

California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative			
Comments on the Draft Strategy for Stakeholder and Interested Public Participation			
	Comment	Response	Proposed Changes
1.	Definition of stakeholders potentially impacted by a system of MPAs should be broadened to include the general public, including those who do not live along the coast.	In the very broadest interpretation, yes. However, the needs and desires of the general public will be much different than users of the marine environment who will be <i>directly</i> impacted by a decision (see first paragraph of Stakeholder Participation section). Conservation organizations are often a <i>proxy</i> stakeholder representative for the general public. Definition given was not intended to exclude those who do not live along the coast.	See p. 3
2.	Central coast and other regional stakeholder groups should be equally (or 'fairly') balanced between extractive and non-extractive (or consumptive and non-consumptive) stakeholders.	Without knowing the division of Californians who are "extractive" or "non-extractive" stakeholders in any particular region, it is difficult to justify a particular division of stakeholder groups that would apply to all regions. Rather, the division and make up of each regional group will necessarily vary along different parts of the coast, depending on uses in the region. However, each group should include both extractive and non-extractive stakeholders, including those who can represent the needs of the general public.	See p. 4
3.	Stakeholder group should have as many representatives as needed to accommodate interests and provide a sense of inclusion. Ten to fifteen may not be adequate.	The size of a group will necessarily impact what can be accomplished under a tight schedule. At the same time, a more inclusionary process will ensure that the needs of a broader constituency and the public are being met. It's a balancing act that will also be affected by the facilitator(s) hired; some facilitators feel more comfortable with larger groups than others. In general, the larger the group the more time that will be needed to complete a regional process.	See p. 4
4.	Productivity of the regional stakeholder groups will be negatively impacted with a larger size. Stay with ten to fifteen members.	See response to item 4. Depending on the size of the region, ten representatives may not be realistic for including a wide enough range of stakeholders to ensure a successful process, including eventual implementation.	See p. 4

5.	In selecting stakeholders, consider those who have already shown a commitment to the process, know and understand the issues, and are willing to take the time necessary to keep up with the process.	Given the short time frame for completing the Central Coast MLPA Project, it will be valuable to select individuals who are familiar with the MLPA Initiative, are willing to commit the necessary time, and already have a working relationship with other stakeholders.	See p. 4
6.	Consider alternates for each stakeholder representative and allowing the representative to select his/her own alternate.	Has been used in previous processes and makes sense here.	No need to specify this level of detail in strategy, but should be considered.
7.	Regional stakeholder groups should include individuals with a wide range of expertise, including in education, management, monitoring, enforcement, consumptive activities, non-consumptive activities, and conservation.	The specific representatives in each regional group will necessarily be dependent, at least in part, on the uses in that region. It is possible that some types of expertise that are relatively similar among all regions (e.g., monitoring, enforcement, management) can be brought into the process through consultants or resource managers when time to prepare a management plan.	See p. 4