

## STAFF SUMMARY FOR FEBRUARY 10-11, 2016

**18. MASTER PLAN FOR MARINE PROTECTED AREAS****Today's Item****Information** **Action** 

Discuss proposed final master plan for marine protected areas (MPAs), an updated version of the 2008 FGC-adopted draft master plan.

**Summary of Previous/Future Actions**

- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| • MRC received overview of master plan for MPAs   | Nov 4, 2015; Ventura               |
| • Received draft proposed final master plan       | Dec 9-10, 2015; San Diego          |
| • <b>Today discuss proposed final master plan</b> | <b>Feb 10-11, 2016; Sacramento</b> |
| • Discuss and adopt final master plan             | Apr 13-14, 2016; Santa Rosa        |

**Background**

The Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) calls for creating an improved network of MPAs, redesigned to increase its coherence and effectiveness at protecting the State's marine life, habitats, and ecosystems (Section 2853(a), Fish and Game Code). To help achieve the stated goals, the MLPA directs FGC to adopt a "master plan" to guide the design, implementation, and management of the redesigned network of MPAs in California (Section 2855, Fish and Game Code).

A draft master plan for MPAs was adopted by FGC in 2008 (available at [www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/mpa/masterplan.asp](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/marine/mpa/masterplan.asp)) as a "living document" with a focus on providing consistent guidance for designing California's MPAs through a regional approach. With regional design and adoption phases completed in 2012, focus has shifted from planning to implementation and management of the coastwide MPA network. To reflect the new focus, DFW has revised the draft master plan for FGC adoption as a final master plan pursuant to Section 2859, Fish and Game Code, and to serve as a foundation for managing the Marine Life Protection Program statewide (Exhibit 2).

DFW has extensively collaborated with staff from FGC, the Ocean Protection Council, and the California Ocean Science Trust to tie together MPA management, monitoring, research and evaluation concepts and priorities across statewide and regional scales. One notable proposed change is to establish a ten year management review cycle for evaluating the statewide MPA network for efficacy and adaptive management. The proposed final master plan also includes five appendices that memorialize the planning and design phase, tribal consultation policies, and regional MPA details and monitoring plans (Exhibit 3). A preliminary draft of the revised master plan was made available by request to California tribes and tribal communities on Sep 25, 2015.

In Dec 2015, FGC received a DFW overview of the draft 2015 master plan. Following the presentation, FGC set a public comment deadline of January 28, 2016 for written comments. DFW has prepared a summary of the written public comments received during the public comment period (Exhibit 4). Today provides the public with additional opportunity to comment on the draft final document.

## STAFF SUMMARY FOR FEBRUARY 10-11, 2016

**Significant Public Comments**

1. During the public comment period, 17 commenters provided 93 unique comments; comments are summarized in Exhibit 4. Comments that include more detailed recommendations than could be encompassed in the summary table are also included as exhibits (exhibits 5-12).
2. Previous commenters representing sport fishing interests have expressed preference for a five year management review cycle rather than the proposed ten year cycle.

**Recommendation (N/A)****Exhibits**

1. [DFW presentation](#)
2. [Draft final master plan, dated Nov 2015](#)
3. [Draft Appendices A-F](#) (links to <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Master-Plan>)
4. [DFW summary of comments and responses, dated Jan 29, 2016](#)
5. [Emailed letter from Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center, dated Jan 27, 2016](#)
6. [Emailed letter from Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative Network, received Jan 28, 2016](#)
7. [Emailed letter from Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition, dated Jan 28, 2016](#)
8. [Emailed letter from six non-governmental organizations \(Natural Resources Defense Council, Heal the Bay, Surfrider Foundation, Wildcoast, Orange County Coastkeeper, California Marine Sanctuary Foundation\) , received Jan 28, 2016](#)
9. [Email from Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, received Jan 28, 2016](#)
10. [Emailed letter from Zachary Plopper, San Diego MPA Collaborative, received Jan 28, 2016](#)
11. [Email from Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, received Jan 28, 2016](#)
12. [Email from Eddie Moreno, Sierra Club, received Jan 28, 2016](#)




**Motion/Direction (N/A)**



# MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT

## Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas

### Discussion Hearing



**California Fish and Game Commission Meeting**

February 10, 2016 • Sacramento, CA


Adam Frimodig

California Department of Fish and Wildlife




# Presentation Outline

1. Review of December 9, 2015 Meeting
2. Review of the Timeline
3. Comments Received











# Review of December 9, 2015 Meeting



- Background
- Purpose and Approach
- Key Components
- Timeline





# Review of the Timeline

- **December 2013 – present:** Updates at MRC and Commission meetings
- **February 6, 2015:** Notified Tribal governments
- **September 25, 2015:** Released preliminary draft to Tribes upon request
- **December 2015:** Draft released to Commission
- **Dec. 3, 2015 – Jan. 28, 2016:** Public comment

---

- ***February 10, 2016: Discussion hearing***

---

- **April 2016:** Potential Commission adoption



# Comments Received

- **Tribal:**
  - Tribal take provisions
  - Concerns with tribal participation for MPA design
- **Partnerships:**
  - Better recognition of partnerships
- **MPA Review Cycle:**
  - 10-year statewide vs. 5-year regional
- **Other:**
  - Improve enforcement technologies and develop Records Management System
  - Minor errors or specific suggestions



# Thank you Questions



# CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas

*Updated Draft*



November 2015

## Photo Credits

Top left (North Coast): Image of Mattole Canyon State Marine Reserve, taken by California Department of Fish and Wildlife / Marine Applied Research & Exploration (note basket stars, a yelloweye rockfish, and other species).

Top right (North Central Coast): Image of Stewarts Point State Marine Conservation Area, taken by Brian Owens, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Bottom left (Central Coast): Image of elephant seals in Piedras Blancas State Marine Reserve, taken by Michelle Horeczko, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Bottom right (South Coast): Image of a giant kelp forest in Laguna Beach State Marine Reserve, taken by Cameron Wertz

DRAFT

# Table of Contents

---

<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>V</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE AND APPROACH</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 NATURAL AND HUMAN DIMENSIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S COASTAL RESOURCES .....	5
1.2 COLLABORATIVE MPA GOVERNANCE AND POLICY .....	6
<i>MPA Governance and Policy</i> .....	7
<i>Marine Life Protection Program</i> .....	8
<i>Consultation with California Tribes and Tribal Governments</i> .....	8
<i>MPA Statewide Leadership Team</i> .....	9
<i>Partnership and the California Collaborative Approach</i> .....	9
1.3 CALIFORNIA’S MARINE MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND MPA MILESTONES .....	11
<b>CHAPTER 2: MPA NETWORK DESIGN AND SITING PROCESS</b> .....	<b>14</b>
2.1 TYPES OF MARINE MANAGED AREAS .....	14
2.2 MLPA INITIATIVE PROCESS AND OUTCOMES .....	15
<i>MLPA Initiative: Establishment and Design and Siting Process</i> .....	15
<i>Scientific Foundation for MPA Network Design</i> .....	20
<i>Influence of Science in California’s MPA Network</i> .....	21
<i>Iterative Development of Alternative Regional MPA Proposals</i> .....	21
<i>MPAs Adopted Pursuant to the MLPA</i> .....	24
Statewide MPA Summary.....	24
Summary of Regional MPAs Adopted .....	26
<b>CHAPTER 3: MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>28</b>
3.1 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.....	28
<i>Outreach Priorities</i> .....	30
<i>Approach to MPA Outreach</i> .....	31
<i>Coordination of Outreach Efforts</i> .....	31
3.2 ENFORCEMENT .....	32
<i>Enforcement Plan Objectives</i> .....	33
<i>CDFW Enforcement Responsibilities</i> .....	34
3.3 REGIONAL MPA BACKGROUND AND PRIORITIES DOCUMENTS .....	34
3.4 ALIGNING MPAs AND OTHER MARINE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EFFORTS .....	35
<i>Fisheries Management</i> .....	36
<i>Water Quality</i> .....	36
<i>Climate Change</i> .....	37
<i>Marine Debris</i> .....	37
<i>Invasive Species</i> .....	38
<i>Other Marine Management Efforts</i> .....	38
<b>CHAPTER 4: ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>40</b>
4.1 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE MLPP .....	40
<i>Purpose of Adaptive Management</i> .....	41
<i>Ten-Year Formal MPA Management Reviews</i> .....	41
4.2 MLPP MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES.....	42
4.3 STATEWIDE MONITORING PROGRAM .....	43
<i>Current Status of MPA Monitoring</i> .....	44

Using a Partnership-Based Approach.....	46
<i>Statewide MPA Monitoring</i> .....	47
Scientific Network Evaluation Questions and Metrics.....	47
Regional MPA Monitoring.....	48
Beyond the MLPA.....	49
4.4 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	50
4.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROCESS.....	51
<b>CHAPTER 5: PROGRAM PARTNERS AND OPERATIONS.....</b>	<b>54</b>
5.1 PARTNERS AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY.....	54
5.2 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES.....	56
5.3 ROLE OF PARTNERS IN LEVERAGING FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES.....	56
<b>CHAPTER 6: SETTING A PATH FORWARD.....</b>	<b>58</b>
6.1 MONITORING, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION.....	58
6.2 ENFORCEMENT.....	59
6.3 PARTNERSHIP COORDINATION.....	59
6.4 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.....	59
6.5 IDENTIFICATION OF LONG-TERM FUNDING SOURCES.....	59
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<i>Appendix A: Marine Protected Area Planning through the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative</i> .....	60
<i>Appendix B: Communication and Consultation with California Tribes and Tribal Governments</i> .....	60
<i>Appendix C: North Coast: MPA Background and Priorities</i> .....	60
<i>Appendix D: North Central Coast: MPA Background and Priorities</i> .....	60
<i>Appendix E: Central Coast: MPA Background and Priorities</i> .....	60
<i>Appendix F: South Coast: MPA Background and Priorities</i> .....	60
<b>GLOSSARY.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>LITERATURE CITED.....</b>	<b>64</b>

# List of Figures

---

FIGURE 1. MAP OF CALIFORNIA'S MPA NETWORK BEFORE AND AFTER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MLPA.....	5
FIGURE 2. CALIFORNIA'S KEY MPA-RELATED MILESTONES.....	12
FIGURE 3. MAP HIGHLIGHTING THE FIVE PLANNING AREAS AND PLANNING PERIODS .....	19
FIGURE 4. DESCRIPTION OF THREE PLANNING BODIES THAT SUPPORTED THE DESIGN AND SITING PHASE FOR EACH PLANNING REGION.....	20
FIGURE 5. GENERAL PROCESS USED BY THE MLPA INITIATIVE TO DEVELOP ALTERNATIVE MPA PROPOSALS IN EACH REGIONAL MPA PLANNING PROCESS OR PLANNING REGION .....	23
FIGURE 6. PERCENT OF EACH TYPE OF MPA ACROSS CALIFORNIA'S MPA NETWORK .....	24
FIGURE 7. PERCENT OF REPRESENTATIVE HABITATS IN MPAS BY DESIGNATION TYPE THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE STATE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA ....	25
FIGURE 8. PERCENT OF PLANNING REGION STATE WATERS COVERED BY EACH MPA TYPE .....	27
FIGURE 9. CALIFORNIA'S STATEWIDE MPA MONITORING FRAMEWORK.....	45
FIGURE 10. TIMELINE FOR BASELINE REGIONAL MONITORING AND FORMAL 10-YEAR STATEWIDE MPA MANAGEMENT REVIEW .....	46
FIGURE 11. MLPP ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROCESS .....	53

# List of Tables

---

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF RECENT OCEAN AND COASTAL STATE LEGISLATION, PROGRAMS, AND PLANS IN CALIFORNIA.....	2
TABLE 2. EXAMPLES OF PAST AND ONGOING MPA COLLABORATIONS AIMED TO INFORM MPA MANAGEMENT .....	10
TABLE 3. DEFINITIONS AND OVERVIEW OF MMA CLASSIFICATIONS .....	16
TABLE 4. COMPARISON OF PROTECTED AREAS PRIOR TO THE MLPA IN 1999 AND PRESENT.....	21
TABLE 5. SUMMARY STATISTICS OF MPAS WITHIN STATE WATERS ACROSS ALL PLANNING REGIONS.....	26
TABLE 6. OVERVIEW OF MPA MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES TO SUPPORT THE MLPP .....	29
TABLE 7. OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL MPA BACKGROUND AND PRIORITIES DOCUMENTS' STANDARDIZED STRUCTURE .....	35
TABLE 8. CURRENT PARTNERS SUPPORTING MANAGEMENT OF CALIFORNIA'S MPA NETWORK AND THEIR CORE COMPETENCIES RELATED TO MPA MANAGEMENT.....	54

# List of Boxes

---

BOX 1. SIGNATORIES OF THE 2015 MOU FOR MPA MANAGEMENT.....	7
BOX 2. PROCESS FOR REGIONAL MPA PLANNING.....	22
BOX 3. PRIORITY AREA IDENTIFICATION .....	32
BOX 4. MLPA DEFINITION OF ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.....	40
BOX 5. MAKING THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN MONITORING AND RESEARCH.....	50
BOX 6. SCIENTIFIC COLLECTION IN MARINE PROTECTED AREAS.....	51

# Acronyms

---

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>ARMP</b>	Abalone Recovery and Management Plan
<b>BRTF</b>	Blue Ribbon Task Force
<b>CASG</b>	California Sea Grant
<b>CCC</b>	California Coastal Commission
<b>CCR</b>	California Code of Regulations
<b>CDFW</b>	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
<b>CNRA</b>	California Natural Resources Agency
<b>Commission</b>	California Fish and Game Commission
<b>COPA</b>	California Ocean Protection Act
<b>FGC</b>	Fish and Game Code
<b>FMP</b>	Fishery Management Plan
<b>MLMA</b>	Marine Life Management Act
<b>MLPA</b>	Marine Life Protection Act
<b>MLPA Initiative</b>	California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
<b>MLPP</b>	Marine Life Protection Program
<b>MMA</b>	Marine Managed Area
<b>MMAIA</b>	Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MPA</b>	Marine Protected Area
<b>MSLT</b>	MPA Statewide Leadership Team
<b>NFMP</b>	Nearshore Fishery Management Plan
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>CINMS</b>	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
<b>NOAA</b>	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
<b>NRDC</b>	Natural Resources Defense Council
<b>OPC</b>	California Ocean Protection Council
<b>OST</b>	California Ocean Science Trust
<b>PISCO</b>	Partnership for Interdisciplinary Study of Coastal Oceans
<b>RLF</b>	Resources Legacy Fund
<b>SAT</b>	Science Advisory Team
<b>SCC</b>	State Coastal Conservancy
<b>SCP</b>	Scientific Collecting Permit
<b>SLC</b>	State Lands Commission
<b>SMCA</b>	State Marine Conservation Area
<b>SMP</b>	State Marine Park
<b>SMR</b>	State Marine Reserve
<b>SMRMA</b>	State Marine Recreational Management Area
<b>SIG</b>	Statewide Interests Group
<b>SWQPA</b>	State Water Quality Protection Area
<b>SWQPA-GP</b>	State Water Quality Protection Area- General Protection
<b>SWRCB</b>	State Water Resources Control Board
<b>US</b>	United States

# Executive Summary

---

## PURPOSE AND APPROACH

California's coastal ocean waters are among the most biologically productive in the world, and California's living marine resources are vital to the state's coastal economy and provide numerous ecosystem benefits. In response to threats to marine ecosystems from human impacts and natural fluctuations, California has taken a proactive approach by managing marine resources for long-term sustainability. Since the 1990s, California has a history of numerous pieces of legislation, programs, and plans that chart a course for ocean management, including through marine protected areas (MPAs). In 1999, California Legislature passed the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) requiring California to reevaluate all existing MPAs, which were at that time largely ineffective and disconnected, and design new MPAs that together function as an interconnected statewide network. The goals of the MLPA are:

1. Protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function and integrity of marine ecosystems.
2. Help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.
3. Improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance, and manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.
4. Protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in California waters for their intrinsic values.
5. Ensure California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement and are based on sound scientific guidelines.
6. Ensure the state's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network.

The MLPA required the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to develop, and the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to adopt, a master plan that guides the implementation of the Marine Life Protection Program (MLPP) to redesign the state's MPA network. The MLPP includes all state MPA governance and management mechanisms and institutions as well as California's MPA network itself. A master plan framework was developed in 2005, and the Commission formally adopted the draft *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* in 2008 following the implementation of the Central Coast MPAs. The 2008 Master Plan guided the three following regional siting and design processes, whereas this 2015 Master Plan sets a statewide foundation for MPA management moving forward to meet the goals of the MLPA.

The MPA network depends on the participation and support of numerous entities that provide specialized knowledge, ensure cost-effective management of the MPA network, and ensure participation from a wide array of stakeholders. Partners in MPA management have signed several memoranda of understanding (MOUs) committing to collaborative planning and management of the MPA network, including an updated 2015 MOU between 15 government and non-governmental entities. The Commission is the primary regulatory decision-making authority for California's MPA network, CDFW is the primary managing agency and implements and enforces regulations set by the Commission and provides scientific expertise, and the California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) is responsible for the direction of policy of the state's MPAs. The MLPP also seeks input from bodies including California Tribes and Tribal governments, an MPA Statewide Leadership Team (MSLT) that is

comprised of agencies and partners that have significant authority related to MPAs or marine sanctuaries, and partners in the California Collaborative Approach.

## MPA NETWORK DESIGN AND SITING PROCESS

The six goals of the MLPA recognize the importance of protecting marine resources for various purposes, and therefore it is important to use multiple types of marine managed areas (MMAs) to achieve these distinct goals. MPAs are a subset of MMAs and include three MPA classifications (State Marine Reserve [SMR], State Marine Conservation Area [SMCA], and State Marine Park [SMP]) and one MMA classification (State Marine Recreational Management Area [SMRMA]). Special Closures are not MMAs, but also contribute to the goals of the MLPA. Each of these classifications includes varying levels and types of protection such as allowed take, scientific research, and recreational and commercial harvest.

The MLPA Initiative was a science-based and stakeholder-driven MPA planning process that utilized the best readily available science in a comprehensive, highly collaborative, and transparent process to establish MPAs. The MLPA Initiative directed and informed four iterative regional siting and design processes (Central Coast, North Central Coast, South Coast, and North Coast, in chronological order) between 2004 and 2012. Three planning bodies – the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), Science Advisory Team (SAT), and Stakeholder Advisory Group – supported the design and siting of each region. The overall aim of the process was for the BRTF to select a set of alternative MPA proposals, including a preferred alternative, for each region and for the Commission to adopt one of the alternatives.

Completed in 2012, California's MPA network generally reflects the integration of the science and science-based MPA design guidelines from the MLPA, the 2008 Master Plan, and SAT guidance. For example, compared to California's 63 MPAs in 1999, the existing network of 124 MPAs and 15 special closures represents increased proportion of state waters protected, number and size of all MPA types, and representation and replication of marine habitats within MPAs.

## MANAGEMENT

The MLPA emphasizes the importance of effective management for California's MPAs, which consists of strong oversight and a process for implementing the legal mandate; comprehensive management planning and permitting; effective enforcement, research, monitoring, evaluation, and outreach; and strong social capital and long-term sustainable financing that is enhanced by partnerships. Another key component of management, discussed later, is a process for adaptive management. To manage California's MPA network, the MLPP is focusing on a variety of management activities related to the components of effective management.

### Outreach and Education

Educating the public about the MPA network is one of the MLPP goals identified in the MLPA. CDFW is committed to work with partners throughout the state to build public awareness and understanding of California's MPA network, including the identification of priorities, approaches, and coordinated efforts. The dissemination of MPA based regulatory, interpretive, and educational materials can improve outreach efforts statewide by reaching out to California's diverse public in a consistent, cohesive and multi-faceted outreach approach.

## Enforcement

The MLPA emphasizes the importance of adequate enforcement as a goal of the MLPP, and identifies CDFW as the primary agency responsible for MPA enforcement. With the key intent of ensuring compliance with regulations, the objectives of enforcement revolve around operational ability (e.g., identify of areas of high priority, hire personnel, etc.); cooperative efforts (e.g., coordinate with allied agencies, utilize judicial system, etc.); and public awareness, outreach, and education (e.g., establish an outreach program, hold public forums, etc.).

CDFW is responsible for enforcing marine resource management laws and regulations, including MPAs, over a vast area spanning California's coastline out to three nautical miles, and will therefore emphasize patrol of priority areas. CDFW also enforces or shares jurisdiction for some federal laws and regulations. Given CDFW's broad enforcement mandates, additional personnel and assets will be needed to effectively enforce the entire MPA network.

## Regional MPA Background and Priorities Documents

To help achieve the management goals of the MLPA, Regional MPA Background and Priorities documents provide historical planning information and regional MPA design considerations and priorities moving forward; which together provide important context to base informed statewide MPA management decisions upon. They are not meant to contain specific details for management protocols and methodologies; and instead are intended as living documents that are readily accessible for reference and adaptive management, and serve as a logical starting place for guiding regionally-based activities. Each Regional MPA Background and Priorities document includes unique regional features and considerations taken into account when designing the MPAs, regional goals and objectives, summaries of regional MPAs, and regional plans for scientific and enforcement considerations.

## Aligning MPAs and Other Marine Resource Management Efforts

Collaborative efforts will be crucial for taking an ecosystem-based approach in which managers across agencies and jurisdictions recognize the numerous interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, instead of focusing on a specific issue, species, or ecosystem service. The MLPA is aligning or could align with management of fisheries, water quality, climate change, marine debris, invasive species, and other existing and emerging marine management efforts. The effort to align MPA management with other marine resource management efforts is largely unprecedented and may lead to lessons learned regarding cooperative management.

## ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

### Adaptive Management and Management Objectives of the MLPP

The MLPP is coordinating with partners to develop a process of adaptive management. Adaptive management, required by the MLPA, is a process that facilitates learning from program actions helps evaluate whether the MPA network is making progress toward achieving the six goals of the MLPA. Adaptive management will help improve management and provide a way to broadly share information about the effectiveness of the MPA network.

To inform the adaptive management process, the MLPP established a formal 10-year cycle of review for California's MPA network. The 10-year reviews will serve to evaluate network efficacy and for the Commission to determine whether changes in management are warranted. This timescale was chosen based on recent scientific findings on the time scales needed to demonstrate ecological change,

lessons drawn from regional MPA implementation, and administrative feasibility. The formal 10-year management review will emphasize ecological, socioeconomic, and governance aspects of the network, including scientific assessment of MPA monitoring results.

The MLPP has defined six management objectives, constructed from the MLPA goals, that will determine whether the mandates of the MLPA are being met and thus help guide adaptive management. The management objectives include themes such as protecting and improving native marine life and ensuring MPA functioning as a network, while allowing sustainable opportunities for human use. These management objectives may be modified as part of the adaptive management process or in response to changing ocean conditions and threats.

## Statewide Monitoring Program

The need for long-term monitoring is described in the MLPA, requiring monitoring, research, and evaluation at selected sites to facilitate adaptive management and ensure that the MPA network meets its goals. Monitoring seeks to understand ecosystem condition and trends and to scientifically evaluate MPA design and to inform adaptive management. As such, long-term monitoring will form an important component of the formal 10-year management reviews.

Effective monitoring requires a partnership-based approach that leverages existing capacity across the state. CDFW partnered with OST to develop a scientifically rigorous statewide MPA monitoring framework, in the form of regional MPA monitoring plans and a statewide framework diagram. This approach was adopted by the Commission and to date, the framework has been used primarily to guide baseline monitoring efforts and provide a foundation for regional monitoring plans. Moving forward, OST, in partnership with OPC and CDFW, is leading a process to develop a statewide MPA monitoring program based on the statewide monitoring framework and regional monitoring plans. This will be coordinated with the MSLT. Statewide MPA monitoring is composed of three interconnected components; the first two components satisfy the requirements of the MLPA, and thus take precedence over the third component, which goes beyond the scope of the MLPA.

1. **Network Scientific Evaluation Questions and Metrics:** CDFW, OST, and partners are committed to developing scientific network evaluation questions and metrics to be integrated in a statewide MPA monitoring plan. The regional MPA monitoring plans provide a starting point for developing network evaluation questions and metrics.
2. **Regional MPA Monitoring:** The state has launched a two-phase approach to MPA monitoring in each region: 1) baseline monitoring and 2) long-term monitoring. Data and information collected during baseline monitoring in the first five years of implementation describes the benchmark state from which to measure MPA performance during long-term monitoring. To date, regional monitoring plans for three regions have been developed and baseline monitoring has begun in all four regions. Long-term monitoring will be implemented at selected sites for selected metrics in each region, with the built-in ability to look at ecosystem conditions and trends at a statewide network scale.
3. **Beyond the MLPA:** While long-term MPA network monitoring is primarily informed by the requirements of the MLPA, it can also provide useful information for other aspects of California's ocean resource management, such as fisheries, climate change, marine debris, and invasive species.

To supplement monitoring, cutting-edge research and development can realize new possibilities for MPA monitoring and adaptive management. Research consists of scientific exploration to address relevant questions that are outside the goals and objectives of long-term monitoring. Development can

advance scientific knowledge and technological capacity, such as through the development of new methods or technical solutions for data collection.

## Adaptive Management Process

The MLPP has defined a process for adaptive management, described below.

1. **Identify and Update Objectives:** The MLPP will select statewide objectives that work toward the goals of the MLPA and other relevant policy and statutes. Baseline monitoring takes place based on the statewide goals and objectives.
2. **Long-Term Monitoring:** Following baseline monitoring and an associated five-year review, long-term monitoring takes place. Concurrently, additional information may be collected to inform interim evaluation and assessment activities between 10-year reviews.
3. **10-Year Management Review:** Scientific evaluation, public scoping meetings, panel discussions, and other forums will draw on monitoring information to shed light on the status, function, and possible changes to the network for the Commission to consider at the 10-year reviews. Findings from the 10-year reviews may feed back into adaptive management of the objectives or the approach to long-term monitoring.

Throughout the entire adaptive management process, there will be the need for learning, communicating lessons, and developing and carrying out targeted research and development projects that can support monitoring and inform adaptive management.

## PROGRAM PARTNERS AND OPERATIONS

The MLPP depends on collaboration to leverage existing human and financial resources, and CDFW and its partners are committed to working together to identify ways to continue to achieve the goals of the state in an efficient and effective way. The MLPP can work with partners to identify opportunities that consider jurisdictions and mandates to leverage core competencies related to MPA management. Based on their strengths and abilities, partners from different sectors will also have different roles relating to identifying, assessing, and securing funding sources. OPC, CDFW, and partners developed and updated a list of potential funding sources for the 2015 Master Plan, and will continually reevaluate existing and new potential funding sources to secure a diversified funding portfolio that ensures long-term financial sustainability.

## SETTING A PATH FORWARD

To operationalize the elements of the 2015 Master Plan, the MLPP will implement a number of steps relating to its core MPA management responsibilities. Throughout the steps outlined below, the overall goal is statewide coordination to achieve effective adaptive management of California's MPA network to meet the goals and objectives of the MLPA.

- **Monitoring, Research, and Evaluation:** Select statewide metrics and evaluation questions, update and adapt regional monitoring plans as necessary, report results, link MPA and other monitoring efforts, and identify and support key MPA related research needs
- **Enforcement:** Identify tools to support enforcement
- **Partnership Coordination:** Build partnerships
- **Outreach and Education:** Prioritize outreach efforts
- **Identification of Long-Term Funding Sources:** Enhance capacity for CDFW's MPA project and prioritize potential funding sources

# CHAPTER 1

## Purpose and Approach

---

California's coastal ocean waters are among the most biologically productive in the world, enriched by seasonally persistent upwelling zones associated with coastal currents such as the California Current. California's living marine resources are vital to the state's coastal economy and support a variety of economic sectors, including commercial and recreational fisheries, tourism, and non-consumptive recreation that together contribute tens of billions of dollars to California's gross domestic product.<sup>1</sup> These sectors provide services and benefits that enhance human well-being, including healthy sources of high-quality protein, recreational experiences, and employment and revenue in coastal communities. California's coastal ocean waters not only provide natural resources, but also spectacular scenery and aesthetic values enjoyed by Californians and visitors alike.

In the past century, humans and natural fluctuations have increased threats to marine ecosystems, which affect ocean habitats from the local to global scales. In response to these threats, California has set itself apart as a leader by taking a proactive approach to managing marine resources for long-term sustainability, thereby helping to ensure their existence for future generations. For example, the California Ocean Resources Management Act (CORMA), passed in 1990,<sup>2</sup> created an Ocean Resources Task Force<sup>3</sup> to prepare a report regarding existing ocean resources management activities and impacts.<sup>4</sup> In 1997, the California Resources Agency (now called the California Natural Resources Agency [CNRA]) released *California's Ocean Resources: An Agenda for the Future* (Ocean Agenda)<sup>5</sup>. The Ocean Agenda recommended the state evaluate its array of over 20 coastal managed area classifications to develop a more effective and less complicated statewide system (Baird et al. 1999). Between 1998 and 2000, the California Legislature passed the Marine Life Management Act (MLMA, 1998),<sup>6</sup> the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA, 1999),<sup>7</sup> and the Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act (MMAIA, 2000).<sup>8</sup> These foundational pieces of legislation have charted the course for ocean management, specifically regarding sustainable fisheries management and ecosystem conservation and protection, in California. In addition, the California Ocean Resources Stewardship Act (CORSAs), and the California Ocean Protection Act (COPA) were integral in paving the way for the partnership-based approach to managing California's marine resources. These pieces of legislation all set the stage for the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), from which this Master Plan originates. Table 1 provides a list and descriptions of relevant legislation, programs, and plans enacted in California since 1990 (see Appendix A, Section 2 for more historical information on California's marine management policies and regulations).

---

<sup>1</sup> National Ocean Economics Program. (2015). *Ocean Economy Data*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://www.oceaneconomics.org/Market/ocean/oceanEcon.asp>

<sup>2</sup> California Public Resource Code (PRC) §36000-36003

<sup>3</sup> PRC §36300

<sup>4</sup> PRC §36500

<sup>5</sup> CNRA. (1997). *California's Ocean Resource: An Agenda for the Future*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/pdfs/agenda011005\\_8.pdf](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/pdfs/agenda011005_8.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> California Fish and Game Code (FGC) §90-99.5, 105, 7050-7090, 8585-8589.7, 8842, and 9001.7

<sup>7</sup> FGC §2850-2863

<sup>8</sup> PRC §36600-36900

Table 1. Summary of Recent Ocean and Coastal State Legislation, Programs, and Plans in California

Policy and Year	Overview
<b>California Ocean Resources Management Act - 1990</b>	Declares state policy for ocean resource planning and management <sup>9</sup>
<b>Marine Life Management Act - 1998</b>	Requires ecosystem-based management of ocean fisheries and establishes a process for such management <sup>10</sup>
<b>Marine Life Protection Act - 1999</b>	Requires California to reevaluate all existing MPAs and design new MPAs that together function as a statewide network; <sup>11</sup> amended by the legislature in 2013 to grant the California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) the responsibility for the direction of policy of MPAs <sup>12</sup>
<b>Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act - 2000</b>	Establishes a new, simplified classification system for state marine managed areas (MMAs) <sup>13,14</sup>
<b>California Ocean Resources Stewardship Act - 2000</b>	Aims to improve the coordination of ocean resource management science in California <sup>15</sup>
<b>Coastal Non-Point Source Pollution Program - 2000</b>	Provides a single unified, coordinated statewide approach to dealing with non-point source pollution <sup>16</sup>
<b>California Ocean Protection Act - 2004</b>	Improves integration and coordination of the state's efforts to protect and conserve ocean resources <sup>17</sup>
<b>California's Ocean Action Plan - 2004</b>	Guides the state's future resources protection and management efforts and seeks to maintain California's role as a national leader in ocean affairs <sup>18</sup>
<b>West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health - 2006</b>	Constitutes a proactive regional collaboration, which protects and manages the ocean and coastal resources along the entire West Coast <sup>19</sup>

Recognizing the importance of California's diverse marine species and ecosystems to public health and well-being, ecological health, and ocean-dependent industries, the California Legislature passed the MLPA in 1999. Prior to the MLPA and the ensuing MPA design and siting process, California's existing MPAs were largely ineffective and disconnected rather than a system designed to function as an interconnected network that could enhance conservation returns for Californians.

The MLPA requires the California Department of Fish and Game (now California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW]) to develop, and the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to

<sup>9</sup> Gurish, J. *Overview of California Ocean and Coastal Laws with Reference to the Marine Environment*. Prepared for OPC. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from

[http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/Documents\\_Page/Noteworthy/Overview\\_Ocean\\_Coastal\\_Laws.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/Documents_Page/Noteworthy/Overview_Ocean_Coastal_Laws.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> FGC §2853(a). See CDFW's website for more information: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/FAQs>

<sup>12</sup> FGC §2850.5

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> MPAs are a subset of MMAs, however throughout this document the more common term "MPA" is used as an umbrella to refer to all types of protected areas (see Chapter 2.1)

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> California Coastal Commission. Water Quality Program Statewide Nonpoint Source (NPS) Program Information. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/nps/npsndx.html>

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> West Coast Governors Alliance on Ocean Health. *WCGA Overview*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from

<http://www.westcoastoceans.org/wcga-overview>

adopt, a master plan that guides the implementation of a Marine Life Protection Program (MLPP)<sup>20</sup> to address the siting of new MPAs and modifications of existing MPAs - thereby redesigning the state's MPA network.<sup>21</sup> To improve the design and management of California's MPAs, the MLPA guides the Commission to adopt the MLPP<sup>22</sup>. The MLPP has statewide goals that focus on protecting, sustaining, and conserving marine life; improving socioeconomic activities and marine heritage provided by marine ecosystems; and ensuring that the state's MPAs are designed and managed to the extent possible as a network and have clearly defined objectives, are based on scientific guidelines, and have effective management measures and enforcement.<sup>23</sup> Through extensive collaboration with partners, CDFW developed a master plan framework in 2005 and then a full master plan document following the adoption of the Central Coast MPAs. The Commission formally adopted the draft *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas (2008 Master Plan)*<sup>24</sup> as a "living" document in February 2008. The 2008 Master Plan integrated the 2005 framework, memorialized the guidance used to develop alternative MPA proposals in the Central Coast planning region, and successively guided the development of alternative MPA proposals in the North Central Coast, South Coast, and North Coast planning regions (see Chapter 2.2 and Appendix A).

Developed through partner collaboration, this 2015 Master Plan is a programmatic guidance document that describes how the MLPP will undertake tasks and activities to manage California's MPAs to the best of its ability to meet the goals of the MLPA and MMAIA.<sup>25</sup> Whereas the 2008 Master Plan described the process for designing and siting MPAs through a regional approach, the 2015 Master Plan focuses instead on setting a statewide foundation for MPA management, moving forward that will include regional components. Thus, the 2008 Master Plan and the 2015 Master Plan are complementary documents reflecting the continuing evolution of the MLPP. The 2015 Master Plan is intended to provide guidance to the MLPP and other natural resource management agencies, California Tribes and Tribal governments, the California Legislature, and the general public. The 2015 Master Plan is also complemented by *The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Area Partnership Plan* (the Partnership Plan [see Chapter 1.1]).<sup>26</sup>

The 2015 Master Plan includes background information on California's heritage and a high-level description of California's MPA design and siting process; readers can refer to Appendix A and the 2008 Master Plan for more detailed information on these topics. The 2015 Master Plan primarily shares the operational and contextual information for management of the MPA network to meet the MLPA goals and objectives. This includes statewide guidance relative to the management and adaptive management – including monitoring, research, and development – as well as operations and funding of the MPA network and next steps to take for MPA management. In this document, management and adaptive management are discussed separately because, while the MLPP has defined its general approach to management of California's MPA network, the MLPA emphasizes the importance of an adaptive and evolving approach to management. This adaptive management process, while closely tied to existing MPA management, is a distinct process meant to build upon and feed back into MPA management. For a more detailed historical description of MPA planning through the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative (MLPA Initiative) that led to the designation of California's MPAs pursuant to the MLPA, see Appendix A. Also appended to the 2015 Master Plan are four Regional MPA

---

<sup>20</sup> FGC §2853(b)

<sup>21</sup> FGC §2855

<sup>22</sup> FGC §2853(b)

<sup>23</sup> FGC §2853(b) – (c)

<sup>24</sup> CDFW. (2008). *Draft Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Master-Plan>

<sup>25</sup> FGC §2861(a)

<sup>26</sup> OPC. (2014). *The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Areas Partnership Plan*. Retrieved Sept 22, 2015 from [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED\\_FINAL\\_MPA\\_Partnership\\_Plan\\_12022014.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED_FINAL_MPA_Partnership_Plan_12022014.pdf)

Background and Priorities documents that capture region-specific MPA planning considerations and priorities moving forward; which together provide important context to base future informed statewide MPA management decisions upon (see Appendices C-F).

To enhance the effectiveness of California's MPAs, the MLPA has six primarily ecosystem-based goals that guided the design and siting, and continue to guide the management, of MPAs:

1. Protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function and integrity of marine ecosystems.
2. Help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.
3. Improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance, and manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.
4. Protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in California waters for their intrinsic values.
5. Ensure California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement and are based on sound scientific guidelines.
6. Ensure the state's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network.


Guided by these six goals, the MPA design and siting process (see Chapter 2.2) resulted in the creation of a true network of 124 MPAs (Figure 1).<sup>27</sup> Together, this network makes up 60% of the total MPA coverage in the contiguous United States (US), placing California as a leader on MPAs both nationally and globally (Saarman & Carr 2013). Furthermore, the actions undertaken to fulfill the mandates of the MLPA, MLMA, and MMAIA put California on track to help meet the vision of the US National Ocean Policy of stewardship that “ensures that the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes are healthy and resilient, safe and productive, and understood and treasured so as to promote the well-being, prosperity, and security of present and future generations.”<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Total number of MPAs includes 111 new or redesigned MPAs and 13 MPAs previously established in 2003 at the northern Channel Islands that were retained without change. Total number of MPAs does not include previously existing San Francisco Bay MPAs.

<sup>28</sup> The White House Office of the Press Secretary. (2010). *Executive Order: Stewardship of the Ocean, our Coasts, and the Great Lakes*. Retrieved Sept 22, 2015 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/files/documents/2010stewardship-eo.pdf>

Figure 1. Map of California's MPA Network before and after Implementation of the MLPA<sup>29</sup>



## 1.1 NATURAL AND HUMAN DIMENSIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S COASTAL RESOURCES

California's MPA network is situated in a geography of rich ecological and human heritage. The combination of California's bathymetry, ocean currents, and seasonal wind patterns provide the necessary conditions that lead to significant abundance and richness of its coastal ocean waters. California's shallow continental shelf is quite narrow, yet includes features such as underwater canyons, islands, offshore rocks, and rocky reefs (Johnson & Sandell 2014). Beyond this coastal zone two major currents meet around Point Conception, creating a rich transition zone that supports vast amounts of life. California's waters host a diversity of species of invertebrates, fish, reptiles, birds, mammals, marine plants, and algae, which can be found in a wide variety of habitats ranging from rocky intertidal shores to deep submarine canyons. For approximately 30,000 years, California's inhabitants have depended on the state's marine and coastal resources (Nies 2012). For countless generations, California Tribes have utilized marine resources and stewarded marine and coastal ecosystems across California's approximately 1,100-mile coastline. Today, California's inhabitants and visitors continue gain significant benefits from the state's oceans and coasts, including economic, nutritional, recreational, cultural, spiritual, and educational, as well as climate regulation and protection from coastal hazards. Many California Tribes continue to regularly harvest marine resources within their ancestral territories and maintain relationships with the coast for ongoing cultural uses, including spiritual and ceremonial purposes.

<sup>29</sup> In the pre-MLPA map, three ecological reserves, one state park and one natural preserve are shown as State Marine Conservation Areas (SMCAs) for comparative purposes. Regulations are consistent with current SMCAs.

California has the nation's second largest ocean economy and largest non-oil and/or gas economy,<sup>30</sup> with oceans contributing more than \$44 billion to California's 2012 gross domestic product.<sup>31</sup> Ocean sectors that depend on marine and coastal ecosystems, including tourism, recreation, and fisheries, contributed nearly \$18 billion. California's oceans also have direct impacts on the job market, producing almost 490,000 jobs in 2012, more than 365,000 of which were within the ocean and coastal tourism and recreation sectors alone.<sup>32</sup> The coasts also provide extensive recreational opportunities; beachgoers make more than 150 million trips to California's beaches per year<sup>33</sup> and in 2013 registered over 820,000 recreational vessels.<sup>34</sup>

A wide range of natural and human-caused factors directly and indirectly influence the abundance and diversity of populations of marine life and the habitats where they live, including shifts in oceanographic conditions (e.g., El Niño and La Niña) and numerous human activities (National Research Council 1995; Parrish & Tegner 2001; Sheehan & Tasto 2001). The development and growth of California's population and economy leads to stresses including chemical pollution and urban runoff, ocean acidification, alteration of physical habitat, invasion of exotic species, and harvest of living marine resources (National Research Council 1995; Jackson et al. 2001; Sheehan & Tasto 2001, Doney et al. 2012; Samhuri & Levin 2012; Kelly et al. 2013). Climate change also poses a significant risk to California's marine resources (Ruckelshaus et al. 2008; Chen et al. 2014). While MPAs may not be appropriate for reducing the impacts of all the threats mentioned above, they can provide a tool for addressing and mitigating many of these threats.

## 1.2 COLLABORATIVE MPA GOVERNANCE AND POLICY

To protect California's marine natural and cultural heritage, the MPA network depends on the participation and support of numerous entities. Throughout the world, the creation of management partnerships has been shown to greatly enhance the effectiveness of MPA network planning and implementation (Kelleher 1999).<sup>35</sup> By tapping into the specialized knowledge of state and federal agencies, California Tribes and Tribal governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academic institutions, and community-based user groups, managing agencies can leverage existing capacities and increase efficiencies on activities such as outreach and education; monitoring, research, and evaluation; building compliance through enforcement; and policy and permitting. Leveraging existing human and financial resources can help ensure cost-effective management of the MPA network. Furthermore, the inclusion of a large and diverse group of stakeholders increases public knowledge, participation, and support for the network (Kelleher 1999).

As the science-based and stakeholder driven process to redesign the state's MPA network progressed in each region from design to designation and implementation (see Chapter 2.2), it became increasingly

---

<sup>30</sup> Texas has the largest ocean economy in the nation at \$121 billion; however, \$113 billion is contributed by the minerals sector.

<sup>31</sup> National Ocean Economics Program. (2015). Ocean Economy Data. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://www.oceaneconomics.org/Market/ocean/oceanEcon.asp>

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Kildow, J. & Colgan, C. S. (2005). *California's Ocean Economy: Report to the Resources Agency, State of California*. [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/Documents\\_Page/Reports/CA\\_Ocean\\_Econ\\_Report.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/Documents_Page/Reports/CA_Ocean_Econ_Report.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> US Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Coast Guard office of Auxiliary and Boating Safety. (2014). *2013 Recreational Boating Statistics*. Retrieved Sept 22, 2015 from <http://www.uscgboating.org/assets/1/AssetManager/2013RecBoatingStats.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> Blue Earth Consultants, LLC. (2012). *From Design to Action: Key Elements and Innovations for Effective Marine Protected Area Network Implementation - Lessons from Successful Case Studies*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.blueearthconsultants.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/From\\_Design\\_to\\_Action\\_Key\\_Elements\\_for\\_Implementing\\_Californias\\_MPA\\_Network.pdf](http://www.blueearthconsultants.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/From_Design_to_Action_Key_Elements_for_Implementing_Californias_MPA_Network.pdf)

clear that the scale and scope of the redesign process required the state to revisit how management responsibilities were allocated. Although the primary management of the state MPA network is assigned by statute to CDFW,<sup>36,37,38</sup> no one agency or group has the authority, capacity, or resources to successfully manage the MPA network in isolation. The state has therefore committed to a partnership-based approach to fulfill its management obligations, which requires a sustained focus on implementing policies that facilitate communication and collaboration among both state and private partners in supporting MPA management.

To memorialize this approach, partner entities have signed several memoranda of understanding (MOUs) committing to collaborative planning and management of the MPA network. In August 2004, CNRA, CDFW, and the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation (now Resources Legacy Fund [RLF]) signed an MOU that launched an effort to implement the MLPA. The 2004 MOU established the MLPA Initiative, a public-private partnership, in all four planning regions (see Appendix A). The 2004 MOU was followed by amended MOUs in 2006/2007 and 2008. In 2010, a separate MOU was signed by 11 government and non-governmental entities to memorialize their commitments to effective management of California's MPA network. The 2010 MOU is titled "Memorandum of Understanding for Implementation of the California Marine Life Protection Act." The 2010 MOU was amended in 2015 to include additional federal signatories, signed by 15 government and non-governmental entities (see Box 1).

#### **Box 1. Signatories of the 2015 MOU for MPA Management**

- California Coastal Commission
- California Department of Fish And Wildlife
- California Department of Parks And Recreation
- California Environmental Protection Agency
- California Fish and Game Commission
- California Natural Resources Agency
- California Ocean Protection Council
- California Ocean Science Trust
- California State Lands Commission
- Resources Legacy Fund
- State Water Resources Control Board
- US Coast Guard
- US Department of Defense
- US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- US National Park Service

The MLPP's philosophy on governance and policy of the MPA network, as well as further activities and entities that are focused on a collaborative approach to management of California's MPA network, are described below.

### **MPA Governance and Policy**

Governance includes the interactions among structures, processes, and traditions that determine how and by whom decisions are made, and how stakeholders have a say in the process (Lockwood et al. 2010). MPA governance in California is comprised of three general categories of regulatory authority, management, and policy that interact to facilitate the design, implementation, and adaptive

<sup>36</sup> FGC §2855(b)(1)-2863

<sup>37</sup> PRC §36600-3690

<sup>38</sup> Pursuant to PRC §36725: California State Parks and Recreation (State Parks) may designate, delete, or modify State Marine Reserves (SMRs), State Marine Parks (SMPs), State Marine Conservation Areas (SMCAs), state marine cultural preservation areas, and State Marine Recreation Management Areas (SMRMAs). State Parks may not designate, delete, or modify a SMR, SMP, or SMCA without the concurrence of the Commission on any proposed restrictions upon, or change in, the use of living marine resources. State Parks may manage SMRs, SMPs, state marine cultural preservation areas, and SMRMAs. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) may designate, delete, or modify state water quality protection areas. The SWRCB and the California regional water quality control boards may take appropriate actions to protect state water quality protection areas. The SWRCB may request the Department or State Parks to take appropriate management action.

management of the MPA network to achieve the goals of the MLPA. These components are led by the Commission, DFW, and OPC, respectively.

The Commission is the primary regulatory decision-making authority for regulations related to California's MPAs. The Commission provides a venue for public comment and formal review to act upon MPA proposals, stakeholder petitions, and regulatory changes.

CDFW is responsible for implementing and enforcing the regulations set by the Commission, as well as providing biological data and expertise to inform the Commission's decision-making process.<sup>39</sup> CDFW manages California's MPAs through enforcement; monitoring, research, and evaluation; and outreach and education.

In 2013, Senate Bill 96 delegated to the OPC the responsibility for the direction of policy of the state's MPAs.<sup>40</sup> To fulfill this mandate, OPC works with both agency and private partners to identify areas that would benefit from policy development. Recommendations are developed collaboratively and then brought to the OPC for consideration. Once adopted, these policies direct all agencies under CNRA in their actions related to MPAs. This approach is grounded in the foundational agency relationship between OPC, CDFW, and the Commission that informs actions in support of the MPA network. This support takes several forms, from formalizing and leading coordination bodies like the MPA Statewide Leadership Team (MSLT) to actively engaging private partners in collaborative dialogues with state agencies.

### Marine Life Protection Program

Core to the MPA design and siting process, as well as to the ongoing management of California's MPA network, is the MLPP, established pursuant to the MLPA. The MLPP is a diverse program that includes groups involved in MPA policy and permitting, enforcement and compliance, research and monitoring, and outreach and education. The MLPP also encompasses the California's MPA network itself, as designated under the MLPA and MMAIA. Therefore, the MLPP constitutes a wide range of entities and activities that all contribute to achieving the goals of the MLPA. Importantly, the components of the MLPP are described in statute<sup>41</sup> and may change based on evolving needs and the outcomes of the ongoing adaptive management process.

### Consultation with California Tribes and Tribal Governments

As the traditional users and stewards of California's marine resources, partnership with California Tribes and Tribal governments is particularly important to the state government and the MLPP for MPA management. The state is committed to engaging in meaningful collaborations with California Tribes and Tribal governments, and Tribes can participate in many facets of MPA management, including, but not limited to, education and outreach, stewardship, research and monitoring, and compliance and enforcement. CNRA,<sup>42</sup> CDFW,<sup>43</sup> and the Commission<sup>44</sup> all have approved Tribal consultation policies to guide effective cooperation, communication, and consultation with Tribes and to enable California

<sup>39</sup> Commission. (2012). *About the Fish and Game Commission*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from

<http://www.fgc.ca.gov/public/information/>

<sup>40</sup> FGC §2850.5

<sup>41</sup> FGC §2853 - 2856

<sup>42</sup> CNRA. (2012). *California Natural Resources Agency Adoption of Final Tribal Consultation Policy*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015

from [http://resources.ca.gov/docs/tribal\\_policy/Final\\_Tribal\\_Policy.pdf](http://resources.ca.gov/docs/tribal_policy/Final_Tribal_Policy.pdf)

<sup>43</sup> CDFW. (2014). *Department of Fish and Wildlife Tribal Communication and Consultation Policy*.

<sup>44</sup> Commission. (2015). *Tribal Consultation Policy*. Retrieved Oct 23, 2015 from

[http://www.fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2015/Jun/Exhibits/0610\\_Item\\_3\\_Tribal\\_Consultation\\_Policy.pdf](http://www.fgc.ca.gov/meetings/2015/Jun/Exhibits/0610_Item_3_Tribal_Consultation_Policy.pdf)

Tribes and Tribal governments to provide meaningful input for natural resource management (see Appendix B).

### MPA Statewide Leadership Team

California's MSLT, led by OPC and nested within the larger MLPP, currently includes agencies and partners that have significant authority related to MPAs or marine sanctuaries. The MSLT was convened with the goal of increasing communication and collaboration among agencies and partners to ensure the state is effectively managing the statewide MPA network. The MSLT has in effect been active through collaborations on organically occurring projects and products, but was formalized in 2015. Further formalizing a commitment to communication and collaboration for MPA management, the MSLT finalized its two-year workplan in September 2015.<sup>45</sup> The MSLT's work is also informed by discussions with key non-profit organizations, Tribes, fishermen, academics, and other federal agencies that play a direct or support role in the management of the MPA Network. The MSLT has identified four focal areas around which to organize its work:

- Outreach and education
- Research and monitoring
- Enforcement and compliance
- Policy and permitting

### Partnership and the California Collaborative Approach

Partnership is a common theme and core strategy underlying the MLPP and the ongoing management of California's MPA network. This section specifically highlights the MLPP's approach to partnership and collaboration, which forms the foundation of all aspects of the state's MPA network, including siting and design, management and adaptive management, monitoring, operations, and other emerging aspects as the MLPP evolves.

Building on momentum from the publically-driven design and siting phase of California's network of MPAs (see Chapter 2.2 and Appendix A), CDFW, OPC, and other partners recognized the need to institutionalize an organized and mutually beneficial approach to partnership around management of the MPA network. Therefore, CDFW, OPC, and partners developed and agreed upon an experimental partnership model – the California Collaborative Approach. The California Collaborative Approach, which is documented in the Partnership Plan,<sup>46</sup> takes advantage of overlapping government mandates, public interest, and science to provide support and create opportunities for the management and governance of the MPA network across sectors and geographic and political scales. Because it is the first partnership model of its kind focused on MPA network management, it will be adapted as needed as new priorities, needs, and information arise.

Table 2 describes a sample of past and ongoing collaborations among diverse entities including agencies, researchers, citizen scientists, and more, that work toward achieving the Partnership Plan objectives. Each of these partnerships has or will potentially inform MPA management as the MLPP evolves. MLPP partners and others will continue to identify and build new partnerships as opportunities and needs arise.

<sup>45</sup> OPC. (2015). *Marine Protected Area (MPA) Statewide Leadership Team Work Plan FY 15/16-17/18*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda\\_items/20150922/Item5\\_Attach2\\_MPALeadershipTeam\\_Workplan\\_FINALv2.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20150922/Item5_Attach2_MPALeadershipTeam_Workplan_FINALv2.pdf)

<sup>46</sup> OPC. (2014). *The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Areas Partnership Plan*. Retrieved Sept 22, 2015 from [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED\\_FINAL\\_MPA\\_Partnership\\_Plan\\_12022014.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED_FINAL_MPA_Partnership_Plan_12022014.pdf)

Table 2. Examples of Past and Ongoing MPA Collaborations Aimed to Inform MPA Management

Partners	Description of Collaborative Effort
<b>CDFW, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed Channel Islands MPA network and federal extension (see Appendix A, Section 2.3 and 3.3)</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, CNRA, RLF</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MLPA Initiative (see Chapter 2 and Appendix A)</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, Channel Islands National Park, CINMS, Partnership for Interdisciplinary Study of Coastal Oceans (PISCO)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborated to produce a Channel Islands MPAs 5-year monitoring report<sup>47</sup></li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, California Ocean Science Trust (OST), OPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing and implementing a long-term statewide MPA Monitoring Program</li> </ul>
<b>California Sea Grant (CASG), CDFW, OST, State Coastal Conservancy (SCC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed and implemented Central Coast MPA Baseline Monitoring Program (see Appendix E for more detail)</li> </ul>
<b>CASG, CDFW, OST, OPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed and implemented MPA Baseline Monitoring Programs for North Central Coast, South Coast, and North Coast (see Appendix D, Appendix F, and Appendix C, respectively, for more detail)</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, OPC, OST, Collaborative Network</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency staff and partners attend meetings and regularly engage with the Collaborative Network</li> </ul>
<b>OPC, OST, CDFW, citizen science groups</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volunteer citizen scientists collect scientific data on coastal and marine resource use</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, OPC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy coordination for California Environmental Quality Act process on MPAs with California Coastal Commission (CCC), State Lands Commission (SLC), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and other permitting agencies</li> </ul>
<b>OPC, CDFW, California Sanctuary Foundation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDFW and OPC funding supported the production and installation of MPA interpretive panels, regulatory signs, brochures, and kiosks</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, OPC-Science Advisory Team (SAT)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrating technical support from University of California Santa Cruz staff and SAT members to analyze impacts from scientific collecting within MPAs and how to best manage those impacts while using a more structured, objective, and quantifiable approach when reviewing permit applications for scientific collecting within MPAs</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), WiLDways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed “You Are Here Signs” with NRDC that were placed along the coast and Spanish translation of materials and “You Are Here Signs” with a South Coast emphasis with WiLDways</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, Ocean Communicators Alliance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statewide docent guides and general MPA education</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed an educational module on MPAs that is utilized in classrooms throughout the state through the PORTS program</li> </ul>
<b>CDFW, US Department of Defense</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed military safety zones around Channel Islands (see Appendix A, Section 3.3: <i>MPA Design and Management Considerations</i>)</li> </ul>

<sup>47</sup> CDFW, PISCO, CINMS, and Channel Islands National Park. (2008). *Channel Islands Marine Protected Areas First 5 Years of Monitoring: 2003-2008*. Airamé, S. and J. Ugoretz (Eds.). 20 pp. Retrieved Aug 7, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=31325&inline=true>

The MSLT created four overarching management objectives that span the entire network, linked to the six MLPA goals, and complement the regional objectives. The four management objectives, as described in the Partnership Plan, include the following:

1. Governance and management process is effective and adaptive.
2. Objective, reliable, and timely scientific information and enforcement data are used in management decisions for stewardship of the statewide network.
3. Compliance with the regulations and participation in management and stewardship of the statewide MPA network is high due to effective enforcement, education, and broad awareness of the MPAs across sectors and by all key stakeholder groups.
4. State MPA network is effectively financed and sustainable over the long term.


In working together to achieve these management objectives, partners will seek to follow the guiding principles of the California Collaborative Approach, including leveraging resources, ensuring transparency, and engaging in partnerships.


As one component of the Collaborative Approach, Community Collaboratives (Collaboratives) reflect the local-scale community focus of the approach. There are currently 14 Collaboratives, together comprising the Collaborative Network. Each Collaborative offers local partners and stakeholders an opportunity to engage with and have an active voice and participation to potentially inform MPA management in a way that reflects their unique community's priorities and needs. The Collaboratives are designed to be self-sufficient and provide a platform for locally-based stakeholders to organize around and support their local MPAs, while supporting the MSLT to achieve the network-wide management objectives and the MLPA goals.

### 1.3 CALIFORNIA'S MARINE MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND MPA MILESTONES

Since the passage of the MLPA, the MLPA Initiative, MLPP, and the state achieved a number of accomplishments. These accomplishments relate to policies and regulation, MPA design and establishment, MPA monitoring, partnerships, communication and outreach, and other achievements. Figure 2 illustrates a timeline of some of these milestones between 1998 and 2015.

Figure 2. California's Key MPA-Related Milestones





## CHAPTER 2

# MPA Network Design and Siting Process

The MLPA, expertise provided by advisory groups, and rigorous stakeholder engagement processes informed the design and siting process for California’s MPA network. Throughout the siting and design process, decision-makers used the best readily available science to designate MPAs with varying degrees of protection (i.e., no-take or limited take) and to integrate MPAs into a statewide network. This chapter describes the types of MPAs that comprise California’s MPA network, the MLPA Initiative design and siting process, and summary statistics describing California’s MPA network.

## 2.1 TYPES OF MARINE MANAGED AREAS

The six goals of the MLPA recognize the importance of protecting marine resources for various purposes (protecting natural diversity and abundance of marine life, sustaining and rebuilding species of economic value, and improving recreational and educational opportunities in areas subject to minimal disturbance). Thus, it is important to use multiple types of MMAs, as defined in the MMAIA, to achieve these distinct goals.<sup>48</sup> MPAs are a subset of MMAs (however throughout this document the more common term “MPA” is used as an umbrella to refer to all types of protected areas), and include three MPA classifications (State Marine Reserve [SMR], State Marine Conservation Area [SMCA], State Marine Park [SMP]<sup>49</sup>) and one MMA classification (State Marine Recreational Management Area [SMRMA]). The special closure designation, which is not an MPA, is used by the Commission for relatively small, discrete marine areas to also contribute to the goals of the MLPA through protections complementary to MPAs.<sup>50</sup> General definitions for these classifications of the protected areas adopted pursuant to the MLPA are described in Table 3 below. For regulations pertaining to areas declared by the Commission to be MPAs, MMAs, and special closures, see California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Section 632<sup>51,52</sup> and the descriptions of California’s MPAs on CDFW’s website.<sup>53</sup>

To date, there has been relatively little direct comparison between the relative benefits of multiple use areas such as marine parks and marine conservation areas compared to no-take marine reserves (Lester & Halpern 2008; Coleman et al. 2013; Kelaher et al. 2014). Because approximately 42% of California’s MPA area (or 6.5% of California’s total state waters<sup>54</sup>) is in SMCAs, SMCA/SMPs, and SMRMAs – which allow multiple uses including limited take – California’s MPA network will provide an opportunity to build scientific knowledge about the effects of different types of MMAs.

<sup>48</sup> FGC §2852[c]

<sup>49</sup> The State Park and Recreation Commission has purview over the addition of SMPs.

<sup>50</sup> Special closures derive from the ecological reserve authority in FGC 1583 to protect terrestrial resources such as nesting sites and pup haul-out areas

<sup>51</sup> CCR. Retrieved Mar 4, 2015 from <https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/>

<sup>52</sup> CCR, Title 14, Section 632 defines provisions for a number of prohibitions and allowances on topics such as access, anchoring, transit or drifting through MPAs or other MMAs, public safety, and Tribal take

<sup>53</sup> Descriptions of California’s MPAs are provided on the CDFW website:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Network>

<sup>54</sup> The boundary of state waters is from mean high tide to three nautical miles offshore of all intertidal rocks and mouths of embayments, including large open bays. This method of measurement creates instances where the state water boundary is further offshore than three nautical miles (e.g., Monterey Bay and the area around Reading Rock)

The MLPP recognizes that designating a network that includes multiple types of MPAs may prove to be problematic relative to enforcement and public understanding of different regulations within contiguous areas. Differences in regulations in MMAs can lead to unintentional infractions and a degradation of the function of MPA network. Therefore, as regulations are developed and continually updated, care must be taken to ensure that regulations are understandable, observed by the public, and enforced as necessary.

## 2.2 MLPA INITIATIVE PROCESS AND OUTCOMES

The MLPA passed in 1999, followed by the MMAIA in 2000. Following two unsuccessful attempts to implement the MLPA due to lack of funding and resources, CDFW entered into a public-private partnership called the MLPA Initiative to undertake implementation of the MLPA. This section describes the MLPA Initiative and the design, siting, and implementation process that was carried out between 2004 and 2012 (see Appendix A). In addition, this section shares the results of this process at the statewide and regional scales.

Following the statewide goals, the MLPA outlined guidelines for the design and siting of the MPA network. The MLPA required the network to comprise areas with various levels of protection, including the following elements:<sup>55</sup>

- 1) An improved marine life reserve component [known as the backbone of the network] consistent with the guidelines for the preferred siting alternative (see Appendix A, Boxes 1 and 3).
- 2) Specific identified objectives, and management and enforcement measures, for all MPAs in the system.
- 3) Provisions for monitoring, research, and evaluation at selected sites to facilitate adaptive management of MPAs and ensure that the system meets the goals stated in this chapter.
- 4) Provisions for educating the public about MPAs, and for administering and enforcing MPAs in a manner that encourages public participation.
- 5) A process for the establishment, modification, or abolishment of existing MPAs or new MPAs established pursuant to this program.

### MLPA Initiative: Establishment and Design and Siting Process

The MLPA Initiative was a comprehensive, highly collaborative, transparent, and iterative process guided by MOUs and enhanced by the advice of stakeholders, scientists, resource managers, and interested members of the public. Over the course of 2004 to 2012, the MLPA Initiative worked together to match public and private resources to direct and inform four regional science-based, stakeholder-driven processes (see Figure 3).

---

<sup>55</sup> FGC §2853(c)

Table 3. Definitions and Overview of MMA Classifications

Classification	Definition	Summary	Additional Information
<b>State Marine Reserve (SMR)</b>	In a <b>state marine reserve</b> , it is unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living geological, or cultural marine resource, except under a permit or specific authorization from the managing agency for research, restoration, or monitoring purposes. While, to the extent feasible, the area shall be open to the public for managed enjoyment and study, the area shall be maintained to the extent practicable in an undisturbed and unpolluted state. Access and use for activities including, but not limited to, walking, swimming, boating, and diving may be restricted to protect marine resources. Research, restoration, and monitoring may be permitted by the managing agency. Educational activities and other forms of nonconsumptive human use may be permitted by the designating entity or managing agency in a manner consistent with the protection of all marine resources. <sup>56</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibits all take and consumptive use (commercial and recreational, living or geologic); scientific research and non-consumptive uses are allowed<sup>57</sup></li> <li>Definition is consistent with “marine life reserve” in MLPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scientific collecting permits (SCP) may be issued by CDFW pursuant to Section 650 of the CCR, Title 14, or specific authorization from the Commission for research, restoration, or monitoring purposes</li> <li>Boating, diving, research, and education may be allowed, to the extent feasible, as long as the area is maintained “to the extent practicable in an undisturbed and unpolluted state,” but activities may be restricted to protect marine resources, including non-extractive activities<sup>15</sup></li> <li>Restrictions must be based on specific objectives for an individual site and the goals and guidelines of the MLPA<sup>58</sup></li> <li>Does not imply that navigation will necessarily be restricted though MPAs or that other non-extractive activities will be regulated</li> </ul>
<b>State Marine Conservation Area (SMCA)</b>	In a <b>state marine conservation area</b> , it is unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living, geological, or cultural marine resource for commercial or recreational purposes, or a combination of commercial and recreational purposes that the designating entity or managing agency determines would compromise protection of the species of interest, natural community, habitat, or geological features. The designating entity or managing agency may permit research, education, and recreational activities, and certain commercial and recreational harvest of marine resources. <sup>59</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May allow select recreational and commercial harvest to continue; scientific research and non-consumptive uses are allowed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCPs may be issued by CDFW pursuant to Section 650 of the CCR, Title 14, or specific authorization from the Commission for research, education, or recreational purposes and certain commercial and recreational harvest, provided it does not compromise protection</li> <li>Fishing restrictions may vary by focal species, fishing gear, habitats, and goals and objectives of individual MPA<sup>60</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>56</sup> PRC §36710(a)

<sup>57</sup> PRC §36710(a)

<sup>58</sup> FGC §2852(c)

<sup>59</sup> PRC §36710(c)

Classification	Definition	Summary	Additional Information
<b>No-Take State Marine Conservation Area (no-take SMCA)</b>	See SMCA definition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibits all take and consumptive use, except for the take incidental to existing permitted activities such as infrastructure maintenance or water quality operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre-existing activities and artificial structures including, but not limited to, wastewater outfalls, piers and jetties, maintenance dredging, and beach nourishment occur throughout heavily urbanized areas</li> <li>Activities are regulated by other federal, state, and local agencies whose jurisdiction cannot be pre-empted through designation of MPAs pursuant to the MLPA<sup>61</sup></li> <li>The Commission identified MPAs with existing structures, and designated them as no-take SMCAs and <i>only</i> these regulated activities are allowed to continue under current permits</li> </ul>
<b>State Marine Park (SMP)</b>	In a <b>state marine park</b> , it is unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living or nonliving marine resource for commercial exploitation purposes. Any human use that would compromise protection of the species of interest, natural community or habitat, or geological, cultural, or recreational features, may be restricted by the designating entity or managing agency. All other uses are allowed, including scientific collection with a permit, research, monitoring, and public recreation, including recreational harvest, unless otherwise restricted. Public use, enjoyment, and education are encouraged, in a manner consistent with protecting resource values. <sup>62</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibits commercial take, but may allow select recreational harvest to continue; scientific research and non-consumptive uses are allowed</li> <li>Prohibits injuring, damaging, taking, or possessing for commercial use any living or non-living marine resources<sup>63</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other uses that would compromise the protection of living resources, habitat, geological, cultural, or recreational features may be restricted, while all other uses are allowed, consistent with protecting resources</li> <li>SCPs may be issued by CDFW pursuant to Section 650 of the CCR, Title 14, or specific authorization from the Commission for research, monitoring, and education and certain recreational harvest in a manner consistent with protecting resources</li> <li>State Parks Commission designates SMPs</li> <li>Fishing restrictions may vary by focal species, habitats, and goals and objectives of individual MPAs<sup>64</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>60</sup> At present, the large fishery closures known as the Cowcod Conservation Areas and the Rockfish Conservation Area may function as *de facto* SMCAs in that bottom fishing for finfishes is prohibited but other types of fishing are allowed, though the specific regulations in these areas are subject to change dependent on stock assessments

<sup>61</sup> For example, wastewater discharge permitted by the SWQCB is not considered to involve take within MPAs, and for the purposes of MPA management, the relation of wastewater discharge to allowable take is at the discretion and jurisdiction of the State and Regional Water Quality Control boards.

<sup>62</sup> PRC §36710(b)

<sup>63</sup> PRC §36700-36900

<sup>64</sup> At present, the large fishery closures known as the Cowcod Conservation Areas and the Rockfish Conservation Area may function as *de facto* SMCAs in that bottom fishing for finfishes is prohibited but other types of fishing are allowed, though the specific regulations in these areas are subject to change dependent on stock assessments

Classification	Definition	Summary	Additional Information
<b>State Marine Conservation Area / State Marine Park (SMCA/SMP)</b>	See SMP definition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPA designated as SMCA by the Commission and SMP by California State Park and Recreation Commission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only one MPA (Cambria SMCA/SMP) currently has this dual designation, as it was adopted by both Commissions at separate times with the same set of regulations and boundaries (Pope 2014)</li> <li>Cambria SMCA/SMP is jointly managed by CDFW and State Parks</li> </ul>
<b>State Marine Recreational Management Area (SMRMA)</b>	In a <b>state marine recreational management area</b> , it is unlawful to perform any activity that, as determined by the designating entity or managing agency, would compromise the recreational values for which the area may be designated. Recreational opportunities may be protected, enhanced, or restricted, while preserving basic resource values of the area. No other use is restricted. <sup>65</sup> The Fish and Game Commission may designate, delete, or modify state marine recreational management areas for hunting purposes. <sup>66</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides subtidal protection equivalent to an MPA while allowing legal waterfowl hunting, scientific research, and non-consumptive uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MMA designation</li> <li>Recreational opportunities may be protected, enhanced, or restricted while preserving basic resource values of the area</li> </ul>
<b>Special Closure</b>	A special closure is an area designated by the Commission that prohibits access or restricts boating activities in waters adjacent to seabird rookeries or marine mammal haul-out sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This designation, which is not categorized as an MMA, is used by the Commission for relatively small, discrete marine areas to also achieve the goals of the MLPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrated into the MLPA process and used to reduce disturbance of nesting or roosting seabirds or hauled out or breeding marine mammals that would not otherwise be protected by MPA designation within the same geographical region</li> <li>Special closures provide an exception to allow CDFW employees and employees of other specified government agencies to enter the area</li> <li>Special closures also include an allowance for CDFW to grant permission to access the area at its discretion</li> </ul>

<sup>65</sup> PRC §36710(e)

<sup>66</sup> PRC §36725(a)

MLPA Initiative staff varied among planning regions, and worked with CDFW staff with scientific expertise and/or knowledge of state policy and resource management, CDFW enforcement staff, California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) staff, Regional Stakeholder Groups, Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members, the Statewide Interests Group (SIG), and/or professional contract staff with other required skills to accomplish MPA planning, project management, decision support tool development, facilitation, and mediation. The MLPA Initiative established an MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), together with a SAT and a stakeholder advisory group (Stakeholder Group) to oversee the achievement of several initial objectives for overall MPA planning in each region.<sup>67</sup> See Figure 4 for a description of the primary roles of each of the three main MLPA Initiative bodies.


The first of the planning objectives for the MLPA Initiative was to complete a master plan framework, adopted by the BRTF in 2005, which included guidance based on the MLPA for the development of alternative MPA proposals statewide. Other important early objectives included establishing a timeline, organizational structure, requirements, work products, and funding for MPA planning. Rather than attempting to design a single MPA network for the entire state at one time, the MLPA Initiative called for the redesign of a statewide network of MPAs by 2011 through a series of geographic planning regions. The state was split into five distinct regions – North Coast, North Central Coast, Central Coast, South Coast, and the San Francisco Bay (see Figure 3). Each region held its own regional MPA public planning process, except the San Francisco Bay. MPA planning in San Francisco Bay will be influenced by the results of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers Delta process and, therefore, MPA planning will occur once that process is complete (see Appendix A).

Figure 3. Map Highlighting the Five Planning Areas and Planning Periods



<sup>67</sup> Complete lists of BRTF, SIG, SAT, and Stakeholder Group (or Regional Stakeholder Group [RSG]) members can be found on CDFW's website: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Planning-Process>

Figure 4. Description of Three Planning Bodies that Supported the Design and Siting Phase for Each Planning Region



### Scientific Foundation for MPA Network Design

In order to prepare the master plan and take full advantage of scientific expertise on MPAs, the MLPA directed CDFW to appoint a Master Plan Team, including science advisors, for advice and assistance.<sup>68</sup> CDFW staff and Master Plan Team scientists played a significant role in guiding and developing components of both the master plan framework adopted by the BRTF in 2005 and the draft Master Plan adopted by the Commission in 2008, resulting in: 1) more specific guidelines for how to implement the broad guidance in the MLPA, and 2) detailed guidance on a variety of scientific considerations in the design of MPAs (see the 2008 Master Plan, Chapter 3). The overall MPA network design guidance addressed statutory requirements for MPA network design and provided a foundation for the SAT to apply a methodology to evaluate alternative MPA proposals in each planning region (Kirlin et al. 2013). The MLPA Initiative was a science-based and stakeholder-driven MPA planning process that utilized the best readily available science,<sup>69</sup> and accordingly, the MPA planning process drew from an existing body of work on both the science underlying MPA design and siting as well as previous MPA management efforts from around the world. Throughout the MPA design process, some of

<sup>68</sup> FGC §2853(c)

<sup>69</sup> For more information on CDFW's approach to using the best readily available science, see the California Fish and Game Commission, *Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action* documents: [http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2007/165\\_632fsor.pdf](http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2007/165_632fsor.pdf) for the Central Coast (2007); <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2009/632fsor.pdf> for the North Central Coast (2010); <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2010/632fsor.pdf> for the South Coast (2011); and <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2012/632ncfsor.pdf> for the North Coast (2012)

the top MPA scientists worldwide played active roles in both the development and review of regional proposals. To pave the way for positive outcomes of California’s MPA network, the MLPP utilized three primary sources of scientific guidance to guide MPA network design: the MLPA, the 2008 Master Plan, and the SAT (see Appendix A, Section 4).

## Influence of Science in California’s MPA Network

California’s MPA network generally reflects the integration of the science and science-based MPA design guidelines from the MLPA, the 2008 Master Plan, and SAT guidance. When compared to California’s MPAs in 1999 (prior to the MLPA), there is a dramatic increase in the proportion of state waters protected and an increase in the number and size of all MPA types (see Table 4). The redesigned MPA network represents a substantial increase in the representation and replication of marine habitats within MPAs, including sandy beaches, rocky shores, kelp, shallow rocky reef/kelp forest (0-30m), mid-depth rocky reef (30-100m), deep rocky reef (100-3000m), shallow sand 0-30m, mid-depth sand (30-100m), deep sand (100-3000m), estuaries, marsh, and eelgrass habitats. There is also a reduction in the distance between habitats protected in MPAs (Saarman et al. 2013; see Tables 1-4 in Appendices C-F, Section 4 for more detailed statistics on each region).

*Table 4. Comparison of Protected Areas prior to the MLPA in 1999 and Present*

Protected Area	Pre-MLPA (1999) <sup>70,71</sup>					Post-MLPA (2015) <sup>72</sup>				
	Count	Min Size	Max Size	Total Area	Mean Size	Count	Min Size	Max Size	Total Area	Mean Size
<b>No-Take</b> <sup>73</sup>	10	0.04	2.5	12.1	1.2	61	0.01	40.7	497.4	8.2
<b>Limited Take</b> <sup>74,75</sup>	53	0.01	30.8	129.8	2.4	63	0.06	23	354.7	5.6
<b>Special Closure</b>	2	0.64	2.2	2.8	1.4	15	0.01	1	3.3	0.2

While science guidelines strongly influenced the design of California’s MPA network, the nature of the highly participatory, stakeholder-driven process led to some tradeoffs between ecosystem protection and socioeconomic considerations in California’s MPA network (Gleason et al. 2013; Saarman et al. 2013). For example, one third of the MPAs considered sufficiently protective to contribute to the conservation goals of the MLPA fell below the minimum MPA size recommended by the SAT (Saarman et al. 2013). Examples like this, where science guidelines were not universally followed, highlight the multiple considerations taken into account during MPA planning, which encompass both ecological and socioeconomic priorities.

## Iterative Development of Alternative Regional MPA Proposals

<sup>70</sup> Includes only coastal MPAs (excludes existing San Francisco Bay MPAs); area units are in square miles

<sup>71</sup> Pre-dates MMAIA; areas included are more variable in designation but are included due to similarity to current MPA take regulations

<sup>72</sup> Includes only coastal MPAs; area units are in square miles.

<sup>73</sup> For the purposes of this table comparison, “No-Take” includes SMRs, SMRMAs, and no-take SMCAs

<sup>74</sup> Limited take includes SMRMAs, SMCAs, SMPs, State Parks, State Marine Natural Preserves, and Ecological Reserves

<sup>75</sup> Restrictions are highly variable across all designations, however pre-MLPA areas are generally less restrictive compared to post-MLPA areas

The BTRF selected the Central Coast region as the initial planning region from which to launch the MLPA Initiative (2005-2007).<sup>76</sup> The Central Coast planning region was followed by the North Central Coast (2007-2010), South Coast (2008-2012), North Coast (2009-2012), and the San Francisco Bay (timing to be determined).<sup>77</sup> The same general iterative process for MPA design was used in each planning region (see Box 2 below), most of which the stakeholder groups and SATs undertook. The overall aim was for the BTRF to select a set of alternative MPA proposals, including a preferred alternative, for each region and for the Commission to adopt one of the alternatives (see Appendix A).<sup>78</sup>

### Box 2. Process for Regional MPA Planning

1. **Regional Planning:** Preparation of a regional profile,<sup>a</sup> engagement of Stakeholder Group and SAT; development of additional advice; and identification of alternative approaches to networks and potential MPA sites.
2. **MPA Planning:** Stakeholder Group development of proposals for MPAs after evaluation of existing and new MPAs and other management activities.
3. **Evaluating Proposals:** SAT, BTRF, and CDFW analysis and evaluations; SAT evaluation of MPA proposals developed by the stakeholder group against the goals of the MLPA; BTRF evaluation of proposals based on factors including SAT guidelines, CDFW feasibility criteria, socioeconomic impacts, and cross-interest support<sup>b</sup> and forwarding a preferred alternative and other alternatives to the Commission; CDFW feasibility analysis, comments on alternatives, and development of initial regulatory documents based on Commission direction.
4. **Commission Action on Alternative MPA Proposals:** Preparation of regulatory analyses, including California Environmental Quality Act review; public testimony; and action by the Commission.

<sup>a</sup> Regional profiles for each planning region can be found on the CDFW website:  
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Planning-Process>

<sup>b</sup> MLPA Initiative. (2010). *Updated Summary of Key Guidance Provided in Previous Marine Life Protection Act Study Regions for the Development of Marine Protected Area Proposals*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=17238&inline=true>

Alternative MPA proposal development in each planning region was an adaptive, flexible, and iterative process that incorporated multiple rounds of MPA design, evaluation, feedback, and redesign (Figure 5). While the same general MPA planning process structure was used throughout the four coastal planning regions, specific details regarding alternative MPA proposal development varied and the iterative nature of the process allowed for adaptation based on lessons learned and unique characteristics of each region. For example, in the North Coast MPA planning process, due mostly to relatively small population size and strength of public involvement, external groups were supported to develop MPA proposals for the first round prior to convening the stakeholder group. Multiple rounds of MPA proposal development also


<sup>76</sup> MLPA Initiative. (2005). *California MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force Selects Central Coast Study Region for Developing Alternative Network Components of Marine Protected Areas*. Retrieved July 22, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=78000>

<sup>77</sup> Options for a planning process in the fifth region, San Francisco Bay, have been developed for consideration at a future date. See Appendix A and CDFW's website for more information:  
<http://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Network/San-Francisco-Bay>

<sup>78</sup> CDFW. (2015). *Overview of Alternative Marine Protected Area Proposals: The Marine Life Protection Act Initiative (2004 – 2012)*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=107532&inline>

provided stakeholder groups with evaluations of the extent to which their draft proposals would meet science and feasibility design guidelines, built trust among stakeholders, increased awareness of constituencies' particular interests, allowed the stakeholder group to develop improved cross-interest proposals, accommodated decision support-tools such as MarineMap that allowed stakeholders to collaboratively develop MPA designs, and increased and facilitated interactions between MLPA Initiative bodies and interested members of the public (Gleason et al. 2010; Fox et al. 2013a, b; Merrifield et al. 2013). In addition, in the South Coast and North Coast planning regions, State Parks and MLPA Initiative staff evaluated MPA proposals for recreation and public access opportunities. All alternative MPA proposals that were considered and reviewed by the Commission, but ultimately not selected for each planning region, can be found on the CDFW website.<sup>79</sup>

Figure 5. General Process Used by the MLPA Initiative to Develop Alternative MPA Proposals in Each Regional MPA Planning Process or Planning Region



<sup>79</sup> CDFW. (2015). *Overview of alternative marine protected area proposals: The Marine Life Protection Act Initiative (2004-2012)*. CDFW, Marine Region, Statewide MPA Management Project. Informational Report. Retrieved Sept 23, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=107532&inline>

## MPAs Adopted Pursuant to the MLPA

Drawing from science guidance and expert advice, California redesigned its system of MPAs into a more cohesive statewide network (see Figure 1 above). Completed in December 2012, California's MPA network currently represents the largest scientifically-based network in the contiguous US to date, and thus the MLPA Initiative process may offer valuable insights for MPA network planning elsewhere in the US and around the world (Gleason et al. 2013).

### Statewide MPA Summary

California's 63 existing MPAs prior to the MLPA were primarily established in an ad hoc manner, were mostly small (covering 2.7% of state waters with less than 0.25% in no-take MPAs), and were considered to be ineffective. Since the passage of the MLPA and the completed redesign of California's MPA network, California now has 124 MPAs (covering about 16% of state waters, approximately 9.4% of which in no-take MPAs) and 15 special closures. The majority of MPAs are in SMCAs and SMRs, with substantially less area in no-take SMCAs, SMRMAs, and SMCA/SMPs, respectively (see Figure 6).

Figure 6. Percent of Each Type of MPA across California's MPA Network<sup>80</sup>





Figure 7 illustrates the percent of 12 of California's most representative habitats protected statewide in MPAs, by MPA designation type. Marsh, deep rock, and rocky shores are the most represented habitats, with shallow sand, estuary, and eelgrass showing the least representation. The majority of habitats are represented in SMRs and SMCAs. See Appendices C-F, Section 4 for detailed statistics of California's most representative habitats in individual MPAs.

<sup>80</sup> All numbers represent rounded values and totals include all MPAs in the North Coast, North Central Coast, Central Coast, and South Coast regions; and do not include existing San Francisco Bay MPAs or special closures

Figure 7. Percent of Representative Habitats in MPAs by Designation Type throughout the Entire State Waters of California<sup>81</sup>



<sup>81</sup> All numbers represent rounded values and totals include all MPAs in the North Coast, North Central Coast, Central Coast, and South Coast regions; and do not include existing San Francisco Bay MPAs or special closures. The single SMCA/SMP designation in California's statewide network (Cambria SMCA/SMP) is too nominal to report.

### Summary of Regional MPAs Adopted

Resulting from the design and siting phase, each planning region contained a unique set of MPAs of varying types (see Table 3 for an overview of MPA types). Table 5 provides a summary of the number of MPAs in each region and the area of coverage for each type. The North Central Coast has the largest coverage of MPAs (20.0%) and the North Coast has the least (13.4%). In addition, the South Coast has the largest area of state waters under protection (355.4 square miles and 15.1% of the region). Figure 8 provides an overview of the percent of coastal area within each type of MPA for each planning region; below is additional detail on each of the four planning regions.

Table 5. Summary Statistics of MPAs within State Waters across All Planning Regions<sup>82</sup>

Type of MPA	North Coast		North Central Coast		Central Coast		South Coast	
	MPAs (number)	Area of State Waters (square miles)	MPAs (number)	Area of State Waters (square miles)	MPAs (number)	Area of State Waters (square miles)	MPAs (number)	Area of State Waters (square miles)
SMR	6	51.3	10	84.2	13	86.3	19	241.5
No-Take SMCA <sup>83</sup>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	33.6
SMCA	13	85.3	12	67.6	14	111.2	21	80.4
SMCA/SMP	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0
SMRMA	1	0.8	3	0.6	1	3.1	0	0.0
Special Closures	7	0.2	6	1.2	0	0.0	2	1.9
<b>Total<sup>84</sup></b>	<b>20</b>	<b>137.4</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>152.4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>206.8</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>355.4</b>

**North Coast:** Covers approximately 1,027 square miles of state waters from the California/Oregon border south to Alder Creek near Point Arena (Mendocino County). MPAs and closures were adopted June 6, 2012 by the Commission and went into effect on December 19, 2012.

**North Central Coast:** Covers approximately 763 square miles of state waters from Alder Creek near Point Arena south to Pigeon Point (San Mateo County). MPAs and closures were adopted August 5, 2009 by the Commission and went into effect May 1, 2010.

**Central Coast:** Covers approximately 1,144 square miles of state waters from Pigeon Point, south to Point Conception (Santa Barbara County). MPAs were adopted April 13, 2007 by the Commission and went into effect September 21, 2007.

**South Coast:** Covers approximately 2,351 square miles of state waters from Point Conception south to the California/Mexico border, including state waters around the Channel Islands. MPAs and closures were adopted December 15, 2010 by the Commission and went into effect on January 1, 2012.


<sup>82</sup> Statistics are from CDFW's Marine Region Geographic Information System unit. Values are current as of January 2015 and are subject to change as improvements in geographic data become available:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/GIS>

<sup>83</sup> No-take SMCA is an administrative term for an SMCA that would have been an SMR but for certain pre-existing permitted activities onsite (see Table 3)

<sup>84</sup> Totals do not include existing San Francisco Bay MPAs or special closures

Figure 8. Percent of Planning Region State Waters Covered by Each MPA Type<sup>85</sup>



<sup>85</sup> Totals include all MPAs in the North Coast, North Central Coast, Central Coast, and South Coast regions; and do not include existing San Francisco Bay MPAs or special closures

## CHAPTER 3

# Management

---

The MLPA emphasizes the importance of effective management measures for California's MPAs. For California's MPA network, effective management consists of an MPA network that has strong oversight and a process for implementing the legal mandate; comprehensive management planning and permitting; effective enforcement, research, monitoring, evaluation, and outreach; and strong social capital and long-term sustainable financing that is enhanced by partnerships. Another measure of effective management is a strong process for adaptive management that enables learning and course-correction based on monitoring findings and lessons learned throughout ongoing management. This chapter describes the MLPP's approach to managing California's MPA network, while Chapter 4 describes the approach and process for continually improving MPA management through adaptive management. Through these management elements, the MPA network may meet its stated goals and objectives.

The MLPA states that California's MPAs should be designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a statewide network.<sup>86</sup> Following this direction, significant efforts were made to ensure that MPAs were designed as science-based, stakeholder-driven, and ecologically connected statewide network during the MPA siting process (Gleason et al. 2013; Saarman et al. 2013; see Chapter 1 and Appendix A). To manage California's MPA network, the MLPP is focusing on a variety of management activities to support the MLPP and other legislated goals and requirements in the MLPA, MLMA, and MMAIA. See Table 6 for a summary of roles in MPA management, which together aim to meet the goals and objectives of the MLPA.

### 3.1 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

Building public awareness through outreach, education, communication, and interpretation efforts (collectively referred to as outreach) is an important component of an effective MLPP. Outreach has been identified as an activity that should be carried out at several levels even when other management activities (e.g., monitoring) are not yet fully implemented. Effective outreach efforts designed to inform potential user groups of MPA regulations and management requirements can have a direct bearing on MPA effectiveness. Increased compliance by an informed public that adheres to specific take regulations allows for MPAs to function in the manner they were designed.

---

<sup>86</sup> FGC §2853(b)(6)

Table 6. Overview of MPA Management Responsibilities and Roles to Support the MLPP

Responsibility	Role	Description
<b>Enforcement</b>	Enforcement of Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure adequate enforcement of MPA regulations to increase compliance</li> <li>• Statutory authority to administer and enforce MPA regulations</li> <li>• Support the Commission through implementation of regulations</li> <li>• Conduct searches, inspections, and has citation authority</li> </ul>
<b>Identification of Long-Term Funding Sources</b>	Secure Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to support the pursuit of long-term funding to adequately support MPA management activities into the future</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring, Research, and Evaluation</b>	MPA Monitoring Planning, Reporting, and Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adhere to processes for MPA review and adaptive management, which are inherently linked to monitoring activities (see Chapter 4)</li> <li>• Continue to advance and provide oversight on all aspects of MPA monitoring, research, assessment/evaluation, and reporting to inform adaptive management</li> <li>• Support the Commission by reporting results of research and monitoring</li> <li>• Actively explore how MPAs may be incorporated into fisheries management</li> </ul>
<b>Partnership Coordination</b>	Build and Participate in Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to work with the MSLT and explore potential new partnerships throughout the state</li> <li>• Collaborate with State Parks to manage marine parks and MPAs that are offshore of existing coastal State Park units</li> <li>• Engage in other partnership platforms, such as Collaboratives and/or the Collaborative Network</li> </ul>
	Integration with Management Efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively communicate with other agencies on how MPAs may be incorporated into other management efforts</li> </ul>
<b>Outreach and Education</b>	Guidelines and Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to work with partners throughout the state to build public awareness and understanding of California's MPA network through outreach, education, communication, and interpretation activities</li> <li>• Set guidelines for outreach materials (e.g., color scheme, messages, etc.)</li> <li>• Improve compliance through education and outreach materials</li> </ul>
<b>Permitting</b>	Scientific Collection Permitting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain a decision framework for issuing SCPs within MPAs</li> </ul>
<b>Regulation, Policy, and Decision-Making</b>	Regulatory Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide advice and information to the Commission to help inform management decisions</li> <li>• Make recommendations on management decisions</li> <li>• Develop rulemaking packages and scoping through the Administrative Procedure Act and Office of Administrative Law</li> <li>• Primary statutory authority for recommending designation of and managing MPAs</li> </ul>

A significant amount of outreach has been accomplished to date by CDFW and partners that include many of the components described in this section. Numerous regulatory guidebooks and brochures have been created and distributed to the public in printed and electronic form throughout the state. Informational kiosks, developed through a collaborative process with agencies and partners, are located in various ports and provide location specific information. A statewide signage project was completed by the MLPP and partners providing interpretive information on MPAs. In addition, no fishing signs were placed near SMRs. Partners and agencies have developed numerous posters, blogs, and videos to help disseminate information to the public about MPAs. CDFW and State Parks have also developed an MPA focused curriculum to incorporate into the Parks Online Resources for Teachers and Students (PORTS) program. To date more than 8,000 students have viewed this module.

While much has been accomplished, there is more to be done. The fundamental tools identified below include: a statewide outreach strategy with regional components, a CDFW guide to developing outreach materials, and staff support for the coordination and review of products developed by outreach participants. Together, they provide a consistent structure and approach to the development and implementation of MPA outreach materials statewide. This enables all levels of government (federal, state, Tribal, and local), the private sector, NGOs, communities, educators, and stakeholders to work together to provide reliable, efficient, and appropriately focused MPA information to the public. This section describes CDFW's responsibilities regarding MPA outreach and actions the MLPP could take to implement effective outreach.

## Outreach Priorities

CDFW, through the MLPP, has the responsibility to provide MPA regulations to the public. Recognizing this responsibility, CDFW's outreach goals are to: increase MPA awareness and understanding, facilitate MPA regulatory compliance, support enforcement, and encourage informed enjoyment and stewardship of MPAs while decreasing unintentional violations. In order to meet these goals, an approach focused on informing users of regulations is CDFW's core function. In this approach to outreach, the initial focus of providing user groups the basic knowledge needed to understand and enjoy MPAs (e.g., locations, boundaries, allowed uses) is an effective measure. It is expected that this approach will support the long-term positive effects of the MPA network, as over time there will be greater voluntary compliance with MPA take regulations.

Additional outreach efforts developed at a more interpretive level, which focus on closely related marine issues and how they interact with and relate to MPAs, would serve to supplement initial regulatory-based outreach efforts. This would allow for a layered outreach approach that uses a variety of actions designed to further increase public understanding and encourage acceptance, while providing incentive for shared stewardship commitments that go beyond the requirements of the law. For achieving its effective outreach and compliance-building goals, the MLPP have prioritized the following actions:

- **Broadly and collaboratively disseminate information:** Continue to distribute information/products to the public through agencies, ocean-related organizations and businesses, and local citizen groups, to improve public understanding of regulations
- **Develop statewide, regional, and local-scale outreach projects:** Statewide and regional outreach efforts can support individual outreach projects by providing information on MPA locations, allowed uses, and benefits; providing localized input on individual MPA signs, panels, and brochures; and helping bring attention to individual

MPA habitats and living marine resources, conservation objectives, and rules intended to achieve them

- **Encourage community involvement:** Community involvement can help foster compliance, especially when working directly with CDFW enforcement and outreach staff; guidance regarding community and citizen actions can be provided to support effective involvement and accurate messaging in materials development
- **Provide targeted outreach:** Conduct directed outreach as needs arise, adapted to address special compliance and enforcement concerns and address public misconceptions; employ a combination of traditional methods and newer technologies to reach a diversity of audiences
- **Focus interpretive outreach on the purpose of MPAs:** Focus additional outreach efforts on raising understanding about the conservation goals and values identified in the law, the role of MPAs as a tool for effective resource management, and the rationale and objectives for individual MPAs, and raise awareness about the particular habitats and/or species found within the specific location

## Approach to MPA Outreach

To achieve the goal of the MLPA to “ensure that the state’s MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network,”<sup>87</sup> a statewide MPA outreach strategy should be developed to:

- Identify overarching outreach goals, strategies, general priorities, and standards to apply statewide
- Identify the role of partners and CDFW in outreach and education activities
- Guide the development of regional outreach, interpretation, and education plans that implement the statewide strategy at the regional scale in a manner that supports statewide consistency and coherency.
- Develop regionally-specific outreach plans

Regionally-specific outreach plans for implementing the statewide outreach strategy should be developed as components of Regional MPA Background and Priorities document. Each regional outreach plan may:

- Consider the unique outreach needs of the region and identify appropriate regional approaches
- Identify existing regional programs and assets
- Identify information gaps, priorities, and prospective strategies to fill gaps
- Identify potential partners in the region with specific outreach expertise and capacity

## Coordination of Outreach Efforts

Effective regional collaboration and coordination among outreach participants has been found to be helpful for sharing information and experiences, identifying common priorities, and finding

---

<sup>87</sup> FGC §2853[b][6]

collaborative solutions.<sup>88</sup> Therefore, a comprehensive MPA outreach program will utilize CDFW and other MLPP partner resources and build effective outreach partnerships. Directed partner contributions can assist and supplement existing outreach activities, leverage skills, expand resources and expertise beyond those of CDFW, and help to reach new target audiences (see the Partnership Plan for more information).

However, in order for materials developed by outreach participants to effectively serve the public and supplement CDFW efforts, they should adhere to specific product standards and be developed in coordination with CDFW. Product standards developed by CDFW and provided to outreach participants through written and verbal guidance along with a defined product review process will help to ensure accurate messaging, increase regulatory compliance, and ensure the use of biologically accurate information regardless of who developed the product. An MPA outreach program should be established with this in mind and work to provide a central point for coordination of, and responsibility for, activities associated with MPA outreach and its oversight at all levels. This will include the following core actions:

- **Establish structure and procedures for coordination:** Identify processes and associated procedures that facilitate coordination and cooperation between MLPP and other partners
- **Develop outreach standards:** Develop standards including protocols for outreach information and signage to achieve reliable outcomes both internally and from partners
- **Provide written outreach and partners guide:** Issue outreach standards and guidance in written format as a “Partners Guide.” Provide an additional review process to augment the written guide
- **Conduct outreach product oversight and review:** Provide individual guidance, input, and product review where possible, to ensure that partner outreach products are delivered to the public consistent with laws, regulations, policies, standards, and best practices

## 3.2 ENFORCEMENT

The MLPA identified enforcement as one of the chief deficiencies in California’s previously existing MPAs. Therefore, the MLPA emphasizes the importance of adequate enforcement as a goal of the MLPP<sup>89</sup> and the inclusion of enforcement measures for all MPAs,<sup>90</sup> and that the Master Plan includes recommendations for improving enforcement. This section describes enforcement objectives for the MPA network and, because CDFW is the primary agency responsible for MPA enforcement, describes CDFW’s responsibilities for ongoing MPA enforcement.

---

<sup>88</sup> National Marine Protected Area Center. (2014). *Updated Framework for the National System of Marine Protected Areas of the United States*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://marineprotectedareas.noaa.gov/pdf/national-system/framework-mpa-oct14.pdf>

<sup>89</sup> FGC 2853(b)(5)

<sup>90</sup> FGC 2853(c)(2)

## Enforcement Plan Objectives

Because the main objective of an MPA enforcement plan is to ensure compliance with regulations, CDFW views outreach and education as a primary tool to support enforcement (see Chapter 3.1). Effective outreach and education of MPA regulations, including MPA boundaries, and the potential benefits of MPAs, builds understanding and buy-in for MPAs and leads people to follow regulations voluntarily, thereby helping alleviate demand on marine resources. In addition to these front-end efforts through outreach and education, compliance is enhanced through on-the-water enforcement efforts such as visible and consistent patrols. Given current CDFW resources, additional enforcement personnel and assets will be needed to effectively enforce the entire MPA network. Increased use of cooperative agreements with other agencies may be a partial solution, but additional funding for enforcement will also be necessary.

### Box 3. Priority Area Identification

Enforcement priorities are developed based on the potential for resource impact, level of use, and potential for violations. High priority areas include habitats that are particularly vulnerable to damage, areas with high aggregations of critical species or species at low abundance, and areas where violations are likely to occur or have occurred at high rates in the past.

Within the primary objective of ensuring compliance with regulations, the objectives of the enforcement plan is comprised of the following categories:

#### Operational Ability

- Identify areas of high priority, biological sensitivity, or enforcement need (see Box 3)
- Determine MPA network enforcement needs
- Hire additional enforcement officers
- Evaluate potential remote observation technology and techniques

#### Cooperative Efforts

- Maintain and enhance cooperative enforcement efforts with allied agencies
- Effectively utilize judicial system resources
- Develop a standardized training program
- Seek and support ongoing and enhanced MOUs

#### Public Awareness, Outreach, and Education

- Establish an MPA outreach program (see Chapter 3.1)
- Develop outreach materials for enforcement staff to distribute
- Develop standardized signage protocols
- Establish an education advisory board
- Hold public forums to educate specific groups

## CDFW Enforcement Responsibilities

CDFW's enforcement staff is charged with enforcing marine resource management laws and regulations over an area encompassing approximately 1,100 miles of coastline out to three nautical miles, resulting in 5,280 square miles of state waters. To do so, CDFW will emphasize patrol of areas of particular concern or at particular risk (see Box 3 above) and use advanced technology and surveillance systems, to the extent practicable, as called for in the MLPA.

In addition to enforcing MPA laws in state waters, CDFW staff also provide enforcement of federal laws and regulations within state waters as well as federal waters, which extend from three to 200 nautical miles out to sea (the US Exclusive Economic Zone). Enforcement duties include all commercial and sport fishing statutes and regulations, all California Fish and Game Code (FGC) and Title 14, CCR, respectively, marine water pollution incidents, homeland security, and general public safety. General fishing regulations and other restrictions apply within MPAs in addition to MPA-specific restrictions.

CDFW shares jurisdiction for federal regulations including the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and the Lacey Act. A significant portion of both commercial and recreational fishing effort, and subsequently CDFW enforcement effort, occurs in federal waters. Therefore, the existing patrol effort beyond state waters and outside MPAs is important to consider in the plan. How effectively state and federal regulations are enforced within and around the MPAs will affect the MPAs' effect on conserving and protecting marine resources.

Given CDFW's other broad mandates to enforce both state and federal marine resource regulations, current assets are not adequate to redirect to MPA-specific patrols.<sup>91</sup> The increased focus on MPAs suggested by the MLPA and the comprehensive network the act mandates will necessitate not only a detailed enforcement plan, but additional enforcement assets as well (see Appendices C-F, Section 6).

### 3.3 REGIONAL MPA BACKGROUND AND PRIORITIES DOCUMENTS

The 2015 Master Plan focuses on statewide guidance relative to MPA management, and emphasizes the importance of an adaptive and evolving approach to management. In recognition of the science-based and stakeholder driven MPA design and siting processes that led to the completion of California's statewide MPA network (see Appendix A), Regional MPA Background and Priorities documents are included as appendices to the 2015 Master Plan to include region-specific MPA design considerations and priorities moving forward; which together provide important context to base future informed statewide MPA management decisions upon. In the 2008 Master Plan, previous iterations of these documents, then called "regional management plans," were contained in a single appendix.<sup>92</sup> The updated regional MPA Background and Priorities documents include unique regional features and design considerations, regional goals and objectives, summaries of regional MPAs, and regional plans

<sup>91</sup> Detailed information about existing enforcement assets and personnel can be found in Section 6 of each regional MPA Background and Priorities document

<sup>92</sup> CDFW. (2008). *Draft Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas. Appendix O, page O-6*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Master-Plan>

for scientific and enforcement considerations moving forward (Table 7). Regional MPA Background and Priorities documents are not meant to contain specific details for management protocols and methodologies; they instead are intended to be living documents that are readily accessible for reference and adaptive management, and serve as a logical starting place for guiding regionally-based activities. While MPAs are actively managed at the local and regional scales, the MLPP will always consider management from the perspective of the statewide network as a whole, informed by lessons and best practices from finer scales across the state. All regional MPA Background and Priorities documents have a standardized structure and are included as separate appendices, recognizing the varying ecological, social, and economic conditions along California’s coast (see Appendices C-F).

*Table 7. Overview of Regional MPA Background and Priorities Documents’ Standardized Structure*

<b>Section</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	Describes the role of Regional MPA Background and Priorities documents and their relationship to the Master Plan, and provides a brief overview of the information they contain
<b>Description of Region</b>	Provides a description of information unique to the region that is relevant to MPA management
<b>Considerations for Designing Regional MPAs</b>	Describes region-specific goals and objectives, stakeholder priorities and objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations
<b>Summary of Regional MPAs</b>	Summarizes MPAs in the region, including information on area, along-shore span, depth, primary habitat types, regulations, boundaries, a summary of objectives, detailed objectives, and a map depicting the location
<b>Scientific Information</b>	Describes scientific information relevant to regional MPA management, including information on the regional monitoring plan, with links to the specific baseline and long-term monitoring plans, and a description of and link to a list of species most likely to benefit from MPA protection, which may inform monitoring and evaluation of MPA effectiveness
<b>Enforcement Plan</b>	Includes information pertaining to enforcement challenges and opportunities specific to each MPA, an inventory of personnel and equipment, and current and potential enforcement partnerships

### 3.4 ALIGNING MPAs AND OTHER MARINE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EFFORTS

The MLPP is coordinating to connect MPA science and management with other efforts and activities, such as fisheries, water quality, climate change, and other management efforts as they emerge. As such, collaborative efforts will be crucial for taking an ecosystem-based approach to management, in which managers recognize the numerous interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, instead of focusing on a specific issue, species, or ecosystem service (Christensen et al. 1996). Furthermore, coordination will be essential for planning and carrying out an effective approach to adaptive management.

While CDFW and the Commission retain jurisdiction over the management and take of species within state waters, including within MPAs, the MLPA cannot supersede otherwise lawful activities that are not within the authority of the Commission to regulate.<sup>93</sup> Regulatory agencies should take into consideration the existence of MPAs in their review of the environmental

<sup>93</sup> FGC §2852(d)

impacts of authorizing a given activity. CDFW may also coordinate with non-regulatory entities such as the OPC and other key partners.

The effort to align MPA management with other marine resource management efforts is largely unprecedented and therefore experimental in nature (see Fox et al. 2013b; Appendix A, Section 3.3: *MPA Design and Management Considerations*). This section shares an overview of how the MLPP is aligning or could align with management of fisheries, water quality, climate change, marine debris, invasive species, which are among some of the most pressing areas for management (Halpern et al. 2009). In addition, this section shares brief summaries of other current and emerging efforts.

## Fisheries Management

Overall, while the MLPA calls for by-in-large ecosystem protection,<sup>94</sup> it also envisions integration of MPAs and fishery management.<sup>95</sup> The MLPA states that “MPAs and sound fishery management are complementary components of a comprehensive effort to sustain marine habitats and fisheries”<sup>96</sup> and requires that MPA management be carried out “with the advice, assistance, and involvement of participants in the various fisheries.” For example, MPAs can serve as an effective conservation and recovery tool for species at risk, vulnerable species, and species with the greatest conservation need by providing protections for essential fisheries habitat and ecosystems. This connection is further reinforced in California’s 2015 State Wildlife Action Plan, which includes linking MPA monitoring as a component of its Data Collection and Analysis conservation strategy.<sup>97</sup> Efforts have been made to align MPAs with fisheries management. For example, CDFW convened a 2011 workshop focused on MPA and fisheries integration<sup>98</sup> to share information and ideas, and OST and CDFW have developed options to better align fisheries monitoring and MPA monitoring through the development of regional MPA monitoring plans.<sup>99,100,101</sup> The MLMA Master Plan for Fisheries is slated to undergo revision by 2017, and represents an opportunity to build upon existing efforts to integrate MPAs and fisheries management.<sup>102</sup>

## Water Quality

Water quality is closely tied to the health of California’s coastal ecosystems, including within MPAs. Point-source and non-point source pollution lead to harmful algal blooms, human health issues, heavy metal sedimentation, and beach closures, which can have impacts on local

---

<sup>94</sup> FGC §2853(b)(1)

<sup>95</sup> FGC §2851(d). See also FGC 7059(a)(3).

<sup>96</sup> FGC §2850-2863

<sup>97</sup> CDFW. (2015). *State Wildlife Action Plan*. Draft Retrieved Sept 24, 2015 from <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/SWAP>

<sup>98</sup> Wertz, S., D. Aseltine-Neilson, T. Barnes, J. Vasques, S. Ashcraft, K. Barsky, A. Frimodig, M. Key, T. Mason, and B. Ota. (2011). *Proceedings of the Marine Protected Areas and Fisheries Integration Workshop*. Retrieved Aug 7, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=42306&inline=true>

<sup>99</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2010). *North Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan. Appendix A-1: Possible Supplemental Fisheries Monitoring Module*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/ncc\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_and\\_appendices.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/ncc_monitoring_plan_and_appendices.pdf)

<sup>100</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2011). *South Coast MPA Monitoring Plan. Appendix A-1: Supplemental Fisheries Monitoring Module*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/sc\\_mpa\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_full.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/sc_mpa_monitoring_plan_full.pdf)

<sup>101</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2014). *Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan. Appendix A: Integrating Fisheries Monitoring and MPA Monitoring*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/central\\_coast\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_final\\_october2014.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/central_coast_monitoring_plan_final_october2014.pdf)

<sup>102</sup> FGC §2851(d); see also FGC §7059(a)(3)

coastal economies (Abraham & Parker 2000; Bay et al. 2003; Anderson et al. 2002; He & He 2008). Aquaculture effluent, once-through cooling from power plants, and brine run-off from desalination plants can also impact water quality.<sup>103</sup> To reduce negative impacts on water quality,<sup>104</sup> the SWRCB, which is named as a managing agency in the MMAIA, sited and implemented State Water Quality Protection Areas (SWQPAs) along the California coast, with the purpose of supporting biodiversity and unique species. These areas include areas of special biological significance and general protection areas (SWQPA-GP), with SWQPA-GPs being designated specifically to protect water quality within MPAs. In addition, SWRCB amended their California Ocean Plan in 2012 to address the designation of new SWQPAs and MPAs.<sup>105</sup> The regional MPA monitoring plans developed by OST, in partnership with CDFW, include guidance for monitoring of species that are sensitive to water quality and encourage partnerships with existing water quality monitoring programs that maintain and gather water quality data.

## Climate Change

MPAs are also linked to marine management efforts related to climate change. CDFW recognizes the effects that climate change has on marine resources<sup>106</sup> and partners on numerous climate change-related projects and issues such as hypoxia, ocean acidification, and the State Wildlife Action Plan process. Although the MLPA does not require consideration of climate change in MPA management, the MLPP recognizes that climate change will likely have an effect on MPAs. At the same time, California's MPAs could potentially help buffer California's living marine resources against the negative impacts of climate change by providing areas of reduced pressures exerted on the resources (Micheli et al. 2012). Furthermore, MPAs can act as "living laboratories" to help scientists and decision-makers understand differences in ecosystem responses to climate change both within and outside MPAs. The MLPP is building partnerships with groups that have aligned and complementary expertise and missions regarding the impacts of climate change on California's MPAs in order to ensure coordination and reduce duplication of effort.

## Marine Debris

Marine debris can lead to mortality of marine life through ingestion, entanglement, and ecosystem alteration.<sup>107</sup> CDFW's Office of Spill Prevention and Response maintains a Marine Wildlife Veterinary Care and Research unit that conducts opportunistic research on marine debris' impacts on marine life and is coordinating with CDFW staff to link MPA and marine debris monitoring (Rosevelt et al. 2013). Additional collaborations to address the impact of marine debris are also occurring with organizations including the University of California Davis, OPC, the SCC, the Northwest Straits Commission, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Marine Debris Program. In addition, beach clean-up programs such as the Coastal Clean-up Day managed by the CCC, while offering only temporary alleviation from marine debris, can help to reduce entry of land- and ocean-based marine debris into the

<sup>103</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency. *Ocean Standards: Desalination Facilities and Brine Disposal*. 25 Feb 2015. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/ocean/desalination/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/desalination/)

<sup>104</sup> California Law. *California Water Code*. Division 7: Water Quality. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=wat&codebody=&hits=20>

<sup>105</sup> SWRCB. (2012). *Water Quality Control Plan – Ocean Waters of California – California Ocean Plan*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/ocean/docs/cop2012.pdf](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/docs/cop2012.pdf)

<sup>106</sup> CDFW. *Unity – Integration – Action: CDFW's Approach to Confronting Climate Change*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/Climate\\_and\\_Energy/Climate\\_Change/](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/Climate_and_Energy/Climate_Change/)

<sup>107</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency. *Marine Debris Impacts*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://water.epa.gov/type/oceb/marinedebris/md\\_impacts.cfm](http://water.epa.gov/type/oceb/marinedebris/md_impacts.cfm)

oceans. Current research and monitoring of marine debris may help document the extent to which marine debris impacts MPAs and can help to inform efforts to reduce marine debris within or adjacent to MPAs.

## Invasive Species

The impact of aquatic invasive species is not widely understood, especially related to MPAs. MPAs could be effective tools for limiting the spread of invasive species and providing safe harbors for native marine species within their boundaries (Francour et al. 2010). However, there is also some research indicating that invasive species thrive in MPAs, which could thereby undermine the MPAs' integrity (Otero et al. 2013). The MLPP will work to identify opportunities to link MPAs and aquatic invasive species management, both internally and with other agencies responsible for managing invasive species, such as the SLC. In addition, OSPR's Marine Invasive Species Program (MISP) conducts biological monitoring in coastal and estuarine waters to determine the level of invasion by non-native species and works to coordinate with the SLC. CDFW Marine Region staff will work to integrate MPA considerations into future biological monitoring by MISP and help to detect new introductions that may impact MPAs.

## Other Marine Management Efforts

In addition to fisheries, water quality, climate change, marine debris, and invasive species, the MLPP may take into consideration the relative impacts of other activities occurring in MPAs when managing the MPA network. This section briefly describes marine management efforts related to these other activities.

- **Non-extractive Uses:** While MPAs can provide opportunities and enhance non-extractive uses of MPAs, such as scuba diving or boating, these uses should be effectively managed to avoid negative impacts caused by overuse beyond the carrying capacity of an MPAs. The MLPP is aware of the potential impact of these uses and will be available to coordinate management of non-extractive uses in MPAs in a way that is consistent with the goals, objectives, and regulations of each individual MPA. Furthermore, the MLPP will take lessons from individual cases and apply them to other sites and the broad network.
- **Oil and Gas Drilling and Transport:** There are currently federal and state moratoriums or bans on leasing of offshore areas for oil and gas mining activities.<sup>108,109</sup> However, offshore oil drilling in federal and state waters on existing leases and gas extraction, including hydraulic fracturing, are occurring in federal waters. Therefore, it is important to consider that potential risks from oil or chemical spills could impact MPAs if they were to occur. CDFW is not responsible for managing these operations, but routinely communicates and trains with other agencies, including the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management, SLC, CCC, and the US Coast Guard to ensure that oil spill prevention and response plans consider catastrophic impacts to MPAs.

---

<sup>108</sup> PRC §6870 - 6879

<sup>109</sup> Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management. (2012). *Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program Final Programmatic EIS*. United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from

[http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Oil\\_and\\_Gas\\_Energy\\_Program/Leasing/Five\\_Year\\_Program/2012-2017\\_Five\\_Year\\_Program/01\\_Introduction\\_Purpose\\_Need.pdf](http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Oil_and_Gas_Energy_Program/Leasing/Five_Year_Program/2012-2017_Five_Year_Program/01_Introduction_Purpose_Need.pdf)

- **Hydrokinetic Power Projects:** California currently has no hydrokinetic power projects, although a past project proposed near Point Cabrillo SMR by Pacific Gas and Electric Company was denied by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.<sup>110</sup>
- **Military Exercises (including Naval Sonar):** MMA classifications may not be inconsistent with US military activities deemed mission critical by the US Military (See Appendix A, Section 3.3: *MPA Design and Management Considerations*; Appendix F, Section 3.3; and Fox et al. 2013b).<sup>111,112</sup>
- **Other Forms of Acoustic Pollution:** Regulatory agencies and commissions, such as the CCC, have the authority to protect and oversee coastal uses that may impact MPAs, including seismic imaging for various uses (e.g., oil and gas exploration). The CCC is now beginning to consider the impacts of acoustic pollution on MPAs in their decision-making. For example, the CCC rejected a permit application requesting use of seismic air guns in central California due to potential “damage to marine protected areas.”<sup>113</sup> CDFW and the Commission provided consultation on this ruling by raising concerns that there could be impacts on four MPAs within or adjacent to the proposed survey area, based on the project as proposed.<sup>114</sup>

The MLPP will continue to work to determine if and how to link MPA management to these growing or emerging management themes in the future.

---

<sup>110</sup> Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2012). *Order Denying Preliminary Permit Application July 19, 2012*.

Retrieved Sept 22, 2015 from [http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file\\_list.asp?document\\_id=14039276](http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/file_list.asp?document_id=14039276)

<sup>111</sup> PRC §36711

<sup>112</sup> FGC §2863

<sup>113</sup> Dettmer, A. (2012). *Addendum to Staff Report for CDP Application E-12-005 and Consistency Certification CC-027-12, Pacific Gas & Electric Company*. California Coastal Commission. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/11/W13b-11-2012.pdf>

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

# CHAPTER 4

## Adaptive Management

---

The MLPP is coordinating with partners to develop a process of adaptive management for California's MPA network that helps evaluate whether the MPA network is making progress toward achieving the six goals of the MLPA. This section describes the purpose and objectives of adaptive management of the MLPP; monitoring, research, and development that is used to inform adaptive management; and the process used to carry out adaptive management.

### 4.1 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE MLPP

Adaptive management, as defined by the MLPA, is a process that seeks to improve management by learning from program actions such as monitoring and evaluation of ecosystem, and management effectiveness (see Box 4). Based on this definition, the MLPP will follow a process for adaptive management of California's MPA network.

#### Box 4. MLPA Definition of Adaptive Management

The MLPA describes adaptive management as:

“Adaptive management,” with regard to marine protected areas, means a *management policy that seeks to improve management of biological resources, particularly in areas of scientific uncertainty, by viewing program actions as tools for learning. Actions shall be designed so that, even if they fail, they will provide useful information for future actions, and monitoring and evaluation shall be emphasized so that the interaction of different elements within marine systems may be better understood* (FGC 2852[a]).

CDFW already carries out many activities that fit under the umbrella of adaptive management. For example, in 2014, CDFW proposed and the Commission adopted amendments to clarify complex regulations to improve compliance and enforceability.<sup>115</sup> Soon thereafter, in 2015, CDFW drafted amendments to improve boundary accuracy and clarify regulatory language to improve network compliance and enforceability. In the near future, regulatory amendments may also be drafted to address existing and emerging management issues with the network, such as extending Tribal take allowances within MPAs in all the regions.<sup>116</sup> As with any new program, especially of the magnitude of California's MPA network, ongoing regulatory adjustments to align MPAs with their original intent or to address management or enforcement concerns may be warranted. Collaborative MPA management, guided in part by the Partnership Plan, will support additional partnership-based adaptive management efforts into the future. The adaptive management process (outlined in Chapter 4.5 below) below will provide a framework for implementing future adaptive management measures.

---

<sup>115</sup> California Fish and Game Commission. (2014). *Marine Protected Areas Clean Up*. Approved regulatory language: <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2014/632fregs.pdf>

<sup>116</sup> CCR, Title 14, Section 632(a)(11) and (b)(1-2, 6, 8-9, 15-16, 20-21, 25, 27)

## Purpose of Adaptive Management

The MLPP recognizes that adaptive management can be appropriate in cases where there is uncertainty about the impacts of management actions<sup>117</sup> or about the costs and benefits of collecting different types of data and information, as in the case of California's MPAs. Adaptive management can also serve an important role in resource management by providing a framework for responsive change in management measures based on current or emerging stressors. Importantly, the MLPP also views adaptive management as a mechanism for sharing information about the effectiveness of the MPA network in reaching its goals not only with agencies, but also with Californians at large.

## Ten-Year Formal MPA Management Reviews

To inform the adaptive management process (see Chapter 4.5), there is the need for a formal review cycle of California's MPA network on a time scale that is both biologically appropriate, and administratively feasible and cost effective. Furthermore, the MLPA requires California's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network.<sup>118</sup> Significant efforts were made to ensure California's MPAs were designed to function as an ecologically connected statewide network (see Appendix A, Boxes 1-3), through four incremental science-based and stakeholder driven regional MPA planning processes resulting in the staggered adoption of MPAs across the state; the Central Coast MPAs in September 2007, North Central Coast MPAs in May 2010, South Coast MPAs in January 2012, and North Coast MPAs in December 2012 (see Chapter 2.2 and Appendix A). Prior to the completion of the statewide MPA network in 2012, the 2008 Master Plan recommended comprehensive reviews of monitoring results to the Commission every five years for each of the four regional MPA networks, in addition to annual reporting on monitoring results, and triennial MPA petition hearings scheduled by the Commission.<sup>119</sup> However, based on the best readily available science and lessons drawn from regional MPA implementation, an ongoing five-year MPA review cycle for incrementally adopted MPAs across four regions is not biologically appropriate or administratively sustainable. The MLPP has therefore set a 10-year cycle of formal management reviews for the statewide MPA network, and is leading the design of a statewide MPA monitoring program, which includes and draws from regional components, to gather sufficient information to evaluate network efficacy and inform the formal 10-year MPA management review (see Chapter 4.3).

The timeframe for the 10-year review is more biologically appropriate, drawing from scientific empirical research and theoretical modeling demonstrating that variables such as biomass, species density, species richness, and size of marine organisms increase with time in no-take reserves (Lester et al. 2009, McCook et al. 2010, Caselle et al. 2015), but may not be realized or easily detected on short timeframes (Babcock et al. 2010, Moffitt et al. 2013, White et al. 2013). This is particularly true in highly dynamic temperate ecosystems such as the California Current and for species such as rockfishes that are long-lived, slow growing, and late to mature (Botsford et al. 2014, Starr et al. 2015). For example, monitoring fish biomass on nearshore rocky reefs in the northern Channel Islands MPAs over the first five years of implementation did

---

<sup>117</sup> Ballard, A., Birss, H., Botta, R., Cantrell, S., Gonzales, A., Johnson, B., Spautz, H., Torres, S., & Yamamoto, J. (2014). *Incorporation of Adaptive Management into Conservation Planning and Resource Management*. Retrieved Mar 4, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=86989&inline=1>

<sup>118</sup> FGC §2853(b)(6)

<sup>119</sup> FGC §2861(a)

not allow enough time to observe dramatic changes,<sup>120</sup> but after 10 years, Caselle et al. (2015) demonstrated that the biomass of target fish species increased consistently inside MPAs. However, monitoring nearshore fishes in Central Coast MPAs over seven years, Starr et al. (2015) determined that 20 years or more may be needed to detect significant changes due to MPA implementation. The timing (i.e., short or long response times), direction (i.e., increase, decrease, or no change), and magnitude of these changes to MPA implementation depends on factors such as MPA age (number of years implemented), size, geography (i.e., whether an MPA is located in southern California versus northern California), and degree of protection (i.e., no-take or limited take), the life history characteristics of target species (i.e., age of maturity, movement, natural mortality rate, lifespan, and larval dispersal pattern), habitat, fishing intensity outside MPAs, and other environmental factors such as complex oceanographic patterns or other indirect effects (Babcock et al. 2010, White & Rogers-Bennet 2010, Carr et al. 2011, White et al. 2011, Moffitt et al. 2013; Botsford et al. 2014, Baskett & Barnett 2015, Caselle et al. 2015, Starr et al. 2015, Young & Carr 2015). These interdependent factors may cause difficulty interpreting monitoring data on short timeframes; for example, fished species may slowly increase, decrease, or oscillate immediately after MPA implementation, even when the long-term trajectory would include an increase in abundance (White et al. 2013). In summary, both empirical evidence from California and theoretical modeling affirm the need for long-term monitoring to detect changes that are attributable to MPAs and an appropriately long timeframe, such as every 10 years, for a management review cycle. Monitoring and the ability to detect and adapt to ecological changes is key to track progress and determine whether changes in management are warranted (Lubchenco & Grorud-Colvert 2015, Schindler & Hilborn 2015). Management adjustments should be made with caution to allow sufficient time to effectively evaluate MPA effects before adjustments are made (Gleason et al. 2013, Moffitt et al. 2013).

The formal 10-year management review will emphasize ecological, socioeconomic, and governance aspects of the network and may include, but not be limited to, a scientific evaluation, public scoping meetings, and panel discussions to determine the status, function, and possible changes to the network. The scientific evaluations that inform the formal 10-year management review will encompass multiple elements, including a scientific assessment of ecological and socioeconomic MPA monitoring results (see Chapter 4.3), together with other data streams such as MPA enforcement data. Based on the 10-year reviews, the Commission may take adaptive management actions if data and information support a change. During the adaptive management cycle, the MLPP may also refine and adjust management tools, measures, and strategies based on the management review and progress made toward achieving the specified objectives. Management tools, measures, and strategies fall into three primary categories: 1) MPA Design, including size and spacing; 2) MPA Access, including permitting, take in relevant MPA types, and use; 3) Enforcement; and, 4) Outreach and Education.

## 4.2 MLPP MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

The six goals of the MLPA are inextricably connected and provide guidance for developing management objectives to determine how the MLPP is performing and, ultimately, if the mandates of the MLPA are being met. The MLPA goals recognize the intrinsic value of marine

<sup>120</sup> CDFW, PISCO, CINMS, and Channel Islands National Park. (2008). *Channel Islands Marine Protected Areas First 5 Years of Monitoring: 2003-2008*. Airamé, S. and J. Ugoretz (Eds.). 20 pp. Retrieved Aug 7, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=31325&inline=true>

natural heritage for all Californians, including Tribes and Tribal governments, and establishing objectives helps take steps towards protecting these places of importance. This section outlines management objectives to effectively and adaptively manage the MLPP, which includes California's MPA network as well as all state MPA governance and management mechanisms and institutions (for information about the management activities to support the MLPP, see Table 6). Management objectives provide guidance to the MLPP and increase partner and public understanding of MPA management priorities.

These management objectives are not intended to be comprehensive, nor specific to each of the six goals of the MLPA, but rather to address the goals holistically, inform the design of the statewide monitoring program, and enable the evaluation of MPA network performance towards meeting the goals of the MLPA. Some objectives speak to the MLPA goals at a high level, while others focus on management tools, measures, and strategies available to support and advance the MLPP. Furthermore, the MLPP management objectives may change during the ongoing adaptive management cycle (see Chapter 4.5). The MLPP will also need to evaluate the objectives in the context of changing ocean conditions and multiple ocean threats, such as climate change, fishing pressure, water quality degradation, marine debris, invasive species, and other existing and emerging issues. As traditional understanding and the components of ecosystem structure (i.e. species and functional groupings) and function (i.e. ecological interactions) may change significantly in the future. Evaluating the effectiveness of the MPA network at achieving the management objectives will need to account for this reality.

Below are the management objectives that the MLPP will address to effectively manage California's MPA network and provide management recommendations to the Commission for the formal 10-year management review, as a part of the adaptive management cycle.

#### MLPP Management Objectives:

- Protect the structure and function of marine ecosystems
- Improve native marine life populations, including those of economic value
- Ensure minimal disturbance while allowing for sustainable opportunities for recreation, education and research
- Ensure comprehensive representation of all key habitats, including unique habitats
- Use learning acquired through administration of the MLPP to adaptively manage the objectives, management measures, enforcement efforts, and scientific guidelines to inform management decisions
- MPAs and the MLPP function as a cohesive statewide network

### 4.3 STATEWIDE MONITORING PROGRAM

Knowledge about the efficacy of MPA networks that cover a geographic scale as large as California is limited due to the limited empirical data from large-scale MPA networks (Gaines et al. 2010a, b; Grorud-Colvert et al. 2011, 2014). Therefore, California's MPA network offers a unique grounds for collecting data and information to learn about the effects of a large-scale MPA network and inform management (NOAA 2013). Based on scientific findings which suggest relatively long time scales for detecting the effects of MPAs, there is the need for long-term monitoring to gather sufficient information to evaluate network efficacy and inform adaptive management (see Chapter 4.1: *Ten-Year Formal MPA Management Reviews*).

This need is described in the MLPA, which requires “monitoring, research, and evaluation at selected sites to facilitate adaptive management of MPAs and ensure that the [MPA] system meets the goals.”<sup>121</sup> Therefore, monitoring results and additional information potentially collected from other scientific data, governance and management review, workshops, and public forums is an accumulation of information that could be used to inform adaptive management which is a response to that information (see Chapter 4.5). The MLPA, together with policy guidance including the Partnership Plan, have guided and will continue to guide the MPA monitoring approach outlined in this section, which will be used to inform adaptive management of California’s MPA network.

## Current Status of MPA Monitoring

CDFW partnered with OST to develop a scientifically rigorous statewide MPA monitoring framework relative to the goals of the MLPA, in the form of regional MPA monitoring plans.<sup>122</sup> Adopted by the Commission as an appendix to the MLPA Master Plan, this framework guides monitoring across the California’s MPA network through an ecosystem-based approach. With this approach, monitoring seeks to understand ecosystem condition and trends (including human uses), and to scientifically evaluate MPA design and management decisions. Figure 9 illustrates this high-level, statewide approach to MPA monitoring. Notably, although evaluation activities are distinct from monitoring, evaluation constitutes one of the core components of the monitoring framework, as illustrated in Figure 9. Furthermore, as described in the MLPP adaptive management process (see Chapter 4.5), research and development play important roles throughout the MPA monitoring framework (see Chapter 4.4).

To date, the statewide monitoring framework has been used primarily to guide baseline monitoring efforts and has served as the foundation for the development of regional monitoring plans and long-term monitoring needs. Moving forward, it will inform the process of building out a more detailed plan for statewide MPA network monitoring.

CDFW, OST, and OPC have taken significant steps towards establishing a long-term, statewide MPA monitoring program based on the statewide monitoring framework and the existing regional monitoring plans. Figure 10 below illustrates the timeline and milestones of baseline monitoring activities in each region and the first formal 10-year management review, anticipated to take place in 2022. Baseline monitoring will be followed by long-term monitoring in each region, and results from monitoring will inform the formal 10-year statewide management review.

Regional monitoring plans for the North Central Coast (2010), South Coast (2011), and Central Coast (2014) regions have been developed to provide guidance on implementation of both baseline and long-term monitoring.<sup>123</sup> The regional monitoring plans align with the statewide MPA monitoring framework while incorporating unique characteristics of each region.<sup>124,125,126,127</sup>

<sup>121</sup> FGC §2853(c)(3), §2852(a), and §2856(a)(2)(H)


<sup>122</sup> The North Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan was adopted by the Commission April 7, 2010, the South Coast MPA Monitoring Plan was adopted by the Commission on August 3, 2011, and the updated Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan was adopted by the Commission on October 8, 2014

<sup>123</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2010). *North Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/ncc\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_and\\_appendices.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/ncc_monitoring_plan_and_appendices.pdf)

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2014). *Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/central\\_coast\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_final\\_october2014.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/central_coast_monitoring_plan_final_october2014.pdf)

Figure 9. California's Statewide MPA Monitoring Framework<sup>128</sup>




Once MPAs are implemented in each planning region, baseline monitoring data is collected to inform a five-year management review of the baseline conditions, followed by a transition to long-term monitoring. At the time of development of this document, the Central Coast region is the only region to have completed its baseline data collection and five-year review of baseline conditions. Beginning in 2015, efforts are underway between OST, CDFW, and OPC to develop a Central Coast MPA Monitoring Workplan which will serve as the first example of an approach to long-term monitoring that can be adapted to other regions and scaled towards the entire state (see Chapter 4.3: *Long-Term Monitoring*).

<sup>126</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2011). *South Coast MPA Monitoring Plan*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/sc\\_mpa\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_full.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/sc_mpa_monitoring_plan_full.pdf)

<sup>127</sup> OST and CDFW anticipate developing a North Coast MPA Monitoring Plan by 2017 (see Appendix C, Section 5.2)

<sup>128</sup> MPA Monitoring Enterprise, OST. (2010). *North Central Coast MPA Monitoring Plan*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/ncc\\_monitoring\\_plan\\_and\\_appendices.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/regions/files/ncc_monitoring_plan_and_appendices.pdf)

Figure 10. Timeline for Baseline Regional Monitoring and Formal 10-Year Statewide MPA Management Review<sup>129</sup>



MPA monitoring results will inform the ongoing process of scientific assessment and evaluation, such as interim evaluations and assessments (see Chapter 4.5), and the evaluation and assessment of data and information for Commission consideration in the formal 10-year MPA management reviews. MPA management will therefore evolve over time through adaptive management and based on monitoring results, and MPA monitoring will likewise be adaptive to remain useful and rigorous as science advances and as management needs change.

### Using a Partnership-Based Approach

The MLPA states that monitoring and evaluation shall take into account existing and planned monitoring and evaluation efforts.<sup>130</sup> Monitoring California's MPA network is not a small task, and thus cannot be carried out by any one agency or organization. Effective, cost-efficient monitoring requires a partnership-based approach that leverages existing capacity across the state and engages the existing wealth of expertise in data collection, analysis and synthesis, and results sharing.

California's approach of establishing a public-private partnership increased the capacity of the state to implement monitoring and builds value and durability for California beyond simply meeting the requirements of the MLPA. To complement the public-private partnership, the Partnership Plan (see Chapter 1) contributes policy guidance for MPA monitoring.<sup>131</sup>

To date, the partnership-based approach to MPA management has involved more than 70 agencies, California Tribes and Tribal governments, and organizations in regional baseline MPA monitoring programs. Long-term monitoring will build on this experience, continuing to leverage capacity and establish partnerships to build a cost-effective, sustainable monitoring program statewide. The MSLT has developed a workplan that emphasizes the ongoing need to build partnerships, broaden participation, include knowledge from diverse sources, and build a deeper understanding of ocean health.<sup>132</sup> The MSLT workplan reflects the philosophy that all

<sup>129</sup> Adapted from: OST. *MPA Timeline and Milestones*. Retrieved Aug 4, 2015 from [http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/mparegiondiagram\\_v2.pdf](http://oceanspaces.org/sites/default/files/mparegiondiagram_v2.pdf)

<sup>130</sup> FGC §2856(a)(2)(H)

<sup>131</sup> OPC. (2014). *The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Areas Partnership Plan*. Retrieved Sept 22, 2015 from [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED\\_FINAL\\_MPA\\_Partnership\\_Plan\\_12022014.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED_FINAL_MPA_Partnership_Plan_12022014.pdf).

<sup>132</sup> OPC. (2015). *Marine Protected Area (MPA) Statewide Leadership Team Work Plan FY 15/16-17/18*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda\\_items/20150922/Item5\\_Attach2\\_MPALeadershipTeam\\_Workplan\\_FINALv2.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20150922/Item5_Attach2_MPALeadershipTeam_Workplan_FINALv2.pdf)

quality science may be useful in building a robust monitoring program, including academic, local, traditional, and citizen science contributions. Citizen science programs provide monitoring support through activities such as trainings to gather biological data in key habitats and recording observations of consumptive and non-consumptive uses of MPAs.

Furthermore, a valuable source of scientific and research expertise lies in California's university systems. California is home to some of the top marine science researchers in the world, and those researchers have an important role to play in enhancing monitoring efforts. These and other top academic institutions can ideally direct their research priorities to align with marine monitoring needs.

## Statewide MPA Monitoring

OST, working in partnership with OPC and CDFW, is leading the design of a collaborative process to develop a statewide monitoring program based on the existing statewide monitoring framework and regional monitoring plans. The statewide monitoring program will integrate across the existing policy and management responsibilities of multiple state partners to guide a scientifically rigorous, sustainable program that advances California's policy goals for a healthy and productive coast and ocean and fulfills the mandates of the MLPA. Many of the technical and programmatic pieces built during baseline MPA monitoring will readily support this process.

Statewide MPA monitoring is comprised of three interconnected components: 1) scientific network evaluation questions and metrics; 2) regional MPA monitoring; and 3) beyond the MLPA. The first two components satisfy the requirements of the MLPA, and thus take precedence over the third component, which goes beyond the scope of the MLPA. However, the third component may be useful in identifying how MPA monitoring can help inform other state priorities, such as fisheries, water quality, climate change, marine debris, and invasive species, thereby driving progress towards a shared vision of a healthy and productive coast and ocean. This component will also play into the adaptive management process, which will help to effectively deploy resources to achieve management goals (Douvere & Ehler 2011; Williams 2011; Steltzenmuller et al. 2012; also see Chapter 4.1).

In summary, network scientific evaluation questions and metrics inform the design of a statewide MPA monitoring plan, and regional MPA monitoring results can, to a large extent, be integrated across regions to inform network-wide evaluation. In the third component, considering the significance of MPAs within the context of other state priorities allows for greater efficiency among ocean management efforts. The three components of the statewide MPA monitoring program inform the formal 10-year management review (see Figure 11) and are described in more detail below.

### *Scientific Network Evaluation Questions and Metrics*

To meet the MLPP management objectives, CDFW, OST, and partners are committed to developing scientific network evaluation questions and select metrics, based on network-wide objectives (see Chapter 4.2), to inform the development of a statewide MPA monitoring plan. Evaluation questions and metrics within regional monitoring plans provide a starting point for the development of network evaluation questions and metrics, specifically to gain an understanding of ecosystem condition and trends across the state and to assess network performance and thus progress towards MLPA goals.

Like other aspects of MPA management, scientific network evaluation questions and metrics are subject to the process of adaptive management, and therefore may evolve over time. To

capture a holistic view of the statewide network performance and effectively guide monitoring, network evaluation questions and metrics will focus on primarily ecological and socioeconomic information. Though the collection of new socioeconomic data is not required by the MLPA, current and future partners who are putting effort toward MPA social sciences, such as economics, management, and governance, can be engaged by incorporating their data into MPA monitoring. For example, as stated in the Partnership Plan, OPC is leading the effort to undertake a management effectiveness evaluation and will utilize data collected from long-term monitoring, including on socioeconomic, management, and governance metrics. This information can feed into the formal 10-year management review. The following are examples of metrics that could be included in the statewide MPA monitoring program:

- **Biological and ecological metrics:** Focal species (commercial and non-commercial) abundance, biomass, size frequency, diversity, and density; biogenic habitat condition; productivity; and/or community structure and composition
- **Socioeconomic metrics:** Governance and management effectiveness, use of marine resources (consumptive and non-consumptive), number of participants in MPA-related activities, geographic patterns of use in and around MPAs, and/or volunteer and community engagement in monitoring and education

### *Regional MPA Monitoring*

Regional monitoring of MPAs helps track progress toward meeting the goals of the MLPA and provides important local-scale results to help inform regulatory and management decisions. Regional MPA monitoring plans are guided by the statewide MPA monitoring framework, and underpinned by the same basic principles and programmatic priorities. Furthermore, the process for building MPA monitoring workplans for each region will consider activities and plans in other regions as well as the need for connectivity and consistency on issues such as site selection.

The state has developed a two-phase approach to MPA monitoring in each region: 1) establishing a benchmark through baseline monitoring and 2) long-term monitoring. These two phases are explained in more detail below.

### *Baseline Monitoring*

Data and information collected during baseline monitoring establishes a regional benchmark of the ecological and socioeconomic conditions when each regional MPA network took effect and documents any initial changes resulting from MPA implementation. As such, the baseline serves as an important set of data against which future MPA performance can be measured. Baseline programs have been launched or completed in each of the four coastal MPA regions. These programs are designed, implemented, and coordinated by CDFW, OPC, OST, and CASG. Each regional MPA baseline program is administered near MPA implementation (Figure 10), and consists of securing funding, establishing a mechanism for disbursing funds, several years of data collection, data analyses and reporting, disseminating results to as wide an audience as possible, and a five-year monitoring and management review of baseline conditions.

When all baseline programs are completed in 2018 (Figure 10), California will have an unprecedented understanding of ecological and socioeconomic conditions along the entire California coast. Results from baseline monitoring, all of which are made publicly available through OceanSpaces.org, inform the initial five-year monitoring and management reviews of the regional MPA baseline conditions. In addition, results guide the development of collaborative, efficient, and cost-effective long-term MPA monitoring program.

The model established through the first regional management review in the Central Coast includes summarizing baseline monitoring results into a five-year 'State of the Region' report shared broadly in advance of the five-year management review. This information can inform the development of management recommendations, including recommendations to continue to improve monitoring and research, education and outreach, and enforcement and compliance. If management recommendations are identified, they will be presented to the Commission during the formal 10-year management reviews.

### Long-Term Monitoring

Building on existing capacity in the state and guided by the regional monitoring plans and workplans, long-term monitoring will be implemented on a regional scale with the built-in ability to look at ecosystem conditions and trends across regions at a statewide network scale. Long-term monitoring will launch first in the Central Coast and subsequently in other regions as the five-year baseline period is completed for each. In each region, the monitoring program will be designed to provide management decision support within the context of the statewide adaptive management review process.

MPA monitoring workplans specify a monitoring program for a stated duration based on available funding, partnership opportunities and capacity in the region, and priorities of CDFW and other partners. These documents include detailed information about recommended budget allocations and funding mechanisms, the specific questions that monitoring should seek to address, design features of ecosystem condition assessments such as temporal frequency and spatial sampling, and incentive structures for encouraging relevant and useful work on the part of organizations and researchers operating in the region.

Not every MPA can be monitored each year, and baseline monitoring results are useful in making strategic choices for long-term monitoring. As directed in the MLPA, long-term monitoring of the MPA network will occur in selected sites. These sites are within the subset of MPAs in the statewide network where the MLPP will focus continued monitoring efforts, and will serve as a frame of reference for assessing the effects of the network as a whole. The process for selecting sites for long-term monitoring is built into workplan development, and balances rigorous scientific design with additional considerations including local priorities and funding availability, management priorities, and opportunities to align with neighboring regions and advance statewide monitoring priorities. For example, the Central Coast workplan for long-term MPA monitoring will include prioritization of sites for tracking change in particular ecosystem features and also considers likely monitoring sites in neighboring regions towards a statewide scale.

### Beyond the MLPA

California's MPAs compose a network of living laboratories from which we can gain a greater understanding of the effects of existing and emerging stressors and begin to understand how MPAs may improve resilience to various impacts. While long-term MPA network monitoring is primarily informed by the mandated requirements of the MLPA, it is also developed to provide useful information for other aspects of California's ocean resource management, such as fisheries, climate change, marine debris, and invasive species, as well as other existing and emerging marine management efforts. Comprehensive, partnership-based MPA monitoring can help realize the value of the MPA network in aligning with these other ocean issues.

The MLPP can ensure that the adaptive management process provides a responsive framework for changes in management measures by linking statewide MPA monitoring to ocean issues that go beyond the MLPA.

## 4.4 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Progress in science and technology changes what is possible in MPA monitoring and adaptive management. Realizing those possibilities requires engagement with relevant cutting-edge research and innovative development (see Box 5 for an explanation of the difference between monitoring and research). Just as the design and siting process of the MPA network relied on cutting-edge science, long-term monitoring and adaptive management of the network must continue to do so as well.

Given the size and scope of MPAs in California's statewide network, research activities will be needed to gain a better understanding of the underlying biological, chemical, and physical phenomena and human dimensions (such as socioeconomic effects and effectiveness of governance and management measures) relevant to particular MPAs or the network as a whole. Information gleaned from regional and statewide monitoring about a specific ecosystem or metric may raise questions that can only be addressed through a program of focused research. In addition, research will almost certainly make use of the datasets collected through baseline and long-term monitoring. Applied research will be needed to develop new monitoring methods, metrics, modeling approaches, or other analytical methods as needs arise during the adaptive management process.

To complement research, development can play an important role in learning about marine ecosystems and the effects of MPAs. While research can gain information about MPAs through the use of systematic hypothesis testing, development can advance scientific knowledge and technological capacity beyond the scope of traditional research endeavors. This can include the development of new or improved methods and approaches for increasing accuracy, efficiency, and effectiveness of data and information collection. Development can play an important role in supporting research, such as by creating technological solutions that enable researchers to carry out

### Box 5. Making the Distinction between Monitoring and Research

While monitoring and research can be closely linked and inter-related, they can serve distinct purposes for natural resource management. For the purposes of the 2015 Master Plan, monitoring and research are defined as follows:

**Monitoring:** An ongoing process, sometimes directed by law, of data collection to inform evaluation of changes and progress over time toward goals and objectives. Monitoring can take place on a set of key metrics at representative sites. Consistent monitoring at an appropriate frequency can shed light on the effectiveness of management actions, and this information can inform adaptive management efforts.

**Research:** Scientific exploration that addresses emerging or otherwise relevant questions that are outside the goals and objectives of long-term MPA monitoring. Research questions can be driven by monitoring gaps or findings and feed into monitoring, such as by testing new scientific methods or providing insight on emerging threats that could affect management. Research can provide pure science to continue learning about MPAs, but is not necessary for ongoing monitoring and evaluation.

projects more effectively or efficiently. Research can similarly support monitoring; for example, new developments in technology for monitoring ocean chemistry could be implemented to increase monitoring capacity of the MLPP (Boehm et al. 2015).

Existing partnerships, especially with academic institutions including the University of California and California State University can be drawn upon to assess research and monitoring gaps and technological development needs, and identify and carry out focused research programs or development projects to fill those gaps. Funding can provide specific incentives to conduct relevant and useful research and development that includes engagement with natural resource managers and other ocean users.

Through these activities, CDFW, OST, OPC, and state partners will continue to foster the naturally occurring overlap and feedback between monitoring, research, and development and the evaluation and adaptive management processes at the individual MPA, regional, and statewide levels. The results of each of these activities will help ensure that the statewide MPA monitoring program utilizes the best readily available science, as required by the MLPA.

Both research and monitoring, as well as potentially development, if unregulated and unchecked, have the potential to have negative impacts on marine environments, such as through collection of specimens. In an effort to prevent negative impacts, CDFW has a process for evaluating and coordinating the permitting of scientific collection activities, as described in Box 6. Some MPAs also require a scientific collection permit (SCP) from State Parks, in addition to CDFW's requirements.<sup>133</sup> High-level planning by the MSLT and individual state partners will focus on increasing coordination between these two permitting processes.

#### Box 6. Scientific Collection in Marine Protected Areas

CDFW uses a decision tree to determine whether to approve or deny SCP requests within MPAs. CDFW reviews proposals for scientific collection and educational activities on an individual, case-by-case basis, but it does not resolve potential cumulative impacts from the effects of multiple activities permitted within an MPA. Therefore, CDFW and OPC's SAT are developing an ecological impact assessment tool to identify potential cumulative impacts prior to issuing an SCP. The ecological impact assessment tool will be used by CDFW to objectively evaluate SCP requests within MPAs.

## 4.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

The MLPA goals and statutory directives, MPA objectives, and design considerations will serve as the cornerstone for adaptive management actions, in a manner that recognizes the original intent identified through the science-based and stakeholder driven process by which California's MPAs were developed. For example, in recognition that individual MPA goals and objectives are not static, a review of whether an MPA's stated goals and objectives are still relevant or may need to be adjusted is an appropriate adaptive management action.

The adaptive management process for the MLPP is illustrated in Figure 11 below. The process begins with the selection of statewide objectives (step 1 in Figure 11; also see Chapter 4.2) that work toward the goals of the MLPA and other relevant policy and statutes. Informed by the

<sup>133</sup> California State Parks. *Crystal Cove State Park*. Retrieved Aug 10, 2015 from <http://www.crystalcovestatepark.org/research-in-the-park/>

statewide goals and objectives, the MLPP developed and is implementing a program of baseline monitoring for the four regions. After the baseline monitoring period concludes for each region, long-term monitoring, which will be based on the regional and statewide objectives, will begin and continue into the future (step 2 in Figure 11; also see Chapter 4.3). Long-term monitoring results, as well as additional information potentially collected from other scientific data, governance and management review, workshops, and public forums could be used to inform interim evaluation and assessment activities. These activities may take place at the regional scale and serve to inform the public about the state of the network and build understanding support for the MPAs. These assessments and evaluation can also feed into the formal 10-year management review (step 3 in Figure 11, and this Chapter 4.5).


A process for MPA management review is an important component of adaptive management. Therefore, the Commission will initiate a formal management review of statewide MPA network performance at least once every decade (step 3 in Figure 11; also see Chapter 4.1: *Ten-Year Formal MPA Management Reviews*). This review will emphasize ecological, socioeconomic, and governance aspects of the network and may include, but not be limited to, a scientific evaluation, public scoping meetings, and panel discussions to determine the status, function, and possible changes to the network. In addition, the Commission receives petitions for the additions, modifications, or deletions of MPAs on a continual basis,<sup>134</sup> favoring those petitions that are compatible with the goals and guidelines of the MLPA. Meritorious petitions at the discretion of the Commission may be incorporated into the decadal review unless circumstances dictate addressing the petition earlier.<sup>135</sup> Exceptions to the decadal review process may be considered if a petitioner makes a substantial case that not taking immediate action will cause significant harm to public safety or public welfare, or identifies scientific or technical issues that significantly impact MPA management or compromise MPA performance. Based on the findings of the Commission's formal 10-year management review, there may be the need for adaptive management actions, such as refining management objectives, policies, and strategies or revising long-term monitoring questions and metrics.

---

<sup>134</sup> FGC §2861a

<sup>135</sup> CCR, Title 14, Section 660.1

Figure 11. MLPP Adaptive Management Process



Throughout the entire adaptive management process, there will be the need for learning, communicating lessons, and developing and carrying out targeted research and development projects that can support monitoring and inform adaptive management (see Chapter 4.4). Learning serves an important role in the adaptive management process, specifically by sharing findings with and engaging a broader audience beyond scientists and management bodies. The MLPP can increase public knowledge about California’s MPA network by translating and sharing the results of the evaluation, assessment, and review process and providing opportunities for partners to be involved in MPA management. Toward this end, the MLPP can identify and develop platforms for broader learning, which could include workshops, symposia, public forums, or web and print media. In addition to building knowledge, learning can help support the MPA network further by building public interest and compliance with MPA regulations. Increasing the reach of knowledge about the state’s MPAs can also lead to new collaborations and partnerships that will build on monitoring and research capabilities. Due to the unprecedented nature of California’s MPA network, the MLPP’s approach to monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management is accordingly a pioneering effort that will inevitably lead to significant learning that can help inform future efforts in California, the US, and beyond.

## CHAPTER 5

# Program Partners and Operations

Operational support as well as adequate funding for CDFW and partners will be crucial for leading effective management of California's MPA network. This section describes the core competencies of partners supporting ongoing management of California's MPA network, potential funding sources that CDFW and its partners could pursue, and the importance of leveraging the human and financial resources of CDFW and partners to achieve sustainable funding.

### 5.1 PARTNERS AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY

Building from the roles and responsibilities described in Section 4.2 of the Partnership Plan, the MSLT workplan, and the MPA management roles and responsibilities described in Table 6. CDFW can work with partners to identify opportunities that consider jurisdictions and mandates to leverage human resources. Table 8 below provides a brief overview of CDFW's current partners in ongoing MPA management, along with a summary of their core competencies in relation to MPA management.

*Table 8. Current Partners Supporting Management of California's MPA Network and Their Core Competencies Related to MPA Management*

Partner	Sample of Core Competencies Related to MPA Management
<b>CDFW</b> <sup>136</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Marine science design and implementation, including MPA siting and design</li><li>• Management and enforcement to implement natural resource trustee agency responsibilities including the MLPA</li><li>• MPA monitoring, research, evaluation, including issuance of scientific collection permits</li><li>• Outreach and education relating to MPAs</li></ul>
<b>Commission</b> <sup>137</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Primary regulatory decision-making authority for regulations and rules related to SMRs and SMCAs</li><li>• Authority and expertise to review MPA proposals and petitions and decide on management actions</li><li>• Provides venue for public comment and review of the Master Plan</li></ul>
<b>CNRA</b> <sup>138,139</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Restoration, protection, and management of California natural resources, including terrestrial, coastal, and marine</li><li>• High-level direction to agencies including CDFW and State Parks</li><li>• Oversight on state actions regarding ocean resources including through OPC, OST, West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health, Thank You Ocean Campaign, and Coastal Impact Assistance Program</li></ul>
<b>State Parks</b> <sup>140</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Management and enforcement of state parks, including terrestrial, coastal, and marine</li></ul>

<sup>136</sup> CDFW. *California Marine Protected Areas*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs>

<sup>137</sup> Commission, *About the Fish and Game Commission*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://www.fgc.ca.gov/public/information/>

<sup>138</sup> CNRA. *California Natural Resources Agency*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://resources.ca.gov/>

<sup>139</sup> CNRA. *Oceans*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://resources.ca.gov/oceans>

<sup>140</sup> State Parks. *About Us*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from [http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=91](http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=91)

Partner	Sample of Core Competencies Related to MPA Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designated management agency under the MMAIA, including designation and administration of MMAs</li> <li>• Administration of funds to support grants relating to state parks</li> <li>• Funding generation to support sustainable financing streams for ongoing management of state parks</li> </ul>
<b>State and Regional Water Boards</b> <sup>141</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of water quality through setting statewide policy and implementing the Clean Water Act</li> <li>• Expertise and authority to set standards, issue permits such as for waste discharge, determine compliance with permits, and enforce requirements</li> <li>• Compilation of information on surface water, ground water, water rights, and other programs to the public and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>OPC</b> <sup>142</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction of policy of MPAs to support the California's MPA network</li> <li>• Identification of recommended changes to state and federal law relating to the oceans and coasts</li> <li>• Identification of opportunities to improve efficiency among agencies to achieve their mandated responsibilities including coordination and sharing of scientific data</li> <li>• Engagement of partners and the public through meetings, workshops, public conferences, and leading the coordination of leadership bodies including the MSLT</li> </ul>
<b>OST</b> <sup>143,144</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a boundary NGO mandated by CORSA, expertise in seeking and providing funds for ocean resource science projects and facilitation of ocean resource science projects and application of science to policy</li> <li>• MPA monitoring program development, design and implementation</li> <li>• Translation of scientific information for multiple audiences</li> </ul>
<b>MSLT</b> <sup>145</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assurance of communication and collaboration among agencies and partners participating in ongoing management of California's MPA network, including permitting activities</li> <li>• Ensures that team members work together on outreach and education, research and monitoring, enforcement and compliance, and policy and permitting relating to MPAs</li> </ul>
<b>SLC</b> <sup>146,147</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal hazard removal, marine invasive species, marine oil terminals, offshore oil permitting, oil spill prevention, sea level rise, renewable energy</li> <li>• Safe and environmentally sound development, regulation, and management of inland and offshore energy and mineral resources</li> </ul>
<b>CCC</b> <sup>148,149</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection, conservation, restoration, and enhancement of environmental and human-based resources of the California coast and ocean</li> <li>• Planning and regulation of the use of land and water in the coastal zone through a permitting process</li> <li>• Implementation of the California Coastal Act</li> </ul>

<sup>141</sup> SWRCB. *California Water Boards*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/publications\\_forms/publications/factsheets/docs/boardoverview.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/publications_forms/publications/factsheets/docs/boardoverview.pdf)

<sup>142</sup> OPC. *About the Council*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://www.opc.ca.gov/about/>

<sup>143</sup> OST. *Our Work*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://www.oceansciencetrust.org/work/>

<sup>144</sup> OST. *CA Ocean Science Trust Releases Progress Report*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015

<http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/05/ca-ocean-science-trust-releases-progress-report/>

<sup>145</sup> OPC. *Marine Protected Area Statewide Leadership Team*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from

[http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda\\_items/20150729/Item7-OPC-July2015-MPAStatewideLeadershipTeam-Memo.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20150729/Item7-OPC-July2015-MPAStatewideLeadershipTeam-Memo.pdf)

<sup>146</sup> SLC. *California State Lands Commission*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://www.slc.ca.gov/>

<sup>147</sup> SLC. *About the California State Lands Commission*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from

<http://www.slc.ca.gov/About/About.html>

<sup>148</sup> CCC. *About Us*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/whoweare.html>

<sup>149</sup> Gurish, J. *Overview of California Ocean and Coastal Laws with Reference to the Marine Environment*. Prepared for OPC. Retrieved Mar 4, 2015 from

[http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/Documents\\_Page/Noteworthy/Overview\\_Ocean\\_Coastal\\_Laws.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/Documents_Page/Noteworthy/Overview_Ocean_Coastal_Laws.pdf)

Partner	Sample of Core Competencies Related to MPA Management
<b>California Environmental Protection Agency</b> <sup>150</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration, protection, and enhancement of the environment</li> <li>• Environmental health, hazard assessment, toxic substances control, water resources control, emergency response, and enforcement</li> </ul>
<b>SCC</b> <sup>151</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection, restoration, and enhancement of coastal resources</li> <li>• Expansion of public access to the shore in partnership with local governments, agencies, non-profits, and private landowners</li> <li>• Distribution of grant funds to improve things like public access to beaches, coastal zone restoration, protection of coastal land, and other issues that help achieve the Conservancy's goals</li> </ul>
<b>West Coast Regional Office of National Marine Sanctuaries</b> <sup>152</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct monitoring and data collection that could inform adaptive management</li> <li>• Maintain authority to patrol, research, inspect, and cite violations of federal regulations (NOAA office of Law Enforcement)</li> <li>• Foster partnerships with State, Tribal, Federal, and non-governmental organizations</li> <li>• Support Joint Enforcement Agreement with CDFW</li> <li>• Provide funding to State to enforce federal regulations in state waters, in federal offshore waters, and in bays, estuaries, rivers, and streams</li> </ul>

## 5.2 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

Securing a diversified funding portfolio can help ensure long-term financial stability that is able to withstand future shifts in funding availability. Areas that have been identified as priority gaps in need of support through partners include monitoring, compliance and enforcement, engagement with Collaboratives, and Tribal collaboration and coordination.<sup>153</sup> The 2008 Master Plan contains a list of potential funding sources the MLPA Initiative identified (Appendix N).<sup>154</sup> Building on the list of potential funding sources identified in the MLPA Initiative process, OPC, CDFW, and its partners developed an updated list of potential funding sources, including federal, state, and local government; private philanthropy; and the private sector to help cover priority gaps. As funding sources are continuously changing and CDFW is now solidifying its operational needs for MPA management, there is the need to continually reevaluate existing and new potential funding sources.

## 5.3 ROLE OF PARTNERS IN LEVERAGING FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES

The MLPP depends on collaboration to leverage existing human and financial resources, and CDFW and its partners are committed to working together to identify ways to continue to achieve the goals of the state in an efficient and effective way. CDFW, OPC, the Resource Legacy Fund, and the Commission have contributed human or financial resources to support

<sup>150</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency. *About Us*. Retrieved Aug 3, 2015 from <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/About/>

<sup>151</sup> SCC. *About the Conservancy*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://scc.ca.gov/about/>

<sup>152</sup> West Coast Regional Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. *About Sanctuaries*. Retrieved Sept 21, 2015 from <http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/about/>

<sup>153</sup> See the Partnership Plan for a list of potential funding sources that could provide opportunities for supporting MPA enforcement, monitoring, and outreach.

<sup>154</sup> CDFW. (2008). *Draft Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas. Appendix N: Task Force Memos and Consultants' Report on Options for Funding the MLPA*. Retrieved July 21, 2015 from <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Master-Plan>

MPA management in the past. Additional partnerships could provide more diversified funding on multiple scales and through various sectors, especially in cases where partners have access to funding sources that CDFW cannot tap into itself, such as foundation or other charitable sources. Based on their strengths and abilities, partners from different sectors will have different roles relating to identifying, assessing, and securing various funding sources.

DRAFT

## CHAPTER 6

# Setting a Path Forward

---

California's MPA network is unique in the world due to its size and coast-wide extent, as well as its strong emphases on science-based design principles and scientifically-informed adaptive management (see Section 2.2 and Appendix A).<sup>155</sup> Therefore, MPA management will involve an adaptive management approach with a continual learning process, which will provide an opportunity from which California and other states and countries can learn. The MLPP will use the adaptive management framework laid out by the MLPA, as well as their experiences in data collection, management, and governance, to address and adapt to new threats and challenges, both environmental and socioeconomic.

To operationalize the elements of the 2015 Master Plan, the MLPP will implement a number of steps to set a course for its core MPA management responsibilities including monitoring and evaluation, enforcement, and outreach and education. The following steps are built from the MPA management responsibilities outlined in Table 6 and will be implemented on either a regional or statewide basis, depending on the scope and focus of the action. Throughout all steps, the overall goal is statewide coordination to achieve effective adaptive management of California's MPA network to meet the goals and objectives of the MLPA. This section details the steps that the MLPP will take to continue to meet the goals and objectives of the MLPA.

### 6.1 MONITORING, RESEARCH, AND EVALUATION

- **Implement a Statewide MPA Monitoring Plan:** CDFW, OST, and other partners, will develop a statewide monitoring plan to serve as the foundation for assessing MPA network performance. A set of network evaluation questions will also be developed, which will build from the network-wide objectives described in Chapter 4.
- **Update Monitoring Plans:** The MLPP will coordinate to update and adapt regional monitoring plans as necessary based on their learning from long-term monitoring and management actions
- **Report Results:** The MLPP will develop an approach that concisely displays the results of monitoring and evaluation. This approach will be used for communicating the results of California's MPAs to broad audiences
- **Link MPA and Other Monitoring Efforts:** The MLPP will partner with other monitoring entities, such as state fisheries managers and ocean acidification researchers (e.g., West Coast Governors Alliance and the West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel). These groups can identify data collection that is relevant to MPA monitoring and assist in efforts to integrate that data into MPA monitoring, evaluation, research, and adaptive management.

---

<sup>155</sup> Ballard, A., Birss, H., Botta, R., Cantrell, S., Gonzales, A., Johnson, B., Spautz, H., Torres, S., & Yamamoto, J. (2014). *Incorporation of Adaptive Management into Conservation Planning and Resource Management*. Retrieved Mar 4, 2015 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=86989&inline=1>

- **Identify and Support Key MPA Related Research Needs:** The MLPP will identify and support research projects that focus on key science questions, including those related to network functioning as well as the effect of MPAs on fisheries

## 6.2 ENFORCEMENT

- **Identify Tools to Support Enforcement:** New and emerging technology options such as remote surveillance, vessel management systems, global positioning system data logger systems, and others may provide options for increased enforcement efficiency. CDFW's Law Enforcement Division would also benefit from a Records Management System as an effective way to collect, organize, and track the vast amount of information that is collected. This will help document CDFW's patrol effort and help identify any geographical or technological areas where changes are needed. Activities associated with research and development can support the identification of these tools.

## 6.3 PARTNERSHIP COORDINATION

- **Build Partnerships:** Through the Partnership Plan and the MSLT, as well as other partnership tools, the MLPP and its constituent partners will renew their commitments to existing, effective partnerships and build new partnerships to help further the MLPP's objectives and fulfill the MLPA mandate. The MLPP will pursue partnerships, such as among local, state, and federal governments, California Tribes and Tribal governments, the University of California and California State University systems, NGOs, the private sector, and citizen science groups.

## 6.4 OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

- **Prioritize Outreach Efforts:** CDFW, in collaboration with partners through the MLPP, will prioritize the key messages, audiences, and communication mechanisms to raise awareness, support, and participation in MPA management. CDFW will also coordinate its outreach with other outside efforts of organizations with aligned priorities.

## 6.5 IDENTIFICATION OF LONG-TERM FUNDING SOURCES

- **Enhance Capacity for MPA Project:** To fulfill its commitment to the MLPP, CDFW established an MPA project under the Habitat Conservation Program. Through the MPA project, CDFW ensures that staff time and resources are allocated to MPA management. However, enhanced capacity will be important to meet the ongoing commitments of the MLPP, and the future needs of California, as the MLPP evolves.
- **Prioritize Potential Funding Sources:** To help secure the resources necessary for continued investment in the MPA network, the MLPP will support OPC and other appropriate partners, including CDFW, to identify the top potential funding sources to fill gaps in financial support for MPA management activities

# Appendices

---

[THE FOLLOWING IS A DRAFT LIST OF APPENDICES TO THE MASTER PLAN AND MAY BE MODIFIED]

**Appendix A:** Marine Protected Area Planning through the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

**Appendix B:** Communication and Consultation with California Tribes and Tribal Governments

**Appendix C:** North Coast: MPA Background and Priorities

**Appendix D:** North Central Coast: MPA Background and Priorities

**Appendix E:** Central Coast: MPA Background and Priorities

**Appendix F:** South Coast: MPA Background and Priorities

# Glossary

---

**Abundance:** *Natural abundance* is the total number of individuals in a population protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (adapted from Department 2004 and Kelleher 1992). *Relative abundance* is an index of fish population numbers used to compare populations from year to year (Department 2002a).

**Adaptive management:** With regard to marine protected areas, is a management policy that seeks to improve management of biological resources, particularly in areas of scientific uncertainty, by viewing program actions as tools for learning. Actions shall be designed so that, even if they fail, they will provide useful information for future actions, and monitoring and evaluation shall be emphasized so that the interaction of different elements within marine systems may be better understood.

**Biodiversity:** A component and measure of ecosystem health and function. It is the number and genetic richness of different individuals found within the population of a species, of populations found within a species range, of different species found within a natural community or ecosystem, and of different communities and ecosystems found within a region (PRC §12220[b]).

**Baseline monitoring:** Baseline monitoring establishes a regional benchmark of the ecological and socioeconomic conditions when each regional MPA network took effect and documents any initial changes resulting from MPA implementation. As such, the baseline serves as an important set of data against which future MPA performance can be measured.

**Biogeographical regions:** The following oceanic or near shore areas, seaward from the high tide line or the mouth of coastal rivers, with distinctive biological characteristics, unless the master plan team establishes an alternative set of boundaries (emphasis added):

- (1) The area extending south from Point Conception.
- (2) The area between Point Conception and Point Arena.
- (3) The area extending north from Point Arena.

**Bycatch:** In fishing, removal or mortality of species other than the declared target species.

**Deep:** Greater than 330 feet (100 meters).

**Ecosystem:** The physical and climatic features and all the living and dead organisms in an area that are interrelated in the transfer of energy and material, which together produce and maintain a characteristic type of biological community (Department 2002b).

**Groundfish:** A species or group of fish that live on or near the ocean bottom.

**Habitat:** The living place of an organism or community, characterized by its physical or biotic properties (Allaby 1998).

**Intrinsic value:** The value that that thing has “in itself,” or “for its own sake,” or “as such,” or “in its own right” (Zimmerman 2004).

**Marine life reserve:** A marine protected area in which all extractive activities, including the taking of marine species, and, at the discretion of the Fish and Game Commission and within the authority of the Fish and Game Commission, other activities that upset the natural ecological functions of the area, are prohibited. While, to the extent feasible, the area shall be open to the public for managed enjoyment and study, the area shall be maintained to the extent practicable in an undisturbed and unpolluted state.”

California Fish and Game Code § 2860 (b) further clarifies permissible activities in “marine life reserves”: “Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, the taking of a marine species in a marine life reserve is prohibited for any purpose, including recreational and commercial fishing, except that the Fish and Game Commission may authorize the taking of a marine species for scientific purposes, consistent with the purposes of this chapter, under a scientific collecting permit issued by the Department of Fish and Wildlife.” (emphasis added)

**Marine managed areas:** A broad group of named, discrete geographic areas along the coast that protect, conserve, or otherwise manage a variety of resources and uses, including living marine resources, cultural and historical resources, and recreational opportunities.

**Marine protected area (MPA):** A named, discrete geographic marine or estuarine area seaward of the high tide line or the mouth of a coastal river, including any area of intertidal or subtidal terrain, together with its overlying water and associated flora and fauna that has been designated by law, administrative action, or voter initiative to protect or conserve marine life and habitat. An MPA includes marine life reserves and other areas that allow for specified commercial and recreational activities, including fishing for certain species but not others, fishing with certain practices but not others, and kelp harvesting, provided that these activities are consistent with the objectives of the area and the goals and guidelines of this chapter. MPAs are primarily intended to protect or conserve marine life and habitat, and are therefore a subset of marine managed areas, which are broader groups of named, discrete geographic areas along the coast that protect, conserve, or otherwise manage a variety of resources and uses, including living marine resources, cultural and historical resources, and recreational opportunities.

**Natural community:** A distinct, identifiable, and recurring association of plants and animals that are ecologically interrelated (California Fish and Game Code subsection 2702[d]).

**Natural diversity:** The species richness of a community or area when protected from, or not subjected to, human-induced change (drawn from Allaby 1998 and Kelleher 1992).

**Reef fish:** A species or group of fish that live on or near the reef.

**Shallow:** 330 feet (100 meters) or less.

### **Glossary Works Cited**

- Allaby, M. (1998). *Concise Oxford dictionary of ecology*. UK: New York Oxford University Press.
- Kelleher, K. & Kenchington, R. (1992). Guide-lines for establishing marine protected areas. *International Union for the Conservation of Nature*.
- State of California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Region (Department 2002a). (2005). Draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.
- State of California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Region (Department 2002b). (2002). Nearshore Fishery Management Plan.
- State of California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Region (Department 2004). (2004). Draft Market Squid Fishery Management Plan.
- Zimmerman, M. J. (2004). Intrinsic vs. extrinsic value., E. N. Zalta (Ed.). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2004 Edition)*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2004/entries/value-intrinsic-extrinsic/>.

# Literature Cited

---

- Abraham, G. M. S., & Parker, R. J. (2007). Assessment of heavy metal enrichment factors and the degree of contamination in marine sediments from Tamaki Estuary, Auckland, New Zealand. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 136(1-3), 227-38.
- Anderson, D. M., Glibert, P. M., & Burkholder, J. M. (2002). Harmful algal blooms and eutrophication: Nutrient sources, composition, and consequences." *Estuaries* 25(4), 704-26.
- Babcock, R. C., Shears, N.T., Alcalá, A.C., Barrett, N.S., Edgar, G.J., Lafferty, K.D., McClanahan, T.R., & Russ, G.R. (2010). Decadal trends in marine reserves reveal differential rates of change in direct and indirect effects. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(43), 18256-18261.
- Baird, B. E., Miller-Henson, M. A., & Semmens, B. X. (1999). Analyzing California's marine managed areas: Existing classifications and options for the future. CalCOFI Rep., Vol. 40: 67-70.
- Baskett, M.L. & Barnett, L.A.K. (2015). The ecological and evolutionary consequences of marine reserves. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, published online 7 August 2015 (DOI: 10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-112414-054424)
- Bay, S., Jones, B. H., Schiff, K., & Washburn, L. (2003). Water quality impacts of stormwater discharges to Santa Monica Bay. *Marine Environmental Research*, 56(1-2), 205-223.
- Boehm, A.B., Jacobson, M.Z., O'Donnell, M.J., Sutula, M., Wakefield, W.W., Weisberg, S.B. & Whiteman, E. (2015). Ocean acidification science needs for natural resource managers of the North American west coast. *Oceanography*, 28(2), 170–181.
- Botsford, L.W., White, J.W.W., Carr, M.H. & Caselle, J.E. (2014). Marine protected area networks in California, USA. *Advances in Marine Biology*, 69, 205-251.
- Carr, M.H., Woodson, C.B., Cheriton, O.M., Malone, D., McManus, M.A. & Raimondi, P.T. (2011). Knowledge through partnerships: integrating marine protected area monitoring and ocean observing systems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 9, 342-350.
- Caselle, J.E., Rassweiler, A., Hamilton, S.L., & Warner, R. (2015). Recovery trajectories of kelp forest animals are rapid yet spatially variable across a network of temperate marine protected areas. *Scientific Reports*, 5, Article number 14102.
- Chen, C., Lopez-Carr, D., & Endemano Walker, B. L. (2014). A framework to assess the vulnerability of California commercial sea urchin fishermen to the impact of MPAs under climate change. *GeoJournal*, 79(6), 755-773.
- Christensen, N. L., Bartuska, A., Brown, J. H., Carpenter, S., D'Antonio, C., Francis, R., Franklin, J. F., MacMahon, J. A., Noss, R. F., Parsons, D. J., Peterson, C. H., Turner, M. G., & Moodmansee, R. G. (1996). The report of the Ecological Society of America Committee on the scientific basis for ecosystem management. *Ecological Applications* 6, 665-691.
- Coleman, M. A., Palmer-Brodie, A., & Kelaher, B. P. (2013). Conservation benefits of a network of marine reserves and partially protected areas. *Biological Conservation*, 167, 257-264.

- Doney, S. C., Muckelshaus, M., Emmett Duffy, J., Barry, J. P., Chan, F., English, C. A., Galindo, M. H., Grebmeier, J. M., Hollowed, A. B., Knowlton, N., Polovina, J., Rabalais, N. N., Sydeman, W. J., & Talley, L. D. (2012). Climate change impacts on marine ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 4(11), 11-37.
- Douvere, F., & Ehler, C. N. (2011). The importance of monitoring and evaluation in adaptive maritime spatial planning. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 15, 305-311.
- Fox, E., Poncelet, E., Connor, D., Vasques, J., Ugoretz, J., McCreary, S., Monié, D., Harty, M., & Gleason, M. (2013a). Adapting stakeholder processes to region-specific challenges in marine protected area network planning. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 74, 24-33.
- Fox, E., Hastings, S., Miller-Henson, M., Monié, D., Ugoretz, J., Frimodig, A., Shuman, C., Owens, B., Garwood, R., Connor, D., Serpa, P., & Gleason, M. (2013b). Addressing policy issues in a stakeholder-based and science-driven marine protected area network planning process. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 74, 34-44.
- Francour, P., Mangialajo, L., & Pastor, J. (2010). Mediterranean marine protected areas and non-indigenous fish spreading. In D. Golani & B. Appelbaum-Golani (Eds.), *Fish invasions of the Mediterranean Sea: Change and renewal*. 127-144. Sofia-Moscow: Pensoft Publishers.
- Gaines, S. D., Lester, S. E., Grorud-Colvert, C., Costello, C., & Pollnac, R. (2010a). Evolving science of marine reserves: New developments and emerging research frontiers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(43), 18251-18255.
- Gaines, S. D., White, C., Carr, M. H., & Palumbi, S. (2010b). Designing marine reserve networks for both conservation and fisheries management. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(43), 18286-18293.
- Gleason, M., Fox, E., Ashcraft, S., Vasques, J., Whiteman, E., Serpa, P., Saarman, E., Caldwell, M., Frimodig, A., Miller-Henson, M., Kirilin, J., Ota, B., Pope, E., Weber, M. & Wiseman, K. (2013). Designing a network of marine protected areas in California: Achievements, costs, lessons learned, and challenges ahead. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 74, 90-101.
- Gleason, M., McCreary, S., Miller-Henson, M., Ugoretz, J., Fox, E., Merrifield, M., McClintock, W., Serpa, P., & Hoffman, K. (2010). Science-based and stakeholder-driven marine protected area network planning: A successful case study from north central California. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 53(2), 52-68.
- Grorud-Colvert, K., Claudet, J., Carr, M., Caselle, J., Day, J., Friedlander, A., Lester, S., Lison de Loma, T., Tissot, B., & Malone, D. (2011). *Marine protected areas: Effects, networks and monitoring - a multidisciplinary approach* (293-321). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Grorud-Colvert, K., Claudet, J., Tissot, B. N., Caselle, J. E., Carr, M. H., Day, J. C., Friedlander, A. M., Lester, S. E., Thierry Lison de Loma, Malone, D., & Walsh, W. J. (2014). Marine protected area networks: Assessing whether the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. *PLOSOne*, 9(8), e102298.
- Halpern, B. S., Kappel, C. V., Selkoe, K. A., Fiorenza, M., Ebert, C. M., Kontgis, C., Crain, C. M., Martone, R. G., Shearer, C., & Teck, S. J. (2009). Mapping Cumulative Human Impacts to California Current Marine Ecosystems. *Conservation Letters*, 2.3, 138-48.

- He, L.-M., & He, Z.-L. (2008). Water quality prediction of marine recreational beaches receiving watershed baseflow and stormwater runoff in Southern California, USA. *Water Research*, 42 (10-11), 2563-573.
- Jackson, J.B.C., Kirby, M. X., Berger, W. H., Bjorndal, K. A., Botsford, L. W., Bourque, B. J., Bradbury, R. H., Cooke, R., Erlandson, J., Estes, J. A., Hughes, T. P., Kidwell, S., Lange, C. B., & Warner, R. R. (2001). Historical overfishing and the recent collapse of coastal ecosystems. *Science*, 293, 629-637.
- Johnson, M. L. & Sandell, J. (2014). *Advances in marine biology: Marine managed areas and fisheries*. London, UK: Elsevier.
- Kelaher, B. P., Coleman, M. A., Broad, A., Rees, M. J., Jordan, A., & Davis, A. R. (2014). Changes in fish assemblages following the establishment of a network of no-take marine reserves and partially protected areas. *PLoSOne*, 9(1),1-13.
- Kelleher, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Guidelines for Marine Protected Areas*. Wales, UK: IUCN. Retrieved from [http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/mpa\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/mpa_guidelines.pdf).
- Kelly, R. P., Foley, M. M., Fisher, W. S., Reely, R. A., Halpern, B. S., Waldbusser, G. G., & Caldwell, M. R. (2013). Mitigating local causes of ocean acidification with existing laws. *Science* 322, 1036-1037.
- fk, S. E. & Halpern, B. S. (2008). Biological responses in marine no-take reserves versus partially protected areas. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 367, 49-56.
- Lester, S.E., Halpern, B.S., Grorud-Colvert, K., Lubchenco, J., Ruttenberg, B.I., Gaines, S.D., Airamé, S., & Warner, R.R. (2009). Biological effects within no-take marine reserves: a global synthesis. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 384, 33-46.
- Lockwood, M., Davidson, J., Curtis, A., Stratford, E. & Griffith, R. (2010). Governance principles for natural resource management. *Society & Natural Resources: An International Journal*, 23(10), 986-1001.
- Lubchenco, J. & Grorud-Colvert, K. (2015). Making waves: The science and politics of ocean protection. *Science*, published online 15 October, 2015 (DOI: 10.1126/science.aad5443).
- McCook, L.J., Ayling, T., Cappel, M., Choat, J.H., Evans, R.D., De Freitas, D.M., Heupel, M., Hughes, T.P., Jones, G.P., Mapstone, B., Marsh, H., Mills, M., Molloy, F.J., Pitcher, C.R., Pressey, R.L., Russ, G.R., Sutton, S., Sweatman, H., Tobin, R., Wachenfield, D.R., & Williamson, D.H. (2010). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(43), 18278-18285.
- Merrifield, M. S., McClintock, W., Burt, C., Fox, E., Serpa, P., Steinback, C., & Gleason, M. (2013). MarineMap: A web-based platform for collaborative marine protected area planning. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 74, 67-76.
- Micheli, F., Saenz-Arroyo, A., Greenley, A., Vazquez, L., Montes, J. A. E., Rossetto, M., & De Leo, G. A. (2012). Evidence that marine reserves enhance resilience to climatic impacts." *PLoS ONE* 7(7), E40832.
- Moffitt, E. A., White, J. W., & Botsford, L, W. (2013). Accurate assessment of marine protected area success depends on metric and spatiotemporal scale of monitoring. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 487, 17-28.

- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2013). Marine protected areas of the United States: Conserving our oceans one place at a time.
- Nies, J. (2012). *Native American History*. New York: Random House Publishing Group.
- National Research Council. (1995). *Understanding marine biodiversity: A research agenda for the nation*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Otero, M., Cebrian, E., Francour, P., Galil, B., & Savini, D. (2013). Monitoring marine invasive species in Mediterranean marine protected areas (MPAs): A strategy and practical guide for managers. *IUCN*.
- Parrish, R. R. & Tegner M. J. (2001). California's Variable Ocean Environment. In *California's Living Marine Resources: A status report* (pages 21-28). California Department of Fish and Game.
- Pope, E. (2014). Overview of the creation and management of California's marine protected area network. *California Fish and Game*, 100(2), 343-347.
- Rosevelt, C., Los Huertos, M. Garza, C. & Nevins, H.M. (2013). Marine debris in central California: Quantifying type and abundance of beach litter in Monterey Bay, CA. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 71, 299-306.
- Ruckelshaus, M., Klinger, T., Knowlton, N., & DeMaster, D. P. (2008). Marine ecosystem-based management in practice: Scientific and governance challenges. *BioScience* 58(1), 53-63.
- Saarman, E., Gleason, M., Ugoretz, J., Airamé, S., Carr, M., Fox, E., Frimodig, A., Mason, T., & Vasques, J. (2013). The role of science in supporting marine protected area network planning and design in California. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 74, 45-56.
- Saarman, E. T. & Carr, M. H. (2013). The California Marine Life Protection Act: A balance of top down and bottom up governance in MPA planning. *Marine Policy*, 41, 41-49.
- Samhuri, J. F. & Levin, P. S. (2012). Linking land- and sea-based activities to risk in coastal ecosystems. *Biological Conservation*, 145, 118-129.
- Schindler, D. E. & Hilborn, R. (2015). Prediction, precaution, and policy under global change. *Science*, 347(6225), 953-954.
- Sheehan, L. & Tasto, R. (2001). The status of habitats and water quality in California's coastal and marine environment. *California's Living Marine Resources: A Status Report* (pages 29-45). California Department of Fish and Game.
- Starr, R. M., Wendt, D. E., Barnes, C. L., Marks, C. I., Malone, D., Waltz, G., Schmidt, K. T., Chiu, J., Launer, A. L., Hall, N. C. & Yochum, N. (2015). Variation in Responses of Fishes across Multiple Reserves within a Network of Marine Protected Areas in Temperate Waters. *PLoS ONE*, 10(3), E0118502.
- Stelzenmuller, V., Breen, P., Stamford, T., Thomsen, F., Badalamenti, F., Borja, A., Buhl-Mortensen, L., Carlstrom, J., D'Anna, G., Danker, N., Degraer, S., Dujin, M., Fiorentino, F., Galparsoro, I., Giakoumi, S., Gristina, M., Johnson, K., Jones, P. J. S., Katsanevakis, S., Knittweis, L., Kyriazi, Z., Pipitone, C., Piwowarczyk, J., Rabaut, M., Sorensen, T. K., van Dalfsen, J., Vassilopoulou, V., Fernandes. T. V., Vincx, M., Voge, S., Weber, A., Wijkmark, N., Jak, R., Qiu, W., & ter Hofstede, R. (2012). Monitoring and evaluation of

- spatially managed areas: A generic framework for implementation of ecosystem based marine management and its application. *Marine Policy*, 37, 149-164.
- White, J.W. & Rogers-Bennett, L. (2010). Incorporating physical oceanographic proxies of recruitment into population models to improve fishery and marine protected area management. *CalCOFI Rep.* 51, 128-149.
- White, J.W., Botsford, L.W., Baskett, M.L., Barnett, L.A.K., Barr, R.J., & Hastings, A. (2011). Linking models with monitoring data for assessing performance of no-take marine reserves. *Front. Ecol. Environ*, 9(7), 390-399.
- White, J.W., Botsford, L.W., Hastings, A., Baskett, M.L., Kaplan, D.M. & Barnett, L.A.K. (2013). Transient responses of fished populations to marine reserve establishment. *Conservation Letters*, 6, 180-191.
- Williams, B. K. (2011). Adaptive management of natural resources – framework and issues. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 92, 1346-1353.
- Wilson, J. R., Prince, J. D., & Lenihan, H. S. (2010). A management strategy for sedentary nearshore species that uses marine protected areas as a reference. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries: Dynamics, Management, and Ecosystem Science*, 2(1), 14-27.
- Wilson-Vandenberg, D., Larinto, T., & Key, M. (2014). Implementing California's Nearshore Fishery Management Plan – twelve years later. *California Fish and Game*, 100(2), 186-217.
- Young, M. & Carr, M. (2015). Assessment of habitat representation across a network of marine protected areas with implications for the spatial design of monitoring. *PLoS One*, 10(3), e0116200.



California Marine Life Protection Act  
UPDATED MASTER PLAN FOR MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

---

**Summary of Public Comments  
Received and Responses**

---

Document prepared for  
California Fish and Game Commission Meeting  
February 10–11, 2016

January 29, 2016

# About this Document

---

The *draft 2015 California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*<sup>1</sup> (draft 2015 Master Plan) was made available to the public on December 3, 2015. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) staff presented the draft 2015 Master Plan to the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) at their December 9-10, 2015 meeting in San Diego. The Commission set the public comment period deadline on the draft 2015 Master Plan for January 28, 2016. The purpose of this document is to inform potential Commission discussion and action at their February 10-11, 2016 meeting in Sacramento by summarizing all public comments received during the public comment period, and draft responses by CDFW staff for how public comments may be addressed (Table 1). CDFW and California Ocean Protection Council (OPC) staff have also identified and addressed minor errors in the draft 2015 Master Plan, such as typos, missing or extra words, clarifications, and formatting and consistency issues (Table 2).

---

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015). *Draft 2015 California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas*. November, 2015.

Table 1. Public comments received by the Commission office on the draft 2015 Master Plan during the public comment period from December 3, 2015 – January 28, 2016. The column on the far right (in green) indicates how each comment may be addressed.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
1 (12/9/2015)	Jenn Eckerle, Natural Resources Defense Council	Chapter 4	Support the 10-year formal review cycle for the adaptive management process.	No action.
2 (12/9/2015)	Jenn Eckerle, Natural Resources Defense Council	Chapters 3, 4; Appendices C - F	Appreciate that the document considers enforcement data along with monitoring results, describes a strategic and efficient long-term monitoring program, lays out enforcement data in the regional appendices for context to help understand marine protected area (MPA) enforcement into the future, and acknowledges the broader use of MPA monitoring results for other things such as fisheries and climate change.	No action.
3 (12/9/2015)	Jenn Eckerle, Natural Resources Defense Council	Chapter 3.1	Recommend improving the outreach and education section by adding further detail to highlight the great efforts already happening, such as folks participating in the Community Collaboratives.	Partnership is a common theme and core strategy underlying the Marine Life Protection Program (MLPP) and the ongoing management of California's MPA network. Examples of past and ongoing MPA collaborations, partnerships, and other efforts aimed to inform MPA management are found throughout the draft 2015 Master Plan, as well as the complementary 2014 document developed by OPC, CDFW, and partners called <i>The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Area Partnership Plan</i> (the Partnership Plan). For example, Community Collaboratives (Collaboratives) are identified in the draft 2015 Master Plan as a component of the California Collaborative Approach to reflect the local-scale community focus. In addition, while not intended to be an exhaustive summary of all MPA collaborations, partnerships, and other efforts; Table 2 includes past and ongoing collaborations, partnerships, and outreach efforts aimed to inform MPA management. CDFW has therefore modified the

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
				description for Table 2 on Page 9 of the draft 2015 Master Plan to clarify the intent of the table, and reinforced that the draft 2015 Master Plan is primarily intended to provide statewide guidance relative to MPA management. See also responses to Comment 5, Comment 20, and Comment 30.
4 (12/9/2015)	Jenn Eckerle, Natural Resources Defense Council	Chapter 3.2; Appendices C- F, Section 6	Recommend more detail in the enforcement section, such as recognizing the value of a Records Management System to help understand violation hot spots and targeting the limited resources we have.	An objective to develop a Records Management System to collect, organize, and track citation information was added to Chapter 3.2 of the draft 2015 Master Plan, including a reference to the MPA Statewide Leadership Team (MSLT) 2015-2018 Work Plan which identifies developing a Records Management System as a strategic priority. Chapter 6.2 of the draft 2015 Master Plan also acknowledges the need for a Records Management System; and Chapter 3.2 includes identifying areas of high priority, biological sensitivity, or enforcement need (see Box 3 for more information).
5 (12/9/2015)	Ray Hiemstra, Orange County Coastkeeper	Chapters 3, 4; Appendix F, Section 6	Recommend more attention on partners and collaboration already happening. For example, Orange County Coastkeeper is doing a lot of restoration activities, education, outreach, and monitoring work. Orange County Coastkeeper, the Sheriff, and City of Laguna Beach are also already collaborating with CDFW enforcement to catch a poacher, for example. However, none of these groups are listed as local partners.	The entities listed in Table 5 of the Regional MPA Background and Priorities documents (Appendices C–F) were generally acknowledged to have MPA enforcement authority and are likely to enforce MPA regulations, or entities that control and/or own land adjacent to MPAs and are likely to have an enforcement partnership with CDFW. However, after reviewing public comments, rather than attempt to provide an all-inclusive list of all existing and potential partnerships and assistance, which will likely evolve, CDFW has removed Column 3 (“Potential Partnerships/Assistance”) from Table 5 of Appendices C – F. Please note CDFW acknowledges and supports the many existing and future partnerships and assistance that are aimed to support and inform MPA management. See also responses to Comment 3, Comment 20, and Comment 30.
6 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	Full document	Concern that the task of developing the Master Plan was given to CDFG, not CDFW.	Mandated by Assembly Bill 2402, and effective January 1, 2013, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) was renamed as the California

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
				Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).
7 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	Full document, Chapter 5	Concern that what the draft 2015 Master Plan proposes is not affordable.	Operational support and adequate funding are crucial for leading effective management of California's MPA network. Chapter 5 of the draft 2015 Master Plan describes how the MLPP depends on collaboration to leverage existing financial resources, and CDFW and its partners are committed to working together to identify ways to continue to manage California's MPAs to achieve the goals of the state in an efficient and effective way. See the Partnership Plan for additional information regarding existing and potential financial resources for MPA management.
8 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	General comment, Chapter 3.2	Fishing in a no-fishing zone is the level of criminality similar to a Jaywalking ticket. How many people are affected by these citations? Not many, but there is so much effort and money put into it.	No action.
9 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	General comment	You have taken away the most pristine areas and prime habitat where the largest fish have always been.	No action.
10 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	General comment	You have created a new religion – it works only if you believe it.	No action.
11 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	General comment	You are punishing the honest fishers, and this is not your resource but that of the people.	No action.
12 (12/9/2015)	Paul Weakland	Full document	Using the "best available science" is a fraud, you use the studies you like and not the ones you do not like.	Implementation of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), including the MLPP and the master plan, is expressly based "on sound scientific guidelines" and "the best readily available science" (California Fish and Game Code §2853[b][5], 2855[a]).
13 (12/9/2015)	George Osborn, California Sportfishing League	Chapter 4.1	Concern regarding the timelines for reviews and for whether MPAs are achieving their objectives. It looks like timelines are being extended to 10 years instead of the original five years, however Commissioners have said in the past they look forward to showing that the MPAs have worked and are no longer needed so that we can again fish in those areas. We	The 2008 draft Master Plan, adopted over four years prior to the completion of the statewide MPA network in December 2012, recommended comprehensive reviews of monitoring results to the Commission five years after MPA implementation within each study region, in addition to annual reporting on monitoring results to the Commission, and triennial MPA proposal hearings scheduled by the Commission. In the draft

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			want to continue regional management of individual MPAs to test their effectiveness and hope that reviews happen more than every 10 years.	2015 Master Plan, based on the best readily available science, lessons drawn from regional MPA implementation, and the significant efforts to ensure California's MPAs were redesigned to function as an ecologically connected statewide network; a 10-year formal management review cycle has been developed by the MLPP to inform the adaptive management of the statewide network on a time scale that is more biologically appropriate and administratively feasible and cost effective. The MLPA also requires California's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network (California Fish and Game Code §2853[b][6]). The 10-year management review cycle will emphasize ecological, socioeconomic, and governance aspects of the network to determine the status, function, and whether possible management adjustments are warranted. To inform the 10-year management review and adaptive management, the MLPP is leading the design of a statewide MPA monitoring program, which includes and draws from regional components, to gather sufficient information.
14 (12/11/2015)	Jimmy Roberts	General comment	Get rid of MPAs and let us fish deep water again, 120 foot ban was temporary as well.	No action.
15 (12/11/2015)	John Valadao	General comment	When will these areas open to fishermen again, we have been waiting patiently.	No action.
16 (12/11/2015)	Chuck Leatherwood	General comment, Chapter 4	Support conserving and protecting our marine environment. I would like the MPA to be evaluated and scientific data used in their management. This is what was promised. Please honor the commitment.	See response to Comment 13.
17 (12/11/2015)	EJ Brandreth	Chapter 4.1, General comment	Urge the FGC to stand by their agreement of reviewing MPAs after five years, and not extend that milestone to 10 years as has been proposed. The current regulations covering bag limits, take limits, seasons and size limits provide more than ample control over our sport	See response to Comment 13.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			fisheries. We have seen these limits adjusted to reflect proper control; bass were extended from 12" to 14" last year, for example. This is the correct type of action to manage our fishery; modify existing limits, as appropriate, based on scientific evidence. But randomly closing major fishing areas, and thus putting twice the pressure on the adjacent areas, has not been proven in our ecosystems and fisheries, and the program is not properly managed, monitored nor sufficiently funded. Please follow through with the agreement of a five year study to determine effectiveness and duration of closure(s).	
18 (12/24/2015)	Shane Yellin	General comment	The MLPA program as it stands is a failure. Closing off large areas of the coast to fishermen has I am sure had some benefits but it appears to have just concentrated fishing into certain areas. I believe that lowering bag limits for many species would be a better solution than forcing fishermen to take from certain areas. For example the limit on yellowtail should be two fish over spawning size (fish should spawn at least once before harvest), white seabass should be certainly less than three fish. While I do believe in opening the MLPA to recreational boats, some could remain but allow catch and release only where necessary. I also would like them to remain closed for commercial net fisheries. Commercial net fisheries can do a lot of damage in a short amount of time and should not ruin what could be a more resilient and economically beneficial recreational fishery.	No action.
19 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 3.4	Recommend the Commission enhance protection of MPAs from oil and gas drilling.	Chapter 3.4 of the draft 2015 Master Plan was modified to clarify that both CDFW and the California Fish and Game Commission do not have the authority and are not responsible for managing oil and gas mining activities, but regularly communicate,

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
				coordinate, and train with other agencies, including the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management, State Lands Commission (SLC), California Coastal Commission (CCC), and the US Coast Guard to ensure that oil spill prevention and response plans consider catastrophic impacts to MPAs. In addition, the MSLT provides another opportunity for state agencies and others to engage in collaborative and cooperative dialogues.
20 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Full document	Recommend more detail on Channel Islands MPAs, including results from monitoring efforts, information on the enforcement, education, outreach, and monitoring partnerships.	The draft 2015 Master Plan is primarily intended to provide statewide guidance relative to MPA management, rather than provide a comprehensive summary of all MPAs, collaborations, partnerships, and other efforts aimed to inform MPA management. As described in Chapter 3.3 of the draft 2015 Master Plan, while MPAs are actively managed at the local and regional scales, the MLPP will always consider management from the perspective of the statewide network; informed by lessons and best practices from finer scales across the state. Nevertheless, more detailed regional and/or local information is included in the draft 2015 Master Plan, such as: 1) statewide and regional MPA summaries (see Chapter 2.2), 2) individual MPA summaries (see Appendices C – F, Section 4); 3) hyperlinks to detailed profiles of each California MPA found on CDFW’s website (see Appendices C – F, Section 4); and 4) hyperlinks and references throughout the document to comprehensive data and results from monitoring efforts that are made publicly available on OceanSpaces.org; and examples throughout the document of partnerships, collaborations, and other efforts aimed to inform MPA management. Furthermore, descriptions of additional efforts may be warranted to include in the future within Appendices C – F. Regional MPA Background and Priorities documents are not meant to contain specific details for management protocols and methodologies; they instead are intended to be living documents that

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
				are readily accessible for reference and serve as a logical starting place for guiding regionally-based activities. See also responses to Comment 3 and Comment 5.
21 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 3.2, 5	Support focus on identifying new and emerging technologies to increase enforcement efficacy, identifying funding to adequately support volunteer based MPA partnerships, and ensuring new and continued monitoring and reporting on results.	Chapter 6.2 of the draft 2015 Master Plan identifies tools to support enforcement, such as new and emerging technology options that may provide options for increased enforcement efficiency. See also response to Comment 7.
22 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 3.4	Support CDFW's efforts to communicate and train with other agencies to consider impacts of oil development on MPAs. As we learned from the 2015 Refugio Oil Spill, careful planning and coordination among agencies and the public is vital to ensure efficient and effective oil spill prevention and response.	See response to Comment 19.
23 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 3.4	Support state legislative action to repeal the exceptions to the California Coastal Sanctuary Act in order to protect MPAs, request CDFW encourage SLC and CCC to not approve projects when requested under these exceptions, and urge CDFW to oppose new federal oil and gas leases and projects that may impact MPAs.	See response to Comment 19.
24 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 3.2	Support ongoing efforts to utilize outreach and education as a primary enforcement tool.	No action.
25 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 3.2	Encourage the use of new and emerging technology to increase enforcement efficiency. Utilizing enhanced technological resources to record enforcement activities and a robust Records Management System is vital for evaluating efficiency of past and current enforcement efforts and informing future enforcement needs. This data is also useful in achieving other goals for the MPA Master Plan, such as informing research and monitoring,	See responses to Comment 4 and Comment 21.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			education and outreach, and partner coordination, among others.	
26 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Chapter 5	Support the identification of adequate funding mechanism to support existing, volunteer based MPA partnerships, such as MPA Collaboratives. The Collaboratives have proven effective at facilitating grassroots stewardship of MPAs and bringing together local experts on education and outreach, enforcement and compliance, along with research and monitoring but require support from the State of California to continue to thrive.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, Comment 7, and Comment 30.
27 (1/27/2016)	Kristen Hislop, Environmental Defense Center	Appendix F	Appendix F does not include a detailed discussion about the federal protections at the Channel Islands MPAs or the collaborative efforts on enforcement, and education and outreach. This appendix should include additional background on the Channel Islands MPAs, details on how past efforts relate to the broader region's implementation activities, and a thorough description of partnerships.	Regarding the Channel Islands MPAs, Table 2 of the draft 2015 Master Plan includes an example of a past collaboration among CDFW and the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) to develop the Channel Islands MPA network and federal extensions; and includes a reference to Appendix A, Section 2.3 and Section 3.3 where more detailed summaries and further links (i.e., the CINMS website) can be found. In addition, Appendix A, Section 2.3 was modified to include the following sentence "Then in 2007, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration extended the boundaries for 8 of these 13 state MPAs into federal waters." Regarding the request to include a thorough description of partnerships, see responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
28 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative	Full document	The plan successfully memorializes MPA planning and gives appropriate attention to implementation efforts to continue protecting California's marine resources consistent with the goals of the MLPA.	No action.
29 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego	Chapter 4	Appreciate the focus on developing an efficient, long-term statewide monitoring program and support the ten-year formal review cycle for adaptive management, as well as the	No action.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	County MPA Community Collaborative		integration of enforcement data to help interpret monitoring results, clear and wide communication of monitoring results, and the use of MPA monitoring data to inform research on issues related to broader ocean health and resource management.	
30 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative	Full document	Recommend additional discussion and information to accurately reflect the implementation activities carried out by regional MPA Community Collaboratives, partners and volunteers; the significant value these local partners play in improving MPA implementation; including a link to the Collaborative Network's website; and DFW staff reach out to the Collaboratives to get more detailed descriptions of Collaboratives' implementation activities.	The website for the MPA Collaborative Network was added in Chapter 1.2 of the draft 2015 Master Plan, where the public can access more information regarding activities and partnerships carried out by the Collaboratives. See also responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
31 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative	Chapter 3.2, 6.2, and Appendix F (Section 6)	The enforcement sections fail to recognize the considerable efforts being conducted by allied agencies, the MPA Community Collaboratives and community partners to help improve compliance and enforcement, such as outreach activities to improve public awareness and compliance with MPA rules; hosting statewide and local enforcement trainings to educate local district attorneys and law enforcement personnel on MPA goals and regulations; MPA-specific trainings with local lifeguard agencies; and MPA Watch includes eight chapter organizations collecting data on human uses within and outside MPAs which is shared regularly with DFW's Law Enforcement Division (LED) to help identify areas of non-compliance and target enforcement efforts.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, Comment 20, and Comment 30.
32 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA	Chapter 3.2, 6.2	Strongly recommend acknowledging the necessity of an updated Records Management System to track citations and repeat violators and identify incident hot spots; which would allow DFW's LED to strategically target its	See response to Comment 4.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	Community Collaborative		efforts and make efficient use of its limited resources, and accurately reflect priorities in the MSLT Work Plan.	
33 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative	Appendix F, Table 5	The "Potential Partnerships/Assistance" column in Table 5 should include additional local partners that can assist in enforcement as eyes on the ground for the following MPAs: Batiquitos Lagoon SMCA (Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation, City of Carlsbad, Leucadia Wastewater District); Swami's SMCA (California State Parks, City of Encinitas Lifeguards, City of Solana Beach, San Diego County Sheriffs); San Elijo Lagoon SMCA (City of Encinitas Lifeguards, San Diego County Parks and Recreation, San Diego County Sheriffs, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy); San Dieguito Lagoon SMCA (San Diego County Sheriffs, City of Del Mar, San Dieguito River Park JPA); San Diego – Scripps Coastal SMCA (City of San Diego Lifeguards, University of California San Diego, Scripps Institution of Oceanography); Matlahuayl SMR (City of San Diego Lifeguards, San Diego County Sheriffs); South La Jolla SMCA (City of San Diego Lifeguards); South La Jolla SMR (City of San Diego Lifeguards, San Diego County Sheriffs); Famosa Slough SMCA (City of San Diego Parks and Recreation, Friends of Famosa Slough); Cabrillo SMR (National Park Service, City of San Diego); and Tijuana River Mouth SMCA (City of Imperial Beach Lifeguards, California State Parks, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Customs and Border Protection.	See response to Comment 5.
34 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA	Appendix F, Table 5	Matlahuayl SMR is listed incorrectly on Page F-24 as an SMCA; it is an SMR.	Matlahuayl SMCA was corrected to Matlahuayl SMR on Page F-24.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	Community Collaborative			
35 (1/28/2016)	Zachary Plopper and Kathy Weldon, San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative	Full document	The draft master plan emphasizes limitations on direct take of living resources and overlooks the importance of non-living resource take restrictions, which is inconsistent with Title 14. 1.39. 632.a(A)(B)(C) “unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living, geological, or cultural marine resource...” Recommend ensuring that nonliving geological and cultural marine resources are provided equal attention in the Plan.	Throughout the draft 2015 Master Plan, CDFW has addressed the concern of unequal importance given to “living” marine resources over “non-living” marine resources by removing the word “living” when it precedes “marine resources”. This ensures equal attention is given to all marine resources as identified in California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §632.
36 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	General comment	Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) – a Federal MPA – overlaps many of the state MPAs in the Central Coast Region, and two other national marine sanctuaries also overlap with additional state MPAs to the north and south; providing an excellent opportunity for both MPA systems to work in partnership and collaborate on monitoring and research.	No action.
37 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	Acronyms	CINMS is out of order. It is listed above NOAA [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration], and since the table is alphabetical, it should be moved. Also, MBNMS is not listed and should, since it will appear in later sections.	CINMS was corrected to follow CDFW in the acronyms table on Page v.
38 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	Full document	MBNMS is a Federal member of the MSLT, and recognition here is warranted; explicitly mentioning MBNMS supports our ongoing partnership with the state, and provides a “place to point to” when the need arises for NOAA staff.	Chapter 1.2, Page 9 of the draft 2015 Master Plan was corrected to include “state” before agencies and inserted “Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary”.
39 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	Chapter 2.2	Switch BTRF to BRTF.	BTRF was corrected to BRTF on Page 22.
40 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay	Chapter 4.1	Regarding “The MLPP has therefore set a 10-year cycle of formal management reviews for	Chapter 4.5 of the draft 2015 Master Plan describes potential exceptions to the decadal review process,

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	National Marine Sanctuary		the statewide MPA network...”; as part of the adaptive management strategy, CDFW and the Commission have the ability to respond quickly during the intervening years between reviews. The point should be emphasized that should a threat or stressor arise prior to a 10-year review, the Department and Commission have the ability to address it at that time.	such as if a substantial case is made that not taking immediate action will cause significant harm to public safety or public welfare, or identifies scientific or technical issues that significantly impact MPA management or compromise MPA performance.
41 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	Chapter 4.1	Agree that a 10 year cycle is appropriate for reviewing ecological trends and is also administratively sustainable. One key to the administrative component will be to ensure some level of staff continuity and curate extensive documentation to facilitate effective and efficient reviews at a decadal scale.	No action.
42 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	Chapter 4.3	Percent cover was not listed under biological and ecological metrics; however if density includes counts per unit area and percent cover, then adding percent cover is unnecessary.	No action.
43 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	Chapter 4.4	Research can clarify ecological relationships that allow proper interpretation of monitoring data, and therefore those types of research projects are “within” the goals and objectives; to broadly say research is outside of the goals is taking too narrow a view.	Corrected errors on Page ix and Box 5 of the draft 2015 Master Plan by replacing “outside” with “complementary to”.
44 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	General comment	Regarding scientific collection in MPAs, we encourage CDFW to continue to work with NOAA on the process of collecting in state waters by Federal agencies that share jurisdictions and have their own Federal mandates and requirements. Pursuit of an MOU with NOAA specifically addressing collections in MPAs could be one mechanism to address this issue. Alternatively, there could be an agency-level Entity Permit that is specifically designed for Federal agencies with legal authorities in state waters.	No action.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
45 (1/28/2016)	Steve Lonhart, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	General comment	Research staff at MBNMS look forward to continuing to work with CDFW scientists and CalOST staff, both in the field collecting MPA data and in working groups to review proposals and products generated by researchers working in MPAs; the linkages between both systems of MPAs leverages limited resources and emphasizes the need to work together towards common goals.	No action.
46 (1/28/2016)	Edward Moreno, Sierra Club California	Chapter 3.4	Applaud the recognition that “collaborative efforts will be crucial for taking an ecosystem-based approach to management”, but would like to see more proactive and specific goals in addressing these diverse ecosystem threats, such as “protect MPAs from oil pollution” and concrete actions to do so; rather than ambiguous statements like “consider potential risks”.	No action.
47 (1/28/2016)	Edward Moreno, Sierra Club California	Chapter 3.4	The 2015 Master Plan does not address the threat that oil and gas drilling has on MPAs, and ignores the fact that there is active drilling within State waters, such as the Ellwood field adjacent to Campus Point. CDFW can and should take a more proactive approach to this threat by explicitly prohibiting “Exploring for, developing or producing oil, gas or minerals” in or under MPAs, as is the case with all federal marine sanctuaries. It is not sufficient to point the state and federal moratoriums on these activities as those can be lifted. There are also exceptions that could affect MPAs, such as the exception allowing drilling from federal land that could affect the Vandenberg SMR, and the proposal by Venoco to expand their existing Ellwood lease into Campus Point SMCA. CDFW should encourage the State Lands Commission and the California Coastal Commission to not approve projects when requested under these	See response to Comment 19.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			exceptions, and also oppose new federal oil and gas leases and projects that may impact MPAs.	
48 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Full document	Appreciate the focus of the document on moving forward and supporting adaptive management. The document correctly identifies monitoring and research, enforcement, and education as key components of long term success of our MPAs.	No action.
49 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Full document	Partnerships and long term funding are also identified but need more emphasis and detail.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, Comment 7, and Comment 20.
50 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Chapter 4	We support the idea of a ten year time frame for review of the MPAs. This provides adequate time for marine ecosystems to react to the initial implementation before the first DFW performance analysis and to adaptive measures implemented afterwards.	No action.
51 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Chapter 3.1	We strongly support the idea of leveraging local partners for educational outreach. Specifically the development of a “Partners Guide” and timely guidance, input, and product review of local materials to ensure accuracy and as possible, conformity with DFW materials.	No action.
52 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Appendix F, Table 5	Appendix F contains a key error in section six. Table five in this section lists no enforcement partners for the Orange County MPAs. On the contrary, Orange County sets the example for local enforcement assistance with the City of Laguna Beach providing a full time Marine Enforcement officer backed up by city lifeguards for the Laguna Beach Reserve and SMCA along with part of the Dana Point SMCA.	See response to Comment 5.
53 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Appendix F, Table 5	The City of Dana Point also provides a full time Marine Enforcement officer for the Dana Point SMCA within city boundaries. Enforcement assistance for the Crystal Cove SMCA is	See response to Comment 5.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			provided by California State Parks Department and the City of Newport Beach supports enforcement in Upper Newport Bay. Additionally the Orange County Sheriff's Department supports all of these agencies as needed. Finally the Orange County District Attorneys office has taken a strong stance in support of MPAs and prioritizes MPA offenses for prosecution.	
54 (1/28/2016)	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Chapter 4	Encourage the 10 year review take into account the impact of ocean discharge and make it a consideration when seeking to restore healthy ocean habitats.	No action.
55 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, Natural Resources Defense Council; Dana Murray, Heal the Bay; Jennifer Savage, Surfrider Foundation, Ray Hiemstra, Orange County Coastkeeper; Zach Plopper, WILD COAST; and Dennis Long, California Marine Sanctuary Foundation <b>(hereafter referred as Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of</b>	Chapter 4	We believe the Plan update successfully memorializes details from the MPA planning phase and turns appropriate attention to implementation efforts and partnerships necessary to continue protecting California's marine resources, consistent with the goals of the MLPA. We appreciate the Plan's focus on developing an efficient, long-term statewide monitoring program and support the ten-year formal review cycle for adaptive management, as well as the integration of enforcement data to help interpret monitoring results, clear and wide communication of monitoring results, and the use of MPA monitoring data to inform research on issues related to broader ocean health and resource management.	No action.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	<b>six non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</b>			
56 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Full document	Recommend the enforcement, outreach and education discussions in the Plan warrant additional detail to accurately reflect the current landscape of collaborative activities and partners and to help direct future actions.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
57 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.1	Recommend updating this section to highlight existing MPA partnerships and outreach efforts across California, including more detail on the makeup, past projects, and ongoing efforts of the Collaboratives in order to acknowledge the significant value these local partners play in bolstering MPA durability.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, Comment 20, and Comment 30.
58 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 1.2	Recommended including a link to the Collaborative website.	See response to Comment 30.
59 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.1	Recommend identifying the California Marine Sanctuary Foundation with their website referenced given the substantial role they have played in creating and disseminating MPA information throughout California.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
60 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.1	Recommend editing text to document the significant efforts that have already been accomplished or are underway rather than as if many of these activities have yet to occur. Then the 2015 Master Plan should note the importance of building on this momentum and identify the highest priority future outreach and education needs.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
61 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.1	Recommend documenting initial efforts towards “coordination of outreach efforts” core actions have already occurred.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
62 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.1	Recommend adding a summary about the progress of increased engagement with California tribes and tribal communities,	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			including the development of MPA messaging and content highlighting traditional and cultural uses along the coast.	
63 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 5.3	Recommend identifying the existing partnerships that are currently providing diversified support opportunities for MPA management, in addition to acknowledging the need for future partnership development and strong communications networks across partners and with DFW.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
64 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapters 3.2 and 6.2	The 2015 Master Plan fails to recognize the considerable efforts being conducted by community partners, and should be revised to acknowledge the role of Collaboratives with respect to MPA enforcement and compliance.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, Comment 20, Comment 21, and Comment 30.
65 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapters 3.2 and 6.2	Recommend the inclusion of a discussion of the statewide MPA Watch program and its value in contributing data to inform enforcement priorities.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
66 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapters 3.2 and 6.2	Recommend that the 2015 Master Plan should call out existing coordination between DFW Law Enforcement, local district attorneys, and the California District Attorneys Association, and highlight the importance of ongoing partnerships among these entities.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 20.
67 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapters 3.2 and 6.2	Recommend highlighting DFW's improved enforcement capacity under AB 298 which provides authority to cite MPA violations as either a misdemeanor or infraction.	No action.
68 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapters 3.2 and 6.2	Strongly recommend including the need for an updated RMS to track citations, repeat violators, and to identify incident hotspots, to allow DFW's law enforcement to strategically target its efforts and make efficient use with limited resources. Recommend adding that the development and implementation of an electronic RMS is an immediate priority.	See response to Comment 4.
69	Jenn Eckerle,	Appendices C-	Recommend updating the potential partnerships	See response to Comment 5.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
(1/28/2016)	on behalf of six NGOs	F	column in these tables to reflect the existing and potential future collaborative efforts supporting MPA enforcement across the State	
70 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Appendix F	Recommend including additional background on the Channel Islands MPAs (including contiguous federal protections), and how implementation activities there fit the broader South Coast efforts, the roles CINMS and CINP play in collaborative enforcement with DFW and a summary of existing monitoring efforts and results at these MPAs.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, Comment 20, and Comment 27.
71 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 4.1	Recommend that this section clarify that formal adaptive management review will provide a status update of MPA performance on a scientifically based, administratively appropriate, reliable schedule and an opportunity to assess and improve MPA protection, consistent with the goals of the Marine Life Protection Act.	No action.
72 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 4.1	Recommend adding the explicit statement that California's MPAs were created as permanent conservation areas and the ten-year adaptive management review is the time to evaluate whether they are providing their intended ecological benefits, not an opportunity to reduce or eliminate their protections.	No action.
73 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 1	Recommend editing the text "improve socioeconomic activities and marine heritage provided by marine ecosystems" on page 3 of the 2015 Master Plan since the Marine Life Protection Plan does not include a goal focused on improving socioeconomic activities. Suggest using the alternative sentence: "...improving recreational activities and marine heritage provided by marine ecosystems subject to minimal disturbance".	No action.
74 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six	Appendices C-F	Recommend revising the bulleted lists in Section 3.2 of appendices to include critical	As identified by the commenters, Appendix A provides context for Appendices C – F, and includes detailed

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	NGOs		scientific design criteria, such as size and spacing of MPAs (as identified in Appendix A)	historical information on all aspects of the process used to design, site, and establish California's MPA network.
75 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Appendices A-F	Recommend that the plan highlights the importance of scientific design guidelines in addition to regional design considerations.	See response to Comment 74.
76 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.4	Recommend adding more discussion on the importance of integrating MPAs into California's ocean governance, consistent with Strategic Priority 3 in the MPA Statewide Leadership Team (SLT) Work Plan. In added discussion, recommended to include SLT partner agency descriptions and their respective and overlapping mandates for regulating activities that could impact MPAs and ocean resources, as well as, summarizing the SLT's priority actions for improving interagency coordination and review consistency for project impacts to MPAs.	Please refer to Table 2 of this document regarding minor corrections CDFW and OPC staff made to the draft 2015 Master Plan to clarify and strengthen the role of the MSLT.
77 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Chapter 3.4	Recommend including the role of DFW's Office of Spill Response and Prevention in developing oil spill contingency plans and implementing spill response strategies that prioritize MPA protection.	The Office of Spill Response and Prevention is part of CDFW. See also response to Comment 19.
78 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Appendices C – F	Recommend updating and cross-referencing MPA names with updates to MPA regulations.	<p>The following corrections were made:</p> <p>Appendix C: Table 5 and Table 6 name Rockport Pocks Special Closure corrected to Rockport Rocks Special Closure.</p> <p>Appendix D: Table 2 names and information added for Montara SMR and Pillar Point SMCA. Table 4 name Estero de Liman-tour SMR corrected to Estero de Limantour SMR. Table 4 name South-east Farallon Island SMR corrected to Southeast Farallon Island SMR. Table 5 and Table 6 name Double Point/Stormy Stack Special Closure corrected to Double Point/Stormy</p>

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
				<p>Stack Rock Special Closure.</p> <p>Appendix E:  Table 2 name Lover's Point SMR corrected to Lover's Point-Julia Platt SMR.  Table 2 name Pt. Lobos SMR corrected to Point Lobos SMR.  Table 2 name Pt. Lobos SMCA corrected to Point Lobos SMCA.  Table 5 and Table 6 name Ano Nuevo SMR corrected to Año Nuevo SMR.  Table 5 and Table 6 name and information added for Natural Bridges SMR  Table 5 and Table 6 and information for Edward F. Ricketts added to replace Lovers Point SMCA.  Table 5 and Table 6 name Lovers Point SMR corrected to Lovers Point –Julia Platt SMR.  Table 5 and Table 6 Point Buchon SMRMA name corrected to Point Buchon SMCA.</p> <p>Appendix F:  Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Blue Cavern SMCA corrected to Blue Cavern Onshore SMCA.  Table 2, Table 5, and Table 6 name Bird Rock SMCA corrected to Blue Cavern Offshore SMCA.  Table 4 name San Miguel Island Special Closure Special Closure corrected to San Miguel Island Special Closure.  Table 4 name Anacapa Island Special Closure Special Closure corrected to Anacapa Island Special Closure.</p>
79 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Appendices C – F	Recommend MPA regulatory updates be referenced.	No action.
80 (1/28/2016)	Jenn Eckerle, on behalf of six NGOs	Appendix F	Recommend "No Take" SMCAs should be listed as such, rather than just SMCAs, given they are more comparable to SMRs in protection level.	The following corrections were made to Appendix F: Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Campus Point SMCA corrected to Campus Point SMCA (no-take). Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Goleta Slough SMCA corrected to Goleta Slough SMCA (no-take).

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
				<p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Point Vicente SMCA corrected to Point Vicente SMCA (no-take).</p> <p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Bolsa Chica Basin SMCA corrected to Bolsa Chica Basin SMCA (no-take).</p> <p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Laguna Beach SMCA corrected to Laguna Beach SMCA (no-take).</p> <p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Batiquitos Lagoon SMCA corrected to Batiquitos Lagoon SMCA (no-take).</p> <p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name San Elijo Lagoon SMCA corrected to San Elijo Lagoon SMCA (no-take).</p> <p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Blue Cavern SMCA corrected to Blue Cavern Onshore SMCA (no-take).</p> <p>Table 2, Table 5 and Table 6 name Casino Point SMCA corrected to Casino Point SMCA (no-take).</p>
81 (1/28/2016)	Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative Network	Chapter 3.1	Recommend including Figure 1 on page 6 of “The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Areas Partnership Plan” to highlight that the Collaboratives are more than community based.	No action.
82 (1/28/2016)	Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative Network	Chapter 1.2	Recommend adding a list naming all 14 collaboratives currently in existence.	See response to Comment 30.
83 (1/28/2016)	Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative Network	Chapter 3.1	Recommend adding a more concrete description of outreach partners and projects, as well as a direct reference to the MPA Collaborative Network’s role in providing on-the-ground assistance with outreach and education.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 30.
84 (1/28/2016)	Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative Network	Chapter 3.2, and Appendices A- F	Recommend referencing the 2015 MPA Collaborative Network hosted enforcement trainings that have been completed or planned to date.	See responses to Comment 3, Comment 5, and Comment 30.
85 (1/28/2016)	Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative	Chapter 5.1	Recommend adding the Collaborative Network to Table 8, since they are part of the MPA Statewide Leadership Team	The Collaborative Network is an MSLT member, however Table 8 of the draft 2015 Master Plan is not a list of MSLT partners. The list of MSLT members can

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	Network			be found in MSLT Work Plan, which is referenced throughout the draft 2015 Master Plan. See also responses to Comment 76.
86 (1/28/2016)	Calla Allison, MPA Collaborative Network	Appendices C- F	Recommend updating the partnerships columns with the following agencies as appropriate: State Parks, Tolowa Dee-ni', Del Norte County Parks, Oregon State Police, Del Norte County (Marine Sheriff), BLM, BLM Offshore Coastal Monument, Redwood State and National Parks, Trinidad Rancheria, Humboldt County Sheriffs, Mendocino County Sheriffs, Soper Timber Company, Mendocino Redwood Company, US Coast Guard US Fish and Wildlife, NOAA, CalTrans, Nature Conservancy, Campbell Hawthorne Timber Company, City of Fort Bragg, Point Cabrillo Lightkeepers Association, Point Arena Lighthouse Association, Stornetta Land Trust, City of Point Arena, Loran Station Mendocino College Marine Lab, Sea Ranch, Sonoma County Regional Parks, Sonoma County Sheriffs, Richardson Family, Kashia Pomo, Sonoma Land Trust, Sonoma County Sheriffs Marine Unit, Bodega Marine Reserve, Doran Regional Park, San Mateo County Parks, Pillar Point Harbor District, San Mateo County Sheriff, Santa Cruz Harbor District, Coal Oil Point Natural Marine Reserve, Santa Barbara County Parks, City of Isla Vista, Goleta County Parks, Santa Barbara Airport, City of Santa Barbara, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, LA County Fire, LA County Sheriffs, USC Wrigley, City of Avalon, LA County, City of Newport Beach, Count of Orange, UC Irvine, Orange County Sheriffs Harbor Patrol, City of Laguna Beach, Orange County Parks and Recreation, Orange County Lifeguards, Orange County Sheriffs, City of Dana Point, City of Carlsbad, City of Encinitas Lifeguards, City of	See response to Comment 5.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
			Solana Beach, San Diego County Sheriffs, San Diego County Parks and Recreation, City of Del Mar, San Dieguito River Park JPA, City of San Diego Lifeguards, UCSD Natural Reserve System, San Diego County Sheriffs, City of San Diego, City of San Diego Parks and Recreation, National Parks Service, City of Imperial Beach Lifeguards, and Customs and Border Protection	
87 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA	General comment	We suggest that CDFW consider creating something analogous to a "neighborhood watch" program, enlisting specific local residents or civic groups to "adopt a refuge" and keep an eye on it, reporting to local wardens any potential refuge violations or suspicious activities. With strained professional LE resources, leveraging the support of interested citizens could make a difference. This could be done through your retired annuitant program and tis person could be the focal point between volunteers and the Department.	No action.
88 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA	General comment	CDFW should explore aerial and seaborne observation support from the US Coast Guard Auxiliary, a volunteer organization organized and funded by the US Coast Guard. The auxiliary dispatches private boats and planes for volunteer observation support in accordance with Coast Guard directives.	No action.
89 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA	Appendix E, Table 5	CDFW should also explore and list potential partnership with the US Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for more coastal MPAs than simply Piedras Blancas SMCA, since most nearshore rocks and islets in the state are part of the California Coastal National Monument, managed and protected by BLM.	See response to Comment 5.
90 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary,	Appendix E, Table 5	Table 5 of the Central Coast Appendix should list Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary as a potential partner for the "Cambria SMCA/SMP", since the vast majority of the	See response to Comment 5.

Comment Number (Date Received)	Commenter, Organization	Applicable Comment Section, or General Comment	COMMENT SUMMARY	DRAFT RESPONSE
	NOAA		MPA falls within the boundaries of MBNMS.	
91 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA	Appendix E, Table 5	Table 5 of the Central Coast Appendix should list California State Parks as a potential partner for the "Asilomar SMR", since the MPA abuts Asilomar State Beach, managed and patrolled by State Parks.	See response to Comment 5.
92 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA	Appendix D, Table 5	Table 5 of the North Central Coast Appendix should list San Mateo County as a potential enforcement partner for the "Pillar Point SMCA" and "Montara SMR", since the county manages the Pillar Point Harbor Patrol and the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve adjacent to those MPAs.	See response to Comment 5.
93 (1/28/2016)	Karen Grimmer, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, NOAA	Chapter 3.4	We recommend a stronger role of the MLPA to ensure that the special protections outlined in the CA Ocean Plan afford high quality water in the MPAs and that there is a concerted effort to coordinate the multiple monitoring efforts required by many different state agencies so that resource managers are able to measure status and trends of water quality pollutants in these protected areas.	No action.

Table 2. Minor errors identified by CDFW and OPC staff in the draft 2015 Master Plan, such as typos, missing or extra words, clarifications, and formatting and consistency issues. The column on the far right indicates how each error was corrected.

Document Section	Page Number	Correction
Executive Summary	vi	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added “the” in the sentence – “In 1999, <b>[the]</b> California Legislature passed...”.
Executive Summary	vi	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: The following sentence was added to clarify that the Partnership Plan is referenced prior to describing the MSLT – “ <b>[The 2015 Master Plan is also complemented by The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Area Partnership Plan (the Partnership Plan)]</b> ”.
Executive Summary	vii	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: To clarify that formalizing the MSLT is implementing the Partnership Plan and a partnership-based approach for MPA management, the following words were added to the end of the sentence “ <b>[– which is documented in the Partnership Plan]</b> ”.
Executive Summary	vii	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Reordered the mandates to align with the order as they appear in the document.
Executive Summary	vii	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: Clarified and strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Executive Summary	viii	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: Removed “of” in “(e.g., identify <b>of</b> areas of high priority...)”.
Executive Summary	viii	5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> paragraphs: Clarified and strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Executive Summary	viii	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: Added “and” in the sentence – “Adaptive management, required by the MLPA, is a process that facilitates learning from program actions <b>[and]</b> helps evaluate...”.
Executive Summary	ix	1 <sup>st</sup> header: Clarified the statewide monitoring program as the <b>Statewide MPA Monitoring Program</b> .
Executive Summary	x	1 <sup>st</sup> header: Clarified and strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Chapter 1	1	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Italicized the “Future” in “ <i>California’s Ocean Resources: An Agenda for the <b>Future</b></i> ”.
Chapter 1	1	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 9 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Removed the following sentence because the Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act, California Ocean Resources Stewardship Act, and California Ocean Protection Act did not technically “set the stage” for the MLPA as they were passed following the MLPA; “ <del>These pieces of legislation all set the stage for the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), from which this Master Plan originates.</del> ”.
Chapter 1	3	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added the words “ <b>[, and the MPA Statewide Leadership Team Work Plan]</b> ” and corresponding footnote citation to clarify the MSLT work plan is also a complementary guidance document.
Chapter 1.1	5	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 6 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Corrected the estimated years California inhabitants have depended on the state’s marine and coastal resources to “ <b>[at least 11,500 years, with some estimates indicating 19,000 years or more]</b> ”; removed “ <del>For approximately 30,000 years,</del> ” and Nies (2012); and added four references to the end of this sentence and in the Literature Cited.

Document Section	Page Number	Correction
Chapter 1.1	5	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 8 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added “to” in the sentence – “Today, California’s inhabitants and visitors continue <b>[to]</b> gain...”.
Chapter 1.2	8	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Removed “agency” in the sentence – “This approach is grounded in the foundational <b>agency</b> relationship between...”.
Chapter 1.2	9	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Corrected the MSLT workplan from finalizing its "two-year" workplan to a <b>three</b> -year workplan.
Chapter 1.2	10	Table 2, row 7: California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) was added as a valued partner for attending meetings and regularly engaging with the Collaborative Network; also made State Parks an acronym on row 14 of Table 2 as a result.
Chapter 1.2	11	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Removed “of the approach” in the sentence – “As one component of the Collaborative Approach, Community Collaboratives (Collaboratives) reflect the local-scale community focus <b>of the approach</b> .”
Chapter 1.3	12	Figure 2: Corrected the milestone "Central Coast MPA design process began" to be listed under <b>2004</b> , instead of 2005.
Chapter 2.1	14-16	It is clearly stated that MPAs are a subset of marine managed areas (MMAs), however throughout the draft 2015 Master Plan the more common term “MPA” is used as an umbrella to refer to all types of protected areas. Therefore, MMAs was changed to <b>MPAs</b> in three instances on pages 14-16.
Chapter 2.1	14	Footnote #49: Removed the period at the end of the footnote.
Chapter 2.1	14	Footnote #50: Added “§” to “FGC <b>§1583</b> ”.
Chapter 2.2	16	Table 3, footnote #15: Corrected footnote #15 to be <b>#59</b> , and added reference <b>PRC §36710(a)</b> .
Chapter 2.2	22	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Corrected the start of the Central Coast planning region, in parentheses, from 2005 to <b>2004</b> .
Chapter 3	28	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph: Clarified and/or strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Chapter 3	28	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: Reordered the mandates to align with the order as they appear in the document.
Chapter 3.4	37	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Corrected the sentence to “These areas <b>include [are called]</b> areas of special biological significance and general protection areas (SWQPA-GP),...”.
Chapter 4, 4.1	40	Chapter 4 and 4.1 header; and 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Clarified and strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Chapter 4.1	42	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Corrected the number of categories to be <b>four</b> , instead of three.
Chapter 4.2	42, 43	Clarified and strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Chapter 4.2	43	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence; and header 4.3: Clarified the statewide monitoring program as the <b>Statewide MPA Monitoring Program</b> .
Chapter 4.2	43	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added a comma after “i.e.,” in two instances.
Chapter 4.3	43	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: Added “testing” in “Therefore, California’s MPA network offers a unique <b>[testing]</b> grounds for collecting data...”.
Chapter 4.3	44	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence: Added the words “ <b>[and the MSLT Work Plan]</b> ”.
Chapter 4.3	44	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Added the words “ <b>[and findings from the regional MPA baseline programs]</b> ”.

Document Section	Page Number	Correction
Chapter 4.3	45	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Slightly modified the sentence.
Chapter 4.3	46	Figure 10 caption: Added " <b>Anticipated</b> " to the beginning of the caption since Figure 10 highlights both existing and anticipated future timeline items.
Chapter 4.3	47	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph: Clarified the statewide monitoring program as the <b>Statewide MPA Monitoring Program</b> in two instances.
Chapter 4.3	48	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Corrected the sentence "...and consists of securing funding, establishing a mechanism for disbursing funds, <del>several</del> <b>[1-3]</b> years of data collection,..."
Chapter 4.3	48	Last paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence: Added "a" in the sentence – "In addition, results guide the development of <b>[a]</b> collaborative, efficient,..."
Chapter 4.3	49	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence: Corrected the sentence " <del>In each region, t</del> <b>[T]</b> he monitoring program will be designed to provide..."
Chapter 4.4	51	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Corrected "potentially" to "potential" in "Both research and monitoring, as well as <del>potentially</del> development..."
Chapter 4.4	51	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence: Removed the following sentence because State Parks does not have the authority to issue Scientific Collecting Permits in the marine environment – " <del>Some MPAs also require a scientific collection permit (SCP) from State Parks, in addition to CDFW's requirements.</del> <sup>136</sup> ". As a result, the following sentence was also modified as "High-level planning by the MSLT and individual state partners will focus on increasing coordination between <del>these two</del> permitting <b>processes[agencies]</b> ."
Chapter 4.5	52	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added "and" in "These activities may take place at the regional scale and serve to inform the public about the state of the network and build understanding <b>[and]</b> support for the MPAs."
Chapter 4.5	52	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added "s" in "These assessments and evaluation <b>[s]</b> ..."
Chapter 4.5	52	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Clarified and/or strengthened the relationship between management and adaptive management.
Chapter 5.2	56	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence: Added the Partnership Plan as a citation in "...developed an updated list of potential funding sources <b>[in the Partnership Plan<sup>156</sup>]</b> , including..."
Literature Cited	64-68	Added a space, for consistency, in between the first initials of authors listed for 12 references.
Literature Cited	64, 66	Corrected the Baskett & Barnett (2015) and Lubchenco & Grorud-Colvert (2015) references, respectively, to include the volume and page numbers.
Literature Cited	66	Corrected "fk, S. E." to be " <b>Lester, S. E.</b> ".
Appendix A, Section 3.3	A-16	Deleted footnote #46 " <del>FGC §8495-8497</del> " because it was an incorrect reference.
Appendix A, Section 7.3	A-55	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Added the Partnership Plan as a citation (footnote #111).

Document Section	Page Number	Correction
Appendix C, D, and F (Chapter 5.3)	C-19, D-20, F-22	Added the website to access the <i>State of the California North Central Coast: A Summary of the Marine Protected Area Monitoring Program 2010-2015</i> report, regarding footnote #33 in Appendix C, D, and F.
Appendix E, Section 2.1	E-2	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence: Corrected that the Central Coast planning process began in <b>2004</b> , rather than 2005.
Appendix E, Section 3.3	E-7	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: Corrected that the Central Coast planning process began in <b>2004</b> , rather than 2005.



January 27, 2016

California Fish and Game Commission  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

**Re: Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas**

Dear California Fish and Game Commission:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas (“MPAs”). The following comments are submitted by the Environmental Defense Center (“EDC”), a public interest environmental law firm headquartered in Santa Barbara, California. The EDC protects and enhances the environment through education, advocacy and legal action. The EDC was founded after the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill and continues to protect and enhance the marine environment through its leadership role working with diverse partners in support of MPAs. EDC has been involved in the MLPA process by supporting the establishment of MPAs in our region and currently co-chairs the Santa Barbara Channel MPA Collaborative.

We recommend that the Commission enhance protection of MPAs from oil and gas drilling. We also recommend that the Commission include more information on the Channel Islands MPAs, including results from monitoring efforts and information on the enforcement, education, outreach, and monitoring partnerships. We support focus on identifying new and emerging technologies to increase enforcement efficiency, identifying funding to adequately support volunteer based MPA partnerships, and ensuring new and continued monitoring and reporting on results.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of the following comments.

*Oil and Gas Drilling and Transport (p. 38)*

We support CDFW’s efforts to communicate and train with other agencies to consider the impacts of oil development on MPAs. As we learned from the 2015 Refugio Oil Spill, careful planning and coordination among agencies and the public is vital to ensure efficient and effective oil spill prevention and response.

We also support state legislative action to repeal the exceptions to the California Coastal Sanctuary Act in order to protect MPAs. Additionally, we request that CDFW encourage the State Lands Commission and the California Coastal Commission to not approve projects when requested under these exceptions. Finally, we urge the CDFW to oppose new federal oil and gas leases and projects that may impact MPAs.

*Enforcement, Plan Objectives (p. 33) and Identify Tools and Support Enforcement (p. 59)*

We support the ongoing efforts to utilize outreach and education as a primary enforcement tool. We also encourage the use of new and emerging technology to increase enforcement efficiency. Utilizing enhanced technological resources to record enforcement activities and a robust Records Management System is vital for evaluating efficiency of past and current enforcement efforts and informing future enforcement needs. This data is also useful in achieving other goals for the MPA Master Plan, such as informing research and monitoring, education and outreach, and partner coordination, among others.

*Partnership Coordination, Build Partnerships (p. 60)*

We support the identification of adequate funding mechanism to support existing, volunteer based MPA partnerships, such as MPA Collaboratives. The Collaboratives have proven effective at facilitating grassroots stewardship of MPAs and bringing together local experts on education and outreach, enforcement and compliance, along with research and monitoring but require support from the State of California to continue to thrive.

*South Coast Implementation Considerations (Appendix F)*

Monitoring activities and reports on their results are vital to understanding the impacts of MPAs. Existing monitoring programs at the Channel Islands MPAs, led by researchers at Channel Islands National Park (“CINP”) and University of California Santa Barbara, have provided a wealth of data. Continuation of such programs, and reporting on the results from these programs, should be a high priority in implementation and informing adaptive management of South Coast MPAs. Appendix F does not include a description of these efforts and should provide a summary of available results of the monitoring efforts at the Channel Islands MPAs.

Additionally, Appendix F does not include a detailed discussion about the federal protections at the Channel Islands MPAs or the collaborative efforts on enforcement, and education and outreach. This appendix should include additional background on the Channel Islands MPAs, details on how past efforts relate to the broader region’s implementation activities, and a thorough description of partnerships.

Again, we urge you to enhance protection of MPAs from oil and gas drilling, include background on the Channel Islands MPAs, and we voice our support for identifying new and emerging enforcement technologies, identifying funding to adequately support volunteer based MPA partnerships, and prioritizing new and continued monitoring and reporting.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kristen Hislop". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kristen" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Hislop".

Kristen Hislop,  
Marine Conservation Program Director



January 28, 2016

California Fish and Game Commission  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Via email: [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov)

### **Comments on the Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan Update**

Dear Fish and Game Commissioners:

The Marine Protected Area Collaborative Network wishes to submit the following comments on the Department of Fish and Wildlife's draft updated Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas (Master Plan).

The Collaborative Network (CN) is comprised of fourteen locally based MPA Collaboratives that bring together community partners supporting MPA implementation in the areas of outreach and education, enforcement and compliance, and research and monitoring. These collaboratives have made great strides towards enhancing the Department of Fish and Wildlife's partnership approach to MPA management – and we anticipate their robust contribution to future management efforts.

The Master Plan would benefit from referencing MPA Collaboratives broadly in several areas, most notably in chapter 1.2 (Collaborative MPA Governance and Policy); chapter 3.1 (Outreach and Education); chapter 3.2 (Enforcement); chapter 5 (Program partners and operations), and chapter 6 (Setting a path forward). Finally, we suggest including additional MPA enforcement partners under each of the regional appendices (1-4).

#### **Outreach and Education**

While we appreciate the reference to the Collaborative Network on Section 1.2, Page 11 of the Master Plan, the emphasis on the “local scale community focus of the approach” suggests an effort that is purely community based. While the focus of each collaborative is indeed local, there is an element that is not captured in this section: the flow of information from the local to statewide level, and from the statewide to local level. State policymakers in the MPA Statewide Leadership Team benefit from hearing on the ground concerns, while collaborative members are kept in the loop about statewide initiatives regarding MPAs. This relationship is detailed in Figure 1 on Page 6

of “The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Areas Partnership Plan”. We recommend this diagram be included in the Master Plan.

We suggest Section 1.2 take the opportunity to list each of the fourteen collaboratives currently in existence on the California Coast. This list can be found at the following web address: <http://mpacollaborative.org/county-collaboratives.html> More specific information about each collaborative, including a map, is available upon request.

Section 3.1: Outreach and Education would benefit from a more concrete description of outreach partners and projects, as well as direct reference to the MPA Collaborative Network’s role in providing on-the-ground assistance with outreach and education, and experience having worked successfully with the Department to have materials approved. Much of the work described here has already been started by collaboratives and other local entities, such as aquaria and statewide NGOs.

### **Enforcement**

To date, the MPA Collaborative Network has provided valuable assistance to the Department’s enforcement efforts in the form of regional MPA enforcement trainings. These trainings include CDFW wardens, other local allied agencies with citation authority over MPAs, and District Attorneys offices. Individual MPA boundaries and access points are detailed in a presentation by a local warden, as well as a hard copy manual prepared by Collaborative Network staff that is provided to each attendee. A representative from the local District Attorneys office discusses key points in building cases against wildlife crimes, while a CDFW Lieutenant presents on Fish and Game regulations most appropriate to each area. These trainings have increased the understanding of MPAs by enforcement officers, as well as strengthened connections with district attorneys.

Specifically, we recommend that section 3.2 of the Partnership Plan, as well as appropriate regional appendices, should reference 2015 MPA Collaborative Network hosted enforcement trainings that have been completed or planned at the following collaboratives:

- **North Coast:** Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino
- **North Central Coast:** Sonoma
- **South Coast:** Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, Catalina Island, Orange County, San Diego
- **Central Coast** (planned for 2016): Golden Gate (San Francisco/Marin); San Mateo; Santa Cruz; Monterey; San Luis Obispo

### **Program Partners and Operations**

As part of the MPA Statewide Leadership Team, the Collaborative Network should be listed in Section 5.1 under Table 8: Current Partners Supporting Management of California’s MPA Network and Their Core Competencies Related to MPA Management.

We suggest listing the following under “Sample of Core Competencies Related to MPA Management”:

- Maintaining community level MPA partnerships
- Hosting regional and statewide forums between community groups and state agencies
- Hosting MPA enforcement trainings for CDFW, allied agencies, and District Attorneys offices

### **Setting a Path Forward**

Chapter 6, “Setting a Path Forward”, suggests five key points for operationalizing the Master Plan. We recommend specifically referencing community partnerships and/or the Collaborative Network in several of these points:

**6.2 – Enforcement:** Recommend referencing the importance of partnerships in enforcement.

**6.3 – Partnership Coordination:** Recommend specifically referencing MPA Collaboratives as a priority for MLPP partnerships

### **Regional Appendices**

Each of the four regional appendices generally provide excellent localized background and priorities, especially regarding CDFW’s enforcement capacity. However, we believe each of these appendices would benefit by listing already completed or planned MPA enforcement trainings, as well as updating the partnerships columns in Table 5 (see the table below).

We offer the following suggestions for the regional appendices:

- For all appendices in Table 5, we suggest numbering each MPA as listed in CCR Title 14, Section 632 (see <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/MPAs/Network/Title-14-Section-632>)
- For all appendices in Table 5, we suggest listing MPAs by county.
- For each appendix in section 6.2 (Training), we suggest adding that “MPA trainings have also been hosted by CDFW, in conjunction with the MPA Collaborative Network, for allied agencies in each of the coastal counties in the region.”

## Potential Partnerships / Assistance

In each of the regional appendices, we recommend adding the following partnerships:

### North Coast

<b>MPA Name</b>	<b>Partnerships to Add</b>
<b><i>Del Norte County</i></b>	
Pyramid Point	State Parks, Tolowa Dee-ni', Del Norte County Parks, Oregon State Police
Point St. George	Del Norte County (Marine Sheriff), BLM
Southwest Seal Rock Special Closure	BLM Offshore Coastal Monument
Castle Rock Special Closure	BLM Offshore Coastal Monument
False Klamath Rock Special Closure	BLM Offshore Coastal Monument
<b><i>Humboldt County</i></b>	
Reading Rock SMCA / SMR	Redwood State and National Parks, Trinidad Rancheria, Humboldt County Sheriffs
Samoa SMCA	BLM, State Parks, Humboldt County Sheriff
South Humboldt Bay SMRMA	BLM, State Parks, Humboldt County Sheriff
Sugarloaf Island Special Closure	BLM
South Cape Mendocino SMR	BLM
Steamboat Rock Special Closure	BLM
Mattole Canyon SMR	BLM
Sea Lion Gulch SMR	BLM
Big Flat SMCA	BLM
<b><i>Mendocino County</i></b>	
Double Cone	State Parks, Mendocino County Sheriffs, (access Soper Timber Company, Mendocino Redwood Company)
Rockport Rocks Special Closure	BLM, US Coast Guard, US Fish and Wildlife, NOAA
Vizcaino Special Closure	BLM, US Coast Guard, US Fish and Wildlife, NOAA
Ten Mile SMR	State Parks, CalTrans, Mendocino County Sheriffs
Ten Mile SMCA	State Parks
Ten Mile Estuary	Nature Conservancy, Campbell Hawthorne Timber Company
MacKerricher	City of Fort Bragg
Point Cabrillo	Point Cabrillo Lightkeepers Association, US Coast Guard

## North Central Coast

<b>MPA Name</b>	<b>Partnerships to Add</b>
<b><i>Mendocino County</i></b>	
Point Arena SMR	BLM, Point Arena Lighthouse Association, US Coast Guard, Stornetta Land Trust
Point Arena SMCA	BLM, Point Arena Lighthouse Association, US Coast Guard, Stornetta Land Trust, City of Point Arena
Sea Lion Cove	BL M, US Coast Guard, Stornetta Land Trust, City of Point Arena, Loran Station, Mendocino College Marine Lab
Saunders Reef	State Parks, Mendocino County Sheriffs
<b><i>Sonoma County</i></b>	
Del Mar Landing	Sea Ranch, Sonoma County Regional Parks, Sonoma County Sheriffs
Stewarts Point SMCA	Richardson Family, Kashia Pomo, Sonoma Land Trust
Stewarts Point SMR	US Coast Guard, Sonoma County Sheriffs Marine Unit
Bodega Head SMR	Bodega Marine Reserve, US Coast Guard
Bodega Head SMCA	US Coast Guard
Estero Americano SMRMA	Doran Regional Park, State Parks
<b><i>Marin County</i></b>	
Point Reyes Headlands Special Closure	BLM, US Coast Guard, US Fish and Wildlife, NOAA
Point Resistance Rock Special Closure	BLM, US Coast Guard, US Fish and Wildlife, NOAA
Double Point/Stormy Stack Special Closure	BLM, US Coast Guard, US Fish and Wildlife, NOAA
<b><i>San Francisco County</i></b>	
North Farallon Island Special Closure	BLM, NOAA
<b><i>San Mateo County</i></b>	
Montara SMR	State Parks, San Mateo County Parks
Pillar Point SMCA	San Mateo County Parks, Pillar Point Harbor District, San Mateo County Sheriff

## Central Coast

MPA Name	Partnerships to Add
<b><i>Santa Cruz County</i></b>	
Natural Bridges SMCA (please insert – omitted in draft Master Plan)	State Parks, Santa Cruz Harbor District
<b><i>Santa Barbara County</i></b>	
Vandenberg SMR	(special considerations – public access is available through Amtrak Station)

## South Coast

MPA Name	Partnerships to Add
<b><i>Santa Barbara County</i></b>	
Point Conception SMR	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Campus Point SMCA	Coal Oil Point Natural Marine Reserve, Santa Barbara County Parks, City of Isla Vista
Goleta Slough SMCA	Goleta County Parks, Santa Barbara Airport, City of Santa Barbara
Note: might make more sense to order these by county or as they are listed in Title 14, section 632, rather than “islands”	
<b><i>Ventura County</i></b>	
Richardson Rock SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
San Miguel Island Special Closure	BLM, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Harris Point SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Judith Rock SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Carrington Point SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Skunk Point SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
South Point SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Painted Cave SMCA	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Gull Island SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Scorpion SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG

<b><i>Ventura County (Continued)</i></b>	
Anacapa Island Special Closure	BLM, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Anacapa Island SMCA	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Anacapa Island SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Footprint SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Begg Rock SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
Santa Barbara Island SMR	Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, USCG
<b><i>Los Angeles County</i></b>	
Point Dume SMCA	State Parks, LA County Fire, LA County Sheriffs
<b><i>Los Angeles County (Catalina Island)</i></b>	
Arrow Point to Lion Head Point SMCA	LA County Sheriff/Fire, USC Wrigley
Blue Cavern Onshore SMCA	LA County Sheriff/Fire, USC Wrigley
Blue Cavern Offshore SMCA	LA County Sheriff/Fire, USC Wrigley
Long Point SMR	LA County Sheriffs/Fire
Casino Point SMCA	City of Avalon, LA County
Lover's Cove SMCA	City of Avalon, LA County
Farnsworth Onshore SMCA	LA County Sheriffs/Fire
Farnsworth Offshore SMCA	LA County Sheriffs/Fire
Cat Harbor SMCA	LA County Sheriffs/Fire
<b><i>Orange County</i></b>	
Bolsa Bay SMCA	State Parks
Bolsa Chica Basin SMCA	State Parks
Upper Newport Bay SMCA	City of Newport Beach, County of Orange, UC Irvine, Orange County Sheriffs Harbor Patrol
Crystal Cove SMCA	State Parks, City of Newport Beach, OC Sheriffs Harbor Patrol
Laguna Beach SMR	City of Laguna Beach, OC Sheriffs Harbor Patrol
Laguna Beach SMCA	City of Laguna Beach, OC Sheriffs Harbor Patrol, Orange County Parks and Recreation, OC Lifeguards, OC Sheriffs
Dana Point SMCA	City of Dana Point, Orange County Parks and Recreation, OC Lifeguard, OC Sheriffs

<b>San Diego County</b>	
Batiquitos Lagoon SMCA	City of Carlsbad
Swami's SMCA	City of Encinitas Lifeguards, State Parks, City of Solana Beach, San Diego County Sheriffs
San Elijo Lagoon SMCA	San Diego County Parks and Rec, San Diego County Sheriffs, State Parks, City of Encinitas Lifeguards
San Dieguito Lagoon SMCA	San Diego County Sheriffs, City of Del Mar, San Dieguito River Park JPA
San Diego-Scripps Coastal SMCA	City of San Diego Lifeguards, UCSD Natural Reserve System
Matlahuayl SMR <sup>1</sup>	City of San Diego Lifeguards, San Diego County Sheriff
South La Jolla SMR	City of San Diego Lifeguards, San Diego County Sheriff
South La Jolla SMCA	City of San Diego
Famosa Slough SMCA	City of San Diego Parks and Rec
Cabrillo SMR	National Park Service, City of San Diego
Tijuana River Mouth SMCA	State Parks, City of Imperial Beach Lifeguards, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Customs and Border Protection

In conclusion, we wish to acknowledge the hard work that went into updating the Master Plan, and thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. We look forward to working with CDFW staff to incorporate our concerns. If you have any questions, please contact Calla Allison at [calla.allison@resources.ca.gov](mailto:calla.allison@resources.ca.gov)

Sincerely,

Calla Allison  
 Director  
 MPA Collaborative Network

---

<sup>1</sup> The Matlahuayl MPA is listed incorrectly on Page F-24 as an SMCA. It is an SMR.



January 28, 2016

California Fish and Game Commission  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA  
94244-2090

Via email: [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov)

**RE: Comments on the Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan Update**

Dear Commissioners:

The Laguna Bluebelt Coalition brings together organizations and individuals with a common goal of protecting and restoring marine life, conserving biological diversity and maintaining healthy, sustainable marine habitats for all plant, fish and animal species. We have been active participants throughout the process of developing and implementing the Marine Protected areas in Laguna Beach and Orange County.

We have reviewed the Department of Fish and Wildlife draft updated Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas and respectfully submit the following comments:

1. We appreciate the focus of the document on moving forward and supporting adaptive management. The document correctly identifies monitoring and research, enforcement, and education as key components of long term success of our MPAs. Partnerships and long term funding are also identified but need more emphasis and detail.
2. We support the idea of a ten year time frame for review of the MPAs. This provides adequate time for marine ecosystems to react to the initial implementation before the first DFW performance analysis and to adaptive measures implemented afterwards.
3. We strongly support the idea of leveraging local partners for educational outreach. Specifically the development of a "Partners Guide" and timely guidance, input, and product review of local materials to ensure accuracy and as possible, conformity with DFW materials.
4. Appendix F contains a key error in section six. Table five in this section lists no enforcement partners for the Orange County MPAs. On the contrary, Orange County sets the example for local enforcement assistance with the City of Laguna Beach providing a full time Marine Enforcement officer backed up by city lifeguards for the Laguna Beach Reserve and SMCA along with part of the Dana Point SMCA.

The City of Dana Point also provides a full time Marine Enforcement officer for the Dana Point SMCA within city boundaries. Enforcement assistance for the Crystal Cove SMCA is provided by the California State Parks Department and the City of Newport Beach supports enforcement in Upper Newport Bay. Additionally the Orange County Sherriff's Department supports all of these agencies as needed. Finally the Orange County District Attorneys office has taken a strong stance in support of Marine Protected Areas and prioritizes MPA offences for prosecution.

Improving water quality is a goal which the Laguna Bluebelt Coalition has promoted with our City and local water agencies, specifically to achieve a reduction of urban runoff and increase in recycled water. Since June 2014, there has been a reduction in the volume of ocean discharge into our local waters through the sewer outfall by over 140 million gallons by expanding recycled water use with a \$2.3 million Aliso Creek Reclamation Facility. We encourage the 10 year review take into account the impact of ocean discharge and make it a consideration when seeking to restore healthy ocean habitats.

In closing we think that the draft updated Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas takes the right approach. We hope to see modifications to emphasize long term funding for MPAs, and to recognize and support local partners in their education and enforcement activities.

Sincerely,

Mike Beanan  
Facilitator  
Laguna Bluebelt Coalition



January 28, 2016

California Fish and Game Commission  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Via email: [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov), [adam.frimodig@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:adam.frimodig@wildlife.ca.gov)

**RE: Comments on the Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan Update**

Dear Commissioners Hostler-Carmesin, Sklar, and Williams:

On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Heal the Bay, the Surfrider Foundation, Orange County Coastkeeper, WiLDCOAST, the California Marine Sanctuary Foundation, and the hundreds of thousands of members we represent, please accept the following comments on the Department of Fish and Wildlife's (DFW) draft updated Master Plan (Plan) for Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). As organizations that have been integrally involved in both the design and implementation of the state's marine protected area network, we appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this important document, which will guide the long-term management of California's MPAs.

**I. Summary**

In general, we believe that the Plan update successfully memorializes details from the MPA planning phase and turns appropriate attention to implementation efforts and partnerships necessary to continue protecting California's marine resources, consistent with the goals of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA).<sup>1</sup> We appreciate the Plan's focus on developing an efficient, long-term statewide monitoring program and support the ten-year formal review cycle for adaptive management, as well as the integration of enforcement data to help interpret monitoring results, clear and wide communication of monitoring results, and the use of MPA monitoring data to inform research on issues related to broader ocean health and resource management.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marine Life Protection Act, Fish and Game Code § 2853(b)

**However, we believe the enforcement, outreach and education discussions in the Plan warrant additional detail to accurately reflect the current landscape of collaborative activities and partners and to help direct future actions.** Significant implementation efforts are already underway and great progress has been made to strengthen public awareness, compliance, and monitoring of MPAs. The Plan should reflect the current status of this work while identifying needs and opportunities to compliment these efforts. Specific suggestions for improving these portions of the Plan, as well as more detailed comments on the adaptive management section, are provided below.

## **II. Outreach and Education**

**Section 3.1 of the Plan should be updated to highlight existing MPA partnerships and outreach efforts happening across California.** The MPA Collaborative Network (Collaboratives) is made up of community partners (lifeguards, tribes, local municipalities, beach managers, academic institutions, federal agencies, non-profit organizations, and others) in fourteen coastal counties who provide local expertise and support MPA implementation activities including outreach and education, enforcement and compliance, and research and monitoring. These Collaboratives are creating the social infrastructure necessary to sustain long-term MPA stewardship and have already made great steps towards advancing public awareness, social investment, and citizen science of MPAs. They are a critical component of the partnership approach to MPA management. While page 11 of the Plan acknowledges the role of the Collaboratives in statewide management efforts, it lacks details on their geographic scope and the breadth of activities they are currently spearheading. **The Plan should be revised to include more detail on the makeup, past projects, and ongoing efforts of the Collaboratives in order to acknowledge the significant value these local partners play in bolstering MPA durability. We also recommend that the Plan include a link to the Collaboratives' website.**<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, as an irreplaceable and highly effective outreach partner, **the California Marine Sanctuary Foundation (CMSF) should be explicitly identified in this section of the Plan,** given the substantial role they have played, and will continue to play, in creating and disseminating MPA information throughout California. CMSF has worked in close consultation with DFW and other agencies, partners and tribes over the course of the past eight years to build bridges for effective MPA outreach and education. **The Plan should reference CMSF's website, [www.californiampas.org](http://www.californiampas.org),** which functions as a library for hundreds of MPA-related materials (brochures, signs, posters, curriculum, etc.), developed by dozens of partners across the state. CMFS regularly utilizes interpretive best practices to develop emotionally engaging films and videos, in-person training events and workshops, and educational children's activities. These materials are valuable resources that compliment and can help build DFW's outreach and education efforts.

Furthermore, Section 3.1, Outreach and Education, identifies outreach priorities but does so only conceptually; the text reads as if many of these activities have yet to occur. A comprehensive list of activities may not be necessary, **but the discussion on pages 30-32 should document the significant efforts that have already been accomplished or are underway. The Plan should note the importance of building on this momentum and identify the highest priority future outreach and education needs.** As an example, **the Plan should describe existing museum and aquaria partners, such as the Southern California Aquarium Collaborative - a network of ten aquaria that have already created a California MPA curriculum, multiple MPA exhibits, and other educational**

---

<sup>2</sup> MPA Collaborative Network: <http://www.mpacollaborative.org/>

**materials**<sup>3</sup> and are currently supporting outreach efforts at a “more interpretive level” as described on page 30.

Similarly, the discussion on “coordination of outreach efforts” on page 31 lists core actions to develop guidance, standards, and a process of review as though such materials have not been developed. DFW has already created a partners guide and outreach standards and has been reviewing partner-developed materials consistent with these documents for several years. While there may be value in updating these documents with more detailed guidance and a clarified review process (including an approach for improved coordination and communication between DFW and the Collaboratives), **the Plan should accurately reflect that initial efforts towards these actions have already occurred. The Plan should also summarize the progress of increased engagement with California tribes and tribal communities, including the development of MPA messaging and content highlighting traditional and cultural uses along the coast.**

Section 5.3, Role of Partnerships in Leveraging Resources, **should identify the extensive existing partnerships that are currently providing diversified support opportunities for MPA management (such as individual Collaborative members, local and federal government agencies, and academic institutions)**, in addition to acknowledging the need for future partnership development and strong communications networks across partners and with DFW.

### **III. Enforcement**

Sections 3.2 and 6.2 of the Plan identify objectives and potential tools to improve MPA enforcement. Like the discussion on outreach and education, the enforcement section of the Plan fails to recognize the considerable efforts being conducted by community partners to help improve compliance and enforcement, which began years ago and are ongoing. As mentioned above, outreach activities conducted by the Collaboratives and others are improving public awareness of, and increasing compliance with, MPA boundaries and regulations. Additionally, the Collaboratives continue to hold statewide enforcement trainings, in partnership with DFW, to educate local beach authorities, district attorneys, and law enforcement personnel on MPA science, regulations, and the importance of strong prosecution of MPA violations. Such trainings have already been held throughout Southern and Northern California and are planned for the Central Coast in the first half of 2016. **The Plan should be revised to acknowledge the role of the Collaboratives with respect to MPA enforcement and compliance.**

**Additionally, the Plan should include a discussion of the statewide MPA Watch<sup>4</sup> program and its value in contributing data to inform enforcement priorities.** MPA Watch is a citizen science monitoring initiative of over ten organizations in California that is mobilizing hundreds of volunteers to help to understand human uses within MPAs. MPA Watch programs, which started in 2010, train and support volunteers in the collection of relevant, scientifically rigorous, and broadly accessible data both inside and outside MPAs. The MPA Watch initiative also has a publicly accessible database that can be a valuable resource for MPA management. The MPA Watch program has been designed with the help of social and biological science experts, including representatives from DFW and the California Ocean Science Trust. Data collected through this initiative is meant to inform the management, enforcement, and monitoring of California’s MPAs and provide insights on how human uses are changing as a result of

---

<sup>3</sup> Southern California MPA Collaborative’s South Coast MPA Curriculum: [http://www.californiampas.org/pubs/South\\_Coast\\_MPA\\_Curriculum.pdf](http://www.californiampas.org/pubs/South_Coast_MPA_Curriculum.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> MPA Watch Program: <http://www.mpawatch.org/>

MPA implementation. The program is guided by the following goals to: 1) help determine how effective MPAs are at meeting their goal of enhancing recreational activities by tracking changes and trends of human use over time; 2) provide contextual information on human use for interpretation of biological monitoring data; 3) inform MPA enforcement and management decisions regarding human activity inside MPAs; and 4) train MPA Watch volunteers as stewards and effective public educators regarding MPAs. MPA Watch data is shared regularly with DFW's Law Enforcement Division (LED) and the program is designed, in part, to help identify areas of non-compliance and target enforcement efforts. In addition, since MPA Watch citizen scientists frequent MPAs and are familiar with boundaries and regulations, they are encouraged to report violations to DFW's CalTIP.

**The Plan should call out existing coordination between DFW LED, local district attorneys, and the California District Attorneys Association (CDA), and highlight the importance of ongoing partnerships among these entities.** Over the last several years, DFW LED has been attending CDA annual meetings and participating in joint enforcement trainings with district attorneys across the state. It is critical to maintain and strengthen these collaborative relationships to ensure that MPA violations are sufficiently prosecuted to punish illegal behavior and deter future violations. **The Plan should also highlight DFW's improved enforcement capacity under AB 298, which was passed in 2015 and provides authority for DFW wardens, and other coastal enforcement with citation authority, to cite MPA violations as either a misdemeanor or infraction.** Also known as a "woblette," this enforcement tool gives wardens the additional ability to write up minor MPA violations via a ticket and fine, akin to a traffic violation. AB 298 retains the enforcement path for more egregious violations to still be persecuted through the courts - such as violators who hold commercial fishing or party boat fishing licenses and repeat violators - and lays the path for increased prosecutions.

Additionally, Box 3 on page 33 describes how enforcement priority areas should be identified and states that, among other criteria focused on sensitive habitats and critical species, high priority areas include places where "violations are likely to occur or have occurred at high rates in the past." We agree that these violation hot spots should be enforcement priorities; however, DFW's LED does not currently have the capability to conduct comprehensive temporal or spatial analyses of MPA violations or track citations in a way that would allow them to target and prioritize problem areas. Doing so would require implementation of an electronic record management system with geospatial analysis capabilities, but there is no mention of the need for such a system in this section of the Plan. Section 6.2 recognizes the value of identifying tools to improve MPA enforcement (including RMS) but downplays the critical need of RMS to increase warden efficiency, effectiveness and safety. **We strongly recommend that sections 3.2 and 6.2 of the Plan be revised to acknowledge the urgent necessity of an updated RMS to track citations and repeat violators and identify incident hot spots, allowing DFW's LED to strategically target its efforts and make efficient use of its limited resources. The Plan should also state that development and implementation of an electronic RMS is an immediate priority.** These revisions would accurately reflect enforcement priorities in the recently adopted work plan for the MPA Statewide Leadership Team (SLT), which identifies the development and implementation of RMS as a key action necessary to increase capacity and effectiveness of DFW's enforcement.<sup>5</sup> The Plan should also recognize the importance of RMS in laying the groundwork for use of other enforcement technologies, such as remote surveillance, and should provide a brief summary of the process underway to obtain approval for, and implement, a RMS for DFW.

---

<sup>5</sup> MPA Statewide Leadership Team Work Plan. Adopted by the Ocean Protection Council on September 22, 2015: [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda\\_items/20150922/Item5\\_Attach2\\_MPALeadershipTeam\\_Workplan\\_FINALv2.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20150922/Item5_Attach2_MPALeadershipTeam_Workplan_FINALv2.pdf)

We appreciate that the enforcement plans in regional backgrounds and priorities documents (Appendices C – F) provide details on DFW’s existing enforcement assets and personnel as well as potential enforcement partnerships. **However, the partnerships column in these tables should be updated to accurately reflect the existing and potential future collaborative efforts supporting MPA enforcement across the state.** As an example, page F-23 of Appendix F incorrectly states that there are no partners to help enforce the Laguna Beach SMR and SMCA. The Orange County Marine Protected Area Council has a well-developed MPA implementation program that predates the MLPA process, including a full-time City of Laguna Beach marine protection officer who works to enforce the Laguna Beach MPAs. This example, along with other eyes-on-the-water partners such as MPA Watch programs and local beach enforcement personnel, should be included in the enforcement plans for each of the study regions. With the passage of AB 298, there are opportunities to improve MPA enforcement through partnerships with local peace officers, which should also be acknowledged in the Plan. **We recommend that DFW staff reach out to the Collaboratives to get a more accurate list of potential enforcement partners and update the Plan accordingly.**

While discussion of the Channel Islands MPAs and the collaborative partnerships between DFW, Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS), and Channel Islands National Park (CINP) is referenced briefly in the main body of the Plan and in Appendix A, Appendix F (South Coast Regional MPA Background and Priorities) lacks a detailed discussion of the Channel Islands MPAs and fails to acknowledge the existence of federal protections contiguous to the state MPAs, as well as the role of CINMS and CINP as a partners in outreach, education, monitoring and enforcement for these offshore protected areas. Reference to the extensive monitoring efforts at the Channel Islands MPAs<sup>6,7,8,9</sup> is also missing from this section, with the text focusing solely on monitoring conducted as part of the recent South Coast baseline program. **Appendix F, specifically section 5.3 on page F-21 should be revised to include additional background on the Channel Islands MPAs and how implementation activities there fit into the broader South Coast efforts, including the roles that CINMS and CINP play in collaborative enforcement with DFW and a summary of existing monitoring efforts and results at these MPAs.**

#### **IV. Adaptive Management**

As stated above, we support the proposed ten-year cycle for formal management review of the MPA network. This timeframe is more biologically appropriate given that changes to species density, richness, size and biomass as a result of MPAs may not be realized or detected within shorter timescales. A range of factors can influence ecosystem response to MPAs including: MPA age, size, and location; level of protection; life histories of target species; fishing intensity prior to MPA establishment and outside MPA boundaries; changing environmental or climate conditions (such as El Niño, sea star wasting disease, and ocean acidification); and type and quality of habitat protected. At short timescales, these factors can confound interpretation of monitoring data, making it difficult to detect ecological trends that would inform MPA management decisions. Evaluation every ten years at a minimum, will allow enough time to

---

<sup>6</sup> Channel Islands Marine Protected Areas First 5 Years of Monitoring: 2003-2008. Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO). <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=31325&inline=true>

<sup>7</sup> A Decade of Protection: Ten Years of Change at the Channel Islands. PISCO. [http://www.piscoweb.org/files/CI\\_10-Yr\\_Brochure\\_web.pdf](http://www.piscoweb.org/files/CI_10-Yr_Brochure_web.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Channel Islands National Park’s Kelp Forest Monitoring Program: <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/units/medn/publications.cfm?tab=2&MonitorKelpForest=open - MonitorKelpForest>

<sup>9</sup> Marine Applied Research & Exploration (MARE), Channel Islands deep water habitat surveys: <http://www.maregroup.org/return-to-the-channel-islands.html>

observe changes in some biological metrics, but within a short enough time frame to keep tabs on trends and make appropriate management changes, with the understanding that detection of significant positive changes from MPA implementation may take twenty years or longer.

Section 4.1 of the Plan states that the ten-year review will use scientific evaluations of ecological, socioeconomic and enforcement data to inform any potential management actions. **We recommend that this section clarify that formal adaptive management review will provide a status update of MPA performance on a scientifically based, administratively appropriate, reliable schedule and an opportunity to assess and improve MPA protection, consistent with the goals of the MLPA. The Plan should explicitly state that California’s MPAs were created as permanent conservation areas and the ten-year adaptive management review is the time to evaluate whether they are providing their intending ecological benefits, not an opportunity to reduce or eliminate their protections.**

## V. Additional Comments

Page 3 of the Plan states that the Marine Life Protection Program (MLPP) has statewide goals that focus on “protecting, sustaining, and conserving marine life; improving *socioeconomic activities* and marine heritage provided by marine ecosystems; have clearly defined objectives, are based on scientific guidelines, and have effective management measures and enforcement (*emphasis added*).” This text aims to reflect the six statutory goals of the MLPA, however, the MLPA does not in fact include a goal focused on improving socioeconomics activities.

Goal 3 of the MLPA states that MPAs should “improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.” We believe the intent of the socioeconomic reference on Page 3 may have been to acknowledge the importance of MPAs in improving recreational activities that can be economic drivers for coastal communities, such as scuba diving and wildlife viewing. Therefore, we recommend that this sentence be revised to state “...improving **recreational activities and marine heritage provided by marine ecosystems subject to minimal disturbance**” to accurately reflect the statutory language of the MLPA. Though ecosystem benefits expected from MPAs will likely convey improvements to fishery and recreational socioeconomics, this is not an explicit goal of the MLPA and the Plan should not represent it as such.

Section 4 of Appendix A (Marine Protected Area Planning through the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative) includes a discussion of the scientific foundation for California’s MPA planning and design. Box 2 on page A-33 and Table 1 on page A-33 of this appendix outline the Science Advisory Team’s (SAT) design guidelines, which were established to assist stakeholders in creating MPAs that would meet the goals of the MLPA. These guidelines include recommendations on the size and spacing of MPAs, as well as representation and replication of habitats. While Appendices C – F include text outlining design considerations at the regional level (Section 3.2), the bulleted lists in these sections do not include the SAT’s scientific guidance for size, spacing and habitat inclusion. **The bulleted lists in Section 3.2 of Appendices C – F should be revised to include these critical scientific design priorities.** MPAs that fail to meet scientific guidelines may not perform as intended and consideration of this design context must be an integral component of adaptive management review. **The Plan should highlight the importance of the scientific design guidelines in addition to the regional design considerations in the appendices.**

Additionally, the long-term success of the state’s MPA network relies, in part, on prioritizing their protection in permitting and policy decisions. Though page 35 of the Plan correctly states that the MLPA cannot supersede otherwise lawful activities that are not within the authority of the Commission to regulate, it fails to acknowledge that “[t]he department, in evaluating proposed projects with potential

adverse impacts on marine life and habitat in MPAs, shall highlight those impacts in its analysis and comments related to the project and shall recommend measures to avoid or fully mitigate any impacts that are inconsistent with the goals and guidelines of this chapter or the objectives of the MPA<sup>10</sup>.” Such guardianship of the state’s MPAs by DFW requires close coordination with other management agencies that make decisions affecting the coast.

Therefore, **the text in Section 3.4 on aligning MPAs with other marine resource management efforts warrants more discussion on the importance of integrating MPAs into California’s ocean governance, consistent with Strategic Priority 3 in the MPA SLT Work Plan. This section should include a description of the partner agencies participating on the MPA SLT and their respective and overlapping mandates for regulating activities and development that could impact ocean resources and MPAs**, as discussed in the Ocean Protection Council’s recently adopted Partnership Plan<sup>11</sup>. **It should also summarize the SLT’s priority actions for improving interagency coordination and review consistency for project impacts to MPAs.**

**Also, the language on oil and gas impacts to MPAs on page 38 should be updated to include the role of DFW’s Office of Spill Response and Prevention in developing oil spill contingency plans and implementing spill response strategies that prioritize MPA protection.**

**Lastly, the lists of specific MPA names in the appendices should be updated and cross-referenced with updates to MPA regulations approved by the Fish and Game Commission (FGC) after MPA adoption.** For example, there are two MPAs at Catalina Island that have changed names and are incorrectly listed on pages F-12, F-25, and F-27 in Appendix F by their old names. During the 2014 MPA regulatory update approved by FGC, the Blue Cavern SMCA [subsection 632(b)(124)] was renamed Blue Cavern Onshore SMCA (No Take), and the Bird Rock SMCA [subsection 632(b)(125)] was renamed to Blue Cavern Offshore SMCA.<sup>12</sup> **We suggest that MPA regulatory updates be referenced in the Plan, particularly in Section 7. We also recommend that in all appendices, “No Take” SMCAs should be listed as such, rather than just as SMCAs**, as these no-take SMCAs have very different regulations than traditional SMCAs and are essentially equivalent to SMRs in protection level.

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft revision of the MPA Master Plan. We look forward to working with staff to ensure that it lays the framework for successful MPA implementation now and into the future. Should you have questions, feel free to contact Jenn Eckerle at [jeckerle@nrdc.org](mailto:jeckerle@nrdc.org).

Sincerely,



Jenn Eckerle  
Ocean Policy Analyst  
NRDC



Ray Hiemstra  
Associate Director of Programs  
Orange County Coastkeeper

---

<sup>10</sup> Marine Life Protection Act, Fish and Game Code § 2862

<sup>11</sup> The California Collaborative Approach: Marine Protected Areas Partnership Plan. Approved by the Ocean Protection Council on December 2, 2014:

[http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED\\_FINAL\\_MPA\\_Partnership\\_Plan\\_12022014.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/docs/mpa/APPROVED_FINAL_MPA_Partnership_Plan_12022014.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> Fish and Game Commission Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations 2014:


<http://www.fgc.ca.gov/regulations/2014/632ntc.pdf>




Zach Plopper  
Coastal and Marine Director  
WILD COAST



Dana Roeber Murray  
Senior Coastal Policy Manager  
Heal the Bay



Jennifer Savage  
California Policy Manager  
Surfrider Foundation



Dennis Long, Executive Director  
Rikki Dunsmore, CA MPA Program Director  
California Marine Sanctuary Foundation

**From:** [Karen Grimmer](#)  
**To:** [FGC](#)  
**Cc:** [Paul Michel](#); [Scott Kathey](#)  
**Subject:** Re: MPA Master Plan comments  
**Date:** Thursday, January 28, 2016 4:50:38 PM

---

Please use this submittal. Thank you.

On Jan 28, 2016, at 4:23 PM, Karen Grimmer wrote:

Dear Commissioners and staff,

On behalf of the Resource Protection Program at NOAA's Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS), I am submitting comments on the draft document entitled "CDFW Draft Updated Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas, November 2015." We at NOAA's MBNMS appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important planning and guidance document.

1. Given that CDFW wardens "cannot be redirected to concentrate on MPA enforcement" but must enforce MPA regulations during the normal course of their duties, we suggest that CDFW consider creating something analogous to a "neighborhood watch" program, enlisting specific local residents or civic groups to "adopt a refuge" and keep an eye on it, reporting to local wardens any potential refuge violations or suspicious activities. With strained professional LE resources, leveraging the support of interested citizens could make a difference. However, making such a program truly effective would require the hiring of a coordinator for each region (part or full time). A retired annuitant would be ideal for the job (particularly a retired warden). That person could be the point of contact for volunteer participants and the focal point for communication between volunteers and the department.
2. CDFW should explore aerial and seaborne observation support from the US Coast Guard Auxiliary, a volunteer organization organized and funded by the US Coast Guard. The auxiliary dispatches private boats and planes for volunteer observation support in accordance with Coast Guard directives.
3. CDFW should also explore and list potential partnership with the US Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for more coastal MPAs than simply Piedras Blancas SMCA, since most nearshore rocks and islets in the state are part of the California Coastal National Monument, managed and protected by BLM.
4. Table 5 of the Central Coast Appendix should list Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary as a potential partner for the "Cambria SMCA/SMP", since the vast majority of the MPA falls within the boundaries of MBNMS.
5. Table 5 of the Central Coast Appendix should list California State Parks as a potential partner for the "Asilomar SMR", since the MPA abuts Asilomar State Beach, managed and patrolled by State Parks.
6. Table 5 of the North Central Coast Appendix should list San Mateo County as a potential enforcement partner for the "Pillar Point

SMCA" and "Montara SMR", since the county manages the Pillar Point Harbor Patrol and the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve adjacent to those MPAs.

7. Page 36 of the Master Plan - We recommend a stronger role of the MLPA to ensure that the special protections outlined in the CA Ocean Plan afford high quality water in the MPAs and that there is a concerted effort to coordinate the multiple monitoring efforts required by many different state agencies so that resource managers are able to measure status and trends of water quality pollutants in these protected areas.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.

Karen Grimmer  
MBNMS Resource Protection Coordinator



## San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative

---

January 28, 2016

California Fish and Game Commission  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

Via email: [fgc@fgc.ca.gov](mailto:fgc@fgc.ca.gov)

### **RE: Comments on the Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan Update**

Dear Commissioners Hostler-Carmesin, Sklar, and Williams:

On behalf of the San Diego County Marine Protected Area (MPA) Community Collaborative, please accept the following comments on the Department of Fish and Wildlife's (DFW) draft updated Master Plan for California MPAs. As a coalition of representatives from NGOs, state, local and federal agencies, local municipalities, local tribes, user groups, researchers and businesses, the San Diego MPA Community Collaborative has been actively involved in the implementation of the state's MPA network. We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on this important document to more effectively guide the long-term management of California's MPAs.

#### ***1. Summary***

We believe that the Plan update successfully memorializes details from the MPA planning phase and gives appropriate attention to implementation efforts to continue protecting California's marine resources, consistent with the goals of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA).<sup>1</sup> We appreciate the Plan's focus on developing an efficient, long-term statewide monitoring program and support the ten-year formal review cycle for adaptive management, as well as the integration of enforcement data to help interpret monitoring results, clear and wide communication of monitoring results, and the use of MPA monitoring data to inform research on issues related to broader ocean health and resource management.

**However, we believe the Plan warrants additional discussion and information to accurately reflect the implementation activities carried out by regional MPA Community Collaboratives, partners and volunteers.** The Plan should reflect this work and identify needs and opportunities to complement these efforts. Specific suggestions for improving the Plan and more detailed comments in regards to Appendix F: South Coast Regional MPA Background and Priorities are provided below.

#### ***2. The Role of Regional MPA Community Collaboratives***

The 14 regional MPA Community Collaboratives in California are creating the on-the-ground networks necessary to sustain long-term MPA stewardship. They have made tremendous progress to increase public awareness, engage local partners and advance citizen science around MPAs and are a critical component of the partnership approach to MPA management. While page 11 of the Plan acknowledges the role of the Collaboratives in statewide management efforts, it lacks details on their geographic scope and the breadth of activities they are currently undertaking. **The Plan should be revised to include more detail**

---

<sup>1</sup> Marine Life Protection Act, Fish and Game Code § 2853(b)

**on the makeup and ongoing efforts of the Collaborative network and recognize the significant value these local partners play in improving MPA implementation. We recommend that the Plan include a link to the Collaborative Network's website.<sup>2</sup> We also recommend that DFW staff reach out to the Collaboratives to get more detailed description of the implementation activities being carried out by the Collaboratives and update the Plan accordingly.**

### ***3. Enforcement***

The enforcement sections (sections 3.2, 6.2 and Appendix F – section 6) of the Plan fail to recognize the considerable efforts being conducted by allied agencies, the MPA Community Collaboratives and community partners to help improve compliance and enforcement. Outreach activities conducted by the regional MPA Community Collaboratives are improving public awareness of, and increasing compliance with, MPA rules. The Collaboratives are hosting statewide and local enforcement trainings to educate local district attorneys and law enforcement personnel on MPA goals and regulations and the importance of strong prosecution of MPA violations. Such trainings have already been held throughout Southern and Northern California and are planned for the Central Coast in the first half of 2016. In San Diego County, subsequent MPA-specific trainings have taken place with local lifeguard agencies. Furthermore, MPA Watch<sup>3</sup> includes eight chapter organizations collecting data on human uses within and outside of MPAs from southern Mendocino to San Diego counties. This data is shared regularly with DFW's Law Enforcement Division (LED) and the program is designed, in part, to help identify areas of non-compliance and target enforcement efforts. **The Plan should be revised to acknowledge the role of these and other local partners with respect to MPA enforcement and compliance.**

**We strongly recommend that sections 3.2 and 6.2 of the Plan be revised to acknowledge the necessity of an updated RMS to track citations and repeat violators and identify incident hot spots.** This would allow DFW's LED to strategically target its efforts and make efficient use of its limited resources. This revision would accurately reflect enforcement priorities in the recently adopted work plan for the MPA Statewide Leadership Team (SLT), which identifies the development and implementation of RMS as a key action necessary to increase capacity and effectiveness of DFW's enforcement.<sup>4</sup>

We appreciate that the enforcement plans in regional backgrounds and priorities documents (Appendices C – F) provide details on DFW's existing enforcement assets and personnel as well as potential enforcement partnerships. **However, the partnerships column in these tables should be updated to accurately reflect the existing and potential future collaborative efforts supporting MPA enforcement across the state.**

Page F-23 of Appendix F incorrectly states that there are no partners to help enforce San Diego County's 11 MPAs. Enforcement and allied agencies represented on the San Diego County MPA Community Collaborative participated in DFW-led training in February, 2015 and in local trainings carried out by the the Collaborative, and are actively enforcing the MPAs. There are also additional local partners that can assist in enforcement as eyes on the ground. We recommend including the following "Potential Partnerships/Assistance" agencies in the table beginning on Page F-23:

---

<sup>2</sup> MPA Collaborative Network: <http://www.mpacollaborative.org/>

<sup>3</sup> MPA Watch Program: <http://www.mpawatch.org/>

<sup>4</sup> MPA Statewide Leadership Team Work Plan. Adopted by the Ocean Protection Council on September 22, 2015: [http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda\\_items/20150922/Item5\\_Attach2\\_MPALeadershipTeam\\_Workplan\\_FINALv2.pdf](http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20150922/Item5_Attach2_MPALeadershipTeam_Workplan_FINALv2.pdf)

**Batiquitos Lagoon SMCA – Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation, City of Carlsbad, Leucadia Wastewater District**

**Swami’s SMCA – California State Parks, City of Encinitas Lifeguards, City of Solana Beach, San Diego County Sheriffs**

**San Elijo Lagoon SMCA – City of Encinitas Lifeguards, San Diego County Parks and Recreation, San Diego County Sheriffs, San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy**

**San Dieguito Lagoon SMCA – San Diego County Sherriffs, City of Del Mar, San Dieguito River Park JPA**

**San Diego – Scripps Coastal SMCA – City of San Diego Lifeguards, University of California San Diego, Scripps Institution of Oceanography**

**Matlahuayl SMR<sup>5</sup>– City of San Diego Lifeguards, San Diego County Sheriffs**

**South La Jolla SMCA – City of San Diego Lifeguards**

**South La Jolla SMR – City of San Diego Lifeguards, San Diego County Sheriffs**

**Famosa Slough SMCA - City of San Diego Parks and Recreation, Friends of Famosa Slough**

**Cabrillo SMR – National Park Service, City of San Diego**

**Tijuana River Mouth SMCA – City of Imperial Beach Lifeguards, California State Parks, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Customs and Border Protection**

**We recommend that DFW staff reach out to the Collaboratives to get a more accurate list of potential enforcement partners and update the Plan accordingly.**

In addition to these suggestions, we would like to highlight that the draft master plan emphasizes limitations on direct take of living resources and overlooks the importance of non-living resource take restrictions. This is inconsistent with Title 14. 1.39. 632. a (A)(B)(C) which says that in MPAs it is “unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living, geological, or cultural marine resource...” We would like to ensure that nonliving geological and cultural marine resources are provided equal attention in the Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft revision of the MPA Master Plan. We look forward to working with staff to ensure that it lays the framework for successful MPA implementation now and into the future. Should you have questions, feel free to contact Zachary Plopper at zach@wildcoast.net.

Sincerely,



Conservation Director, WILDCOAST  
San Diego County MPA Community  
Collaborative Co-chair



Coastal Zone Manager, City of Encinitas  
San Diego County MPA Community  
Collaborative Co-Chair

---

<sup>5</sup> The Matlahuayl MPA is listed incorrectly on Page F-24 as an SMCA. It is an SMR.

**From:** [Steve Lonhart - NOAA Federal](#)  
**To:** [FGC](#)  
**Cc:** [Paul Michel](#); [Karen Grimmer](#); [andrew.devogelaere@noaa.gov](mailto:andrew.devogelaere@noaa.gov)  
**Subject:** MPA Master Plan: public comment  
**Date:** Thursday, January 28, 2016 11:21:19 AM

---

Dear Commissioners and staff,

On behalf of the Research Program at NOAA's Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS), I am submitting comments on the draft document entitled "CDFW Draft Updated Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas, November 2015." We at NOAA's MBNMS appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important planning and guidance document. As many of you already know, MBNMS—a Federal MPA—overlaps many of the state MPA sites in the Central Coast Region, and two other national marine sanctuaries also overlap with additional state MPAs to the north and south. This provides an excellent opportunity for both MPA systems (i.e. the state network and the Federal system) to work in partnership and collaborate on monitoring and research within these unique and special places.

The comments presented below are focused on the research and monitoring aspects covered by the Draft Plan. Other elements (e.g., enforcement, education, policy) will be covered in a separate email/letter by our Resource Protection and Education programs at MBNMS.

Specific comments and edits:

Page v. CINMS out of order. It is listed above NOAA, and since the table is alphabetical, it should be moved. Also, MBNMS (Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary) is not listed and should, since it will appear in later sections of the draft plan (see comments below).

Page 9. Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) is in a unique position as Federal member of the MPA statewide leadership team (MLST), and recognition here is warranted. Explicitly mentioning MBNMS supports our ongoing partnership with the state, and provides a "place to point to" when the need arises for NOAA staff.

Page 22. First paragraph, BTRF must be switched to BRTF.

Page 41. "The MLPP has therefore set a 10-year cycle of formal management reviews for the statewide MPA network, ..." As part of the adaptive management strategy, CDFW and the Commission also have the ability to respond quickly during the intervening years between reviews. The point should be emphasized that should a threat or stressor arise prior to a 10-year review, the Department and the Commission have the ability to address it at that time.

We also agree that a 10 year cycle is appropriate for reviewing ecological trends and is also administratively sustainable. One key to the administrative component will to ensure some level of staff continuity and curate extensive documentation to facilitate effective and efficient reviews at a decadal scale.

Page 48. Percent cover was not listed under biological and ecological metrics. If density includes counts per unit area and percent cover, then adding percent cover is unnecessary.

Page 50. Research can clarify ecological relationships that allow proper interpretation of monitoring data, and therefore those types of research projects are "within" the goals and objectives. To broadly say research is outside of the goals is taking too narrow a view.

Page 51. Scientific collection in MPAs. We encourage CDFW staff to continue to work with NOAA (both National Marine Fisheries and National Ocean Services) on the process of collecting in state waters by Federal agencies that share jurisdictions and have their own Federal mandates and requirements. Pursuit of an MOU with NOAA specifically addressing collections in MPAs could be one mechanism to address this issue. Alternatively, there could be an agency-level Entity Permit that is specifically designed for Federal agencies with legal authorities in state waters.

Research staff at MBNMS look forward to continuing to work with CDFW scientists and CalOST staff,

both in the field collecting MPA data and in working groups to review proposals and products generated by researchers working in MPAs. The linkages between both systems of MPAs leverages limited resources and emphasizes the need to work together towards common goals.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.

-----  
Steve I. Lonhart, Ph.D.  
NOAA's Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN)  
Unit Diving Supervisor  
110 Shaffer Road Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Office 229A: (831) 420-3661

[sanctuariesimon.org](http://sanctuariesimon.org)

"The mission of NOAA's national marine sanctuaries is to conserve, protect and enhance the biodiversity, ecological integrity and cultural legacy of these special underwater places."



January 27, 2016

California Fish and Game Commission  
P.O. Box 944209  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

RE: Comments on 2015 Master Plan for MPAs

Dear Commissioners:

Sierra Club California thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the 2015 Master Plan for MPAs. We appreciate that the 2015 Master Plan for MPAs represents the initiation of a process to demonstrate leadership in protecting California's valuable marine resources. We present the following comments to help support that leadership.

**Specific Suggestions for Improvement**

"Chapter 3: Management" of The 2015 Master Plan for MPAs has a section called, "ALIGNING MPAS AND OTHER MARINE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EFFORTS" (page 35). This section covers how to collaborate on management of fisheries, water quality, climate change, marine debris, invasive species, oil and gas drilling, acoustic pollution, etc. We applaud the recognition that, "collaborative efforts will be crucial for taking an ecosystem-based approach to management," but would like to see more proactive and specific goals in addressing these diverse ecosystem threats.

For example, it is well documented that oil and gas drilling and transport constitute a direct threat to marine ecosystems. A complete ban on these activities is the defining hallmark of National Marine Sanctuaries. The threat is not theoretical. In fact, in 2015 the Plains Pipeline Oil spill at Refugio had a direct and measurable impact on marine life in state MPAs (most directly in the nearby Kashtayit State Marine Conservation Area, the Naples State Marine Conservation Area and the Campus Point State Marine Conservation Area). The Master Plan fails to mention that there is active drilling in State waters, such as at the Ellwood field adjacent to Campus Point, and fails to take responsibility for this threat:

"Oil and Gas Drilling and Transport: There are currently federal and state moratoriums or bans on leasing of offshore areas for oil and gas mining activities. However, offshore oil drilling in federal and state waters on existing leases and gas extraction, including hydraulic fracturing, are occurring in federal waters. Therefore, it is important to consider that potential risks from oil or chemical spills could impact MPAs if they were to occur. CDFW is not responsible for managing these operations, but routinely communicates and trains with other agencies, including the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management, SLC, CCC, and the US Coast Guard to ensure that oil spill prevention and response plans consider catastrophic impacts to MPAs." (page 38)

The CDFW can and should take a more proactive approach to this threat. Firstly, there should be an explicit prohibition on "Exploring for, developing or producing oil, gas or minerals" in or under MPAs, as is the case by definition with all federal marine sanctuaries. It is not sufficient to point to the state and federal moratoriums on these activities as those can be lifted. There are also exceptions that could affect MPAs, e.g., the exception allowing drilling from federal land that could affect the Vandenberg State Marine Reserve, and the proposal by Venoco to expand their existing Ellwood lease into the Campus Point State Marine Conservation Area. The CDFW should encourage the State Lands Commission and the California Coastal Commission to not approve projects when requested under these exceptions. The CDFW should also oppose new federal oil and gas leases and projects that may impact MPAs.

Sierra Club California strongly endorses the emphasis on ecosystem-based and adaptive management of MPAs put forward in the Master Plan. However, we believe putting that into action requires concrete plans, proactive regulations and advocacy. We understand that this approach to management of MPAs is new and that, "The effort to align MPA management with other marine resource management efforts is largely unprecedented and therefore experimental in nature." (page 36) However, to judge the success of experimental efforts, one needs concrete and measureable goals, such as, "protect MPAs from oil pollution," and concrete actions to do so, rather than ambiguous statements like, "consider potential risks." We urge you to expand on the Management section of the Master Plan with this goal.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2015 Master Plan for MPAs.

Regards,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eddie Moreno". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "E" and a long, sweeping tail.

Eddie Moreno  
Policy Advocate