

To: CCRSG Members

From: MLPA Initiative Staff

**Re: Revised Draft Provisional Regional Objectives:
For Review, Discussion, Revision and Adoption by CCRSG at
September 7-8, 2005 meeting**

Date: September 1, 2005

Introduction: The September CCRSG meeting will focus on review, final revision and adoption of the draft provisional regional objectives. This is a critical benchmark for the CCRSG's work. To set the stage, this memorandum summarizes work done to-date, outlines the draft document to be discussed and reviewed at the meeting, and lays out the approach for finalizing this task.

Background

Over the past two months, CCRSG members have worked with the support of Initiative staff to develop and revise a set of draft provisional regional objectives associated with the six regional goals adopted at the July CCRSG meeting. This effort has included:

- A work session at the July CCRSG meeting to brainstorm draft provisional regional objectives.
- Subsequent written submittals of additional brainstormed objectives
- A work session teleconference on July 26, 2005 to refine and gauge support of a preliminary list of draft provisional regional objectives. This resulted in the development of a matrix for each objective and included a rationale, references to supporting data, considerations for how each objective would relate to the design of MPAs, and preliminary indicators for measuring each objective.
- Full CCRSG review and discussion of the draft provisional regional objectives at the August CCRSG meeting. On Day 1 of the meeting, CCRSG members proposed revisions to several of the draft objectives. On Day 2, the CCRSG deliberated on approximately half of these proposals (primarily under goals 1 and 2). During these deliberations, straw votes were used to gauge levels of CCRSG support.
- A Regional Objectives Work Team meeting on August 29, 2005 to review and comment on draft text and consider alternate language for the remaining eleven unaddressed proposed revisions. The Work Team deliberated on all of these, making broadly supported recommendations for nine of them, and proposing a series of options for the final two.
- One-on-one phone calls with to participants from the ad hoc work group on Goal 3, Objective 1 to clarify underlying interests and elicit suggestions for revised text for consideration by the CCRSG.

At the August CCRSG meeting, stakeholders requested that Initiative staff provide guidance on the appropriateness of re-categorizing some of the proposed objectives as “design considerations.” MLPA Initiative staff has prepared two memoranda in response.

- Memo on “*Design considerations and implementation issues*”: MLPA Initiative staff produced an August 24, 2005 memorandum advising that the CCRSG produce packages of MPAs that include provisional objectives, design considerations, as well as “implementation considerations.”
- Memo on “*Coordination of MLPA objectives and information from other management plans*”: The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) produced an August 24, 2005 memorandum recommending that two objectives under Goal 2—those concerning the nearshore fishery management plan (NFMP) and abalone recovery management plan (ARMP)—be considered more appropriately as design considerations.

Note: Stakeholders raised other issues at the August CCRSG meeting that are not clearly addressed in the MLPA or the Master Plan Framework (MPF). These included concerns about the impacts of water quality, marine mammals, and safety issues, among others. As differing views exist as to the degree to which the MLPA requires consideration of these issues, they are currently not reflected in this document. As outlined in a separate memorandum in this packet, these issues will be taken up at the September CCRSG meeting in a systematic fashion via a “TBD (to be decided) bin process.”

Structure and organization of attached document

The attached document is organized into two main sections:

1. The first section lists Design and Implementation Considerations. Currently, it contains only those Design Considerations that received strong CCRSG member support during the August meeting. At the September meeting, CCRSG members will consider moving other objectives to this section.
2. The second section contains an updated version of the draft provisional regional objectives. It is organized as follows.
 - It references the entire list of draft provisional regional objectives discussed during the August CCRSG meeting.
 - It describes the *status* of the CCRSG’s deliberations on each draft objective.
 - For the proposed revisions not discussed at the August CCRSG meeting, this section provides one or more recommendations developed by the Regional Objectives Work Team and the SAT. A *rationale* is also provided for each proposed recommendation.

3. The third section presents an illustrative format for the final document. The purpose of this section is to provide stakeholders with a feel for how the document might look once completed. The number of Design and Implementation Considerations and Provisional Regional Objectives listed approximate the number currently under consideration.

Steps for CCRSG Review, Revision, and Adoption

A primary goal of the September CCRSG meeting is to review, discuss, revise and adopt a complete set of provisional regional objectives and design and implementation considerations. This recommendation will then be forwarded to the BRTF.

One focus of CCRSG deliberation will be on those objectives and issues not fully discussed at the August CCRSG meeting. Stakeholders will then have the opportunity review and deliberate on the entire package of draft provisional regional objectives.

Staff will organize this discussion to ensure that stakeholder deliberations proceed in an efficient manner so that CCRSG members are able to decide on adoption of the full set of provisional regional objectives by the end of Day 1. We will allocate fixed amounts of time to review and discuss the objectives under each goal. The discussion will proceed as follows:

- Staff will review the status of the CCRSG's and work team deliberations on each specific objective. The I-Team will also outline recommended revisions and present rationales for these revisions. The focus of the discussion will be on outstanding issues not yet discussed by the full CCRSG.
- Staff will invite comment from CCRSG members. CCRSG members will be asked to focus their comments on devising proposed text that integrates multiple stakeholder interests.
- Staff will use straw voting to gauge support for individual objectives. Staff will use its discretion in composing these straw votes.
- Staff will assemble and print the full suite of objectives resulting from this deliberation.
- To the extent possible, staff will work with the CCRSG to produce a unified recommendation on a full suite of objectives.
- If necessary, staff may work with the CCRSG to transmit a recommendation that embeds a couple of alternate formulations if there are strongly divergent views, which will be accompanied by a recommendation from Initiative staff.

Next Steps

MLPA Initiative staff will present the results of the CCRSG deliberations to the Blue Ribbon Taskforce at their September 28-29 meeting. In order to keep the Central Coast

Project on schedule, any work that is not completed will also be forwarded, along with staff recommendations for completing it.

Preparing for the September CCRSG meeting

We strongly encourage CCRSG members to review this document closely as part of your preparations for the September meeting. This will greatly facilitate a focused and efficient discussion.

DRAFT PROVISIONAL GOALS/OBJECTIVES DOCUMENT

Draft Design and Implementation Considerations

(For review, discussion, and adoption at September 7-8, 2005 CCRSG meeting)

In developing regional goals and objectives for the central coast, the Regional Stakeholder Group identified several issues that should be considered in the design and evaluation of marine protected areas. Like the “Considerations in the Design of MPAs” that appears in the Master Plan Framework, these considerations may apply to all MPAs and MPA proposals regardless of the specific goals and objectives for that MPA. The design considerations below will be incorporated with the provisional goals and objectives and provided to the Science Advisory Team, the Blue Ribbon Task Force, and the Fish and Game Commission.

Design Considerations

1. [Formerly Goal 2, Objective 4] Minimize socio-economic, and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, while following the Master Plan Framework design guidelines for the establishment of regional MPA network components.

Status: CCRSG members proposed revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. In a straw vote, the CCRSG strongly supported moving the above revised text to a section on Design Considerations.

2. [Formerly Goal 2, Objective 5] Incorporate existing state and federal fishery management areas, to the extent possible, when designing new MPAs or modifying existing ones.

Status: In a straw vote, the CCRSG strongly supported moving the original text to a section on Design Considerations.

3. [Formerly Goal 2, Objective 7] To the extent possible, site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.

Status: CCRSG members proposed revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. In a straw vote, the CCRSG strongly supported moving the above revised text to a section on Design Considerations.

Implementation Considerations

To be determined

Revised Draft Provisional Goals and Objectives (For review, discussion, and adoption at September 7-8, 2005 CCRSG meeting)

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. [Revised objective 1] Protect areas of high species diversity and maintain species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in representative habitats.

Status: CCRSG members proposed revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. The above revised text received strong support in a “straw vote.”

2. [Original objective 2] Protect areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

3. [Revised objective 3] Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective in the August CCRSG meeting. The Science Advisory Team proposed replacing “maintain” with “protect”.

Rationale: This change is consistent with the goal and facilitates measuring success. While “protect” is not totally defined, one can assume that if populations are not subject to extraction then a higher level of “protection” has been achieved. This would be measured by a differential change in population structure (size, abundance, etc.) when compared to non-MPA areas.

4. [Revised objective 4] Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective in the August CCRSG meeting. The Science Advisory Team proposed replacing “maintain” with “protect” in order to be consistent with the goal and to facilitate measuring success. See above rationale.

5. [Revised objective 5] Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from perturbations both natural and human induced.

Status: CCRSG members proposed revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. The above revised text received some support in a “straw vote.” The Science Advisory Team proposed replacing “maintain” with “protect” in order to be consistent with the goal and to facilitate measuring success. See above rationale.

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. [Original objective 1.] Help protect or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depleted, or over fished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

2. [Original objective 2.] Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of species most likely to benefit from MPAs through retention of large, mature individuals.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

3. [Revised Objective 3] Protect selected species and the habitats on which they depend while allowing the harvest of migratory, highly mobile, or other species where appropriate through the use of State Marine Conservations Areas and State Marine Parks.

Status: CCRSG members proposed revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. The above text had broad CCRSG support.

4. [Revised objective 4—Moved to Design Considerations].

5. [Original objective 5—Moved to Design Considerations.]

6. [Original objective 6—Recommendation: Move to Design Considerations as specified below.] Protect populations of 19 finfish species per the objectives of the state's Nearshore Fishery Management Plan.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Move this to Design Considerations. Add reference to the following design considerations outlined in the NFMP:

1. Restrict take in any MPA [intended to meet the NFMP goals] so that the directed fishing or significant bycatch of the 19 NFMP species is prohibited.
2. Include some areas that have been productive fishing grounds for the 19 NFMP species in the past but are no longer heavily used by the fishery.
3. Include some areas known to enhance distribution or retain larvae of NFMP species
4. Consist of an area large enough to address biological characteristics such as movement patterns and home range. There is an expectation that some portion of NFMP stocks will spend the majority of their life cycle within the boundaries of the MPA.

5. Consist of areas that replicate various habitat types within each region including areas that exhibit representative productivity.

Rationale (per August 24, 2005 memorandum from DFG): It is important to note that neither management plan includes specific, measurable, objectives for MPAs; instead, they list features of MPAs that are necessary to meet the management goals and objectives. The NFMP addresses this on pages 87 and 88 of Section 1, Chapter 3. It notes specifically that once the MLPA process is complete, “the Department [of Fish and Game] and [California Fish and Game] Commission will thoroughly review the plan and adjust the NFMP accordingly.” Thus, if the final network of MPAs does not include the features identified in the NFMP, DFG and the commission may adjust existing MPAs or create new MPAs through the NFMP process in order to do so. Similarly, the draft ARMP lists “criteria for MPA development” in order to meet the plan’s goals and objectives (Page 7-2). Each MPA designated or modified through the MLPA process can be compared to these criteria to see if the ARMP goals and objectives are met.

With this in mind, DFG concludes that the features and criteria listed in the NFMP and draft ARMP are appropriately addressed by the MLPA Master Plan Framework and as design considerations. They should not be added as objectives for the central coast region.

7. [Revised objective 7—Moved to Design Considerations.]

8. [Original objective 8—Recommendation: Move to Design Considerations as specified below.] Protect populations of red and black abalone in order to assist in their recovery per the objectives of the state’s draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Move this to Design Considerations. Add reference to the following design considerations outlined in the Abalone Recovery and Management Plan:

Proposed MPA sites should satisfy at least four of the previous criteria.

1. Include within MPAs suitable rocky habitat containing abundant kelp and/or foliose algae
2. Insure presence of sufficient populations to facilitate reproduction.
3. Include within MPAs suitable nursery areas, in particular crustose coralline rock habitats in shallow waters that include microhabitats of moveable rock, rock crevices, urchin spine canopy, and kelp holdfasts.
4. Include within MPAs the protected lee of major headlands that may act as collection points for water and larvae.
5. Include MPAs large enough to include large numbers of abalone and for research regarding population dynamics.
6. Include MPAs that are accessible to researchers, enforcement personnel, and others with a legitimate interest in resource protection.

Rationale (per August 24, 2005 memorandum from DFG): It is important to note that neither management plan includes specific, measurable, objectives for MPAs; instead, they list features of MPAs that are necessary to meet the management goals and objectives. The NFMP addresses this on pages 87 and 88 of Section 1, Chapter 3. It notes specifically that once the MLPA process is complete, “the Department [of Fish and Game] and [California Fish and Game] Commission will thoroughly review the plan and adjust the NFMP accordingly.” Thus, if the final network of MPAs does not include the features identified in the NFMP, DFG and the commission may adjust existing MPAs or create new MPAs through the NFMP process in order to do so. Similarly, the draft ARMP lists “criteria for MPA development” in order to meet the plan’s goals and objectives (Page 7-2). Each MPA designated or modified through the MLPA process can be compared to these criteria to see if the ARMP goals and objectives are met.

With this in mind, DFG concludes that the features and criteria listed in the NFMP and draft ARMP are appropriately addressed by the MLPA Master Plan Framework and as design considerations. They should not be added as objectives for the central coast region.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

- 1. [Original objective 1] Ensure some MPAs, including State Marine Reserves, are close to population centers, research and education institutions, and harbors, and are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities.**

Status: This is the original language as proposed on August 10. An ad hoc work group met on Day 2 to explore revised text that could be broadly supported.

RECOMMENDATION from Don Maruska following calls with ad hoc work group members: Focus CCRSG discussion on the draft text produced by the ad hoc work group. Consider adding an additional sentence as follows:

"Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers, research and education institutions, and areas of traditional nonconsumptive recreational use, and are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities."

Rationale: The above text was supported by most, although not all, of the ad hoc work group members contacted.

Proposed additional design consideration: "In evaluating the siting of MPAs for the purpose of enhancing nonconsumptive recreational activities, considerations shall include the needs and interest of other users."

- 2. [Original objective 2—Recommendation: consider alternative text below.] To the extent possible, provide replicate state marine reserves to function as reference areas for research and monitoring to assess impacts of human use activities and natural events.**

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Consider the following two alternative text proposals.

- 2a. Similar types of marine habitats and communities shall be replicated, to the extent possible, in more than one state marine reserve as reference areas for research and monitoring to assess impacts of human use activities and natural events.**

Status: Objective 2a emerged as a proposed revision from CCRSG comments on August 10.

Rationale: The original language recognizes that reserves serving as reference areas need to be replicated to increase the statistical power of any conclusions made about their effectiveness, as recommended by the Science Advisory Team. The first part of the original objective was re-worded in option

2a to reflect the exact language of the MLPA. Section 2857 (c)(3) states “Similar types of marine habitats and communities shall be replicated, to the extent possible, in more than one marine life reserve in each biogeographical region.” The term “marine life reserve” is synonymous with state marine reserve.

2b. Replicate some marine protected areas to function as reference areas and, to the extent possible, replicate similar types of marine habitats and communities for research and monitoring to assess impacts of human activities and natural events.

Status: Objective 2b was proposed but not fully supported by the Work Team on August 29.

Rationale: Option 2b recognizes that it may also be desirable to replicate habitats in state marine parks or state marine conservation areas in order to make statistically-based conclusions on the results of restricting fishing for certain species or from certain gear types. The phrase “to the extent possible” recognizes that it may not be possible to find similar habitats (i.e. scientific replicates) within more than one state marine reserve or other type of MPA.

SCIENCE ADVISORY TEAM RECOMMENDATION: This objective was discussed at the 8/30/05 SAT meeting and Mark Carr provided the following alternative:

2c. Based upon identified scientific study objectives, both basic and applied, replicate as necessary appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies.

Status: Objective 2c is a new proposal to replace both above proposals. The CCRSG has not yet discussed this proposal.

Rationale: Option 2c recognizes the fact that all types of MPAs, habitats, and open areas may need to be replicated depending on the scientific study objectives. This allows flexibility in design to meet a variety of study needs without presuming a particular type of study will be conducted.

3. [Original objective 3] Develop collaborative scientific monitoring and research projects evaluating MPAs that link with classroom science curricula, volunteer dive programs, and fishermen of all ages, and identify participants.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

4. [Original objective 4—Recommendation: consider options below.] Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations for observation, photography, and other non-consumptive uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS by Work Team 8/29: The Regional Objectives Work Team discussed this issue but did not come up with a single recommendation for the CCRSG. The work team discussed the following possible options (rationales included):

Option: delete this objective.

Rationale: This objective is duplicative of Goal 1, objective 3, which states “Maintain natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.” Furthermore, agreed-upon language for Goal 3, Objective 1 may incorporate the remaining part of the concept of this objective, that of providing opportunities for non-consumptive uses in MPAs.

However, the objective under goal 1 relates to the goal of ecosystem protection rather than improving recreational, educational, and study opportunities.

Alternative text revisions:

4a. Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations for non-consumptive uses within state marine reserves and for consumptive uses in other areas

Rationale: This recognizes that Goal 4 has a broader interpretation, that of improving recreational opportunities, e.g. fishing, in areas outside of MPAs as a result of the benefits provided by those MPAs. The “spillover” effect is an example of this potential improvement.

4b. Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations.

Rationale: This wording does not limit the type of recreational activities which may be enhanced to the following: observation, photography, and other non-consumptive uses, and recognizes the above rationale in 4a.

4c. Retain original language in 4 but add a new objective: Provide MPAs that are sited to improve recreational fishing areas.

Rationale: This also relates to the rationale in 4a (spillover effect).

SCIENCE ADVISORY TEAM RECOMMENDATION: This objective was discussed at the 8/30/05 SAT meeting and Linwood Pendleton provided the following alternative, note that **both** the following are suggested to replace the original, not one or the other:

4d1. Protect or enhance consumptive recreation near state marine reserves and near or within other MPAs by increasing total abundance and individual

sizes of previously fished populations within MPAs and increasing size and quantity of catch near state marine reserves and near or within other MPAs.

4d2. Protect or enhance non-consumptive recreational experiences within and near MPAs, by maintaining minimal human impacts on the ecosystem within MPAs and increasing total populations and individual size of previously fished populations within MPAs.

Rationale: This recognizes that goal 4 has a broader application to all recreational activities (e.g. fishing outside reserves and/or fishing inside other MPAs). It also makes the objective more measurable by recognizing the root causes of benefits to recreation (size and numbers inside for observation and increases in catch through spillover of larger individuals). The proposed objective is accompanied by proposed measurement options that are included in the matrix for MPA analyses.

5. [Original objective 5] Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for central coast MPAs.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in central California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. [Original objective 1—Recommendation: see work team recommendation below.] Identify and protect unique habitats, such as estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, pinnacles, upwelling centers, and larval retention areas for their intrinsic value.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29):

Option 1a. Include within at least one MPA the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, pinnacles, upwelling centers, and larval retention areas.

Status: This was proposed by the Team on August 29.

Rationale: This option addresses specific habitat types that are less common within the study region. Work Team members thought that this would make the objective more measurable. In the Science Advisory Team discussion, it was recommended that the term “intrinsic value” not be repeated in the objectives as it was redundant to the goal.

Alternative text revisions:

Option 1b. Identify and protect unique habitats for their intrinsic value.

Status: This was proposed by the CCRSG on August 10.

Rationale: Unique habitats are not specifically defined in the MLPA. Although some of the Science Advisory Team members have suggested the above referenced habitats as examples of unique or rare habitats within the central coast study region, the deletion of the reference to specific habitat types will allow RSG members to suggest what they consider to be unique habitats and provide their own justification.

2. [Revised objective 2] Protect representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the Master Plan Framework across a range of depths.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective in the August CCRSG meeting. The Science Advisory Team recommended removing the phrase “for their intrinsic value” as this is redundant to the goal.

Goal 5. To ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. [Original objective 1—Recommendation: See Work Team recommendation below.] For each MPA, develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic monitoring protocols, and a strategy for MPA evaluation, and ensure that each MPA objective is linked to one or more regional objectives.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Adopt the following alternative text proposal:

- 1a. For all MPAs in the region, develop objectives, a long-term monitoring plan that includes standardized biological and socioeconomic monitoring protocols, and a strategy for MPA evaluation, and ensure that each MPA objective is linked to one or more regional objectives.

Status: This text revision was suggested by the CCRSG on August 10. It was strongly supported by the Work Team on August 29.

Rationale: This text clarifies that the objective applies to existing as well as any new MPAs that may be established. This language also avoids the possibility of interpreting that objective as requiring a separate monitoring plan for each MPA.

2. [Original objective 2] In developing alternative MPA proposals, consider existing state and federal programs, including but not limited to those related to water quality, fisheries management, species recovery, and those of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

3. [Original objective 3—Recommendation: Move to Design Considerations as is] To the extent possible, site MPAs adjacent to terrestrial federal, state, county, or city parks, marine laboratories, or other "eyes on the water" to facilitate management, enforcement, and monitoring.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Move this to Design Considerations.

Status: Moving this item to a Design Consideration was suggested by CCRSG members on August 10. The Regional Objectives Work Team strongly supported this proposal.

Rationale: This proposed objective does not directly relate to the establishment of clear objectives, effective management, and adequate enforcement. While it could be argued that the term "adjacent" is measurable

and therefore qualifies this concept as an objective, the concept is more related to where to site an MPA rather than the function which the MPA will serve.

4. [Original objective 4] If necessary, phase the implementation of central coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Move this to “Implementation Considerations”.

Status: CCRSG members requested at the August CCRSG meeting that Staff obtain policy guidance on this issue. In an August 24, 2005 memorandum from John Kirlin, MLPA Initiative staff recommends this be moved to a new section called “*Implementation Considerations*”. Staff recommends that “Implementation Considerations” be treated separately since they relate to activities after the design phase. Work Team members discussed this issue and strongly supported Staff’s recommendation.

Rationale: This is not appropriate as an objective. The Department has stated in public testimony that it will not bring any recommendations of central coast MPA alternatives to the Commission that are not implementable (i.e. the Department’s feasibility study, cited in step 3.4 in the MPA planning process of the Master Plan Framework), and that phasing may be recommended as a way to defray costs. Furthermore, the MLPA allows for phasing; Section 2857(e) states “The department and team may provide recommendations for phasing in the new MPAs in the preferred siting alternative.” Finally, this issue was important to the Commission in their hearings on the Master Plan Framework.

5. [Original objective 5—Recommendation: Move to Design Considerations as is] To the extent possible, site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Move this to Design Considerations.

Status: Moving this item to a Design Consideration was suggested by CCRSG members on August 10. The Regional Objectives Work Team strongly supported this proposal.

Rationale: This proposed objective does not directly relate to the establishment of clear objectives, effective management, and adequate enforcement. The concept is more related to where to site an MPA rather than the function which the MPA will serve.

6. [Original objective 6—Recommendation: Move to Design Considerations as is] To the extent possible, site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Move this to Design Considerations.

Status: Moving this item to a Design Consideration was suggested by CCRSG members on August 10. The Regional Objectives Work Team strongly supported this proposal.

Rationale: This proposed objective does not directly relate to the establishment of clear objectives, effective management, and adequate enforcement. The concept is more related to where to site an MPA rather than the function which the MPA will serve.

7. [Original objective 7] Develop regional management and enforcement measures, including cooperative enforcement agreements, adaptive management, and jurisdictional maps, which can be effectively used, adopted statewide, and periodically reviewed.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

8. [Original objective 8] To the extent possible, design MPAs boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

9. [Original objective 9] To the extent possible, effectively utilize scientific guidelines in the Master Plan Framework, including size and spacing of MPAs, in the overall design of individual MPAs.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

10. [Original objective 10] Secure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement before implementing any new MPAs.

RECOMMENDATION by Regional Objectives Work Team (8/29): Delete this objective. As an alternative, it might also be moved to "Implementation Considerations".

Status: CCRSG members requested at the August CCRSG meeting that Staff obtain policy guidance on this issue. In an August 24, 2005 memorandum from John Kirlin, MLPA Initiative staff recommends this be moved to a new section called "*Implementation Considerations*". Staff recommends that "Implementation Considerations" be treated separately since they relate to activities after the design phase. Work Team members discussed this issue and supported Staff's recommendation.

Rationale: This is not appropriate as an objective. The concept is covered by the Department's review of all recommendations. It is also covered well in the MLPA and in the Master Plan Framework.

Goal 6. To ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. [Original objective 1] To the extent possible, effectively utilize scientific guidelines in the Master Plan Framework, including those related to size and spacing of MPAs, in the overall design of the central coast MPA network component.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

2. [Original objective 2] Develop a regional review and evaluation of implementation effectiveness to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

3. [Original objective 3] Develop a mechanism to coordinate with future MLPA Regional Stakeholder Groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets the goals of the MLPA.

Status: CCRSG members did not propose revisions to this objective at the August CCRSG meeting. It stands as originally proposed.

Illustrative Format (Look and Feel of Final Provisional Regional Objectives Document)

(The following presents an illustrative format of what the final document might look like given the design and implementation considerations and provisional regional objectives under discussion above.)

Design and Implementation Considerations

Introduction

The members of the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group agree that Regional Goals, Objectives and Design Considerations are all very important in the development of an effective system of MPAs that have stakeholder support. Regional Goals are statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al. 2004). The Regional Goals are largely taken directly from the MLPA itself. Regional Objectives are more specific measurable statements of what must be accomplished to attain a related goal (Pomeroy et al. 2004).

Design Considerations are additional factors that may help fulfill provisions of the MLPA related to facilitating enforcement, encouraging public involvement, and incorporating socio-economic considerations, while meeting the Act's goals and guidelines. Design considerations will be applied as the location, category (reserve, park or conservation area), size and other characteristics of potential MPAs are being developed (Kirlin Memo, 8/22/05). Design considerations are cross cutting (they apply to all MPAs) and are not necessarily measurable (Kirlin Memo, 8/22/05). MPA alternatives developed by the RSG should include analysis of how the proposal addresses both regional goals and objectives and design guidelines. (Kirlin Memo, 8/22/05).

Design Considerations

In developing regional goals and objectives for the central coast, the Regional Stakeholder Group identified several issues that should be considered in the design and evaluation of marine protected areas. Like the "Considerations in the Design of MPAs" that appears in the Master Plan Framework, these considerations may apply to all MPAs and MPA proposals regardless of the specific goals and objectives for that MPA. The design considerations below will be incorporated with the provisional goals and objectives and provided to the Science Advisory Team, the Blue Ribbon Task Force, and the Fish and Game Commission.

1. Adopted design consideration.
2. Adopted design consideration.

3. Adopted design consideration.
4. Adopted design consideration
5. Adopted design consideration.
6. Adopted design consideration.
7. Adopted design consideration.
8. Adopted design consideration.
9. Adopted design consideration.

Implementation Considerations

1. Adopted implementation consideration.
2. Adopted implementation consideration.

Provisional Regional Objectives

Goal 1. To protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

1. Adopted objective.
2. Adopted objective.
3. Adopted objective.
4. Adopted objective.
5. Adopted objective.

Goal 2. To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

1. Adopted objective.
2. Adopted objective.
3. Adopted objective.

Goal 3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbances, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

1. Adopted objective.
2. Adopted objective.
3. Adopted objective.
4. Adopted objective.
5. Adopted objective.

Goal 4. To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in central California waters, for their intrinsic value.

1. Adopted objective.
2. Adopted objective.

Goal 5. To ensure that central California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

1. Adopted objective.
2. Adopted objective.
3. Adopted objective.
4. Adopted objective.
5. Adopted objective.

Goal 6. To ensure that the central coast's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.

1. Adopted objective.
2. Adopted objective.
3. Adopted objective.