

**Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries**  
**256 Figueroa Street #1, Monterey, CA 93940**  
**(831) 373-5238**  
[www.alliancefisheries.org](http://www.alliancefisheries.org)

**Alternate Analysis of Need for MBNMS MPAs**

General

This analysis should answer the question: Is there a “need” for additional MPAs within the boundary of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (including the proposed addition of the Davidson Seamount)? The “need” for additional MPAs will be in reference to the goals, purposes, and requirements of the National Marine Sanctuary Act. The need for additional MPAs (if any) will particularly address research and ecosystem health issues. The evaluation will consider how other regulations (e.g. Essential Fish Habitat and Rockfish Conservation Area closures, quotas, seasons, etc.), policies, and programs contribute to meeting the goals of the NMSP. These other regulations and programs include those of the MBNMS, PFMC, NMFS, USFW, EPA, Cal State DFG/FGC, the State RWQCB, the California Coastal Act, and others. The study region will be primarily the region of the MBNMS between Pigeon Point and Cambria, including the proposed addition of the Davidson-Seamount. The analysis will also consider the effects on ecosystem health and science study opportunities, of neighboring MPAs, and other spatial closures, both in place or likely within the biological region. The analysis will be based on the best available scientific information and methods.

Additionally, if this analysis reveals a need for an additional MPA (or multiple MPAs), it will include recommendations as to their (its) size, location, opportunities for integration with existing MPAs, and regulations, and clearly identify a threat or problem to be solved, as well as costs and potential negative environmental consequences.

It is intended that this analysis will eventually be presented to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and its Science Committee. This analysis is being conducted independent of the MBNMS MPA Workgroup process.

Possible outcomes of this evaluation will range from no new MPAs being needed to accomplish the goals of the NMSA, to recommendations for new MPAs, based on clear needs.

## The Science Team

This analysis will be led by Dr. Richard Parrish, who will contract with (or otherwise gain the assistance of) other scientists in the disciplines of fishery biology, fishery population dynamics, fish ecology, oceanography, and socio-economics. Stipends of between \$4,000 - \$8,000 are available, depending on the level of work.

Dr. Parrish will be deemed the “lead scientist” for this project. He will in turn develop a budget for this analysis, not to exceed \$50,000, including travel, printing, and contingency funds. Dr. Parrish and all other paid scientists will serve as independent contractors to the Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries, 256 Figueroa Street #1, Monterey, California 93940. Science team members may participate through in-person meetings, by email or tele/video conference.

## Stakeholders

The ACSF shall invite up to five (5) commercial and recreational fishermen, and a Coastal Community representative to provide stakeholder advice to this analysis. Additionally, the ACSF will invite a representative of the MBNMS, as well as a representative of the area’s conservation organizations, to provide their advice and insight to the analysis. The role of these stakeholders will be to provide information and advice to the Science Team, and to engage in active dialogue with the Science Team. Any new MPAs that might be recommended will be modeled (if appropriate) and discussed by the Science Team and stakeholders. While stakeholder support is a desired goal of this process, ultimately recommendations as to the need for and the placement of new MPA’s in the MBNMS will be up to the science team.

## Developing Approaches to Answering the “Need For” Question

One of the first tasks of the science team will be to identify a variety of relevant ways in which the need question can be analyzed. For example, the MBNMS MPAWG has created some guidelines for analyzing this question. These guidelines are not written into law, and they are not accepted by all MPAWG members. Nevertheless, they can serve as one lens through which the need for additional MPAs may be viewed, and existing MPAs/spatial closures may be evaluated. These guidelines address conservation, educational, social, and research goals. Please see attachment “A.”

Other approaches will be needed, such as determining if there is evidence that the ecosystem in the MBNMS region is in ill health. Also, the broad goal of the NMSA should serve as a basis for analysis: “to maintain the natural biological communities in the sanctuaries, and to protect, and, where appropriate, restore and enhance natural habitats, populations, and ecological processes.” The

achievement of this goal shall be weighted against the condition of the MBNMS as found at the time of its 1992 designation, and the evolution of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

During the “need for” analysis it should be noted that the NMSA is not a “wilderness” law, and is not aimed specifically at creating “wilderness” type areas. Therefore, although some members of the public believe some places in the ocean contain high intrinsic value, this alone does not appear to justify closing areas of the ocean to human use under the law. The NMSA can be viewed at [www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/FHPL\\_NtlMarineSanct.pdf](http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/FHPL_NtlMarineSanct.pdf)

If a need for additional MPAs is found, the analysis will discuss in general terms the socioeconomic costs and/or benefits of such an MPA or MPAs. Related to this, the analysis will discuss any potential negative environmental consequences that may result from fishermen changing their behavior as a result of new MPAs.

Finally, in answering the above questions, an opinion should be provided as to whether or not an MPA (or MPA network) is the best and most cost effective way of assuring ecosystem health, and if research and ecosystem health “needs” can be addressed by MPAs or essential fish habitat areas located outside the MBNMS.

### Budget

The budget for this analysis is attached as attachment “C”.

### Timeline

Assuming that the Science Team can be assembled by June 1, 2007, the analysis determining the need for, if any, for additional MPAs to be placed in the federal waters portion of the MBNMS should be complete by August 30, 2007. If the analysis shows a need for additional MPAs, a recommendation for the size, siting, and regulations for the MPA (or MPAs) will be provided by October 31, 2007. Presentations of the analysis and recommendations to the PFMC will follow.