

**Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management
Advisory Team Meeting Notes—August 10, 2007**

Humboldt Area Foundation, Bayside

8:30 a.m to 11:30 a.m.

Attendance: Diane Ashton, Greg Crawford, Mike Furniss, Paula Golightly, Steve Hackett, Sharon Kramer, Moira McEnespy, Eric Nelson, Becky Price-Hall, Scott Quackenbush, Jennifer Rice, Susan Schlosser, Sheila Semans, Lisa Shikany, Mark Wheatley, Adona White, Don Allan, Jennifer Kalt, Hank Seeman, Craig Benson, Annie Eicher, Anne Short.

Handouts: 1. Working definitions of Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management; 2. List of EBM issues identified by core working group

Welcome *by Susan Schlosser*

A moment of silence in remembrance of Jeff Robinson, Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation, and Conservation District Conservationist. A memorial service will be held August 19, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the Wharfinger Building in Eureka.

Reports and Announcements:

- ❖ On July 17, 2007 Susan gave a presentation to the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors on the Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management Program.
- ❖ On July 22-26, 2007, Susan attended the Coastal Zone Conference in Portland, OR, where she gave a presentation on the Humboldt Bay EBM Program and she attended other presentations/ discussions on EBM. Susan will post conference abstracts and program at the EBM website.
- ❖ The Coastal Zone Management Act is currently up for re-authorization, and there are discussions among the Coastal Zone Management community to incorporate EBM language into the Act.
- ❖ About 20 states are currently working in five regional collaborations on legislation to address EBM at the national level.
- ❖ A Water Resources workshop to be held the afternoon of Aug 10, 2007 at the D Street Community Center in Arcata was announced.
- ❖ NOAA Coastal Services Center recently released a call for proposals for a cultural and historical inventory to supplement the Humboldt Bay EBM Program.

Approval of July Meeting Notes

Overview of Agenda: Noted change of meeting duration from 4 to 3 hours in response to Advisory Team request.

Definition of Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management

Presentation by Becky Price-Hall: At the July 13, 2007 meeting, five working definitions were drafted collaboratively. A smaller working group then met to combine and refine the elements into one definition. Becky presented the revised definition (also provided as a handout).

Discussion: The following definition incorporates suggestions resulting from group discussion. Following the definition is a list of EBM elements. Craig posted Susan's email address (scschlosser@ucdavis.edu) so that comments can also be submitted following today's meeting.

~~A~~ *The Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management Program* ~~Ecosystem-based management in Humboldt Bay~~ is a collaborative approach to ~~managing~~ *influence* human activities ~~in order~~ to promote the *sustainable* coexistence of healthy (?), productive, and resilient natural (?) ~~communities~~ and human communities. Ecosystem-based management seeks to balance ecological, economic, and social considerations in a science-based management program that considers multiple external influences, cumulative impacts, change, and uncertainty (*expand this*). (*This definition was compiled from McLeod et al. 2005, Scientific Consensus Statement on Marine Ecosystem-Based Management, statement released at first California Ocean Protection Council meeting in March 2005; Coast Information Team Ecosystem-based Management Framework, 2004, <http://www.citbc.org/>; Ecosystem Science Capabilities Required to Support NOAA's Mission in the Year 2020, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-74, July 2006: and two original definitions developed by Advisory Team members*)

More comments on definition:

- ❖ The use of the words “healthy” and “natural” can be problematic because people have different interpretations.
- ❖ “Managing” people implies some position of authority and it may be more appropriate for these purposes to say “influencing.”
- ❖ We could write a definition of terms used to supplement the EBM definition
- ❖ Maybe the definition should state the boundaries of the management area.

Elements of EBM Projects

(May be used as project criteria)

- ◆ Ecological boundaries (*need to clarify to make more transparent to public*)
- ◆ Collaborative
- ◆ Integrates social, environmental and political principles
- ◆ Strategic
- ◆ Adaptive and responsive to new information
- ◆ Includes multiple spatial scales
- ◆ Includes multiple temporal scales
- ◆ Maintains ecosystem processes, function and structure
- ◆ Humans are integral components
- ◆ Sustains human communities and economies
- ◆ Strives to balance diverse societal objectives
- ◆ Maintains or restores natural resources
- ◆ Acknowledges local knowledge
- ◆ Considers cumulative impacts or multiple sectors
- ◆ Management decisions are made on best available science

- ◆ Incorporates uncertainty and risk (*expand—precaution in proportion to what is known about a system*)

Suggested as additional elements:

- ❖ Strives to be incentive based (i.e., pro-active and encouraging vs reactive)
- ❖ Ecosystem structure, process, and function as a design template or starting point
- ❖ Improves management and/or policy
- ❖ Acknowledge institutional and governance constraints and influence (needs to be incorporated at local level)
- ❖ Coordinated regulatory process is embraced to address regulatory agency needs
- ❖ To be successful, needs to meet socio-cultural values
- ❖ Addresses 3 levels of management: awareness, motivation, and action

Boundaries for Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management

Presentation by Sharon Kramer: At the July 13, 2007, working boundaries were drawn on maps collaboratively. A smaller working group then met to combine and refine the boundaries. Sharon reported that the working group recommends a tiered approach for Humboldt Bay EBM boundaries defined as:

- ❖ Primary Zone: Humboldt Bay, defined as extending from Mad River to Table Bluff, including all tidally influenced areas and historic tidelands.
- ❖ Secondary Zone: includes watersheds that directly connect to Humboldt Bay and extends seaward to include the littoral zone (hard to define exactly but intended to include area of sediment influence to and from the bay, estimated at 30 fathoms).
- ❖ Tertiary Zone: includes nearby watersheds of Little River, Mad River, Eel River, and Bear River, and extends further past the littoral zone to include mixing zones (outward boundary could be drawn at the outer limit of state waters).

Discussion:

- ❖ Clarification: tertiary boundaries are intended to be boundaries of the nearby watersheds referenced.
- ❖ Littoral zone—30 fathoms is conservatively deep; a good starting point. This is an information gap and needs to be defined in terms of relevant issues, e.g. sediment transport.
- ❖ Question RE: tertiary boundary. Do the Mad and Eel Rivers really have more of an influence than the Klamath or the Trinity?
- ❖ Mad River can enter directly into the bay during 100-yr flood events.
- ❖ Eel River definitely has a significant sediment influence on Humboldt Bay.
- ❖ The influence of the California Current needs to be somehow acknowledged, possibly in the tertiary zone definition.
- ❖ Need to consider not only zones of influence to Humboldt Bay, but also areas influenced by the bay (e.g., pollutant transport to nearshore waters).
- ❖ Boundaries were defined on spatial scale, but many comments coming up are referencing processes, and maybe we can re-define boundaries in terms of processes.
- ❖ “Nearshore” needs to be defined.
- ❖ General agreement on primary and secondary zones; most questions are RE: how far to extend tertiary boundaries.

- ❖ Do we really need to define precise tertiary boundary lines? We don't want to ignore influences beyond set bounds.
- ❖ Projects/issues each have an appropriate scale and maybe boundaries of influence can be considered on a project-specific basis.
- ❖ Should we distinguish between factors that we can control (to some extent) and those beyond our control?
- ❖ Note: HBHRCD Humboldt Bay Management Plan provides a map showing jurisdictional boundaries.
- ❖ Primary Zone was intended to include are in which direct impacts from management actions are possible.
- ❖ Working group assignment: incorporate group comments, especially RE: tertiary zone boundaries.

Ocean Protection Council Funding Guidelines

Presentation by Sheila Semans: The California Ocean Protection Council was created by the California Ocean Protection Act of 2004. The Council meets 4 times a year. It is not a decision-making body. The main priority is to look at how we are managing our oceans and how we can improve our management. The State Coastal Conservancy is the staffing agency for the Council. The Ocean Science Trust is a non-profit organization created by the Legislature to provide more science-driven policy. The OPC strategic plan has a goal of mapping all state waters within 5 years. OPC priorities for 2007 include research and monitoring, water quality, the Marine Life Management and the Marine Life Protection Acts, governance, and EBM. Funding Avenues include direct submissions of proposals to staff (accepted at any time; guidelines on OPC website); annual research grant given to Sea Grant (RFPs in Jan-Feb); competitive grants when called for by the Council (proposed—to be announced on OPC website); project-specific RFPs, e.g, monitoring of Marine Protection Areas.

Discussion:

- ❖ There probably will not be grants directed specifically at EBM, but projects identified by EBM process could be funded.
- ❖ To show the utility of EBM, we can try to incorporate the elements we have identified into specific projects to put forth for funding.
- ❖ There are few EBM models currently available; it is our charge to figure out what is needed.

Humboldt Bay EBM Six Month Road Map

Facilitated by Craig Benson: A workplan was proposed for the period June-Nov 2007 to reach the end goal of developing specific project proposals with EBM elements for integrated management, restoration, and/or research.

June: Kick-off

July: Establish standards

August: Identify, categorize, and prioritize issues.

September: Identify, categorize, and prioritize opportunities.

October: Identify, categorize, and prioritize constraints.

November: Identify, categorize, and prioritize projects.

Discussion:

- ❖ Realistically each of the above tasks could be expanded to two months; we have through May 2008 to achieve end goal.
- ❖ Working groups can help by task-specific work in between monthly advisory meetings.
- ❖ It may be premature to start prioritization before gathering information and discussing.
- ❖ Identifying and prioritizing issues/projects is important (categorization may not be necessary); the consideration of opportunities and constraints can then be on a project-specific basis.
- ❖ Important to make projects multi-disciplinary. The multidisciplinary backgrounds of the advisory team members are valuable.
- ❖ Maybe advisory team can function to identify/prioritize issues, core working groups can develop specific project ideas, and advisory team can then evaluate/prioritize project proposals.
- ❖ Integration should be central to this process and maybe we should not view this as a linear process but more of a matrix.
- ❖ It is valuable to begin with the end in mind.
- ❖ All issues and projects identified during this process will be documented (not just those that are prioritized).
- ❖ An assessment of “big picture” needs and gaps is important—what do we want to know, what to we need to know, what should we do about it?
- ❖ Maybe all these lists should be considered working lists.
- ❖ Fundability is an important consideration in deciding which projects to put forth.
- ❖ Any individual project can have multiple funding sources; makes sense in terms of integration and funders like to see matching funds.
- ❖ Suggestion: if results of core workgroups can be available to advisory team members before each meeting, people could have time to think about things and come to the meetings prepared with comments.
- ❖ Mike Furniss volunteered to help develop a process for exchange of information among members between meetings, e.g. using online collaborative tools including writing capabilities with open editing; Mike said he could give a presentation on this at the next meeting.
- ❖ Core working groups are formed on a volunteer basis. Members of the public can volunteer to participate on a core group.
- ❖ Public involvement can also come later on a project-specific basis.

Discussion of Issues Identified by Core Working Group

- ❖ Core group that created list of issues did take into consideration issues already identified by other groups e.g. RCAA Coastal Needs Assessment, HBWAC, HBHRCO Humboldt Bay Management Plan.
- ❖ Suggestion: maybe Moira could make a presentation at an advisory team meeting on the Coastal Needs Assessment.
- ❖ List of issues identified by working group could be re-defined in terms of needs and using action terminology (volunteers to work with core team for this process: Don Allan, Diane Ashton, Eric Nelson).
- ❖ It would be helpful if core group could do some level of prioritization and bring advisory team a shorter list of issues/needs.
- ❖ The online collaborative tools could be helpful to open that preliminary prioritization to comments from other advisory team members.
- ❖ When issues/needs are tied to the bigger picture, they are easier to comprehend.

Work To Be Done by Core Groups Before Next Meeting

- ❖ Refine definitions of Humboldt Bay EBM.
- ❖ Refine boundaries of Humboldt Bay EBM.
- ❖ Re-define issues as needs, do preliminary prioritization, and make available for review by advisory team.

NEXT MEETING: **Friday, September 21, 2007, 9:00-noon**
 Humboldt Area Foundation, Bayside

Please note date and time changes from previous scheduling due to meeting room availability. Alternative meeting locations were suggested and these will be discussed at the next meeting.