

THE MASTER PLAN FRAMEWORK

FINAL DRAFT

11 April 2005

Where We Are and Where We're Going

- **Third draft**

- **Next steps, if MPF approved (changes in this draft can be handled as recommendations to the department)**
 - **Review by department**

 - **Peer review**

 - **Submission to the commission**

 - **May 23 meeting with the commission**

 - **Commission hearings**

 - **Commission action**

Major Comments on the Preliminary Draft and the Revised Draft

- **Marine wildlife and habitats are affected by many activities. The MPF should not impose MPAs unrelated to the causes of damage.**
- **No new MPAs should be designated until all current MPAs have been analyzed. The MPF must include a stronger statement about abolishing MPAs.**
- **No new MPA can impose fishing restrictions in light of the California Constitution.**
- **Any new MPA should take into account existing fishing regulations, and these should be adjusted to reflect the MPA.**
- **All stakeholders must be deeply involved in the planning of new MPAs.**
- **There should be no new MPAs if funding is inadequate.**

General Categories of Comments

- **The MLPA process**
- **Fishing**
- **Benefits of MPAs**
- **MPA design**
- **State parks and marine conservation areas**
- **List of species likely to benefit**
- **Land-sea connections**
- **Socio-economic considerations**
- **Monitoring**
- **Enforcement**
- **Funding**
- **Department of Defense**
- **Management of MPAs and networks**

Major Changes in the Draft Master Plan Framework Since February

- **Addition of an executive summary**
- **Introduction**
 - **COPA and other management programs**
 - **Other environmental and non-fishing impacts**
 - **Recent fishery management decisions**
 - **Scientific literature on MPA effects**
 - **Roles of principal groups**
- **New section 2**
 - **Detailed description of steps in MPA design**
- **Section 3**
 - **Major revisions of sections**
 - **E.g., socio-economic information, other activities**
 - **Addition of science advisory team advice**
- **Section 5 on enforcement revised**
- **Additional appendices, e.g. socio-economic**

The Final Draft of the Master Plan Framework

Executive Summary

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Process for Developing Alternative Marine Protected Area Proposals

Section 3: Considerations in the Design of Marine Protected Area Networks

Section 4: Management

Section 5: Enforcement

Section 6: Monitoring and Evaluation

Section 7: Financing

Appendices

- A. The Marine Life Protection Act**
- B. The Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act**
- C. Implementation of the Marine Life Protection Act:
1999-2004**
- D. Strategy for Stakeholder and Interested Public
Participation**
- E. Social Science Tools and Methods**
- F. Outline of Information Required for Proposals for
Alternative Networks of Marine Protected Areas**
- G. Master List of Species Likely to Benefit from Marine
Protected Areas**
- H. Summary of Recent and Ongoing Processes**
- I. Related to the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative**

Additional Appendices

- J. Description of Existing State Marine Protected Areas**

K. Glossary

**L. Suggested Outline for Regional Management Plans of
Marine Protected Areas**

M. Draft Enforcement Action Plan

Section 2: Process for Designing Alternative Marine Protected Area Network Proposals

- 1) Regional MPA planning**
- 2) MPA planning**
- 3) Assembling alternative MPA proposals**
- 4) Evaluating alternative MPA proposals**
- 5) Fish and Game Commission consideration and action**

MPA Design Process

Step 1

- 1.1 Establish regional process**
- 1.2 Develop additional advice**
- 1.3 Prepare regional profile**
- 1.4 Design regional ecological and socioeconomic goals and objectives and network concepts**
- 1.5 Analyze adequacy of existing MPAs and management**
- 1.6 Identify monitoring and evaluation indicators**
- 1.7 Identify potential MPA locations**

MPA Design Process

Step 2

- 2.1 Prepare profile of potential MPAs**
- 2.2 Design MPA goals and objectives for each potential MPA**
- 2.3 Identify potential positive and negative impacts of the MPA on a regional scale**
- 2.4 Recommend potential changes to existing MPAs**
- 2.5 Design alternative MPAs**
- 2.6 Identify monitoring methods and resources**

MPA Design Process

Step 3

- 3.1 Assemble MPA proposals into alternative proposals for the region**
- 3.2 Evaluate alternatives against regional goals and objectives and the MLPA**
- 3.3 Identify potential significant negative and positive impacts**
- 3.4 Design general management plan for MPAs in the region**

MPA Design Process

Step 4

- 4.1 Evaluate alternative MPAs proposals against the MLPA**
- 4.2 Forward alternative proposals to the department**
- 4.3 Conduct peer review, and review proposals and relevant documents**
- 4.4 Department submission of alternative proposals, a preferred alternative, and other documents to the commission**

MPA Design Process

Step 5

- 5.1 Commission review of alternative proposals and public testimony**
- 5.2 At request of commission, prepare regulatory documents and CEQA analysis**
- 5.3 Commission takes public comment on alternative MPA proposals and supporting documents**
- 5.4 Commission acts on MPA proposals**

Section 3: Considerations in the Design of MPAs

- **Goals of the Marine Life Protection Program**
- **MPA networks**
- **Consideration of habitats in the design of MPAs**
- **Species likely to benefit from MPAs**
- **Geographical regions**
- **Types of MPAs**
- **Setting goals and objectives for MPAs**
- **Enforcement considerations in setting boundaries**
- **Information used in the design of MPAs**
- **Other activities affecting resources of concern**

Science Advisory Team Advice On the Design of MPA Networks

- **No single optimum network design in all environments.**
- **To protect the diversity of species, every ‘key’ marine habitat should be represented in the MPA network.**
- **To protect the diversity of species, MPAs should extend from the intertidal zone to deep waters offshore.**
- **To best protect adult populations, MPAs should have an alongshore extent of at least 5-10 km of coastline, and preferably 10-20 km.**
- **To facilitate dispersal among MPAs, MPAs should be placed within 50-100 km of each other.**
- **To aid evaluation and to buffer against catastrophic loss, at least three to five replicate MPAs should be designed for each habitat type within a biogeographic region.**

MPA Design Advice contd.

- **To lessen negative impact while maintaining value, placement of MPAs should take into account local resource use and stakeholder activities.**
- **Placement of MPAs should take into account the adjacent terrestrial environment and associated human activities.**
- **To facilitate adaptive management and the use of MPAs as natural scientific laboratories, the network design should account for evaluating and monitoring biological changes within MPAs.**

Science Advisory Team Advice On Representative Habitats

- **MLPA: rocky reefs, intertidal zones, sand or soft ocean bottoms, kelp forests, submarine canyons, seagrass beds, underwater pinnacles**

- **Science advisory team:**
 - **Rocky reefs, intertidal zones, kelp forests each include several types of habitat**

 - **Five depth zones:**
 - **Intertidal**
 - **Intertidal-30 meters,**
 - **30 -100 meters,**
 - **100-200 meters,**
 - **Deeper than 200 meters.**

 - **Estuaries**

 - **Ocean circulation features**
 - **Upwelling centers,**
 - **Freshwater plumes, and**
 - **Retention areas.**

Outstanding Issue 1

Biogeographic Regions

Options:

- **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; or**
- **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.**

Outstanding Issue 2

Representative Habitats

Options:

- **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.**

Outstanding Issue 3

Guidance on the Design of MPAs

Options:

- **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; or**
- **Conclude that there is inadequate scientific understanding of this issue to provide general guidance.**

Outstanding Issue 4

Additional Comments

Options:

- **Incorporate comments before submitting final draft master plan framework to the department;**
- **Provide the department with the task force's recommendations on the comments; or**
- **Defer consideration of the comments until the commission process begins.**

Outstanding Issue 5

Action on the Draft Master Plan Framework

Options:

- **Approve the final draft and forward to the Department as is;**
- **Approve the final draft with additional recommendations and forward to the department as is;**
- **Approve the final draft pending incorporation of additional comments and forward to the department; or**
- **Defer approval of the final draft pending resolution of issues.**