

# California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force

## MEMORANDUM

Phil Isenberg, *Chair*  
*Isenberg/O'Haren, Government Relations*

William Anderson  
*Westrec Marina Management, Inc.*

Meg Caldwell  
*Stanford University Law School*

Ann D'Amato  
*Los Angeles City Attorney's Office*

Susan Golding  
*The Golding Group, Inc.*

Dr. Jane Pisano  
*Natural History Museum of L.A. County*

Cathy Reheis-Boyd  
*Western States Petroleum Association*

Douglas P. Wheeler  
*Hogan & Hartson, LLP*

John J. Kirlin, *Executive Director*

**To: Members, MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force**  
**From: John Kirlin, Executive Director, MLPA Initiative**  
**Subject: Major comments on the revised draft master plan framework, responses and outstanding issues**  
**Date: April 10, 2005**

Before you today is the third version of the master plan framework. The first draft was released on February 10, 2005. We received many email, verbal and written comments on that draft, which were reflected in a revised draft released on March 15, 2005. Once again, we received comments and suggestions on the revised draft from both individuals and organizations. These comments have been considered in producing the final draft master plan framework, which was released on April 5, 2005. This document will undergo additional public review in the course of the Fish and Game Commission's consideration.

Attached to this memo is background on the following topics:

1. Major issues raised in public comment on the preliminary and revised draft master plan framework and our responses to them.
2. Several outstanding issues together with options for addressing.
3. A summary of major changes to the draft master plan framework since the February meeting of the task force in Monterey.
4. A review of somewhat more detailed comments on the preliminary and revised draft master plan framework.

As you will see, this version of the MPF is markedly different from earlier versions. For the most part, the differences reflect consideration of the large number of suggestions and comments by stakeholders.

The text also incorporates two new sections prepared by the science advisory team: one on the design of MPAs and one on the consideration of habitats in designing MPAs and networks. These two sections were prepared by a sub-team of the science advisory team, then reviewed and approved by the entire team. They have not been reviewed by the public.

The text also includes a major revision of the section on enforcement, prepared by the Department of Fish and Game's enforcement staff, as

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force  
April 10, 2005  
Page Two

well as a draft enforcement action plan added as an appendix. These sections have not received public review.

I believe that the process overseen by the task force has produced a strong draft master plan framework that can be best refined through the regulatory process overseen by the department and the Fish and Game Commission. It is in this spirit that we recommend the task force adopt the draft master plan framework and forward it to the department for formal consideration. Clearly, there are issues remaining that the task force may well wish to comment further upon as the formal process moves ahead.

Staff will also be circulating this draft to stakeholders via the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative website and other means. The April 11, 2005 meeting will include a brief presentation by Mike Weber regarding this draft.

## Attachment 1: Major Issues Raised in Public Comment

Based on the frequency of mention, and the fundamental questions raised by the assertions, here is a short list of the major issues raised by those who commented:

- Adverse impacts on the health of the ocean often come from human activities unrelated to fishing. For example, oil spills or pollution discharge from land may be a prime cause of ocean damage. The master plan framework must take this fact into account, and avoid automatic designation of MPAs or imposition of fishing restrictions that are unrelated to the significant impact causing the damage.

Response: The master plan framework has been revised in a number of ways to respond to concerns regarding activities other than fishing that may have an impact on marine wildlife and habitats.

- The introduction includes a brief discussion of potential impacts from pollution and habitat loss and of a few government programs that address activities generating these impacts.
- Also, the master plan framework requires that at several points in the regional process, activities that are likely to have a significant impact on marine wildlife and habitats of concern throughout the regional process and their management be evaluated, specifically Activities 1.3.6, 2.1.4, and 2.5.4.
- The master plan framework provides that regional MPA proposals may include recommendations to responsible agencies to take actions to reduce impacts of activities they manage and to the California Ocean Protection Council.
- At the end of section 3, there is a discussion of other programs and activities other than fishing.

While the MLPA does provide the department with authority to regulate some activities other than fishing such as scientific collecting and diving, it does not provide authority to regulate other activities under the management of other agencies, such as coastal development and water quality.

While such stresses as pollution and habitat loss have clearly affected some populations of marine wildlife in some areas, these stresses have not had a demonstrated affect on populations in most other areas. The linkage between fishing and changes in marine ecosystems is much more clearly established, as confirmed by several studies by the National Academy of Sciences. Levels of fishing that may produce maximum sustainable yields for individual species or groups of species significantly alter marine ecosystems. One goal of the MLPA is to return some areas to a less-stressed state.

- The Marine Life Protection Act should be read in such a way that no new MPA can ever be created until all existing protected areas have been analyzed, reviewed, researched and otherwise studied at great length. A far stronger, and clearer statement on the need to evaluate existing MPAs, and to modify or abolish those that require change, must be included in the master plan framework.

Response: The MLPA requires the development of a statewide network of MPAs, including a “marine reserve component” that protects representative habitats at two sites, at least, in each biogeographic region. The current array of MPAs does not meet

this standard since it does not include all types of representative habitats in all depth zones, as required by the MLPA. The legislature also set a deadline for completion of the statewide network, which has not been met.

The master plan framework recognizes the importance of evaluating existing MPAs in the course of meeting the requirements of the MLPA. At several stages in the design process, the master plan framework requires an evaluation of existing MPAs, specifically Activities 1.5 and 2.4, once a standard for evaluation has been set through the development of regional goals and objectives.

- No new MPA can impose any fishing restrictions under the provisions of the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 25, the so-called Right to Fish provision.

Response: The General Counsel's Office of the Department of Fish and Game has reviewed the text regarding this matter in the introduction to the master plan framework. That text has been expanded somewhat for the sake of clarity. In the end, the state does have the authority to impose restrictions on fishing and other activities in MPAs.

- If a new MPA network is identified, there must be a careful and systematic review of existing fishing regulations (both commercial and sports fishing) within the area, and the Fish & Game Commission should harmonize those regulations with the goals of the new MPA.

Response: The master plan framework explicitly requires the consideration of existing fishing regulations in the MPA design process, specifically Activity 1.5.3. Depending on size and other factors, MPAs may or may not affect other management of fisheries.

- The master plan framework, unlike the MLPA itself, must identify the priority order in which the various statutory goals will be addressed.

Response: The master plan framework does not seek to prioritize the goals identified for the Marine Life Protection Program in the MLPA. The statewide network created under the MLPA must, taken as a whole, meet all of these goals, although individual components of the network will emphasize one or another goal over the others.

- Any stakeholder process must grant to those stakeholders the right to select their own representatives.

Response: The master plan framework does not establish rules for the selection of stakeholders on advisory groups. Rather, the master plan framework defers this decision to each regional process, since the mix of interest groups and appropriate methods for involving stakeholders will shift.

- All stakeholders must be deeply involved in the planning of new MPA networks, the evaluation of existing MPAs, and the monitoring, study and research that follows any MPA designation.

Response: The master plan framework provides all stakeholders with many opportunities to provide comments and suggestions regarding discussions and decisions. The initial development of alternative MPAs proposals, which is the goal of the regional process, must be the work of a much smaller group—the regional stakeholder group. The work of this group, and the science advisory sub-team, will be open to the public, and the main products of this work, which are identified in Section 2 of the master plan framework, will be open for public comment and suggestion in the regional process, in the task force’s consideration, and in the review by the Fish and Game Commission.

- In order for the MLPA to work there must be adequate funding for monitoring and enforcement.

Response: The MLPA Initiative acknowledges the need for adequate funding in several ways. First, the master plan framework requires that regional MPA proposals include a basic management plan that identifies ranges of costs of key activities, such as enforcement and monitoring. Second, in December, the task force will be considering a comprehensive long-term funding strategy for the statewide MPA network.

## Attachment 2: Outstanding Issues in the Revised Draft Master Plan Framework and Options

The MLPA touches upon a number of difficult and complex issues that may have several reasonable resolutions. The three main issues of great difficulty and complexity are discussed here. In two cases, we recommend the BRTF make a recommendation from among the alternatives identified. That recommendation would be made to the Department of Fish and Game to consider as it reviews and revises this Master Plan Framework. In the third case, we believe peer review can provide additional information upon which the Department can address the issue.

- **Biogeographic Regions:** A key feature of the statewide MPA network required by the MLPA is the definition of biogeographic regions. The MLPA provides a general definition and identifies three biogeographic regions, while authorizing the master plan science advisory team to identify these regions otherwise. Both the science team convened in 2000 and the science team convened under the MLPA Initiative reviewed the MLPA's biogeographic regions and suggested others.

As a result of these discussions, there are four defensible definitions of biogeographic regions:

- The three biogeographic regions defined in the MLPA;
- The two *biogeographic provinces* recognized by many scientists with a boundary at Point Conception;
- The four *marine regions* identified by the former Master Plan Team, with boundaries at Pt. Conception, Pt. Año Nuevo, and Pt. Arena; and
- The biogeographic regions recognized by scientists who have identified borders based on species distributional patterns or on abundance and diversity data with boundaries at Pt. Conception, Monterey Bay and/or San Francisco Bay, and Cape Mendocino.

**POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM:** The BRTF recommends to the Department of Fish and Game the following definition of biogeographic region: \_\_\_\_\_.

- **Representative Habitats:** The MLPA requires that the statewide MPA network include representative habitats in at least two marine reserves in each biogeographic region. The MLPA identifies several types of habitats and calls for their representation in all depth zones. The science advisory team has recommended expanding the definition of habitats in several ways:
  - Five depth zones: intertidal, intertidal to 30 meters, 30 meters to 100 meters, 100 meters to 200 meters, and deeper than 200 meters.
  - Estuaries should receive special treatment since they are unique.
  - Three of the habitats identified in the MLPA are generic—rocky reefs, intertidal zones, and kelp forests. These should be further refined.
  - Habitats also include ocean circulation features, specifically upwelling centers, freshwater plumes, and retention areas.

Options include the following:

- Retain the habitats identified in the MLPA.
- Add some or all of the habitats identified by the science advisory team.
- Add some or all of the depth zones identified by the science advisory team.

- Defer this decision to the Commission process and ask for further review and discussion by the science advisory team and the public.

**POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM:** The BRTF recommends to the Department of Fish and Game the following definition of habitats: \_\_\_\_\_

- Guidance on the Design of MPAs: The MLPA identifies certain required features of the statewide network of MPAs. Among others, these include that the size, location, and number of MPAs make it possible to meet the goals and objectives of individual MPAs and of the statewide network. The master plan framework includes advice from the science advisory team regarding the design of MPAs to meet this standard. Salient elements of this advice include the following:
  - To best protect adult populations, based on adult neighborhood sizes and movement patterns, MPAs should have an alongshore extent of at least 5-10 km of coastline, and preferably 10-20 km. Larger MPAs would be required to fully protect marine birds, mammals, and migratory fish.
  - To facilitate dispersal among MPAs for important bottom-dwelling fish and invertebrate groups, based on currently known scales of larval dispersal, MPAs should be placed within 50-100 km of each other.
  - To provide analytical power for management comparisons and to buffer against catastrophic loss of an MPA, at least three to five replicate MPAs should be designed for each habitat type within a biogeographic region.

Each of these design principles has consequences for the number and extent of MPAs as well as their effectiveness in achieving different goals and objectives. These and the other design principles have received limited review by the public.

Options include the following:

- Include one or all of these principles in the draft master plan framework for purposes of review by the department and commission, after peer review.
- Leave the decision regarding design guidance to each regional stakeholder group and science advisory sub-team
- Conclude that there is inadequate scientific understanding of this issue to provide general guidance.

**POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM:** The BRTF recommends to the Department that the peer review process address this issue and that the Department and eventually the Commission make a decision regarding design guidance.

### Attachment 3: Major Changes to the Draft Master Plan Framework Since the February 2005 Meeting of the Task Force

- Addition of an executive summary,
- Additions to section 1, the introduction:
  - Description and discussion of the California Ocean Policy Act and the potential for the California Ocean Protection Council to help in integrating the measures of the MLPA with other management programs;
  - An expanded description of environmental factors and non-fishing activities that may affect the abundance and diversity of marine wildlife;
  - An expanded description of recent fisheries management decisions, such as the closure of some federal and state waters to some types of fishing;
  - A brief review of scientific literature on some aspects of the effect of marine protected areas on fish populations and fishing; and
  - A description of the principal formal groups engaged in the MLPA Initiative and their roles.
- Section 2 has been split into a section on the process for designing MPA network proposals and a section on considerations in the design of MPA networks.
  - The new section 2 consists of a relatively detailed description of steps involved in designing alternative MPA proposals in the central coast study region. The description of steps and activities in this section addresses many of the concerns raised by stakeholders regarding the evaluation of existing MPAs, mitigation of the impacts of activities other than fishing, and consideration of the socio-economic effects of MPAs.
- The new section 3, which discusses considerations in the design of MPAs, was significantly reorganized and altered in response to comments and to submissions by the science advisory team. This section now includes discussions of the following issues:
  - Goals of the Marine Life Protection Program,
  - Definitions of MPA networks,
  - Science advisory team advice on MPA network design that addresses key issues in the MLPA regarding size and location of MPAs, replication of habitats in reserves, etc.,
  - Science advisory team advice on consideration of habitats in the design of MPAs, including types of habitats and depth zones;
  - A general list of species likely to benefit from MPAs;
  - A discussion of possible definitions for biogeographical regions;
  - Types of MPAs;
  - Setting goals and objectives for MPAs;
  - Enforcement and public awareness considerations in setting boundaries for MPAs;
  - Information supporting the design of MPAs, including a discussion of socio-economic information; and



- A revised and expanded version of a description of other activities than fishing that may affect marine wildlife populations, current management programs for these activities, and a role for the California Ocean Protection Council in helping to address these other pressures.
- Section 4 on management has been shortened.
- Section 5 has been altered significantly to reflect additional information from the department's enforcement staff.
- Section 6 has been shortened.
- Section 7 has been shortened.
- Additional material has been added to the appendices, specifically appendices on the following topics:
  - Social science tools and methods,
  - A glossary of key terms in the MLPA,
  - A suggested outline for regional management plans of marine protected areas, and
  - A draft enforcement action plan.

Attachment 4: More Detailed Comments on the Draft Master Plan Framework

We received comments on nearly 300 issues, small and large, from three dozen individuals and organizations who commented on the preliminary draft master plan framework (MPF). Based on these comments, comments from the task force, and a review of the preliminary draft by the science advisory team, we revised the preliminary draft master plan in mid-March. This revised draft was then circulated for comment. We received two dozen sets of comments on this revision from federal and state agencies, industry groups, individuals, and non-governmental organizations. Below is a summary of the comments we received together with our response.

	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b><u>General</u></b>		
1	The MPF should include directives and should say who does what	The revised MPF includes much greater detail on roles. See Section 2.
2	The regional process should not weaken the standards of the MPF	The MPF now makes it clear that the task force will review progress of regional process at key points.
3	Use “extractive” and “non-extractive” rather than “consumptive” and “non-consumptive	This change in terminology was made.
4	Include an extra-long executive summary	Done.
5	MPA closures will duplicate other closures imposed by fisheries management agencies, for example	MPAs are different from MPA closures in important ways. The MPF calls for considering closures in designing MPAs.
6	The MPF must be explicit about the department’s legal responsibility to ensure the MPA proposals are consistent with the MLPA	This standard has been clarified in Section 2.
7	Phase MPAs since they are an experiment	The MPF effectively phases MPA design and implementation region by region so that later phases can benefit from the experience of earlier phases. All management of marine wildlife, including fisheries management, is experimental.
8	“Best readily available science” is not a high enough standard	The legislature set this standard, which is similar to that of the Marine Life Management Act passed the year before the MLPA.
<b><u>Introduction</u></b>		

9	Include description of recent events, such as the Cowcod closure	These events are now described in the Introduction.
10	Include description of other programs, such as the National Marine Sanctuary Program, that do what the MLPA wants done	See end of Section 3 under Other Programs and Activities Other Than Fishing.
11	Parts of the introduction are unnecessary	Some readers have remarked on the usefulness of these same sections.
<b><u>MLPA Process</u></b>		
12	Consider whether the current stakeholder strategy is sustainable beyond 2006	The MPF now requires development of a workplan and budget early in the regional process. See Activity 1.1.4. This activity provides an opportunity to evaluate the scale and intensity of stakeholder involvement methods.
13	Add charts that show steps in process of developing MPAs	See Section 2.
14	Need to expand role of adaptive management in the MPF	The core of adaptive management is the articulation of goals and objectives and the design of monitoring plans, which are covered in Section 2 on the MPA design process, in Section 3 on setting goals and objectives, Section 4 on management, and Section 6 on monitoring and evaluation.
15	The MLPA cannot be implemented further until a full analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act has been conducted	Legal counsel disagrees.
16	The MPF should more clearly articulate how the MLPA will integrate with other coastal programs	The MPF now calls for explicit consideration of any coastal threats clearly affecting resources of concerns and of the programs for their management. MPA proposals may include recommendations to other coastal programs for reducing the impact of activities harming MPA resources.
<b><u>Fishing Issues</u></b>		
17	Remove anti-fishing bias from the MPF.	Passages identified by concerned stakeholders have been changed or removed in most cases.
18	Ecosystems should be the focus, not just fishing	This view is evident from the MLPA, but its implementation will differ with each region.

19	There is no longer any overfishing	The Pacific Fishery Management Council has determined that a number of species of groundfish are overfished. Several species in state waters are also below target levels. The status of most species is poorly known.
<b><u>Benefits of MPAs</u></b>		
20	Benefits from role as reference sites, ecosystem protection, generic insurance policy	Agreed.
21	MPAs will lead to shift in fishing effort and zero-sum game	Effective monitoring will help in building empirical evidence regarding this issue, which does not now exist.
22	Clarify that MPAs are not the principal tool for fisheries management	The goals of the Marine Life Protection Program mandated by the MLPA include the recovery of fish populations among several other goals.
23	Evidence of fisheries benefits from marine reserves is not compelling	The MPF does not emphasize possible fisheries benefits, but includes the range of goals identified in the MLPA.
24	The MPF overlooks recent literature on MPAs and fisheries management	The Introduction discusses recent literature regarding fisheries benefits and other issues.
<b><u>MPA Design</u></b>		
25	Clarify timing and process for reviewing existing MPAs	See Section 2, Activities 1.5 and 2.4.
26	Priority focus should be on reviewing existing MPAs and other closures	The MPF provides for consideration of existing MPAs in light of the goals of the MLPA and regional goals and objectives. See Section 2, Activities 1.5, 2.4.
27	The MPF appears to insist on new MPAs before evaluation of existing MPAs	On the contrary, evaluation of existing MPAs occurs early in the MPA design process in Activity 1.5 and later.
28	MPAs should be used in zoning	See discussion of zoning in Section 2 at page 56 regarding zoning. More information needs to be developed.
29	Need more specific guidelines for siting MPAs	See the science advisory team's suggested guidance in Section 3.

30	Network should include dimensions other than biological, such as social and institutional, or should not be biological at all.	This topic is the focus of a discussion by an expert panel and a stakeholder panel at the April task force meeting.
31	The science advisory team should refine the list of habitats and depth zones, develop criteria for evaluating proposed networks	See the science advisory team's suggested guidance in Section 3.
32	Must consider location of infrastructure such as outfalls in the design of MPA.	These concerns can be taken up in the regional profile and the consideration of activities affecting wildlife and habitats of concern described in Section 2.
33	Straight line boundaries may not be consistent with ecosystem boundaries	This comment will best be taken up in the central coast MPA design process.
34	The number of regions should be two, three, or four	See the discussion in Section 3.
35	Larval transport is a theory that has not been proved	Larval transport is a confirmed part of the life cycle of many marine species. The dimensions of larval transport for many species can only be estimated. This lack of empirical evidence is characteristic of most aspects of marine management science, including fisheries management.
36	Reserves should include "no-go" zones	The MPF allows for this.
37	Limit number of MPAs at traditional access points	These considerations can enter into regional discussions of goals and objectives.
38	Divers should be assured the right of access unless other means have been exhausted and a compelling need is shown	The MLPA requires that marine reserves remain in an undisturbed state. Other designations are less restrictive. Specific restrictions will depend upon the details of a particular MPA.
39	MPAs should be sited where institutions are nearby that can help monitor, etc.	These considerations can enter into regional discussions of goals and objectives.
40	Marine reserves should be open for enjoyment, to maximum extent possible	The MLPA provides as much.
41	Safety of small-boat fishermen should be directly addressed in the MPF	These considerations can enter into regional discussions of goals and objectives.

42	MPAs should not be sited where there are water quality problems	Designation as an MPA may help in attracting financial and technical assistance in reducing water pollution problems in area.
43	Locating MPAs far from harbors will be beneficial or detrimental to different user groups	These considerations can enter into regional discussions of goals and objectives.
44	Monitoring techniques should be identified early in the MPA design process	See Section 2, Activities 1.6 and 2.6.
45	The list of species likely to benefit should not be assumed as the list of species in all regions	Agreed.
46	MPAs should not be implemented unless other problems affecting coastal resources are addressed	The MPF calls for considering other impacts and encourages recommendations to responsible agencies.
47	There is not enough knowledge on which to base guidelines for the size and spacing of MPAs	The science advisory team has developed guidance on these matters.
48	All activities should be subject to possible regulation in marine reserves	The MLPA and MMAIA provide some authority to insure that a wide range of activities do not disturb or pollute an area.
49	Mariculture is generally a non-extractive use and should be allowed in MPAs as long as it is compatible with the MPA's goals and objectives	The MPF does not directly address aquaculture. Like other activities, mariculture will be evaluated for consistency with the MLPA and the goals and objectives of an MPA.
50	The process should insure examination of existing MPAs, definition of goals and objectives, a regional problem statement, gather baseline data, develop long-term monitoring and financial plan	These elements are now included in the process described in Sections 2, 4, 6 and 7.
51	MPA design should be integrated with other programs, such as fisheries management	The process outlined in Section 2 requires the consideration of other such programs.
52	MPF should spell out how state and federal closed areas might be reformed to meet MLPA standards	The MPF includes the consideration of fishery closures in Activities 1.5.3 and 1.5.4.

53	The process outlined in the MPF should be ordered differently	The process described in the MPF is a logical approach to moving from general standards of the MLPA and regional conditions to the specific design of individual MPAs.
54	Definitions of different types of MPAs should be more complete	The MPF includes expanded definitions of each type of MPA. The appendices including the full text of the MLPA and MMAIA provide complete definitions.
55	The criteria for selection of the central coast study region should be included in the MPF	The MPF now includes these criteria at page 31.
<b><u>State parks and marine conservation areas</u></b>		
56	The MPF should give equal time to state parks and marine conservation areas	See revision in Section 3, page 54-55.
57	MPF needs to provide guidance how state parks and marine conservation areas contribute to goals of MLPA	These considerations can enter into regional discussions of goals and objectives.
58	Use of state parks and marine conservation areas as buffer zones will only lead to confusion	These considerations can enter into regional discussions of goals and objectives.
59	Saying MLPA emphasizes marine reserves is an editorial statement	The plain language of the MLPA quite clearly singles out marine reserves.
<b><u>List of species likely to benefit</u></b>		
60	Science advisory team should review existing list and adapt for central coast study region	Agreed.
61	Both species likely to benefit from MPAs and those likely not to benefit should be identified	This suggested is incorporated in Activity 2.1.5 in Section 2.
<b><u>Land-sea connections</u></b>		
62	Discuss land-sea linkages and programs that manage them	These linkages are discussed in the Introduction and Section 3. The MPA design process outlined in Section 2 requires the consideration of these and other such non-fishing impacts.

63	Ecosystem-based approach requires including water quality	Agreed.
64	Don't limit MPAs to clean areas, since designation as an MPA may make it easier to get funding from bonds and other sources to address water quality problems	Agreed.
<b><u>Socio-economic considerations</u></b>		
65	The socio-economic dimensions of MPA design need to be incorporated early, and should not be an afterthought	The MPF now explicitly calls for consideration of socio-economic concerns early in the process at Activities 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5.3 and 3.3.
66	Socio-economic information should be developed in parallel with biological information	In Section 2, assembling socio-economic information occurs at the same time as other types of information in preparation of the regional profile and potential MPA activities at Activities 1.3.1 and 2.1.1.
67	Economic impacts of MPAs will be both positive and negative	The MPF includes the consideration of economic impacts at several points in the MPA design process.
68	More attention should be paid to the socio-economic impacts of MPAs	Socio-economic impacts are explicitly taken into account in the regional profile in Activities 1.3; 2.2; 2.3; 2.5.3; 3.3; 5.2.
<b><u>Monitoring</u></b>		
69	The MPF should identify minimum monitoring standards	The MPF describes a rigorous process for developing a monitoring plan for regional MPAs.
70	Link monitoring to hypothesis-driven research	This linkage can be developed in preparing a monitoring plan and management plan for regional MPAs.
71	The MPF should promote collaborative monitoring and research	The MPF identifies the value of collaborative efforts in addressing non-fishing impacts at page 63, and in monitoring programs at page 78.
72	Monitoring review should be conducted no more frequently than every three to five years	The MPF has been changed to reflect this suggestion.



73	Monitoring should be required at all sites	The MPF has been changed to reflect this suggestion. While all sites will receive some level of monitoring, selected sites may receive more intensive monitoring in order to promote understanding of regional MPAs as a whole and to support adaptive management.
74	If no monitoring has occurred at a site after a fixed number of years, it should be abolished	This type of standard may be adopted in a regional management plan.
75	Expand on partnerships in monitoring and other activities	The discussion of collaborative monitoring has been expanded somewhat. Greater detail can be included in regional proposals.
<b><u>Enforcement</u></b>		
76	As time passes, technology will improve and become cheaper and allow more flexibility in setting boundaries	Agreed.
77	The MPF should identify minimum monitoring and enforcement standards	The MPF includes a structure for developing comprehensive enforcement programs for regional MPAs. These plans may include minimum standards suited to the specific region.
<b><u>Funding</u></b>		
78	Cost should not be a constraining factor on MPA design	The consideration of costs formally enters the design of regional MPAs in the preparation of a regional management plan. See the discussion of financing in Section 7.
79	Current funding sources for the department should be described	Current funding sources will be considered in the long-term funding strategy due in December 2005.
80	The MPF should be clear that if there is no funding, then an MPA should be abolished	The performance of individual MPAs must be evaluated from a number of perspectives including the effectiveness of management measures, etc.
81	The MPF should state that if there is no funding, there are no MPAs	The MLPA does not include this as a standard. The MPF requires the development of budgets for regional processes and for the management of MPAs in advance of their establishment.
<b><u>Military</u></b>		

82	The MPF should acknowledge the operational needs of the U.S. Department of Defense and include them in the design of MPAs	The MPF includes language in the Introduction reflecting this understanding.

<b><u>Management of MPAs and networks</u></b>		
83	The MPF should elaborate on opportunities for collaboration with the National Marine Sanctuary Program	Additional mention is made in the MPF of the potential for collaboration with the National Marine Sanctuary Program.
84	MPAs should not be treated as permanent fixtures, but should be subject to change, including abolition, through adaptive management	The MPF includes explicit consideration for changing or abolishing existing MPAs at Activities 1.5 and 2.4. In addition, the discussion of monitoring in Section 6 describes a process that should enable changes to other MPAs in response to monitoring results.
85	Some monitoring should be required of all MPAs, not just selected MPAs	Agreed. See change in language in Section 6.
86	There should be a statewide standing advisory committee on implementation of the MLPA	This suggestion is recommended in Section 4.
87	Avoid implication that every MPA will have an advisory group	The MPF discusses the role of advisory groups in Section 4 on management. The MPF does not require advisory groups, but encourages consideration of them.
88	Build regional management into the MPF	The MPF approaches the statewide network regionally by outlining a process for the design of MPAs in different regions of the state over the next six years.