

**California Ocean Protection Council
Joint Science Advisory Team (OPC-SAT)/Management Team Meeting**

Hosted by California Ocean Science Trust

Tuesday, July 20, 2010

1330 Broadway, Room 1101

Oakland, CA

8:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

OPC-SAT Members Present: R. Ambrose, A. Boehm, M. Carr, K. Coale, C. Costello, J. Field, G. Griggs, F. Gulland, M. Hall-Arber, T. Haymet, K. McLeod, S. Johnson, S. Murray, K. Nielsen, J. Paduan, J. Stachowicz, B. Sydeman, S. Weisberg

Ocean Science Trust (OST) Staff Present: E. Knight, S. McAfee, D. Pietri, L. Rogers

Ocean Protection Council (OPC) Management Team Present: B. Baird, CA Natural Resources Agency; N. Fishman, Ocean Protection Council/State Coastal Conservancy; A. Mace, Ocean Protection Council; M. McEnespy, Ocean Protection Council S. Schuchat, Ocean Protection Council/State Coastal Conservancy

OPC-SAT Members Absent: D. Cayan, F. Chavez, S. Gaines, M. Moline, H. Scheiber, J. Schubel

Guests: A. Doherty, Ocean Protection Council; D. George, Ocean Protection Council; T. Mizerek, Communication Partnership for Science and the Sea; P. Rittelmeyer, Ocean Protection Council; S. Semans, Ocean Protection Council; V. Termini, Ocean Protection Council; M. Weber, Resources Law Group

* The meeting was facilitated by R. Martin, Amplifier Strategies

MAIN ACTIONS:

- **ACTION:** The OST will provide monthly updates to the SAT on the activities of the OPC, OPC-SAT, and Science Advisor.
- **ACTION:** The OST, OPC and the SAT Executive Committee will consider assigning a SAT member as an advisor to each new OPC funded project.
- **ACTION:** The OST will communicate with the SAT about the ongoing development of the Management Research and Information Prioritization Process, and will work to develop and share specific roles for the SAT on this project.



- **ACTION:** The OST will work with the OPC and SAT Executive Committee to create a document that will be shared with the SAT outlining the OPC's grant making process and highlighting possible roles and points of entry for the SAT. OST and the Executive Committee will also develop a set of criteria for when to engage the SAT and other relevant science resources and will share this with the SAT for input.
- **ACTION:** The OPC staff has prioritized five topical areas around which they will engage the SAT on an ongoing basis. The topics are: climate change adaptation, coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP), sustainable fisheries, land/ocean interface, and emerging industrial uses. This will be in support of OPC's strategic planning efforts, as well as other ongoing work. The first three topics (climate change adaptation, CMSP, sustainable fisheries) will be addressed first - potentially in the next six months.
- **ACTION:** To engage the SAT, for each topic area above the OPC will: 1) define the management question/challenge, and 2) draft a problem statement that includes the rationale for addressing the topic and an action plan for how the OPC will engage on this issue area. Following the creation of these issue summaries, the OPC will engage the SAT to develop science needs for each issue. The OST will work with the Executive Committee to establish timeframes for each of these topic areas.
- **ACTION:** The OPC will request input from the SAT on the CMSP draft resolution for the September OPC meeting.
- **ACTION:** The OPC staff will look at the issue areas identified from the previous round of Sea Grant research priorities (which were approved in November 2008) and coordinate with the SAT to update the research priorities or identify new ones.
- **ACTION:** The SAT organized into ad hoc working groups for each of the five topic areas identified by OPC staff. The OST and SAT Executive Committee will coordinate with OPC staff to define the charge and activities of the working groups. Once these assignments have been more clearly defined, the OST and SAT Executive Committee will provide support and clear instructions to the working groups to initiate the activities of the groups. (Working group members are listed at the end of the document).

MEETING MINUTES:

1. Welcome & Introductions, Meeting Objectives, Agenda Review

G. Griggs opened the meeting, welcomed the members, and gave a few opening remarks. Griggs pointed out that the SAT is still a young and developing organization, noted that this is a unique

opportunity to change the way science is used in California, and pointed out that many states are looking at California as a model. Griggs highlighted two important changes since the last SAT meeting: appointing Amber Mace as the OPC Executive Director and hiring Skyli McAfee as the OST Executive Director and OPC Science Advisor.

S. McAfee echoed Griggs' sentiment, expressed her hopes and excitement for the SAT, and stated that she is looking forward to this opportunity. McAfee reviewed the objectives of the meeting and noted that this meeting will be an opportunity to foster dialogue between the SAT and OPC Management Team and to develop agreement about future SAT priorities, roles and responsibilities.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Foster productive dialog between the SAT and OPC management about how best to work together to promote the integration of science and policy
- Develop a long-term vision for the role of the SAT with the OPC
 - Understand the opportunities for greatest influence
 - Clarify what's worked well, what's been challenging (from all perspectives: SAT, OPC and OST)
 - Develop agreement on future SAT priorities
- Advance ongoing SAT business
 - Review status of action items agreed on at 12/2009 meeting; determine next steps
 - Agree on action items for remainder of year based on our priorities
- Achieve agreement with management on specific SAT roles/responsibilities and path forward for prioritized SAT work

McAfee introduced R. Martin, the meeting facilitator. R. Martin had the group do brief introductions, reviewed the agenda, and outlined the ground rules and logistics for the meeting.

2. Integrating Science and Policy: A Funder's Perspective

S. McAfee introduced M. Weber, Program Officer for Oceans, Coasts and Fisheries with the Resources Law Group (RLG).

M. Weber gave a presentation on the culture of politics and policy, and the importance of integrating science into policy. Drawing from his experience in law, government, and a private foundation, he provided his vision on the role of the OPC-SAT, OPC, and OST in this process. He noted that this is a great opportunity to do well by the State of California and establish a unique model that can be built upon. Weber highlighted some of his early involvement with the OPC through his work with RLG and the overall goals and hopes for the OPC when it was established. He stressed that the SAT was a

central component of major reform and that it really affects the influence of science on management. Weber also noted that both the OPC and OPC-SAT are still growing and are entering into a challenging development phase where there may be frustration due to ongoing cultural learning. He pointed out that fostering the use of science in decision making can be tedious, but it is critical to provide scientific advice as effectively as possible. He introduced the term “aggressive incrementalism” - pursuing a major goal through a series of small steps that can be accommodated by the political system – as a framework for thinking about how the SAT can effect change Weber closed by encouraging the group to think in the long-term about what they can do to reach their full potential.

Following M. Weber’s presentation, there was some discussion amongst the group about the concept of aggressive incrementalism and the potential that crises offer to take bolder, exponential leaps, the importance of paying attention to values when talking about science, the role for the SAT in putting forth what is known so that there can be an informed discussion, and the importance of informing and educating the general public.

3. State of the OPC-SAT

S. McAfee gave a presentation on the state of the SAT and the unique roles of the OPC-SAT, the OPC and the OST. McAfee explained that the role of the OST is to be an objective body that is able to translate between the OPC and the SAT. She pointed out that both the OPC and the OST are new institutions, that processes are still being developed, and that the OPC, OST, and SAT are all working on this together. McAfee shared the list of all funded OPC projects with the group and pledged that as the new OPC Science Advisor, the percentage of OPC projects that have gone through scientific review or received another form of scientific input will increase.

There was discussion amongst the group about how the OPC decides when a project requires scientific review, how the OPC funds projects and the difference between peer review of projects and proposals. The group began to discuss that a role for the SAT could be to identify the different classes of OPC projects and develop a protocol for deciding when a project needs scientific review.

A. Mace explained that the SAT has been involved in reviewing both OPC projects and proposals. Mace also noted that there are two ways the OPC provides funds for projects: 1) solicited proposals, and 2) unsolicited proposals that are consistent with program priorities. S. Schuchat noted that there are a range of OPC projects, from those that do not cost any money and may not warrant scientific review to large projects that are mandated by another government entity, such as funding for the Department of Fish and Game’s participation in Marine Life Protection Act, which is mandated by legislation. A. Mace pointed out that the OPC is also constrained by politics and legislative mandates that factor into the projects they can and cannot undertake.

There was further discussion among members about the role for the SAT to be proactive and bring issues to the attention of managers that might not have been on the radar, as well as to

identify matching funds for OPC projects and to help the OPC think about integrating funded projects. S. Schuchat clarified the role of council members and the role of OPC staff and pointed out that the OPC is a staff-driven organization, and staff generally decides what gets put on the agenda.

G. Griggs gave a presentation on the accomplishments and activities of the SAT since the December 2009 meeting. He noted that this meeting is a unique opportunity to have decision makers in the room. He provided the group with an update on the progress on action items that were agreed upon at the last meeting and discussed how the ocean observing consensus statement has been incredibly useful and distributed widely by the OPC. He highlighted the topics that the SAT identified for possible future consensus statements, including: ocean/coastal impacts of climate change, land-sea interactions, marine spatial planning, ocean energy development, and fisheries issues. Griggs explained that the SAT decided to wait until they had more information about how these topics could be developed most usefully for the OPC before moving forward.

There was discussion amongst the group about the usefulness of the ocean observing consensus statement in supporting legislation and following the Gulf oil spill. S. Schuchat provided more detail about how he had disseminated the consensus statement in DC. S. McAfee pointed out that the statement was valuable for informing decision makers and also increasing the importance and relevance of the SAT.

The group discussed the need to communicate clearly what happens to the products the SAT produces and how information generated by the SAT is having an impact. S. McAfee noted that the first of what will be a regular update was sent out in June, but that in the future, updates will contain more information about the activities of the Science Advisor.

- **ACTION:** The OST will provide monthly updates to the SAT on the activities of the OPC, OPC-SAT, and Science Advisor.
- **ACTION:** The OST, OPC and the SAT Executive Committee will consider assigning a SAT member as an advisor to each new OPC funded project.

4. OPC Update

A. Mace provided the group with an update about OPC activities since the last SAT meeting. She pointed out some of the multi-agency state-based committees of which the OPC is a member, including the coastal and ocean subgroup of the Climate Action Team (CO-CAT), the marine debris steering committee, the renewable energy working group, the OPC steering committee, the sustainable seafood advisory panel, and the collaborative fisheries research organization.

Mace provided an update on the OPC evaluation and mentioned that the draft evaluation will be available at the September OPC meeting. Mace noted that a number of SAT members were

interviewed for the evaluation and participated in the online survey. She briefly highlighted the preliminary key findings.

Mace provided a legislative update on pending rigs to reef legislation and a bill on MSP and pointed out that SAT members were signed up for COMPASS updates, which contain details about relevant marine legislation at the state and national level.

Mace noted that science input is continuing to increase and that there is demonstrated benefit in the science that the SAT has already provided; some OPC projects have been revised, rewritten, or not selected for funding due to SAT input.

Mace also explained that the OPC will be instituting a process for the next strategic plan and will be engaging the SAT on this. The five prioritized topical areas that the OPC staff has developed and plan to focus on are: climate change adaptation, coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP), sustainable fisheries, land/ocean interface, and emerging industrial uses (i.e. ocean energy, aquaculture). Mace noted that there is an opportunity to develop SAT working groups on these topics.

There was a discussion amongst the group about additional ways in which the SAT could be involved, such as topical working groups, sponsoring workshops on specific topics, developing fact sheets (e.g., consensus statements or statements of common misconceptions) that could be given to decision makers and used as educational tools, and scientific peer review for proposals and projects. The group discussed the need to standardize the approach with a common template of work products that could be developed as needed for all issue areas. S. McAfee noted that they can brand these as SAT products with the SAT seal of approval to develop a higher profile for the group.

There was some discussion amongst the group about potential critics of the OPC. It was noted that a few of the critics are NGO's or other agencies that would like the OPC to take a different position. A. Mace noted that when talking to candidates for governor she makes the case that the OPC is working to find efficiencies in government and that healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems mean a healthy economy.

S. Schuchat gave a presentation on the evolution of the OPC and the SAT. Schuchat noted that the relationship between the OPC and SAT is an evolving one. He explained that the OST was created as a vehicle to translate the science and pointed out that the Executive Director of the OST is also a member of the OPC Management Team and Science Advisor for the OPC. He noted that we now have robust and functioning institutions to inform the work of the OPC. He pointed out that getting science into the broader political management and policy processes of state government is a more difficult challenge.

There was a question about reaching out to local and county managers and S. Schuchat noted that some county agencies are already on board in regards to specific topics, such as climate change, but there is the opportunity to use other regions as pilot projects to engage with local government organizations.

5. Introduction to the Management Research and Information Prioritization Process (MRIPP)

E. Knight introduced MRIPP to the group. She noted that this project seeks to promote and institutionalize science integration beyond the OPC. Knight reviewed the project objectives, which are to: 1) design a process to survey the science needs of state agencies and prioritize those needs, 2) produce a Final Report on the process and outcomes, and finally 3) select at least one priority science need for an OPC-funded study. The partners for this project will be the OPC Management Team, OPC staff, OPC-SAT, OPC Steering Committee, and agency staff.

Knight described the four phases of the project, which are as follows: Phase 1-Develop criteria and establish collaborative process; Phase 2 – Receive input from managers and development of science needs; Phase 3 – Prioritize science needs; Phase 4- Final product and lessons learned

Knight noted that there will be opportunities for SAT participation throughout the process, such as advising on the science needs and science questions, reviewing documents, including review of project proposals identified by MRIPP as candidates for OPC funding. She also pointed out that this is an opportunity for the SAT to move beyond the OPC to other state agencies.

A. Mace explained that the OST will work at multiple levels through the agencies, but they will need to get buy-in from agency directors to support key informants to work with OST staff.

The group asked clarifying questions and provided suggestions for MRIPP. E. Knight pointed out the next step which is to develop a collaborative process with partners, welcomed all ideas from the SAT, and noted that by the end of the year there will be another update on the progress of MRIPP.

- **ACTION:** The OST will communicate with the SAT about the ongoing development of the Management Research and Information Prioritization Process, and will work to develop and share specific roles for the SAT on this project.

6. Mapping SAT's Opportunities

The group discussed how to create processes for the SAT to productively engage with the OPC. R. Martin posed a few initial questions to begin the discussion, such as: how can the SAT most productively engage and how do we create a process for productive engagement? S. McAfee suggested creating working groups for the five topic areas that were identified by the OPC.

The group raised questions that they had regarding the process for grants. Multiple members noted that they were not aware of the process for grants, or where the SAT came into this process. They agreed that it would be helpful to define clearly how the SAT will be involved in this process.

Questions were raised about when outside scientists should be invited to participate in any SAT working groups that are formed and other SAT sponsored workshops and activities. A. Mace noted that the SAT is here to make the link with outside experts and that the OPC relies on the SAT members' varying expertise and contacts.

There was discussion about how the priorities identified in MRIPP will fit with OPC topic areas. A. Mace pointed out that since the OPC priorities are very broad, the priorities identified in MRIPP will likely fit under one or some of the OPC priorities.

A. Mace discussed the goals of the strategic planning process and the priorities that the OPC has identified: coastal and ocean climate change adaptation, coastal and marine spatial planning, sustainable fisheries, land-ocean interface, and emerging industrial uses of the ocean. A. Mace also noted the strategic planning process was slated to begin in fall, 2010.

There was a discussion about whether the SAT should engage in environmental literacy. G. Griggs pointed out that the SAT is an advisory body to the OPC and so should think about how far beyond that they want to step.

Some SAT members expressed a desire to select one of the OPC issue areas and outline a process for how the SAT can engage and approach the issue. There was discussion on whether the group should pick one priority issue area to discuss in detail for the rest of the meeting.

A. Mace explained that CMSP will be on the agenda at the September OPC meeting. The OPC staff will be coming to the council with a draft resolution on CMSP, and the OPC will be asking the SAT for their input on the resolution. Mace further noted that the state is not ready to undertake a large CMSP planning process on the heels of the difficult and politically wrought MLPA Initiative. S. McAfee pointed at that as the goals and process for CMSP are rolled out, there will be multiple layers and opportunities for the SAT to provide input.

The group spent time discussing the OPC's goals and objectives are in regards to CMSP, and it was suggested that there are opportunities for the SAT to identify the data gaps that exist for doing CMSP and could suggest those as potential funding areas for OPC. It was also pointed out that the OPC needs to give some attention to what it is they are trying to do and what questions they are trying to answer with respect to CMSP and this in turn will help identify the gaps that need to be filled.

A. Mace acknowledged that it would be helpful for the OPC to provide the SAT with more clarification regarding each of the issue areas in order for the SAT to engage on these. Mace stated that that the OPC will prepare background white papers on these issue areas, to identify the problem, rationale and need, management questions, science needs, partners, goals, funding

and define the entry point for SAT members and ask the SAT for feedback. This will help develop greater specificity around these issues.

There was discussion about the timeline for these issue areas. A. Mace mentioned that this will be an extensive process and the first three (climate change, MSP, and fisheries) are more reasonable to focus on now. A. Mace explained that climate change and CMSP will be on the agenda for the November OPC meeting, but pointed out that this will be a long-term process. S. Schuchat noted that these would become sections for the strategic plan. S. McAfee also pointed out that the strategic plan will set priorities for funding for the OPC and the SAT will have a role to play in this process. A. Mace noted the importance of spending time to get this process right.

S. McAfee noted that there should be some standardization of the process for addressing these issues and pointed out that there is a role for the OST and the Executive Committee to be involved in developing this process.

A. Mace noted the limited staff capacity at the OPC due to funding and the budget and the small staff at the OST. Mace indicated that the staff would work on the summaries of the issue papers internally, and will reach out for help in areas where they do not have capacity. The group discussed mechanisms for the SAT to help these efforts.

R. Martin suggested that the OST and SAT Executive Committee would work with the OPC to figure out the process for addressing these issues. S. McAfee noted that once this process has been more clearly defined, the OST and OPC will communicate this to the SAT.

- **ACTION:** The OST will work with the OPC and SAT Executive Committee to create a document that will be shared with the SAT outlining the OPC's grant making process and highlighting possible roles and points of entry for the SAT. OST and the Executive Committee will also develop a set of criteria for when to engage the SAT and other relevant science resources and will share this with the SAT for input.
- **ACTION:** The OPC staff has prioritized five topical areas around which they will engage the SAT on an ongoing basis. The topics are: climate change adaptation, coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP), sustainable fisheries, land/ocean interface, and emerging industrial uses. This will be in support of OPC's strategic planning efforts, as well as other ongoing work. The first three topics (climate change adaptation, CMSP, sustainable fisheries) will be addressed first - potentially in the next six months.
- **ACTION:** To engage the SAT, for each topic area above the OPC will: 1) define the management question/challenge, and 2) draft a problem statement that includes the rationale for addressing the topic and an action plan for how the OPC will engage on this issue area. Following the creation of these issue summaries, the OPC will engage the SAT to develop

science needs for each issue. The OST will work with the Executive Committee to establish timeframes for each of these topic areas.

- **ACTION:** The OPC will request input from the SAT on the CMSP draft resolution for the September OPC meeting.

7. Updates and New Business

B. Baird provided an update on the upcoming California and the World Oceans Conference September 7-10. He noted that S. Weisberg and G. Griggs were involved in the concurrent sessions committee that selected the proposals. A. Mace thanked the SAT for suggesting issue areas and representation on the concurrent session committee. Mace pointed out that this is a good example of how SAT can inform the conference.

A. Mace provided an update on 2011 Sea Grant Research. Mace noted that it is anticipated that at the November OPC meeting, the OPC will allocate about \$1M for applied research to the two CA Sea Grant programs. Mace noted that the OPC staff will look at the issue areas identified from the previous round of research priorities and coordinate with the SAT to update the research priorities or identify new ones.

A. Mace pointed out that a State Parks Access Pass initiative will be on the November ballot. The initiative will add an \$18 registration fee to every car and it is anticipated that 4% (about \$20M) of the revenue will be allocated to the OPC per year for implementing the MLPA.

There was further discussion about why the OST is separate from the OPC. A. Mace stressed that it was intended to keep science at arm's length from the policy process, to ensure objectivity and credibility. The OST was created to receive funds and fund projects, and the OST as an NGO can receive state, federal and private funds.

- **ACTION:** The OPC staff will look at the issue areas identified from the previous round of Sea Grant research priorities (which were approved in November 2008) and coordinate with the SAT to update the research priorities or identify new ones.

8. Open Issues/Tabled Items; Wrap-Up and Meeting Evaluation

The group provided an evaluation of the meeting.

The positive aspects of the meeting included logistics; clarifying the vision, strategies, priorities and process of the OPC; hearing Mike Weber's long-term perspective; and being in the same room with the OPC Management team. There was a request for a one-page visual of the OPC's

vision, strategies and priorities. A question was raised if SAT meetings should always include the OPC Management team. The changes for the meeting included having more tangible, agreed upon action steps and a desire to do more content-specific work and not talk about who and what the SAT is.

A. Mace pointed out that SAT members are designated for 3-year terms and noted that February 2011 is the next round of SAT selection. It was suggested that the SAT members serve staggered terms, and that some SAT members be reappointed by a random drawing. It was also noted that it would be beneficial to have economists and social scientists on the SAT.

S. McAfee thanked the OST staff, SAT Executive Committee, SAT members and OPC Management Team for coming to the meeting.

- **ACTION:** The SAT organized into ad hoc working groups for each of the five topic areas identified by OPC staff. The OST and SAT Executive Committee will coordinate with OPC staff to define the charge and activities of the working groups. Once these assignments have been more clearly defined, the OST and SAT Executive Committee will provide support and clear instructions to the working groups to initiate the activities of the groups. (Working group members are listed below).

Climate Change Adaptation

Tony Haymet
Kenneth Coale
Karina Nielsen
Bill Sydeman
Gary Griggs
Steve Weisberg
Mark Carr
Steve Murray

CMSP

Karen McLeod
Chris Costello
Tony Haymet
Sam Johnson
Karina Nielsen
Bill Sydeman
Mark Carr

Sustainable Fisheries

Chris Costello
John Field
Madeleine Hall-Arber

Kenneth Coale
Bill Sydeman
Karina Nielsen
Mark Carr

Land-Ocean Interface

Tony Haymet
Rich Ambrose
Ali Boehm
Gary Griggs
Steve Weisberg
Mark Carr
Steve Murray
Karina Nielsen

Emerging Industrial Uses

Madeleine Hall-Arber
Jeff Paduan
Kenneth Coale
Mark Carr
Steve Murray (aquaculture)
Karina Nielsen
Bill Sydeman

9. Meeting Adjourned