



The primary purpose of the kiosk is to educate the public about safe fishing practices and to have them make informed decisions about what fish to catch and eat. Current outreach materials such as the MSRP Fish ID card, What's the Catch comic book and fish advisory information could be used with the kiosk. Bald eagles, wetlands, seabirds could also be included in the kiosk information.

Jenifer Boyce recommended putting the amount for the kiosk into the budget. Maintenance costs and the difference between 5 and 10 year plans will be discussed on the December trustee council conference call.

**AGENDA TOPIC REVIEW OF PREVIOUS PHASE TWO DISCUSSION AND REVIEW OF PHASE ONE SPENDING JENNIFER BOYCE**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>TOTAL SETTLEMENT ESTIMATED: \$38M</b>  <b>PHASE ONE ALLOCATED: \$25M</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fish and Fish habitat \$12M</li> <li>• Birds \$13M</li> </ul> <p>(Eagles: \$6.2 million with a balance of \$1-2 million. Allocation for seabird restoration: \$6.5 million)</p> <p><b>Total to Allocate: \$13M???</b>  Current Balance in DOI Fund- \$30 Million</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fish - Fish Habitat \$8 million</li> <li>• Bald Eagles and Falcons \$3.5+ million</li> <li>• Seabirds \$2.65+ million</li> <li>• Operating costs \$1 million per year</li> <li>• Outreach \$30,000 per year</li> <li>• Data Gaps \$???</li> </ul> <p>The original costs of Scorpion Rock were underestimated in the original budget. Jennifer Boyce explained how the San Miguel island money will be allocated to cover additional costs for Santa Barbara Island, San Nicholas Island and Scorpion Rock / Santa Cruz Island seabird restoration projects.</p> <p>The Trustee Council requested printed copies of MSRP Phase One restoration balance sheet.</p> <p>The budget summary and recommendation made is to use the roughly \$9M left of allocated money from Phase 1+ \$20M to allocate for Phase 2.</p> <p>The restoration plan that will be written for Phase 2 will include contingencies that would allow the program to allocate any remaining funds following implementation of Phase two on similar activities so as not to require the writing of a Phase 3 restoration plan.</p> <p>Jennifer Boyce stated than EA will be developed for Phase 2 that tiers off the Phase 1 EIS.</p> <p>Laird Henkel raised the question if data gap should be included in the written Phase 2 plan.</p> <p>Phase 2 allocation notes:  Jennifer Boyce said to include the decision about how Operating costs will be presented in the Phase 2 restoration plan. Patty Velez raised the question about total operating costs and if they should be included yearly, covered by interest, or listed through the projected end date of 2017 at \$1M per year.</p> <p>Outreach allocations will be divided into general outreach and also project specific outreach.</p>
-------------------	--

**AGENDA TOPIC PHASE TWO FISH RESTORATION PROPOSED ALLOCATION BREAKDOWN DAVE WITTING**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rocky Reef Restoration \$ 6 Million</li> <li>• Kelp Forest \$2.2 Million</li> <li>• Wetlands \$?????</li> </ul> <p><u>\$6M Rocky Reef Restoration</u></p> <p>Area being considered is on the Palos Verdes Shelf between White Point and Bunker Point, and was affected by the Portuguese Bend landslide. Surveys have shown 200 acres of impacted reef and this cost would restore approximately 90 acres of modules that would extend beyond the area because of scoping.</p>
-------------------	---

	<p><u>\$2.2M Kelp Forest Restoration</u></p> <p>This area is also on the Palos Verdes Shelf consisting of 25-30 acres impacted by high urchin densities. Restoration would involve a partnership between the Santa Monica Restoration Commission, Santa Monica Baykeepers and commercial urchin divers. Kate Faulkner asked what keeps the urchins from coming back. Per Dave the project would require some maintenance and there is no guarantee the urchins won't come back. However, there are restoration sites in both Santa Monica Bay that were restored 5-7 years ago which still support healthy kelp forests. The goal is to do the restoration before the area is an MPA under the way that MPA. Dave Witting feels that using the urchin divers and volunteer divers in the role of predator in the area is a positive outreach and education tool. This proposal is implementable immediately. Monitoring and maintenance is built into the budget amount.</p> <p>Dave Witting can distribute the preliminary kelp forest proposal and other details will be outlined in the Phase two restoration plan.</p> <p>Chuck McKinley asked if the urchins are fished commercially – Per Dave, red and purple urchins are both fished commercially, but the more highly valued urchins are red urchins while the purple urchins are dominant in urchin barrens. Jim Haas asked if there are other concerns aside from urchins for kelp recruits once they are big enough. The urchin barrens are the primary recruitment limiter for the area proposed for restoration. There is an ample supply of kelp recruits.</p> <p><u>Wetlands ???</u></p> <p>Does the council want to allocate more funds for wetlands projects? Four possible projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Additional funding for Bolsa Chica Wetlands is non-preferred</li> <li>2) Colorado Lagoon in Long Beach (~10 acres)- funding needs would probably be small and there is good momentum with Port of LB and the Army Corps</li> <li>3) Ballona Wetlands - 1-2 acre section next to larger area that Port of LA will do mitigation with a cost of ~ \$1.2M</li> <li>4) Prisoners on Santa Cruz Island – NPS is putting out final EIS in Feb 2010 and hope to move dirt in fall of 2010. 3 acres of removing fill and removing dense Eucalyptus in the wetlands area. The tidal connection would be berm breaches during stormy weather. Per Kate there would not be a fish benefit.</li> </ol> <p>Sharon Taylor suggested Buena Vista Lagoon in Northern San Diego– USFWS is doing the engineering studies now. Sharon said she would find out the funding needs are.</p> <p>Jennifer Boyce recommends putting short near-term and long-term concepts in the plan for opportunities for wetlands restoration.</p>
--	---

<b>AGENDA TOPIC</b>	<b>PHASE TWO BIRD RESTORATION PROPOSED ALLOCATION BREAKDOWN</b>	<b>ANNIE LITTLE / LAURIE HARVEY</b>
---------------------	---	-------------------------------------

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Annie Little summarized the bald eagle restoration program from 2001- 2017. MSRP started funding in 2001 – as of 2009 \$4.7M has been spent on both Catalina and NCI bald eagle restoration. More time is needed to evaluate NCI breeding program (all eagles are not of breeding age yet). If the remaining \$1-2M remaining of Phase 1 money is spent, it will take the program through 2012. The proposal is to continue the program through 2017 with annual monitoring for \$3M. The cost is scalable depending on monitoring intensity. Patty Velez suggested stopping at 2015 and doing monitoring every other year like the peregrine falcons. Annie Little recommends 10 years out from the time that all the birds reach breeding age. Chuck McKinley questioned the \$500K yearly cost of monitoring and he feels the cost is high. Kate Faulkner suggested considering nest enhancement on NCI past nest sites – especially on islands that are underutilized. Annie will follow up with Peter Sharpe on the idea of nest enhancement and also monitoring intervals.</p> <p>Jim Haas suggested trying to gather data on immigration of birds from the mainland.</p> <p>Bald eagle restoration total spent 2001- 2017 would be ~ \$9.5M over 17 years (~ \$500,000 per year)</p>
-------------------	--

**BALD EAGLE RESTORATION – NOTHERN CHANNEL ISLANDS**

2001 Phase 1 funding begins  
2002 Start of NCI program  
2006 End of releases; first chicks on Santa Cruz Island  
2008 First breeding on Santa Rosa Island  
2009 5 pairs on NCIs - \$4.7M spent  
2011 10 year mark from start of program  
2012 End of Phase 1 - \$6.5M spent  
2013-2017 Phase 2 funding begins: \$3M for 5 years  
2015 10 year mark from first breeding

**BALD EAGLE RESTORATION – CATALINA ISLAND**

1989- 2008 Artificial incubation  
2008 First nest unassisted  
2009 All nests unassisted – 11 chicks  
2010 30 year mark of overall program – 10 year funding MSRP

**PEREGRINE FALCONS - \$500,000**

Includes 2 comprehensive surveys on the Channel Islands to monitor recovery. Surveys would take place every 4-5 years.

The report from Brian Latta is one year overdue.

One more survey is left for Phase 1. Annie Little will do an RFP for the next survey.

**SEABIRD RESTORATION**

- Restore Ashy Storm Petrels (Anacapa and Santa Cruz rocks) \$500,000
- Continued Restoration Santa Barbara Island \$2++ Million
- Prince Island Restoration \$105,000
- Disturbance Reduction \$100,000

Restore Ashy Storm Petrels

Some locations for habitat enhancement on Anacapa Island have been identified to restore Ashy Storm Petrels. Laurie Harvey feels there is a lot of potential on Anacapa Island and the frequency of boat trips and existing equipment make the logistics of implementation easier. This project would also involve continued restoration efforts at Santa Cruz Island.

Continued Restoration at Santa Barbara Island

Continuation of the Santa Barbara Island Restoration Project is estimated to costs \$2M+ for an additional ?? years,. The project would include maintaining current restored areas and adding new ones.

Prince Island Restoration

Prince Island project proposal would be to remove crystalline ice plant and do revegetation work to restore habitat for Cassin's Auklets.

Disturbance Reduction

Ashy Storm Petrel disturbance reduction on Santa Cruz Island is going well. There are other areas where breeding birds could benefit from signage. One option is to work with the Command Seabird Protection Network and Torch Trustee Council. Working with NMS program mailers to include information might be an option. Private boaters are the main source of disturbance problems.

Kate Faulkner asked if there is any consideration for mitigation of fishing gear - derelict gear, bird hooking, lights from boats (squid boats and recreational boats - observer program) and climate change

Laird Henkel pointed out that there reduction of entanglement was part of the Phase 1 plan and hasn't been done yet.

**AGENDA TOPIC PHASE TWO OUTREACH PROPOSED ALLOCATION BREAKDOWN GABRIELLE DORR**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>\$30,000 allocated per year is for ongoing outreach activities. Funding at this level or higher would be required for future outreach activities.</p> <p><u>Ongoing Outreach Activities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach Products (website hosting, fact sheets, updates, new publications)</li> <li>• Outreach Events (conferences, public workshops, special events)</li> <li>• Other (press trips, staff time, photography)</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Future Activities to Consider</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Films</li> <li>• New events/audiences</li> </ul>
-------------------	---

**AGENDA TOPIC DATA GAPS AND RESTORATION PLANNING LAURIE HARVEY**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Costs are TBD not included in Phase 2 allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine Mammal Contaminant Study-Condor Risk Exposure Feasibility Study</li> <li>• Pilot Light Study</li> <li>• Prince Island Data</li> <li>• Pelagic Cormorants</li> <li>• XAMU Eggshell</li> <li>• EPA remedial contaminants – Fish</li> <li>• Seabird egg contaminant</li> <li>• Stable Isotopes Seabirds</li> <li>• 2000 and 2001 SBI At Sea Data Write Up</li> </ul>
-------------------	---

**AGENDA TOPIC DISCUSSION ON CALIFORNIA CONDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY JIM HAAS**

	<p>Jim Haas referred to the Condor White Paper emailed to the council.</p> <p>Condors historically met the definition for injury and condors reintroduced into Big Sur are foraging on marine mammals and are experiencing egg shell thinning. Big Sur fledgling success rate is not sustainable due to DDE exposure.</p> <p>Marine mammals are feeding and transporting contamination from the Southern California Bight. Jim feels a case can be made to consider condors for Montrose restoration activities.</p> <p>FWS and several zoos are partnering to spend \$5M year on the current condor program maintaining reintroduced condors.</p> <p>There are 22 condors in California and 350 condors in the wild?. A blue ribbon panel was put together to evaluate the condor program to create a sustainable naturally reproducing population of condors. The panel's number one recommendation was to eliminate the lead threat: for reintroduced condors the panel wants to ban lead ammunition used in hunting (condors feed on carcasses killed with lead bullets) – however hunting is also a food source for the condors.</p> <p>Jim is proposing to evaluate contaminant exposure through marine mammal carcasses.</p> <p>Should populations be manipulated to be sustainable – consider for evaluating new release areas.</p> <p>Northern California is the next area being considered for condor reintroduction. Northern California and Oregon coastal tribes are supportive. Controlled areas could ban use of lead on an extensive area.</p> <p>Eggshell thinning has been in excess of 33% - evidence of ongoing injury. World population is 350 and wild population is 150. Current program needs logistical and resourced help.</p> <p>No new reintroductions are being done until the lead issue is resolved.</p> <p>Levels of contamination in migrating sea lions in Northern California need to be studied to determine if a new release area in northern California is viable.</p>
--	--

	<p>Goals in feasibility study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor contaminant levels in failed to hatch eggs</li> <li>• Look at exposure in Big Sur marine mammals</li> <li>• Look into north coast and tribal areas to see what marine mammal concentrations are and compare to Southern California</li> </ul> <p>Bob Riseborough has been doing the current studies of contaminants in condor eggs. Contaminant analysis has been done and the DDE concentrations in the failed egg embryos were high.</p> <p>Chuck McKinley discussed re-opening the consent decree- it would be unlikely to reopen it and succeed. There was info at the time and there was evidence that the condors were impacted.</p> <p>Chuck McKinley doesn't think the consent decree is a constraint. The list of birds is an inclusive type of phrase or language. Evaluating condors doesn't compare to opening up the door to other species that don't have a strong and urgent nexus as the condors do.</p> <p>The feasibility study would also include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Egg analysis</li> <li>• Organochlorine exposure</li> <li>• Marine mammal carcass analysis – harbor seals, sea lions</li> </ul> <p>Per Chuck McKinley, the council needs to agree to spend money on data gap studies if there is the potential for a restoration project. The affected environment would need to be broadened. Chuck feels it is legitimate to spend money on restoring a species such as condors affected by Montrose related injuries.</p> <p>Laird Henkel suggested study of three areas of sea lion contamination levels.</p> <p>Cost: \$500,000 over four years for marine mammal study and egg analysis. Researchers will have access to lead exposure and micro-trash data.</p> <p>Jim Haas said it could wait for Phase 2.</p> <p>If the link is made after doing a study of marine mammals, it would be put into the Phase 2 plan as a potential to restore condors.</p> <p>Chuck McKinley: If money is going to be spent there needs to be reflection in an official document (i.e. resolution, minutes). Chuck suggested stating priority species but include that the council will consider other species if a nexus to the injury is proven and fits the definition of the injury.</p> <p>Laird Henkel suggest to possibly also considering Laysan Albatross. Noted by Kate Faulkner, the Yurok's would need to agree to ban the use of lead ammunition based on the blue ribbon panel's recommendation.</p> <p>A call will be scheduled with a council sub group after the new year. Jim Haas would do the contracting through UC Santa Cruz.</p> <p>Jim will send an email out to form the sub group to further discuss condors.</p>
--	--

<b>AGENDA TOPIC</b>	<b>PHASE 2 PROPOSED ALLOCATION DISCUSSION TIMELINE AND NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>JENNIFER BOYCE</b>
---------------------	---	-----------------------

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>PHASE 2 OUTLINE - Jennifer Boyce will email rough outline for Phase 2 to the council</p> <p>Phase 2 restoration plan timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agency draft by summer 2010</li> <li>• Public draft release EA by end of summer/early fall 2010</li> </ul> <p>A Trustee Council Resolution will be sent out early 2010 to adopt the 2010 budget</p> <p>Anyone interested in going on an Ashy Storm Petrel trip (3 day trip) during the months of June – October should contact Laurie Harvey. There are also Shearwater trips , three in March 2010, one in April 2010 (4 day trips).</p> <p>The next council call is December 17, 2009 at 2:00pm</p> <p>The next council meeting / field trip is TBD.</p>
-------------------	---

# END MINUTES

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

JENNIFER BOYCE

DISCUSSION	End of minutes. Meeting dismissed at 4:30pm.
------------	--