

Staff Identified Issue / Topic /Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report

Key:
 Received ≥75% support
 Process item
 Received <75% support

TOTAL COUNT - PRIORITY	TOTAL COUNT - KEEP	TOTAL COUNT - DO NOT ADDRESS	% Priority/Keep	% Do Not Address
---------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------	------------------

Coastal Development						
1.0	Implement new coastal sediment plans	8	2	0	100%	0%
1.1	Continue application of NOAA Guidelines for citing desalination facilities, modeling and monitoring	11	6	0	100%	0%
1.2	Coordinate with US Army Corp of Engineers, GFNMS and Surfer's Beach stakeholders for pilot beach nourishment project	8	8	1	94%	6%
1.3	Continue coordination with local harbors on dredge disposal activities and beach nourishment	12	4	0	100%	0%
1.4	Delete Submerged Cables Plan and incorporate relevant permitting elements into Permit Strategies in new Ops and Admin Plan	4	11	1	94%	6%
Ecosystem Protection Plans						
2.0	Continue attending Big Sur Multi-agency meetings	3	11	2	88%	13%
2.1	Continue coordination with CalTrans on Big Sur Hwy landslide disposal activities	5	9	2	88%	13%
2.2	Update Big Sur Coast GIS sensitivity Index	4	7	3	79%	21%
2.3	Delete Big Sur Ecosystem Plan and incorporate above elements into a new Ops and Admin Activities Plan	5	10	1	94%	6%
2.4	Continue to track PFMC process for Groundfish EFH modifications (Collaborative Proposal)	11	5	1	94%	6%
2.5	Implement Sanctuary Ecologically Significant Areas (SESAs)	8	4	2	86%	14%
2.6	Direct focus on benthic habitat protection, not trawling	8	6	1	93%	7%
2.7	Delete Benthic Effects of Trawling Plan and incorporate relevant and new elements into new Ecosystem Management Plan	12	2	3	82%	18%
Davidson Seamount						
3.0	Replace existing plan with new (mostly existing since 2011) Davidson Seamount Management Zone plan	11	6	0	100%	0%
Emerging issues						
4.0	Delete Emerging Issues Plan and Develop new plan for Climate Change issues (ocean acidification, etc)	12	3	2	88%	12%
4.1	Develop new plan regarding sound (acoustics) with focus on study of MBNMS' soundscape to identify potential impacts to resources - put in new Ecosystem Management Plan	12	4	1	94%	6%
4.2	Develop new plan that addressed growing demand for renewable energy projects (wind, wave, etc)	11	4	2	88%	12%
Introduced Species						
5.0	Continue to coordinate with NOAA and Aquatic Nuisance Species groups	8	8	0	100%	0%
5.1	Update majority of existing plan	8	8	0	100%	0%
Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN)						
6.0	Maintain existing online infrastructure	10	5	1	94%	6%
6.1	Expand to new sites (external funding dependent)	6	8	2	88%	13%
Marine Protected Areas						
7.0	Delete current plan and replace with an Ecosystem Management Plan that incorporates SESAs, the EFH Collaborative Proposal, and MBNMS partnerships efforts with MLPA implementation (SCUBA surveys, outreach, etc.)	11	4	1	94%	6%
Operations and Administration						
Operations						

Staff Identified Issue / Topic /Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report

Key:
 Received ≥75% support
 Process item
 Received <75% support

		TOTAL COUNT - PRIORITY	TOTAL COUNT - KEEP	TOTAL COUNT - DO NOT ADDRESS	% Priority/Keep	% Do Not Address
8.0	Update to include permitting, Big Sur issues, new boat, aircraft, diving SOPs	7	6	2	87%	13%
8.1	Add appropriate elements of Cross Cut Operations Plan	2	8	2	83%	17%
Performance Evaluation						
9.0	Develop new performance measures for all plans	9	3	5	71%	29%
Partnerships and Opportunities						
Fishing-Related Education and Research						
10.0	Identify relevant activities for MBNMS to realistically implement (Fisherman in the Classroom, Voices of the Bay)	12	5	0	100%	0%
10.1	Enhance communication between fishermen and researchers	13	3	1	94%	6%
Interpretive Facilities						
11.0	Incorporate visitor center operations into new Ops and Admin Plan and program development into a new Education and Outreach Plan	8	7	0	100%	0%
Ocean Literacy and Constituent Building						
12.0	Rename Education and Outreach Plan for better understanding	4	9	2	87%	13%
12.1	Revise and update contents	5	8	2	87%	13%
12.2	Incorporate relevant elements of Cross Cut Outreach Plan	2	9	4	73%	27%
Water Quality						
13.0	Update beach closures and microbial contamination action plan	12	3	2	88%	12%
13.1	Delete Cruise Ship Discharges Plan and incorporate continued collaboration with US Coast Guard and City of Monterey on cruise ship inspections into Ops and Admin Plan	12	3	2	88%	12%
13.2	Revise regional monitoring and data access to focus on only those elements that MBNMS is lead or major partner	9	7	1	94%	6%
13.3	Incorporate wetland and riparian areas into revised action plan	6	9	1	94%	6%
Wildlife Disturbance						
Marine Mammal, Seabird and Turtle Disturbance						
14.0	Update enforcement strategies	9	8	0	100%	0%
14.1	Address whale entanglement	10	4	2	88%	13%
14.2	Assess and evaluate issues related to MBNMS' soundscape (Acoustics) [move to Ecosystem Management Plan]	9	6	1	94%	6%
14.3	Continue Leatherback sea turtle conservation work	9	3	3	80%	20%
14.4	Consider a marine mammal approach regulation	7	5	4	75%	25%
Motorized Personal Watercraft						
15.0	Consider new permit requirements for volunteer safety group at Mavericks (as required for agencies)	8	3	4	73%	27%
15.1	Consider change to regulation to allow access to Mavericks during High Surf Advisory during Dec-Feb. (see regs section below:C1)	12	3	2	88%	12%
Tidepool Protection						
16.0	Extract the relevant outreach elements and move them to new Education and Outreach plan	8	6	1	93%	7%
Cross Cut Plans						
17.0	Update Ops and Admin Plan (per above recommendations)	8	5	0	100%	0%
17.1	Move Community Outreach relevant items to new Education and Outreach Plan	10	6	0	100%	0%
17.2	Move Ecosystem Monitoring relevant items to new Research and Monitoring Plan	8	9	0	100%	0%
17.3	Use the new regional Maritime Heritage Plan to revise MHP plan	7	9	0	100%	0%

Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 Summary
Advisory Council

Staff Identified Issue / Topic /Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report

Key:
 Received ≥75% support
 Process item
 Received <75% support

		TOTAL COUNT - PRIORITY	TOTAL COUNT - KEEP	TOTAL COUNT - DO NOT ADDRESS	% Priority/Keep	% Do Not Address
17.4	Incorporate Northern Management Area Action Plan relevant items into appropriate action plans (Ed & OR, Permitting, Water Quality)	6	10	0	100%	0%
Regulations						
R1	Clarify shoreward boundary lines across the entrances of annual and seasonal streams and lagoons	6	9	1	94%	6%
R2	Clarify boundary points for MPWC zones to make buoy maintenance more efficient	7	7	2	88%	13%
R3	Consider new regulation to explicitly allow NOAA to assess a vessel owner for the cost of salvage and removal of the vessel by the government, should the owner not take sufficient action to remove the threat of an oil spill, discharge, or abandonment in the sanctuary	11	2	2	87%	13%
Definition Changes to Consider						
D1	Modify MPWC definition as necessary to address remote controlled MPWC	7	7	1	93%	7%
D2	Modify definition of “motorized aircraft” to include model aircraft and unmanned aircraft	9	1	5	67%	33%
D3	Define an anchored vessel condition that “creates potential for a grounding, discharge, or deposit.”	9	3	1	92%	8%
D4	Define “mean high water”; describe how it is derived (based on NOAA methodology), its relation to mean high tide, and how often it changes	9	5	3	82%	18%
D5	Define “emergency.” Clarify what an emergency is and who determines when an emergency exception applies under MBNMS regulations	9	6	2	88%	12%
D6	Modify cruise ship definition to include “condo-style” cruise ships, where berths are owned rather than rented	8	5	3	81%	19%
Clarifications						
C1	Reduce required High Surf Warning condition for MPWC operations at Mavericks to a High Surf Advisory condition	12	0	2	86%	14%
C2	Modify overflight exceptions to read “valid, non-training law enforcement purposes.”	10	4	1	93%	7%
C3	Modify seaward boundary lines for overflight zones from arcs to straight lines	5	8	1	93%	7%
C4	Identify in regulation what distance spectators must keep from certain species of whales (blue, fin, humpback, gray and orca).	6	2	7	53%	47%
C5	Modify 15 CFR922.132(c)(1) or 2008n FEIS to reference 2009 letter to USAF regarding USAF exempted activities	5	7	1	92%	8%
C6	Consistent with other national marine sanctuaries, add prohibition against tampering with MBNMS signage, buoys or other property.	11	4	0	100%	0%

Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report

Key:
 Received ≥75% support
 Process Item
 Received <75% support
x Priority
- Keep
0 Do not address

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	TOTAL COUNT - PRIORITY	TOTAL COUNT - KEEP	TOTAL COUNT - DO NOT ADDRESS	% Priority/Keep	% Do Not Address
-------------	------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	--------------	--------	-----------	----------------------	------------------------	---------	------------	----------	---------	------	------	------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------	-----------------	------------------

Coastal Development																										
1.0	Implement new coastal sediment plans		x		x	x				x	x	x					-	x			-	8	2	0	100%	0%
1.1	Continue application of NOAA Guidelines for citing desalination facilities, modeling and monitoring	x		x	-	x		-	x	x	-	x	-	x	x	x	x	x			-	11	6	0	100%	0%
1.2	Coordinate with US Army Corp of Engineers, GFNMS and Surfer's Beach stakeholders for pilot beach nourishment project	x		x	-	0		-	x	x	-	x	x	-	-	x	-	x			-	8	8	1	94%	6%
1.3	Continue coordination with local harbors on dredge disposal activities and beach nourishment	x		x		x		-	x	x	-	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			-	12	4	0	100%	0%
1.4	Delete Submerged Cables Plan and incorporate relevant permitting elements into Permit Strategies in new Ops and Admin Plan	-		-		x		x	0	-	-	x	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	4	11	1	94%	6%
Ecosystem Protection Plans																										
2.0	Continue attending Big Sur Multi-agency meetings	-		-	-	x		-	0	x	-	0		-	-	-	-	x			-	3	11	2	88%	13%
2.1	Continue coordination with CalTrans on Big Sur Hwy landslide disposal activities	-		x	x	x		-	0	x	-	0		-	-	-	-	x			-	5	9	2	88%	13%
2.2	Update Big Sur Coast GIS sensitivity Index	-		0	x	x		-	0	x	-	0		-	-	-	-	x			-	4	7	3	79%	21%
2.3	Delete Big Sur Ecosystem Plan and incorporate above elements into a new Ops and Admin Activities Plan	-		x	-	x		x	x	-	-	x	0	-	-	-	-	-			-	5	10	1	94%	6%
2.4	Continue to track PFMC process for Groundfish EFH modifications (Collaborative Proposal)	x		x	-	x		-	x	-	x	x	-	x	0	x	x	x			-	11	5	1	94%	6%
2.5	Implement Sanctuary Ecologically Significant Areas (SESAs)	-		-	x	x		x	0	x	x	x	-	0	-	-	-	x			-	8	4	2	86%	14%
2.6	Direct focus on benthic habitat protection, not trawling	-		x	-	-		-	0	-	x	x		x	-	x	x	x			-	8	6	1	93%	7%
2.7	Delete Benthic Effects of Trawling Plan and incorporate relevant and new elements into new Ecosystem Management Plan	x		x	x	x		x	0	-	0	0	x	x	-	x	x	x			x	12	2	3	82%	18%
Davidson Seamount																										
3.0	Replace existing plan with new (mostly existing since 2011) Davidson Seamount Management Zone plan	-		x	-	x		x	x	x	-	x	x	-	x	-	x	x			-	11	6	0	100%	0%
Emerging Issues																										
4.0	Delete Emerging Issues Plan and Develop new plan for Climate Change issues (ocean acidification, etc)	0		x	x	x		x	x	x	-	x	x	x	x	x	x	0			-	12	3	2	88%	12%
4.1	Develop new plan regarding sound (acoustics) with focus on study of MBNMS' soundscape to identify potential impacts to resources - put in new Ecosystem Management Plan	-		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	0	-	x	-	x	x			-	12	4	1	94%	6%
4.2	Develop new plan that addressed growing demand for renewable energy projects (wind, wave, etc)	x		-	-	x		x	x	x	x	0	0	x	-	x	x	x			-	11	4	2	88%	12%
Introduced Species																										
5.0	Continue to coordinate with NOAA and Aquatic Nuisance Species groups	-		x	-	-		-	x	-	x	x	-	-	x	-	x	x			x	8	8	0	100%	0%
5.1	Update majority of existing plan	-		x	-	x		x	x	-	-	x	-	-	-	-	x	x			x	8	8	0	100%	0%
Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN)																										
6.0	Maintain existing online infrastructure	x		x	x	-		x	0	x	x	x	-	x	-	-	x	x			-	10	5	1	94%	6%
6.1	Expand to new sites (external funding dependent)	x		-	-	x		-	0	x	x	x	0	-	-	-	x	-			-	6	8	2	88%	13%
Marine Protected Areas																										
7.0	Delete current plan and replace with an Ecosystem Management Plan that incorporates SESAs, the EFH Collaborative Proposal, and MBNMS partnerships efforts with MLPA implementation (SCUBA surveys, outreach, etc.)	-		x	x	x		x	x	-	x	x	-	-	0	x	x	x			x	11	4	1	94%	6%
Operations and Administration																										
Operations																										
8.0	Update to include permitting, Big Sur issues, new boat, aircraft, diving SOPs	-		x		x		-	0	-	-	0	x	-	-	x	x	x			x	7	6	2	87%	13%
8.1	Add appropriate elements of Cross Cut Operations Plan	-		0		-		-	0	-	-	x	-	-	-	-	x	-			-	2	8	2	83%	17%
Performance Evaluation																										
9.0	Develop new performance measures for all plans	x		0	x	x		x	0	x	-	0	0	x	x	x	x	x	0		-	9	3	5	71%	29%
Partnerships and Opportunities																										
Fishing-Related Education and Research																										
10.0	Identify relevant activities for MBNMS to realistically implement (Fisherman in the Classroom, Voices of the Bay)	x		x	-	x		-	x	-	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			-	12	5	0	100%	0%
10.1	Enhance communication between fishermen and researchers	x		x	-	x		-	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			0	13	3	1	94%	6%
Interpretive Facilities																										

Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report

Key:
 Received ≥75% support
 Process item
 Received <75% support
x Priority
- Keep
0 Do not address

	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	TOTAL COUNT - PRIORITY	TOTAL COUNT - KEEP	TOTAL COUNT - DO NOT ADDRESS	% Priority/Keep	% Do Not Address
11.0	Incorporate visitor center operations into new Ops and Admin Plan and program development into a new Education and Outreach Plan	-		x		x		x	x	x	-	x	-	-	-	x	-	x	-	-			8	7	0	100%	0%
Ocean Literacy and Constituent Building																											
12.0	Rename Education and Outreach Plan for better understanding	-		x		x		-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	x	x	-				4	9	2	87%	13%
12.1	Revise and update contents	-		x		x		-	0	-	-	0	x	-	-	-	x	x	-				5	8	2	87%	13%
12.2	Incorporate relevant elements of Cross Cut Outreach Plan	-		0		-		-	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	x	x	-				2	9	4	73%	27%
Water Quality																											
13.0	Update beach closures and microbial contamination action plan	x		x	x	x		-	0	x	x	x	x	0	x	x	x	x	x				12	3	2	88%	12%
13.1	Delete Cruise Ship Discharges Plan and incorporate continued collaboration with US Coast Guard and City of Monterey on cruise ship inspections into Ops and Admin Plan	x		x	-	x		-	0	x	x	x	x	0	x	x	x	x	x				12	3	2	88%	12%
13.2	Revise regional monitoring and data access to focus on only those elements that MBNMS is lead or major partner	x		x	x	x		-	0	-	-	x	-	x	x	-	x	x				9	7	1	94%	6%	
13.3	Incorporate wetland and riparian areas into revised action plan	-		x	-	x		-	0	x	-	x	x	-	x	-	-	-				6	9	1	94%	6%	
Wildlife Disturbance																											
Marine Mammal, Seabird and Turtle Disturbance																											
14.0	Update enforcement strategies	-		x	-	x		-	x	x	x	x	-	-	-	-	x	x	-				9	8	0	100%	0%
14.1	Address whale entanglement	x		-		0		x	x	x	x	x	-	0	-	-	x	x	x				10	4	2	88%	13%
14.2	Assess and evaluate issues related to MBNMS' soundscape (Acoustics) [move to Ecosystem Management Plan]	-		x		-		-	x	x	x	x	0	-	x	-	x	x				9	6	1	94%	6%	
14.3	Continue Leatherback sea turtle conservation work	-		x		0		-	x	x	x	x	0	0	x	-	x	x				9	3	3	80%	20%	
14.4	Consider a marine mammal approach regulation	0		x		x		-	0	x	x	x	0	-	-	0	x	-				7	5	4	75%	25%	
Motorized Personal Watercraft																											
15.0	Consider new permit requirements for volunteer safety group at Mavericks (as required for agencies)	0		x	-	x		x	x	-	0	0			x	0	x	x				8	3	4	73%	27%	
15.1	Consider change to regulation to allow access to Mavericks during High Surf Advisory during Dec-Feb. (see regs section below:C1)	x		x	-	x		x	x	-	0	x	0	x	x	x	x	x				12	3	2	88%	12%	
Tidepool Protection																											
16.0	Extract the relevant outreach elements and move them to new Education and Outreach plan	-		x		x		x	0	x	-	x	x		x	-	x	-				8	6	1	93%	7%	
Cross Cut Plans																											
17.0	Update Ops and Admin Plan (per above recommendations)			x	x	x		-	x	x	-	x	-	-	x	-	x	-				8	5	0	100%	0%	
17.1	Move Community Outreach relevant items to new Education and Outreach Plan	x		x	-	x		-	x	x	-	x	x	x	x	-	x	-				10	6	0	100%	0%	
17.2	Move Ecosystem Monitoring relevant items to new Research and Monitoring Plan	-		x	x	x		-	x	x	-	x	-	-	x	-	x	-				8	9	0	100%	0%	
17.3	Use the new regional Maritime Heritage Plan to revise MHP plan	-		x	-	x		-	x	x	-	x	-	-	x	-	x	-				7	9	0	100%	0%	
17.4	Incorporate Northern Management Area Action Plan relevant items into appropriate action plans (Ed & OR, Permitting, Water Quality)	-		x	-	x		-	x	x	-	x	-	-	x	-	-	-				6	10	0	100%	0%	
Regulations																											
R1	Clarify shoreward boundary lines across the entrances of annual and seasonal streams and lagoons	x		-		-		-	0	x	-	x	x	x	x	-	-	-				6	9	1	94%	6%	
R2	Clarify boundary points for MPWC zones to make buoy maintenance more efficient	-		-		x		x	0	x	-	0	-	-	-	-	x	x	x				7	7	2	88%	13%
R3	Consider new regulation to explicitly allow NOAA to assess a vessel owner for the cost of salvage and removal of the vessel by the government, should the owner not take sufficient action to remove the threat of an oil spill, discharge, or abandonment in the sanctuary	-		x		x		x	0	x	x	x	x	-	x	0	x	x				11	2	2	87%	13%	
Definition Changes to Consider																											
D1	Modify MPWC definition as necessary to address remote controlled MPWC	-		-	-	x		-	0	-	-	x	x	-	x	-	x	x				7	7	1	93%	7%	
D2	Modify definition of "motorized aircraft" to include model aircraft and unmanned aircraft	0		x		x		-	0	x	x	0	x	0	x	0	x	x				9	1	5	67%	33%	
D3	Define an anchored vessel condition that "creates potential for a grounding, discharge, or deposit."			x		x		-	x	-	-	x	x	-	x	0	x	x				9	3	1	92%	8%	
D4	Define "mean high water"; describe how it is derived (based on NOAA methodology), its relation to mean high tide, and how often it changes	x		x	x	x		-	0	x	x	0	0	x	x	-	x	-				9	5	3	82%	18%	
D5	Define "emergency." Clarify what an emergency is and who determines when an emergency exception applies under MBNMS regulations	-		x	x	x		-	0	x	x	x	-	-	x	0	x	-				9	6	2	88%	12%	

Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report

Key:
 Received ≥75% support
 Process item
 Received <75% support
x Priority
- Keep
0 Do not address

		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	TOTAL COUNT - PRIORITY	TOTAL COUNT - KEEP	TOTAL COUNT - DO NOT ADDRESS	% Priority/Keep	% Do Not Address
D6	Modify cruise ship definition to include "condo-style" cruise ships, where berths are owned rather than rented		0			x	-	x		-	0	x	x	0	-	-	x	-	x	x			x	8	5	3	81%	19%
Clarifications																												
C1	Reduce required High Surf Warning condition for MPWC operations at Mavericks to a High Surf Advisory condition		x			x		x		x	x		0	x	0	x	x	x	x	x			x	12	0	2	86%	14%
C2	Modify overflight exceptions to read "valid, non-training law enforcement purposes."		-			x		x		x	x	0	-	x	x	-	x	-	x	x			x	10	4	1	93%	7%
C3	Modify seaward boundary lines for overflight zones from arcs to straight lines		-			x		x		x	x		-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-			x	5	8	1	93%	7%
C4	Identify in regulation what distance spectators must keep from certain species of whales (blue, fin, humpback, gray and orca).		0			x		x		0	x	x	x	0	0	0	-	0	0	-			x	6	2	7	53%	47%
C5	Modify 15 CFR922.132(c)(1) or 2008n FEIS to reference 2009 letter to USAF regarding USAF exempted activities		-			x		x		0	x			x	-	-	-	-	-	-			x	5	7	1	92%	8%
C6	Consistent with other national marine sanctuaries, add prohibition against tampering with MBNMS signage, buoys or other property.		-			x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	-	x	-	x	-			x	11	4	0	100%	0%

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Advisory Council Comments

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

Coastal Development		
1.0	Implement new coastal sediment plans	<p>CA Natural Resource Agency: Ensure continued active coordination with and implementation of state sediment management plans.</p> <p>Diving: The southern most regions of Monterey Bay continue to suffer significant beach and coastal erosion. Sensitive habitats in the dunes area, and social</p>
1.1	Continue application of NOAA Guidelines for citing desalination facilities, modeling and monitoring	<p>AMBAG: Continue application of NOAA guidelines for local desalination solutions for the local region and the solutions should work to minimize ocean environmental</p> <p>CDFW: 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</p> <p>Conservation: Include considering sand mine impacts.</p> <p>Diving: We support desalination development in supplying our arid climate with a more constant supply of drinking water. We have little reservoir capacity that will offset the variances in annual rainfall. Desalination is a proven method through out the world in sensitive marine habitats. We need to permit facilities and operations</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Clarity of guidelines based on science.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Monitor and observe.</p> <p>Harbors: A (or more than one) successful desalination project is of extreme importance to the MB region. The MBNMS should continue to work constructively with the communities and applicants to make progress on these projects. It is likely that some environmental consequences will occur that some will view as negative; it will be</p> <p>Harbors: A (or more than one) successful desalination project is of extreme importance to the MB region. The MBNMS should continue to work constructively with the communities and applicants to make progress on these projects. It is likely that some environmental consequences will occur that some will view as negative; it will be</p>
1.2	Coordinate with US Army Corp of Engineers, GFNMS and Surfer's Beach stakeholders for pilot beach nourishment project	<p>Diving: Beach nourishment is critical to the surrounding communities. Noting especially in the southern end of the Monterey Bay region. The Sanctuary should be able to permit, under strict guidelines, the ability to use dredge disposal anywhere in the Sanctuary that benefits the environment and community infrastructure before the</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Concern ongoing</p> <p>Harbors: This is long overdue, but the answer is in removing the regulation prohibiting new dredge material disposal sites, not in creating a "pilot" project. The letter</p>
1.3	Continue coordination with local harbors on dredge disposal activities and beach nourishment	<p>AMBAG: Very important for all communities</p> <p>Diving: 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</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Beach projects to improve use and safety should be addressed.</p> <p>Harbors: 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</p> <p>Harbors: This is long overdue, but the answer is in removing the regulation prohibiting new dredge material disposal sites, not in creating a "pilot" project. The letter from Tom Kendall of the USACE is noteworthy. 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</p>
1.4	Delete Submerged Cables Plan and incorporate relevant permitting elements into Permit Strategies in new Ops and Admin Plan	<p>Diving: A critical item for streamlining the permitting process for seafloor modifications</p>
Ecosystem Protection Plans		
2.0	Continue attending Big Sur Multi-agency meetings	<p>Diving: The concept of a condensed Operational and Administrative Review Plan consolidates MBNMS management role in to an integrated plan that is less</p> <p>Research: Coordinated 7-agency plan is a good idea if all parties are ready to participate.</p>
2.1	Continue coordination with CalTrans on Big Sur Hwy landslide disposal activities	<p>Diving: The concept of a condensed Operational and Administrative Review Plan consolidates MBNMS management role in to an integrated plan that is less</p> <p>Research: Coordinated 7-agency plan is a good idea if all parties are ready to participate.</p>
2.2	Update Big Sur Coast GIS sensitivity Index	<p>Diving: The concept of a condensed Operational and Administrative Review Plan consolidates MBNMS management role in to an integrated plan that is less</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Advisory Council Comments

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

2.3	Delete Big Sur Ecosystem Plan and incorporate above elements into a new Ops and Admin Activities Plan	<p>Diving: The concept of a condensed Operational and Administrative Review Plan consolidates MBNMS management role in to an integrated plan that is less complicated</p>
2.4	Continue to track PFMC process for Groundfish EFH modifications (Collaborative Proposal)	<p>Diving: MBNMS staff should continue to monitor current PFMC actions in conjunction with the Department of Fish and Game. MBNMS staff should provide</p> <p>Recreation: Given the efforts the MBNMS has put into tracking Groundfish protection and habitat protection, it only makes sense to prioritize a collaborative working effort with the PFMC. This should then allow us to have a greater voice In any proposed Groundfish EFH changes that we would deem not in the best interest of the</p>
2.5	Implement Sanctuary Ecologically Significant Areas (SESAs)	<p>At-Large (Northern): Implement Sanctuary Ecologically Significant Areas. This is a great way to focus staff and other resources on geographic or topical hotspots, which can draw conclusions applicable to other areas for research, provide interesting content for education, and vital resources for protection. If funding is an issue</p> <p>Conservation: Would be invaluable to conduct more research, monitoring and more protections on these areas within the sanctuary. Tremendous amount of effort</p> <p>Conservation: Focus on research and exploration.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): We support vigorous science and requests that the revised Management Plan clearly state that the MBNMS will not create no fishing zones out of SESA's. The MSA is the dominate statute for any fishing- related management issues, including the creation of marine protected areas. The MPLA and consideration</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Concern by many in the public, not only fishermen, as revised no-fishing, de-facto MPAs.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Not without extensive review from fishing industry.</p> <p>Research: It is not clear what is meant by "Implement Sanctuary Ecologically Significant Areas (SESAs)." This phrase is not defined here or in readily available documents. It could mean any combination of enhancing research in SESAs, providing educational materials about SESAs, putting additional weight on SESAs in</p> <p>Research: Specific activities to implement SESAs are not well defined in available documents.</p>
2.6	Direct focus on benthic habitat protection, not trawling	<p>Conservation: Keep trawling.</p> <p>Diving: Trawling and fishing gear that intentionally or unintentionally damages sensitive habitat areas need continued research and oversight. Trawling can be one of</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Confusing and specifically from whom are you protecting the habitat?</p> <p>Harbors: What will the MBNMS do to "protect benthic habitats"? The MBNMS has already heard the concerns of trap and pot fishermen that EFH will be used to push</p>
2.7	Delete Benthic Effects of Trawling Plan and incorporate relevant and new elements into new Ecosystem Management Plan	<p>Conservation: Maintain focus on trawling; update as needed.</p> <p>Diving: Please stay with habitat studies and protection</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Trawling is a permitted science based coordinated and regulated activity and portrayed badly. This should be corrected.</p> <p>Harbors: It is unclear what this means, but whatever new elements are created should be the result of collaboration with regional fisheries leaders.</p>
Davidson Seamount		
3.0	Replace existing plan with new (mostly existing since 2011) Davidson Seamount Management Zone plan	<p>Diving: We support this issue for our continued studies of our changing environment</p> <p>Education: We should keep the momentum with all the new exploration/research going on recently.</p>
Emerging issues		
4.0	Delete Emerging Issues Plan and Develop new plan for Climate Change issues (ocean acidification, etc)	<p>AMBAG: Other federal agencies are lead agencies NMSMB have other priorities</p> <p>At-Large (Southern): 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 and impacts to the coastal zone. Ocean acidification, sea level rise, increase in harmful algal blooms, changes in the</p> <p>CDFW: 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</p> <p>Conservation: Not sure if entire emerging plan should be deleted; yes to climate plan.</p> <p>Diving: Can our current plan be modified to include ocean acidification?</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Monitoring is good. However, it cannot be regulated.</p> <p>Research: New plans for climate change, acoustics and renewable energy would be good. It seems there still needs to be a placeholder for other emerging issues.</p>
	Develop new plan regarding sound (acoustics) with	<p>Diving: Certain intensities of generated sound is damaging to the environment and to divers. One of the lesser known concerns to the general public is the use of seal bombs can and does hurt divers and marine mammals. Sound travels 20 times faster underwater than in the atmosphere. A criminal case was brought before the courts in Monterey County when a fisherman was using seal bombs to get rid of the SCUBA divers in his fishing area concluding they were scaring fish away. He was</p> <p>Diving: We agree that the continued or planned use of acoustical testing that can be harmful to the environment and the different marine mammal species and</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

Advisory Council Comments

4.1	focus on study of MBNMS' soundscape to identify potential impacts to resources - put in new Ecosystem Management Plan	<p>Fishing (Commercial): Expensive projects are nice. Does MBNMS have the funds? Same answer for 6.1 in collaboration with fishermen.</p> <p>Harbors: Developing scientific information about the "soundscape" would be good, but does the MBNMS have the staff science capability to do this? And/or, does it</p> <p>Fishing (Recreational): More energy needs to be put into the study of acoustics and the effect of sound on our marine wildlife.</p>
4.2	Develop new plan that addressed growing demand for renewable energy projects (wind, wave, etc)	<p>At-Large (Northern): Develop new plan that addresses growing demand for renewable energy. There is currently an offshore wind farm proposed for the area being considered for a possible Chumash Heritage NMS, and to the best of our knowledge this is (figuratively, not literally) un-charted territory. MBNMS may see proposals for</p> <p>Diving: Not at this time given the lack of current resources</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): There is a growing concern by fishermen and communities that wave energy or similar alternatives that use ocean harvest area may be</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): We are interested in the status of the projects and what MBNMS's position. Concerned about fishing.</p> <p>Harbors: Basically what needs to occur is a "compatibility determination" for these energy projects. This ought to be the result of a science and public process, and not</p>
Introduced Species		
5.0	Continue to coordinate with NOAA and Aquatic Nuisance Species groups	At-Large (Southern): Especially estuarine and harbor
5.1	Update majority of existing plan	
Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN)		
6.0	Maintain existing online infrastructure	Diving: SIMoN is and has been a win win project for the public. Under Dr. Steve Lonharts direction and support
6.1	Expand to new sites (external funding dependent)	CA Natural Resource Agency: Need to coordinate closely with OST and OPC to see how SIMoN may be linked more directly to the statewide data management system
Marine Protected Areas		
7.0	Delete current plan and replace with an Ecosystem Management Plan that incorporates SESAs, the EFH Collaborative Proposal, and MBNMS partnerships efforts with MLPA implementation (SCUBA surveys, outreach, etc.)	<p>At-Large (Northern): Delete current plan and replace with an Ecosystem Management Plan. Putting everything into one plan and incorporating partnerships, SESAs, and other relevant elements will be more efficient, effective and will save time and money. Give consideration to emergency projects by local governments, such as</p> <p>CA Natural Resource Agency: Continued improvement and integration of MBNMS effort related to SESA, EFH etc. Need to be more closely linked to the state's MPA</p> <p>Conservation: Plan should include research on EFH reopenings and Voluntary Management Areas.</p> <p>Diving: If bringing these plans together simplifies and streamlines management time and saves resources "funds" then we support this concept.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): We support vigorous science and requests that the revised Management Plan clearly state that the MBNMS will not create no fishing zones out of SESA's. The MSA is the dominate statute for any fishing- related management issues, including the creation of marine protected areas. The MPLA and consideration</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Fishermen are not supportive of coordinating MLPA and SESA projects.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Not without further review. Industry does not want anything similar to MPAs.</p> <p>Harbors: It is understandable and appropriate that the MBNMS identifies particular areas which it wishes to better document or research. Care must be given, however, to resist both the desire to "protect" these special areas (presumably from fishing) by its own federal regulations, and to resist the efforts of others who would seek protections in the name of the sanctuary. Hopefully these SESAs will study existing features and the change that might/might not occur to them over time.</p> <p>Research: SESA implementation needs to be more specifically defined.</p>
Operations and Administration		
Operations		
8.0	Update to include permitting, Big Sur issues, new boat, aircraft, diving SOPs	<p>Diving: We are concerned that there are other areas needing more attention where human interaction is affecting the sensitive habitats more. If resources were</p> <p>Harbors: "Operations and Administration appear to be the most appropriate place for this priority comment. 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 locally-represented body would advise the MBNMS, and seek to work collaboratively. As Sam Farr advised in his 2002 letter to Bill Douros, there</p> <p>Harbors: The category of "Operations and Administration" is the likely place for the MBNMS to consider supporting a different, independent SAC structure, such as has</p>
8.1	Add appropriate elements of Cross Cut Operations	Diving: Standardizing cross cut elements in each of the plans is supported
Performance Evaluation		
		Diving: Not at this time. We have base line measurements in place, not perfect, but to continuously change our measurement tools and methods would further delay the usefulness of the current baselines we have established. No matter what tools were put into place, there would be someone to challenge the methodology or

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Advisory Council Comments

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

	9.0 Develop new performance measures for all plans	<p>Fishing (Commercial): We support separation between MBNMS management and operations of the SAC. We support establishing the SAC under a local joint-powers</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Important. Fishermen have a vested interest in their livelihood as referenced in the 1992 documents of intent. They should be consulted before ideas surface as Sanctuary changes because they have a voice in those decisions. The ACSF represents port communities and fishing groups in the Sanctuary to</p> <p>Harbors: This is a critically important task. If the Condition Reports are examined, two conclusions are obvious: First, that even with the progress made by using "professional judgment" as a metric, that still falls short of an science-based metric, or set of standards. Second, there seems to be no outside reference or control</p> <p>Research: Meaningful "performance measures" for environmental policy are very difficult to create, tedious to implement, and usually deceptive as ways to communicate. With activities as "fluid" as the sanctuary action plans, which depend heavily on unforeseen opportunities, changing partner activities, fluctuating staffing levels and unpredictable urgencies, performance measures have a very low probability of being anything but a large waste of time. Management usually requires quantitative or semi-quantitative measures that they can review quickly, and such preconceived, short-hand metrics are usually very far from accurate</p> <p>Research: Performance measures are tedious to develop, and are of little use when performance under so many action plans is dependent on external opportunities.</p>
Partnerships and Opportunities		
Fishing-Related Education and Research		
	10.0 Identify relevant activities for MBNMS to realistically implement (Fisherman in the Classroom, Voices of the Bay)	<p>AMBAG: Continue the fundamental Congressional intent when the MBNMS was established. The Sanctuary role is not to regulate fishing. State and federal fisheries have the authority to research monitor and regulate. The sanctuary should not lobby or advocate. Yes, enhance the relationships with the fishing industries both</p> <p>Conservation: Include conservation community.</p> <p>Diving: Education and out reach are our strongest tools in the community. The more people know, the more involved they become. Conservation is a state of mind grown from within and becomes a perspective or a lens we look through. School educational programs, business collaboration, and educational resources need to be</p> <p>Education: With the new science standards in place and a new history framework being drafted, those curricula will be more relevant than ever. They are sitting on a</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): "Fishermen in the classroom". We value the educational program and encourages the MBNMS to commit to it again in the revised Management</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Great point and very helpful to all involved. Fishermen are often misunderstood. This is an opportunity to educate the public on the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act and how regulations work. To teach how young this science based public process protects the resources fishermen</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Need to connect to community.</p> <p>Harbors: 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. The MBNMS could be helpful to fishermen by establishing an educational</p> <p>Harbors: The fishermen in the classroom was a good project for the MBNMS. The challenge is finding people to do it.</p>
	10.1 Enhance communication between fishermen and researchers	<p>Fishing (Recreational): Activities need to be developed to better reach out to the public. The "Fishermen in the Classroom", Paul's cable TV show are very good tools</p> <p>CDFW: There is always a need to increase public awareness about fishing issues in the MBNMS and more actively involve fishermen in research activities to add to the information available for fishery related decision-making processes. The historic knowledge and experience of fishermen can be a benefit to academic researchers developing projects, studying resources related to a fishery, or in interpretation of results. One example is the research done (with more planned) by Dr. James Lindholm in collaboration with fishermen to study impacts of trawling on soft bottom habitat. Another is the collaborative study done by CDFW, NOAA, and a halibut trawler in Monterey Bay to look at immediate impacts of trawl gear on soft bottom. The 2008 Management Plan recognized the need for increased involvement of fishermen to increase understanding of the importance of all the ecosystem resources that interact with fishing activities. Often fishermen are the most able to</p> <p>Diving: The outreach started by Nikki Dunsmore needs to be reignited and maintained on a consistent basis. Not just when there are issues or controversies before the</p> <p>Education: The more fishermen and researchers work together, speak the same language, and understand each other, the more comprehensive and extensive will the protection of the sanctuary be. Both groups want the same for the future of our waters and specifically our bay. But getting them to collaborate efforts will be</p> <p>Education: This is my personal #1 problem. We solve this, we pretty much have world peace.</p> <p>Fishing (Recreational): Fishermen are the eyes and ears of the sanctuary. More communication between them and the science community needs to be developed to</p>
Interpretive Facilities		
	11.0 Incorporate visitor center operations into new Ops and Admin Plan and program development into a new	<p>Diving: We really are proud of the visitor centers, both in Cambria and in Santa Cruz. Can we increase the funding to support there needs in growing the</p> <p>Harbors: We would benefit from an independent survey of visitors to the Exploration Center, asking questions before they enter to gage why they came and from</p>
Ocean Literacy and Constituent Building		

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Advisory Council Comments

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

12.0	Rename Education and Outreach Plan for better understanding	<p>At-Large (Southern): Education and Outreach are important tools the Sanctuary has in achieving its natural resource protection goals. Revising and updating the Ocean Literacy and Outreach plan and incorporating elements of climate change, water quality, ecosystem health and prevention of wildlife disturbance will help</p> <p>Harbors: As a related topic to # 11 above, the MBNMS could be helpful to fishermen by establishing an educational approach to inform the public (and even some SAC members) about the laws that govern US and California fisheries, and the level of science and public process used to implement/enforce those laws. This would help</p>
12.1	Revise and update contents	Diving: Not clear what this means
12.2	Plan	Diving: Should be added in time, right now we need more funding.
Water Quality		
13.0	Update beach closures and microbial contamination action plan	<p>AMBAG: Impacts health and safety</p> <p>At-Large (Southern): Water quality is a very high priority issue for protection of all Sanctuary resources. 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. Updating the beach closures and microbial contamination plan is important. Monitoring and collaborating with partner agencies to identify these pollutants and impacts is vital to assess the health of the Sanctuary. Addressing runoff from urban and rural landscapes to research and implement mitigation is a key to addressing impacts. As the transition zone between the land and ocean, incorporating wetland and riparian areas into a revised</p> <p>Diving: Monitoring is done by the county health departments, the current action plans in place by those organization work well in notifying the public. It would be helpful to understand the causes when these events occur so we could better look at our oversight and determine are there items and issues that MBNMS should address from a management standpoint.</p>
13.1	Delete Cruise Ship Discharges Plan and incorporate continued collaboration with US Coast Guard and City of Monterey on cruise ship inspections into Ops and	<p>AMBAG: This plan has room for modifications and has economic impacts to the region.</p> <p>Diving: I happen to manage the cruise ship business for the City of Monterey. We have advocated to the Coast Guard more security and oversight during visits. The Regional Water Resource Board and USCG now complete random inspections of vessel operations. We would like to see more of them while in the Sanctuary waters.</p>
13.2	Revise regional monitoring and data access to focus on only those elements that MBNMS is lead or major partner	<p>At-Large (Southern): Streamline and efficiency vs. omitting information. Please clarify - provide examples that is generated.</p> <p>CA Natural Resource Agency: Focusing on regional priorities and data access is critical to helping to find sources of outside funding.</p> <p>CDFW: Given the above concerns expressed in Priority 2 in Exercise 3, the broad scope and complexity of water quality issues within the Sanctuary, and the limited financial resources within the Sanctuary office to administer and implement the Management Plan, it seems logical to focus on only those elements, as related to water quality, for which the Sanctuary is the lead or a major partner. The Sanctuary has limited resources to devote to monitoring and data access and should consider the following: 1) how to maximize efforts by collaborating with other monitoring entities or clearinghouses (e.g., CenCOOS); 2) use the actions in Priority 2 Exercise 3</p> <p>Diving: Limit our scope where we can to save funding for those projects or items that need protection</p>
13.3	Incorporate wetland and riparian areas into revised action plan	<p>Fishing (Commercial): Confusing. If it is for testing, you need area outside the Sanctuary to compare. Only if no fishing activity is impacted.</p> <p>Diving: These protected areas are sensitive marine areas that affect our ecosystem. Natural wetlands should be incorporated</p>
Wildlife Disturbance		
Marine Mammal, Seabird and Turtle Disturbance		
14.0	Update enforcement strategies	<p>At-Large (Southern): The increase in foreign tourism, people interacting with wildlife, commercial wildlife watching and fishing operations are resulting in increasing wildlife disturbances (i.e., flushing, behavioral changes, whale and other marine mammal entanglements.)</p> <p>Diving: We need more man power for this vital aspect of Sanctuary Management. One is not enough...</p> <p>Research: The only reason to update them is to address the lack of NOAA OLA support.</p> <p>USCG: Recommend adding a Law Enforcement exemption for all Law Enforcement activity within the Sanctuary to allow for continued enforcement of wildlife</p> <p>AMBAG: Ensure the whale watch professional are at the table and can help.</p> <p>Conservation: More incidents reported recently and increased attention due to more public coverage of whales in and migrating through MBNMS.</p> <p>Conservation: Response in MBNMS, participate in statewide working groups.</p> <p>Diving: Absolutely, this is getting more problematic as whale populations grow.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): There is a growing concern by fishermen and communities that wave energy or similar alternatives that use ocean harvest area may be</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Allow only fishing related agencies to control whale dis-entanglement and use of best fishing practices set forth by NMFS Pacific Offshore Take</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Industry input. More info needed.</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

Advisory Council Comments

14.1	Address whale entanglement	<p>Harbors: The MBNMS should strongly support, with staff and vessel resources, a whale disentanglement team.</p> <p>Conservation: Overwhelming public comment on issue; multiple resource management/protection concerns.</p> <p>Conservation: Address seal deterrents.</p> <p>Diving: Absolutely, seal bombs, acoustic testing, or any other sonic producing apparatus is harmful. These activities need to be regulated in the Sanctuary and kept to</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): If agreeable to others involved.</p>
14.2	Assess and evaluate issues related to MBNMS' soundscape (Acoustics) [move to Ecosystem Management Plan]	<p>Harbors: Developing scientific information about the "soundscape" would be good, but does the MBNMS have the staff science capability to do this? And/or, does it</p> <p>Conservation: Explore sister sanctuary.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Leatherback Sea Turtle conservation work is fine if it excludes fishing related activities to avoid campaigns against fishing.</p> <p>Fishing (Recreational): I believe our work to help in the recover of the sea turtle population is of our greatest accomplishments. It brought people from different parts</p> <p>Research: Not clear what this entails. Important species, highly threatened. Good to help with.</p>
14.3	Continue Leatherback sea turtle conservation work	<p>Conservation: Due to more attention to Monterey Bay (e.g. Big Blue Live) and increased tourism, there have been more incidents of vessels, kayaks, etc. try to</p> <p>Diving: Intensification of Marine Mammal life and migration counts in connection with fishing activities, research, and whale watching uses.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Not a good idea. Marine Mammals are unpredictable. Address damage from sea lions to property and species of concern.</p> <p>Research: Only if not addressed by NMFS.</p>
14.4	Consider a marine mammal approach regulation	<p>USCG: Harassment of marine mammals is a difficult regulation to enforce under the Marine Mammal Protection Act as it does not define an exact distance to stay away from marine mammals. A marine mammal approach regulation, with a defined distance, would improve Coast Guard's ability to enforce marine mammal</p>
	Motorized Personal Watercraft	
15.0	Consider new permit requirements for volunteer safety group at Mavericks (as required for agencies)	<p>AMBAG: Important for Santa Cruz communities and AMBAG.</p> <p>Diving: No, to date their self management has proven affective. The current oversight by their respective organization has not failed. Allow them to self manage until</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Mavericks. Allow MPWC during high surf safety conditions called "Advisory" rather than issue permits.</p> <p>Recreation: The safety issue in surfing large waves has been resonated by big wave (Maverick) surfers who want to use their MPWC's in rescue operations. By considering and implementing a new permit process, the MBNMS/GFNMS will be more in line with worldwide, accepted safety practices for this activity. When developing this new process, representatives from the user group (including other safety groups), should be consulted to gather what is the most current 'best practice'</p>
15.1	Consider change to regulation to allow access to Mavericks during High Surf Advisory during Dec-Feb. (see regs section below:C1)	<p>AMBAG: For the region, item 15.1 is important and it should be included as a priority issues. Mavericks is an important event and appeals to recreational users of the Sanctuary. To restrict the use of MPWC at this event is creating a continual hazard for those who are in the surf and may need rescue. During the high surf conditions</p> <p>AMBAG: For safety the regulations should be relaxed.</p> <p>Diving: 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</p> <p>Diving: Most important, Please make this change as soon as possible.</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Mavericks. Allow MPWC during high surf safety conditions called "Advisory" rather than issue permits.</p> <p>Harbors: The permit system created by the MBNMS (the "27 points") is not remotely practical. Specific to Mavericks, reducing the MPWC time to include "High Surf Advisory" conditions is a practical and broad solution. Other areas for MPWC use should be identified, and the current system of zones with buoys dropped. Very few</p> <p>Recreation: The safety issue in surfing large waves has been resonated by big wave (Maverick) surfers who want to use their MPWC's in rescue operations. By considering and implementing a new permit process, the MBNMS/GFNMS will be more in line with worldwide, accepted safety practices for this activity. When developing this new process, representatives from the user group (including other safety groups), should be consulted to gather what is the most current 'best practice'</p> <p>USCG: USCG is highly interested in any regulation changes involving Mavericks due to safety implications and potential search and rescue operations.</p>
	Tidepool Protection	
16.0	Extract the relevant outreach elements and move them to new Education and Outreach plan	<p>At-Large (Southern): Linked to the enforcement aspect - is there a need for sanctuary regulation protecting tidepools from trampling or disturbance?</p> <p>Diving: Yes, continuing to bring together the educational components under one heading will help us manage and fund this important area more effectively we</p> <p>Education: We feel that there should be some general reorganization and Education and Outreach has its own plan. This, we imagine, would include LiMPETS citizen</p> <p>Research: Here and elsewhere related to planning, the effort to rewrite plans and other documents should only be made if they result in better efficiency or results on</p>
Cross Cut Plans		
17.0	Update Ops and Admin Plan (per above)	

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Advisory Council Comments

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

17.1	Move Community Outreach relevant items to new Education and Outreach Plan	<p>Diving: Yes, continuing to bring together the educational components under one heading will help us manage and fund this important area more effectively we</p> <p>Education: We feel that there should be some general reorganization and Education and Outreach has its own plan. This, we imagine, would include LiMPETS citizen</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Advance document and Agenda distribution would eliminate public confusion at SAC meetings and better preparation by SAC members who</p>
17.2	Move Ecosystem Monitoring relevant items to new Research and Monitoring Plan	<p>Diving: Yes, simplification</p>
17.3	Use the new regional Maritime Heritage Plan to revise MHP plan	<p>Diving: Yes, simplification</p>
17.4	Incorporate Northern Management Area Action Plan relevant items into appropriate action plans (Ed & OR,	<p>Conservation: MBNMS should manage Northern Management Area, not GFNMS.</p> <p>Diving: Yes, simplification</p>
Regulations		
R1	Clarify shoreward boundary lines across the entrances of annual and seasonal streams and lagoons	<p>Diving: Would help in planning and management boundaries</p> <p>Fishing (Commercial): Work with and property owners who should support and /or agree.</p> <p>Harbors: This should be done if there is agreement from the property owners.</p> <p>Research: This seems to apply mostly to berm breaching. Is specifically helpful or problematic?</p>
R2	Clarify boundary points for MPWC zones to make buoy maintenance more efficient	<p>Diving: We do not see the problem with the current buoyage system. The points are clearly marked and correspondingly printed information sheets are clear as well. We will need to understand this comment before making judgement. If it is a cost issue in maintaining the buoys, then we suggested terminating one zone. They are</p> <p>Harbors: The permit system created by the MBNMS (the "27 points") is not remotely practical. Specific to Mavericks, reducing the MPWC time to include "High Surf Advisory" conditions is a practical and broad solution. Other areas for MPWC use should be identified, and the current system of zones with buoys dropped. Very few</p>
R3	Consider new regulation to explicitly allow NOAA to assess a vessel owner for the cost of salvage and removal of the vessel by the government, should the owner not take sufficient action to remove the threat of an oil spill, discharge, or abandonment in the sanctuary	<p>At-Large (Northern): Allow NOAA to access vessel and resources for cost recovery. This is a basic tool that MBNMS should have. Other agencies have this authority. The number of vessels transiting MBNMS will increase, and currently there are a number of vessels involved in illegal activity, meaning their owners will not have the</p> <p>At-Large (Southern): Should this include abandoned fishing gear?</p> <p>Diving: Currently the USCG will pay for clean up for a vessel that causes a hazmat spill if the owner will not. However, USCG will not pay for salvage or vessel removal if NO Hazmat situation exists. We think this is an important topic. Our suggestion is to duplicate the USCG plan when the USCG cannot fund the response for an</p> <p>Harbors: It is hard to imagine a federal regulation that would also be just and fair in many circumstances. What about the situation where a person or family is already financially ruined by the loss of the vessel? What about if the owner dies in the beaching, will the surviving family be forced to also pay for removal? Harbors suggest</p>
Definition Changes to Consider		
D1	Modify MPWC definition as necessary to address remote controlled MPWC	<p>At-Large (Southern): Is this a threat? Need more info.</p> <p>Diving: Yes, add the language to reflect common element restrictions</p> <p>Education: This seems like a relatively simple wording issue that could be done quickly through a SAC vote.</p> <p>Harbors: We don't understand what the problem is being addressed? Toy boats?</p>
D2	Modify definition of "motorized aircraft" to include model aircraft and unmanned aircraft	<p>AMBAG: This is important for many communities in Monterey Bay!</p> <p>Diving: Model Aircraft is too broad and would include Radio Controlled gliders and slope soarers commonly used along the coastlines.</p> <p>Education: This seems like a relatively simple wording issue that could be done quickly through a SAC vote.</p> <p>Harbors: A new federal regulation is not the right approach. There are existing state and federal laws re the harassment of marine mammals and birds that can be</p>
D3	Define an anchored vessel condition that "creates potential for a grounding, discharge, or deposit."	<p>At-Large (Southern): Need more information - why is this necessary?</p> <p>Diving: This is an important topic in that defining or determining if a vessel meets the definition of "potential" is not black and white. A well moored vessel in more</p> <p>Education: This seems like a relatively simple wording issue that could be done quickly through a SAC vote.</p> <p>Harbors: A federal regulation and enforcement is not the right approach. Use education and warnings about existing penalties for pollution, etc, to obtain needed</p>
D4	Define "mean high water"; describe how it is derived (based on NOAA methodology), its relation to mean high tide, and how often it changes	<p>AMBAG: Connected to beach nourishment and dealing with beach erosion.</p> <p>Diving: These areas would change with every season and every year. The costs to resurvey and construct maps every year would be wasteful. Maybe consider a new</p> <p>Harbors: We presume this is not a boundary change; rather, it is an educational effort to advise where the MBNMS shore side boundary is.</p> <p>Research: This seems to apply mostly to berm breaching. Is this specifically helpful or problematic?</p> <p>Diving: Emergency's should be defined as: (1) Life threatening (2) Hazardous material spill in which the environment maybe affected (3) Significant habitat harm</p>

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Management Plan Review Exercise 2 and 4
Advisory Council**

**Staff Identified Issue / Topic / Recommendation
from Management Plan Status Report**

Advisory Council Comments

Key:
 Priority comment from Exercise 4
 Extra comments from Exercise 2

D5	Define "emergency." Clarify what an emergency is and who determines when an emergency exception applies under MBNMS regulations	<p>Harbors: We are not sure what problem this addresses. If it is meant to change the meaning to not allow MPWC to be used for "emergencies", in a broad meaning, we</p> <p>Recreation: Should a situation arise that needs an emergency response, who makes that determination and how? A clear definition is needed to clarify what an emergency actual is. So, if an emergency exception is needed, under MBNMS regulations, the determining authority can then act swiftly and directly to address that</p>
D6	Modify cruise ship definition to include "condo-style" cruise ships, where berths are owned rather than	<p>Diving: These are SOLIS vessels under the same restrictions as cruise ships except for security requirements imposed by the DHS. They can be inspected and</p> <p>Harbors: A federal rule change seems unnecessary for the very few visits Monterey has from such nonSolas vessels. And, the City of Monterey still requires these</p>
Clarifications		
C1	Reduce required High Surf Warning condition for MPWC operations at Mavericks to a High Surf Advisory condition	<p>Diving: 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</p> <p>Diving: Please incorporate this as soon as possible.</p> <p>Harbors: Agree, for Mavericks. The permit system created by the MBNMS (the "27 points") is not remotely practical. Specific to Mavericks, reducing the MPWC time to include "High Surf Advisory" conditions is a practical and broad solution. Other areas for MPWC use should be identified, and the current system of zones with buoys</p>
C2	Modify overflight exceptions to read "valid, non-training law enforcement purposes."	<p>Education: This seems like a relatively simple wording issue that could be done quickly through a SAC vote.</p> <p>USCG: USCG believes in strong need for training exemptions in addition to active law enforcement case exemptions. In order for Coast Guard to execute all statutorily mandated missions to include search and rescues, law enforcement, and living marine resources, various training must be complete. Many USCG assets do not have</p> <p>USCG: USCG also believes in strong need for training exemptions.</p>
C3	Modify seaward boundary lines for overflight zones from arcs to straight lines	<p>At-Large (Southern): What problem are you trying to fix? Need more info.</p> <p>Diving: Please leave airspace management to FAA</p>
C4	Identify in regulation what distance spectators must keep from certain species of whales (blue, fin, humpback, gray and orca).	<p>At-Large (Northern): Already in MMPA</p> <p>Diving: Being an active Monterey Bay captain this is not as simple as it seems. Though we agree with keeping a distance from marine mammals and not disturbing them we have been at anchor during diving operations and had marine mammals approach our vessel to feed on the forage fish species that congregate in the shadow of our vessel. We have been reported as being to close, though when we anchored no marine mammals were nearby. We support the distance concept</p> <p>Education: Too hard to enforce; too hard for tourists to adhere to strict distances. "Disturbing" allowed for more room for interpretation from authorities.</p> <p>Harbors: Don't create a federal regulation. Whales travel fast and are often underwater. Continue to utilize a strong public and industry educational program.</p> <p>Recreation: It was the agreement of our seat that some definition of a safety distance from certain species of whales is warranted BUT that sometimes the animals themselves are to blame by getting too close to spectators in the water. Hence, a specific regulation defining specific distance may prove to be an exercise in futility</p>
C5	Modify 15 CFR922.132(c)(1) or 2008n FEIS to reference 2009 letter to USAF regarding USAF exempted	<p>At-Large (Southern): Need more info.</p>
C6	Consistent with other national marine sanctuaries, add prohibition against tampering with MBNMS signage, buoys or other property.	<p>Education: This seems like a relatively simple wording issue that could be done quickly through a SAC vote.</p>