

# California Marine Life Protection Act

## Evaluation of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Process



August 7, 2008

Dr. Jonathan Raab  
RAAB ASSOCIATES, LTD.



12 Farnsworth St.  
Boston, MA 02210  
617.350.5544  
[www.RaabAssociates.org](http://www.RaabAssociates.org)

## **Table of Contents**

<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. On-Line Survey Respondents</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III. Composition, Size, Timeframe, and Organization</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IV. Work Products, Information and Technical Assistance</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>V. NCCRSO Process Objective</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VI. Blue Ribbon Task Force and Department of Fish and Game</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VII. Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>21</b>

## I. Introduction

This report focuses exclusively on data from an on-line survey of representatives and alternates who participated in the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSO). The NCCRSO was the second stakeholder process launched to help implement California's ground-breaking Marine Life Protection Act along California's entire coast. The first RSO, the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSO) was completed in 2006.<sup>1</sup>

The NCCRSO met eleven times in 2007 and 2008. There were a total of 45 primary and alternate representatives participating. At the end of April 2008 the NCCRSO submitted three different MLPA package proposals to a Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), which forwarded those packages, along with the BRTF's own Integrated Preferred Alternative, to the Fish and Game Commission (FGC) in June 2008.

Raab Associates conducted an online survey for 2.5 weeks in June 2008, after the BRTF's submittals to the FGC, but before the FGC's final decision (which is still pending as this document is finalized). This window between the BRTF recommendations and the FGC's final decision is the same window during which we evaluated the CCRSO process previously, and was adopted here for consistency.

In the body of this report, we present our analysis of the NCCRSO data from the on-line survey, and in the appendix, we reproduce the written responses to the more open-ended questions. Where the questions were reasonably identical to those we asked of CCRSO stakeholders previously (about 1/3 of the questions), we compare and contrast the results. Most of the analysis focuses on the statistical means of the total results, although the full range and distribution of responses are also shown and drawn into the analysis where appropriate.

The primary purpose of this report is to provide data and feedback based on the on-line survey responses to the MLPA Team, the evaluators, the public, and the stakeholders themselves. This report does not include recommendations, as its primary purpose is to provide data for a broader evaluation being conducted by Michael Harty.

---

<sup>1</sup> Raab Associates, Ltd. conducted an evaluation of the CCRSO process, including one-on-one interviews, group interviews, and direct observation in addition to an on-line survey. Raab Associates, Ltd., "California Marine Life Protection Act: Evaluation of the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group Process", August 14, 2006.

## II. On-Line Survey Respondents

Thirty-two participants in the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRS), accounting for 71% of the 45 primary and alternate representatives, responded to the online survey.

<b>Survey Respondents from the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (n=32)</b>		
Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
Baty	Tom	independent sportfisher and conservationist (alternate for Craig Merrilees)
Becker	Ben	Pacific Coast Science and Learning Center Director, Point Reyes National Seashore (alternate for Don Neubacher)
Bernard	Bill	Member, Abalone Advisory Group
Breen	Bob	Educator
Charter	Richard	Associate, Defenders of Wildlife Marine Program (alternate for Karen Garrison)
Churchman	Josh	commercial fisherman
Estes	Tom	commercial fisherman (alternate for Michael McHenry)
Fastenau	Henry	Diving and Boating Safety Officer, Bodega Marine Laboratory, UC Davis
Faurot-Daniels	Ellen	Oil Spill Supervisor, California Coastal Commission
Garrison	Karen	Co-Director, Natural Resources Defense Council Ocean Program
Golbus	Aaron	Wharfinger, Port of San Francisco
Herring	Russell	Secretary/Treasurer, Southern Pacific Sinkers Fish Club (alternate for Bill Bernard)
Johnson	Rick	docent and teacher (alternate for Bob Breen)
Jones	Ken	President, United Pier and Shore Anglers of California
King	Patricia L	ocean conservationist and docent (alternate for Kelly Nelson)
Koe	Francesca	VP and Managing Director, Underground Ads
Mattusch	Tom	Owner, Hulicat Sportfishing (alternate for Jay Yokomizo)
Mellor	John	commercial fisherman (alternate for Josh Churchman)
Murray	Samantha	Ecosystem Program Manager, The Ocean Conservancy
Pierce	Paul	Member, Coastside Fishing Club (alternate for Ben Sleeter)
Reyna	Karen	Resource Protection Specialist, Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (alternate for Irina Kogan)
Roberts	Santi	Project Manager, Oceana
Sanders	Philip	Member, California Abalone Association (alternate for Dirk Ammerman)
Sleeter	Ben	Political Advocate/Scientist, Coastside Fishing Club
Smith	Frederick	Executive Director, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin
Swolgaard	Craig	Natural Resources Program Manager, California Department of Parks and Recreation
Tavasieff	Ed	Owner, California Fresh Fish and Secretary, Pacific Fisheries Enhancement Foundation
Teufel	Cassidy	Coastal Program Analyst, California Coastal Commission (alternate for Ellen Faurot-Daniels)
Tipon	Nick	Member, Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (alternate for Nelson Pinola)
Wilson	Robert J.	Policy Liaison, The Marine Mammal Center (alternate for Santi Roberts)
Yarger	David	Past President, Fisherman's Marketing Association of Bodega Bay (alternate for Ed Tavasieff)
Yokomizo	Jay	Captain, Emeryville Sportfishing

Exactly half of the respondents were Primary Representatives and half were Alternate Representatives. Survey respondents were active participants in the NCCRSR process, with 47% attending all 11 meetings, and the other 54% attending 7-10 meetings.

<b>I was a member of the NCCRSR as a</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Primary Representative	50.0%	16
Alternate Representative	50.0%	16
<i>answered question</i>		<b>32</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

<b>There were 8 full NCCRSR meetings and 3 full Gems work sessions, for a total of 11 meetings, plus additional informal work sessions. I attended at least portions of</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
0 none	0.0%	0
1	0.0%	0
2-6	0.0%	0
<b>7-10</b>	53.1%	17
11 (all full RSG meetings and formal work sessions)	46.9%	15
<i>answered question</i>		<b>32</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

Three-quarters of the respondents identified the entire MLPA North Central Coast Study Region as their primary geographic area of use and interest, with approximately 22% identifying themselves primarily with the section north of San Francisco Bay and 3% with the section south of the Bay.

<b>My primary geographic area of use and interest in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region is</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
North of San Francisco Bay	21.9%	7
South of San Francisco Bay	3.1%	1
Entire MLPA North Central Coast Study Region	75.0%	24
<i>answered question</i>		<b>32</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

Approximately one third of the respondents identified themselves as “consumptive users” (fisherman, consumptive diver). Approximately another third identified themselves as affiliated with a “conservation group” or as a “non-consumptive user” (kayaker, diver, marine educator). The remaining third indicated affiliation with public agencies, or identified themselves as “other” (see below for responses to other).

<b>The following category best captures my affiliation</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Consumptive user (fisherman, consumptive diver)	34.4%	11
Non-consumptive user (non-consumptive kayaker or diver, marine educator)	9.4%	3
Public agency	18.8%	6
Conservation group	21.9%	7
Other (please specify)	15.6%	5
	<i>answered question</i>	32
	<i>skipped question</i>	0
<b>Responses to “Other” (5)</b>		
Native American alt.		
dive instructor, consumptive & non-consumptive diver, and dive charter operator		
commercial fisherman /wholesaler		
So you can not be a "consumptive user" and a "conservation group"? I represented a partnership of conservation angling groups.		
F&G Commission appointed Recreational Advisor		

### III. Composition, Size, Timeframe, and Organization

Overall, respondents rated the composition of the stakeholder organization as more well-balanced than poorly balanced, with a mean of 3.81 out of six. However, while 44% of respondents felt the composition was well balanced (choosing 5 or 6), 22% felt it was poorly balanced (choosing 1 or 2). It's also noteworthy that overall satisfaction with the composition of the RSG was higher in the NCCRSR process than in the Central Coast RSG (CCRSR) process, where the mean was only 3.16, indicating a stronger concern with the overall balance. When asked "what would have made it more balanced?", 20 of the NCCRSR respondents offered a wide range of suggestions (see appendix); however, there was a relatively even split between those recommending inclusion of more consumptive users vs. those recommending inclusion of more non-consumptive users and NGOs..

Overall, I felt that the composition of stakeholder organizations represented on the NCCRSR was								
Answer Options	1 (Poorly balanced)	2	3	4	5	6 (Well balanced)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer	18.8% 6	3.1% 1	12.5% 4	21.9% 7	31.3% 10	12.5% 4	3.81	32
							<i>answered question</i>	32
							<i>skipped question</i>	0

Question Text	Scale	2008 NCCRSR		2006 CCRSR		Change in Means 2008-2006
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Overall, I felt that the composition of stakeholder organizations represented on the (N)CCRSR was:	1 (Poorly balanced)  6 (Well balanced)	3.81	1.72	3.16	1.4	0.65

The overall perception regarding the size of the NCCRSG came down slightly on the “too large” side, with a mean of 4.45 out of 7. However, 65% of the respondents rated the size as essentially just right (ranking it a 4) and none of the respondents ranked it as “too small”. In the Central Coast process, the adjusted mean was slightly higher - 4.76 vs. 4.45 - indicating that a few more respondents in that process felt the group size was too large. Also, the standard deviation for the NCCRSG was smaller than for the CCRSG (0.9 vs. 1.35), indicating a wider range of views on size among participants in the earlier RSG process. (See appendix for 13 comments related to group size.)

<b>I felt that the overall group size of the NCCRSG (i.e., number of Primaries and Alternates) was</b>									
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>1=Too Small</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7=Too Large</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Answer:	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.2% 1	<b>64.5%</b> <b>20</b>	22.6% 7	3.2% 1	6.5% 2	4.45	31
<i>answered question</i>									31
<i>skipped question</i>									1

<b>Question Text</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>2008 NCCRSG</b>		<b>2006 CCRSG</b>		<b>Change in Means</b>
		<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>2008-2006</b>
I felt that the overall group size of the (N)CCRSG (i.e., number of Primaries and Alternates) was*:	1 (Too small) 7 (Too large)	4.45	0.9	4.76	1.35	-0.31

\* Survey mean (for 2006 data) has been adjusted from a 1-6 answer range to a 1-7 range.



Almost half of the respondents rated the length of time for the entire NCCRSG process as just right (4 out of 7). However, with a mean of 3.58, the group as a whole felt that the length of time was a bit too short. The adjusted mean from the previous CCRSG process of 2.94 indicates that not having enough time was less of a concern in the NCCRSG process than the CCRSG process, but that it was still a concern. (Suggestions from 16 respondents on improving the timeframe are in the appendix.)

I felt that the length of time for the entire NCCRSG process (approximately eleven months from our first plenary meeting in May 2007 to our last meeting in April 2008) was									
Answer Options	1 (Too Short)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Too Long)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	9.7%	12.9%	9.7%	<b>48.4%</b>	16.1%	3.2%	0.0%	3.58	31
	3	4	3	15	5	1	0		
<i>answered question</i>									31
<i>skipped question</i>									1

Question Text	Scale	2008 NCCRSG		2006 CCRSG		Change in Means
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	2008-2006
I felt that the length of time for the entire (N)CCRSG process was*:	1 (Too short)– 7 (Too long)	3.58	1.29	2.94	1.26	0.64

\* Survey mean (for 2006 data) has been adjusted from a 1-6 answer range to a 1-7 range.

Overall, respondents felt that the cross-interest works groups were “very helpful”, with a mean of 4.81, and with over 50% of respondents giving it a 6. Only four respondents out of 31 thought that it was “very unhelpful.” (See appendix for thoughts from 15 respondents on working group structures.)

How helpful was the creation and use of cross-interest working groups (i.e., Gems) to the overall success of the NCCRSG process and results?									
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count	
Answer:	12.9%	0.0%	3.2%	12.9%	19.4%	<b>51.6%</b>	4.81	31	
	4	0	1	4	6	<b>16</b>			
<i>answered question</i>									31
<i>skipped question</i>									1

## IV. Work Products, Information and Technical Assistance

We asked respondents to rate the “helpfulness” of eight work products produced in the course of the NCCRSR process. All of the work products, with the exception of the “Options for Special Closures,” got a mean rating above 3.5 (the middle of the 1-6 range). The “Options for Special Closures” received the lowest mean, 3.13, with over 50% of respondents rating the products as “very unhelpful”. The work products that were rated as most helpful were the “Round 2 and Round 3: Draft Proposals,” with means of 4.34 and 4.25 respectively. Not far behind were the “Groundrules” (4.16), the “Regional Profile” (4.13), and the “Round 1 Work Team Concepts and Draft External Proposals” (4.13). Slightly lower, but still receiving overall positive means were the “Regional Goals” (4.13) and the “Regional Objectives/Design Considerations” (3.88). (The Appendix contains a wide range of suggestions for improving the work products in future RSG processes, with comments from 22 respondents.)

How helpful did you feel the following work products were in completing the overall work of the NCCRSR?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count
Groundrules	3.1% 1	6.3% 2	15.6% 5	<b>34.4%</b> 11	28.1% 9	12.5% 4	4.16	32
Regional Profile	9.4% 3	6.3% 2	15.6% 5	21.9% 7	<b>25.0%</b> 8	21.9% 7	4.13	32
Regional Goals	3.1% 1	9.4% 3	<b>28.1%</b> 9	18.8% 6	15.6% 5	25.0% 8	4.09	32
Regional Objectives/ Design Considerations	3.1% 1	18.8% 6	18.8% 6	18.8% 6	<b>28.1%</b> 9	12.5% 4	3.88	32
Round 1: Work Team Concepts and Draft External Proposals	15.6% 5	3.1% 1	6.3% 2	<b>28.1%</b> 9	21.9% 7	25.0% 8	4.13	32
Round 2: Draft Proposals	9.4% 3	6.3% 2	6.3% 2	21.9% 7	<b>31.3%</b> 10	25.0% 8	4.34	32
Round 3: NCCRSR Proposals	9.4% 3	9.4% 3	12.5% 4	12.5% 4	<b>28.1%</b> 9	<b>28.1%</b> 9	4.25	32
Options for Special Closures	<b>25.8%</b> 8	<b>25.8%</b> 8	3.2% 1	16.1% 5	12.9% 4	16.1% 5	3.13	31
<i>answered question</i>								<b>32</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>0</b>

Below is a comparison of the means and standard deviations for similar work products in both the NCCRS and CCRS processes (at least in form if not exactly in content). The table shows that while the “Groundrules” were more favorably rated in the CCRS process than in the NCCRS process (4.50 vs. 4.16), the “Regional Profile”, “Regional Goals,” and “Regional Objectives” were all ranked somewhat higher in the NCCRS process.

Question Text	Scale	2008 NCCRS		2006 CCRS		Difference in Means
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	2008-2006
How helpful did you feel the following work products were in completing the overall work of the NCCRS/CCRS:						
Groundrules	1 (Very unhelpful)–6 (Very helpful)	4.16	1.22	4.50	1.50	<b>-0.34</b>
Regional Profile	1 (Very unhelpful)–6 (Very helpful)	4.13	1.15	3.88	1.60	<b>0.25</b>
Regional Goals	1 (Very unhelpful)–6 (Very helpful)	4.09	0.99	3.79	1.59	<b>0.30</b>
Regional Objectives	1 (Very unhelpful)–6 (Very helpful)	3.88	1.43	3.54	1.67	<b>0.34</b>

Respondents rated the technical information and analysis provided by the MLPA Initiative Team as very helpful, with a mean of 4.84, and 61% of respondents rating the I-Team’s technical information and analysis as a 5 or 6. The technical information and analysis provided by the SAT, also received high ratings, with a mean of 4.03, and 45% of respondents rating their contribution as a 5 or 6. The Department of Fish and Game’s contribution of technical information and analysis received a positive, though slightly lower mean of 3.84. While 45% of respondents rated it as “very helpful”, almost 30% rated it as “very unhelpful” (a rating of 1 or 2). (The appendix lists technical documents that 18 respondents indicated were particularly helpful.)

<b>I felt that the technical information and analysis provided by the following entities as we worked on forming MPA proposals during the course of the NCCRSG process was</b>								
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>1 (Very Unhelpful)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6 (Very Helpful)</b>	<b>Rating Average</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
MLPA Initiative Team	0.0% 0	6.5% 2	6.5% 2	16.1% 5	<b>38.7%</b> <b>12</b>	32.3% 10	4.84	31
Science Advisory Team	9.7% 3	12.9% 4	16.1% 5	16.1% 5	16.1% 5	<b>29.0%</b> <b>9</b>	4.03	31
Dept. of Fish and Game	6.5% 2	22.6% 7	12.9% 4	12.9% 4	<b>29.0%</b> <b>9</b>	16.1% 5	3.84	31
							<i>answered question</i>	31
							<i>skipped question</i>	1

Of the socioeconomic data provided to the NCCRSG, the means indicate that only the Ecotrust estimate of impacts to commercial fisheries from the MPA proposals (4.26) and the information in Regional Profile Section 5 (4.03) were viewed as being helpful. At the same time, the mean of the Ecotrust estimate of impacts to recreational fisheries from MPA proposals (3.52), and the survey data on selected non-consumptive uses in the NCC region (3.39) were both viewed as somewhat less helpful. (The appendix includes recommendations from 22 respondents for improving the socioeconomic information in MLPA study areas.)

How helpful did you feel the following sources of socioeconomic information were in completing the work of the NCCRSG								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count
Information in Regional Profile Section 5	6.9% 2	3.4% 1	20.7% 6	<b>31.0%</b> 9	24.1% 7	13.8% 4	4.03	29
Survey data (MPA Center/MCBI) on selected non-consumptive uses in NCC region	16.1% 5	9.7% 3	22.6% 7	<b>32.3%</b> <b>10</b>	9.7% 3	9.7% 3	3.39	31
Ecotrust estimate of impacts to commercial fisheries from MPA proposals	0.0% 0	3.2% 1	<b>29.0%</b> 9	22.6% 7	<b>29.0%</b> 9	16.1% 5	4.26	31
Ecotrust estimate of impacts to recreational fisheries from MPA proposals	16.1% 5	12.9% 4	<b>19.4%</b> 6	<b>19.4%</b> 6	<b>19.4%</b> 6	12.9% 4	3.52	31
<i>answered question</i>								<b>31</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>1</b>

On average, respondents expressed strong support for all the assistance to the NCCRSB from various entities. The strongest support, with a mean of 5.52, was for the Planning/GIS staff, followed by the Facilitation staff (Concur) with a mean of 5.35, and then the MLPA I-Team (overall), with a mean of 5.10. The Department of Fish and Game staff had a relatively lower but still positive rating with a mean of 4.42. (In the appendix, 13 respondents offer suggestions for improving the assistance provided by one or more of the entities identified in the table.)

How helpful was the assistance provided to the NCCRSB throughout its process by								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count
MLPA I-Team overall	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	6.5% 2	25.8% 8	19.4% 6	48.4% 15	5.10	31
Planning/GIS staff	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	6.5% 2	9.7% 3	9.7% 3	74.2% 23	5.52	31
Facilitation staff (Concur)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.2% 1	16.1% 5	22.6% 7	58.1% 18	5.35	31
Dept. of Fish & Game staff	3.2% 1	9.7% 3	19.4% 6	12.9% 4	19.4% 6	35.5% 11	4.42	31
<i>answered question</i>								31
<i>skipped question</i>								1

Respondents found the assistance provided to the NCCRSR by the SAT to be “helpful” on average but not “very helpful”. The highest scores were given to the SAT’s evaluation of MPA proposals (4.39) followed by the SAT’s briefings on topics of interest (4.33). Less helpful but still with slightly positive means were the SAT’s answers to science questions from the RSG (3.84) and the respondents’ direct interaction with SAT members at RSG or other meetings (3.81). (The appendix includes responses from 13 respondents about what should be done differently in future MLPA study regions regarding the understanding and use of scientific information.)

How helpful was the following assistance provided to the NCCRSR throughout its process by the Science Advisory Team (SAT)?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count
Direct interaction with SAT members at RSG or other meetings	9.7% 3	12.9% 4	<b>22.6%</b> <b>7</b>	16.1% 5	19.4% 6	19.4% 6	3.81	31
SAT answers to science questions from RSG	12.9% 4	16.1% 5	12.9% 4	12.9% 4	<b>22.6%</b> <b>7</b>	<b>22.6%</b> <b>7</b>	3.84	31
SAT briefings on topics of interest (e.g. oceanography, birds and mammals, etc.)	3.3% 1	10.0% 3	23.3% 7	10.0% 3	20.0% 6	<b>33.3%</b> <b>10</b>	4.33	30
SAT evaluation of MPA proposals	6.5% 2	12.9% 4	6.5% 2	16.1% 5	25.8% 8	<b>32.3%</b> <b>10</b>	4.39	31
<i>answered question</i>								<b>31</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>1</b>

Regarding decision-support tools provided during the RSG process, respondents found the hardcopy maps and live GIS support during work sessions to be very helpful, with means of 5.55 and 5.45, respectively. The internet map service site was also found to be helpful, with a mean of 4.03. However, the respondents were evenly divided regarding the helpfulness of Doris, the online MPA decision support tool, with a mean of 3.48. (16 respondents provide suggestions for improving the decision-support tools in the appendix.)

How helpful were the decision-support tools provided to the RSG during the process?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count
Live GIS support during work sessions	3.2% 1	0.0% 0	6.5% 2	3.2% 1	12.9% 4	<b>74.2%</b> <b>23</b>	5.45	31
Internet map service site (www.marinemap.org)	3.2% 1	13.3% 4	20.0% 6	16.7% 5	<b>33.3%</b> <b>10</b>	13.3% 4	4.03	30
Doris, the online MPA Decision Support Tool	12.9% 4	<b>19.4%</b> <b>6</b>	<b>19.4%</b> <b>6</b>	16.1% 5	<b>19.4%</b> <b>6</b>	12.9% 4	3.48	31
Hardcopy maps	3.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.2% 1	22.6% 7	<b>71.0%</b> <b>22</b>	5.55	31
<i>answered question</i>								<b>31</b>
<i>skipped question</i>								<b>1</b>



## V. NCCRSG Process Objective

As with the CCRSG process before it, some confusion persists among participants as to whether the primary objective of the NCCRSG process was to develop multiple MPA proposals or a single, consensus MPA proposal. While 47% believed the goal was to develop multiple proposals and 16% thought the goal was a single proposal, another 38% identified the goal as “other” and described their confusion about this issue (shown below in table). In the CCRSG on-line survey, 29% thought the primary objective was multiple MPA packages, 25% believed the goal was a single consensus package of MPAs, and 46% selected “other”.

<b>I understood that the primary objective of the NCCRSG process was to attempt to develop</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Multiple MPA proposals	46.9%	15
A single, consensus, MPA proposal	15.6%	5
Other (please specify)	37.5%	12
<i>answered question</i>		<b>32</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>
<b>Responses to “Other” (n=12)</b>		
While the NCCRSG agreed at the outset to attempt to arrive at a single proposal, there was very little support for this from either the BRTF or even the I-Team late in the process. Much was originally made of the strength of a single proposal, but it really seemed as though housekeeping concerns such as the CEQA requirements of multiple alternatives as well as an overarching BRTF desire to have a menu to choose from made multiple proposals the true game. A clearer understanding of this at the outset would have been preferable.		
i understood that a single consensus proposal would have been preferred (different versions of it could then have been used for CEQA purposes). This was clearly unlikely however, so i think the message that 2 or 3 proposals was the goal came through loud and clear.		
a single proposal seems unlikely. it's competitive so multiple		
A network of MPA's that both helped ecosystems and the communities that live around them		
single consensus proposal if possible, otherwise, three options		
A mixed message was given in that people were told that multiple proposals were expected but that a single proposal (if possible) would be accepted.		
an MPA network with high conservation value and scientific integrity AND cross-interest support		
multiple proposals from which the BRTF would choose one		
I was expecting when the process started to develop a single proposal but was happy to see that more than one was put forward to the BRTF		
Evaluate and, if necessary, improve the current MPA's to conform to the MLPAL within the current study region to become an integral part in the statewide network of MPA's. This could be one consensus array or a set of arrays.		
While we were told that multiple proposals were required we understood "no action" was a proposal and most of us hoped for a single consensus proposal perhaps with only one or two areas that might have some small disagreements. But, Coastside prevented this		
The best MPA's for ecosystem function in support sustainable fishery practices.		

## VI. Blue Ribbon Task Force and Department of Fish and Game

Respondents were completely split as to whether or not the guidance provided by the BRTF to the NCCRSO after Rounds 1 and 2 was helpful, with a mean rating of 3.55. 32% found the guidance “very helpful”, but 29% found it “very unhelpful” and 39% found it equally either only marginally helpful or marginally unhelpful. (See suggestions in appendix from 14 respondents as to how the BRTF feedback could have been more helpful.)

How helpful was the feedback and guidance provided by the BRTF to the NCCRSO after Rounds 1 and 2?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unhelpful)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Helpful)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	16.1% 5	12.9% 4	19.4% 6	19.4% 6	16.1% 5	16.1% 5	3.55	31
<i>answered question</i>								31
<i>skipped question</i>								1

Respondents expressed little satisfaction with the deliberative process used by the BRTF at its April 22-23 meeting to develop the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA proposal for the NCC. They gave it a mean rating of 3.26, and 39% of respondents said that they were “very unsatisfied”. (In the appendix, 23 respondents describe what would have made them more satisfied)

How satisfied are you with the deliberative process the BRTF used at its April 22-23 meeting to develop the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal for the NCC?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unsatisfied)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Satisfied)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	25.8% 8	12.9% 4	9.7% 3	25.8% 8	12.9% 4	12.9% 4	3.26	31
<i>answered question</i>								31
<i>skipped question</i>								1

On average, respondents were fairly evenly divided in their level of satisfaction with the substance of the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal adopted by the BRTF on April 23, which received a mean rating of 3.48. By contrast, respondents expressed reasonable satisfaction levels with the BRTF’s decision to forward all three MPA proposals developed in the NCCRSR process to the Fish and Game Commission. This decision received a mean score of 4.35. With a mean of 4.10, respondents also indicated, that, on average, they had a somewhat, but not entirely clear understanding of the way in which the BRTF was going to review and then make recommendations to the Fish and Game Commission on the MPA proposals developed by the stakeholders. (In the appendix, 20 respondents describe what would have made them more satisfied with the substance of the IPA MPA proposal, and 12 describe what might have better clarified the BRTF’s review and recommendation process.)

How satisfied are you with the <i>substance</i> of the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal adopted on April 23?								
Answer Options	1 (Very unsatisfied)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very satisfied)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	9.7% 3	16.1% 5	19.4% 6	<b>35.5%</b> <b>11</b>	9.7% 3	9.7% 3	3.48	31
<i>answered question</i>								31
<i>skipped question</i>								1

How satisfied are you with the BRTF’s decision on April 23 to forward all 3 MPA proposals developed in the NCCRSR process to the California Fish and Game Commission?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unsatisfied)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Satisfied)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	9.7% 3	12.9% 1	3.2% 4	25.8% 6	<b>29.0%</b> <b>8</b>	19.4% 9	4.35	31
<i>answered question</i>								31
<i>skipped question</i>								1

Thinking back to the outset of the NCCRSR process, how clear was your 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?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unclear)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Clear)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	9.7% 3	12.9% 4	3.2% 1	25.8% 8	<b>29.0%</b> <b>9</b>	19.4% 6	4.10	31
<i>answered question</i>								31
<i>skipped question</i>								1

Respondents, on average, reported that they were reasonably clear in their understanding of how the Department of Fish and Game staff was going to review and comment on the feasibility of the MPA proposals developed by the NCCRSG. The mean response was 4.26. Nearly half the respondents indicated they were “very clear” and only 19% said they were “very unclear”.

Thinking back to the outset of the NCCRSG process, how clear was your understanding of the way in which California Department of Fish and Game staff was going to review and comment on the feasibility of the MPA proposals developed by the NCCRSG?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unclear)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Clear)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	6.5% 2	12.9% 4	6.5% 2	25.8% 8	19.4% 6	29.0% 9	4.26	31
							<i>answered question</i>	31
							<i>skipped question</i>	1

## VII. Overall Satisfaction

Respondents indicated that, on average, they were satisfied - but not **very** satisfied - with the NCCRSG process to develop MPA proposals (before the final proposals were considered by the BRTF), with a mean of 4.03 (on scale of 1-6). (See appendix for 18 respondents' comments about what would have made them more satisfied).

My overall level of satisfaction with the NCCRSG process to develop MPA proposals (before the final proposals were considered by the BRTF) can best be characterized as								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unsatisfied)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Satisfied)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	6.5% 2	3.2% 1	19.4% 6	<b>35.5%</b> <b>11</b>	22.6% 7	12.9% 4	4.03	31
							<i>answered question</i>	31
							<i>skipped question</i>	1

On average, respondents expressed satisfaction with the overall process to develop MPAs for the NCC after the BRTF's recommendations but before the Fish and Game Commission's final decision, with a mean of 3.90. Almost half the respondents said they were "very satisfied", while 23% were "very unsatisfied". In contrast, when the same question was asked of the CCRSG participants at the same juncture in the process, the mean was only 3.00, indicating a lack of satisfaction, on average. (In the appendix, 16 NCCRSG respondents describe what would have made them more satisfied with the overall process.)

Recognizing that the California Fish and Game Commission has not yet decided on an MPA proposal for the NCC, how satisfied are you with the overall process to develop MPAs for the NCC?								
Answer Options	1 (Very Unsatisfied)	2	3	4	5	6 (Very Satisfied)	Rating Average	Response Count
Answer:	3.2% 1	19.4% 6	12.9% 4	16.1% 5	<b>45.2%</b> <b>14</b>	3.2% 1	3.90	31
							<i>answered question</i>	31
							<i>skipped question</i>	1

Question Text	Scale	2008 NCCRS		2006 CCRSG		Difference in Means
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	2008-2006
Recognizing that the California Fish and Game Commission has not yet decided on an MPA proposal for the NCCRS/CCRSG, how satisfied are you with the overall process to develop MPAs for the NCCRS/CCRSG?	1 (Very unsatisfied)- 6 (Very Satisfied)	3.90	1.35	3.00	1.53	<b>0.90</b>

On average, respondents reported - with a mean of 3.19 - that their overall level of satisfaction with the NCCRS effort was dependent on the final outcome at the Fish and Game Commission. Almost half the respondents, however, claimed that their overall satisfaction is “very dependent” on the final outcome at the Commission. The same questions asked of the CCRSG members revealed overall satisfaction levels that were even more contingent upon the Commission’s final decision, with a mean of 2.83.

To what degree is your overall level of satisfaction with the NCC effort dependent on the final outcome at the California Fish and Game Commission?									
Answer Options	1 (Very Dependent)	2	3	4	5	6 (Not Very Dependent)	Rating Average	Response Count	
Answer:	22.6%	<b>25.8%</b>	3.2%	16.1%	22.6%	9.7%	3.19	31	
	7	<b>8</b>	1	5	7	3			
	<i>answered question</i>								<b>31</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>								<b>1</b>

Question Text	Scale	2008 NCCRS		2006 CCRSG		Difference in Means
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	2008-2006
To what degree is your overall level of satisfaction with the NCCRS/ CCRSG effort dependent on the final outcome at the California Fish and Game Commission?	1 (Very dependent)- 6 (Not dependent)	3.19	1.78	2.83	1.97	<b>0.36</b>

Note: The appendices to this report also include suggestions from NCCRS participants as to which aspects of this process should be preserved in future RSG processes and which should be changed.