

Voting Members

Deborah Streeter
Representative At-Large
Chair

Thomas Canale
Fishing
Vice Chair

Kaitilin Gaffney
Conservation
Secretary

Kirk Schmidt
Agriculture

Brian Baird
CA Resources Agency

David Vincent
CA State Parks

Tracey Weiss
Education

Frank Degnan
Diving

Nancy Black
Business/Industry

Michael Bekker
Tourism

Charles Lester
CA Coastal Commission

Christopher Harrold
Research

Mike Laffen
Representative At-Large

Margaret Webb
Representative At-Large

Dan Haifley
Recreation

Howard Egan
Recreational Fishing

Brian Foss
Harbors

Stephanie Harlan
AMBAG

Russ Jeffries
CA EPA-RWQCB

Paul Reilly
CA Dept of Fish and Game

**Non-Voting
Members**

LTJG Jacob Gustafson
US Coast Guard

Becky Christensen
Elkhorn Slough NERR

Chris Mobley
Channel Islands NMS

Maria Brown
Gulf of the Farallones

Dan Howard
Cordell Bank NMS

William Douros
Monterey Bay NMS

**Sanctuary Advisory Council
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary**

299 Foam Street
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 647-4201

Dec. 30, 2006

Holly Price, Acting Sanctuary Superintendent
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
299 Foam St.
Monterey, CA 93950

RE: Sanctuary Advisory Council Comments on the Draft Management
Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Dr. Price,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Monterey Bay National
Marine Sanctuary Draft Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact
Statement.

At our Dec. 7, 2006 Advisory Council meeting we developed the attached
comments on the final draft. Rather than voting, we sought consensus on
each action plan, and we indicate when we all agreed. In addition we add
non-consensus comments.

We are very pleased to see the formal release of the documents at long last.

Although the attached set of comments is relatively brief, our strong interest in
the plan is evident from our long history of involvement in shaping the issues
and recommendations contained in the document.

Beginning in 2001, many Advisory Council members participated in the
scoping meetings for the Management Plan. In 2002 we devoted several
meetings to prioritizing the many issues identified in the scoping workshops.
Many of us participated in a variety of the multistakeholder committees
established in 2003 to evaluate each priority issue and develop
recommendations on how the issue should be addressed in the action plans.

In the summer and fall of 2003, the Advisory Council devoted three meetings
to reviewing and commenting on the draft action plans, and ultimately voted to
forward all of the action plans to be included in the documents, with various
specific recommendations for improvements.



We are proud of our role in helping to bring this effort to fruition--it is important blueprint for our future efforts.

We also know that this plan document is only as valuable as the work that actually gets done to carry it out--most of which still lies ahead. We trust that NOAA will provide adequate funding and staffing to carry out the work, in collaboration with many sanctuary partners.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Deborah Streeter".

Deborah Streeter, Chair

**Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Sanctuary Advisory Council
Comments on the Sanctuary's Draft Management Plan / DEIS
December 15, 2006**

The following pages provide numbered comments that Sanctuary Advisory Council representatives provided on the sanctuary's Draft Management Plan / Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DMP/DEIS) during the December 15, 2006 Advisory Council meeting. A meeting attendance record is included at the end of this attachment and shows which Advisory Council representatives were present at the time the Advisory Council passed a motion to submit these comments to Holly Price (Acting Sanctuary Superintendent). Regarding the format, comments are listed by Action Plan or Regulation with consensus comments listed first, then comments by one or more individual members listed below as "non-consensus" comment.

The SAC supports the following plans as currently written:

- **Emerging Issues**
- **Operations and Administration**
- **Performance Evaluation**
- **Fishing Related Education and Research**
- **Interpretive Facilities**
- **Ocean Literacy**
- **Beach Closures**
- **Water Quality Protection Program**
- **Marine Mammals Seabirds & Turtles**
- **SIMoN**
- **Tidepools**
- **Big Sur Coastal Ecosystem**
- **Cross cutting**
 - **Admin and ops**
 - **Community Outreach**
 - **Ecosystem Monitoring**
 - **Maritime Heritage**
 - **Northern Management Area Transition**

Davidson Seamount

Consensus comments:

- The SAC supports inclusion of Davidson Seamount in the MBNMS as proposed in the Management Plan, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the proposed Regulations

Non-consensus comments:

- Recognize potential need for NMSA regulations in the future
- Fishing regulations shall only be set by PFMC in the future

Cruise Ships

Consensus comments:

- The SAC supports the regulation of cruise ship discharges in the Sanctuary

Non-consensus comments:

- Regulations need to be defined as "harmful"
- Regulations as currently written (without "harmful") are appropriate
- The Alaska alternative is not viable

Introduced Species

Consensus comment

- The SAC supports the regulation of release of introduced species in the Sanctuary
- The SAC supports the interagency coordination efforts as outlined in the plan

Non-consensus comments:

- The MBNMS will obtain concurrence from any local jurisdiction that will be affected by a sanctuary regulation aimed at preventing or managing an introduced species before such a regulation takes effect.

MPWC

Consensus comments:

- The SAC was unable to reach consensus on this issue and recommends that NOAA look at individual SAC member comments as they relate to MPWCs

Non-consensus comments:

- The issue of MPWC should be referred back to a multi-stakeholder working group for resolution

Harbors and Dredge

Consensus comments:

- The SAC supports the Harbors and Dredge Action Plan as currently drafted

Non-consensus comments:

- Sanctuary status will not reduce the ability of a harbor to transport and deposit dredge material to disposal sites. The Sanctuary's role will be to comment to local, state, and federal agencies that have direct responsibility to permit dredging operations, including dredged material disposal. Sanctuary comments should be based on the best available science.

Other regulations

- White shark attraction beyond 3nm

Consensus comments:

The SAC supports the proposed regulation as drafted.

- Deserting a vessel

Consensus comment:

The SAC supports the regulation as drafted but with the addition of clarifying language regarding the intent and preemptive application of the regulation

- Possession of Sanctuary historical resource

Consensus comment:

The SAC supports the proposed regulation as drafted

- Leaving harmful matter aboard a grounded or deserted vessel

Consensus comment:

The SAC supports the proposed regulation as drafted

- Locking marine sanitation devices to prevent discharge
Consensus comment:
The SAC supports the proposed regulation as drafted with the addition of an educational component to increase understanding of the vessel discharge regulations

- Allowing for discharge of generator cooling water, anchor wash, and clean bilge water
Consensus comment:
The SAC supports the proposed regulation as drafted

MPAs

Non-consensus comments:

- The plan should contain improved performance measures
- Fishing regulations should be created by the Pacific Fishery Management Council
- The Sanctuary should retain its authority to issue regulations under the NMSA
- The plan should contain specific dates for completion
- The structure and function of the MPA working group needs to be reexamined
- Affirm that the MPA action plan is appropriate
- The passage of time has demonstrated a lack of need for the MPA action plan
- MPAs are an important conservation tool for the MBNMS

Bottom Trawling

Consensus comments:

The SAC supports the strategies of the plan as written except with the rewording of activities 6.4 and 6.5. Activity 6.4 should read: "Any proposed restrictions on trawling activities should consider the impact on the fishery participants and the community. Activity 6.5 should read: "The sanctuary may recommend management changes with input from..."

Non-consensus comments:

- Recognize potential need for NMSA regulations in the future
- Fishing regulations shall only be set by PFMC in the future
- Make the tone of the introduction more neutral regarding trawling activity

Submerged Cables

Consensus comments:

The SAC supports the strategies to minimize the environmental impacts of submerged cables

Non-consensus:

- The plan should not include reference to potential permitting mechanisms to allow for commercial cable projects
- Research cables may also have commercial benefits to the owners, so an assessment needs to be made as to whether fees are appropriate

Desalination

Consensus comments:

The SAC supports the plan with a modification to Activity 4.1 to state that academia and industry experts will be consulted to analyze plume modeling and conduct related scientific analysis

Coastal Armoring:

Consensus comments:

The SAC supports the plan with a clarification to Activity 1.4 to state that, "The Sanctuary should collaborate with other entities to quantify and compare the impact...and conditions".

* The SAC did not review or discuss the budget estimates contained in the draft

