



Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 1 Raw Datasheet  
Advisory Council

Key:  
Keep  
Discuss  
Drop  
1 Topic ranked as "Should Not Address"  
\*\* High ranking for "Should Not Address"

Public Scoping Issue / Topic/ Recommendation	Agriculture	Assoc. of Monterey Bay Area Gov'ts	Business/Industry	California Coastal Commission	California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	California EPA	California Resources Agency	California State Parks	Citizen-At-Large Northern	Citizen-At-Large Central	Citizen-At-Large Southern	Conservation	Diving	Education	Fishing (Commercial)	Fishing (Recreational)	Harbors	Recreation	Research	Tourism	NMFS	USCG	n (members voting)	Overall rank (by n)	Total	Rank of Totals	AC Working Group needed	AC Workshop	Staff Organized Workshop	Staff to Address	Should not address	Extra Advice	
6.1 Implement established desalination guidelines	7	10	7		8	9			8	10	5		8		3		5		8	10			13	2	98	1	3	1	3	5	1		
Address ocean acidification, sea level rise preparedness and community resilience with a new action plan	5	2			10	7	7		10		10	5		7	2	10	2		4	9			14	1	90	2	3	6	5			1 STA	
13.1 Develop coordinated regional monitoring program			10		9	6	10		5	7	1			3		4			10	8			11	3	73	3	2	3	5	1		1 STA	
14.2 Address entanglement impacts from fishing and research equipment							4		4		8	9	6		8	1		8	3	3		3	11	3	57	4	1	3	3	2	2		
4.1 Prioritize citizen science programming		4	8		2	4	5		7					10			3		9				9	7	52	5	2	2	4	2			
2.1 Implement sediment management plans to address beach loss	3	8			5	5				3	3	4				6		2	7	5			11	3	51	6	2	2	5	1		1 SOW, 1 SNA	
10.1 Address marine debris issues in MBNMS	4	3	4		3	8					6	6		6		7	1		1				11	3	49	7	1	5	3	2			
1.1 Install artificial reefs in sanctuary	2	5										10			6	8	6	4		7			8	9	48	8	2	4	1	1		2 SNA	
14.1 Address harassment of wildlife by a variety of recreators	10		5		6	2	2		6					4				7				4	9	7	46	9	3	2	3	1		1 ACW	
3.2 Expand south if Chumash Heritage NMS does not progress **	8									4					9		10						10	5	41	10				1	2	2 SNA	
8.2 Address Fishing overall in MBNMS **		7							8						10		10					2	5	36	11				1	1	2	1 ACWG, 3 SNA	
13.3 Address Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) (research, identify & address problems)					7	10	9			1		2			5								2	5	34	12		2	2	1	1	1 ACW, 1 SNA	
7.2 Do more outreach on current marine events and make it more accessible								2				5	8		7	9		9					5	5	33	13	2		2	1		1 STA, 1 SNA	
2.2 Change definition of dredge spoils in designation to permit beach nourishment				4					6				7		7		7						5	5	31	14	1		2	3		1 SNA	
12.4 Reduce High Surf Warning requirement to High Surf Advisory	6				3			1					9					6	5				6	30	15	1	1	2	2			1 SNA	
7.1 Expand signage efforts about wildlife issues			9							7			1	5						6			5	5	28	16	2	2	1	1			
4.2 Invest more in citizen science programming						6				2			3	9				3		4			6	27	17	1	1	2	2	1		3 SNA	
8.1 Address Anchovy fishery issue			6							4	7							10					4	27	17	2		2					
3.1 Expand north to include Pacifica Exclusion area (aka "Donut hole")								9	5		3											9	4	26	19		1			4		1 ACW	
13.2 Address runoff from urban landscapes (research, identify & address problems)		1	3				8		2	9						3							6	26	19	1	1	2	2			1 SOW, 1 SNA	
9.1 Establish a Joint Powers Authority for Advisory Council	1	9													4		8	1					5	23	21	3						2 SNA	
12.1 Allow safety training			2					3								5			6				7	5	23	21	1		2	2			1 STA
12.2 Add locations for recreational use and training		6													1		4	6					6	5	23	21	2	1	1	1		1 STA	
14.4 Address issues with ocean noise (research, identify and address problems)					1	1						10	4			2				2	2		7	10	22	24	2		1	2			2 SNA
14.3 Develop a marine mammal viewing (encroachment) distance regulation							3					8											5	3	16	25	2			1			2 SNA
11.1 Install mooring buoys at popular dive sites	9			1								2									1		1	5	14	26	2		1	2			1 SOW, 1 SNA
6.2 Do not allow/permit desalination								9															1	9	27	1							3 SNA
14.6 Explore new overflight zone at Devil's Slide (to protect Common Murre colony)											1												8	2	9	27				2			1 ACWG, 1 SNA
13.5 Address drought related issues (over draught, steelhead)													2										1	2	29				1				3 SNA
7.3 Establish a Monterey visitor center													1										1	1	30					1			1 STA, 2 SNA
9.2 Increase business representation on Advisory Council																																	1 STA, 2 SNA
12.3 Adjust zones for utility and effectiveness																																	1 ACW, 1 SNA
13.4 Monitor for radiation (Fukushima)																																	3 SNA
14.5 Allow chumming to attract seabirds		1																															1 SNA
14.7 Expand focus to include more avian species of concern utilizing MBNMS resources (e.g., Condors, Ashy Storm-petrels)																																	1 ACWG, 1 SNA

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

Public Scoping Issue	Comment
<p><b>1.0 Artificial Reefs</b></p> <p>1.1 Install artificial reefs in sanctuary</p>	<p><b>Diving:</b> Our A1:C42 during the last four years has been surveyed and overwhelmingly supports and wants desperately to use the NOAA procedures used in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary in establishing an artificial reef in Monterey Bay. Artificial reefs are enormously popular all over the world to divers and fisherman because of the diverse marine life that inhabit them. From the NOAA's website and concluded by NOAA. When a structure is intentionally placed on the seafloor as an artificial reef, it can create habitat for a variety of marine life. For this reason, artificial reefs are often popular destinations for divers, snorkelers, and fishermen. In areas such as the Florida Keys, heavy visitation, particularly by novice or uninformed divers and snorkelers, can take a toll on coral reefs. Research suggests that in some instances, artificial reefs may divert some pressure away from natural reefs while still allowing visitors to enjoy diverse marine life. Because many of these divers, snorkelers, and anglers charter through local businesses, artificial reefs can have a positive impact on local economies. In such an instance, the artificial reef would be considered a 'win-win' for the economy and the environment. In some instances, however, the negative ecological impacts of artificial reefs may outweigh potential economic gains. For example, development of artificial reefs may cause an increase in overall visitation to an area, meaning more visitors to both artificial and natural reefs. The San Diego area has constructed four artificial reefs outside Mission Bay. There are several local areas that possess the same bottom habitat and would support such a project. There are benefits to the local economy; marine life habitats, dive community, and additional reef structures. The dive community would fully support the financial aspect of the project. Partnering with the Coastal Commission, MBNMS, and a professional stakeholder group this is project that will not require funding from NOAA</p> <p><b>Fishing (Recreational):</b> The installation of artificial reefs in areas throughout the world have been successful in creating nurseries for fish and other wildlife. They become "community centers" for wildlife. Sunken ships around the globe, whether by accident or deliberately, are havens for all types of sea creatures. We need more of these centers in the sanctuary.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> The RAP was unanimous in opposition to artificial reefs. Reefs create artificial habitat for some hard bottom species while reducing habitat for naturally occurring soft bottom species, such as market squid. There is plenty of hard substrate available to divers. Artificial reefs run contrary to the sanctuary mission of preserving habitat in its natural state. Everything humans do has consequences, intended or not. It is highly unlikely that other regulatory agencies would allow artificial reefs here, and MBNMS should not be leading any efforts to allow or promote them.</p>
<p><b>2.0 Beach Nourishment</b></p> <p>2.1 Implement sediment management plans to address beach loss</p>	<p><b>Research:</b> The Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plans for the Santa Cruz Littoral Cell and Southern Monterey Bay should be implemented. MBNMS should develop an Action Plan to define the sanctuary's role. MBNMS should actively support elimination of large sand extraction activities along sanctuary shorelines.</p> <p><b>AMBAG:</b> All coastal cities are dealing with coastal erosion and have attempted to address beach nourishment with a narrow set of Sanctuary rules. When the "high mean tide" is used as the border of the Sanctuary, and cities find their beaches falling in the jurisdiction of the Sanctuary nourishment and impossible to address nourishment since that is not allow. San, soils ad sediment movement can not be replaced to the areas that are eroding in several coastal cities within the AMBAG sphere until the rules change. Recommend that an Advisory Council group be assigned for a close examination.</p>
<p>2.2 Change definition of dredge spoils in designation to permit beach nourishment</p>	<p><b>Diving:</b> The loss of beach mass in the last few years has been noted by the dive community. Del Monte Beach, Macbee Beach, and Del Monte Beach notably have receded. We have been able to answer the questions regarding the pace of beach loss with our knowledge and background. Between the drought and continued operation of the Cemex plant the Southern Portion of the Bay will continue to lose our near coastal marine environment. Without a review of beach nourishment, a shutdown of the Cemex plant, and a return of normal rainfall qualities supplying our creeks, rivers, and tributaries this loss of beach environments will continue to accelerate. Dredge spoils and beach nourishment can help mitigate this problem but not fix it alone. The continued loss of beach areas would highly impact the available areas where beach diving could occur. This will also affect the established shallow marine environments; eel grass beds, and other habitats that rely on sunlight and warmer near shore water to survive. Beach re-nourishment however accomplished is necessary. The recently released documentary film Sand Wars further spot lights the grave concern we face if we lose these sensitive areas.</p> <p><b>Fishing:</b> We support the use of dredge spoils for beach nourishment for port entrances safety of vessel traffic.</p> <p><b>Harbors:</b> The region's harbors do not see any environmental value-added by MBNMS oversight of dredging, or disposal, with the exception of new dredging sites that might be proposed within the sanctuary. Even then, the regulation governing disturbance of the seafloor is sufficient to assure no environmentally damaging project occurs. On this subject, the MBNMS should consider allowing dredging, for beach nourishment purposes, of the huge shoal of sand that has built up immediately east of Wharf II in Monterey. The Wharf structure has created an un-natural accumulation of sand there and covered the sand and rocky structure that existing 40 years ago. The regulation which prevents new dredged material disposal sites should be changed to allow new sites for beach nourishment purposes.</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

3.0	<b>Boundary Changes</b>	<p><b>Harbors:</b> The position on NMS program expansions and/or new NMS designations is clear: Ports and Harbors OPPOSE expansions/new NMS's, at this time. Both the CA Association of Harbormasters and Port Captains and the CA Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference (CMANC) have written policy statements to this effect. The CMANC statement is as follows: MARINE SANCTUARIES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C-MANC supports the preservation of the Nation's oceans through Congressionally established Marine Sanctuaries.</li> <li>2. Sanctuary status should not reduce the ability to transport dredged material to designated disposition sites. Sanctuaries should not add additional requirements or obstacles to the existing rigorous State and Federal regulatory review process for dredged material disposition.</li> <li>3. Sanctuary status should not restrict vessel traffic nor require alterations to shipping lanes that are not supported by that industry.</li> <li>4. Sanctuaries should not be involved in the regulation of fisheries, either directly or indirectly or through reserves or no-take zones, on behalf of the Sanctuary Program. This should be left to existing regulatory authorities.</li> <li>5. Sanctuaries should not restrict the ability of Ports and Harbors to perform general maintenance, or construct improvements required for operations. To that end, C-MANC recommends boundary buffer zones around Ports and Harbors.</li> <li>6. Sanctuary Advisory Councils should be strengthened to create a well represented local voice in partnership with Sanctuaries and their managers in decision-making for issues that affect local interests. The Program needs to be accountable to the communities that it neighbors.</li> <li>7. C-MANC recommends suspending the expansion of existing Sanctuaries or designating new Sanctuaries until the problems identified above are resolved.</li> </ol> <p>In addition to these concerns, it appears the NMS Act does not allow for new NMS's to be designated until all of the Acts conditions are fulfilled-which they are not. Also, there appears to be no budget for expansions or new NMS's, and any such addition to the NMS program will likely just take away resources from existing NMS's like the MBNMS. Last, there appears to be significant opposition to the Chumash application. Even the SLO Chamber of Commerce does not support the application.</p> <p><b>USCG:</b> Recommend adding a Law Enforcement exemption for all Law Enforcement activity within the Sanctuary to include vessel and aircraft operations. NMS regulations currently prohibit all discharge which impedes Coast Guard operations and ability to enforce Sanctuary regulations. Recommend adding 3.3 – Law Enforcement Exemption</p>
3.1	Expand north to include Pacifica Exclusion area (aka "Donut hole")	<p><b>At-Large (Northern):</b> Expand north to include Pacific Exclusion area; Priority Score: 9. Why: When MBNMS was designated the Exclusion Zone was established to ensure that the then-aging and dysfunctional City/County of San Francisco sewage treatment plant and outfall near Lake Merced would not violate water quality rules, but that is no longer needed since the plant has been upgraded to higher standards. It was also established to enable the Port of Oakland to dispose dredge spoils there, and that is also no longer needed since they are being used elsewhere. Conversely, waters in the Zone would benefit greatly from the resource protection, research, and education mission of MBNMS, as administered by GFNMS in the northern management area. The original intent of citizens and elected officials who supported Boundary #5 for MBNMS in the early 1990s was to protect the entire set of waters north to the GFNMS, this change will honor that.</p> <p><b>Fishing (Commercial):</b> Do not expand the MBNMS boundary south or advocate for expansion without support of the fishermen, and their community.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> The RAP felt this was an issue that should be decided by the public residing in areas adjacent to the proposed new sanctuaries or extensions. Expanding the existing MBNMS boundary might also dilute the efforts of MBNMS research staff and their partners on related projects.</p> <p><b>USCG:</b> Recommend adding a Law Enforcement exemption for all Law Enforcement activity within all current and expanded boundaries(donut hole) to include vessel and aircraft operations. NMS regulations currently prohibit all discharge which impedes Coast Guard operations and ability to enforce Sanctuary regulations.</p>
3.2	Expand south if Chumash Heritage NMS does not progress	<p><b>Fishing (Commercial):</b> Do not expand the MBNMS boundary south or advocate for expansion without support of the fishermen, and their community.</p> <p><b>USCG:</b> Recommend adding a Law Enforcement exemption for all Law Enforcement activity within all current and potential expanded boundaries (within Chumash or MB expansion south) to include vessel and aircraft operations. NMS regulations currently prohibit all discharge which impedes Coast Guard operations and ability to enforce Sanctuary regulations.</p>
4.0	<b>Citizen Science Programming</b>	<p><b>Research:</b> Citizen Science was a high priority for the RAP. The RAP is supportive of the work done by the WQPP, Beachcombers and similar programs. Action plans related to citizen science should include strategies through which RAP and other scientists can assist in designing and evaluating such programs.</p> <p><b>At-Large (Northern):</b> Prioritize citizen science programming; Priority Score: 7. Why: Many of the other proposed action areas, such as Fukushima monitoring, Harmful Algal Blooms could be handled through Citizen Science. For example, Fukushima is the subject of two efforts, one coordinated by Woods Hole Institute and another by a professor at CSU Long Beach, and of course these cover the entire west coast. One area of citizen science that can involve many partners and volunteers is the effort being investigated by MBNMS staff around plankton monitoring in Monterey Bay. This would necessitate a MBNMS staff person to coordinate, but it could outsource much of the work and cost, and is a great way to engage others. Citizen science is growing in popularity and can build MBNMS's constituency.</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

4.1	Prioritize citizen science programming	<p><b>Education:</b> Citizen Science programs can address multiple goals of the Sanctuary and education communities in that programs can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- engage the public and/or schools in the sanctuary</li> <li>- foster deep connections to the marine environment</li> <li>- enable the public to make contributions toward better understanding, protecting, or improving the environment</li> <li>- engage for a wide range of audiences</li> <li>- address a variety of topics of interest or concern</li> </ul>
4.2	Invest more in citizen science programming	
<b>5.0 Climate change</b>		
5.1	Address ocean acidification, sea level rise preparedness and community resilience with a new action plan	<p><b>CDFW:</b> There is widespread evidence of a trend in warming of average temperatures in both the world’s oceans and atmosphere. Although the magnitude and duration of these increases cannot be predicted with certainty, it is responsible to think globally and act locally within the limits of practicality when developing a realistic management plan for the sanctuary to address this topic. The consequences of increasing temperatures are far-reaching and could include sea level rise, change in distribution of marine species, increase in number or intensity of winter storms, increased coastal erosion, and changes in water quality due to increased storm runoff, to name a few. All of these changes could have substantial and far-reaching impacts on the state’s natural marine or anadromous resources or their habitat. There are many ways in which the Sanctuary could take action. For example, the Sanctuary could function 1) in a supporting role for research and/or monitoring with respect to ocean acidification and the effects on organisms with calcareous skeletons; 2) as a facilitator and public educator in disseminating results of its own research and that of others within central California with regard to climate change; 3) within its permit process in the consideration of aspects of climate change on those who request permits from the Sanctuary.</p> <p><b>At-Large (Northern):</b> Address Ocean Acidification, sea level rise preparedness and community resilience with new Action Plan; Priority Score: 10. Why: Climate change will likely 1) change habitats and the mix of species due to acidification and hypoxia, 2) change the interface between ocean and land through sea level rise and increased ocean activity affecting infrastructure, beach and near shore habitats, wetlands, coastal and ocean access all of which will 3) affect research, resource protection and education activities. This will fundamentally affect MBNMS’ operations and mission. The Action Plan can be general and focus on responses to both likely and unforeseen changes. It is important to constituents who value MBNMS resources and want to preserve the ability to conserve whatever mix of species it hosts.</p> <p><b>At-Large (Southern):</b> Climate change is the overarching issue facing the planet. The ocean is an integral part of the ecosystem responses to a changing climate. Our communities are seeing extreme weather events --such as droughts, El Nino, record breaking temperatures-- and the impacts to the coastal zone. Tools such as the “Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment for the North-central California Coast and Ocean” should be used to inform assessment of how habitats, species and ecosystem services are likely to be impacted. This can help the Sanctuary management to respond to and plan for the changes we are going to see. The issue is not just the habitat but also the protection of the ocean food web.</p> <p><b>Education:</b> Climate change has been identified as the number one threat to coastal cities, national security, and local economies like ours. By addressing these issues, the SAC/Staff would be protecting the sanctuary and the community at the same time, not only for a momentary issue but for a long term solution.</p> <p><b>Fishing (Recreational):</b> This issue is important to anyone who doesn’t want to see the destruction of our oceans and its habitat and wildlife. This should continue to be a major topic of study and discussion, and monitoring to see how our sanctuary is being affected.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> Climate change is a high priority issue. MBNMS should leverage existing science from partner organizations such as the universities and MBARI, and focus on making this scientific information useful for sanctuary management. The Climate change category should be kept broad, to include temperature, ocean circulation, pH, dissolved oxygen, sea level rise and changes in ocean condition, productivity and community composition.</p>
6.0	<b>Desalination</b>	<p><b>Research:</b> The sanctuary should continue to follow the existing Guidelines for Desalination Plants in their NEPA and permitting processes. MBNMS should seek to support, encourage and evaluate marine science and monitoring related to desalination plant design and impacts. Proposals with sound scientific documentation should receive stronger support.</p>
		<p><b>AMBAG:</b> For all Monterey communities especially communities on the peninsula the ability to move ahead with desalination projects are a critical importance. These projects should all, (Cal Am and the other two potential projects) utilize sound science with consideration to the human factor and the business need. Without water we obviously will have an altered way of life and it will be a devastating economic Tsunami for all communities. But, we do expect the desalination process and likely 20 to 30 year like of the water plant should be safe and balanced in the areas ecosystems and protecting our Sanctuary. Appropriate management oversight and long term review of the effects should be a priority science and business working together.</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

		<p><b>CDFW:</b> Desalination is one of the most important issues facing the Sanctuary today. The guidelines address the potential environmental, economic, and social impacts, both positive and negative, associated with seawater desalination if conducted in the Monterey Bay area. The guidelines were developed to specifically address the potential impacts that were identified during the initial investigation. The guidelines are extensive and comprehensive (pages 4-13 in the Sanctuary’s 20-page document). We are particularly interested in the following guidelines: 1) the minimization of impingement and entrainment, as this will minimize impacts to marine organisms, some of which are larval or juvenile forms of species of commercial and recreational importance; 2) the avoidance of sensitive habitat and highly productive areas; 3) the inclusion of mitigation language if impacts to habitat and organisms do occur; 4) the evaluation of potential impacts of the brine plume on marine organisms; 5) the requirement to monitor the brine discharge; and 6) the requirement to design and operate desalination facilities to minimize impacts to recreational and commercial activities that occur within the MBNMS.</p> <p><b>At-Large (Northern):</b> Implement established desalination guidelines; Priority Score: 8. Why: There are currently desalination proposals queued up in the near-term and MBNMS has some well-developed guidelines for its role in permitting. Although MBNMS rules are weighted towards stricter environmental standards when there is a conflict, it is better for MBNMS to not disallow desalination since those rules must mesh with proposed on-shore uses and the mission and priorities of other government agencies. If desalination proposals are approved by local governments they by definition have a level of community support; the role of MBNMS is to ensure the ocean is protected as much as possible.</p> <p><b>At-Large (Central):</b> MBNMS must get ahead of this and work with the community on tis. If not, the MBNMS will face repercussions and backlash.</p> <p><b>Diving:</b> The Dive community is concerned about the installation of desalination plants in Monterey Bay and what role they will play in changing the marine environment. Given the ever changing environment we are in, establishing guidelines that will permit these projects and also protect sensitive marine environments is essential. The dive community is hesitant in supporting desalination unless the science behind them protects and conserves our ocean environment. The community wants MBNMS to have a hands on approach to these proposed desalination plants.</p>
6.1	Implement established desalination guidelines	
6.2	Do not allow/permit desalination	<b>At-Large (Central):</b> MBNMS must get ahead of this and work with the community on tis. If not, the MBNMS will face repercussions and backlash.
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Education and Outreach</b>	<p><b>Research:</b> The RAP also proposed that MBNMS assist local NMFS programs with Education and Outreach. NMFS traditionally has not participated in a level of public engagement that would help clarify a number of fishery issues affecting the sanctuary, and MBNMS partnership here could lead to better communication and coordination on fisheries issues. In particular the RAP did not feel that resources should be expended on a visitor center in Monterey, but that coordination with the Monterey Bay Aquarium would be appropriate to highlight sanctuary related information. Note that sanctuary visitor centers are free to the public and that the MBA is expensive, so they do not necessarily reach the same audiences.</p>
7.1	Expand signage efforts about wildlife issues	<b>At-Large (Southern):</b> This should be more than just about signage. Outreach should include information to hospitality and other businesses to include safe wildlife viewing tips, littering – including marine entanglement issues, tide pool protection, regulations in force and other applicable natural resource protection messages from the Sanctuary.
7.2	Do more outreach on current marine events and make it more accessible	<p><b>Education:</b> (Many of these issues are related, for example: Doing more Outreach on current events overlaps with our #5, more signage.) Outreach on current marine events are an effective way to increase public awareness and understanding of the sanctuary. It reaches more diverse audiences and increase pools of stakeholders. As mentioned above, this outreach can be combined effectively with other outreach and education goals.</p> <p><b>Fishing (Recreational):</b> The public must be better informed about the current state of our sanctuary and its habitat and wildlife. This information must be accessible for many outlets, schools, visitor center and maybe a visitor center in the Monterey area should be established to help in this task.</p> <p><b>Recreation:</b> Without the participation of the public and most importantly children, we will not have an effective Sanctuary. We strongly encourage re-doubling our efforts to engage the community with outreach programs and events. These would include creative educational programs like the Fisherman in the Classroom. We believe persistent communication with the National PR group to have focused set of campaigns directed toward awareness surrounding the MBNMS/GFNMS would enhance local program development.</p>
7.3	Establish a Monterey visitor center	
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Fisheries</b>	
		<p><b>Conservation:</b> Primary concern is direct disturbance of humpback whale feeding behavior. Sanctuary should consider new regulations prohibiting seal deterrents in Sanctuary for all fisheries. Sanctuary should also engage with fishermen, whale watching community, conservation community, and relevant agencies to engage sufficient anchovy abundance as forage for whales.</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

8.1	Address Anchovy fishery issue	<p><b>Fishing (Commercial):</b> The MSA is the dominate statute for any fishing- related management issues, including the creation of marine protected areas, inside Sanctuaries and marine National Monuments. The existing language of the NMSA, which some have interpreted as providing Sanctuaries with the ability to override the regional fishery management councils, combined with the repeated statements from the sanctuary leaders that their primary mandate is "resource protection," creates an atmosphere of intense unease among fishermen and other resource users. Anchovies are harvested only when they are plentiful and to prevent harvesting is a regulation. Fishing is not subject to regulation by the Sanctuary or making of new regulations that effect fishing including area set aside for research that prevents fishing. We recommend to revise fishing language in the 2008 Management Plan the inaccurate language about several fishing practices.</p> <p><b>Recreation:</b> Serious concerns have been raised about the sustainability of the anchovy fishery as it is currently being managed. While ultimate responsibility for the fishery's policies lie outside our domain, we must ensure that sustainable fishing practices are mandated; prey species harvesting no longer impacts a few fishermen. The entire ecosystem is threatened. Salmon, sea lions, sea birds, and the region's economic well-being is dependent on the presence of mega fauna which rely on anchovies.</p>
8.2	Address Fishing overall in MBNMS	<p><b>AMBAG:</b> AMBAG has repeatedly commented that the MBNMS should respect the agreement made with the fishing community that it would not regulate them or threaten their livelihoods. Since AMBAG was the central local agency named to work with NOAA on community expectations, this agreement is well recalled. The best approach for the MBNMS when fishing issues arise (such as the 50 or so comments re anchovies) is to take an educational approach and inform the public as to the science and public processes used by the PFMC/NMFS and the DFW/FWCCommission.</p> <p><b>At-Large (Central):</b> Need to continue the relationship with the fisheries.</p> <p><b>Fishing (Commercial):</b> The MSA is the dominate statute for any fishing- related management issues, including the creation of marine protected areas, inside Sanctuaries and marine National Monuments. The existing language of the NMSA, which some have interpreted as providing Sanctuaries with the ability to override the regional fishery management councils, combined with the repeated statements from the sanctuary leaders that their primary mandate is "resource protection," creates an atmosphere of intense unease among fishermen and other resource users. Anchovies are harvested only when they are plentiful and to prevent harvesting is a regulation. Fishing is not subject to regulation by the Sanctuary or making of new regulations that effect fishing including area set aside for research that prevents fishing. We recommend to revise fishing language in the 2008 Management Plan the inaccurate language about several fishing practices.</p> <p><b>Harbors:</b> The MBNMS is well advised to keep the "promise made to fishermen" when the sanctuary was designated in both the spirit and the letter of the law. Had the MBNMS done so since 1992, it is possible that fishermen would not be so skeptical about the sanctuary program, or new NMS's. This issue very much affects Harbors as recreational and commercial fishing is a large part of our purpose and economic base.</p>
9.0	<b>Management</b>	<p><b>Research:</b> Management changes listed in 9.0 were considered low priority.</p>
9.1	Establish a Joint Powers Authority for Advisory Council	<p><b>AMBAG:</b> AMBAG would like to suggest separation between MBNMS management and the operations of the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC); and explore establishing the SAC under a local joint powers authority (JPA). A JPA would allow for a more open and inclusive process for representation in the SAC. AMBAG feels that the SAC would be better represented if it included more elected officials, as elected official representation is currently limited on the SAC.</p> <p><b>Harbors:</b> As noted in the CMANC policy statement, the MBNMS needs to be accountable to its stakeholders and communities. Thus, Harbors support the advice provided by the City of Monterey, AM BAG, and the MPCC, paraphrased as follows: Consider separation between MBNMS management and the operations of the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC). Explore establishing the SAC under a local joint-powers authority, with the abilities to select representatives, determine agendas and communication, all vested locally and not under MBNMS management. Determine if this can be accomplished administratively, or whether an amendment to the National Marine Sanctuaries Act is required. Such a locallyrepresented body would advise the MBNMS, and seek to work collaboratively.</p>
9.2	Increase business representation on Advisory Council	
10.0	<b>Marine Debris</b>	
10.1	Address marine debris issues in MBNMS	<p><b>Education:</b> Marine debris has been a focus of efforts in the sanctuary for a few years now. As more tourists visit the peninsula, the threat of marine debris will continue to be an issue and will probably increase as a threat. This is an issue that must be kept in check and constantly in the forefront of all stakeholders' minds in the peninsula.</p> <p><b>Fishing (Recreational):</b> A few years ago, the MBNMS, working with MBARI, surveyed and collected some marine debris from Monterey Bay. This process revealed great amounts of debris that is still sitting on the bottom of our sanctuary. This issue should be addressed and methods should be explored to retrieve as much of the debris as possible.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> Marine debris is a priority for continued efforts to limit inflows of debris through Education and Outreach, and through activities of the WQPP. The RAP did not think marine debris was a high priority for research.</p>
11.0	<b>Mooring Buoys</b>	
11.1	Install mooring buoys at popular dive sites	<p><b>Research:</b> The RAP thought that installing mooring buoys at popular dive sites was a very good idea, but that these buoys would be very expensive for the sanctuary to install and maintain. MBNMS should support partners, such as the Monterey Harbor District, who can take on this worthwhile action.</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

		<p><b>Research:</b> Staff should involve the SAC in addressing safety issues related to MPWC, especially in the Mavericks Zone. For Item 12.4, staff should move quickly to allow use of MPWC for safety support at Mavericks during high surf advisories. This will likely require SAC and public input on the various ramifications, such as how activities other than safety patrol, such as tow-in surfing, would be regulated. MBNMS should also involve the SAC in continued efforts to promote creation of a safety patrol and allow for their access to high surf training areas.</p>
12.0	<b>Motorized Personal Watercraft</b>	
12.1	Allow safety training	
12.2	Add locations for recreational use and training	
12.3	Adjust zones for utility and effectiveness	
12.4	Reduce High Surf Warning requirement to High Surf Advisory	<p><b>Diving:</b> We do have a mixed constituency of water recreating people. The problem in the use of PWC's to the habitat is of a concern, but also to the safety of surfers during big wave events. With the number of presentations about statistics, reasons why we are compelled to cautiously approach this subject. We do not support expansions of use zones for PWC's. We DO support redefining from high surf warning down to high surf advisory in the Mavericks area. This is a personal safety issue for human life on an activity that will remain popular for generations to come.</p>
12.5	Add locations for recreational use and training	
13.0	<b>Water Quality Protection</b>	<p><b>At-Large (Central):</b> Need to continue relationship with agriculture community.</p>
13.1	Develop coordinated regional monitoring program	<p><b>CDFW:</b> Changes in water quality conditions within the Sanctuary can have a significant impact on Sanctuary resources and can only be detected through effective, comprehensive long-term monitoring of environmental and biological indicators. Currently there are numerous entities conducting monitoring of sanctuary waters as well as watersheds that drain into the sanctuary (e.g., CCLEAN, LOBO, First Flush, CDPH, CCAMP, SWAMP, etc). However, current monitoring is insufficient to allow an accurate determination of sanctuary water quality and its effects on biological resources. Emerging issues such as the increased presence of domoic acid in Monterey Bay, and its effect on marine species consumed by humans, has had researchers scrambling for information. There is a critical need for a coordinated regional water quality monitoring program to provide an integrated assessment across the range of stressors, jurisdictions and information needs. The 2008 MBNMS Management Plan identified the goal of more coordinated monitoring as a means to ensure water quality is maintained and to reduce threats to Sanctuary resources. The MOA regarding water quality and discharges outlines a Sanctuary program that calls for the establishment of a comprehensive water quality monitoring program to: (1) determine the sources of pollution causing or contributing to existing or anticipated pollution problems in the Sanctuary, (ii) evaluate the effectiveness of efforts to reduce or eliminate those sources of pollution, and (iii) evaluate progress toward achieving and maintaining water quality standards and toward protecting and restoring any degraded areas and living marine resources of the Sanctuary. Additionally, a more coordinated program would help identify gaps or shortcomings in existing monitoring (e.g., temporal, spatial, level of sampling effort) which could help identify areas for supplementation of Sanctuary resources. In general, monitoring data need to be collected and analyzed in a manner so that the data are widely applicable and provide timely and pertinent information for academic, management and educational purposes. A MBNMS-sponsored staff-led workshop seems like the most appropriate venue to address this issue.</p> <p><b>CA Natural Resource Agency:</b> A coordinated regional program modeled after SCWRP would provide multiple benefits and increase efficiencies. This would likely allow more inclusive use of citizen science data.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> The top priority selected from the list of public scoping issues is to develop a coordinated regional water quality monitoring program. (Please note that Dr. Hunt worked on this issue while with MBNMS, and has worked closely with Bridget Hoover and the WQPP on this ever since. If such a program were to launch during the next five years, there is a chance that Dr. Hunt and/or affiliated organizations would be involved in its implementation.) The RAP was very supportive of a coordinated regional water quality monitoring program as a high priority. It addresses critical issues identified in the condition report in a way that involves sanctuary leadership and engagement with important partner organizations, while advancing research, resource protection and outreach. WQPP activities listed as 13.1 through 13.3 are high priority issues for the RAP. As for item 13.4, it was mentioned that radiation on the west coast from Fukushima debris is expected to be less than that currently resulting from 1950's atmospheric weapons testing, so this was considered a low priority.</p>
13.2	Address runoff from urban landscapes (research, identify & address problems)	<p><b>At-Large (Southern):</b> The Condition Report highlights the poor quality in the estuary and nearshore with high levels of contaminants from pesticides, pathogens and other pollutants posing dangers to plants, animals and human health. Water quality is a very high priority issue for protection of all Sanctuary resources.</p> <p><b>CA Natural Resource Agency:</b> Obviously this will degrade habitats and negatively affects marine populations. It also reduces the potential benefits that can accrue with marine protected areas. Accumulating data and recent events like the Dungeness crab closer are showing this may be the new normal. Land based sources, including treated water, exacerbate HABS.</p>



**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

	Address Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) (research, identify & address problems)	<p><b>CDFW:</b> Harmful algal blooms (HABs) are caused by high concentrations of certain species of phytoplankton that produce toxins, which in turn spread into the marine ecosystem through bio-accumulation and can harm or kill fish, shellfish, marine mammals, seabirds, and humans. The most recent HAB affecting the MBNMS (<i>Pseudo-nitzschia</i>) produces a toxin called domoic acid; the recent algal bloom was the largest recorded to date in Monterey Bay. Algal toxins are accumulated and concentrated as it moves up the food chain, as small consumers are consumed by larger marine organisms. Bio-accumulation in the marine food web can also result in economic impacts to local communities (i.e. high levels and prolonged presence of domoic acid resulted in prohibitions on recreational and commercial fishing for valuable Dungeness and rock crab, as well as modification of the commercial anchovy fishery to prevent harvest for human use.) Paralytic shellfish poisoning is also caused by a toxin produced by phytoplankton (<i>Alexandrium</i>) that accumulates in bivalve shellfish (i.e. mussels, clams, oysters, razor clams) and the viscera of sardines, anchovies, crab and lobster. Researchers are still investigating the causes of these HABs, which are tied to water quality and inputs to Sanctuary waters and there is limited monitoring. A fuller discussion of the issue through a SAC workshop would likely provide the most up-to-date information, as well as give the SAC a means to determine the best course of action for the Sanctuary to follow via the Management Plan process. More specifically, the workshop could address the following: improving public communication and education on the causes and threats to wildlife and humans; identifying ongoing efforts to identify the problem and the linkages (e.g., water quality, nutrient inputs); whether and how to dedicate limited research dollars; linkage of this issue with the Sanctuary role in water quality monitoring.</p> <p><b>CA Natural Resource Agency:</b> Obviously this will degrade habitats and negatively affects marine populations. It also reduces the potential benefits that can accrue with marine protected areas. Accumulating data and recent events like the Dungeness crab closer are showing this may be the new normal. Land based sources, including treated water, exacerbate HABs.</p>
13.3	Monitor for radiation (Fukushima)	
13.4	Address drought related issues (over draught, steelhead)	
13.5		
14.0	<b>Wildlife Disturbance</b>	
14.1	Address harassment of wildlife by a variety of recreators	<p><b>Recreation:</b> Our Sanctuary is fortunate to have the world’s best marine wildlife viewing which drives much of the region’s economy. Our laws, outreach, enforcement and efforts to educate the public, have not kept pace with the changes in species, quantity and our interactions with them. The Sanctuary should take a leadership role in revising antiquated rules and education regarding wildlife harassment.</p>
14.2	Address entanglement impacts from fishing and research equipment	<p><b>At-Large (Southern):</b> The increase in foreign tourism; people interacting with wildlife in the Sanctuary; commercial wildlife watching and fishing operations are resulting in increasing wildlife disturbances (i.e., flushing, behavioral changes and whale and other marine mammal entanglements.)</p> <p><b>CA Natural Resource Agency:</b> It is important for MBNMS to engage with the already existing process and Dungeness Crab Task Force. The federal and state jurisdictional authorities are leading this effort and a separate process would not be helpful at this juncture. The process needs MBNMS to help move the existing process forward.</p> <p><b>Conservation:</b> MBNMS appears to be a hotspot of entanglements in recent years. Focus should be on improving response/disentangle capacity and actively participating in state working groups to better prevent entanglements. This is a major conservation and humane concern.</p> <p><b>Fishing (Commercial):</b> Marine mammal entanglement has protection from fishing gear is regulated by several NOAA offices with vigorous science. California developed a task force to use collaborative measures to resolve entanglement. NMFS has a POCTRT and Office of Protected Resource and a Marine Mammal Commission all monitor fisheries mammal interaction should it occur. The MBNMS may consider using resources to resolve the sea lion overpopulation leading to their death and disease and take of endangered species such as salmon.</p> <p><b>Recreation:</b> There are over 110,000 crab traps in our State waters. At least 10,000 of those go missing every year. It is very likely they are killing many whales. Many of those entangled whales often go outside Sanctuary borders. The disentanglement efforts, while good intentioned, are very ineffective. We need to take a leadership role in solving this problem so fishermen and whales can coexist more amiably.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> Decreasing the frequency and impact of organism entanglement is a priority, as is continued participation in the NOAA/Navy effort to define and implement management options for acoustic impacts on wildlife. The RAP offers to continue advising the SAC on the scientific aspects of these issues.</p>
14.3	Develop a marine mammal viewing (encroachment) distance regulation	<p><b>Conservation:</b> Concern is that current guidelines are insufficient to allow for effective enforcement of MMPA disturbance requirements. Sanctuary should look to other regions that have regulatory distances as the basis for action. This should apply equally to all wildlife-viewing activities.</p> <p><b>Research:</b> The RAP did not support harassment regulations based on specific distances between humans and wildlife. RAP members cited numerous types of situations in which marine organisms, rather than humans, initiate close encounters, or for which non-harassing proximity is unavoidable, such as in harbors.</p>
14.4	Address issues with ocean noise (research, identify and address problems)	<p><b>Conservation:</b> MBNMS received over 30,000 public comments requesting prohibition on high-energy seismic testing. Ocean noise can have widespread impacts on ocean wildlife. This has been an important focus area for the CWG and SAC. High-energy, dangerous seismic testing should be distinguished from low-energy testing done by local research community; and prohibited as part of the ban on oil and gas exploration. Many acoustic-sensitive marine species in MBNMS.</p>
14.5	Allow chumming to attract seabirds	

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Management Plan Review Exercise 3  
Advisory Council**

14.6	Explore new overflight zone at Devil's Slide (to protect Common Murre colony)	<b>USCG:</b> Recommend adding a Law Enforcement exemption for all overflight regulations. Overflight regulations could impede Coast Guard operations.
14.7	Expand focus to include more avian species of concern utilizing MBNMS resources (e.g., Condors, Ashy Storm-petrels)	