

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

Decision Context: Packages of MPAs for the Central Coast

Presentation to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force
January 31, 2006 • Morro Bay, CA

John J. Kirlin, MLPA Initiative

Overview of Roles Under MOU

- BRTF: policy guidance and recommendations to Department of Fish and Game
- Department of Fish and Game: receive BRTF work, modify and recommend to Fish and Game Commission
- Fish and Game Commission: adopt plans and regulations to create MPAs
- Master Plan Science Advisory Team: provide scientific guidance and evaluations, "best readily available science"
- Stakeholders and interested parties: provide practical information on marine environment, ecological values, fishing and socio economics; as CCRSG, develop proposed packages

Avoiding Information Overload

- Context, package, and SAT evaluation information in binder
- Major elements of packages compared in two pages for each of seven sub regions
- SAT evaluation includes major points and SAT members available to answer questions
- Details available as needed
- Package proponents on panel to answer questions

BRTF Charter on Role in MLPA Central Coast Project

- Secretary Chrisman's Charter for the Blue Ribbon Task Force
 - " ..oversee a regional project to develop a proposal for alternative networks of marine protected areas in an area along the central coast.. "

Steps to BRTF Decisions Regarding MPA Packages

- Central Coast Study Region selected
- Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group appointed
- Master Plan Science Advisory Team establishes sub-team and processes to support CCRSG
- Seven two-day meetings of full CCRSG, plus smaller work sessions
- Extensive staff support including Regional Profile, data layers, mapping tools, facilitation
- Strong commitment and lots of hours

Decisions Not Anticipated in BRTF Charter or MOU

- Military use areas – USAF asserts off Vandenberg – staff recommends refer to Secretary Chrisman
- Kelp bed leases – conflict with proposed SMRs – staff recommends refer to DFG and Fish and Game Commission

Complaints Heard

- Time lines too tight
 - Inadequate/unequal information/resources
 - Guidance creep from SAT
 - Errors in staff and SAT work products
-

- Yes, time line is tight, but MLPA passed in 1999, MLPA I started late 2004, CCRSG started June 2005 and process moves to DFG and F&GC for several more months
- Readily available information shared equally
- SAT evaluations are consistent with MLPA and MPF
- Have applied MLPA, MPF and staff guidance consistently
- Some errors have been made and were corrected ASAP; some "errors" are really differences in judgment

Decisions Logically Available to BRTF

- Identify any package which does not satisfy MLPA/MPF (SAT and staff recommends re: package B)
- Statements on strengths and weaknesses of packages
- Recommendations on changing any or all plans
- Recommendations to DFG regarding preferred alternative

BRTF Guidance if Changes Desired

- Guidance regarding:
 - Response to SAT evaluation
 - Resolve differences in areas of convergence
 - Reduce areas of divergence
 - Other ideas to make existing packages more responsive to MLPA
- Guidance in form of:
 - Requests to package proponents (note: the CCRSG as a whole has ended its formal work)
 - Questions to SAT
 - Direction to staff