Dr. Donald McIsaac, Executive Director
Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC)
7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 200
Portland, OR, 97220

In accordance with action taken by the PFMC at its September 2005 meeting in Portland, options regarding the proposal by the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) to enact various fishing regulations within the CINMS were reviewed by the Coastside Fishing Club. We offer the following comments, and submit them for Council's consideration and action.

The Coastside Fishing Club believes that the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) has long been recognized as the authority for establishing fishing regulations in federal waters. We believe that the MSA has been and should remain the single and sole authority by which fishing in all federal waters should be managed. We note that during the public debate concerning the establishment of the CINMS, and other Sanctuaries along the Pacific Coast, that its Designation Document specifically excluded fishing regulations from the CINMS charter. During the debate, the commercial and recreational fishing communities were promised that the CINMS would not engage in fishing regulations. We now expect that promise to be honored, and we oppose any change to the CINMS Designation Document that would abrogate that promise.

Recreational fishermen comprise a segment of the stakeholders directly affected by fishing regulations inside federally managed waters. We currently have a viable means, via the MSA and the PFMC whereby we can effectively participate in the current regulatory process. We do not have that same level of opportunity to participate in the CINMS process - the necessary level of recreational fishing representation and necessary processes are simply not built into the CINMS structure to allow us full participation. We are dismayed that any federal agency would even contemplate, let alone pursue, a process change whereby direct stakeholders would be disenfranchised from the regulatory process.

http://www.coastsidefishingclub.com
Because we find it inappropriate for the CINMS to change its Designation Document enabling it to engage in fishery regulations, we find that both options 2 and 3 as defined in PFMC September Agenda Item H.1.a, Attachment 1, September 2005 are NOT appropriate to consider, and urge that they both be rejected. Should the PFMC wish to consider option 1 of that document under MSA authority, it would be within the Council’s existing prerogative to do so.

Additionally we find that continuing the process of dual rulemaking by the PFMC under MSA, and by the CINMS under Sanctuary authority is an abrogation of the promises made to the fishing community, and an inordinate and unnecessary drain on the resources of the PFMC. This is simply a blatant attempt by the CINMS to undermine and usurp the authority of the PFMC. Furthermore, a dual / parallel process adds a degree of unneeded confusion into the rulemaking process, and it places an undue hardship on recreational fishing stakeholders, who do not have and who cannot support full time professional staff, but rather must rely on part time and volunteer support to the regulatory process.

Given the inordinate energy and effort that the CINMS has devoted to pursuing this objective, we find it hard to believe that they will cease in this effort without clear-cut direction to do so. Nor do we foresee that any of the options in Agenda Item H.1.a represent an end point of their objectives. Rather we expect that they will gradually seek expanded fishing regulatory authority as the years go on. Consequently we foresee years of wasted effort and wasted resources unless this power grab is stopped at this step.

In summary, the Coastside Fishing Club urges the PFMC to once again state its opposition to any change in the CINMS Designation Document that would allow the CINMS to engage in fishery regulations, and to reject as inappropriate both options 2 and 3 in Agenda Item H.1.a, Attachment 1, September 2005. We further request that NOAA direct the CINMS to cease pursuit of this objective under Sanctuary authority and to direct that they come to the PFMC, under MSA authority, for any fishing related objectives they would like the Council to consider.

The Coastside Fishing Club represents over 10,000 California recreational anglers. We are an all volunteer California non profit organization dedicated to enhancing the recreational fishing experience for all Californians.

Dan Wolford, Science Director

Coastside Fishing Club

http://www.coastsidefishingclub.com
Copies to

Daniel Basta, Director
National Marine Sanctuary Program
1305 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

William Hogarth, Director
NOAA Fisheries
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910.

Vice Admiral Conrad C. Lautenbacher, Jr.,
Undersecretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere
US Department of Commerce
1401 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20230

Chris Mobley, Manager
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
113 Harbor Way
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Forbes Darby
National Recreational Fisheries Coordinator
Office of Constituent Services
1315 East West Highway, 9th Floor
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Marty Golden
Pacific Recreational Fisheries Coordinator
501 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802
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October 7, 2005

Mr. Frank Kellogg, President and Fish and Game Commissioners
California Fish and Game Commission
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Request to Review Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Marine Protected Areas

Dear President Kellogg and Commissioners:

We write you today on behalf of the California Lobster and Trap Fishermen’s Association to request that the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) Marine Reserves be brought before the Commission for review and reconsideration. New information and analyses, along with new evidence of seriously deficient monitoring efforts to assess reserve performance, all point to a lack of clear criteria for success or failure of the reserve network. You may recall that this eventuality is the reason then-President Mike Chrisman felt the need to vote “no” on the original CINMS Marine Reserve designation vote at the Commission.

We believe that it is timely for the Commission to review this marine protected area (MPA) program. Periodic review and assessment of management programs such as this CINMS MPA network are essential if true adaptive management, specified in both the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) and the Marine Life Management Act (MLMA), is to be given more than lip service. We further believe that a review is now timely because designation of marine reserves in CINMS is now advancing to Phase Two as described in the State’s CEQA-equivalent document.

We recommend that several of these no-take reserves now be considered for being re-designated as Marine Conservation Zones. We have new evidence that suggests that the economic impacts to our fisheries are significantly more than projected by the State’s original environmental review document. This new information was developed when we finally gained access to Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and used that tool to compare spatially-explicit data sets to verify accuracy of the original economic impact assessment. Re-designation as Marine Conservation Zones will address this economic impact disparity.

We suggest that this process start with a review of the procedures used for the CINMS biological and economic modeling, because assumptions underlying this modeling were intimately connected with the assumptions of the Marine Reserve Working Group (MRWG) Science Advisory Panel (SAP). We would like to offer new information indicating that the community based goals and objectives (achieved by consensus) were not well-served by a number of these critical assumptions.
A full review of monitoring efforts achieved to date should also be an integral part of this timely performance assessment. We would like an opportunity to provide new information concerning the adequacy of methodology of the monitoring program for CINMS MPAs, and offer information to improve survey calibration.

Re-assessment of the CINMS MPA network, and re-designation of a few elements as Marine Conservation Zones should also be looked at based on the significant number of State and Federal fishery management actions that have been taken in the interim of Phase One at CINMS. Several fishery management plans have now been completed under MLMA guidance for improved conservation and essential fishery information. Further, the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) has implemented major groundfish stock rebuilding programs using a zonal management (MPA) strategy including ultra-large no-take zones (e.g., Cowcod Conservation Area, Shelf Closure and essential fish habitat (EFH) no-take zones under Magnuson Act provisions) that need to be evaluated to assess how the entire network of MPAs in the Southern California Bight is achieving the goals and objectives of the MRWG and the MLPA.

One interface for improved integration of various marine conservation and fishery management practices is the Nearshore Fishery and its relatively new Management Plan. We believe that evidence now supports a position that the Plan cannot achieve the goals for MPAs as defined in the Plan's harvest control rule. This clearly illustrates the basis and need for integration of MPAs with more “traditional” fishery management tools.

The Nearshore Fishery Plan states that reserves will serve as references for assessing the performance of harvest control. We have been diligent in repeatedly bringing this to the attention of the Department of Fish and Game (DFG). This is an important point because these methods are the same ones needed to measure efficacy of marine reserves in meeting objective performance criteria (or more nebulous “goals and objectives”) that should have been more explicitly and succinctly developed, a priori, in the designation process, as Mr. Chrisman rightly observed in 2002.

We also have new information that addresses the justifications for the number of no-takes as replicates are not scientifically supportable. The notion that there is a distinct transition zone between the Californian Province and Oregonian Province has now been further evaluated along with the notion of the use of percentages for habitat representation that were used in the CINMS environmental document. These design elements are no longer consistent with the MLPA master plan framework given this new information.

From our analysis of habitats in a joint scientist-and-fishery habitat-modeling project with senior fisheries scientists, we have developed new information which illustrates that we are experiencing congestion in our fishing grounds for our fisheries. It is inappropriate that this result is based on marine areas being designated no-take that do not actually have high biodiversity value or really qualify as essential fishery habitat for no-take designation.

Our fishing community has maintained its commitment to your Commission to be constructive in developing MPA design. We would like to have the opportunity to fully explain how we believe the CINMS reserve network can be adapted to better meet our needs while improving
overall conservation of living marine resources in our area. We share this overarching philosophy with the Commission and marine conservation community.

We would like to offer specific topics to the Marine Sub-Committee and get feedback from the Committee to guide this adaptive management review and assessment. Our working hypothesis is that these topics point to a need to improve the balance in the CINMS no-take-dominated network among Marine Reserves and Marine Conservation Zones to improve conservation of quality habitat while minimizing economic impacts overall to our fisheries. We also would like feedback from the Marine Sub-Committee and the Commission on how best to develop an agenda that ensures this is done so that truly objective and measurable performance criteria evolve or are developed for the reserves, in the sense of a true adaptive management plan that cycles between designation of performance criteria, adequate monitoring and assessment of performance against those criteria, and adjustment of MPA networks as determined to improve overall network performance.

We further believe that this review process is essential for integrating CINMS MPAs with the coastal reserves in the Santa Barbara Channel region coming in future MLPA implementation. From a scientific and management perspective we have a unique opportunity here to use this CINMS MPA review for improving the State’s procedure for adaptive management under both the MLPA and MLMA, as well as with its representation at the PFMC regarding related issues.

From our recent experience collaborating with marine scientists, we believe there is a core consensus to define improved methods that will measure MPA performance against clear and measurable objectives, and that will better define these performance criteria for MPAs as a whole network. Our Santa Barbara area also sits on the boundary of two separate coastal MLPA planning areas. It may be possible that this review will initiate a pro-active process to develop coastal MPA alternatives that achieve better overall balance in marine ecosystem conservation, a balance that also improves integration of MPAs with more traditional fisheries management in this bioregion.

Sincerely,

Chris Miller,
Vice-President

cc: Mr. Robert Treanor, Commission Executive Director
Mr. Mike Chrisman, Secretary, Resources Agency
Mr. Ryan Broddrick, Director, Department of Fish and Game
Mr. Don Hansen, Chairman, Pacific Fisheries Management Council and Ad-Hoc Marine Reserves Committee
Mr. Don Mclsaacs, Executive Director, PFMC
Ms. Cindy Thompson, SSC Chair, PFMC
October 12, 2005

Admiral Conrad Lautenbacher, USN (ret.)
Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmosphere
Department of Commerce
1401 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230

Dear Admiral Lautenbacher:

We are writing to inform you of a vote by a key regional organization of public agencies regarding the possibility that the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) will change its Designation Document to give it the authority to use the National Marine Sanctuary Act to create fishing regulations.

We are also writing to ask you to clarify NOAA policy to direct the National Marine Sanctuary Program to utilize the Fishery Management Councils and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act to accomplish Sanctuary goals because the Management Councils and the Act can fundamentally address any legitimate resource concerns that the Sanctuary Program might have.

Regarding the first item, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) considered the role of the Sanctuary in creating fishing regulations at their September 14, 2005 meeting. AMBAG is composed of 21 elected officials representing each city and each county in a three county area that includes much of the coast of the MBNMS. Please find attached the meeting minutes of the AMBAG Board of Directors meeting. As you can see on page 5, the AMBAG Board overwhelmingly endorsed by a 15-3 vote the following motion:

Support the original promise made to the fishing community, as found in the 1992 Designation Document, that fishing regulations will be made by the appropriate state and federal fishery management agencies.

This motion was made and adopted after public testimony from both an invited representative of NOAA Fisheries (who also provided background on the Pacific Fishery Management Council), and testimony from a representative of senior management of the MBNMS. There was also substantial public comment; nearly all of which asked the AMBAG Board to support the motion. We also point out that this vote by AMBAG closely follows a similar unanimous vote of the Monterey County Board of Supervisors, who supported a similar motion.

You should be aware that the two fundamental reasons expressed by the fishing community to support this motion were: (1) that the fishing community in this region had been promised, before the designation of the Sanctuary, that the Sanctuary would not become a regulatory agency with the power to create rules affecting them. This
"promise" is well documented and remembered within our community. It is expressed in the Designation Document for the Monterey Sanctuary by not giving this Sanctuary the authority to create fishing regulations for that specific reason. The Sanctuary efforts to change the Designation Document are most unwelcome and will only create an embittered and hostile fishing community toward the Sanctuary Program for many years to come, and that would be a shame. It is understood in our communities that the Sanctuary could not have come into existence had the fishermen not lent their support, and that their support was contingent on this promise. Please also find attached a January 31, 2002 letter from Congressman Sam Farr, which has a section that very clearly addresses this issue.

(2) The other reason that was given in support of the motion is that for very practical reasons, the Sanctuary ought not to be in the role of regulating fishing. Those reasons include its need for a more transparent public decision-making process. Currently, the Sanctuary relies heavily on its Sanctuary Advisory Council to represent the "voice of the communities." However, the Sanctuary manager gets to pick the majority of members who comprise that Council. His selections for different stakeholders have, in some cases, been quite controversial, with the stakeholder organizations strongly objecting to who is picked to be their voice. This has in turn diminished the role of the Advisory Council as it is viewed as being close to Sanctuary Management.

The Sanctuary Act also does not task the Program to justify its actions through the best available science and/or submit its proposed actions to review of something like a Science and Statistical Committee (such as is used by the Fishery Management Councils). Indeed, the paper, entitled "Regulatory Coordination Between the National Marine Sanctuaries Program and Fishery Management Agencies", produced by the Sanctuary Program (also attached), states the Sanctuary Program's self view that they can create fishing regulations, even if federal councils or state agencies object to this, if in their opinion it is "to maintain the health and balance of the Sanctuary." Is it not possible that a State or council may not want to adopt a rule for good, science-based reasons? We suggest that this is such a broad concept that literally any prohibition against human use could be justified under that umbrella without rigorous science justification.

Additionally, it is well established that both the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and by direction from senior NOAA management that NOAA Fisheries and the Councils are tasked with ecosystem-based management. Programs like its Essential Fish Habitat effort and setting harvest guidelines that consider predator-prey relationships are examples of this. This is an important point because the sanctuaries tend to claim that they are different somehow from NOAA Fisheries, and that they alone are tasked with ecosystem-based management. This may well have been the case in 1992 when the MBNMS was designated, but we do not believe that this is now the case.

We also note that a "Supplemental Tribal Comment," to the Pacific Fishery Management Council at their September 2005 meeting, expresses the strong opinion of the West Coast's Tribes that sanctuaries ought not be making fishery regulations.

Lastly, an important reason to clarify that the Magnuson-Stevens Act will be used, rather than the National Marine Sanctuary Act, is the fact that a public perception exists that the Sanctuary Program is competing with NOAA Fisheries for regulatory authority. This is causing confusion within the industry, the public, and the regulatory climate. There is
much irony in this, as much as the US Ocean Commission Report concludes, in part, that Ocean Management must be unified and consolidated to the extent possible. We want to add that this confusion also includes economic uncertainty cast over those in the fishing industry who do not know what restrictions could come out of a National Marine Sanctuary Program that views its role in such broad terms and does not need the test of science or the test of community support for its regulations. For economic uncertainty to be a result of a Department of Commerce program is a point of irony that we are sure you will appreciate.

For all of these reasons, we urge you to clarify within NOAA that for issues that affect fishery management and fishing operations, the Magnuson-Stevens Act will be the law of choice for NOAA agencies. We hope that you can support this and we are available to answer any other questions that you may have regarding our position.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kathy Fosmark
Co-Chair, ACSF

[Signature]

Frank Emerson
Co-Chair, ACSF

Attachments as stated

Supporting Associations & Organizations
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association
Port San Luis Commercial Fishermen's Association
Morro Bay Commercial Fishermen's Association
Monterey Commercial Fishermen's Association
Fishermen's Association of Moss Landing
Santa Cruz Commercial Fishermen's Marketing Association
Half Moon Bay Fishermen's Marketing Association
Fishermen's Alliance
Western Fishboat Owners Association
Ventura County Commercial Fishermen's Association
Federation of Independent Seafood Harvesters
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association
Port San Luis Harbor District
City of Morro Bay Harbor
City of Monterey Harbor
Moss Landing Harbor District
Santa Cruz Port District
Pillar Pt. Harbor, San Mateo County Harbor District

C: MBNMS
    MBNMS — SAC
    The Honorable Ted Stevens
    The Honorable Richard Pombo
    The Honorable Wayne Gilchrest
    The Honorable Sam Farr
MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

AMBAG NO. 8

SEPTEMBER 14, 2005

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Directors of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, President Ralph Rubio presiding, convened at 6:02 p.m. Wednesday, September 14, 2005 at Padres Hall in Corralitos, California.

2. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Harlan (6:11)</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel-by-the-Sea</td>
<td>Hazdovac</td>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>Pendergrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>Gourley</td>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Huerta (6:45)</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Gray (6:04)</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>Lindley (6:04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>Miller (6:12)</td>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Beutz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>Emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>Pereira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Reilly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of San Benito</td>
<td>Botelho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests Present:** Craig Heberer, NOAA Fisheries; Holly Price, Rachel Saunders and Robert Frischmuth, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary; Ed Fincke and Bill Tibbet, QualityWise; Jose Rios, PG&E; Yolanda Teneyuque, City of Greenfield; Steve Scheiblauer, City of Monterey; Karin Strasser Kauffman; Linda G. McIntyre and Russ Jeffries, Moss Landing Harbor District; Bill Phillips, Monterey County Water Resources Agency; Ana Ventura Phares and Antonio Rivas, City of Watsonville; Kathy Fosmark, ACSF; Dave Danborn, retired fisherman; Mike Maiorana, Monterey Bay Boatworks; Kelly Morgan; Rosie Hernandez, David Delfino; Chris Herald; Monterey Bay Aquarium; R. Scoces, San Benito County;

**Staff Present:** Nicolas Papadakis, Executive Director; Shelley Gesicki, Transportation Demand Coordinator; Kathy Urfie, Principal Planner; Todd Muck, Senior Planner; Ray Millard, Finance Officer; Elizabeth Flores, Finance Specialist; David Rosmer, Planner; Carrie Mann, Consultant; Ana Flores, Administrative Assistant.
3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE BOARD ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Director Reed announced to the Board of Directors that San Benito County voted unanimously on September 13, 2005 to join AMBAG after a 35-year absence. Director Gourley announced that Director Smith was elected to the Board of Directors of Cal LAFCO. Staff member Gesicki pointed out the Rideshare Week marketing material on the table.

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

5. PRESENTATIONS

A. PRESENTATION ON SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

The presentation was postponed to the next scheduled Board of Directors Meeting.

B. PRESENTATION TO PG&E ON ITS 100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

President Ralph Rubio recognized PG&E by presenting Jose Rios with a Resolution congratulating PG&E for all their efforts in helping communities in the tri-county area.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes of the August 10, 2005 Board of Directors Meeting

The minutes of the August 10, 2005 Board of Directors meeting were enclosed for approval.

B. Regional Clearinghouse Items for August 2005

The Clearinghouse list for the month of August 2005 was enclosed for the Board's information.

C. Logs of Significant Staff Meetings for August 2005

The logs of significant staff meetings for August 2005 were enclosed for the Board's information.

D. Disposal of Surplus Property

Enclosed was a staff memorandum and recommending approval for the forgoing AMBAG surplus property.

E. Rideshare Week 2005

Enclosed for approval was a staff memorandum and resolution declaring the week October 3-8, 2005 as Rideshare Week in the Monterey Bay region.

F. FY 2005-06 Overall Work Program Amendment No. 1
Enclosed for approval was a staff memorandum and OWP Amendment No. 1.

G. Out-of-State Travel

Approve out-of-State travel for the Executive Director to attend the annual International City/County Management Association Conference in Minneapolis.

H. Regional Travel Demand Model and Use Agreement

A staff memorandum and separate attachments providing information on staff’s response to RBF Consulting’s June 8, 2005 memorandum regarding the Regional Travel Demand Model and the Model Use Agreement were enclosed for the Board’s information.

I. FY 2004/05 to FY 2006/07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment No. 11

Enclosed for approval were a staff memorandum, resolution and separately enclosed revisions providing information regarding the FY 2004/05 to FY 2006/07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment No. 11.

J. AMBAG Agendas Subscription Rates

Enclosed for approval was a staff memorandum recommending annual subscription rates.

K. Residential Green Building Workshop

Enclosed for approval was an announcement for the September 21, 2005 workshop. Staff recommends co-sponsorship of this workshop by contributing $200.

The Executive Director pointed out to a revised page for Agenda Item 6.F that was handed out at the beginning of the meeting.

Motion made by Director Gourley, seconded by Director Gomez to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

7. ADMINISTRATION

A. Executive Committee Report

President Rubio reported on three items: first, the committee recommended approval to increase the Executive Director’s salary per the Bylaws to 5% retroactive to July 1, 2005. Second, the Executive Committee accepted the profit & loss statement. Third, the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations on decision-making were discussed and the Executive Committee directed the Executive Director to return to the Committee and Board in October with alternatives on the weighted vote and in November with proposed voting structure.

Motion made by Director Russell, seconded by Director Aguilar to approve the Executive Committee Report. Motion passed unanimously.
B. Results of Board of Directors and Clients Survey

Ed Fincke and Bill Tibbit of QualityWise briefed the Board on the results of the Board of Directors' and Clients' surveys conducted in the spring of 2005.

8. PLANNING

A. Fisheries Regulations in the Marine Sanctuary

Craig Heberer, NOAA Fisheries and Holly Price, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, gave presentations on present and future fishing regulatory authority within the Marine Sanctuary. They were followed by questions and comments from the public and from the Board of Directors.

Motion made by Director Downey, seconded by Director Pendergrass to support the original promise made to the fishing community as found in the 1992 designation document that fishing regulations will be made by the appropriate state and federal fishery management agencies. Motion passed with Directors Beutz, Harlan and Miller voting No.

9. TRANSPORTATION

A. Regional Blueprint Program Grant Application

Kathy Urlie, Principal Planner, presented information from the regular and supplemental agenda packets on a proposed grant application to the State of California for incorporating a "Smart Growth" type visioning process to the development of the land use forecasts update through comprehensive interaction between the region's communities and the public.

Motion made by Director Gomez, seconded by Director Gray to approve the California Regional Blueprint Program Grant Application and for the Executive Director to accept such funds, if offered. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Caltrans Grant Matching FAA Land Use Compatibility Plan Grant

In the Supplementary Agenda, enclosed for approval was a resolution to authorize submitting a grant application to Caltrans to cover the majority of the non-federal match required by the Federal Aviation Administration grant received by AMBAG in August for the Land use Compatibility Plan for Monterey County Airports.

Motion made by Director Gourley, seconded by Director Gomez to add item 9.B to the agenda as an emergency item. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Director Aguilar, seconded by Director Gomez to approve the Resolution to submit for Caltrans Grant Matching monies for the FAA Land Use Compatibility Plan Grant. Motion passed unanimously.
10. CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. ORAL

1. Director Huerta introduced Yolanda Teneyuque, Vice Mayor of the City Greenfield the new representative to AMBAG. He will remain as the alternate representative.

B. WRITTEN

1. Central Coast Broadband Initiatives Program. The Executive Director referred to the enclosed program and urged member agencies to participate.

11. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

__________________________  ____________________________
Ralph Rubio, President      Nick Papadakis, Executive Director