Objectives:
1. Summarize how MPAC advice was incorporated into spatial and aspatial components of the draft plan
2. Explain changes to the draft plan that arose from the internal review process
3. Enable discussion related to Central Coast draft Marine Plan
4. Discuss implementation phase

Attendance:

MPAC Members and Alternates:
Kim Wright – Conservation
Janice Kyle and Nick Heath – Public Recreation
Warren Warttig – Coastal Forestry
Alison Sayers and Brian Lande – Local Government, Central Coast Regional District
Jim McIsaak – Commercial Fisheries
Mairi Edgar – Commercial Tourism

MaPP:
Gord McGee – Central Coast Indigenous Resource Alliance (Co-Chair)
Ken Cripps – Central Coast Indigenous Resource Alliance (alternate Co-Chair)
Sally Cargill – Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations (Co-Chair)
Craig Darling - Facilitator
Charlie Short – Marine Coordination Team (Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations)
Brad Smith - Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resource Operations
Fiona Kilburn – MaPP Technical Support
Kelly Wozniak – MaPP Technical Support

Regrets:
Greta Geankoplis – Renewable Energy
Anne Salomon – Marine Academia
Gary Wilson and Roberta Stevenson - Shellfish Aquaculture
Day 1: June 17th

Welcome and Opening:
- Gord provided a welcome on behalf of the Central Coast Technical Team
- Sally discussed the objectives of the meeting and reviewed the agenda

Updates:
- The Central Coast draft Marine Plan was posted for public review on June 6th, 2014. It is the fourth sub-regional plan to go through the public review process and will be available for comment until July 11th, 2014.
- Public review periods for the North Vancouver Island (NVI), North Coast (NC) and Haida Gwaii (HG) draft marine plans have already closed. Sub-regional technical teams are in the process of reviewing comments received through the public review process, and incorporating them as appropriate.
- The Regional Priorities Plan is being reviewed by the Regional Marine Advisory Committee (RMAC) and the sub-regional technical teams. It is expected to be posted for public review in Fall, 2014.
- Work terms for some MaPP contractors and Provincial and First Nations staff will be extended until the end of October 2014 to ensure all MaPP commitments are fulfilled.
- The Marine Coordination Team (MCT) is beginning to focus on developing Implementation Agreements and securing funding for implementation of approved MaPP outputs.

Round Table:
- MPAC members provided updates from their sectors and shared thoughts and discussion points from the open house that occurred on June 16th, 2014.
- Topics discussed included:
  - Options for disseminating educational materials to marine users
  - Concern about potential misrepresentation of maps in the Central Coast draft Marine Plan
  - The role of local government through the implementation process
  - The upcoming (July 10) presentation to the Central Coast Regional District
  - Challenges associated with getting feedback from some sectors at this time of year

Revisions to Chapters 1-4 (Introductory Chapters):
- Gord reviewed the key steps through which the Central Coast draft Marine Plan was developed.
The public review version includes feedback incorporated from the MPAC, from the Province (including feedback from the Ministry of Environment including BC Parks, Energy and Mines, International Trade, Natural Gas Development, Attorney General, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training, and Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation) and internal review by the Heiltsuk, Kitasoo/Xai’Xais, Nuxalk, and Wuikinuxv Nations.

Gord reviewed the revisions that were made to the introductory chapters. The following advice/feedback was received:

- Suggestion to add a section about topics of importance that are not addressed in the Central Coast draft Marine Plan (ie, tanker traffic, enforcement responsibilities, sale of fish) as this is included in other sub-regional plans.
- Suggestion to add a section on the broader socio-economic situation in the plan area and the importance of maintaining a strong local connection to resources.
- Suggestion to address the issue of unpredictability of cyclical changes in Section 4.2 (economic development) in addition to management decisions.

Revisions to Chapters 5 (Management Direction):

Gord reviewed the revisions that were made to Chapter 5. The following advice/feedback was received:

- Suggestion to split out issue 3 from Section 5.2 (Monitoring and Enforcement) and make it its own section
- Suggestion to make tone in tourism, aquaculture and renewable energy chapters more positive in order to match tone of lines 480-484. Potential options include switching the order of the objectives, adding “potential” to impact, or changing “impact” to “effects”
- Suggestion to include Scott Islands on the proposed protection map in the protection chapter
- Suggestion to reference ocean acidification somewhere in Chapter 5. May be most logical to include in Section 5.5, along with a discussion about how CO₂ causes both acidification and climate change. Alternatively it could be built into its own section or included in the aquaculture section.
- The way that Crown agencies are referenced throughout the document should be consistent
- Misleading to only reference PMZ 79 as an important carbon sink
- Suggestion to add language about how commercial tourists often also participate in recreational fishing

Revisions to Chapters 6 (Spatial Plan):

Sally reviewed the revisions that were made to Chapter 6. The following advice/feedback was received:

- Explain why IUCN II’s in the Central Coast draft Marine Plan are not always large
- Consider changing the acceptability of aquaculture in Rescue Bay because of the adjacent terrestrial Conservancy
- Consider adding a condition related to visual quality and shore access for shellfish aquaculture in McMullin Group
Suggestion to add language about blue carbon where appropriate in an individual PMZ or in the Chapter 6 introduction
- Add a strategy about maximizing local benefits of blue carbon
- Consider making anchorages and commercial recreation and tourism allowable in Eucott Bay (PMZ 54).
- Revise boundary of PMZ 64 so that breakwater is removed and buffered by about 200 metres to allow for expansion of infrastructure

Day 2: June 18th, 2014

Welcome and Recap of Day 1
- Craig reviewed the meeting objectives and discussed the agenda for the day

Review of Chapter 7 (Implementation):
- Sally reviewed the content of Chapter 7.
- Concerns about the challenges associated with monitoring and improving human wellbeing were discussed
- The following advice/feedback was received:
  - Consider noting whether strategies will be implemented in the short-, medium- or long-term
  - Concern that human wellbeing goals would not be met was expressed by MPAC members
  - Challenges related to monitoring human wellbeing were discussed
  - Consider circulating Andrew Days ecosystem-based management indicator reports (phase 2 and draft phase 3) to MPAC
  - Consider adding local government as a partner at the governance committee level

Wrap-up:
- Plan development phase is wrapping up. It is now important for MPAC members to think about how to communicate with their sectors, what level of support they have for the plan, and how they may wish to convey this level of support to their sectors
- MPAC members each described their initial impressions of the revisions made to the Central Coast draft Marine Plan. In general, it was felt that the plan had improved.
- Individual sector concerns will be submitted through the public review process. MaPP will create an MPAC advice log with responses to feedback submitted by MPAC members and alternates.
- Next steps:
  - MPAC members to comment on Central Coast draft Marine Plan as soon as possible
  - Co-leads to update MPAC members about anticipated timelines for finalizing Central Coast draft Marine Plan by July 18th, 2014
  - Co-leads to consider best way of reporting out on revisions that will be made as a result of the public review process. Consider available funding and depth and breadth of revisions.