

**California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative
Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Adopted Provisional Regional Goals and Objectives Package
September 8, 2005**

Design and Implementation Considerations

Introduction

The members of the Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) agree that Regional Goals, Objectives, and Design and Implementation Considerations are all very important in the development of an effective system of marine protected areas (MPAs) that have stakeholder support. Regional goals are statements of what the regional MPAs are ultimately trying to achieve (Pomeroy et al. 2004)¹. The Regional goals are largely taken directly from the Marine Life Protection Act (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 CCRSG 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 CCRSG 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 Master Plan Science Advisory Team, the Blue Ribbon Task Force, and the California Fish and Game Commission. Design considerations with long-term monitoring components (such as socio-economic impacts) will be used in developing monitoring plans and to inform the adaptive management process.

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts and optimize positive socio-economic impacts for all users, to the extent possible, while following the Master Plan Framework

¹ Pomeroy R.S., J.E. Parks, and L.M. Watson. 2004. How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook of Natural and Social Indicators for Evaluating Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xvi + 216 p. (Accessed 17 January 2004). <http://effectivempa.noaa.gov/guidebook/guidebook.html>.

design guidelines for the establishment of regional MPA network components. [Note: the CCRSG was split over whether this text should appear here as a design consideration or alternatively as an objective under goal 2.]²

2. Recognize relevant portions of existing state and federal fishery management areas and regulations, to the extent possible, when designing new MPAs or modifying existing ones.
3. To the extent possible, site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.
4. When crafting MPA proposals, include considerations for design found in the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan³ and the draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.⁴
5. In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.
6. In developing MPA proposals, consider how existing state and federal programs address the goals and objectives of the MLPA and the central coast region as well as how these proposals may coordinate with other programs.

² CCRSG members considered various text choices for many of the draft provisional regional goals, design considerations, and implementation considerations. In assembling this document, we have included the text for which there was greater support. In a few instances, the CCRSG was split in its support for particular text options. CCRSG members and MLPA Initiative staff agreed that these cases should be highlighted. These cases are referenced either with a note (as for design consideration #1) or by listing the options that received split support (see goal 4, objective 1). Additional guidance on these issues will be sought from the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). MLPA Initiative staff will prepare an appendix that details the alternate text formulations for all provisions and the number of straw votes each one received. This appendix will be attached to the adopted "package" of provisional regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations to be discussed by the Blue Ribbon Task Force on September 28, 2005.

³ Design considerations from Nearshore Fishery Management Plan:

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.

⁴ Design considerations from draft Abalone and Recovery and Management Plan:

Proposed MPA sites should satisfy at least four of the following 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.

7. 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.
8. To the extent possible, site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.
9. To the extent possible, site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.
10. To the extent possible, design MPA boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.

Implementation Considerations

Implementation considerations arise after the design of MPAs as the California Department of Fish and Game and any other responsible agencies implement decisions of the California Fish and Game Commission and, if appropriate, the California Park and Recreation Commission, with funding from the Legislature or other sources.

1. Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for central coast MPAs.
2. When appropriate, phase the implementation of central coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.
3. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement is available prior to implementing new MPAs.
4. 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.

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. Protect areas of high species diversity and maintain species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in representative habitats.
2. Protect areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.

3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from disturbances both natural and human induced.

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

1. Help protect or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depleted, or overfished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.
2. Protect larval sources and enhance reproductive capacity of species most likely to benefit from MPAs through retention of large, mature individuals.
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 conservation areas and state marine parks.

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. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers and research and education institutions and include areas of traditional non-consumptive recreational use and are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities.
2. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.
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.
4. Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations.

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. Option a. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, pinnacles, upwelling centers, and larval retention areas.
1. Option b. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, pinnacles, upwelling centers.
2. Protect, and replicate to the extent possible, representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the Master Plan Framework across a range of depths.

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. 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.
2. To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines 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. Develop a process for regional review and evaluation of implementation effectiveness that includes stakeholder involvement to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.
2. 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.

APPENDIX

Text Options Considered and Results of Straw Votes During Deliberations on the Policy Package of Provisional Regional Objectives, and Design and Implementation Considerations at the September 7-8, 2005 Meeting in Cambria, California

Introduction

This appendix contains the provisional regional goals, objectives, and design and implementation considerations adopted at the September Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG) meeting. It also presents the options considered and the results of straw voting conducted. For each straw vote taken (there were approximately 40 in all), this document indicates both the options considered and the results of the voting (in italics).¹

Note on CCRSG Voting and the Package Adoption Process

In developing the text of the final package, CCRSG members and MLPA Initiative staff proceeded through the following steps:

- CCRSG members reviewed the current version of draft text.
- CCRSG members reviewed the derivation and rationale for the text.
- CCRSG members received commentary from policy advisors and Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) members.
- Staff invited comment from CCRSG members.
- CCRSG members arrived at stable text configurations.
- Staff framed straw votes.

MLPA Initiative facilitators used several straw voting techniques to help gauge CCRSG member support for both individual draft regional objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations and the complete package. This step was taken consistent with the adopted CCRSG ground rule that states “CCRSG facilitators will use ‘straw votes’ to track progress and help the group arrive at short-term decisions to propel the process forward in an efficient fashion.” Participants eligible to take part in the straw voting included primary CCRSG members or, in cases where primary members were not present, their designated alternates.

To help gauge support for individual objectives or design/implementation considerations or to help choose between two options, facilitators recapped key text formulations in progress and then most often framed the voting choices in one of the following main ways:

- “Who cannot live with” the proposed text? or
- “Who prefers option A? Who prefers option B?”

¹ Note: This document does not reflect straw voting that took place in our preliminary deliberations at the August CCRSG meeting. As a result some items do not have straw votes attached.

In the September CCRSG meeting, facilitators relied most heavily on the “who cannot live with this text” formulation to frame straw votes. Facilitators made this wording choice as a practical application of the ground rule on decision rules which states:

In their advice-giving role, CCRSG members will strive to achieve a high level of consensus in developing and advancing alternative proposals for MPAs. However, it is not the intent here to accord CCRSG members a “de facto” veto on substantive issues, but rather to strive for an expression of proposals that earn broad support across CCRSG members’ interests. The objection of a few CCRSG members will not be grounds to impede movement.

For three highly contested objectives under Goal 3, the facilitators composed a straw ballot and asked participants to rank the options under each objective in order of preference (“1” for most preferred, “2” for second most preferred, etc.). This produced a distribution of “points” in which the option with the lowest total number of “points” was considered as the most preferred, while that with the largest sum represented the choice least preferred for each objective.

Vote to Adopt Policy Package of Provisional Regional Objectives, Design Considerations and Implementation Considerations

To adopt the suite of objectives, design considerations, and implementation considerations, the facilitators asked CCRSG members to review and consider the entire suite of items. The facilitators then took two votes. They asked: Who “can support this package?” and “Who cannot support this package?” In response, 28 members indicated that they could support the package; zero members indicated that they could not support it.

Straw Vote Annotations for Provisional Regional Objectives, and Design and Implementation Considerations

For each straw vote taken (there were approximately 40 in all), this document indicates both the options considered and the results of the voting (in italics).

Design Considerations

1. Minimize negative socio-economic impacts 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.

Straw vote: 12 CCRSG members indicated that they could not live with including this as an objective under goal 2.

Zero members indicated they could not live with keeping this as a design consideration.

13 members indicated they would prefer to include it as an objective under goal 2.

*MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Appendix: Text Options Considered and Results of Straw Votes
at the September 7-8, 2005 Meeting in Cambria, California
September 19, 2005*

[Note: Initiative staff will seek the BRTF's guidance on this issue at the BRTF's September, 2005 meeting.]

2. Recognize relevant portions of existing state and federal fishery management areas and regulations, to the extent possible, when designing new MPAs or modifying existing ones.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members indicated they could not live with the text as revised above.

3. To the extent possible, site MPAs to prevent fishing effort shifts that would result in serial depletion.

[Note: This text received strong support in a straw vote at the August CCRSG meeting.]

4. When crafting MPA proposals, include considerations for design found in the Nearshore Fishery Management Plan and the draft Abalone Recovery and Management Plan.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members indicated they could not live with the above revised text as a design consideration.

5. In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.

Straw vote: See the results of voting for goal 3, objective 1 below.

6. In developing MPA proposals, consider how existing state and federal programs address the goals and objectives of the MLPA and the central coast region as well as how these proposals may coordinate with other programs.

Straw vote: Zero indicated they could not live with the above revised text and including it as a design consideration.

7. 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.

8. To the extent possible, site MPAs to facilitate use of volunteers to assist in monitoring and management.

9. To the extent possible, site MPAs to take advantage of existing long-term monitoring studies.

Straw vote: For design considerations 7-9 above, 1 CCRSG member could not live with including the above text as design considerations.

10. To the extent possible, design MPA boundaries that facilitate ease of public recognition and ease of enforcement.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members indicated they could not live with including the above text as a design consideration.

Implementation Considerations

1. Improve public outreach related to MPAs through the use of docents, improved signage, and production of an educational brochure for central coast MPAs.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members indicated they could not live with the above text as an implementation consideration.

2. When appropriate, phase the implementation of central coast MPAs to ensure their effective management, monitoring, and enforcement.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members indicated they could not live with including the above revised text as an implementation consideration.

3. Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement is available prior to implementing new MPAs.

Straw vote: 7 CCRSG members indicated they could not live with the above revised text as an implementation consideration.

Optional text considered: "Ensure adequate funding for monitoring, management, and enforcement."

Straw vote: 9 CCRSG members indicated they could not live with the above proposed revised text.

Optional action considered: Delete this implementation consideration.

Straw vote: 16 CCRSG members could not live with deleting this item from the package.

4. 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.

Straw vote: 13 CCRSG members preferred including the above text as an implementation consideration.

5 members preferred to include the above text as an objective under goal 5.

Zero members could not live with including it as an 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. Protect areas of high species diversity and maintain species diversity and abundance, consistent with natural fluctuations, of populations in representative habitats.

[Note: This text received strong support in a straw vote at the August CCRSG meeting.]

2. Protect areas with diverse habitat types in close proximity to each other.

[Note: This text received strong support in a straw vote at the August CCRSG meeting.]

3. Protect natural size and age structure and genetic diversity of populations in representative habitats.
4. Protect natural trophic structure and food webs in representative habitats.
5. Protect ecosystem structure, function, integrity and ecological processes to facilitate recovery of natural communities from disturbances both natural and human induced.

Straw vote: 24 CCRSG members preferred the term “disturbances”; 6 preferred the term “perturbations”.

Straw vote on goal 1, objectives 3-5: Zero CCRSG members could not live with replacing the term “maintain” with the term “protect”.

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

1. Help protect or rebuild populations of rare, threatened, endangered, depleted, or overfished species, where identified, and the habitats and ecosystem functions upon which they rely.

[Note: This text received strong support in a straw vote at the August CCRSG meeting.]

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

[Note: This text received strong support in a straw vote at the August CCRSG meeting.]

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 conservation areas and state marine parks.

[Note: This text received strong support in a straw vote at the August CCRSG meeting.]

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

Straw vote: 20 CCRSG members ranked the above revised text (formerly option 1a) as the most preferred of two options. This preference also included the proposal to include the following new design consideration: "In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users." 8 CCRSG members ranked this option as their second preference.

The other option (1b) considered and the results of ballot voting are shown in the table below.

Goal 3, Objective 1		Rank in Order of Preference (1-2)		Final Score
		1 st	2 nd	
	<i>OPTION 1a. Ensure some MPAs are close to population centers and research and education institutions and include areas of traditional nonconsumptive recreational use and are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities. Add the following design consideration: In evaluating the siting of MPAs, considerations shall include the needs and interests of all users.</i>	20	8	36
	<i>OPTION 1b. Design consideration: Ensure some MPAs, including State Marine Reserves, are accessible for recreational, educational, and study opportunities.</i>	8	20	48

[Note: The lowest "point total" represents the option that received the greatest support. We "coded" first choices as 1 point, second choices and 2 points each, etc., and added these up to produce a final point total]

2. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.

MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Appendix: Text Options Considered and Results of Straw Votes
at the September 7-8, 2005 Meeting in Cambria, California
September 19, 2005

Straw vote: 19 of 28 CCRSG members ranked the above revised text (formerly option 2c) as the most preferred of three proposed options. 4 ranked it as second most preferred. 5 ranked it as third most preferred. The total score was 42.

The other options (2a and 2b) considered and the results of ballot voting are shown in the table below.

Goal 3, Objective 2	Rank in Order of Preference (1-3)	Rank in Order of Preference (1-3)			Final Score
		1 st	2 nd	3 rd	
OPTION 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.	5	9	14	65	
OPTION 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.	4	15	9	61	
OPTION 2c. To enhance the likelihood of scientifically valid studies, replicate appropriate MPA designations, habitats or control areas (including areas open to fishing) to the extent possible.	19	4	5	42	

[Note: The lowest "final score" represents the option that received the greatest support. We "coded" first choices as 1 point, second choices and 2 points each, etc., and added these up to produce a final score.]

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.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members could not live with the above text as an objective.

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

Straw vote: 15 of 28 CCRSG members ranked the above revised text (formerly option 4b) as the most preferred of four proposed options. 7 ranked it second. 4 ranked it third. 1 ranked it fourth. The total score was 45 points.

The other options (4x, 4a, and 4d) considered and the results of ballot voting are shown in the table below.

MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
 Appendix: Text Options Considered and Results of Straw Votes
 at the September 7-8, 2005 Meeting in Cambria, California
 September 19, 2005

Goal 3, Objective 4		Rank in Order of Preference (1-4)				Final Score
		1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	
	<i>OPTION 4x: delete this objective.</i>	9	8	1	10	68
	<i>OPTION 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.</i>	1	8	15	5	79
	<i>OPTION 4b. Protect or enhance recreational experience by ensuring natural size and age structure of marine populations.</i>	15	7	4	1	45
	<i>Option 4d. Modified versions of original 4d1 and 4d2. 4d1. Protect or enhance consumptive recreation near and within 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 increasing total populations and individual size of previously fished populations within MPAs.</i>	3	4	8	12	83

[Note: The lowest "final score" represents the option that received the greatest support. We "coded" first choices as 1 point, second choices and 2 points each, etc., and added these up to produce a final score.]

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

- Option a. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, pinnacles, upwelling centers, and larval retention areas.

Straw vote: 15 CCRSG members preferred option 1a and retaining reference to "larval retention areas" as a habitat type in this objective.

- Option b. Include within MPAs the following habitat types: estuaries, heads of submarine canyons, pinnacles, upwelling centers.

Straw vote: 12 CCRSG members preferred option 1b and removing "larval retention areas" from the list of habitat types in this objective.

[Note: Initiative staff will seek the BRTF's guidance on this issue at the BRTF's September 2005 meeting.]

Straw vote on goal 4, objective 1: 1 CCRSG member could not live with the above revised text of "Include within MPAs".

11 CCRSG members could not live with changing this text to “Include within replicate marine reserves.”

2. Protect, and replicate to the extent possible, representatives of all marine habitats identified in the MLPA or the MPF across a range of depths.

Straw vote: 2 CCRSG members could not live with the above revised text.

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. 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.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members could not live with the above text.

2. *To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines in the Master Plan Framework.*

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members could not live with the above revised text.

Optional text considered: “To the extent possible, effectively use scientific guidelines in the Master Plan Framework, including size and spacing of MPAs, in the overall design of individual MPAs.”

Straw vote: 12 CCRSG members could not live with the above optional text.

Optional action considered: Delete this objective.

Straw vote: 10 CCRSG members could not live with deleting this item from the package.

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. Develop a process for regional review and evaluation of implementation effectiveness that includes stakeholder involvement to determine if regional MPAs are an effective component of a statewide network.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members could not live with the above revised text.

*MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group
Appendix: Text Options Considered and Results of Straw Votes
at the September 7-8, 2005 Meeting in Cambria, California
September 19, 2005*

2. 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.

Straw vote: Zero CCRSG members could not live with the above text.

Optional text considered: "Develop a mechanism to coordinate with future MLPA Regional Stakeholder Groups in other regions to ensure that the statewide MPA network meets guidelines of the Master Plan Framework and the goals of the MLPA."

Straw vote: 6 CCRSG members could not live with this optional text.