

Attachment 3

Department of Fish and Wildlife: Summary of Marine Protected Area (MPA) Regulation Change Petition Framework Discussion

(07/27/23) Revised 08/10/23; Revised 8/17/23; Revised 6/26/25; Revised 7/24/25 (new text is *italicized*).

CDFW has annotated this document to reflect which questions in the [DRAFT Evaluation Framework \(Draft Framework\)](#) for 2023 MPA Bin 2 petitions relate to each component of the MPA Regulation Change Petition Framework approved by CFGC in 2023 outlined here. Related question numbers that appear in the Draft Framework are listed in bold font.

At the California Fish and Game Commission's (CFGC) July 20, 2023 Marine Resources Committee (MRC) meeting, MRC, CFGC staff, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) staff, and stakeholders discussed potential next steps in pursuing the MPA Decadal Management Review (DMR) report recommendations and goals. The discussion included a potential framework to assist in evaluation of petitions the CFGC may receive related to changes to the MPA network and management program. At the request of MRC, staff from CDFW summarized the input received at the July 20, 2023 MRC meeting regarding these MPA petition framework considerations.

Broadly, petitions submitted to the CFGC are evaluated on a case by case by basis. To help guide petition development and subsequent review by CDFW, the MRC received the following input for evaluating petitions related to MPAs:

- Compatible with the goals and guidelines of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) (**Draft Framework Question 1**)
- Help advance one or more of the [six goals](#) of the MLPA; (**Draft Framework Question 1**)
- Garner strong community support; and/or (**Public input will be considered throughout the petition evaluation process**)
- Advance adaptive management recommendations under the cornerstones of MPA governance, MPA Management Program activities, and MPA Network Performance outlined in [DMR Table 6.1](#) to ensure that petitions meet MPA management priorities (**Draft Framework Question 2**)

The MRC also received input organized by cornerstone as follows:

- MPA Governance:
 - Simplifies regulatory language or enhances public understanding (**Draft Framework Questions 11 and 12**)
 - Addresses inaccuracies or discrepancies in regulations (**Draft Framework Questions 11 and 12**)
 - Accounts for regional stakeholder group intent identified during the regional MLPA planning process (including MPA-specific goals/objectives and design considerations) (**Draft Framework**

Questions 7 and 8)

- Accounts for CDFW's [MPA design and management feasibility guidelines](#) **(Draft Framework Question 10)**
- Advances tribal stewardship and co-management, consistent with the CFGC [Co-Management Vision Statement and Definition](#) **(Section III of the Draft Framework)**
- Improves access for traditionally underserved or marginalized communities, consistent with the [CFGC Policy on Justice Equity, Diversity and Inclusion](#) **(Draft Framework Questions 14 and 16)**
- Acknowledges socio-economic implications, such as access for consumptive or non-consumptive users **(Draft Framework Question 15)**
- MPA Management Program Activities:
 - Clearly addresses or identifies scientific need for MPA Network based on best available science and scientific advancement since Network completion **(Draft Framework Question 9)**
 - Improves compliance and/or enforceability **(Draft Framework Questions 11 and 12)**
- MPA Network Performance:
 - Maintains or enhances the protections and integrity of the MPA Network **(Draft Framework Question 13)**
 - Maintains or enhances habitat and species connectivity **(Draft Framework Question 9)**
 - Adheres to science guidelines, such as maintaining minimum size and spacing, and protection of diverse habitats **(Draft Framework Question 9)**
 - Enhances climate resilience and/or helps mitigate climate impacts **(See *opening evaluation preamble*)**