calculations. Most home computers couldn't handle some of the Doris stuff. Saving it and making sense of it and sharing it with others was impossible for some of us.
having GIS support assigned to each workgroup and then dedicated to that team for the whole process so no info or context gets lost. having two people - one to drive the GIS and one to capture narrative
Get more money for the Doris Team to develop that tool. Use of Doris was not what you would

<p>call menu driven or easy. With a little more time, Doris could be the best tool for the RSG and any working member of the process to develop or inform decision makers. With the data layers that are available to Doris in a timely manner, there is little reason not to develop a very easy user friendly format. I have given them my suggestions and hope they are able to bring them to fruition. A huge thanks to the GIS staff.</p>
<p>Development of a real decision support tool and a planning tool that would enable RSG members to visualize how they were achieving (or not) the SAT goals as they were creating MPAs. This should be available in real time. Doris is a complete waste of resources. All SAT evaluation tools (spreadsheets etc...) should be available to RSG members so they can experiment with various options. the entire SAT evaluation process needs to be streamlined to facilitate real stakeholder participation without having to wait weeks-months for an evaluation.</p>

<p>How could the feedback and guidance provided by the BRTF to the NCCRSR after Rounds 1 and 2 have been more helpful? (n=14)</p>
<p>Feedback and guidance from the BRTF seemed to be completely ignored by everybody---the RSG, the I-Team, and the BRTF itself. Guidance on special closures? The weight of cross interest support? Perhaps simpler or more specific guidance (eg: three proposals) would be more helpful/useful.</p>
<p>the feedback was pretty clear.</p>
<p>Feedback amounted to nothing more than a goal number of proposals to reach if they had a clue. none of them were "ocean people".</p>
<p>BRTF did not appear to be fully engaged, except for one or two individuals who took the time to attend RSG meetings and observe the negotiating process, and who know the details of this particular study region</p>
<p>I felt mixed messages were sent.</p>
<p>Th brtf did not do their home work . The Chair asked the question " what is ex - vessel prices" ? on april 22 08 .</p>
<p>Not always what we wanted to hear but fair in there expectations. After all they too had a job to do and we should be glad they even asked us for our work in the process.</p>
<p>BRTF guidance was absolutely critical and was properly conveyed to us.</p>
<p>Golding was a poor leader, Caldwell came with too strict an agenda, of her own. Put members onthe BRTF the more represent sectors of the public that stand too loose, boat manufactures, tackle manufacturers, wholesalers.</p>
<p>less emphasis on consensus - consensus wasn't the objective</p>
<p>If the BRTF would have had the proper guidance from the SAT the BRTF would have had the information they desparatly needed to give the RSG the guidance they needed. I give a 3 out of respect to the BRTF members. It was not their fault.</p>
<p>Something more than telling us to reduce the number of proposals. At least in Round 2 they finally provided something resembling guidance</p>
<p>We got conflicting and unclear messages based on who you talked to. Staff opinions varied from what BRTF said publicly during the meetings. The issue of special closures was one which staff tried to derail throughout the process and used the BRTF as the bad guy. But, in fact the BRTF was fine with whatever the stakeholders came up with for special closures.</p>

What would have made you more satisfied with the deliberative process the BRTF used at its April 22-23 meeting to develop the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal for the NCC? (n=23)
The BRTF meeting on April 22-23 was not the best of public meetings. All the boilerplate for the first 2/3 of April 22 should not have been on the agenda; adequate time should have been reserved for presentations of 3 proposals; an adequate number of equally functional microphones should have been available; public comments should have all been taken at once (to reduce that urge that some people have to speak whenever given the chance); public comment should have been random rather than stacked according to support, and should have taken place close to staff guestimates (@ 2:00pm rather than six hours later). The deliberations that took place on the morning of April 23 should have started as early as possible on the first day---this was the essence of this meeting and many people---RSG members as well as the public---did not get to witness the best of the process.
I was not present, but watching parts of it on the internet it seemed very heavily on evaluation presentations etc the first day, when much of that could have been done by individual BRTF members if provided the info beforehand/briefed the night before. the time then could have been better spent in discussions with the RSG members over the reasons for differences in proposals.
If they had stuck with 1-3. I think they were winging it to make a new proposal. I agree with adding most of the state Parks changes but the other pieces shifted the balance.
Guidelines RSG were to follow was ok for BRTF to dismiss.
I feel the BRTF did not take into consideration the social-economic impact their preferred alternative will have on the communities in the north coast region.
If I felt the stakeholders had any connection with the BRTF world. They were not stakeholders at all.
It was sort of hard to swallow some of the miss information they put out to make their changes Where were we for a whole year to have things shot to hell in four hours?
Less politics and more science, less changing their minds after being lobbied at lunch by extractive users.
It was very unclear as to how and when testimony from the various stakeholders would be given. Due to prior commitments I could not attend both days of the meeting and really hoped to speak up during Day 1. Unfortunately, I was never given the opportunity to speak due to both format issues and what I felt was a poorly managed meeting. I had many things I wanted to say about the process and was never given the chance to say a single word. I was very unhappy driving home that night. As to the deliberative process used by the BRTF, I am still in the blue as to their thinking.
I am completely disenchanted with the brtf . I believe all three proposals should have gone to the commission without being accompanied with the brtf preferred alt.
Meeting was very long but overall good interaction between groups and BRTF. Recongition should have been at an earlier time so all RSG members that attended could have gotten there award rather than those whom stayed til the end.
I know the BRTF understodd the subtleties of the proposals and boundaries. But I don't know if they did the best job of showing that knowledge to those present at meeting. I also feel that MUCH more time should have spent doing side-by-sides by proposal co-leads. This is where the meat is, but because the meeting was run so poorly, we got only 1 minute each or so to explain why our shapes are the way they are, and I think this left many people feeling disillusioned with the BRTF process.
The North coast was an abomination. The ideas from the Russian River and south were good.
the meeting was poorly organized, and there should have been dedicated time slots for guest speakers like the director of parks, and other officials who came to speak but left because they had waited for so many hours. it would have also been much better if public comment by user groups was staggered and alternated, so not all 2xa at once or all 4 at once, but alternating so it was more evenly distributed.
I don't feel that there is even a need for a BRTF. I believe that the DFG Commission could decide for themselves what would be the best MPAs

<p>A more integrated approach that had closer interaction with the RSG working on the existing proposals per array and using the flexibility that is offered to the BRTF to further refine the proposals. At this time if the BRTF felt that they needed to integrate another proposal or that there were several proposals that were essentially the same and reduce the number sent to the Commission, they could.</p>
<p>There was no "process" involved in their creation of the "IPA". This was nothing more than politicians creating sausage. Only one proposal achieved ALL of the SAT guidelines and it did it with the least socioeconomic impact yet the BRTF chose to simply ignore that and succumb to political pressure. Their action reflects poorly on the entire process.</p>
<p>last minute changes by the BRTF seemed odd</p>
<p>They had made decisions the night before on their compromise. Give the north to 1-3 or 4 (because coastside is not strong there) and from Bodega south, go with 2. They tipped their hand when they got back from lunch and "admitted" they had voted the wrong way. Also, these were developed as packages not shopping carts. Yet, they went through each particular area and discussed the best for each area. Thus, the whole concept of a package was thrown out. So, next time, if that's what they are going to do, take each proposed area and have options for each discreet area. At the end then, a truly integrated package will be decided upon. And, any alternatives presented to F&G would be site specific which is how the hearings go anyway. The package system will only work if it is a take it or leave it but can't change it package.</p>
<p>greater consideration of RSG proposals with the most cross-interest support</p>
<p>There was a process? It seemed like the same thing as the meeting when the RSG was forced to vote after being presented to for an entire day. We were braindead after that meeting. I felt that the presentations before public comment and deliberation were way too long. The BRTF had heard much of this before and it forced public comment to wait until almost after dinner. Public comment in support of proposal 4 did not begin until after 9 p.m. It was unfair to let all the 2XA people go first and force everyone else to wait. Day 2 was a different story and made alot more sense.</p>
<p>Justifications for changes were not given.</p>

What would have made you more satisfied with the <i>substance</i> of the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal adopted on April 23? (n=20)
I would have been more satisfied if the IPA as well as the 3 final proposals from the RSG were less the products of anecdotal posturing and was anchored to a greater degree in science. I realize that our science is quite incomplete and also quite expensive, but there still should be a way to use the brains of all those marine scientists in the room that could have generated a network of MPAs that had less politic and more science.
the BRTF was interested and deliberative, and did a good job trying to take the needs of everyone into account.
a more common sense approach to the northern region. it seems like they got overwhelmed.
Less impact to the region north of Fort Ross.
many changes happened near the end, the salmon closure, VMS, no time to adjust, too fast track
I think the whole precess could have done its job without the BRTF
Restoration of reef habitats is among the most important part of bringing back California's nearshore coastal ecosystem and depleted rockfish populations, but Duxbury Reef is provided no option for restoration at all. Tragic outcome !
Following the 1-3 proposal for Saunder's Reef and keeping all of Salt Point open to recreational anglers.
The brtf voted 5-0 to adopt the 1-3 version at Saunders Reef ,, Then at the 11th hour chose the prop 4 version ... I am at a loss to explain this.
I was sorry the 1-3 plan for Duxsbury reef was dropped but other than this I thought there plan was something I could live with. I still think that the 1-3 plan was the best.
northern end of Bodega, Duxbury, more at northern end of Fitzgerald
stronger protection from Bodega Head to the southern end of the region. From the Russian River on down, the IPA replicates the least protective proposal, and that's a huge missed opportunity. Particularly disappointing is the omission of the highly diverse rocky reef habitat (with walls, pinnacles, rock islands...) at the northern end of the Bodega Head reserve and of an MPA at Duxbury Reef/Double Point, where an SMCA in part of the reef could help restore a treasured but heavily impacted place.
No Sea Lion Cove at all, no Saunder Reef, Less loss at Salt Point, more loss at Sea Ranch unless there want an agreement to improve access. In reality, access will very virtually non-existent. This becomes a private diving area for rich folk.
higher protection of fitzgerald and an smca at duxbury. creating an smca at duxbury does not shut down family fishing opportunities - it enriches them by allowing some of this critical habitat protection and a chance to replenish and eventually feed fishing ops. i will say that i wholeheartedly support how the BRTF attempted to listen to all info and chose to select from a variety of proposals with the strong back-bone of proposal 1-3 since proposal 1-3 was truly the only integrated/cross user proposal
I think the area North of the Russian River has been impacted too much.
From Russian River South the MPA's that were selected by the BRTF are "livable" and I feel will contribute to a viable statewide network. The areas that I find unnecessarily restrictive and somewhat punitive are the large SMR above Salt Point, Saunder's Reef, and Sea Lion Cove. The MPA with the most impact to the North is the large SMR. Feasibility has already indicated the use of Sea Lion Cove and Saunder's Reef as MPA's are not to the Departments liking and will do nothing to contribute to a viable statewide network. In proposal 2/XA, a solution has been offered that would conform to the MLPAL and cause the least impact to the extremely fragile economic nature of the North coast business structure. Further, the 2/XA solution will have the least impact to the Sea Ranch community and local land owners. With the IPA there will be a shift of effort that will result in further impact to the Ft. Ross area, and an increase in the use of the Sea Ranch, something that is already very contentious. In phone surveys of the Sea Ranch long term residents, it was an overwhelming consensus that they did NOT want any more public interaction. PERIOD One individual said that he will hire armed guards to stop any trespassing. I was told that dozens of trespassing tickets are given out on a regular basis by one member who should know. There are only 40 parking spaces among six access points in TSR. There are hundreds

<p>along the road south including the Salt Point State Park. This area needs to stay open to keep the masses where they normally go. The IPA will entirely eliminate any access for several land owners to the waters off their land. These landowners have always been great stewards of the lands and sea and really don't deserve such a blow. 2/XA provides some access. On a safety note for trollers working the contours off the coast for salmon, the IPA will cause a dangerous and unnecessary change in course that will put the boats broadside to the seas that are well known in the area. When you consider the most biologically important habitat is inside close to shore, less than 1 mile, why extend the MPA out to 3 miles and cause a dangerous condition. The Pt. Arena MPA is a good choice. Note to the BRTF: The job you did at Fitzgerald was excellent. We tried to do this but did not have the flexibility that you do. I appreciate your wisdom and sensability in creating this fine example of your abilities. I hope we or you are able to do this more in the future.</p>
<p>See previous question. A more balanced approach in the north was needed (north of Russian River).</p>
<p>All the real compromises had been made in 1-3. Dropping Duxbury was a real tragedy. It had one of the few areas where the effectiveness of MPA's could have been studied. Instead we ended up like the central coast process which is that wherever rec fishers go there are no reserves and so all the reserves are where nobody fishes now anyway. The one true exception to this was the Farallon islands where because Coastside didn't have a lot of input it turned out to be a very good proposal that all could agree on.</p>
<p>inclusion of additional MPA near double point that was included in 2 of the 3 RSG proposals</p>
<p>Duxbury, what else? But after all the rec fishing email alerts falsely told their members that we wanted to close down all of Duxbury (and the John Ugoretz letter) I assumed Duxbury was done for anyway. When the BRTF accidentally included it I was ecstatic. Its unfortunate that my efforts to be truthful with my membership (as all RSG members agreed to) was not met with the same level of truth from the other side.</p>

<p>Thinking back to the outset of the NCCRSG process, what, if anything, would have given you a clearer understanding of the way in which the BRTF was going to review and then make recommendations to the California Fish and Game Commission on the MPA proposals developed by stakeholders?? (n=12)</p>
<p>The unclarity was mostly a personal fault of not registering early or strong enough the role that the BRTF would have. I don't know if other RSG members shared this problem; if so, a BRTF meeting at the very beginning of the process, (rather than the occasional visit to the RSG meetings by Task Force members) might have been helpful</p>
<p>A statement of intent from the BRTF as to what or how they intended to use our proposals if you told us we were probably going to have very little to do with the outcome</p>
<p>Tell us at the outset that at the end of the day, when all of our diligent work was done, that our negotiated outcome would be supplanted by simple political shenanigans by appointees who had not really been part of the negotiations and who had not been following the science very closely.</p>
<p>The understanding was fairly clear; unfortunately some of my fears were proved to be accurate.</p>
<p>Perhaps to have had one of the BRTF members speak to the RSG toward the end of the meetings and explain how they plan on processing the RSG proposals.</p>
<p>Have all stakeholders understand the BRTF's goals and how they may differ from the NCCRSG's goals.</p>
<p>A primer on and discussion of the review process. But it's also important to emphasize the importance of the goals, not just the guidelines and analytic techniques. Otherwise there can be a tendency to game the system, or see meeting the guidelines as the end not the means.</p>
<p>in my mind this is a moot point - what the RSG should have been focused on is creating a proposal that best meets the charter, and giving the BRTF robust choices to select from</p>
<p>It would have been clearer if we knew that packages meant nothing. Except for them to be able to pass on so they could be in an EIS.</p>
<p>more explicit description of evaluation criteria</p>
<p>Considering how it turned out to be, not much.</p>

Thinking back to the outset of the NCCRSG process, what, if anything, would have given you a clearer understanding of the way in which the California Department of Fish and Game staff was going to review and comment on the feasibility of the MPA proposals developed by the NCCRSG? (n= 12)

Throughout the process the DFG played a deceptive and underhanded role as rulemaker, gatekeeper, and referee. Many of the Department staff were a great help to the RSG process, providing significant technical support and guidance. The Department's overarching dominance of defining the playing field---from delineating which species are "Depleted or Overfished" to a completely arbitrary and inconsistent measures of feasibility in regulatory structures---significantly undermined entire process. The Department's final analysis of the 3 proposals seemed to be bordering on bad faith. Many of the proposed MPAs had been on the table for months, so the absolutely critical and thoroughly dismissive tone of this final memo was really beyond comprehension. Where was the constructive feedback MONTHS earlier? If boundaries or whole MPAs were to be so unacceptable, shouldn't this have been made clear by the numerous Department staff that we repeatedly queried? A more cynical mind would think that a political fix had been leveled. unbelievable.

It seemed clear from the outset, but the final feasibility analysis memo was a surprise and appeared to be making at least some subjective recommendations best left to the BRTF and Commission.

just hand it to them from the start

Tell us that one person had what was essentially veto power over any of our negotiated proposals. The enforcement feasibility feedback was fine, but the arbitrary rejection of certain proposals was unfair and unreasonable. DFG staff should also be trained not to argue openly with members of the public during scoping meetings and other public events, it does not help reassure the general public....

I had thought that the DF&G would be a more neutral player in this process. Instead it appeared that they are advocates of the MLPA (perhaps due to the legislation) and far too often seemed to work against anglers

Again, if they thought that SMPs were something that contributed little to the MLPA, we should have discussed this early on in the process.

Immed feedback after purposals was submitted

I thought I fully understood. However, once they basically chose their own proposal under the guise of their DFG Feasibility memo, I realized I didn't.

DFG did a good job stating its preferences for how lines should be drawn, right from the beginning. Less clear was its interpretation of objectives (e.g. that some couldn't be applied at the site level, even once that site was part of a network; and that some were consistent only with full protection) and various other criteria for whether an MPA was acceptable.

this is the area that i think needs the most improvement. and to be clear i think feasibility choices are often at odds of other choices, so when we as stakeholders choose safety or local support over some obtuse feasibility i think that dfg has to do a better job of capturing and understanding that trade off - especially when they are in each and every work group and we purposefully address these choices and questions to them.

Unfortuntualy the DFG has been castrated in this process. This was evident when the BRTF chose to simply ignore all of their suggestions in favor of a politically motivated move to support California Parks. This action removed any amount of trust that this process is fair and balanced.

I give it a high score because we all understood that F&G is not bound by anything the RSG or BRTF does and will make their own decision. At least this time they won't have F& G staff fighting the RSG as much.

What, if anything, would have made you more satisfied with the NCCRSR proposal development process (before the final proposals were considered by the BRTF)? (n=18)
Recognizing that there would almost always be a hard consumptive and a hard non-consumptive position staked out, more time and effort should have been put into supporting a middle position, with some mechanism that would reward or elevate participation in the middle position. The polar proposals had the support of professional staffers (from the RSG pool) and lobbyists, whereas for the most part, 1 & 3 were generalists attempting to craft a proposal that was truly cross interest. The merge of the cross interest proposals should have taken place significantly earlier in the process to allow the time to completely develop this proposal.
RSG members (or external others) being permitted to provide synthesized information into the process at an earlier time.
if something could be done to make it even more collaborative, less competitive
The user groups with the most to lose were the least represented.
consider the over educated people who battle with the less educated. advantage goes to the educated
BRTF should have played a bigger role in the development of the options. I think giving the options leaders a few minutes to explain what they were trying to accomplish was not fair.
some key and critical areas, Duxbury Reef and Salt Point State Park in particular, were left behind and not addressed due to serious flaws in the stakeholder process, not for any other reason
A willingness by "all" participants to truly listen, empathize and sympathize with the feeling of fellow stakeholders. I know it's unrealistic and "pie-in-the-sky" but I was hoping for a miracle.
location of all the meetings should have been in the port towns that will be suffering the impacts of these MPA.
Already mentioned the last minute merges. I forgot to mention that some of the stakeholders were switching merge groups in order to vote in more than one proposal group. Not fair- stay where you were put!
I know that my voice was heard and sometimes even made a difference to how we decided to proceed with our work. I think everybody's did and even though not all of us got everything we wanted we were able to voice our concerns.
Too many conservation groups wanted closures for the sake of closures, without regard to economic impact too north coast areas. The Park service should be glad they get any closures and rally around those rather than advocating to take land from the public for their underwater park ideas. The idea of the Park Service wanting to close areas to the public should be met with a tremendous cut to their funding.
less straw polling so early with such random attendance in rooms, more decisions based on established criteria
Some reason you guys keep erasing my answers? Having the full plenary involvement I have stated earlier and without the agenda driven protectionist element causing unnecessary conflict to people that are trying to do the best for all of California and Californians.
A fair and balanced treatment of all stakeholders. See other comments for details.
Groups 4 and 1-3 worked well. Group 2 was a failure and allowing Coastside to capture group 2 and introduce an outside proposal as if it were a negotiated proposal was wrong. While group 4 was labeled as the conservation proposal it was in fact a multi-stakeholder group and modified their proposals based on input from stakeholders and other community members
slightly more time towards the end of the process to refine proposals and develop more consensus among stakeholders
I felt the closed caucus was a joke. It allowed all the fishermen to basically get together and strategize for their interests in a way that was unavailable and unsought by others who wanted an open process. This is the 2nd worst decision after my earlier complaint about throwing out hard-won compromise moderate MPAs.

Recognizing that the California Fish and Game Commission has not yet decided on an MPA proposal for the NCC, what changes would have improved your overall satisfaction with the process to develop MPAs for the NCC? (n=16)
further improvements to make the process even more transparent and democratic would help public buy-in ultimately
More consideration given to the commercial fisheries and to the social-economic impact of closure of abalone habitat
less politics, more reality. this is about the future generations, not preferred sites.
Not follow the process of sequential erosion of proposals that we saw during this process, only to set us up for more sequential erosion during the BRTF decision at the end, and likely a final political manipulation of the product still to come. Embarrassing!
More time might have allowed the stakeholders to reach consensus and prevented the horse trading going on in the back rooms.
F&G commission should have held at least one meeting with the RSG
I've already discussed them.
I still think that being asked for feedback is better than not and while maybe the process is not perfect it still beats having the Fish and Game Commission make decisions without information from the stakeholders.
Make that 5.5. Less emphasis on short-term, worst-case economic impact estimates. There should be more emphasis on benefits, or less on costs that probably won't be incurred, or both. My general satisfaction has a lot to do with the fact that the process was generally open, inclusive, and responsive. That feeling could be changed dramatically if the Commission were to weaken the IPA.
Some groups, like NRDC, Oceana, et al, were unrealistically recalcitrant towards the consumptive users.
less politicking, less tolerance for lying - but overall i have to say everyone who had their hearts in the right place and the majority of the staff did a tremendous job
I really don't think there is a need for an IPA.
I think if you read the previous statements I have made you will understand
See previous answers
If we had come up with proposals that really would have made a difference in the ocean ecosystem
Obviously, I wish it wasn't so political. But such is life.

Please list up to 3 things you would recommend doing similarly in future MLPA study regions - first recommendation: (n=25)
DFG not make preferred alternative
eco trust scocio-eco data
cross-interest work groups
More user group participation.
Small working groups. e.g., gems
establish goals and objectives early on in the process
Diverse "gem" groups
Good ecological characterization as baseline at the beginning
Have a diversity of interests represented on the group.
keep the working group structure intact
covering ground rules and goals
Breaking up in small work groups (gem groups)
work groups across interests
facilitator interviews of RSG candidates
Structured outcomes for meetings
Gems group formations
mixing up the work groups is good
GIS help
Keep as many of the administrative Teams as possible in order to have a strong knowledge base of experienced individuals to offer their expertise to emerging RSG. I Team, Concur, Ecotrust, Dept. etc.
Continue to strengthen the mapping capabilities
Concur facilitators
cross interest working groups
Get good representative stakeholders
use of cross interest work groups
gem groups - breakouts rock

Second recommendation of what to do similarly (n=20)
Similar makeup/balance of RSG
live gis personal
support information & documents
Providing a regional profile
split people into cross-interest teams
continue social gatherings of groups
Good sidescan sonar done for all of the region
Follow most of the procedures that were used up until the December meeting.
access to SAT / BRTF meetings
Traveling to all regions in study area so can understand all areas.
several iterations of proposals, with SAT and DFG feedback after each
cross-int RSG groups, eventual incentives to merge divergent proposals
EcoTrust socioeconomic data
having co-leads
staff availability
Continue to have meetings in familiar places but please find somewhere better than Pacifica. That place has the worst lighting and gives everyone that braindead feeling. LOL I did find the meeting in Gualala to be extremely helpful for public outreach and local interaction for the RSG. These outlier areas need to be physically experienced by the RSG.

Live GIS support
Be sure F&G staff are fully involved and participate
use of meeting locations throughout study region
top notch GIS/Planning/CFGD/Concur/Initiative staff - the best part of the whole process

Third recommendation of what to do similarly (n=18)
equal representation in work groups
side-by-side comparisons
Straw voting
keep the size of the group the same or smaller
keep Delbra and give her a raise
Explain to the RSG at the beginning that they are only advisory and may be over-ruled by politics
Provide adequate compensation to those stakeholders whose organizations do not compensate them for their time and expenses. It's one way to assure a more level playing field
gem groups
Facilitation by either Concur or Fish and Game staff for meetings and work sessions to stay focused!
equal representation in work groups
side-by-side comparisons
Straw voting
keep the size of the group the same or smaller
keep Delbra and give her a raise
Explain to the RSG at the beginning that they are only advisory and may be over-ruled by politics
Provide adequate compensation to those stakeholders whose organizations do not compensate them for their time and expenses. It's one way to assure a more level playing field
gem groups

Please list up to 3 things you would suggest doing differently in future MLPA study regions – first recommendation (n=26)
Ensure DFG provides feasibility evaluations in the detail of their final feasibility analysis much earlier on during RSG process
more live sat participation
"Surprise" straw votes to rank or narrow selections
Less enviro and gov participation on the RSG.
Streamline the paperwork
try to reach consensus on FINAL goals and objectives
Lessa time on ground rules
Use more caution in picking stakeholders
More democratic facilitation process, no favoritism by facilitators, stick to professional facilitators, not DFG staff to lead groups
Decrease the number of stakeholders who come from public agencies
put the cost of monitoring and enforcement up front
I would try to explain better the role & goals of State Parks in relation to the MLPA to the other RSG members
Converging gem groups sooner in process
DFG should not overstep by making biased statements about how some MPAs should be eliminated. The point of protection levels is flexibility; to allow uses to account for socioeconomics and then have been so flexible that DFG says they'e useless is a Catch 22 that is very unhelpful
more extensive data collection on non consumptive use, and use it, if possible, to compare benefits of various alternatives
More time for group discussions

Speed up the process when lines start to appear on maps
better agenda and time management
more time to develop the final gems proposals
Convene the SAT very early in the process and have them work closely with the RSG to make sure that the RSG fully understands what the levels of protection mean and how the evaluation process works. There should be a test for all RSG to pass and a mock MPA study to help them in their development skills.
Too many to list...No forced cross-interest groups
Minimize listserve informal and off-topic comments
Acknowledge that Fishers have a strong conflict of interest in MPA design.
Prevent a group like Coastside or other rec fishers from "hijacking" the process
commitment by BRTF and F&G Commission to adopt a consensus proposal if the RSG can achieve one
punishment for RSG members that attempt boycotts (Sean, ed and Ben) or intimidate other RSG members (sean white comes to mind)

Second recommendation of what to do differently (n=24)
Set time aside for including discussion on ways to use MPAs to better meet the goals of the MLPA (eg no disturbance areas/Special Closures)
accurate substrate charts
Less time laying groundwork - We didn't look at maps & #s until well into the 11 months
Quicker response from the SAT to questions from RSG
allow special closure discussions early on (in applicable)
less time hashing goals and objectives in the beginning
More representation provided to non-extractive interests
Give adequate time to process new information. Receiving new study materials a day or two before the meeting is unacceptable and if the meetings have to be scheduled further apart so be it.
put the cost to the economy up front
Don't allow a situation where the balance of representation by stakeholders is compromised by an external group
More direct interaction or coaching from SAT at work sessions or during travel meetings.
less time on models
more complete DFG guidance on feasibility upfront
More early guidance from SAT
Have EcoTrust value economic loss of closure proposals
always professional facilitation esp for very divergent grps
no government representatives allowed to vote on proposals
Do not break up the RSG. This only dilutes the effectiveness of the RSG knowledge base and causes some to take on a competition attitude that is not conducive to making viable MPA's that will benefit California. Make sure that each RSG member is fully versed and understands the evaluation processes and is well aware of the master plan. Tests should be given prior to the creation of MPA's. Also, as the RSG is formed, it would be wise to see how the members interact with one another in a mock MPA creation setting. See previous responses for further suggestions.
Balanced approach when selecting RSG
Better facilitate review of external proposals
Rely on Marxan and other models
Decide well in advance against packages. Do site specific negotiations
consideration of non-fishing related adverse impacts to marine life
consumptive users should not have more votes than all other interests combined. After all some of the other RSG members were bound by multiple use mindset or did not allow themselves to vote at all (like GFNMS)

Third recommendation of what to do differently (n=19)
Synthesize regional profile into more digestible form
less of a doomsday atmosphere in the beginning
Get correct socioeconomic info out more quickly
More time for public comment.
Bring SAT and BRTF out of the clouds. they are just people
No intimidation of stakeholders by other stakeholders should be permitted, as was routine in the NCCR, particularly the intimidation of female RSG members by certain of the sport fishing interests
Provide a copy of the SAT scores for the Central and North Central regions at the start of the process and discuss how important the scores are to the process.
add the above figures together
No last minute merges- it invites political maneuvering and dishonesty
More concern about vocational outcomes and bringing in the appropriate agencies to help with this issue. Shifts can be achieved and there are agencies to help with this if Fish and Game are not. Impact studies should be at least attempted by somebody from the state of CA.
brief BRTF and decisionmakers ahead of time on SAT and DFG evals so that public meetings are not bogged down with lengthy presentations
socio-ec data available earlier, and 100 penny maps distributed
RLFF fund upgraded laptops for participants
better adherence to ground rules
Please make sure that you ask all RSG if they have any affiliations or connections to other organizations. For the SAT make sure they are using sound science and not just pulling rabbits out of their hats.
Remove agency reps that do not bring anything to process of MPA creation (NPS, NMS, State Parks)
Get work sessions on task sooner
Set the bar high for MPAs, Have SAT re evaluate if they really think their size and spacing guidelines are adequate and how they might better interact with the EDOM models.
ensuring that hard won compromises are respected instead of trashed by members of the MLPA leadership

Additional comments to share with evaluators: (n=14)
thanks!
I'm fearful that this process is privately funded. it's a scary course change away from representative gov't towards corporate control of public policy. This seems to be the thing that scares people the most. it also leads to cynicism.
It was quite an education in many ways. It opened my eyes to many of the agendas of the environmental community. As our population continues to grow we need more areas to recreate and here we are making this area smaller. It would have been nice to have a few MPAs and study them to confirm their value as the scientific community seems to be split on their value.
Overall this has been a rewarding experience. Because of the varied interest of the RSG membership getting to agreement on anything was a challenge. The current process works but the timeline we were given was too short. Thank you for the opportunity to share my comments with you.
overall I enjoyed the whole thing. It drew me to tears, it helped develop friendships with people I disagree with. I would do it again.
I tried as hard as I could to save as much of our fishing grounds as I could I was disappointed that we lost some of our grounds but feel that we did save enough area to survive if the commission is fair

<p>It is obvious that this is a difficult set of social decisions for any population to make, and it enrages some interest groups to step back from their habitual extractive endeavors and recognize that there must be reasonable limits on "taking" from natural systems. But no segment of our society has the right to deplete the public trust resource to their own profit and benefit, at the cost of passing the living marine environment on to future generations intact and in sustainable condition. Democratic process should prevail, to a greater extent than this time during the NCCR, in the next shoreline segment to be undertaken in the MLPA process. RSG members, serving as volunteers, should not be allowed to unwittingly become objects of intimidation and antisocial treatment by those who disagree with them philosophically. The process is as important as the outcome.</p>
<p>Although some of my answers may seem to be somewhat negative, I also felt the process was one of the most enriching of my life. I am better educated, have a better understanding of both sides of the equation, and have several new friends. I just hope that whatever we have done is a positive action that helps more than it hurts.</p>
<p>I am appalled that the th process allowed paid reps from large non governmental organizations like nrdc and oc to participate. The word stakeholder implies someone who has something to loose.</p>
<p>Have followup in future to see outcome of MLPA's and how stakeholders were effected. I plan on not only explaining to my grandchildren how process went to create MLPA's but ensure that they interact in there lifetime with the finished product. I think this would be great publicity to show how process worked!</p>
<p>Overall, a great, functional process and I am proud to have been a part of it.</p>
<p>Building relationships on RSG was important, and encouraged by dinners, boat trip to Farallones, etc. Keep that up! Encouragement to stakeholders to represent more than a single constituency was also important.</p>
<p>are we there yet? :) ha ha! i learned a great deal from what i like to call "my year of making sausage" and am glad to have been able to contribute to the process. i fully expect/hope the commission to choose the BRTF IPA - because otherwise it feels like a lot of really hard work for nothing.</p>
<p>Scott and Eric - you're great facilitators. Thanks for all your work. I have my few misgivings, but you did a great job. Grade A- (for the closed caucus decision)</p>