

**Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
Public Comments Submitted  
through May 12, 2010**

From: Lonnie Dollarhide  
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 7:05 PM  
To: Kathie Magnuson  
Subject: Hi

I would like to comment on the MLPA for the north coast. I feel we do not need MPA at False Cape, Mattole Canyon, Cape Mendocino. We People here have lost enough areas thru out the years. You people need to take the cotton out of your ears , and open your hearts and hear what we have to say, please..... Their is no science you people have that can show us a decline in the fish population here. We the people here can give you all the science facts you need if you want it. Thanks .

**From:** Jennifer Savage

**Sent:** Friday, May 07, 2010 9:29 AM

**To:** gaines@lifesci.ucsb.edu; vCostello@bren.ucsb.edu; ron@madriverbio.com;  
smurray@Exchange.FULLERTON.EDU; eric.bjorkstedt@noaa.gov

**Cc:** MLPAComments

**Subject:**

Dear members of the North Coast Science Advisory Team,  
Please see attached request for scientifically optimized model arrays to be  
provided to inform the North Coast Regional Stakeholder Group.

Best,

Jennifer Savage

NCRSG member

Jennifer Savage

North Coast Program Coordinator

Mobile: 707-477-8283

E-mail: [jsavage@oceanconservancy.org](mailto:jsavage@oceanconservancy.org)

**Delivered by electronic mail to:** [MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov](mailto:MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov)

May 6, 2010

Members of the Science Advisory Team  
c/o Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Request for examples of “optimized” MPA arrays using bioeconomic model**

Dear Members of the Science Advisory Team:

As members of the North Coast Regional Stakeholder Group, creators of Round 1 external arrays and citizens of the North Coast community, we have been continuing to study MPA design with respect to the Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluation materials.

It is clear from the SAT evaluations that all of the external arrays (including the ones we submitted) fail to meet the basic SAT guidelines in significant ways. The challenge now before the RSG is how to design MPAs that benefit conservation and minimize short term economic impacts to fishermen.

We are having a really tough time meeting this challenge. The SAT evaluation materials provide some useful advice on how to improve the external arrays – thank you – but we believe that even more feedback would be more helpful. As we've learned more about MPAs and the bioeconomic models used by the SAT to evaluate the proposed arrays, we are very interested in the possibility of scientifically optimizing an MPA network for both maximum conservation and economic benefits. Having some feasible new ideas in the mix beyond the current external proposals would be a great benefit to the NC RSG MPA design discussion.

Therefore, those of us on the RSG would like to request that the SAT run several arrays that meet the science guidelines, from all along the optimization curve, in order to provide the RSG with greater understanding of the possibilities.

Ideally, interested RSG members could also question SAT members about the models and how they work, the data and assumptions behind them, etc. RSG members could, if they choose to, use the model results to inform our own attempts at creating arrays that meet science guidelines and also address economic issues. It would be most useful to have any results available by May 14<sup>th</sup> to help inform our Round 2 MPA array discussions.

Thank you,

Jennifer Savage, NC RSG member, external array contributor  
Bill Lemos, NC RSG member, external array contributor  
Pete Nichols, NC RSG member, external array contributor  
Harold “Skip” Wollenberg, NC RSG member  
Dave Jensen, NC RSG member  
Robert Jamgocian, NC RSG member, external array contributor  
Steve Chaney, NC RSG member  
Don Gillespie, NC RSG member, external array contributor  
Beth Werner, North Coast resident, external array contributor

a  
h  
r  
a



www.albionharbor.org  
**ALBION HARBOR REGIONAL ALLIANCE**

May 12 2010

To: North Coast SAT

[MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov](mailto:MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov)

also:

**Evan Fox**

Principal Planner, California MLPA Initiative

[evanwfox@gmail.com](mailto:evanwfox@gmail.com)

From: Tomas DiFiore

Albion Harbor Regional Alliance

[ahra@mcn.org](mailto:ahra@mcn.org)

Re: Submission of External Data

In the Submission of External Data "preliminary assessment of the data against the as many of the below criteria as possible ..." **Document D.1**

*California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Protocol for Evaluating Incoming Data from Sources External to the Master Plan Science Advisory Team (Adopted February 24, 2009)*

1) Concern regarding parameters of use of external data:

**Doc D.1 Page 1 Item 2 B states:**

Does the SAT already have data of a similar type, or data that addresses the same question? If so, then the staffer will evaluate whether the data sets are complimentary (with the potential that both sets may be considered) or if the datasets overlap. This may require the MLPA staff to consult with SAT member(s) and/or other MLPA staff to determine what data is already in-house.

No mention is made of the procedural roadmap for *contrary* data which is different than the statement above, "evaluate whether the data sets are *complimentary* (with the potential that both sets may be considered) or if the datasets *overlap*". the North Coast nearshore substrate data is all proxy, based on model input assumptions of a reality that is not present or at least not comparable with any LEK.

2) If a movie was brought in, say showing contiguous kelp habitat from the Oregon Border to Point Conception, how would that be evaluated? 3) Would that be evaluated as - (complimentary, overlapping, or contrary)? 4) The film is visual media, no peer review, no science degrees, just raw film - on DVD, not even official, just a couple guys with cameras, a boat, and a plane - what would make it more official?

**Doc D.1 Page 2 Item 4**

States that "to determine that data would add value to the MLPA process " and the concern is that the process, the MLPA process, is rushed, with deadlines that don't allow for the time necessary to check for accuracy or communication between workgroups and planning groups, the RSG and constituents, the RSG and SAT the RSG and the BRTF, the BRTF and SAT; this is reiterated in the Lessons Learned and comments by the above mentioned groups and individuals over the length of this process thusfar in every Study Region.

5)And this leads to the concern that, if the External Data is such contrary information, that it causes the 'process' to restart or backup, will the submitted external data receive the appropriate review? 6)Who would make the decision to the SAT or MLPA staff?

**Doc D.1 Page 2 Item 5 *states that;***

If the MLPA staff member determines that another component of the MLPA process would benefit from the information or data then the information will be passed on to that MLPA component .

7) Concern is whether this means 'in addition to' or 'instead of' the SAT?

Respectfully submitted,  
Tomas DiFiore

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tomas DiFiore". The signature is stylized with a large, looping initial "D" and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

**From:** InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 12, 2010 11:38 PM  
**To:** Meg Caldwell; Roberta Cordero; Cindy Gustafson; Bill Anderson; Virginia Strom-Martin; Jimmy Smith; Catherine Reheis-Boyd; Greg Schem  
**Cc:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; Kelly Sayce  
**Subject:** Sinkyone Council's Recommended Changes to Meg Caldwell's Proposed Motion  
**Importance:** High

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force Members:

The InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council is pleased to provide you with our recommended changes to the May 4 motion proposed by Meg Caldwell regarding the Tribes' traditional use of marine resources. As you know, this motion was drafted by Meg as a way of providing additional guidance to the NCRSG in their work to evaluate the arrays. We believe Meg's motion is an excellent way of addressing this need. We developed our recommended revisions to Meg's motion in order to provide additional clarifying details and to amplify critical areas of Tribal concern.

The motion is scheduled for discussion at the May 17 BRTF teleconference/webinar meeting.

The attached revised wording was finalized and approved tonight at a meeting of our board of directors. Present at the meeting were ten board members, seven of whom are elected Tribal Council officials of our organization's 10 member Tribes.

We respectfully request that you review and consider our recommended revisions preparatory to Monday's meeting.

Sincerely,  
Hawk

**Hawk Rosales, Executive Director**  
**InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council**  
**P.O. Box 1523**  
**Ukiah, CA 95482**  
**Phone: (707) 468-9500 Fax: (707) 462-6787**  
**intertribalsinkyone@sbcglobal.net**

**InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council's Recommended Changes to  
Proposed Motion of May 4, 2010 by BRTF Member Meg Caldwell**

**Regarding Traditional, Non-Commercial Tribal  
Gathering and Other Uses of Marine Resources**

**May 12, 2010**

The BRTF requests that the NCRSG use its best efforts, as information allows, to avoid traditional non-commercial Tribal gathering, subsistence, harvesting, ceremonial and stewardship areas while conforming as closely as is feasible to the SAT guidelines. The NCRSG is encouraged to engage regularly with the Tribes and Tribal Communities of the North Coast Study Region in order to obtain as much information as possible, consistent with cultural and social strictures against disclosure of confidential information. The BRTF is aware, however, that it may not be possible to avoid altogether such areas when designating MPAs in the North Coast Study Region. As a matter of policy, the BRTF has determined that MPAs that are otherwise intended by the NCRSG as state marine reserves, but for continued traditional non-commercial Tribal gathering, subsistence, harvesting, ceremonial or stewardship uses, should be designated as Tribal Resource Protection state marine parks (SMPs) or state marine conservation areas (SMCAs). Further, the BRTF has determined that allowance of Tribal uses within SMPs or SMCAs is consistent with the goals of the MLPA. As the MLPAI's North Coast process moves forward, the NCRSG, MLPA Initiative staff, and the Department of Fish and Game should consult with the region's Tribes to ensure that traditional Tribal uses are allowed to continue at appropriate levels and to ensure the highest possible level of protection for specific Tribal Resource Protection SMPs or SMCAs, consistent with Tribal cultural values. Such consultation should include but not be limited to consideration of co-management opportunities.

For the purposes of MLPA Master Plan SAT evaluations, Tribal Resource Protection MPAs should be evaluated and displayed in SAT evaluation materials as very high-level protection SMPs or SMCAs.

*Approved by the board of directors of InterTribal Sinkyone Wilderness Council on May 12, 2010*