Marine and Coastal Area-based Management Advisory Committee Meeting
Silver Spring, Maryland
August 27-28, 2024

Advisory Committee Members Present:
Peter Auster, Mystic Aquarium; University of Connecticut
Jessica Coakley, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Jenn Eckerle, California Natural Resources Agency; California Ocean Protection Council
Deanna Erickson, Lake Superior National Estuarine Research Reserve
Kirsten Grorud-Colvert, Department of Integrative Biology for Oregon State University
Martha Guyas, American Sportfishing Association
Heather Hall, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jaime Jahncke (virtual), California Current Group, Point Blue Conservation Science
Amy Kenney, National Ocean Protection Coalition
Aaron Kornbluth, Akorn Environmental Consulting
Joseph Oatman (virtual), Nez Perce Tribe
Eric Reid, New England Fisheries Management Council
Donald Schug, Northern Economies, Inc.
Peter Stauffer, Surfrider Foundation
Angelo Villagomez, Center for American Progress
Lela DeVine, EarthEcho International
Anthony Dvarskas, Orsted Americas
Heather Hall, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Federal Agency Representatives, non-voting members:
Stacy Aguilera-Peterson, National Science Foundation
Ronald Howard, U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service

NOAA Staff in Attendance:
John Armor, Director, NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Kelly Denit, Director, NOAA Fisheries' Office of Sustainable Fisheries
Lauren Wenzel, Director, National Marine Protected Areas Center, NOAA
Heather Sagar, Senior Policy Advisor, NOAA Fisheries
Ellie Roberts, Policy Analyst, NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
Maureen Brooks, Ocean Portfolio Advisor, NOAA Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research
Josh Lott,Manager, NOS Policy Program, NOAA Office for Coastal Management
Amanda Sullivan,
Gabrielle Hillyer, Knauss Fellow
Amanda Kirkland, Knauss Fellow

Day 1 -August 27, 2024

Meeting welcome and introductions
John Armor, Director, NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and Committee Designated Federal Official

Welcomed everyone to the public meeting of the Marine and Coastal Area-based Management Federal Advisory Committee. Armor reminded the Committee that it has been just over 6 months since the full Committee last met. Armor recognized that the committee has been hard at work standing up our two subcommittees, and honing in on key areas of focus.
We recognized that building a Committee from the ground up is challenging, and that NOAA is appreciative of all the time, effort, and consideration the committee members have given so far.

During the meeting, Armor advised that the Committee should be able to see certain priorities take shape, as the Committee charts a course for our work over the next 6 months/1 year.

Ellie Roberts, Program Analyst for NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries provided a brief overview of the meeting platform.

Amy Kenney, MCAM Advisory Committee Chair, welcomed the Committee and provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

Committee Team building / Sharing
Each member shared a photo of their favorite ocean area, ocean animal, or coastal area, and shared information about themselves and the ocean places and resources they value. Following the ice breaker, the committee broke out into small groups to share advice and recent personal or professional points of pride.

NOAA Update - Bipartisan Infrastructure Law & Inflation Reduction Act implementation
Chris Doley, Division Chief for the Restoration Center and Josh Lott, Manager, Policy and Communications Program, Office for Coastal Management

Chris Doley and Josh Lott provided an update on the status of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) and Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) implementation.

Josh Lott provided an update of BIL and IRA funding programs (year one results and future opportunities) provided through the National Ocean Service, a total of $1.2B over five years under BIL and $1.5B under IRA. The presentation included an overview of four funding programs: the National Coastal Resilience Fund ($492M), Habitat Protection and Restoration Awards for Coastal Zone Management Programs ($207M) and National Estuarine Research Reserves ($77M), and the Climate Resilience Regional Challenge ($575M). The presentation highlighted some year one successes, including $70.3M awarded to 33 projects under the Habitat Protection and Restoration Awards, consisting of 12 land conservation, 14 habitat restoration, and 7 habitat restoration planning, engineering, and design projects. Six land acquisition projects closed, conserving 5,200+ acres of habitat. In addition, 77% of reserve & 65% of coastal zone management projects supported meaningful engagement with Tribes and

underserved communities. In one example, South Carolina's Black River Project is reducing flooding, preserving habitat, and providing myriad benefits to historically underserved communities through the permanent conservation of 1,800 acres.

The presentation also highlighted examples from the Climate Resilience Regional Challenge, which received 869 eligible letters of intent totaling $16 billion. Nineteen projects received funding, including these two examples shared in the presentation:

- Expanding Climate Adaptation Technical Assistance for Frontline Alaska Native Communities: $74,950,045 to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium to engage ~100 Alaska Native communities to build a network of practitioners focused on building climate adaptation capacity. Focus areas: establish a community climate risk assessment program, expand statewide tribal adaptation and technical assistance, networking/knowledge sharing.
- ʻĀina Restoration through Community Governance to Advance Climate Resilience in the Hawaiian Islands: $68,497,799 to University of Hawaiʻi Sea Grant College Program. Project will reinvigorate the moku system, a Native Hawaiian framework for traditional land tenure and contemporary biocultural stewardship.

Chris Doley then provided an update on BIL and IRA funding opportunities from the NOAA Fisheries Office of Habitat Conservation (OHC). OHC is responsible for executing approximately $891M over 5 years of BIL funding – $491M for habitat restoration and $400M for fish passage, of which up to 15 percent is reserved for tribes. In addition, OHC is executing an additional $484M of IRA funding. This is being administered through three rounds of competitive funding opportunities across four competitions: Fish Passage, Tribal Fish Passage, Transformational Habitat Restoration, and Tribes & Underserved Communities.

The presentation included a map of the distribution of BIL/IRA habitat restoration awards through two rounds of funding. To date, OHC has funded 214 awards totaling $985M. Recently-funded transformation habitat restoration initiatives include the following: CA Rocky Reef and Kelp, Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, Cape Haze, and South Florida Keys restoration projects. Round 3 of the four funding opportunities will open this fall to early-winter on a rolling basis.

The presentation then described the three main types of performance metrics for BIL (ecological, socioeconomic, and community benefits), as well as OHC's definition, activities, and ongoing learning related to meaningful engagement with tribes and underserved communities.

The Committee asked if NOAA could characterize the interest versus the availability of funds across NOS BIL/IRA funding. NOAA advised that they are looking into that across other competitions. The Committee affirmed that these are fantastic stories and case studies to tell, and asked if some of these transformational habitat restoration projects are available as a report. NOAA shared that brief impact stories are available online at this link.

The Committee asked how NOAA is supporting underserved communities in receiving this funding, and also asked who the allowed funding recipients are (eg, governments, institutions, etc).

The Committee asked about the performance metrics that are being used for all NOAA programs distributing BIL/ IRA funds. NOAA shared that for the climate resilience regional challenge competition, we compiled applicant resources keyed to the competition goals:

1) Equity and Inclusion
2) Community Engagement for Equity and Inclusion
3) Risk Communication for Equity and Inclusion
4) Regional Coordination and Collaboration
5) Risk Reduction
6) Enduring Capacity

Additional information is available at
https://coast.noaa.gov/funding/ira/resilience-challenge/resources.html

NOAA Update- Implementation of Administration Priorities
Lauren Wenzel, Director, National MPA Center; Danika Kleiber, Research Social Scientist, NOAA Fisheries; Carolina Behe, National Cultural Resource Coordinator, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries

Lauren Wenzel introduced the topic of how Administration priorities -- including environmental justice, tribal consultation, and engagement with Indigenous Peoples -- are being implemented at the program level within NOAA.

Danika Kleiber spoke about the NOAA Fisheries Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Strategy, including how and why it was developed, and how it is being implemented. Environmental justice is rooted in the civil rights movement, with the understanding that environmental management is inextricably linked to the history of our country. This link was made explicit in the description of environmental racism, which is the disproportionate and unequal impact and environmental decision on non-white people and communities. An equity approach to fisheries can include mitigation of inequitable distribution of fisheries resources or regulatory burdens, expanding fisheries research to be co-produced and reflect diverse knowledge systems, and restructuring decision making to ensure authentic participation, with processes that are accountable to those most impacted. In 2024 NOAA Fisheries went on to publish 10 regional and program office EEJ implementation plans, and internal EEJ training has also been developed to support capacity development across NOAA Fisheries staff.

Carolina Behe shared a presentation on “Building Equitable Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples and Including Indigenous Knowledge”. The presentation highlighted work that the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) is doing to advance meaningful engagement and equitably working with Indigenous Peoples. A large part of this work includes building internal capacities and implementing policies such as those related to consultation. The presentation also highlighted the Imila-alpa Commitments. ONMS made the Commitments in response to the Second Cross-Pacific Indigenous Exchange discussions. Resources referenced during the presentation can be accessed here on the ONMS public page.

The Committee asked, with respect to the Ocean Equity (equitable inputs = more equal outputs), to what extent may NOAA look to the MCAM FAC to help attain equity in Access, Chance of Success, and Outcomes. The Committee also requested a deeper dive on this work in a follow up presentation with time for questions/discussion.

The Committee asked if NOAA Fisheries has staff support for working with Tribal Nations and Indigenous communities, similar to Carolina's position with the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. In addition, the Committee asked how the efforts and initiatives described in these presentations integrated into the BIL/IRA programs?
NOAA noted that more information on the Transformational, Fish Passage, and Tribal and

Underserved Community projects (as well as an interactive project map) on the following web site: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/habitat-conservation/habitat-restoration-under-biparti:san-infrastructure-law-and-inflation-reduction-act

NOAA advised that they will follow up with the Committee to provide more information in response to the questions raised during these presentations.

Effectiveness and Outcomes Subcommittee Presentation
Pete Stauffer - Outcomes & Effectiveness Subcommittee Chair
Jessica Coakley - Outcomes & Effectiveness Subcommittee Co-Chair

The Committee briefly shared their work plan and that the subcommittee had met four times so far. The subcommittee initially focused on BIL/IRA funding recommendations, and plans to follow this topic area with future work focused on:

- Conservation and Stewardship Atlas, including its current utility & future improvements
- The desired outcomes/goals of area-based management, including metrics
- Best practices for communicating area-based management tools, status, and outcomes

The Subcommittee shared their BIL/IRA funding recommendations with the wider committee for deliberation. There were six recommendations shared, including:

1. NOAA should work to obligate funds promptly to states, communities, and Tribes so that projects can be quickly and effectively implemented.
2. BIL/IRA funding should not lead to a decrease in baseline funding for NOAA programs that support area-based management.
3. NOAA should conduct meaningful community and Tribal outreach and engagement on BIL/IRA funding opportunities.
4. BIL/IRA investments should advance biodiversity conservation, habitat restoration, coastal resilience, and equitable public access.
5. BIL/IRA investments and projects across the U.S. should be captured in the Conservation & Stewardship Atlas.
6. Metrics to measure success should be created that link to conservation and other management goals.

There was general consensus around these recommendations but there was a suggestion to create a seventh recommendation related to environmental compliance capacity. The Committee discussed a plan to have these recommendations finalized, approved by the committee, and sent to NOAA leadership as soon as possible.

Meaningful Engagement with Communities Subcommittee Presentation
The Meaningful Engagement with Communities Subcommittee shared on the four topics, as well as goals and potential tasks, they plan to work on in the coming months. The subcommittee is interested in feedback from the full Committee. Those topics, as well as discussion and suggestions for each include:

1. How can NOAA use area based management to foster healthy coastal communities through partnerships, jobs, and support across governmental bodies?
    a. The goals for Topic 1 include recommending best practices for how NOAA can engage across state, federal, territorial, local, and tribal governments (including

workforce development).
    b. The subcommittee is considering the development of best practices, and/or Identifying examples or opportunities that sustain household economies or traditional livelihoods, as well as gaps in current initiatives
    c. Some Committee members advised the subcommittee to consider non-consumptive recreation, and how those activities could be compatible
    d. The work plan highlights partnerships between NOAA and academic institutions. The Committee suggested not limiting it to academic institutions, but also including youth orgs, museums, aquariums, etc. The subcommittee should broaden this to consider partnerships with groups that look at these things from a different lens.
    e. A lot of the tasks are dollar based or economic based, but there are other contributions and values that may be considered. Regarding job development and training, the Committee may focus on other organizations that are working in that space.
    f. Regarding engagement with Tribal governments, NOAA advised that the agency also works with Indigenous groups beyond tribal nations. Indigenous organizations and governments have put forward best practices for working within their homelands and this applies to area based management. Some governments have been engaged in area based management and may have helpful input. Sometimes it is important to engage Indigenous governments and organizations through a different process to ensure equity in the process of bringing information to the forefront from Indigenous Peoples.
    g. Consider also noting the difference in recognized Indigenous governance and what recommendations are put forward for other stakeholders. A best practice related to Indigenous governments and communities may not be appropriate to apply to stakeholders. Also consider what resources are needed by Indigenous Peoples to meaningfully engage in this process of putting forward promising practices and to be involved in area based management.
2. Identify how NOAA can better support and prioritize Indigenous-led conservation and co-stewardship.
    a. The Committee will dive deeper into this topic on day two of the meeting.
3. Recommend ways to improve area-based management tools, investments, and authorities to foster partnerships and co-develop programs that support healthy communities and local economies.
    a. The goals for topic 3 is to network by connecting communities and conservation areas, and to establish a process that supports community co-stewardship
    b. The Committee is considering tasks that include a white paper for NOAA that identifies internal and external factors that facilitate/impede community co-stewardship; and recommendations for NOAA that could accentuate / minimize factors described in white paper
4. Recommend improvements for NOAA's engagement approaches and communications about America the Beautiful.
    a. The Committee is considering if there is a need for recommendations for effective communications regarding the Biden-Harris Administration's America the Beautiful initiative.

Following discussion on each topic area, the Committee had a general discussion on the subcommittees area of focus. The Committee noted that "Educate " and "education" are not mentioned anywhere in these recommendations. The Committee also discussed if and how to consider Fisherman's ecological knowledge across these spaces in the appropriate contexts

The Committee asked if there are definitions for “Outreach” and “Engagement”, as each are important methods for NOAA communication, and noted the need to make sure we are clear about the words being used, and their definitions - especially as NOAA may not use the same definitions.

The Committee asked how engagement may differ across NOAA, and asked if there are statutory, regulatory, or other ways that definitions are provided. The Committee also asked if there are community liaisons, and considered the need for more positions like that, which could have relationships within communities to help communities understand how NOAA works. NOAA mentioned Sea Grant Extension Agents as potentially filling this role.

The next step for this subcommittee is to draft recommendations about topic number 2.

Public Comment
None was shared at this time.

Closing
The Committee Chair and Vice Chair thanked everyone for a great day. Thank you to the NOAA team for their work and presentations, as well as the Committee for their engagement. We made progress on subcommittee work, and will continue that work tomorrow. The Chair closed by providing a brief overview of discussion topics for the following day.

John Armor thanked the Committee for their time and work. The meeting was adjourned for the day.

Day 2 - August 28, 2024

Welcome
Kelly Denit, Alternate Designated Federal Official; Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries

Kelly Denit called the meeting to order. Kelly shared reflections from the first day of the meeting, and looks forward to continuing the discussion today.

Angelo Villagomez shared reflections from the first day of the meeting, and then led the Committee through an introductory icebreaker activity for Committee members.

Effectiveness and Outcomes Subcommittee Discussion
Pete Stauffer - Outcomes & Effectiveness Subcommittee Chair

Led a discussion and editing session of the seven recommendations to NOAA regarding BIL/IRA investments. Committee members were encouraged to reach out to Subcommittee leadership or NOAA staff to identify individuals or offices to be added to the transmittal email. The committee engaged in 45 minutes of technical editing of the recommendation memo. Changes included clarification of purpose, refining definitions, and editing to make language

more concise. NOAA staff helped identify what level of detail is appropriate for inclusion in the memo. This discussion was continued at the end of the meeting.

Meaningful Engagement with Communities Subcommittee Presentation
Joseph Oatman (Subcommittee Co-chair) and Angelo Villagomez (Committee Vice Chair)

The Meaningful Engagement with Communities Subcommittee led a discussion on how NOAA can better support and prioritize Indigenous-led conservation and co-stewardship.

Joe Oatman emphasized the importance of co-stewardship and co-management in conserving environments, highlighting the deep connections and unique knowledge Indigenous communities have regarding land stewardship. He noted the ongoing impacts of colonialism on these communities and their traditional practices, particularly in relation to declining salmon populations and related socio-economic issues. He stated the importance of integrating Indigenous knowledge with scientific approaches to management, asserting that Indigenous tribes play a crucial role in reversing climate change and revitalizing fisheries.

Angelo Villagomez stated that NOAA's relationships with Indigenous Peoples should be based on true partnership and compromise, recognizing tribes as sovereign entities within a complex colonial context. He highlighted the need to move beyond traditional consultation processes that perpetuate power imbalances and instead adopt co-management approaches. Villagomez addressed the diversity among Indigenous communities, including state-recognized and unrecognized tribes, and stressed the importance of creating pathways for their knowledge to inform government decisions, despite challenges posed by existing colonial constructs with U.S. governance.

The MCAM FAC then separated into breakout groups to discuss how NOAA can better support and prioritize Indigenous-led conservation and co-stewardship. Some of the suggestions included the importance of creating roadmaps for Indigenous peoples that consider geographic and legal status issues, facilitating better communication and understanding of governance processes with NOAA. Others called for a thorough examination of existing Secretarial orders to identify gaps, balancing national advice with regional needs. One group stated that the unique challenges faced by different regions, such as New England versus the Pacific Northwest, must be addressed, particularly in relation to supporting subsistence fishers, including those from non-federally recognized tribes.

The Committee asked what NOAA's current capacities are going towards tribal conservation and co-stewardship efforts. The Committee responded by saying that it would be helpful to identify staff who are spending at least 50% of their time on work with Tribal Nations and Indigenous peoples by line office.

Cross cutting priorities
Lori Arguelles, NOAA Director of Strategic Communications; Jasmine Blackwell, NOAA Public Affairs; Mimi D'Iorio, Geoscientist, NOAA's National MPA Center

Lori and Jasmine NOAA provided a series of presentations about priorities that related to aspects of both FAC subcommittees. The first presentation focused on communication of area-based management, specifically identifying ways to reinforce who we are (NOAA), effectively demonstrating and advertising products and services, and social media. Additional discussion included considering multiple definitions of "communication", "outreach", and other similar terms, and how BIL/IRA outcomes could be leveraged as communication tools to reach

more communities on topics related to climate resilience.

The Committee asked who NOAA sees as the audience for BIL/IRA outcomes. NOAA advised that media is an avenue to reach people, and that who you are trying to reach is always dependent on the topic. The BIL/IRA announcements are very community-based, to reach the areas where they are having the most impact. The climate resilience regional challenge has given NOAA the opportunity to reach more communities

The Committee asked howOnce we have recommendations how NOAA platforms can be used to share Committee recommendations with the public. NOAA advised that we can help with that, and we have a robust list of stakeholders who we often share announcements with.

The Committee asked if NOAA has a list of official definitions of communications, outreach, engagement, etc. NOAA advised that these definitions can be fluid. Outreach is more broadly defined–constituents rather than media. It may not be useful to think about it in small pieces but rather who you want to reach and why. Then NOAA can figure out what tools are useful to that goal.

The second presentation, provided by Mimi D'Iorio, focused on the Conservation and Stewardship Atlas, a story map that shows layers of area-based management. There was significant discussion dedicated to US water protections, including getting a better understanding about how MPAs, commercial fishing, and similar related terms are defined. Additional ideas included: adding layers that could highlight biodiversity threats, OECM calculations, specifically how offshore wind areas factor into these discussions.

The Committee asked what the NOAA definition is for commercial fishing, and asked if different agencies define it differently.NOAA advised that NOAA Fisheries has not adopted the IUCN definition of commercial fishing.

NOAA advised that the data on this is so rich, that we can probably tell more about intensity of fishing rather than the regulation of it. The Committee noted that "fishing allowed" is different than "fishing is occurring". NOAA stated that conservation outcomes do matter. The Committee thanked NOAA for their work on compiling all of this data, a huge task.

The Committee asked if there is a plan to update data, some of which is from 2005. NOAA noted that we include it as a piece of the puzzle. While it is older data, it was all gathered from scratch. There is new data now available, and we incorporate it when possible.
The Committee noted that there has been a lot of work on defining MPAs since 2005. The IUCN guidance was published in 2010, and the IUCN MPA standards in 2019. A Committee member shared work on translating IUCN guidance in the state of California: https://opc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Item-7-Exhibit-A-Draft-30x30-Decision-Making-Framework-Coastal-Waters-508.pdf

NOAA followed up to state that the de facto MPA data sets are those that are definitely outside the IUCN definition of an MPA. But it is possible that some "de facto" MPAs could meet the definition of "other effective conservation measures" -- a newer category by IUCN that captures areas that are not necessarily designed for conservation but deliver conservation benefits.

The Committee noted that the Conservation Atlas shows geographical distribution of remedial measures but does not show areas where potential threats to biodiversity are occurring; and asked if NOAA has considered overlaying the two in order to reveal the gaps between existing

solutions and ongoing problems. Potential threats with spatial elements include water temp. increases; acidification; offshore blobs (hypoxic areas); vessel traffic; fishing intensity; oil and gas development; offshore wind energy development; microplastic concentration, military, deep sea mining. NOAA responded by noting that the agency is currently working on bringing together these spatial representations that would influence decision making–trying to hone in and vet layers that would be useful in these analyses so once can see where these activities coexist. Need to find the right data sets and make sure they are well maintained.

The Committee also asked if NOAA is including OECMs in calculations of MPAs, as well as the definition of a conservation area. NOAA noted that we have yet to define OECM in the US, but that in the future there is an opportunity for a definition to align with how the Atlas defines conservation. It was designed with partners across NOAA. The application of framework is the most important part, and we are hoping to learn from other countries.

Committee Goals - Outputs and Timelines
Kelly Denit, Alternate Designated Federal Official; Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries; Ellie Roberts, Program Analyst, NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries; Amy Kenney, Committee Chair

Kelly thanked the Committee for all of the wonderful discussion over the past two days. When we first met in February, NOAA introduced a very broad charge and asked the Committee to consider critical and broad topics. We are excited about the progress you are making, and note that the Committee does not need to tackle this all at once. NOAA is encouraged to hear about the progress of the subcommittees, in finding areas of focus.

Ellie Roberts provided a brief orientation to Committee resources in the shared drive, and also shared the operational guidelines for the Committee.

Amy led a discussion centered on reviewing guiding principles and practices for the FAC, including a focus on information sharing, outcomes, collaboration, and healthy discussion. It was reiterated that folks should reach out after reviewing the guidelines to identify if there is something missing from the document. Additional information was shared about the FAC work plan and timelines. The next meeting will be in the spring and is planned to be in person. Other virtual meetings will happen throughout the year on a quarterly basis.

Public Comment
None was shared at this time.

Effectiveness and Outcomes Subcommittee Discussion
Pete Stauffer - Outcomes & Effectiveness Subcommittee Chair

The Committee continued their discussion and editing of the seven recommendations to NOAA regarding BIL/IRA investments. The committee engaged in an additional 30 minutes of technical editing of the recommendation memo. The committee reached consensus on the recommendations by the end of the session. NOAA staff agreed to help clean up the working document and provide guidance on the transmittal process.

Closing
Kelly Denit, Alternate Designated Federal Official; Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries

NOAA thanked the Committee and staff for their time, thoughtfulness and engagement over the

past two days. NOAA looks forward to the next meeting of the Committee, and will follow up with resources and action items for Committee members.

Meeting adjourned