
APPENDIX A-1

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

final affirmative scope determination; in response, the Court issued a final and conclusive court decision with respect to the rough forgings scope litigation.

The Court determined that the Department should liquidate entries of rough forgings suspended since the publication of the A-588-604 antidumping duty order in 1987 without re-opening or re-reviewing any closed segment of the proceeding. The Department considers as open any segments of an antidumping proceeding which were ongoing at the time the scope issue was first raised before the Department with respect to forgings (*i.e.*, as of Koyo's September 17, 1993 request for a scope inquiry). This decision thus requires liquidation under the TRBs order of all rough forgings entries suspended during any administrative review period open at the time the Department received the scope inquiry. Because the final results of the 1990-1992 reviews were not published until December 9, 1993 (*see Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan*, 58 FR 64720), which was after the date on which Koyo filed its scope inquiry, the Department will liquidate all entries of rough forgings suspended during the 1990-1992 review periods under the TRBs antidumping duty order. Therefore, we will issue instructions to Customs to liquidate all suspended entries of TRBs and forgings subject to the A-588-604 order manufactured by Koyo during these periods pursuant to these amended final results.

Amendment To Final Determinations

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e), we are now amending the final results of administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from Japan (A-588-604) for Koyo. The weighted-average margins are as follows:

Period	Final results margin (percent)
3/27/87-9/30/88	36.29
10/1/88-9/30/89	24.88
10/1/89-9/30/90	30.08
10/1/90-9/30/91	17.36
10/1/91-9/30/92	24.87

Appraisal Methodology

Accordingly, the Department will determine and Customs will assess appropriate antidumping duties on

entries of the subject merchandise manufactured/entered by Koyo covered by the reviews of the periods listed above. The Department will instruct Customs to liquidate TRBs manufactured by Koyo and entered into United States during the first three administrative review periods (1987-1988, 1988-1989, and 1989-1990) using the above-referenced weighted-average margins. As a result of the Court's decision with regard to the rough forgings scope litigation, the Department will instruct Customs to liquidate all suspended entries of TRBs and rough forgings manufactured by Koyo and entered into the United States between October 1, 1990 and September 30, 1992 using importer-specific assessment rates. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs.

Dated: October 15, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-28093 Filed 11-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Notice of Initiation of Joint Review of Management Plans/Regulations for the Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries; Intent To Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Statements and Management Plans; Scoping Meetings

AGENCY: Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce (DOC).

ACTION: Initiation of joint review of management plans/regulations; intent to prepare environmental impact statements; scoping meetings.

SUMMARY: Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary (CBNMS) was designated in 1989 and encompasses 526 square miles of open ocean off Point Reyes, California. Cordell Bank is a submerged island that reaches within 120 feet of the ocean surface. The upwelling of nutrient rich ocean waters and the bank's topography create one of the most biologically productive areas in North America. The present management plan was completed in 1989.

Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (GFNMS) is located

along the California coast west of the San Francisco Bay area. It was designated in 1981 and encompasses 1,255 square miles. The Gulf of the Farallones is rich in marine resources, including spawning grounds and nursery areas for commercially valuable species, at least 36 species of marine mammals, and 15 species of breeding seabirds. The present management plan was completed in 1987.

Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) stretches along 276 miles of the central California coast and encompasses 5,328 square miles of coastal and ocean waters. It was designated in 1992 and contains many diverse biological communities, including sandy bottom and rocky outcrop habitats, the nation's largest expanse of kelp forests, one of the deepest underwater canyons in North America, and a vast open ocean habitat. The present management plan was completed in 1992.

The National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) is jointly reviewing the management plans for all three sanctuaries. These sanctuaries are located adjacent to one another, managed by the same program, and share many of the same resources and issues. In addition, all three sites share many overlapping interest and user groups. It is also more cost-effective for the program to review the three sites jointly rather than conducting three independent reviews.

In accordance with section 304(e) of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, as amended, (NMSA) (16 U.S.C. 1431 *et seq.*), the Marine Sanctuaries Division (MSD) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is initiating a review of the management plans, to evaluate substantive progress toward implementing the goals for the Sanctuaries, and to make revisions to the plans and regulations as necessary to fulfill the purposes and policies of the NMSA.

The proposed revised management plans will likely involve changes to existing policies and regulations of the Sanctuary, to address contemporary issues and challenges, and to better protect and manage the Sanctuaries resources and qualities. The review process is composed of four major stages: information collection and characterization; preparation and release of a draft management plan/environmental impact statement, and any proposed amendments to the regulations; public review and comment; preparation and release of a final management plan/environmental impact statement, and any final amendments to the regulations. NOAA

anticipates completion of the revised management plans and concomitant documents will require approximately eighteen to twenty-four months.

NOAA will conduct public scoping meetings to gather information and other comments from individuals, organizations, and government agencies on the scope, types and significance of issues related to the sanctuaries management plans and regulations. The scoping meetings are scheduled starting on November 28, and are detailed below.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before January 31, 2002.

Scoping meetings will be held at:

- (1) Wednesday, November 28, 2001, 1 P.M. and 6:30 P.M. in Santa Cruz*, CA.
- (2) Thursday, November 29, 2001, 1 P.M. and 6:30 P.M. in Monterey*, CA.
- (3) Saturday, December 1, 2001, 1 PM in Salinas*, CA.
- (4) Monday, December 3, 2001, 6:30 P.M. in San Luis Obispo, CA.
- (5) Tuesday, December 4, 2001, 6:30 P.M. in Cambria, CA.
- (6) Wednesday, December 5, 2001, 6:30 P.M. in Big Sur, CA.
- (7) Thursday, December 6, 2001, 6:30 P.M. in Half Moon Bay, CA.
- (8) Friday, December 7, 2001, 8:30 A.M. in Half Moon Bay, CA.
- (9) Tuesday, December 11, 2001, 10 A.M.—2 P.M. in Sacramento, CA.
- (10) Friday, December 14, 2001, 10 A.M.—12:30 P.M. in Washington, DC.
- (11) Monday, January 7, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in Gualala, CA.
- (12) Tuesday, January 8, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in Bodega Bay, CA.
- (13) Wednesday, January 9, 2002, 7:30 P.M. in Pt. Reyes Station, CA.
- (14) Thursday, January 10, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in San Rafael, CA.
- (15) Monday, January 14, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in Rohnert Park, CA.
- (16) Tuesday, January 15, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in San Francisco, CA.
- (17) Wednesday, January 16, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in Pacifica, CA.
- (18) Thursday, January 17, 2002, 6:30 P.M. in San Jose*, CA.

* Spanish Translation Available

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be sent to either of the following addresses: Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries, Anne Walton, Management Plan Coordinator, Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123, (415) 561-6622 phone, (415) 561-6616 fax, Anne.Walton@noaa.gov.
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Sean Morton, Management Plan Coordinator, 299 Foam Street, Monterey, CA 93940, (831) 647-4217 phone, (831) 647-4250 fax, Sean.Morton@noaa.gov.

Comments will be available for public review at the same addresses. Comments may also be submitted on the Joint Management Plan Website at <http://sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/jointplan> or via e-mail at jointplancomments@noaa.gov.

Scoping meetings will be held at:

- (1) Santa Cruz Civic Center, 307 Church Street, Santa Cruz, CA, 95060.
- (2) Monterey Conference Center, One Portola Plaza, Monterey, CA, 93940.
- (3) Hartnell College, 156 Homestead Avenue, Salinas, CA, 93901.
- (4) San Luis Obispo Public Library, 995 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93401.
- (5) Cambria Grammer School, 1350 Main Street, Cambria, CA, 93428.
- (6) Big Sur Lodge at Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park, 47225 Pacific Coast Highway One, Big Sur, CA, 93920.
- (7) Ted Adcock Community Center, 535 Kelly Avenue, Half Moon Bay, CA, 94019.
- (8) Douglas Beach House, 311 Mirada Road, Half Moon Bay, CA, 94019.
- (9) Sheraton Grand Sacramento, Compagno Room, 1230 J Street, Sacramento, CA, 95814.
- (10) U.S. Department of Commerce, Herbert C. Hoover Bldg., Rooms 6800 & 6802, 14th Street and Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC, 20230.
- (11) Gualala Arts Center, 46501 Old State Highway, Gualala, CA, 95445.
- (12) Bodega Marine Laboratory, 2099 Westside Road, Bodega Bay, CA, 94923.
- (13) Point Reyes Dance Palace, Main Hall, 5th and B Street, Pt. Reyes Station, CA, 94956.
- (14) Marin Center, Hospitality Room and Six Meeting Rooms, Avenue of the Flags, North San Pedro Road, San Rafael, CA, 94903.
- (15) Doubletree Hotel, Rohnert Park, Salons 3 & 4, One Doubletree Drive, Rohnert Park, CA, 94928.
- (16) Marina Middle School, 3500 Fillmore Street, San Francisco, CA, 94123.
- (17) Oceana High School, 401 Paloma Avenue, Pacifica, CA, 94044.
- (18) Santa Clara County Office of Education, 1290 Ridder Park Drive, San Jose, CA, 95131.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries, Anne Walton, Management Plan Coordinator, Fort Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, CA 94123, (415) 561-6622, Anne.Walton@noaa.gov.

-or-

Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Sean Morton, Management Plan Coordinator, 299 Foam Street, Monterey, CA 93940, (831) 647-4217, Sean.Morton@noaa.gov.

Information about the Joint Management Plan Review can also be found on the Internet at: <http://sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/jointplan>.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.429 Marine Sanctuary Program)

Authority: 16 U.S.C. section 1431 *et seq.*

Jamison S. Hawkins,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.

[FR Doc. 01-28054 Filed 11-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Bangladesh

November 2, 2001.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 8, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ross Arnold, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port, call (202) 927-5850, or refer to the U.S. Customs website at <http://www.customs.gov>. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, refer to the Office of Textiles and Apparel website at <http://otexa.ita.doc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

The current limits for Categories 352/652 and 369-S are being increased for carryforward.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the **CORRELATION:** Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 65 FR 82328, published on December 28, 2000). Also

APPENDIX A-2

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE A
SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT**

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration****15 CFR Part 922****Notice of Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Proposed Rule Limiting Discharges From Vessels in Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries**

AGENCY: National Marine Sanctuary Program, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) is preparing a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) to supplement and/or replace information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Joint Management Plan Review, the management plan review for the Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries. The SDEIS will analyze revisions to the proposed action that would in effect prohibit the following discharges within the sanctuaries: All sewage from vessels 300 gross registered tons (GRT) or more with the capacity to hold sewage while within the sanctuary; and, in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, all graywater from vessels 300 GRT or more with the capacity to hold graywater while within the sanctuary.

DATES: Because the NMSP has previously requested (64 FR 31528 and 71 FR 29096) and received extensive information from the public on issues to be addressed in the SDEIS, and because the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) do not require additional scoping for this SDEIS process (40 CFR 1502.9(c)(4)), the NMSP is not asking for further public scoping information and comment at this time. Upon release of the SDEIS the NMSP will provide a 45-day public review/comment period.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the 2006 DEIS are available at NOAA offices located at 1 Bear Valley Rd., Point Reyes Station, CA; West Crissy Field on the Presidio, 991 Marine Drive, San Francisco, CA, 299 Foam Street, Monterey, California,

and on the Web at <http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/jointplan/>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sean Morton at (301) 713-7264 or sean.morton@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has proposed draft revised management plans, revised designation documents, and revised regulations for the Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary (CBNMS), Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary (GFNMS), and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS). The proposed regulations would revise and provide greater clarity to existing regulations. In particular, NOAA proposed changes to prohibitions regarding "discharge and deposit" in the MBNMS, and prohibiting discharging or depositing most matter from cruise ships.

On May 11, 2007 NOAA received a request from the California State Water Resources Control Board to prohibit discharges from certain vessels in national marine sanctuaries offshore California. In addition, on August 10, 2007, the California Coastal Commission voted to concur with the consistency finding the Jmpr actions are consistent with the policies of the California Coastal Management Program, on the condition that NOAA revise the proposed discharge and deposit regulation to prohibit vessels of 300 gross registered tons (GRT) or more from discharging sewage or graywater into the waters of the sanctuaries. After reviewing public comments on the proposed regulations, considering the California Coastal Commission's federal consistency review (per the Coastal Zone Management Act; 16 U.S.C. 1451 *et seq.*), and further analyzing vessel discharge issues, NOAA decided to revise the CBNMS, GFNMS, and MBNMS proposed discharge regulations to prohibit discharges of all sewage from vessels 300 gross registered tons (GRT) or more with the capacity to hold sewage while within the sanctuary; and in the MBNMS limit the exception for graywater discharges to vessels less than 300 GRT and vessels 300 GRT or more without the capacity to hold graywater while within the MBNMS. The revised proposed regulations will include prohibitions satisfying the request from the State of California for the CBNMS, GFNMS, and MBNMS.

The SDEIS, in conjunction with the concomitant supplemental proposed rule, will evaluate the revised proposed action and provide the public with an opportunity for additional review and comment.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1431 *et seq.*

Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.429 Marine Sanctuary Program.

Dated: November 15, 2007.

Elizabeth R. Scheffler,

Associate Assistant Administrator for Management, Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.

[FR Doc. E7-22710 Filed 11-20-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-NK-P

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION**17 CFR Part 150****RIN 3038-AC140****Revision of Federal Speculative Position Limits**

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("Commission") periodically reviews the speculative position limits for certain agricultural commodities set out in Commission regulation 150.2 ("Federal speculative position limits"). In this regard, the Commission has reviewed the existing levels for Federal speculative position limits and is now proposing to increase these limits for all single-month and all-months-combined positions in all commodities except oats, based on the formula set out in Commission Regulation 150.5(c). In addition, the Commission is also proposing to aggregate traders' positions for purposes of ascertaining compliance with Federal speculative position limits when a designated contract market ("DCM") lists for trading a futures contract that shares substantially identical terms with a Regulation 150.2-enumerated contract listed on another DCM, including a futures contract that is cash-settled based on the settlement prices for a futures contract that is already enumerated. The Commission is requesting comment on these rule amendments.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 21, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to David Stawick, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581. Comments also may be sent by facsimile to (202) 418-5521, or by electronic mail to secretary@cftc.gov. Reference should be made to "Proposed Revision of Federal Speculative Position Limits." Comments may also be

submitted by connecting to the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov> and following comment submission instructions.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Heitman, Attorney, Division of Market Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581, telephone (202) 418-5041, facsimile number (202) 418-5507, electronic mail dheitman@cftc.gov; or Martin Murray, Economist, Division of Market Oversight, telephone (202) 418-5276, facsimile number (202) 418-5507, electronic mail mmurray@cftc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

A. Introduction

The Commission has long established and enforced speculative position limits for futures contracts on various agricultural commodities. The Commission periodically reviews these Federal speculative position limits, which are set out in Commission regulation 150.2.¹ In this regard, the Commission has reviewed the existing levels for Federal speculative position limits and is now proposing to increase these limits for all single-month and all-months-combined positions in all commodity markets enumerated in Commission regulation 150.2, except Chicago Board of Trade (“CBT”) Oats, based on the formula set out in Commission Regulation 150.5(c). In particular, the Commission is proposing to increase levels for single-month and all-months-combined positions for CBT Corn, Soybeans, Wheat, Soybean Oil, and Soybean Meal; Minneapolis Grain Exchange (MGE) Hard Red Spring Wheat; Kansas City Board of Trade (KCBT) Hard Winter Wheat, and New York Board of Trade (NYBOT) Cotton No. 2. The spot month limits for all of these commodities would remain unchanged. In addition, the Commission is also proposing to aggregate traders’ positions for purposes of ascertaining compliance with Federal speculative position limits when a DCM lists for trading a futures contract that shares substantially identical terms with a Regulation 150.2-enumerated contract listed on another DCM, including a futures contract that is cash-settled based on the settlement prices for a

¹ Regulation 150.2 imposes three types of position limits for each specified contract: A spot month limit, a single-month limit, and an all-months-combined limit. The Commission most recently adopted amendments to levels for Federal speculative position limits in 2005 (see 70 FR 24705 May 11, 2005).

futures contract that is already enumerated.

B. Regulatory Framework

Speculative position limits have been a tool for the regulation of the U.S. futures markets since the adoption of the Commodity Exchange Act of 1936. Section 4a(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (Act), 7 U.S.C. 6a(a), states that:

Excessive speculation in any commodity under contracts of sale of such commodity for future delivery made on or subject to the rules of contract markets or derivatives transaction execution facilities causing sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of such commodity, is an undue and unnecessary burden on interstate commerce in such commodity.

Accordingly, section 4a(a) provides the Commission with the authority to:

Fix such limits on the amounts of trading which may be done or positions which may be held by any person under contracts of sale of such commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any contract market or derivatives transaction execution facility as the Commission finds are necessary to diminish, eliminate, or prevent such burden.

This longstanding statutory framework providing for Federal speculative position limits was supplemented with the passage of the Futures Trading Act of 1982, which acknowledged the role of exchanges in setting their own speculative position limits. The 1982 legislation also provided, under section 4a(e) of the Act, that limits set by exchanges and approved by the Commission were subject to Commission enforcement.

Finally, the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 (“CFMA”) established designation criteria and core principles with which a DCM must comply to receive and maintain designation. Among these, Core Principle 5 in section 5(d) of the Act states:

Position Limitations or Accountability—To reduce the potential threat of market manipulation or congestion, especially during trading in the delivery month, the board of trade shall adopt position limitations or position accountability for speculators, where necessary and appropriate.

As outlined above, the regulatory structure is administered under a two-pronged framework. Under the first prong, the Commission establishes and enforces speculative position limits for futures contracts on a limited group of agricultural commodities. These Federal speculative position limits are enumerated in Commission regulation 150.2, and apply to the following

futures and option markets: CBT Corn, Oats, Soybeans, Wheat, Soybean Oil, and Soybean Meal; MGE Hard Red Spring Wheat; NYBOT Cotton No. 2; and KCBT Hard Winter Wheat. Under the second prong, individual DCMs establish and enforce their own speculative position limits or position accountability provisions, subject to Commission oversight and separate authority to enforce exchange-set speculative position limits approved by the Commission. Thus, responsibility for enforcement of speculative position limits is shared by the Commission and the DCMs.²

II. Commission Speculative Position Limit Levels

The Commission is proposing several revisions to the Federal speculative position limit levels found in regulation 150.2 based upon its experience in administering these limits and the open interest formula found in Commission Regulation 150.5. Under the proposed revisions, spot month limits would remain unchanged from the current levels, but every single-month and all-months-combined position limit, except for CBT Oats, would be increased based upon open interest data for the most recent calendar year (2006). For all-months-combined levels, the Commission proposes to amend the limits set forth in Regulation 150.2 to the maximum levels permitted under the open interest formula, and to adjust the single month limits to reflect the existing ratio of single month to all-months-combined levels. With respect to the single month limits, a strict application of the open interest formula contained in regulation 150.5 would have resulted in somewhat lower single month limits for some commodities and higher limits for others than those proposed below. However, the Commission believes that maintaining the existing ratios between single-month and all-months-combined speculative position limit levels is of benefit to the marketplace, and thus the Commission is proposing to establish single-month limits that are consistent with that

² Provisions regarding the establishment of exchange-set speculative position limits were originally set forth in CFTC regulation 1.61. In 1999, the Commission simplified and reorganized its rules by relocating the substance of regulation 1.61’s requirements to part 150 of the Commission’s rules, thereby incorporating within part 150 provisions for both Federal speculative position limits and exchange-set speculative position limits (see 64 FR 24038, May 5, 1999). Section 4a(e) of the Act provides that a violation of a speculative position limit set by a Commission-approved exchange rule is also a violation of the Act. Thus, the Commission can enforce directly violations of exchange-set speculative position limits as well as those provided under Commission rules.

approach.³ The open interest formula does not justify an increase in the CBT Oats single month or all-months-combined limits, and the Commission does not propose any change in their levels at this time.

In addition, with respect to the MGE and KCBT Wheat contracts, the Commission proposes to maintain parity with the levels proposed for CBT Wheat rather than establish different limits based on the open interest formula for each contract. The Commission first adopted this parity approach in an action to revise position limits in 1993.⁴ At that time the Commission concluded that the breadth and liquidity of the cash markets underlying the KCBT and MGE Wheat contracts justified setting these limits at parity with little risk of regulatory harm from such action.⁵ The Commission continues to believe that the breadth and liquidity of underlying cash markets, as well as continued growth in open interest, for the KCBT and MGE Wheat contracts support

maintenance of these speculative position limit levels at parity with one another.⁶

Finally, the Commission is also proposing to aggregate traders' positions for purposes of ascertaining compliance with Federal speculative position limits when a DCM lists for trading a futures contract that shares substantially identical terms with a Regulation 150.2-enumerated contract listed on another DCM, including a futures contract that is cash-settled based on the settlement prices for a futures contract that is already enumerated. In this regard, when the Commission last amended regulation 150.2, it clarified its practice of aggregating traders' positions when a single DCM lists for trading two or more contracts with substantially identical terms based on the same underlying commodity characteristics, such as the CBT Corn and Mini-Corn futures contracts.⁷ At the time it adopted those clarifying amendments, the Commission noted, "that should a DCM list a

contract that shared substantially identical terms with a Regulation 150.2-enumerated contract listed on another DCM, the Commission could consider at that time whether to amend regulation 150.2 to likewise apply Federal limits to the newly-listed contract." Since then, the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX) has listed for trading a Cotton futures contract that is cash-settled based on the settlement price for the NYBOT Cotton No. 2 futures contract. The Commission believes that aggregation of traders' positions in such circumstances is necessary to protect the integrity of the existing limits by removing the ability of a trader to flout the limits by taking a position in the non-encumbered market.

Based on the criteria noted above, the Commission is proposing the following changes to the Federal speculative position limits (additions are underlined, and deletions are struck through).

Speculative Position Limits¹ [By contract]

Contract	Spot Month	Single Month		All Months	
Chicago Board of Trade					
Corn & Mini-Corn ⁺²	600	13,500	<u>26,000</u>	22,000	<u>42,400</u>
Soybeans & Mini-Soybeans ⁺² ..	600	6,500	<u>8,600</u>	10,000	<u>13,300</u>
Wheat & Mini-Wheat ⁺²	600	5,000	<u>11,100</u>	6,500	<u>14,500</u>
Soybean Oil	540	5,000	<u>6,600</u>	6,500	<u>8,600</u>
Soybean Meal	720	5,000	<u>5,500</u>	6,500	<u>7,100</u>
Minneapolis Grain Exchange					
Hard Red Spring Wheat	600	5,000	<u>11,100</u>	6,500	<u>14,500</u>
New York Board of Trade					
Cotton No. 2	300	3,500	<u>5,300</u>	5,000	<u>7,300</u>
Kansas City Board of Trade					
Hard Winter Wheat	600	5,000	<u>11,100</u>	6,500	<u>14,500</u>

¹ For purposes of compliance with these limits, positions in a futures contract that shares substantially identical terms with a contract market enumerated herein, including a futures contract that is cash-settled based on the settlement price of an enumerated contract market, shall be aggregated with positions in the enumerated contract market.

² For purposes of compliance with these limits, positions in the regular sized and mini-sized contracts shall be aggregated.

³ The Commission used this more flexible approach when it last revised the Federal speculative position limits in 2005 (See 70 FR 24705, May 11, 2005).

⁴ See 58 FR 17973 (April 7, 1993).

⁵ *Id.* at 17979.

⁶ The Commission maintained parity between the CBT, MGE, and KCBT wheat contracts when it last

revised the Federal speculative position limits in May, 2005.

⁷ 70 FR 24705, (May 11, 2005).

III. Related Matters

A. Cost Benefit Analysis

Section 15(a) of the Act requires the Commission to consider the costs and benefits of its action before issuing a new regulation under the Act. By its terms, section 15(a) does not require the Commission to quantify the costs and benefits of a new regulation or to determine whether the benefits of the proposed regulation outweigh its costs. Rather, section 15(a) requires the Commission to “consider the costs and benefits” of the subject rule.

Section 15(a) further specifies that the costs and benefits of the proposed rule shall be evaluated in light of five broad areas of market and public concern: (1) Protection of market participants and the public; (2) efficiency, competitiveness, and financial integrity of futures markets; (3) price discovery; (4) sound risk management practices; and (5) other public interest considerations. The Commission may, in its discretion, give greater weight to any one of the five enumerated areas of concern and may, in its discretion, determine that, notwithstanding its costs, a particular rule is necessary or appropriate to protect the public interest or to effectuate any of the provisions or to accomplish any of the purposes of the Act.

The proposed rule amendments impose limited additional costs in terms of reporting requirements, particularly since entities trading in or holding large positions, which either approach or meet the speculative limits of the rules herein, already file large trader reports with the Commission. Moreover, the amendments proposed herein would increase Federal speculative position limits for some commodities and, to that extent, reduce the compliance costs associated with these speculative position limits. The countervailing benefits to any additional costs are that the continued inclusion of appropriate speculative limits will help to ensure the maintenance of competitive and efficient markets, protect the price discovery and risk shifting functions of those markets, and protect market participants and the public interest.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq., requires federal agencies, in proposing rules, to consider the impact of those rules on small businesses. The Commission believes that the proposed rule amendments to raise Commission speculative position limits would only impact large traders. The Commission has previously determined that large traders are not small entities for purposes of the RFA.⁸ Therefore, the Acting Chairman, on behalf of the Commission, hereby certifies, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b), that the action taken herein will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The Commission also notes in this regard that the proposed rules will raise speculative limit levels and thereby reduce the regulatory burden on all affected entities.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

When publishing proposed rules, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507(d)) imposes certain requirements on federal agencies (including the Commission) in connection with their conducting or sponsoring any collection of information as defined by the Paperwork Reduction Act. In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Commission, through this rule proposal, solicits public comment to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (2) evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information

technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

The Commission has submitted the proposed rule and its associated information collection requirements to the Office of Management and Budget. The proposed rule is part of two approved information collections. The burdens associated with these rules are as follows:

Collection Number

[3038-0009]

Average burden hours per response: 3.

Number of respondents: 2946.

Frequency of response: On occasion.

Collection Number

[3038-0013]

Average burden hours per response: 3.

Number of respondents: 9.

Frequency of response: On occasion.

List of Subjects in 17 CFR Part 150

Agricultural commodities, Bona fide hedge positions, Position limits, Spread exemptions.

In consideration of the foregoing, pursuant to the authority contained in the Commodity Exchange Act, the Commission hereby proposes to amend part 150 of chapter I of title 17 of the Code of Federal Regulations as follows:

PART 150—LIMITS ON POSITIONS

1. The authority citation for part 150 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 6a, 6c, and 12a(5), as amended by the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, Appendix E of Pub. L. 106-554, 114 Stat. 2763 (2000).

2. Section 150.2 is revised to read as follows:

§ 150.2 Position limits.

No person may hold or control positions, separately or in combination, net long or net short, for the purchase or sale of a commodity for future delivery or, on a futures-equivalent basis, options thereon, in excess of the following:

SPECULATIVE POSITION LIMITS¹

[In contract units]

Contract	Spot month	Single month	All months
Chicago Board of Trade			
Corn and Mini-Corn ²	600	26,000	42,400
Oats	600	1,400	2,000

⁸ 47 FR 18618 (April 30, 1982).

SPECULATIVE POSITION LIMITS¹—Continued
[In contract units]

Contract	Spot month	Single month	All months
Soybeans and Mini-Soybeans ²	600	8,600	13,300
Wheat and Mini-Wheat ²	600	11,100	14,500
Soybean Oil	540	6,600	8,600
Soybean Meal	720	5,500	7,100
Minneapolis Grain Exchange			
Hard Red Spring Wheat	600	11,100	14,500
New York Board of Trade			
Cotton No. 2	300	5,300	7,300
Kansas City Board of Trade			
Hard Winter Wheat	600	11,100	14,500

¹For purposes of compliance with these limits, positions in a futures contract that shares substantially identical terms with a contract market enumerated herein, including a futures contract that is cash-settled based on the settlement price of an enumerated contract market, shall be aggregated with positions in the enumerated contract market.

²For purposes of compliance with these limits, positions in the regular-sized and mini-sized contracts shall be aggregated.

Issued by the Commission this November 15, 2007, in Washington, DC.

David Stawick,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7-22681 Filed 11-20-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

19 CFR Part 4

[USCBP-2007-0098]

Hawaiian Coastwise Cruises

AGENCY: Customs and Border Protection; Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Proposed interpretation; solicitation of comments.

SUMMARY: This document proposes new criteria to be used by Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to determine whether non-coastwise-qualified vessels are in violation of the Passenger Vessel Services Act (PVSA) when engaging in cruise itineraries in which passengers board at a U.S. port, the vessel calls at several Hawaiian ports, and then the vessel proceeds to a foreign port or ports for a brief period, before ultimately returning to the original U.S. port of embarkation where the passengers disembark to complete their cruise. CBP believes these itineraries are contrary to the PVSA because it appears that the primary objective of the foreign stop is evasion of the PVSA.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 21, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Glen E. Vereb, Cargo Security, Carriers & Immigration Branch, Office of International Trade, (202) 572-8730.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number, by one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail:* Border Security Regulations Branch, Office of International Trade, Customs and Border Protection, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., (Mint Annex), Washington, DC 20229

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Public Participation

Interested persons are invited to participate in this proposed interpretation by submitting written data, views, or arguments on all aspects of the proposed interpretation. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) also invites comments that relate to the economic, environmental, or federalism effects that might result from this proposed interpretation. Comments that will provide the most assistance to CBP in developing these procedures will reference a specific portion of the proposed interpretation, explain the reason for any recommended change, and include data, information, or authority that support such recommended change.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number for this proposed

interpretation. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided.

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Submitted comments may also be inspected on regular business days between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. at the Office of International Trade, Customs and Border Protection, 799 9th Street, NW., 5th Floor, Washington, DC. Arrangements to inspect submitted documents should be made in advance by calling Mr. Joseph Clark at (202) 572-8768.

II. Background

The maritime cabotage law governing the transportation of passengers was first established by section 8 of the Passenger Vessel Services Act of June 19, 1886 (the “PVSA”), 24 Stat. 81; as amended by section 2 of the Act of February 17, 1898, 30 Stat. 248, formerly codified at 46 U.S.C. App. 289 (now codified at 46 U.S.C. 55103). That statute provided that no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports or places in the United States, either directly or by way of a foreign port, under a penalty of \$200 (now \$300, as promulgated in T.D. 03-11 pursuant to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. 2461 note) for each passenger so transported and landed.

The intent of the maritime cabotage laws, including the PVSA, was to provide a “legal structure that guarantees a coastwise monopoly to

APPENDIX A-3

**JOINT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY
SCOPING DOCUMENT**

Joint Management Plan Review
Cordell Bank
Gulf of the Farallones
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries



Summary Scoping Document

Report to Sanctuary Advisory Councils

February 25, 2002

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Document

1.2 Summary of Public Scoping Process

2.0 Evaluating Issues and Setting Priorities

2.1 Advisory Council Input

Figure 1. Process for Prioritizing Scoping Issues

2.2 Tables Summarizing Comments

Table 1. Summary of Issues Raised During Scoping

Table 2. Analysis of Cross-cutting Issues

Table 3. Analysis of Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Table 4. Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Table 5. Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

2.3 Appendices

Appendix 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meetings and in Writing

Appendix 2: JMPR Process Diagram

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Document

This document was created to assist National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP) staff and Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) members from Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries, and the public, in understanding and interpreting the comments received during the scoping phase of the Joint Management Plan Review (JMPR). Approximately 4,000 comments were obtained from participants at the 20 public scoping meetings. Additionally, the NMSP received nearly 8,500 written comments via letters, emails, and petitions.

This document summarizes the scoping comments received through early February 2002. It organizes the comments into 30 general issue categories. When feasible, the comments are attributed to a specific sanctuary or to multiple sites. Background information is provided for each issue area. NMSP staff and the three SACs will use this document, in conjunction with evaluation criteria, to prioritize issues that will be addressed in the JMPR.

1.2 Summary of Scoping Process

Raising Public Awareness and Participation

Management plan review is a lengthy and complex public process, particularly when three individual sanctuaries are involved at the same time. In order to raise awareness, reduce confusion, and increase public participation throughout the JMPR, Sanctuary staff from all three sites and headquarters developed a joint Strategic Communications Plan. The plan calls for conducting outreach to various user groups and members of the media, and detailed methods for informing the public about the JMPR.

One of the first outreach strategies was to create a project website and specific outreach materials. Informational pamphlets were developed in early November to inform people about each sanctuary, the JMPR process, and how they could get involved. The program launched a JMPR website (<http://sanctuaries.nos.noaa.gov/jointplan/>) in early November. The website contains information about the JMPR and other general information about each site, including maps, existing regulations and management plans. All outreach materials and products from the public scoping meetings have also been posted on the website.

Individual State of the Sanctuary reports were developed for Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries. They were made available on the website and hard copies were sent out to thousands of people on each of the Sanctuary's mailing lists. The reports provide information about each Sanctuary, their significant accomplishments to date, and the current and emerging resource management issues. The intent of these reports was to help raise public awareness about each Sanctuary before the public scoping meetings were held.

Prior to the scoping meetings, staff made efforts to contact and explain the Jmpr process to local and regional media. Media were encouraged to help raise awareness about the Jmpr and bolster public participation at the scoping meetings. To date, the following media “hits” have been tracked: 35+ feature print articles, 7 radio interviews, and 6 television station reports. Staff also distributed newspaper and radio public service announcements, calendar event listings, and placed advertisements announcing the local scoping meetings. Scoping meeting flyers and posters were posted at ports and harbors, universities, and other marine-related businesses. Finally, a notice was placed in the *Federal Register* formally announcing the scoping process.

Scoping Meetings

Beginning on November 28, 2001, and lasting until January 17, 2002, the NMSP held 20 public scoping meetings in communities throughout the north-central California coast, from Gualala to San Luis Obispo, and one meeting each in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. Approximately 1,000 people participated in these forums to comment on the three Sanctuaries’ management strategies and provide input on specific issues they see as management priorities for the next 5 to 10 years. The scoping meetings and written comments are tools that are used to “scope out” or receive input from resource users, interest groups, government agencies, and other members of the public on resource management issues. After the meetings, Sanctuary staff compiled all of the comments raised at the meetings and posted them on the Joint Management Plan Review website.

The format for each public scoping meeting was similar, though tailored to meet the needs for each venue. The Sanctuary manager or superintendent opened each scoping meeting and provided a summary of the Jmpr process, detailed the meeting format, and answered questions. Following the introduction, the participants broke into smaller discussion groups of 10 to 12 people. Each group had an NMSP staff leader, or on some occasions a member of a Sanctuary Advisory Council, to help guide the discussion and ensure everyone had the opportunity to provide comments. Each group also had an NMSP staff person record each of the comments on a flip-chart so the group could see that their comments were captured. At the end of the meeting, the whole group reconvened and the Sanctuary manager or superintendent summarized issues raised in the individual breakout groups so everyone could hear a sampling of issues raised in other groups.

Written Comments

In addition to public scoping meetings, the program accepted written comments from early November 2001 to early February 2002. Comments were sent to the NMSP in the form of E-mails, letters, faxes, and a standard form (handed out at scoping meetings and provided on the website). As of February 14, 2002, the program received approximately 6,500 e-mails, 300 letters, 13 faxes, and a petition with 1,700 signatures.

A full list of issues raised at the scoping meetings and in the written comments can be found on the website and are included with all the other comments in Appendix 1.

2.0 EVALUATING ISSUES AND SETTING PRIORITIES

2.1 Advisory Council Input

The public scoping process was incredibly successful at generating public participation in the management plan review for all three sites and for identifying compelling suggestions for improving management of these three national treasures. The sheer number of comments exceeded program expectations, as more public comments were received than when the sites were designated. Moreover, comments have been received from individuals in most states across the nation.

Below are tables that have been developed by staff at each site, and the NMSP headquarters, to analyze and synthesize the thousands of comments received. They serve as the next iteration of comments from the “raw” comments listed on the website for the scoping meetings.

The next step in the process is to get advice from the Sanctuary Advisory Councils that help with management of all three national marine sanctuaries (see Figure 1; this diagram shows more clearly the specific steps that the program will take from scoping, to issue prioritization, to the development of a work plan on priority issues). This summary scoping document and a set of proposed criteria for establishing priorities is being distributed to all three Sanctuary Advisory Councils on or around February 25, 2002. Sanctuary Advisory Council members will use this document as they communicate with their constituents and the public about the issues raised during the scoping process. Individual Advisory Council members will be asked to review this summary scoping document, the proposed prioritization criteria, and input from their constituents to select their top four site-specific sub-issues (i.e., MBNMS SAC member choose Monterey Bay NMS issues) and their top four cross-cutting sub-issues that they believe should be addressed in the JMPR. These eight priority issues will need to be submitted to their respective management plan coordinators by Friday, March 22.

The members' individual priority issues will be compiled into a matrix and distributed prior to a joint SAC workshop in April (the date for the workshop still needs to be established). The purpose of the workshop is to narrow down and prioritize the list of issues identified during the scoping process into something that can be realistically addressed during the JMPR. The three SACs, as a group, will use agreed-upon evaluation criteria to prioritize those issues they will recommend to the Sanctuary to address during the JMPR. Each individual SAC will also provide recommendations on site-specific issues.

Following the joint SAC prioritization workshop, Sanctuary staff will analyze the SAC recommendations and develop a draft working plan for how they could be addressed in the JMPR. Staff may also suggest additional national or site-specific issues that need to be addressed during the review. It is envisioned that working groups will be created to address site-specific issues and cross-cutting issues. SAC members will have an opportunity to comment on the draft plan before it is made final. Once working groups are formed, the issue characterization phase of the JMPR will begin. We hope to begin the issue characterization phase of JMPR, including the creation of working groups in summer.

2.2 Tables Summarizing Comments

At the December 5, 2002 meeting, the MBNMS Advisory Council asked sanctuary staff to exercise professional judgement to synthesize the thousands of comments provided during the scoping process and provide some analysis of those comments that need further consideration as priorities. This request matched the analytical process NMSP intended to apply to comments. Thus, the tables that follow provide a synthesis and analysis of comments, as discussed further below.

The approximately 12,500 comments raised during the scoping process break into 30 broad categories or “issues”. In the tables that follow, sub-issues for most of these broad issues are identified from the scoping comments. The sub-issues reflect priorities, that came from the public, that the NMSP could further develop in the joint management plan review process.

Table 1: Summary of Issues Raised During Scoping

Table 1 presents a general overview of the issues raised during scoping. It provides summary information for each meeting in terms of location, number of participants, and issues raised (organized into 30 main categories). The table also depicts those issues raised in the written comments and the number of comments received. This table is a reflection on whether an issue was brought up during a meeting or in the written comments, and does not attempt to prioritize or count the number of comments received on each issue.

Tables 2 - 5: Analysis of Issues

These tables summarize, synthesize and conduct background analysis on the numerous issues raised during the scoping process. Table 2 presents issues that cross-cut two or three of the national marine sanctuaries here in northern/central California. Issues that apply to two or more sites, and a table for each of the site-specific issues. In all tables, the issues were divided into 30 categories with a brief background description for each. The sub-issues reflect a consolidation of similar comments and themes. Although some sub-issues could conceivably apply to more than one issue area, staff assigned sub-issues to the issue area with the most significant relationship. For instance, the comment that MBNMS should expand and more fully support the Citizen Watershed Monitoring Network is shown in the issue area, Monitoring, yet, it could have also been shown in the issue area Water Quality.

It should also be noted that the NMSP received many comments concerning a particular issue that were opposed to each other (i.e., sanctuary should do something; the sanctuary should not do something). This scenario occurs in almost every category provided. For example, one comment says to move a boundary in a certain way and another comment says to keep things status quo. In the tables below, staff have captured the comments that asked for action, and typically have not included comments that asked for no action. It is reasonable for readers to consider that for every sub-issue that calls for an action, there was another received that asked

for no action on that same topic. Nonetheless, all of the comments received are part of the record and can be found in Appendix 1

Table 3 provides the comments that relate specifically, and exclusively, to the Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary. Table 4 is the same for the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, and Table 5 provides the comments that relate to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. It is possible that for all three sites there may be site-specific comments that have a close analogue in the cross-cutting table. It is important for all Sanctuary Advisory Council members to read the site-specific table that applies to you, as well as the cross-cutting table to discern those comments that apply to the sanctuary you represent. It is also important to us that, at a minimum, you take a chance to get acquainted with the comments that pertain to other sanctuaries. A major goal of the NMSP is to get your assistance in prioritizing the issues that relate to the entire region, not just the sanctuary on whose advisory council you sit.

2.3 Appendices

Several appendices have been produced that you may wish to refer to in reviewing this summary scoping document. Other analytical material may be produced, and will be provided as additional appendices.

Appendix 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meetings and in Writing

This appendix organizes the scoping meeting and written comments received at all three sites and headquarters into the 30 main issue areas. Under each issue area, the comments are divided between issues and suggested strategies and tools. The NMSP received thousands of individual comments that ranged from issues and problems, to strategies and tools. This table provides summarizes all of the non-duplicate comments. The “raw” or unprocessed comments can be viewed on the website for the scoping meetings.

Appendix 2: JMPR Process Diagram

This diagram depicts the entire joint management plan review process from the initial planning stages to the completion of the final management plan. It also shows the reader where we are in the process, at step 4 - internal evaluation of issues.

Figure 1: Process for Prioritizing Scoping Issues - CA JMPR




TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING SCOPING

Venue		ISSUES																															
		Acoustics	Administration	Aquaculture/ Kelp Harvest	Boundary Modifications	Coastal Armoring	Coastal Development	Community Outreach	Cultural Resources	Eco-Based Cons. Mgmt.	Education	Enforcement & Regulations	Exotic Species	Fishing	Habitat Alteration	Marine Bioprospecting	Marine Debris & Discharge	Military Activities	Monitoring	Oil & Gas Development	Partnerships w/ Agencies	Partnerships w/ Community Groups	MPWCs	Radioactive Waste	Research	SACs	Spill Response & Contingency	User Conflicts	Vessel Traffic	Water Quality	Wildlife Disturbance		
11/28/01	Santa Cruz 1:00 pm 51 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11/28/01	Santa Cruz 6:30 pm 73 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
11/29/01	Monterey 1:00 pm 58 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
11/29/01	Monterey 6:30 pm 40 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/01/01	Salinas 7 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/03/01	San Luis Obispo 24 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/04/01	Cambria 24 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/05/01	Big Sur 30 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/06/01	Half Moon Bay 62 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/07/01	Half Moon Bay 30 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/11/01	Sacramento 14 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12/14/01	Washington, DC 5 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/07/02	Gualala 35 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/08/02	Bodega Bay 120 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/09/02	Pt. Reyes Station 80 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/10/02	San Rafael 40 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/14/02	Rohnert Park 45 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/15/02	San Francisco 80 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/16/02	Pacifica 65 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
01/17/02	San Jose 20 participants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
8,500 Written Comments (email, letters, faxes, forms, petitions)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

*Over 4,000 individual comments were taken during the 20 public scoping meetings.

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
1.0 Acoustics	A number of studies document impacts to living marine resources, including behavioral changes and physical effects due to exposure to anthropogenic noise and pressure waves in the marine environment. Anthropogenic sources of noise include: large commercial shipping traffic such as container ships, freighters, barges and tankers, recreational and commercial boats, military low frequency testing, research activities and aerial overflights. Marine mammals have been observed to deviate from their migration paths to avoid noise, or interrupt their communications in response to elevated noise levels. Certain anthropogenic noise is thought to mask sounds used for mating, feeding and avoiding predators. Responses vary depending on the acoustic frequency, decibel level, proximity to the source and other species-specific sensitivity factors. Concern about the cumulative impacts of noise from a variety of sources has grown as the ocean has become noisier in past half-century. However, long-term cumulative impacts are uncertain and range from minimal impacts in some situations to behavioral alterations to possible physiological or physical damage to hearing. The Sanctuaries have been involved in evaluating and requesting limits or alterations of specific proposals to use acoustic devices in the region, such as the Navy’s recent Low-Frequency Array proposal, but has not addressed the overall issue of cumulative noise impacts	1.1 Restrict or prohibit all harmful sources of marine noise	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		1.2 Research / Survey existing and potential noise impacts, identify alternatives and mitigation.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
2.0 Administration	Administrative roles for governing each sanctuary are divided up between the Manager or Superintendent and the National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP). The NMSP provides oversight and coordination among the thirteen national marine sanctuaries, taking responsibility for ensuring each site’s management plan is coordinated and consistent with the National Marine Sanctuary Act while developing a general budget and staffing for the site. The Sanctuary Manager or Superintendent is responsible for determining expenditures for program development, operating costs and staffing to meet the site’s annual operating plan. The Manager or	2.1 All three sanctuaries need to increase coordination on key programs and resources threats	✓	✓	✓		
		2.2 Increase public responsiveness and accountability	✓	✓	✓		
		2.3 Increase funding for all sites	✓	✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	<p>staffing to meet the site’s annual operating plan. The Manager or Superintendent and NMSP work together to monitor effectiveness of the management plan and to develop programs or policies that help meet resource management priorities</p> <p>Since its designation in 1989, CBNMS has grown from no full time staff or budget to a dedicated full time staff of three and a budget of \$480,000. Since 1990, GFNMS staff has grown from one and a budget of just under \$300,000 to a current staff of four with a budget of \$975,000. Since 1992, the MBNMS staff has grown to 12 government employees and about 10 contractors; its budget has grown from about \$450,000 in the first year to \$2,750,000 in fiscal year 2002. Prior to 1998, the GFNMS had management responsibilities for the northern half of the MBNMS. Since then, most of the management duties for this region have shifted to the MBNMS, although certain management responsibilities are carried out through joint consultation.</p>	<p><i>See also</i> Section 5.0 Boundary Issues and Section 11.0 Enforcement which include sub-issues related to Administration.</p>					
3.0 Aquaculture	<p>NOAA defines aquaculture as, “The propagation and rearing of aquatic organisms in controlled or selected environments for any commercial, recreational, or public purpose.” Aquaculture is used for bait production, wild stock enhancement, fish cultures for zoos and aquaria, rebuilding of populations of threatened and endangered species, and food production for human consumption. One of the concerns about aquaculture is the impact it has on water quality. Intensive cage, floating pen and other types of aquaculture systems discharge wastes directly to the aquatic environment. Ocean water circulatory systems used for pools and tanks often discharge pulses of highly concentrated waste discharges during cleaning and harvesting. Other concerns related to aquaculture activities may include: an elevated risk for eutrophication; disease and parasite introduction; accumulation of antibiotics; introduction of exotic species (including genetically altered); and escapement of hatchery stocks that may lead to interbreeding with native wild stocks altering genetic make-up.</p>	<p>3.1 Evaluate environmental impacts and if necessary, increase regulation.</p> <p>3.2 Increase education regarding aquaculture and how facilities can reduce impacts.</p>		✓	✓		
4.0 Biodiversity Protection and	<p>The goals and objectives set forth by the National Marine Sanctuary Act (NMSA) direct each of the sanctuaries to take an ecosystem-based approach to managing these fluid marine environments that have great</p>	<p>4.1 Revised management plans and future actions must focus on primary goal of resource protection</p>	✓	✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
Ecosystem Conservation	temporal and spatial complexity, diversity and dimension. Through sanctuary partnerships, our experience has shown that the scientific community, resource agencies and the public have recognized the importance of an integrated ecosystem approach to management of the sanctuaries. Ecosystems include habitat structure, species assemblages and ecological processes, as well as humans and their use patterns. While upholding the main goal of resource protection, sanctuaries do allow for multiple use that is compatible with resource protection. Among other things, Management Plans set out to describe how human use activities will be addressed by the sanctuaries while improving the conservation, understanding, management and wise and sustainable use of marine resources. Many of the comments received during scoping reiterate the goals and objectives of the NMSA. Furthermore, comments directed the Sanctuary program to actively pursue protection of the ecosystem and enhance biodiversity through their management strategies, via strategies such as marine reserves, tidepool protection, eliminate fishing gear that damages habitat and boundary changes to better protect ecosystems	4.2 Management should focus on long term sustainability	✓	✓	✓		
		4.3 Protect biodiversity by Sanctuaries adopting more fully protected marine reserves throughout region.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		4.4 Adopt marine reserves in Federal waters; participate with and advise CDFG in MLPA process.	✓	✓	✓		
		4.5 Need special protection of biodiversity at special places (e.g. Salinas River, kelp beds, Bolinas Lagoon).		✓	✓		
		4.6 Develop action plans specific to NMSP to help recover endangered species or key species at risk	✓	✓	✓		
		<i>See also Section 5.0 Boundary Changes:</i> many boundary changes were proposed to increase biodiversity protection					
5.0 Boundary Modifications	All three sites have boundaries that define the sanctuary itself, and where applicable, special use zones (like dredge disposal areas for MBNMS) within the sanctuary. These boundaries received extensive debate and analysis when the sites' were designated. Typically, a sanctuary's boundary is set to protect a defined ecosystem; human use zones either allow uses within a zone or prohibit them. Comments have arisen about the need to adjust boundaries for various reasons, and the management plan review process is the proper place to consider those. Reasons for boundary adjustments have included better protection of an ecosystem (Move MBNMS boundary further south), increased biodiversity protection (Include Davidson Seamount in MBNMS; Close "donut hole" off San	5.1 Consider moving the boundaries to better reflect socio-political and biological factors.	✓	✓	✓		
		5.2 Boundary of the CBNMS should be extended inward to the coastline.	✓	✓			
		5.3 Combine CB/GF/MB into one Sanctuary	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		5.4 Resolve "co-management" of the northern MBNMS; consider moving shared GF/MB boundary south		✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	Francisco), and administrative/operation reasons (Move shared GF/MBNMS boundary south; Create one national marine sanctuary instead of three). Some changes might reduce resource protection (Create buffer zones off urban areas) while others are beyond the initial intent of sanctuary designation, and possibly the NMSA (Move sanctuary boundaries into harbors and up watersheds).	5.5 Consider changing the boundary of the Sanctuary to include inland areas and watersheds.	✓	✓	✓		
6.0 Coastal Armoring	Development along the coast has increased the pressure to protect coastal structures with various types of coastal armoring (such as seawalls, bulkheads and revetments) to manage erosion. Approximately 14 miles of the MBNMS coastline is already armored, and this is estimated to double if trends continue at the current rate. Coastal armoring can damage or alter local coastal habitats, deprive beaches of sand, lead to accelerated erosion of adjacent beaches, and hinder recreational access. MBNMS has reviewed and authorized permits for seawalls, riprap or other coastal armoring projects at 16 sites since its designation, issuing conditions primarily focused on minimizing impacts from the construction process rather than long-term impacts from the armoring itself. Only a fraction of the total number of coastal armoring projects underway in the region came to the Sanctuary for review. This past year MBNMS staff have initiated a joint evaluation of coastal armoring with the California Coastal Commission, with a goal of developing a more proactive, comprehensive regional approach to the issue.	6.0 Prohibit coastal armoring (“seawalls”) in the GFNMS and MBNMS		✓	✓		
7.0 Coastal Development	The population of the greater San Francisco and Monterey Bay region numbers over 6 million and their populations are expected to keep increasing. Commercial and residential development is already concentrated around the Monterey Bay including the Monterey Peninsula, Marina, Watsonville and Santa Cruz, Half Moon Bay and north to San Francisco and Marin. Indirect affects of continued coastal development include increases in point (increased sewer use) and non point source pollution, nearshore habitat conversion to urbanized areas, as well as increased human presence at easily accessible points along the shoreline for the purposes of coastal recreation.	7.1 Sanctuary should take active role in promoting alternatives to development along coastline.		✓	✓		
		7.2 Minimize shoreline development along the sanctuary.		✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
8.0 Community Outreach	<p>CBNMS' outreach programs are directed at improving public awareness and understanding of the significance of the Sanctuary and the need to protect its resources. Public opportunities for direct interaction with Sanctuary resources are limited due the isolation of Cordell Bank, weather conditions and depth below the water surface. The goal of the Sanctuary's interpretive outreach programs is to reach three target audiences: 1) site visitor programs for fishing and whale watching excursions and other recreational visitors to the Sanctuary; 2) programs for those visiting the Sanctuary visitor centers; and 3) outreach programs for interested groups in the region. CBNMS also provides the public with information on the Sanctuary through fairs, school presentations, and lecture series.</p> <p>GFNMS, in cooperation with the Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association, sponsors events, interpretive trips and exhibits. FMSA and GFNMS have worked together in establishing visitor centers in Pacifica and San Francisco. Sanctuary outreach materials are also available at Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Bodega Marine Lab</p> <p>Communication and Outreach for the MBNMS currently centers around its four facilities. The main thrust remains in Monterey and Santa Cruz, but has recently expanded south to San Simeon and north to Half Moon Bay. Most events and news surrounding the Sanctuary is disseminated through the education staff located in each office. Limited programming at schools and the general public are available. MBNMS just completed a multi-cultural education plan, targeting the large Hispanic community in Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties. The plan is to have bilingual marine educators working with families in their community groups, at targeted State Beaches and Parks and with Hispanic serving teachers. The majority of current outreach is in the form of informal presentations and distributed print materials</p>	8.1 Implement a nationwide outreach program	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		8.2 Increase marketing, media exposure and public awareness	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		8.3 Increase multicultural outreach for all three sanctuaries	✓	✓	✓	✓	
9.0 Cultural Resources	Submerged cultural resources include shipwrecks, aircraft, wharfs and dock sites, prehistoric archaeological sites and associated artifacts. For hundreds of years mariners transiting this region have been faced with prevailing	9.1 Recognize and help preserve traditional cultures, communities and activities within the sanctuary.	✓	✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	winds, extreme weather conditions and natural hazards. Although there is not a complete inventory, remnants of hundreds of ships are believed to be off the coast, within Sanctuary waters. With the development of underwater technologies that bring the public virtually closer to the marine environment, there is increasing interest in submerged cultural resources. The continuing discovery, exploration, documentation and study of these resources provides a richer understanding of the region's maritime community and the larger ecosystem all three sanctuaries are protecting.	9.2 Develop and implement a research plan to identify submerged cultural resources, such as shipwrecks, and enforcement and education efforts to better protect them.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10.0 Education	Education programs are designed to enhance public awareness and understanding of marine natural and cultural resources of the Sanctuary. Education is essential to achieving many of the Sanctuary's management objectives, and is an important component in promoting the Sanctuary's research and restoration projects. The Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association (FMSA) works collaboratively with GFNMS to implement various education, interpretation, and research programs. GFNMS in cooperation with FMSA, sponsors student summits, lectures, teacher training, summer camps and other education programs. FMSA is also supporting the development of a Coastal Ecosystem curriculum for high school students and multi-cultural programs with the San Francisco Dept. of Parks and Recreation and the California Coastal Commission.	10.1 Develop more targeted education as to how local communities and resource users can help protect sanctuary resources.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		10.2 Use new technologies to bring offshore areas of the Sanctuary to the public.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		10.3 Provide education program for local schools.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11.0 Enforcement and Regulations	The purpose of Sanctuary enforcement is to ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and appropriate regulations of the Sanctuary. Section 207 of the NMSA authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct activities for carrying out the Act, delineates civil penalties and powers of authorized officers, and provides for recovery of penalties by the Secretary. Although GFNMS does not have an enforcement program of its own, it works together with the U.S. Coast Guard, National Marine Fisheries Service and Dept. of Fish and Game to enforce Sanctuary regulations. The Sanctuary also works directly with user groups to encourage compliance and best management practices. As an example, GFNMS has worked with CalTrans to stop the disposal of highway spoils along the Sanctuary shoreline. Sanctuary staff worked for more than 10 years with the City of Santa Rosa to prevent sewage discharge in the Sanctuary. As a result, the City's tertiary treatment system processes discharges that can be used to irrigate crops and recharge the aquifer for the Geyser electric generating facility.	11.1 All sanctuaries should have the same regulations and permit procedures	✓	✓	✓		✓

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
12.0 Exotic / Introduced Species	Invasions by non-native species are increasingly common worldwide in coastal habitats. Estuaries, in particular, harbor large numbers of introduced species. For example, there are about 250 known invasive species in the San Francisco Bay and Delta, and many in Elkhorn Slough. Although the effects of many introduced aquatic species on habitats they colonize is unknown, some clearly have had serious negative influences. Impacts often include decreasing abundance and even local extinction of native species, alteration of habitat structure, and extensive economic costs due to biofouling. Probably the most important mechanism for the introduction of aquatic/marine species is transport in ship ballast tanks, though other mechanisms such as disposal of aquarium materials contribute to the issue. Eradication of introduced species is difficult, and management practices focus largely on prevention of introductions.	12.1 Prohibit disposal of ballast water in Sanctuaries to reduce threat of introduction.	✓	✓	✓		
		12.2 Develop and implement invasive species protection plan	✓	✓	✓		
13.0 Fishing & Kelp Harvesting	The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) regulates fisheries in State waters and, under the Marine Life Protection Act, is currently restructuring marine managed areas and establishing new ones. The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) regulates fisheries in Federal waters and designates essential fish habitat as fisheries management tools. Fishing is a critical part of the regions culture and economy. Although some stocks appear healthy, fishery managers are concerned about declining stocks and habitat threats for other species, including many rockfish species, the live fish fishery, and anadromous species such as salmon and steelhead. The three sanctuaries do not currently manage any aspect of commercial or recreational fisheries. Kelp harvesting is also managed by the Department of Fish and Game although the appropriate level of kelp harvest remains an ongoing issue of interest in the MBNMS; kelp is not currently harvested in the CBNMS or GFNMS, rather only in the MBNMS. However, sea palms are harvested in the GFNMS.	13.1 Develop programs with fishing community to promote positive aspects of fishing, such as fish stocks that are sustainable.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		13.2 Coordinate with NMFS in the coho salmon recovery plan and other fishery management plans.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		13.3 Pursue fishing regulations only in Federal waters	✓	✓	✓		
		13.4 Define Sanctuary role in fisheries management	✓	✓	✓		
		13.5 Regulate shore fishermen separately from commercial and sport fishermen in regards to possible management and possible fishing closures.		✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	<p>About 200 species of fish and invertebrates are harvested in the three sanctuaries. In CBNMS, commercial fisheries generally target rockfish, flatfish, salmonoids, groundfish and albacore tuna. Recreational fisheries generally focus on rockfish, lingcod, salmon and albacore tuna. Most of the private boats and charter vessels that fish CBNMS are from Bodega Bay. Rough ocean conditions often prevent smaller recreational boats from accessing CBNMS. Fishery gear types include: hook and line, long lines, bottom trawlers and mid-water trawlers. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) regulates fisheries in State waters and, under the Marine Life Protection Act, is currently restructuring marine managed areas and establishing new ones. The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) regulates fisheries in Federal waters and designates essential Fish habitat as fisheries management tools. CBNMS staff coordinates with these fisheries management agencies. During the management plan review process CBNMS staff will be evaluating the best tools for protection of living resources and habitats.</p>	<p><i>See also Section 4.0 Biodiversity Protection and Ecosystem Conservation</i> for marine reserve sub-issues.</p> <p><i>See also Sub-issue 14.1</i> below regarding bottom trawling.</p>					
14.0 Habitat Alteration	<p>MBNMS and GFNMS have regulations that prohibit habitat alteration such as seabed disturbance (Cordell Bank does not have a seabed disturbance regulation only the taking of algae and invertebrates). Exceptions to this include fishing activities and normal anchoring. Habitat alteration can from construction activities or repeated activity such as bottom trawling or tidepool trampling. Habitat or environmental alteration can also occur as a form of restoration to a more natural state or by “improvements” such as artificial reefs. Placement of seawalls, rip rap, or other coastal armoring also alters the habitat however this issue is included in this summary as Issue 6.0. The impacts of activities that alter the habitat vary depending upon the action or duration of the activity. Sanctuaries received comments calling for stricter regulation or prohibition of fiber optic cables and</p>	14.1 Ban or restrict bottom trawling in sanctuaries	✓	✓	✓		
		14.2 Ban or restrict construction of commercial submarine cables	✓	✓	✓		
		14.3 Altered coastal habitats should be restored to the natural state; remove non-native species and restore with indigenous flora and fauna .		✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	calling for stricter regulation or prohibition of fiber optic cables and anchoring, regulation of coastal sand mining operations, and restrictions on bottom trawling. Other comments called for restoration activities, primarily in coastal wetlands that have been degraded by past human activity. Other specific comments called for placement of structures on the seafloor to propagate kelp for the purpose of harvesting or to act as habitat in order to mitigate for kelp harvesting activities.						
15.0 Marine Bioprospecting	Marine bioprospecting may include either sampling or continuous extraction of a living marine resource for commercial purposes. What differentiates marine bioprospecting from commercial fishing or kelp harvesting is the genetic value of the bioprospected material. Genetic material means any material of plant, animal, microbial or other origin containing genetic elements. Extraction for the purposes of marine bioprospecting may cause injury to Sanctuary resources, have impacts on biodiversity and/or interfere with the natural functional aspects of the ecosystem. The most common use of marine bioprospected materials to date is pharmaceuticals. Inquiries about collecting Sanctuary resources for biochemical analysis are an indication of the current expansion in this field. In the GFNMS, active harvesting of sponges, algae and shark cartilage for medicinal use and research is under way.	15.1 Regulate or prohibit marine bioprospecting in the sanctuaries.	✓	✓			
16.0 Marine Discharge and Debris	Marine deposits in the MBNMS include harbor dredged materials and landslide material related to maintenance and repair of coastal highways. MBNMS review the composition of the sediment and any associated contaminants and authorizes dredged material disposal at these sites for clean sediments of the appropriate grain size and amounts. Deposition of material from landslides along the Sanctuary's steep coastline can bury intertidal and subtidal habitat, and increase sand scour which inhibits larval settlement in certain habitats. Some of these slides occur naturally while	16.1 Review Sanctuaries' role in permit process for dredge disposal to ensure efficiency of review and protection of Sanctuary resources		✓	✓		
		16.2 Develop marine debris reduction program	✓	✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	<p>settlement in certain habitats. Some of these slides occur naturally, while other slides are created or exacerbated by highway design, repair and maintenance practices. Sanctuary regulations currently prohibit these discharges. The interagency review process for both dredging and landslide disposal is quite complicated, and improvements in coordination of the process have begun.</p> <p>Marine debris along the coastline includes litter and trash from the watersheds, beaches and boats which can harm marine life which may mistake them for prey or become entangled. Debris also reduces enjoyment of recreational use of the coastline. The Sanctuaries assists annually with Coastal Cleanup Day and has some urban runoff educational materials which mention debris, but has otherwise not focused heavily on this issue.</p>						
17.0 Military Activities	The U.S. Navy and the U.S. Coast Guard regularly use the GFNMS for operations. U.S. Navy's third fleet conducts surface, air and submarine maneuvers. Just outside GFNMS to the north, there is a special submarine transit lane used primarily on approach to, and departure from, San	17.1 Sanctuaries should reduce or eliminate the impact from military experiments and activities, including pollution, sound, etc.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	<p>Francisco Bay. The U.S. Navy’s operations areas are located 8 nautical miles (nmi) southeast and 9 nmi northwest of the Farallon Islands. This submarine activity includes a trial diving exercise and various equipment checkouts normally following vessel refitting or overhauls. Approximately 10 nmi southwest of the Pt. Reyes Headlands, the U.S. Navy conducts both aircraft and surface vessel exercises, often coordinated with submarine operations. Submarine transit lanes run parallel to the mainland and due west of Bodega Headland and vary in width from 7 to 10 nmi. When activated, all other vessels in the vicinity are cautioned against towing submerged objects. The U.S. Coast Guard flies maintenance personnel to the lighthouse on Southeast Farallon Island for periodic servicing. They also conduct regular flights within the Sanctuary for enforcement and search and rescue missions.</p> <p>Military use of the MBNMS includes air, surface and underwater activity. Some activity includes the use of non explosive ordnance, sonar, smoke markers and the temporary placement of objects for torpedo firing or sonar location training. Air activities include aircraft carrier takeoffs and landing, and low-level air combat maneuvering. The U.S. Navy uses these areas for submarine operations. Navy minesweeping ships in Monterey Bay conduct mine hunting training eight times a year; each exercise lasts about one week. On occasion, U.S. Marines practiced amphibious landings on the beaches adjacent to this area. Concerns regarding the military activity in the MBNMS primarily relate to conflicts and disturbances to marine life, both temporary or long term. Acoustic issues such as the Navy’s LFA Sonar are addressed in Section 1.0. Other concerns include the carrier launched jet aircraft and their impact on seabird roosting areas along the coast.</p>						
18.0 Monitoring	Data derived from monitoring efforts provide an important tool in effective resource management at all three sanctuaries. Monitoring provides long-term information about the resources, often indicating trends, changes over time or cause and/or effect relationships. Ideally, good monitoring data will allow sanctuary management to discern natural variability in populations from adverse human-induced change, and work to reduce or eliminate the harmful human activities.	18.1 Establish long-term monitoring for intertidal areas.		✓	✓		
		18.2 Increase monitoring of Water Quality.	✓	✓	✓		
		18.3 Expand SIMoN to GFNMS and CBNMS and fully fund critical monitoring efforts.	✓	✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	Over the past 20 years, the GFNMS has supported several seabird and marine mammal monitoring programs and is currently involved in several marine mammal monitoring programs, shoreline monitoring, intertidal monitoring, coastal ecology relationships monitoring, and restoration monitoring. Virtually the same is true for the MBNMS. In addition, the MBNMS has recently developed an integrated ecosystem monitoring program, SIMoN (Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network) to use existing data collected by regional scientists and to collect new data to better monitor the health of the sanctuary’s ecosystem. CBNMS has initiated several monitoring projects to assess environmental changes as they occur including: monitoring harmful algal blooms; visual assessments of the Cordell Bank reef community; population assessments of blue and humpback whales; seabird surveys; and monitoring of biological, physical and chemical properties of the CBNMS.						
19.0 Motorized Personal Watercraft (MPWC)	MPWCs operate in a manner unique among recreational vehicles creating potentially significant impacts on wildlife, water quality and personal safety. The high speed and maneuverability of personal watercraft, and the fact they tend to operate nearshore and in a repeated fashion, within a confined area, results in recurring disturbance to animals and habitats. Suspected impacts include behavior modification of sea birds, fish and pinnipeds; and site abandonment and avoidance by certain porpoises and whales. In 2000, GFNMS prohibited use of MPWCs in the Sanctuary. MBNMS restricted use of these vehicles with the designation in 1992 and confined them to four zones outside of the four harbors in the Sanctuary. The MBNMS regulation includes a provision in the definition of a MPWC that states it has the capacity to carry not more than the operator and one other person while in operation. Since adoption of this regulation, certain MPWC manufacturers have designed vehicles that do not fall under the MBNMS definition. Specifically, certain MPWCs now are capable of carrying two, three or four people in addition to the operator and therefore are not subject to the MBNMS regulation. There have been conflicts between PWCs and other recreational ocean users due to the noise and operation of PWCs. Comments received during scoping include calling for a complete ban, adopting the GFNMS definition, using marine zones for buffering the impacts from wildlife, or well as removing regulations related to MPWCs.	19.1 Reassess environmental impacts from MPWC and recast regulations accordingly; ensure regulatory consistency at all three sanctuaries.	✓	✓	✓		
		19.2 Ban MPWCs entirely, except for genuine lifesaving duties	✓	✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
20.0 Oil and Gas Exploration and Development	Oil and gas activity was one of the major reasons for designation of all three of the north/central California National Marine Sanctuaries. In the past 10 years, the State of California has adopted legal restrictions to prohibit new oil and gas leasing and development. Temporary moratoria have been in place in federal waters since 1982. The most current directive (June 1998, Clinton administration) under the OCS Lands Act prevents any leasing of new areas for oil and gas exploration and development through June 30, 2012. The OCS presidential deferrals do not restrict development of already leased Federal areas. There are 36 remaining undeveloped active OCS leases south of the MBNMS off the coast in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara counties.	20.1 Maintain prohibition on oil and gas exploration and development	✓	✓	✓		
21.0 Partnerships with Agencies	The NMSP is committed to coordinating with other Federal, State and local agencies on a continuous ecosystem management process. The process is designed to ensure the long-term protection of the unique resources of this region, while considering the demands of multi-use interests. As such, the management process requires that cooperation of many agencies and institutions that historically may not have focused on the same goals. Overlapping jurisdictions, different agency mandates and limited resources necessitate the development of a relationship that brings together multiple agencies for the common purpose of ecosystem management. Achieving the long and short-term goals of the Sanctuary Program requires close and continuing partnerships among all agencies.	21.1 Work with other local, state and federal agencies having shared resource management authorities and responsibilities.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		21.2 Coordinate with coastal planning agencies to reduce marine impacts from coastal development issues.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
22.0 Partnerships with Community Groups	The Sanctuaries could not function in the many roles they undertake without the support of community partnerships. For instance, the MBNMS Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) is comprised of 40 agency and user group representatives as well as the public at large. Its advice is critical to	22.1 Develop regional partnership program to capitalize on shared interests with tourism industry, and with regional NGOs.	✓	✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
	understanding the needs of the local communities while protecting the Sanctuary's resources. The SAC relies on an additional 80 individuals on 4 working groups for the best information regarding Research, Education, Conservation, Business and Tourism. Each of these groups is comprised of representatives, who volunteer their time to help develop the Sanctuary's programs, products and viewpoints. 30 Hispanic serving institutions worked with MBNMS staff to develop the multicultural education plan. Partnerships with State and Regional Parks and private nonprofit groups have greatly enhanced the MBNMS's ability to share its mission. The GFNMS is similar in its success due via support from many non-governmental organizations. The Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association provides volunteers and funding for many important sanctuary activities and programs.						
23.0 Radioactive Waste	No Cross Cutting Comments See analysis of Gulf of the Farallones NMS Issues						
24.0 Research	The opportunities for marine research within the Sanctuaries are abundant, as seen by past research studies that have provided important baseline information about the area. The diversity of habitat types and communities provides a wealth of opportunities for conducting a variety of research programs. Studies on the processes at the land-sea interface are also feasible due to the accessibility of extensive coastline. Finally, the marine research institutions within the area provide an exceptional resource to draw upon in furthering our understanding, and thus the management of, the Sanctuary's marine resources. Research is necessary to understand how the Sanctuary ecosystem functions and how humans impact it. This can be accomplished by improving our understanding of the Sanctuary environment, resources and qualities, resolving specific management problems, and coordinating and facilitating information flow between the various research institutions, agencies and organizations in the area. Research results can be used for making management decisions about resource protection and to develop and improve education programs for visitors and others interested in the Sanctuary.	24.1 Coordinate research activities among all three sites concerning sanctuary resources.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		24.2 Need research on water quality impacts from San Francisco Bay industrial point sources	✓	✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range					
			C B	G F	M B	R	N	
25.0 Sanctuary Advisory Councils	No Cross Cutting Comments See analysis of Monterey Bay NMS Issues							
26.0 Spill Response and Contingency Planning	Emergency response within the Sanctuary ranges from small events associated with fuel and oil discharges, debris and habitat damage from vessel groundings, sinkings and plane crashes, to larger oil spills from offshore shipping traffic, sunken vessels or natural seeps where damages can span hundreds of miles of coastline. The most severe oil spill impacts would result from large, acute spills usually associated with oil well blowouts, or in the case of this sanctuary, tanker accidents. Oil spills could have a major impact on foraging birds including the fouling of feathers, reducing flying and swimming ability, loss of buoyancy and thermal insulation. Preening birds can ingest oil leading to death, reproductive failure, unviable eggs or the transfer of oil to chicks. Pinnipeds may experience loss of buoyancy and thermal insulation from coming into contact with oil. Impacts on cetaceans from oil spills include contact with eyes or skin, fouling of baleens and ingestion or inhalation. Oil spill impacts on fish and benthic fauna may include reproductive failure and disruption in larval development. Additionally, oil residue may impact habitats throughout the water column, benthic habitats, kelp forests, rocky reefs and sandy beaches.	26.1 Stage adequate oil spill response supplies in Bodega Bay, not just SF Bay.	✓	✓	✓			
		26.2 Develop an oil spill contingency plan that applies to all three sanctuaries	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		26.3 Develop a Sanctuaries policy for use of oil spill dispersants	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
27.0 User Conflicts	<p>All three Sanctuaries are located near some of California’s most urbanized areas and have experienced an increase in the number of users. Users have put increasing demands on the resources through commercial and recreational fishing, wildlife viewing, boating, tourism, research interests and educational opportunities. Because the area is large and includes adjacent rural and urban areas, management must be responsive and equipped to deal with a broad range of concerns. One tool National Marine Sanctuaries use to address user conflicts is through zoning. Zoning may be used to avoid concentration of uses that could result in significant impacts on marine resources; to reduce conflict between users; provide opportunities for scientific research; and/or to provide for the recovery of resources from degradation or other injury attributable to human uses. Other tools to address user conflicts include: the promulgation of regulations restricting activities that are harmful and the development of voluntary rules for interaction with Sanctuary resources such as wildlife viewing guidelines.</p>	27.1 Sanctuary should not limit access to resources or recreational opportunities. Provide more public access to the Sanctuary.	✓	✓	✓		
28.0 Vessel Traffic	<p>The diverse resources in the Sanctuaries are particularly sensitive to the impacts of spilled oil or other hazardous materials. The Sanctuaries are also located in an area of active maritime commerce, which is a major component of the regional and national economy. Vessel traffic was a major issue of concern raised during the Sanctuary designation and concerns continue today. The historical record of spills for the Pacific Coast indicates that the total number of spills from transiting vessels is relatively small in number, but the potential impacts can be enormous given the number and volume of these vessels and the potential size of a spill.</p> <p>Due to the high volume of large commercial vessel traffic and the risks and consequences of spills, vessel traffic was a major issue during the MBNMS designation in 1992. NOAA and the Coast Guard used a collaborative “key stakeholder” process to develop recommendations, much of which were approved internationally, to move shipping lanes 12 to 20 miles offshore, and keep most tanker traffic out of the Sanctuary. Individuals commented on this issue during scoping with recommendations to move the vessel traffic lanes further offshore and thereby further reduce the threat potential.</p>	28.1 Move tanker traffic further offshore, outside of Sanctuaries.	✓	✓	✓		

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
29.0 Water Quality	<p>Nonpoint Source Pollution Coastal watersheds immediately adjacent to the three sanctuaries cover over 10,000 square miles of land with a mix of land uses including major urban areas, rural communities, agricultural land, and pockets of industrial areas. As rainfall or irrigation water in these watersheds moves downstream, it picks up a variety of contaminants. Offshore areas of the Sanctuaries are in relatively good condition, but nearshore coastal areas, harbors, lagoons, estuaries and tributaries show a number of problems including elevated levels of coliform bacteria, detergents, oils, nitrates, sediments, and persistent pesticides such as DDT and toxaphene. These contaminants can have a variety of biological impacts including bioaccumulation, reduced recruitment of anadromous species, algal blooms, transfer of human pathogens and interference with recreational uses of the sanctuary due to beach closures. In addition, recent problems such as recurring beach closures which are in part due to nonpoint sources of coliform pollution have not yet been adequately addressed in the urban runoff and water quality monitoring efforts.</p> <p>Point Source Pollution Point sources of pollution are those in which a single discharge point is evident, and they include sewage spills and discharges, desalination plants, and industrial discharges such as power plants. Sewage spills have become more frequent in recent years, in part due to cracks and clogging of aging pipelines beneath many of the region’s cities and small communities. These spills, along with nonpoint sources of coliform, have contributed to more frequent beach closures which reduce recreational use. Pathogens from sewage have also been implicated in sea otter diseases and mortality patterns. In addition, there are currently 15 desalination plants that are existing or in some stage of planning within MBNMS, with an increasing trend towards the development of small independent plants for private developments. Discharges from these plants have potential impacts due to elevated salinity and metal levels, toxic contaminants associated with cleaning and maintenance, and construction impacts from pipelines</p>	29.1 Collaborate with local, state and federal management agencies to address impacts from point and non-point source pollution.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		29.2 Prohibit private desalination facilities		✓	✓		
		29.3 Address pollution from municipal sewage system outfalls.		✓	✓		
		29.4 Establish a water quality pollution monitoring program through all three sanctuaries	✓	✓	✓		
		29.5 Monitor and address pollution from SF Bay.	✓	✓	✓	✓	

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues	Spatial Range				
			C B	G F	M B	R	N
30.0 Wildlife Disturbance	The Sanctuaries provide many opportunities for observation of nature, including whale watching, bird watching and pinniped pupping and haulout activity. Party boats are used for nature observation tours. Rocky shorelines provide pedestrians opportunities to view the flora and fauna associated with the habitat. With the multitude of opportunities for observation comes the potential for wildlife disturbance which may result in flushing birds from their nesting sites, pinnipeds abandoning pups, potential harassment or even death. Previously in the MBNMS ecotourism operations included white shark viewing with the aid of chumming and other attraction methods. MBNMS has adopted prohibitions for white shark attraction. These activities do occur in the GFNMS or CBNMS, however no regulations for these activities exist.	30.1 Develop responsible wildlife viewing standards for various user groups (kayakers, hikers, boaters, divers, etc.).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		30.2 Adopt regulations that limit or prohibit “chumming” for great white sharks; keep regulations consistent between sanctuaries.	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		30.3 Develop action plan, and possibly new regulations, to better protect sanctuary tidepool wildlife from trampling and collection activities.		✓	✓		

TABLE 3: Analysis of Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
1.0 Acoustic Impacts	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
2.0 Administration	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
3.0 Aquaculture	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
4.0 Biodiversity Protection & Ecosystem Conservation	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
5.0 Boundary Modifications	All three sites have boundaries that are defined by their terms of designation. The boundary delineates the spatial extent of each sanctuary. During the designation process, a range of boundary options are proposed, and often modified based on public and agency input before there is a final determination on the boundary. Typically, sanctuary boundaries are designed to protect areas of special significance such as a distinct ecosystem, and address human uses. The management plan review process provides an opportunity to re-examine, evaluate, and, as appropriate, redefine a sanctuary's boundary.	5.1 Boundary of the Sanctuary should be extended north and inwards toward the coast.
6.0 Coastal Armoring	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
7.0 Coastal Development	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
8.0 Community Outreach	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
9.0 Cultural Resources	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
10.0 Education	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
11.0 Enforcement & Regulations	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
12.0 Exotic/ Introduced	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.

TABLE 3: Analysis of Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
Species		
13.0 Fishing	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
14.0 Habitat Alteration	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
15.0 Marine Bioprospecting	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
16.0 Marine Debris & Discharge	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
17.0 Military Activities	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
18.0 Monitoring	Data derived from monitoring efforts provide an important tool in effective resource management. Monitoring provides short- and long-term information about the resources. This information may indicate trends, changes over time, or cause-and-effect relationships. CBNMS has initiated several monitoring projects to assess environmental changes as they occur including: monitoring harmful algal blooms; visual assessments of the Cordell Bank reef community; population assessments of blue and humpback whales; seabird surveys; and monitoring of biological, physical and chemical properties of the CBNMS.	18.1 Expand Monterey Bay NMS’s Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN) program to Cordell Bank.
19.0 Motorized Personal Watercraft (MPWC)	MPWCs operate in a manner unique among recreational vehicles creating potential impacts on wildlife, water quality and the quality of a person’s experience. The high speed and maneuverability of personal watercraft, and the fact they tend to operate nearshore and in a repeated fashion, within a confined area, results in recurring disturbance to animals and habitats. Suspected impacts include behavior modification of sea birds, fish and pinnipeds; and site abandonment and avoidance by certain porpoises and whales. The National Marine Sanctuary Program has regulated MPWC in both the Monterey Bay and Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuaries. The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary restricted use of these vehicles with the designation in 1992 and confined their use to four zones outside of the four harbors in the Sanctuary. That regulation defined MPWC to mean any motorized vessel that is less than 15 feet in length, is capable of exceeding speeds of 15 knots, and has the capacity to carry not more than the operator and one other person while in operation. Since adoption of this regulation, certain MPWC manufacturers have designed vehicles that do not fall under the MBNMS definition. Specifically, certain MPWCs now are capable of carrying two, three or four people in addition to the operator and therefore are not subject to the MBNMS regulation. There have been conflicts between MPWCs and other recreational ocean users due to the noise and operation of MPWCs. On Sept. 10, 2001, the	19.1 MPWC should be banned from Cordell Bank NMS and Bodega Bay.

TABLE 3: Analysis of Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	Gulf of the Farallones NMS published a final rule prohibiting MPWC throughout the entire sanctuary except for emergency search and rescue and for law enforcement purposes. Currently there is no regulation pertaining to MPWC for Cordell Bank NMS.	
20.0 Oil/Gas Development & Exploration	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
21.0 Partnerships w/ Agencies	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
22.0 Partnerships w/ Community Groups	CBNMS has a staff of 4 1/2 and a budget of \$480,000. Community partnerships provide a useful, economical and efficient means of project implementation.	22.1 Provide more opportunities to work with volunteers and other community partners
23.0 Radioactive Waste	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
24.0 Research	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
25.0 Sanctuary Advisory Council	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
26.0 Spill Response & Contingency Planning	The Sanctuary participates in emergency response and contingency planning for oil spills, hazardous material spills, grounded vessels or natural disasters. The plan is based on the Incident Command System and U.S. Coast Guard’s Area Contingency Plan and seeks to initiate a seamless operation in cooperation with various Federal, State and local emergency response agencies in California. The most severe oil spill impacts would result from large, acute spills usually associated with oil well blowouts, or in the case of this sanctuary, tanker accidents. Oil spills could have a major impact on foraging birds including the fouling of feathers, reducing flying and swimming ability, loss of buoyancy and thermal insulation. Preening birds can ingest oil leading to death, reproductive failure, unviable eggs or the transfer of oil to chicks. Pinnipeds may experience loss of buoyancy and thermal insulation from coming into contact with oil. Impacts on cetaceans from oil spills include contact with eyes or skin, fouling of baleens and ingestion or inhalation. Oil spill impacts on fish and benthic fauna may include reproductive failure and disruption in larval development. Additionally, oil residue may impact habitats throughout the water column, benthic habitats, kelp forests, rocky reefs and sandy beaches.	26.1 Ensure there is an updated contingency plan to respond to oil and hazardous material spills.
27.0 User Conflicts	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.

TABLE 3: Analysis of Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
28.0 Vessel Traffic	The Sanctuary is home to an extraordinarily diverse array of marine mammals, sea birds, fishes and invertebrates, including many species that are particularly sensitive to the impacts of spilled oil or other hazardous materials. The Sanctuary is also located in an area of critical importance to the conduct of maritime commerce, which is a major component of the regional and national economy. Vessel traffic within the Sanctuary was a major issue of concern raised during the Sanctuary designation process and continues today. The historical record of spills for the Pacific Coast indicates that the total number of spills from transiting vessels is relatively small in number, but the potential impacts can be enormous given the number and volume of these vessels and the potential size of a spill.	28.1 Provide more safeguards to reduce incidences of vessel oil spills or discharges in or near Cordell Bank.
29.0 Water Quality	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.
30. 0 Wildlife Disturbance	No Comments specific to CBNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No Comments specific to CBNMS.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
1.0 Acoustic Impacts	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.
2.0 Administration	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.
3.0 Aquaculture	NOAA defines aquaculture/mariculture as, “The propagation and rearing of aquatic and/or marine organisms in controlled or selected environments for any commercial, recreational, or public purpose.” Aquaculture is used for bait production, wild stock enhancement, fish cultures for zoos and aquaria, rebuilding of populations of threatened and endangered species, and human food production. One of the concerns about aquaculture is the impact it has on water quality. Intensive cage, floating pen and other types of aquaculture systems discharge wastes directly to the aquatic environment. Ocean water circulatory systems, used for pools and tanks, often discharge pulses of highly concentrated waste discharges during cleaning and harvesting. Other concerns related to aquaculture activities may include: an elevated risk for eutrophication; accumulation of antibiotics; and disease, parasite, and exotic species introduction (including genetically altered). Escapement of hatchery stocks may lead to interbreeding with native wild stocks altering genetic make-up. In GFNMS, oysters and scallops are grown on tracts of tidelands in Tomales Bay leased from the State Lands Commission and regulated by CDFG.	3.1 Regulate the operation of aquaculture/mariculture facilities in the Sanctuary, particularly as it relates to water quality discharges. 3.2 Prohibit aquaculture facilities from discharging harmful pathogens or introducing non-native species.
4.0 Biodiversity Protection & Ecosystem Conservation	The goals and objectives set forth by the National Marine Sanctuary Act (NMSA) direct each of the Sanctuaries to take an ecosystem-based approach to managing marine environments that have temporal and spatial complexity, diversity and dimension. Through Sanctuary partnerships, experience has shown that the scientific community, resource agencies and the public have recognized the importance of an integrated ecosystem approach to sanctuary management. Ecosystems include habitat structure, species assemblages and ecological processes. While upholding our highest goal of resource protection, Sanctuaries do allow for multiple uses that are compatible with resource protection. Management Plans set out how human use activities will be addressed by the Sanctuaries while improving the conservation, understanding, management and sustainable use of marine resources.	4.1 Need better integration of land use planning adjacent to the estuaries 4.2 Land around Esteros should remain zoned for agriculture. 4.3 Increase protection of sanctuary habitats and natural resources, particularly in intertidal areas 4.4 Sanctuary should evaluate watershed/upland uses and how they impact the marine environment (agriculture, vineyards, forestry/logging, waste management). 4.5 Sanctuary should recognize the good land stewardship practices by ranchers and farmers.
5.0 Boundary Modifications	All three sites have boundaries that are defined by their terms of designation. The boundary delineates the spatial extent of each sanctuary. During the designation process, a range of boundary options are proposed, and often modified based on public and agency input before there is a final determination on the boundary. Typically, sanctuary boundaries are designed to protect areas of special significance such as a distinct ecosystem, and address human uses. The management plan review process provides an opportunity to re-examine, evaluate, and, as appropriate, redefine a sanctuary’s boundary.	5.1 Move the GFNMS southern boundary to Ano Nuevo or the San Mateo County Line. 5.2 Move the GFNMS southern boundary south to include Marin County. 5.3 Extend the boundary into San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento River. 5.4 Extend the boundary north into Sonoma County.
6.0 Coastal Armoring	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
7.0 Coastal Development	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.
8.0 Community Outreach	Outreach programs are intended to reach a broader audience than focused education programs. Outreach programs complement educational efforts in achieving many of the Sanctuary’s management objectives. GFNMS, in cooperation with the Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association, sponsors events, interpretive trips and exhibits. FMSA and GFNMS have worked together in establishing visitor centers in Pacifica and San Francisco. Sanctuary outreach materials are also available at Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Point Reyes National Seashore, and Bodega Marine Lab.	8.1 Expand community lecture series and make it more accessible to the public.
		8.2 Continue existing sanctuary volunteer programs.
		8.3 Sanctuary should work with the Steinhart Aquarium on outreach activities.
9.0 Cultural Resources	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.
10.0 Education	Education programs are designed to enhance public awareness and understanding of marine natural and cultural resources of the Sanctuary. Education is essential to achieving many of the Sanctuary’s management objectives, and is an important component in promoting the Sanctuary’s research and restoration projects. The Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association (FMSA) works collaboratively with GFNMS to implement various education, interpretation, and research programs. GFNMS in cooperation with FMSA, sponsors student summits, lectures, teacher training, summer camps and other education programs. FMSA is also supporting the development of a Coastal Ecosystem curriculum for high school students and multi-cultural programs with the San Francisco Dept. of Parks and Recreation and the California Coastal Commission.	10.1 Continue and expand volunteer programs such as BEACH Watch.
		10.2 Establish an outreach program with the agriculture industry in Sonoma County.
		10.3 Inform users and landowners about the Sanctuary and its regulations
11.0 Enforcement and Regulations	The purpose of Sanctuary enforcement is to ensure compliance with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and appropriate regulations of the Sanctuary. Section 207 of the NMSA authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct activities for carrying out the Act, delineates civil penalties and powers of authorized officers, and provides for recovery of penalties by the Secretary. Although GFNMS does not have an enforcement program of its own, it works together with the U.S. Coast Guard, National Marine Fisheries Service and Dept. of Fish and Game to enforce Sanctuary regulations. The Sanctuary also works directly with user groups to encourage compliance and best management practices. As an example, GFNMS has worked with CalTrans to stop the disposal of highway spoils along the Sanctuary shoreline. Sanctuary staff worked for more than 10 years with the City of Santa Rosa to prevent sewage discharge in the Sanctuary. As a result, the City’s tertiary treatment system processes discharges that can be used to irrigate crops and recharge the aquifer for the Geyser electric generating facility.	11.1 Enforce existing regulations, particularly the new jet ski regulation.
		11.2 Acquire a dedicated Sanctuary enforcement officer.
12.0 Exotic /	Exotic species in the marine environment can be defined as a plant, invertebrate, fish, amphibian, bird, reptile or mammal whose natural zoogeographic range would not have	12.1 Prohibit those activities that could result in the introduction of non-native disease and species.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
Introduced Species	included the waters of the Eastern Pacific without passive or active introduction to the area through anthropogenic means. San Francisco Bay is considered to be one of the most invaded aquatic ecosystems in North America with more than 200 introduced species. Exotic species in the marine environment threaten the diversity and/or abundance of native marine species and human recreational and commercial activities. Common sources of introduction of exotic species include ballast water and disposal of aquaria materials. Prevention of exotic species introduction is proving to be more effective than eradication of exotic species.	12.2 Limit the spread of non-native oysters in Tomales Bay by commercial culture operations.
13.0 Fishing & Kelp Harvesting	King salmon and rockfish are the primary sport fishing targets. The most important commercial harvests include salmon, rockfish, flatfish, albacore tuna and Dungeness crab. Most of the commercial catches harvested in GFNMS are landed in San Francisco, Bodega Bay, Oakland, Half Moon Bay, and Sausalito. Clam digging is a popular activity for gaper, Washington, and littleneck clams. The tidal community includes a wide diversity of invertebrates such as barnacles, limpets, black turban snails, mussels, sea anemones and urchins that may be harvested as well. Gear types used in GFNMS include: sceines, round haulnets, gillnets, trammel nets, hook and line, long lines, bottom trawlers and mid-water trawlers. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) regulates fisheries in State waters and, under the Marine Life Protection Act, is currently restructuring marine managed areas. The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) regulates fisheries in Federal waters and designates Essential Fish Habitat as a fisheries management tool. GFNMS staff coordinates with these agencies. During the management plan review process GFNMS staff will be evaluating the best tools for protection of living resources and habitats.	13.1 Ensure the fish and invertebrates are not overfished or depleted (i.e., salmon, rockfish, geoducks, horse neck clams, abalone).
14.0 Habitat Alteration	Human alteration of the environment includes any modification from the natural state. Types of alteration include the laying fiber optic cables or placement of other objects like artificial reefs on the seabed. Alteration can occur from repeated activity such as bottom trawling or tidepool trampling, Habitat alteration can have either negative or positive impacts depending upon the nature of the activity (i.e., habitat destruction or creation). Placement of seawalls, riprap, or other coastal armoring also alters the habitat however this issue is included in this summary as a coastal armoring issue. Many land based human actions may also directly alter the habitat in the Sanctuaries, however these specific actions were categorized under the coastal development issue. The impacts of activities that alter the habitat vary depending upon the action or duration of the activity.	<p>14.1 Sanctuary should determine, and if necessary regulate, the impacts from upstream land use practices (forestry, agriculture, development) on sanctuary resources.</p> <p>14.2 Protect tidepool habitats from trampling and collection.</p> <p>14.3 Establish a mooring buoy system for vessels at various anchorage locations.</p> <p>14.4 Explore opportunities to use wrecks and other artificial reefs to enhance sanctuary resources.</p>
15.0 Marine Bioprospecting	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
16.0 Marine Debris and Discharge	Marine debris and discharge originates from both land-based and at-sea sources. Due to the proximity to San Francisco Bay, the Sanctuary has been thought of as a convenient location to dump dredge spoils. The Sanctuary has worked closely with the Port of Oakland, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U. S. EPA to identify appropriate locations outside of the Sanctuary for clean dredge material disposal. The Sanctuary worked with the City of Santa Rosa to find alternatives for sewage disposal that included using tertiary treatment system to process discharges to be used to irrigate crops. The Sanctuary has also worked with partners such as the Pt. Reyes National Seashore to identify sources of land-based discharges such as mercury from abandoned mines. With more than 58 coastal access points to the Sanctuary and three major shipping lanes converging on San Francisco Bay, discharges from vessel traffic and associated activities is a major concern that us partially addressed by Sanctuary regulations.	16.1 Organize clean-up events for coastal areas and beaches.
17.0 Military Activities	The U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard (non-military) regularly use the GFNMS for operations. U.S. Navy’s third fleet conducts surface, air and submarine maneuvers. Just outside GFNMS to the north, there is a special submarine transit lane used primarily on approach to, and departure from, San Francisco Bay. The U.S. Navy’s operations areas are located 8 nautical miles (nmi) southeast and 9 nmi northwest of the Farallon Islands. This submarine activity includes a trial diving exercise and various equipment checkouts normally following vessel refitting or overhauls. Approximately 10 nmi southwest of the Pt. Reyes Headlands, the U.S. Navy conducts aircraft and surface vessel exercises, often coordinated with submarine operations. Submarine transit lanes run parallel to the mainland and due west of Bodega Headland and vary in width from 7 to 10 nmi. When activated, all other vessels in the vicinity are cautioned against towing submerged objects. The U.S. Coast Guard flies maintenance personnel to the lighthouse on Southeast Farallon Island for periodic servicing. They also conduct regular flights within the Sanctuary for enforcement and search and rescue missions.	17.1 Sanctuary should reduce or eliminate the impact of pollution (including sound) from military experiments and activities.
18.0 Monitoring	Data derived from monitoring efforts provide an important tool in effective resource management. Monitoring provides short- and long-term information about the resources. This information may indicate trends, changes over time, or cause and/or effect relationships. Over the past 20 years, the GFNMS has supported several seabird and marine mammal monitoring programs. These include the investigation of pollutants in breeding seabirds and Steller sea lions, and surveys of the number and distribution of pinnipeds, harbor porpoises, and humpback, gray, blue and minke whales. Currently, GFNMS is involved in several marine mammal monitoring programs, shoreline monitoring, intertidal monitoring, coastal ecology relationships monitoring, and restoration monitoring.	18.1 Determine the status of and continually monitor red abalone in Bodega Bay. 18.2 Monitor sea lion populations. 18.3 Increase monitoring efforts to determine impacts of the radioactive waste disposal site. 18.4 Monitor water quality for presence and impacts of pollutants. 18.5 Monitor impacts of shark chumming on sharks and other prey populations. 18.6 Expand the MBNMS’s Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN) to GFNMS.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
19.0 Motorized Personal Watercraft (MPWC)	PWCs operate in a manner unique among recreational vehicles creating potentially significant impacts on wildlife, water quality and personal safety. The high speed and maneuverability of personal watercraft, and the fact they tend to operate nearshore and in a repeated fashion, within a confined area, results in recurring disturbance to animals and habitats. Studies have shown that the use of PWCs in nearshore areas can increase flushing rates, reduce nesting success of certain bird species, have impacts on spawning fish, and reduce fishing success. Coastal nests can be flooded by wakes of the vehicles, which can also cause shoreline erosion, and increased turbidity via shallow-water sediment resuspension. Offshore, marine mammals or surfacing birds may be unaware of the presence of the vehicles due to the low frequency sound, combined with the vehicles' high speed, and rapid and unpredictable movements, putting animals and operators at risk. Suspected impacts include behavior modification of sea birds, fish and pinnipeds; and site abandonment and avoidance by certain porpoises and whales. A majority of PWCs have two-stroke engines that release 10% to 50% more pollutants into the water column than other vessels with 4-stroke engines. On Sept. 10, 2001, the Gulf of the Farallones NMS published a final rule prohibiting MPWC throughout the entire sanctuary except for emergency search and rescue and for law enforcement purposes.	19.1 Expand the sanctuary boundary north to prohibit jet skis off Sonoma County.
20.0 Oil and Gas Exploration and Development	Oil and gas activity was one of the major reasons for designation of all five of the West Coast National Marine Sanctuaries. In 1989, the State Lands Commission administratively foreclosed the possibility of new oil and gas leasing in California State coastal waters. This administrative Sanctuary was incorporated through the California Coastal Sanctuary Act of 1994. Pursuant to that statute, all State coastal waters, except those under lease on January 1, 1995, are permanently protected from development. No portion of the Federal OCS has a permanent moratorium on oil and gas leasing and development except some of the waters within National Marine Sanctuaries (by regulation or statute). A temporary moratorium has been in place since 1982. The most current directive (June 1998, Clinton administration), under the OCS Lands Act, prevents any leasing of new areas for oil and gas exploration and development through June 30, 2012. The OCS presidential deferrals can be reversed by subsequent administrations and do not restrict development of already leased Federal areas. There are 79 remaining active OCS leases, all off the coast of central and southern California in San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura and Los Angeles counties. There are no active leases in or adjacent to GFNMS, CBNMS or MBNMS. A concern about activities related to oil and gas development is the impacts on marine resources from oil spills.	20.1 Permanently prohibit petroleum and natural gas exploration, development, or production with the sanctuaries or in areas with the potential to impact the Farallon Islands.
21.0 Partnerships with Agencies	GFNMS and the NMSP are committed to coordinating with other Federal, State and local agencies on a continuous ecosystem management process. The process is designed to ensure the long-term protection of the unique resources of this region. As such, the management	21.1 Coordinate with Coast Guard and Navy and other aviators during the breeding season to minimize disturbance at the Farallon Islands.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	<p>process requires the cooperation of many agencies and institutions that historically may have different goals. Overlapping jurisdictions, different agency mandates and limited resources necessitate the development of a relationship that brings together multiple agencies for the common purpose of ecosystem management. Achieving the long and short-term GFNMS goals requires close and continuing partnerships among all agencies. The GFNMS borders are adjacent to, or overlap areas under the authority of several different agencies. GFNMS partners with/ and or shares management responsibilities with ten Federal agencies, twelve State, and many local agencies and not for profit organizations.</p>	<p>21.2 Collaborate with local, state and federal management agencies to address impacts from development and non-point source pollution.</p>
<p>22.0 Partnerships with Community Groups</p>	<p>As an individual site, GFNMS has limited staff and financial resources. Without the support of community partnerships, GFNMS could not carry out its current level of day-to-day operations. Community partnerships provide a useful and efficient means of project implementation. Community partnerships include five research and educational institutions, over 450 Beach Watch, SEALS, and other volunteers, 14 non-governmental organizations, and the Farallones Marine Sanctuary Association (FMSA). FMSA, a not for profit organization, works collaboratively with GFNMS to implement various education, interpretation, outreach and research programs.</p>	<p>22.1 Explore opportunities to work with the Surfrider Foundation on coastal water quality monitoring.</p> <p>22.2 Expand efforts to involve volunteer organizations and community groups in sanctuary management.</p>
<p>23.0 Radioactive Waste</p>	<p>From 1946 to 1970, a variety of U.S. government agencies and private research institutions legally dumped more than 50,000 55-gallon drums containing low, high and undetermined levels of radioactivity. Working with the U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Navy and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, GFNMS has conducted limited exploratory testing of substrates and groundfish in the dumpsites.</p>	<p>23.1 Determine status of barrels containing radioactive waste and assess potential impacts of contamination.</p> <p>23.2 Develop a clean-up plan for the Farallones radioactive dumpsite and implement it.</p> <p>23.3 Disseminate more information about the effects of radiation on fish, the fishing industry, and humans.</p> <p>23.4 Prohibit bottom trawling in vicinity of radioactive waste site.</p>
<p>24.0 Research</p>	<p>The diversity of physical and biological habitats throughout the Gulf of the Farallones offers an outstanding opportunity for scientific research on marine and estuarine ecosystems. Marine research activities focus on Intertidal flora, seabirds, and marine mammals. On the mainland, numerous bays and headlands offer prime locations for ecological studies of coastal ecosystems. The Areas of Special Biological Significance around the Farallon Islands, Point Reyes Headlands, Duxbury Reef, Double Point, Bird Rock and Bodega Marine Life Refuge all contain unique resources warranting protection for educational and scientific use. Most research in the GFNMS is carried out by investigators associated with Universities, CDFG, NPS or PRBO</p>	<p>24.1 Complete joint tax inventory of Sanctuary with Point Reyes National Seashore.</p> <p>24.2 Conduct research on white sharks, including the effects of chumming.</p> <p>24.3 Determine the sources and impacts of pollution on sanctuary wildlife (include SF Bay).</p> <p>24.4 Coordinate and disseminate information about research activities in the Sanctuary.</p> <p>24.5 Encourage and provide support for research in the sanctuary</p>
<p>25.0 Sanctuary Advisory Council</p>	<p>No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.</p>	<p>No comments specific to GFNMS.</p>

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
26.0 Spill Response and Contingency Planning	No comments specific to GFNMS. See Analysis of Cross-Cutting Issues Table.	No comments specific to GFNMS.
27.0 User Conflicts	All three Sanctuaries are located near some of California’s most urbanized areas and have experienced an increase in the number of users. Users have put increasing demands on the resources through commercial and recreational fishing, wildlife viewing, boating, tourism, research and education. Because the area is large and includes adjacent rural and urban areas, management must be responsive and equipped to deal with a broad range of concerns. National Marine Sanctuaries may address user conflicts via zonal management. Zoning may be used to: avoid concentration of uses that could result in significant impacts on marine resources; reduce conflict between users; provide opportunities for scientific research; and/or to provide for the recovery of resource degradation.	27.1 Determine whether too many users are negatively impacting sanctuary resources. 27.2 Ensure the Sanctuary users (kayakers and hikers) do not impact wildlife on nearby private lands and ranches. 27.3 Prohibit “extreme” sports from occurring in the Sanctuary. 27.4 Resolve conflict between shark researchers and shark wildlife watching operators. 27.5 Determine whether there is a need to regulate the number of kayakers and boaters in Tomales Bay.
28.0 Vessel Traffic	The Sanctuary is home to an extraordinarily diverse array of marine mammals, sea birds, fishes and invertebrates, including many species that are particularly sensitive to the impacts of spilled oil or other hazardous materials. The Sanctuary is also located in an area of critical importance to the conduct of maritime commerce, which is a major component of the regional and national economy. Vessel traffic within the Sanctuary was a major issue of concern raised during the Sanctuary designation process and continues today. The historical record of spills for the Pacific Coast indicates that the total number of spills from transiting vessels is relatively small in number, but the potential impacts can be enormous given the number and volume of these vessels and the potential size of a spill.	28.1 Safety should be considered in the westbound lane for ships, fishing vessels, and all watercraft. 28.2 Evaluate the need to require tug escorts in other sensitive coastal areas.
29.0 Water Quality	Oceanic water quality along the northern California coast generally ranges from very good to high, except in areas adjacent to population centers. The Sanctuary works with Federal and State agencies to monitor near-shore and estuarine areas of the Sanctuary for pollutant, oxygen, and nutrient levels, and algal blooms. Of special concern are the estuarine habitats of Bolinas Lagoon, Tomales Bay, Estero Americano, and Estero de San Antonio. The watersheds of these areas are subject to runoff from agricultural, livestock grazing, improperly treated effluent, dumping, historic mining and development. These pollutants affect the biological, recreational, economic, and aesthetic resources of the Sanctuary. Since 1970, there have been regular reports of birds with oil on them at the Farallon Islands. The sanctuary’s shoreline monitoring program, BEACH Watch, and the State’s Office of Spill Prevention and Response, have shown that hydrocarbons found on bird feathers and in tarball samples are not from local sources. This suggests that vessels cleaning tanks or discharging their bilges prior to entering the bay are primary source of chronic oil pollution.	29.1 Develop a plan for addressing polluted runoff from agriculture and forestry lands. 29.2 Develop a plan for addressing polluted runoff from urbanized and developed areas (homes, streets, storm drains, etc.). 29.3 Improve water quality in the Estero de San Antonio 29.4 Regulate the dumping of pollutants into Americano Creek 29.5 Eliminate sewage discharges in the Sanctuary 29.6 Focus water quality protection efforts within local watersheds 29.7 Expand BEACH Watch to include a water quality monitoring component.

TABLE 4: Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
		29.8 Provide incentives to farmers (and other non-point source pollutions sources) to improve the quality of runoff into the Sanctuary.
30.0 Wildlife Disturbance	The Sanctuaries provide many opportunities for observation of nature, including whale watching, bird watching, and pinniped pupping and haulout activity. Party boats are used for nature observation tours. Rocky shorelines provide pedestrians opportunities to view the flora and fauna associated with the habitat. With the multitude of opportunities for observation comes the potential for wildlife disturbance which may result in flushing birds from their nesting sites, pinnipeds abandoning pups, potential harassment or even death. Previously in the MBNMS ecotourism operations included white shark viewing with the aid of chumming and other attraction methods. MBNMS has adopted prohibitions for white shark attraction. These activities do occur in the GFNMS or CBNMS, however no regulations for these activities exist.	30.1 Prohibit shark chumming activities for the purpose of wildlife viewing (consistent with the existing MBNMS regulations). 30.2 Regulate shark ecotourism by establishing a limited entry permit system. 30.3 Investigate the impacts of overflight on wildlife. 30.4 Evaluate the impacts of wildlife disturbance from too many people viewing or recreating nearby. 30.5 Protect tidepools from overuse by limiting the number of people.

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
1.0 Acoustic Impacts	<p>A number of studies document impacts to living marine resources, including behavioral changes and physical effects due to exposure to anthropogenic noise and pressure waves in the marine environment. Anthropogenic sources of noise include: large commercial shipping traffic such as container ships, freighters, barges and tankers, recreational and commercial boats, military low frequency testing, research activities and aerial overflights. Marine mammals have been observed to deviate from their migration paths to avoid noise, or interrupt their communications in response to elevated noise levels. Certain anthropogenic noise is thought to mask sounds used for mating, feeding and avoiding predators. Responses vary depending on the acoustic frequency, decibel level, proximity to the source and other species-specific sensitivity factors. Concern about the cumulative impacts of noise from a variety of sources has grown as the ocean has become noisier in past half-century. However, long-term cumulative impacts are uncertain and range from minimal impacts in some situations to behavioral alterations to possible physiological or physical damage to hearing. The MBNMS has been involved in evaluating and requesting limits or alterations of specific proposals to use acoustic devices in the region, such as the Navy’s recent Low-Frequency Array proposal, but has not addressed the overall issue of cumulative noise impacts.</p>	<p>1.1 Restrict harmful sources of marine noise</p> <p>1.2 Ban LFA within MBNMS</p>
2.0 Administration	<p>Administrative roles for governing the MBNMS are led by the MBNMS Superintendent, with direction and support from the National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP). The NMSP provides oversight and coordination among the thirteen national marine sanctuaries, taking responsibility for ensuring each site’s management plan is coordinated and consistent with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act while developing a general budget and staffing for the site. The MBNMS Superintendent is responsible for determining expenditures for program development, operating costs and staffing to meet the site’s annual operating plan. Annually, based on Congressional appropriations, the NMSP reviews and adjusts funding priorities and requirements with the Superintendent to reflect resource management needs. The Superintendent and NMSP work together to monitor effectiveness of the management plan and to develop programs or policies that help meet resource management priorities. Since 1992, the MBNMS staff has grown to 12 government employees and about 10 contractors; its budget has grown from about \$450,000 in the first year to \$2,750,000 in fiscal year 2002. Prior to 1998, the GFNMS had shared management responsibilities for the northern half of the MBNMS. Since then, most of the management duties for this region have shifted to the MBNMS, although certain management responsibilities are carried out through joint consultation.</p>	<p>2.1 Pursue additional resources to implement all programs</p> <p>2.2 MBNMS should increase role in conflict resolution among agencies and public</p> <p>2.3 Need increased presence (office, resources) outside of Monterey Peninsula (north, south, inland)</p> <p>2.4 Increase public responsiveness and accountability</p>
3.0 Aquaculture	<p>Currently six aquaculture companies operate within the MBNMS, culturing species such as abalone, algae, steelhead, salmon, and shrimp. NOAA defines aquaculture as, “The propagation and rearing of aquatic</p>	<p>3.1 Increase regulation and education on aquaculture.</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	<p>organisms in controlled or selected environments for any commercial, recreational, or public purpose.” Aquaculture is used for bait production, wild stock enhancement, fish cultures for zoos and aquaria, rebuilding of populations of threatened and endangered species, and food production for human consumption. One of the concerns about aquaculture is the impact it has on water quality. Other concerns related to aquaculture activities may include: an elevated risk for eutrophication; disease and parasite introduction; accumulation of antibiotics; introduction of exotic species and escapement of hatchery stocks that may lead to interbreeding with native wild stocks altering genetic make-up</p>	<p>3.2 Increase education regarding aquaculture and how facilities can reduce impacts.</p>
<p>4.0 Biodiversity Protection and Ecosystem Conservation</p>	<p>The goals and objectives set forth by the National Marine Sanctuary Act (NMSA) direct each of the sanctuaries to take an ecosystem-based approach to managing these fluid marine environments that have great temporal and spatial complexity, diversity and dimension. Through sanctuary partnerships, our experience has shown that the scientific community, resource agencies and the public have recognized the importance of an integrated ecosystem approach to management of the sanctuaries. Ecosystems include habitat structure, species assemblages and ecological processes, as well as humans and their use patterns. While upholding the main goal of resource protection, sanctuaries do allow for multiple use that is compatible with resource protection. Among other things, Management Plans set out to describe how human use activities will be addressed by the sanctuaries while improving the conservation, understanding, management and wise and sustainable use of marine resources. Many of the comments received during scoping reiterate the goals and objectives of the NMSA. About 7,000 comments were received that directed the MBNMS to actively pursue protection of the ecosystem and enhance biodiversity through management strategies, such as marine reserves, tidepool protection, eliminate fishing gear that damages habitat and boundary changes to better protect ecosystems. Over 1,000 individuals signed a petition stating that any action towards marine reserves must involve affected parties like fishermen and must rely on regulatory authority of other agencies, like Fish and Game and NMFS/PFMC. Clearly this subissue received the most comments during the scoping process.</p>	<p>4.1 Produce one management plan for each ecosystem, not by agency.</p> <p>4.2 Revised management plan and future actions must focus on primary goal of resource protection.</p> <p>4.3 Management should focus on long term sustainability.</p> <p>4.4 Protect biodiversity by MBNMS adopting more fully protected areas, marine reserves, throughout Sanctuary.</p> <p>4.5 Adopt marine reserves in Federal waters; participate with and advise Cal Fish and Game in MLPA process.</p> <p>4.6 Advise and partner with CDFG and PFMC on marine reserves these agencies adopt</p> <p>4.7 Better protection of high use intertidal areas like Pt. Pinos</p> <p>4.8 Need special protection of biodiversity at special places – Salinas River, Pillar Point, all kelp beds.</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
		<p>4.9 Develop MBNMS specific action plans to help recover endangered species, or key species at risk.</p> <p>4.10 Evaluate extent of bycatch in local fisheries; consider further restrictions by fisheries agencies or MBNMS to protect ecosystem function.</p> <p>4.11 Evaluate effects to kelp forest community from nearshore (live fish) fishery; consider further restrictions by fisheries agencies or MBNMS to protect ecosystem function.</p> <p>4.12 Explore methods of balancing protected species populations affecting other protected populations (i.e. pinnipeds and anadromous fish)</p> <p>See also 5.0 Boundary Modifications: many boundary changes were proposed to increase biodiversity protection.</p>
5.0 Boundary Modifications	<p>All three sites have boundaries that define the sanctuary itself, and where applicable, special use zones (like dredge disposal areas for MBNMS) within the sanctuary. These boundaries received extensive debate and analysis when the sites' were designated. Typically, a sanctuary's boundary is set to protect a defined ecosystem; human use zones either allow uses within a zone or prohibit them. Comments have arisen about the need to adjust boundaries for various reasons, and the management plan review process is the proper place to consider those. Reasons for boundary adjustments have included better protection of an ecosystem (Move MBNMS boundary further south), increased biodiversity protection (Include Davidson Seamount in MBNMS; Close "donut hole" off San Francisco), and administrative/operation reasons (Move shared GF/MBNMS boundary south; Create one national marine sanctuary instead of three). Some changes might reduce resource protection (Create buffer zones off urban areas) while others are beyond the initial intent of sanctuary designation, and possibly the NMSA (Move sanctuary boundaries into harbors and up watersheds).</p>	<p>5.1 Move MBNMS boundary south.</p> <p>5.2 Include Davidson Seamount in MBNMS; include all offshore seamounts in MBNMS.</p> <p>5.3 Move Sanctuary boundaries inside harbors.</p> <p>5.4 Close 'Donut Hole' off San Francisco and Pacifica.</p> <p>5.5 Include Santa Cruz City area into MBNMS.</p> <p>5.6 Adopt buffer zones around harbors.</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
6.0 Coastal Armoring	Development along the coast has increased the pressure to protect coastal structures with various types of coastal armoring such as seawalls, bulkheads and revetments to manage erosion. Approximately 14 miles of the coastline is already armored in the MBNMS, and this is estimated to double if trends continue at the current rate. Coastal armoring can damage or alter local coastal habitats, deprive beaches of sand, lead to accelerated erosion of adjacent beaches, and hinder recreational access. MBNMS has reviewed and authorized Coastal Commission permits for seawalls, riprap or other coastal armoring projects at 16 sites since its designation. Conditions imposed primarily focused on minimizing impacts from the construction process rather than long-term impacts from the armoring itself. Only a portion of the total number of coastal armoring projects underway in the region came to the Sanctuary for review. This past year staff has initiated a joint evaluation of coastal armoring with the California Coastal Commission, with a goal of developing a more proactive, comprehensive regional approach to the issue.	6.1 Prohibit armoring (“seawalls”) in the Sanctuary. 6.2 Work with Coastal Commission to reduce emergency permitting and enact Sanctuary armoring policy which avoids sensitive areas. 6.3 Increase beach nourishment projects.
7.0 Coastal Development	It is predicted that the major population centers near all three sanctuaries will continue to grow steadily. Commercial and residential development is concentrated around the Monterey Bay including the Monterey Peninsula, Marina, Watsonville and Santa Cruz, as well as Half Moon Bay and north to San Francisco and Marin. With increases in development, additional pressures will come to install structures both to access the ocean and to protect property from the ocean. These include infrastructure associated with harbors, breakwaters, and jetties as well as forms of coastal armoring. Indirect effects of continued coastal development include increases in point source (increased sewer use) and non point source pollution as well as increased human presence at easily accessible points along the shoreline for the purposes of coastal recreation. Coastal development is typically controlled by local governments and the California Coastal Commission. Because coastal development can harm the marine environment, public comments asked the MBNMS, and to a lesser extent GFNMS, to influence such activity along their shorelines.	7.1 Sanctuaries should take active role in reducing impacts of population growth. 7.2 Restrict all development surrounding coastal wetlands 7.3 Preserve Big Sur area in its existing state
8.0 Community Outreach	<p>Communication and outreach for the MBNMS currently centers around its four facilities. The main thrust remains in Monterey and Santa Cruz, but has recently expanded south to San Simeon and north to Half Moon Bay. Most events and news surrounding the Sanctuary is disseminated through the education staff located in each office. Limited programming at schools and the general public are available. MBNMS just completed a multicultural education plan, targeting the large Hispanic community in Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties. The plan is to have bilingual marine educators working with families in their community groups, at targeted State Beaches and Parks and with Hispanic serving teachers. The majority of current outreach is in the form of informal presentations and distributed print materials.</p> <p>Many suggestions were raised during scoping regarding the need for increased outreach on many resource issues, the direction of outreach, as well as methods of outreach. Some general themes are captured in the subissues, however, please refer to Appendix 1 for specific comments and suggestions</p>	8.1 Build a visitor center and regional interpretive centers. 8.2 Increase marketing, media exposure and public awareness. 8.3 Increase outreach to inland areas. 8.4 Increase multicultural outreach efforts. 8.5 Increase availability of materials at other visitor centers.

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
9.0 Cultural Resources	Submerged cultural resources include shipwrecks, aircraft, wharfs and dock sites, prehistoric archaeological sites and associated artifacts. For hundreds of years mariners transiting this region have been faced with prevailing winds, extreme weather conditions and natural hazards. Although there is not a complete inventory, remnants of hundreds of ships are believed to be off the coast, within Sanctuary waters. With the development of underwater technologies that bring the public virtually closer to the marine environment, there is increasing interest in submerged cultural resources. The continuing discovery, exploration, documentation and study of these resources provides a richer understanding of the region's maritime community and the larger ecosystem.	9.1 Fully characterize and protect cultural resources in MBNMS.
10.0 Education	<p>MBNMS programming is designed to promote stewardship of the Sanctuary's natural and cultural marine resources while interpreting the issues affecting the MBNMS and the research being conducted. This is done through a broad array of symposia, student ocean conferences, workshops, print materials, signage, and public events. Programs and priorities are reviewed by the Sanctuary's Education Panel, a consortium educators from over 20 regional marine education/interpretation facilities. Current programming falls into one of three categories: resource issue education, general public education and teacher/student programming.</p> <p>During the scoping process, many people commented about the need for more education regarding the many resource protection issues affecting the sanctuary such as: natural processes, tidepool collection or trampling, population growth, impacts of dogs, resource protection issues, water pollution, regulated activities, fossil fuel use, aircraft overflight, positive aspects of fishing, fishing regulations, marine debris, and wildlife interaction.</p>	<p>10.1 Coordinate education, communication and outreach programs to reach strategic audiences for priority issues.</p> <p>10.2 Increase multicultural education programs.</p> <p>10.3 MBNMS should support special programs such as SeaLab Monterey Bay and Ocean Science Bowl.</p> <p>10.4 Develop plan to better use volunteers and interpretive panels/ kiosks to increase public education.</p> <p>10.5 More education articles in media (newspapers, public television).</p> <p>10.6 Expand Team Ocean kayak program</p> <p>10.7 Develop and implement a regional education plan .</p> <p>10.8 Build and equip effective education team.</p>
11.0 Enforcement of Regulations	The most common reported violations in the MBNMS are jetskis operating outside their designated zones, unlawful discharges from boats or land, and disturbance of marine mammals and seabirds from planes, recreational vessels, fishermen, and the general public. MBNMS enforcement capabilities have increased in the past two years with the addition of an enforcement investigation officer dedicated to the MBNMS. However, MBNMS field presence from a single officer is still quite limited due to the broad expanse of coastline and marine waters necessary to cover with very limited staff hours and vessel capabilities. Training and cross-deputizing CDFG wardens and CDPR rangers to also enforce Sanctuary regulations, as their time and staffing allows, have leveraged enforcement presence. Promotion of voluntary compliance	<p>11.1 Utilize existing enforcement agencies.</p> <p>11.2 Reduce enforcement, focus on data collection and education</p> <p>11.3 Increase enforcement of existing regulations.</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	<p>their time and staffing allows, have leveraged enforcement presence. Promotion of voluntary compliance is the first alternative for many types of Sanctuary violations, and has led to the establishment of effective programs to reduce harassment of elephant seals at Piedras Blancas and kayaker-sea otter interactions off Cannery Row. For those violations best dealt with by more traditional approaches, MBNMS has the authority to assess fines of up to \$109,000 per day of violation.</p>	<p>11.4 Develop voluntary compliance programs.</p> <p>11.5 Conduct more coastal patrols and obtain more “eyes” for the sanctuary.</p> <p>11.6 Institute an appeal process for MBNMS permits</p> <p>11.7 Streamline permitting process and assist in expediting multi-agency permits.</p> <p>11.8 Modify regulations so MBNMS does not have to issue permits; rely on other agency permits only.</p> <p>11.9 Print regulations in other languages.</p> <p>11.10 Need a tracking system for violations and enforcement action.</p> <p>11.11 Improve getting enforcement actions to prosecution.</p>
<p>12.0 Exotic / Introduced Species</p>	<p>Invasions by non-native aquatic species are increasingly common worldwide in coastal habitats. Estuaries, in particular, harbor large numbers of introduced species. For example, there are about 250 known invasive species in the San Francisco Bay and Delta, and 55 invasive invertebrates in the Elkhorn Slough. Although the effects of many introduced aquatic species on habitats they colonize is unknown, some clearly have had serious negative influences. Impacts often include decreasing abundance and even local extinction of native species, alteration of habitat structure, and extensive economic costs due to biofouling. Probably the most important mechanism for the introduction of aquatic species is transport in ship ballast tanks, though other mechanisms such as disposal of aquarium materials, aquaculture operations, bait and seafood packing, and research operations contribute to the issue. Eradication of introduced species is difficult, and management practices focus largely on prevention of introductions.</p>	<p>12.1 Prohibit disposal of ballast water to reduce threat of introduction</p> <p>12.2 Develop and implement introduced species prevention plan.</p> <p>12.3 Assess species introduction pathway and how to mitigate impacts.</p>
<p>13.0 Fishing / Kelp Harvesting</p>	<p>Fishing is a critical part of the region’s culture and economy, with about 1,000 commercial vessels fishing in the region annually, along with substantial recreational fishing. About 200 species are typically caught in the commercial and recreational fisheries, with the bulk of the commercial landings composed of squid, rockfishes, salmon, albacore, Dover sole, sablefish, mackerel, anchovy, and sardines. The five primary</p>	<p>13.1 Further refine language in Management Plan / EIS to describe MBNMS role in fishery management</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	<p>gear types used are pots and traps, trawl nets, hook-and-line gear, purse seines, and gill nets. Although some local stocks appear healthy, fishery managers are concerned about declining stocks and habitat threats for other species. MBNMS does not currently manage any aspect of commercial or recreational fisheries. The FEIS indicates that MBNMS should conduct research on harvested species and their ecological status, and use that advise and advocate with fishery management agencies. The FEIS did not envision a regulatory role for the MBNMS on fishing issues; if ecological problems arose , it was to consult with state and federal fishery agencies, and fishing industry, for regulatory or other solutions. The public has expressed concern about effects of fishing and certain gear types on MBNMS resources, habitats and ecosystems, while many fishermen have indicated they do not want MBNMS to regulate fisheries. Current involvement of MBNMS in issues related to fishing include conducting fisheries-related research, sponsoring educational events, occasionally commenting to other agencies on fishery issues, and, during the past year, working collaboratively with a Fishermen’s Alliance committee established to evaluate the potential for marine reserves.</p> <p>Kelp harvesting is also managed by the Department of Fish and Game although the appropriate level of kelp harvest remains an ongoing issue of interest in the MBNMS; In 2001, the Fish and Game Commission adopted a kelp harvesting plan for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.</p>	<p>13.2 Abide by existing language in designation documents and FEIS to limit role on fishing</p> <p>13.3 Focus efforts on activities that affect fishing (runoff, oil pollution)</p> <p>13.4 Pursue fishing regulations only in Federal waters</p> <p>13.5 Need further restriction of kelp harvesting in MBNMS</p> <p>13.6 Construct artificial reef for kelp harvesting or as mitigation for kelp harvesting</p> <p>13.7 Install artificial reefs to increase rockfish populations</p> <p>13.8 Develop programs with fishing community to promote positive aspects of fishing, such as fish stocks that are sustainable</p> <p><i>See also 3.0 Biodiversity Protection, and 14.0 Habitat Alteration</i></p>
<p>14.0 Habitat Alteration</p>	<p>All three sanctuaries have regulations that prohibit habitat alteration such as seabed disturbance. Exceptions to this include fishing activities and normal anchoring. Habitat alteration can result from construction activities or repeated activity such as bottom trawling or tidepool trampling. Habitat or environmental alteration can also occur as a form of restoration to a more natural state or by “engineered habitat such as artificial reefs. Placement of seawalls, rip rap, or other coastal armoring also alters the habitat however this issue is included in this summary as Issue 6.0, Coastal Armoring. The impacts of activities that alter the habitat vary depending upon the action or duration of the activity. Sanctuaries received comments calling for stricter regulation or prohibition of fiber optic cables, regulation of coastal sand mining operations, and restrictions on bottom trawling. Many comments also called for restoration activities, primarily in coastal wetlands that have been degraded by past human activity. Other specific comments called for placement of structures on the seafloor to propagate kelp for the purpose of harvesting or to act as habitat in order to mitigate for kelp harvesting activities.</p>	<p>14.1 Ban or restrict construction of commercial submarine cables</p> <p>14.2 Evaluate effects to benthic habitat from trawling; consider further restrictions by fishery agencies or MBNMS to protect habitat.</p> <p>14.3 Restrict sand mining along shores of or in MBNMS</p> <p>14.4 Increase riparian and wetland restoration amd salmonid watershed habitat</p> <p>14.5 Investigate coastal erosion caused by coastal development</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
15.0 Marine Bioprospecting	No Comments specific to MBNMS See Analysis of Crosscutting Issues	<i>See also 6.0 Coastal Armoring</i>
16.0 Marine Discharge and Debris	<p>Discharge or material in the Sanctuary include harbor dredged materials and landslide material related to maintenance and repair of coastal highways. When the Sanctuary was designated in 1992, two existing offshore sites for dredge disposal were identified, and the establishment of new sites was prohibited within its boundaries. Since then, MBNMS has recognized and authorized the use of additional sites at Santa Cruz and Monterey Harbors which were in use prior to designation. MBNMS reviews the composition of the sediment and any associated contaminants and authorizes dredged material disposal at these sites for clean sediments of the appropriate grain size and amounts. Deposition of material from landslides along the Sanctuary’s steep coastline can bury intertidal and subtidal habitat, and increase sand scour which inhibits larval settlement in certain habitats. Some of these slides occur naturally, while other slides are created or exacerbated by highway design, repair and maintenance practices. Sanctuary regulations currently prohibit these discharges. MBNMS is working with Caltrans and others to address this issue, including development of a regional plan to improve highway practices to reduce the need for disposal, and assessments of the relative contribution of natural versus anthropogenic material. A proposal has also been developed to evaluate the sensitivity of various locations and habitats along the coast to deposition, with the goal of identifying appropriate and inappropriate circumstances for disposal adjacent to the ocean. The interagency review process for both dredging and landslide disposal is quite complicated, and improvements in coordination of the process have begun. MBNMS also reviews NPDES permit issuance and renewals for point source discharges such as treated sewage. Growing “discharge” issues in central California also include new desalination facilities.</p> <p>Marine debris along the MBNMS coastline includes litter and trash from the watersheds, beaches and boats which can harm marine life which may mistake them for prey or become entangled. Other marine deposits include oil slicks from bilge pumping, groundings, cargo holds, and sunken vessels. Debris also reduces enjoyment of recreational use of the coastline. MBNMS assists annually with Coastal Cleanup Day and has some urban runoff educational materials which mention debris, but has otherwise not focused heavily on this issue.</p>	<p>16.1 Review and improve MBNMS role in permit process for dredge disposal to ensure efficiency of review and protection of sanctuary resources.</p> <p>16.2 Identify disposal locations and conditions for landslide disposal.</p> <p>16.3 Develop Big Sur landslide / Cal Trans spoils disposal policy.</p> <p>16.4 Develop debris and trash education and reduction program</p> <p><i>See also 14.0 Habitat Alteration, 18.0 Monitoring, and 29.0 Water Quality</i></p>
17.0 Military Activities	<p>Military use of the MBNMS includes air, surface and underwater activity. Some activity includes the use of non explosive ordnance, sonar, smoke markers and the temporary placement of objects for torpedo firing or sonar location training. Air activities include aircraft carrier takeoffs and landing, and low-level air combat maneuvering. The U.S. Navy uses these areas for submarine operations. Navy minesweeping ships in Monterey Bay conduct mine hunting training eight times a year; each exercise lasts about one week. On occasion, U.S. Marines practiced amphibious landings on the beaches adjacent to this area.</p>	<p>17.1 Prohibit non-emergency military overflights</p> <p>17.2 Exempt military use</p> <p>17.3 Prohibit use of LFA sonar in Sanctuaries</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	<p>week. On occasion, U.S. Marines practiced amphibious landings on the beaches adjacent to this area. Concerns regarding the military activity in the Sanctuary primarily related to conflicts and disturbances with marine life both temporary or long term. Acoustic issues such as the Navy’s LFA Sonar are addressed in Section 1.0. The military also conducts non-combat preparedness activities such as underwater cable repair and breakwater maintenance. Other concerns include the carrier launched jet aircraft and their impact on seabird roosting areas along the coast.</p>	<p><i>See Also 1.0 Acoustics and 14.0 Habitat Alteration</i></p>
<p>18.0 Monitoring</p>	<p>Reports of events such as beach closings, oils spills, harmful algal blooms, exotic species introductions, and habitat losses appear to be increasing in frequency worldwide, and it is now well documented that many marine environments are deteriorating significantly. However, the anthropogenic and natural causes of these changes to habitats and resources are complex and varied, commonly occurring on different temporal and spatial scales. Effective resource management is therefore reliant on integrated approaches to identify and track changes to important and sensitive marine environments. Comprehensive, long-term monitoring, a requirement of the original MBNMS management plan, is a fundamental element of resource management. It has been recognized in numerous reviews and studies that coordinated, standardized approaches to monitoring are essential to effectively determine temporal and spatial trends. However, despite the substantial efforts by private and government organizations, monitoring programs are typically incomplete, inconsistent, fragmented and inaccessible. This is commonly a result of insufficient infrastructure and funding to achieve a comprehensive, long-term perspective. To assure the effective and continuous evaluation of a region and its resources, particularly large areas on the scale of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, a commitment towards a stable network of flexible ecosystem and issue-based monitoring programs is needed. With the support of many partners, the MBNMS has recently initiated a Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network (SIMoN) to try and address this critical need. The Sanctuary recently established the Citizen Watershed Monitoring Network with volunteers to fill in gaps in monitoring by state and local agencies.</p>	<p>18.1 NOAA needs to fully fund SIMoN.</p> <p>18.2 Increase monitoring of special point sources like Duke Moss Landing Plant and sewage overflow.</p> <p>18.3 Increase monitoring and expand Sanctuary Citizen Watershed Monitoring Network</p> <p>18.4 Employ others, like fisherman and volunteers to help monitor resources</p> <p>18.5 Use / expand Team Ocean to monitor for nearshore activity</p> <p><i>See Also Sec. 24.0 Research</i></p>
<p>19.0 Motorized Personal Watercraft</p>	<p>MPWCs operate in a manner unique among recreational vehicles creating potentially significant impacts on wildlife, water quality and personal safety. The high speed and maneuverability of personal watercraft, and the fact they tend to operate nearshore and in a repeated fashion, within a confined area, results in recurring disturbance to animals and habitats. Suspected impacts include behavior modification of sea birds, fish and pinnipeds; and site abandonment and avoidance by certain porpoises and whales. The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary restricted use of these vehicles with the designation in 1992 and confined them to four zones outside of the four harbors in the Sanctuary. The MBNMS regulation includes a provision that defines a MPWC. Since adoption of this regulation, most MPWC manufacturers have designed vehicles that do not fall under the MBNMS definition. Specifically, certain MPWCs now are capable of carrying two, three or four people in addition to the operator and therefore are not subject to the MBNMS regulation. There have been conflicts between MPWCs and other recreational ocean users due to the noise and operation of MPWCs. Comments received during scoping include calling for a complete ban, adopting the GFNMS definition, using marine zones for buffering the impacts from wildlife, or well as removing regulations related to MPWCs. Some comments regarding MPWC also distinguished between two-stroke and four-stroke motors. These issues also are a concern for noise impacts and water quality.</p>	<p>19.1 Reassess environmental impacts from MPWC and recast regulations accordingly</p> <p>19.2 Ban MPWC entirely, except for genuine lifesaving duties</p> <p>19.3 Close loopholes on definition of larger MPWC in MBNMS</p> <p>19.4 Need additional enforcement of MPWC prohibitions</p> <p>19.5 Make buoy system safer for marking zones – lighting on buoys or remove buoys.</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	Two-stroke engines are generally louder and do not burn hydrocarbons as efficiently as four stroke engines.	
20.0 Oil and Gas Exploration and Development	<p>Oil and gas activity was one of the major reasons for designation of all three of the north/central California National Marine Sanctuaries. In the past 10 years, the State of California has adopted legal restrictions to prohibit new oil and gas leasing and development. Temporary moratoria have been in place in federal waters since 1982. The most current directive (June 1998, Clinton administration) under the OCS Lands Act prevents any leasing of new areas for oil and gas exploration and development through June 30, 2012. The OCS presidential deferrals do not restrict development of already leased Federal areas. There are 36 remaining undeveloped active OCS leases south of the MBNMS off the coast in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara counties.</p> <p>Also of great concern related to oil and gas development, are the impacts on marine resources from an accidental oil spill. The most severe impacts would result from large oil spills usually associated with oil well blowouts, or tanker accidents. Oil spills could have a major impact on foraging birds, marine mammals, and fishes, as well as important habitat like kelp beds, wetlands and rocky shores. Tourism and coastal economies could also be devastated by a large oil spill. Tracts once considered for leasing also exist off of San Luis Obispo County reaching north almost to the southern boundary of the MBNMS. The threat of leasing or development of the existing leases has prompted many comments from individuals requesting a southern expansion of the MBNMS to reduce the possibility of further offshore oil and gas development.</p>	<p>20.1 Expand prohibition on oil and gas drilling and exploration to include slant drilling</p> <p>20.2 Develop Strategies to influence oil and gas development beyond MBNMS, whose impacts could nonetheless affect MBNMS</p> <p><i>See Also Subissue 5.1 Moving MBNMS South</i></p>
21.0 Partnerships with Agencies	The MBNMS and the NMSP are committed to coordinating with other Federal, State and local agencies on a continuous ecosystem management process. The process is designed to ensure the long-term protection of the special resources of this region, while considering the demands of multi-use interests. As such, the existing management plan identifies strategies for cooperation among many agencies and institutions that historically may not have focused on the same goals. Overlapping jurisdictions, different agency mandates and limited resources necessitate the development of a relationship that brings together multiple agencies for the common purpose of ecosystem management. The MBNMS has used such techniques for its Advisory Council, its Water Quality Protection Program, Vessel Traffic Strategies, and resolution of kelp management. Many comments during the scoping process focused on how these shared agency roles can be improved. An area to test true shared agency-public responsibilities may be the Big Sur region, where many related local, state and federal agencies are revising management plans for similar, resource protection and use, missions.	<p>21.1 Establish program for ‘seamless management’ between coastal agencies.</p> <p>21.2 Update MOA with State Water Board.</p> <p>21.3 Expand interaction with Coastal Commission on shared conservation and multiple use objectives.</p> <p>21.4 Continue work with Big Sur Multi-Agency Council and Coast Highway Management Plan</p> <p>21.5 Explore partnership beyond MBNMS, e.g., with Morro Bay National Estuary Program</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
		<p><i>See also 4.0 Biodiversity Protection and Ecosystem Conservation</i> for alternatives for marine reserves which include collaboration with agencies.</p>
<p>22.0 Partnerships with Community Groups</p>	<p>The MBNMS could not function in the many roles it undertakes without the support of its community partnerships. For instance, the MBNMS Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) is comprised of 40 agency and user group representatives as well as the public at large. Its advice is critical to understanding the needs of the local communities while protecting the Sanctuary's resources. The SAC relies on an additional 80 individuals on 4 working groups for the best information regarding Research, Education, Conservation, Business and Tourism. Each of these groups is comprised of representatives, who volunteer their time to help develop the Sanctuary's programs, products and viewpoints. 30 Hispanic serving institutions worked with MBNMS staff to develop the multicultural education plan. Partnerships with State and Regional Parks and private nonprofit groups have greatly enhanced the MBNMS's ability to share its mission.</p>	<p>22.1 Expand partnerships with businesses, tourism boards, and chambers of commerce</p> <p>22.2 Expand partnerships with many groups; e.g. Hearst Castle and Friends of the Elephant Seal, Santa Cruz Office of Education, Fitzgerald Marine Reserve.</p> <p>22.3 Hire volunteer coordinator to focus on improved interactions with existing volunteer efforts and expand efforts</p>
<p>23.0 Radioactive Waste</p>	<p>No comments specific to Monterey Bay NMS See Analysis of Gulf of the Farallones NMS</p>	
<p>24.0 Research</p>	<p>The opportunities for marine research within the Sanctuary are abundant, as seen by past research studies that have provided important baseline information about the area. The diversity of habitat types and communities provides a wealth of opportunities for conducting a variety of research programs. For example, the Monterey Canyon provides a unique opportunity to engage in deep- water marine research without extensive voyages offshore. Studies on the processes at the land-sea interface are also feasible due to the accessibility of extensive coastline. Finally, the marine research institutions within the area provide an exceptional resource to draw upon in furthering our understanding, and thus the management of, the Sanctuary's marine resources. Research is necessary to understand how the Sanctuary ecosystem functions and how humans impact it. This can be accomplished by improving our understanding of the Sanctuary environment, resources and qualities, resolving specific management problems, and coordinating and facilitating information flow between the various research institutions, agencies and organizations in the area. Research results can be used for making management decisions about resource protection and to develop and improve education programs for visitors and others interested in the Sanctuary.</p>	<p>24.1 Procure MBNMS research vessel and ROV</p> <p>24.2 Better research on critical species (e.g. krill, squid) or threatened species (e.g. whales, otters)</p> <p>24.3 Need research center in southern region of MBNMS</p> <p>24.4 increase public access to research results</p> <p>24.5 Enhance NOAA Vessel and Aircraft Capability</p> <p>24.6 Link coastal health to ocean productivity</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
		24.7 Participate in regional cabled observatory development 24.8 Quantify extractive human impacts. 24.9 Quantify non-extractive human use impacts. 24.10 Understand transport and sinks of pollution 24.11 Update the MBNMS Site Characterization 24.12 Coordinate regional research and monitoring
25.0 Sanctuary Advisory Council	<p>The SAC, with its expertise and broad-based representation, offers advice to the Sanctuary Superintendent on: 1) protecting natural and cultural resources and identifying and evaluating emerging or critical issues involving Sanctuary use or resources; 2) identifying and realizing the Sanctuary’s research objectives; 3) identifying and realizing educational opportunities to increase public knowledge and stewardship of the Sanctuary environment; and 4) assisting to develop informed constituency to increase awareness and understanding of the purpose and value of the Sanctuary and National Marine Sanctuary Program. The broad representation of the SAC ensures that the manager has an expanded information base on which to make management decisions. The MBNMS has had a SAC since 1993; GFNMS and CBNMS established theirs in 2002. The MBNMS Advisory Council is comprised of 40 agency and user group representatives and the public at large. The SAC relies on an additional 80 individuals on 4 working groups for the best information regarding Research, Education, Conservation, Business and Tourism. Each of these groups is comprised of representatives, who volunteer their time to help develop the Sanctuary's programs, products and viewpoints.</p> <p>Several issues of SAC governance, SAC seat selection, and its autonomy have been raised.</p>	25.1 Add a recreational fishing seat 25.2 Add seat for different commercial fishing gear types. 25.3 Add military representative to SAC. 25.4 Review SAC appointment process for SAC members. 25.5 Review SAC charter and protocols to provide more autonomy. 25.6 Remove SAC from NOAA, operate under separate authority. 25.7 Require SAC members to disclose financial interests to determine conflicts of interest
26.0 Spill Response and	Emergency response within the Sanctuary ranges from small events associated with fuel and oil discharges, debris and habitat damage from vessel groundings, sinkings and plane crashes, to larger oil spills from offshore shipping traffic, sunken vessels or natural seeps where damages can span hundreds of	26.1 Improve response capabilities along Big Sur coast

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
Contingency Planning	miles of coastline. Interagency response coverage remains inadequate for some portions of MBNMS coastline, such as the Big Sur and Cambria area where rescue vessels and crews must travel long distances. In addition, MBNMS staff have not yet fully defined or held drills regarding their specific roles in the event of a large spill. The USCG and OSPR, with MBNMS participating to provide information and assess damage to resources, lead response to larger spills. Staff also participates on USCG’s contingency planning committee to coordinate response to large spills. For smaller events and vessels, by default MBNMS has often assumed a lead role in ensuring that fuel and oil, debris and where possible, the vessel itself, is adequately removed to minimize damage. MBNMS has recently initiated an interagency subcommittee effort to improve prevention, coordinated interagency response and funding efforts related to small vessel sinkings and groundings.	<i>See Also Table 2 Cross-cutting Issues</i>
27.0 User Conflicts	The San Francisco Bay metropolitan area, home to more than 8 million people, influences the uses, health and three Sanctuaries. Located near some of California’s most urbanized areas, the MBNMS has experiences an increase in the number of users and demands on the resources. This has increased human demands on the resources, including commercial and recreational fishing as well as wildlife viewing, research interests and educational opportunities. Because the area is large and includes adjacent rural and urban areas, management must be responsive and equipped to deal with a broad range of concerns. One tool National Marine Sanctuaries use to address user conflicts is zonal management. The MBNMS uses zonal management to avoid concentration of uses that could result in significant impacts on marine resources; to reduce conflict between uses; provide opportunities for scientific research; and/or to provide for the recovery of resources from degradation or other injury attributable to human uses. Other tools Sanctuaries use to address user conflicts: for uses not compatible with the Sanctuary’s primary purpose of resource protection, the Sanctuary may promulgate regulations; and/or the Sanctuary may recommend voluntary rules of conduct for interacting with Sanctuary resources such as wildlife viewing guideline.	27.1 Complete an MBNMS visitor use survey to identify types of users <i>See Also 19.0 Motorized Personal Watercraft and 30.0 Wildlife Disturbance.</i>
28.0 Vessel Traffic	Due to the high volume of large commercial vessel traffic and the risks and consequences of spills, vessel traffic was a major issue during the MBNMS designation in 1992. NOAA and the Coast Guard used a collaborative “key stakeholder” process to develop recommendations to improve protection of the MBNMS and allow for safe and efficient vessel transportation. These strategies, much of which were approved internationally, move shipping lanes 12 to 20 miles offshore, and keep most tanker traffic out of the Sanctuary (50 nautical miles offshore). Certain individuals commented on this issue during scoping with recommendations to move the vessel traffic lanes further offshore and thereby further reducing the threat potential.	28.1 Develop enforcement and monitoring program for vessel traffic program 28.2. Remove oil tanker traffic from sanctuary <i>See also 26.0 Spill Response and Contingency Planning</i>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
<p>29.0 Water Quality</p>	<p><i>Nonpoint Source Pollution</i> Coastal watersheds immediately adjacent to MBNMS cover over 7000 square miles of land with a mix of land uses including major urban areas, rural communities, agricultural land, and pockets of industrial areas. As rainfall or irrigation water in these watersheds moves downstream, it picks up a variety of contaminants. Offshore areas of the Sanctuary are in relatively good condition, but nearshore coastal areas, harbors, lagoons, estuaries and tributaries show a number of problems including elevated levels of coliform bacteria, detergents, oils, nitrates, sediments, and persistent pesticides such as DDT and toxaphene. These contaminants can have a variety of biological impacts including bioaccumulation, reduced recruitment of anadromous species, algal blooms, transfer of human pathogens and interference with recreational uses of the sanctuary due to beach closures. The Sanctuary’s Water Quality Protection Program has developed multistakeholder plans for urban runoff, marinas and boating, agriculture and rural lands, and water quality monitoring. Implementation of all of these plans have begun, but most of the recommendations are not yet implemented due to lack of funding and staffing for MBNMS and its partners. In addition, recent problems such as recurring beach closures which are in part are probably due to nonpoint sources of coliform pollution have not yet been adequately addressed in the urban runoff and water quality monitoring efforts.</p> <p><i>Point Source Pollution</i> Point sources of pollution are those in which a single discharge point is evident, and they include sewage spills and discharges, desalination plants, and industrial discharges such as power plants. Sewage spills have become more frequent in recent years, in part due to cracks and clogging of aging pipelines beneath many of the region’s cities and small communities. These spills, along with nonpoint sources of coliform, have contributed to more frequent beach closures which reduce recreational use. Pathogens from sewage have also been implicated in sea otter diseases and mortality patterns. In addition, there are currently 15 desalination plants that are existing or in some stage of planning within MBNMS, with an increasing trend towards the development of small independent plants for private developments. Discharges from these plants have potential impacts due to elevated salinity and metal levels, toxic contaminants associated with cleaning and maintenance, and construction impacts from pipelines. MBNMS has previously reviewed these plants on a case-by-case basis to recommend measures to reduce impacts, but has recently initiated an interagency effort to evaluate the issue and develop regional guidelines.</p>	<p>29.1 Fully implement all elements of existing water quality plans produced by Water Quality Protection Program and integrate WQPP into management plan</p> <p>29.2 Develop and implement action plans for coliform contamination / beach closures</p> <p>29.3 Fund DNA pollutant source tracing for coliform</p> <p>29.4 Increase beach closure notification</p> <p>29.5 Prohibit 2-stroke engines in sanctuary</p> <p>29.6 Develop and implement regional desalination policy including prohibitions on private desalination facilities</p> <p><i>See also Issue 16.0 Marine Discharge and Debris</i></p>
<p>30.0 Wildlife Disturbance</p>	<p>The Sanctuaries provide many opportunities for observation of nature, including whale watching, bird watching, and pinniped pupping and haulout activity. Partyboats are used for nature observation tours. Rocky shorelines provide pedestrians opportunities to view the flora and fauna associated with the habitat. With the multitude of opportunities for observation come the potential for wildlife disturbance which may</p>	<p>30.1 Review shark attraction regulation to restrict permit issuance and implement guidelines for interaction.</p>

TABLE 5: Analysis of Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Issues

Issue Area	Description of Issue Area	Summary of Sub-Issues
	<p>result in flushing birds from their nesting sites, pinnipeds abandoning pups, potential harassment or even death. Previously in the MBNMS ecotourism operations included white shark viewing with the aid of chumming and other attraction methods. MBNMS adopted prohibitions for white shark attraction.. Potential impacts to seabird nesting from low-flying aircraft are addressed with a prohibition on low flying (under 1,000 feet) aircraft in certain zones with sensitive wildlife. Some implementation problems have occurred since the overflight regulations are not noted on FAA charts.</p>	<p>30.2 Review overflight regulations to address consistency with FAA charts and guidelines, increase outreach to pilots and to review potential environmental impacts.</p> <p>30.3 Need wildlife viewing guidelines, and enforcement and education effort</p> <p>30.4 Research, and if necessary develop action plan, to nonextractive user impacts (e.g. wildlife viewing, kayaking, diving, research)</p> <p><i>See also 19.0 Motorized Personal Watercraft</i></p>

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

ACOUSTIC IMPACTS:

Issues:

- Sanctuary should be proactive in regards to Low Frequency Acoustics in Big Sur. (MB)
- Concerned about acoustic impacts including behavior modification, injuries, or death to marine mammals and humans. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Prohibit and research sources of artificial marine noise. (All)
- Sanctuaries should not allow SONAR and acoustical experimentation. (All)
- There should be a ban on all activities, which cause noise of any type, which kills, harms or changes the behavior of any biota within all the sanctuaries, but especially the MBNMS. (All)
- A study should be conducted surveying existing and potential noise impacts, alternatives and mitigations In the Sanctuary, which should include shipping and military operations. (All)
- Sanctuary should develop a policy prohibiting adverse impacts associated with underwater sound. (All)
- Investigate the issue of marine noise. Combine all underwater sound issues and evaluate both long and short term impacts (All)
- Document baseline and new acoustic conditions at selected representative sites throughout the sanctuaries, to improve the knowledge of ambient and anthropogenic sound sources in marine ecosystems. (All)
- Ban all underwater “acoustical devices” producing sound greater than 80 decibels at the source, until proven safe for marine life. (All)

ADMINISTRATION:

Issues:

- Sanctuary needs much more funding to achieve adequate ecosystem protection. (All)
- Need more money and support for water quality action plans. Currently they are poorly implemented. (MB)
- The Sanctuary needs to respond to public requests in a more timely fashion. (All)
- The name of the Sanctuary should be changed to “Offshore Central California NMS” or something similar. The current name is misleading, since the Monterey Bay is just a small proportion of the total area of the bay. (MB)
- Does not understand whom the Sanctuary program is accountable to. There should be more accountability for the actions of the Sanctuary. (All)
- Dissatisfied with the management style of the Sanctuary: MBNMS does not play well with others, particularly re: coast highway landslide disposal. Does not consider the needs of other stakeholders in many cases. (MB)
- Sanctuary resources should be dedicated to resolving conflicts. MBNMS needs a policy to deal with conflicts more efficiently. Should be based on what has and has not worked in the past. (MB)
- MBNMS is better managed than GF/CB (SAC established). Should be similar management for all three sanctuaries. (All)
- GFNMS and CBNMS need better facilities to serve as meeting rooms for volunteer meetings, and education and outreach. These should include a wet lab. (GF/CB)
- Need procedure for evaluating public comments. (All)
- Supportive of the approach of the Management Plan Review process (outreach, meetings, etc). (All)
- Scoping meeting should have been held in Morro Bay or somewhere on the coast, instead of in San Luis Obispo. (MB)
- NOAA should allocate resources for voluntary implementation. (All)
- Staff the research program with knowledgeable scientists, capable in conducting as well as interpreting research. (MB)
- Integrate research with Sanctuary Education, Conservation and Research Protection Programs. (MB)
- GFNMS Manager is praised by members of the community, and is doing a good job. Consequently, the Sanctuary is expected to be very successful with continued public support. (GF/CB)
- Adoption of new or revised management plans will require NMSP to submit to the Coastal Commission a *consistency determination* pursuant to the CZMA. (All)
- Too much agency emphasis on locking up resources. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- NOAA should allocate more resources towards implementation of the agriculture action plan. (MB)
- Sanctuary should help secure funds for additional water quality monitoring. (MB)
- Increase funding for enforcement. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- More funding should be made available for education in schools (elementary school to college). (All)
- More funding for monitoring of water quality. (All)
- Increase funding for staffing at GFNMS. (GF)
- Encourage funding of “Dock Walk” materials (educational information, bilge sponges, etc). (MB)
- The Sanctuary should be part of the Department of the Interior rather than Department of Commerce. The Sanctuary could learn from the Department of the Interior’s experience. (All)
- National Marine Sanctuary Program should complete a visitor use survey. (All)
- Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary should not change its name. (MB)
- Adhere to language in National Marine Sanctuaries Act. (All)
- There must be measurable, quantifiable performance measures. (All)
- A comprehensive cost/benefit analysis of presence of the Sanctuary should be conducted; results should be distributed widely to the public. (All)
- Sanctuary should have “objective based” policy, and regulations should have definite goals. Should educate more about why the policy or regulation is in place. (All)
- Sanctuaries should consider economic impacts on local communities as part of the Joint Management Plan Review (JMPR). Should provide mitigation for impacts on users/communities. (All)
- Sanctuaries should use both breakout sessions (like this JMPR scoping meeting), and an open forum format at the end of the meeting, where comments are limited to 2-3 minutes. (All)
- Increase staffing of sanctuaries to meet goals. (All)
- Sanctuaries should remain as 3 entities. (All)
- Names of Sanctuaries should not be changed but should look at streamlining efforts among the three. (All)
- Would like to see Sanctuary Headquarters in Santa Cruz County not Monterey County. (MB)
- Need to ensure that local voices can be heard over national voices from Washington DC. (All)
- The Sanctuary should hold meetings inland as well as in coastal areas.
- Sanctuary should conduct a cost-benefit analysis of its management programs. Revenues should be tied to benefits. (All)
- Sanctuary should set measurable and defined goals or standards. (All)
- Add language to the Management Plan to include the concept that “ecosystem” includes an understanding of the socio-economic impact on a business or community of any particular sanctuary permit or regulation. (All)
- Sanctuary use and economic opportunities need to be actively promoted. A staff position should be added or current staff time should be directed, to develop a Sanctuary marketing plan and facilitate the use of the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Reconsider the evaluation process for comments received during the JMPR. (All)
- Management plan changes should be based on sound science and hard data.
- Allow public access to all public comments. (All)
- Public should vote on comments provided during scoping process. (All)
- Published list of scoping comments should be in a searchable database.
- Priorities need to be in management plan. (All)
- Sanctuary should be revising its management plan each 5 years. (All)
- Stress in the Management Plan Review that the essential work of the Program is the oil/gas ban, education, research, and the work of the Water Quality Protection Program. Also Stress its need to accomplish goals by working with other agencies rather than becoming a larger and larger organization itself. (All)
- NOAA should allocate more resources towards implementation of the agriculture action plan. (MB)
- Establish some sort of central revenue collection point for habitat protection.
- SIMoN program should receive the highest possible level of financial support. (All)
- Sanctuary should do a socioeconomic study to assess the value of the Sanctuary in terms of natural ecosystem value versus extractive value. (All)
- Sanctuary should acquire public access lands. (All)
- Revised management plans should address staffing needs to accomplish water quality protection goals. (All)
- Create a mechanism for ongoing evaluation of programs and products (All).
- Support and promote Research Activities Panel. (MB)
- Additional staff needed for Half Moon Bay. (MB)
- Add a volunteer coordinator position. (MB)
- Continue to maintain local offices in each county. (MB)
- The revised management plan should include a description of additional staff and resources needed to fully implement and enforce the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, its regulations, and the Water Quality Protection

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

Plans, as well as to accomplish any additional goals that are established for the program in the foreseeable future. (MB)

AQUACULTURE:

Issues:

- Concerned about management of kelp resources, and the impacts from abalone farming and other aquaculture operations. (MB)
- Aquaculture (shellfish) operations in Tomales bay introduce disease and alien species. (GF)
- Concerned about the impacts of commercial raising of non-native oysters in Tomales Bay. (GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- The Sanctuary should explore the potential of artificial reefs to enhance winter harvest of kelp in Del Monte. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should prohibit open water aquaculture, because there is no control over what is broadcast into the ocean. (All)
- Sanctuaries should increase education and outreach regarding aquaculture, further north of Elkhorn Slough. (All)
- Cumulative impacts of aquaculture projects should be considered. (MB/GF)
- Aquaculture of any non-native species should be land grown with closed systems (no ocean outfall) to prevent hybridization with indigenous species and introduction of parasites. (MB/GF)
- Ban all notions of abalone farming. (MB/GF)
- Report should be done and include related impacts, such as the plastic bags associated with Asian oyster growing. (GF)
- Restrict abalone farming because of bacteria and worms that contaminate water. (GF)

BIODIVERSITY PROTECTION AND ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION:

Issues:

- The less than one percent of the Sanctuary that is currently fully protected, is insufficient to fulfill the Sanctuary's mandate of maintaining its natural biological communities and protecting, restoring, and enhancing its natural habitats, populations, and ecological processes. Appreciates regional approach to scoping process, to capture local issues. (MB)
- Need more conservation in general. (All)
- Goal of MBNMS should be to protect and preserve. (MB)
- It is much better economically (and easier) to save species and ecosystems before they become endangered or compromised in some way. Protection now makes the most long-term sense. (All)
- More attention is needed for maintenance of the Salinas River (vegetation and wildlife). (MB)
- Sanctuary should better protect low tide reef areas at Pillar Point. (MB)
- Concerned about loss of species biodiversity and abundance, impacts to habitat, impacts to predator/prey interactions. (All)
- Any proposals to make multiple use equivalent to resource protection, to have a separate category of "minimal use", to exempt certain areas from jurisdiction, etc. should be viewed with caution. (All)
- Concern that "sanctuary" is a misnomer since the MBNMS does not protect fish in any way.
- Describing sanctuaries as "Marine Protected Areas" leads to public confusion, because the definition of MPA used for the MLPA includes a restriction or prohibition of recreational or commercial fisheries. "Marine Managed Area" would be more appropriate. (All)
- Term "sanctuary" is a misnomer. True sanctuary status is nearly impossible to establish in the marine environment, save some marine caves or extreme deep-water sites populated only by resident species and devoid of any effects of ocean current and free from impacts of pollution. (All)
- Coastal habitat restoration is extremely important. (GF and MB)
- Need better integration of land use planning around the estuaries. (GF)
- Lumber activities upstream detrimental to sanctuary. (GF)
- Intensive agricultural development carries increasing adverse impacts. (GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Consider regulation with long-term vision (erosion lasts longer than 50 years). (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- There should be one management plan for each ecosystem, not one management plan per agency. This public thinks of ecosystems as one, not as six agencies with varying degrees of management responsibility. Appreciates regional approach to scoping process, to capture local issues. (All)
- Management should strive for long-term sustainable use (e.g., not taking juvenile fish). Appreciates regional approach to scoping process, to capture local issues. (All)
- The Sanctuary needs to find the right balance between use and protection. (All)
- More protection is needed in general for the ecosystem and biodiversity. (All)
- Resource protection should be the main priority. (All)
- Sanctuary should manage the resources using a holistic watershed approach. (All)
- Strengthen resource protection; do not allow local control to undermine this. (All)
- Expand sanctuary concept to unify and make consistent resource protection, for better management of resources. (All)
- Use holistic management practices that focus on entire watersheds. (All)
- Sanctuary should advocate maintaining the vegetation in riparian corridors for filtration. (MB)
- Sanctuary should look at the big picture of overall environmental impacts, and manage the resources appropriately. For example trawling has significant impacts, yet much more attention is given to fiber optic cables. (All)
- Sanctuaries should ensure comprehensive coverage with overlapping jurisdiction, to improve resource protection. (All)
- Sanctuaries should continue to provide consistent habitat protection. (All)
- Provide protection and conservation to marshes and sloughs, and other wetlands. (MB)
- Recognize intrinsic values and aesthetics as well as ecological values. (All)
- Create more of a policy balance between conservation and use, with a strong educational program being the key to achieving this balance. (All)
- Use of precautionary principle for protection of natural phenomenon.
- More protection of riparian ecosystems. (All)
- Sanctuary should consider ecological trade offs. In some cases terrestrial impacts from alternatives to Sanctuary restrictions are much worse. (All)
- The Sanctuary should be involved in enhancing near-shore ecosystems through research and staff involvement in other agency processes. (MB/GF)
- Do not utilize a marine zoning approach. (All)
- We urge the National Marine Sanctuary Program to ensure that any issues considered during Jmpr process be considered in the context of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act's primary goal of resource protection. We strongly advocate for the adoption and enforcement of strong policies and regulations that provide maximum protection of Sanctuary resources. (All)
- Fish and wildlife breeding habitats, submarine canyons, and giant kelp forests are some of the special areas within the Sanctuary that need protection. Marine reserves are needed and should be large enough to help the many species in trouble recover and also to provide insurance against disasters and management mistakes. (All)
- Sanctuary should take immediate action to adopt a management plan to protect steelhead and salmon from predation by pinnipeds. (MB)
- GFNMS should work with Point Reyes National Sea shore to quickly implement a network of marine reserves to be protected from all harmful activities. (GF)
- Strengthen the Sanctuary's Program of resource protection through zonal management, an important tool in achieving long-term sustainability of our large-scale coastal ecosystem. (All)
- Investigate agricultural certification of farms through such organizations as "Salmon Safe" in order to promote healthy fish habitat in the watersheds. (MB)
- The revised management plans should be designed to help recover species that are most at risk and should reflect a precautionary approach to resource management to avoid future species declines.
- Revised management plans should contain directives and timelines for developing specific action plans focused on protecting, and where necessary, restoring, natural habitats, populations, and ecological processes. Plans should also contain specific directives and management measures on certain issues. (All)
- Revised management plans should also outline enforcement, research, and monitoring needs associated with future marine reserve sites. (All)
- Link coastal health to ocean productivity. (All)
- Integrate marine research in resource management decisions. (All)
- Try thinking of the sanctuary as a gift as well as a resource. (All)
- Think as long term as possible. This plan is designed to last 5 or 10

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Years, but maybe we also need to identify issues that are considered 50 or 100-year issues. (All)
- Remember to think and plan as systemically as possible, not just about distinct and separate issues, but about all the connections and boundaries and overlaps: coastlines and jurisdictions and regions and ecosystems and partnerships and nexuses and all those connections. (All)
- “Seamlessness” should be the goal of Sanctuary management. (MB)
- Protect impacts to seals from humans by upholding laws such as the Elephant Seal Closure Law. (MB/GF)
- Under present MBNMS administration, rules, guidelines and laws of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA) and the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) charter have been neglected, overlooked or dismissed to the detriment of conservation efforts of local organizations that have differing goals and objectives contrary to the MBNMS leadership. (MB)
- Establish a water quality plan for GFNMS and CBNMS with standards and monitoring. (GF, CB)
- Land around Estero should remain agriculture. (GF)
- Agriculture plan/ outreach extended to Sonoma County. (GF)
- Sanctuary should work with land management agencies. (MB, GF).
- Rancher perspective – would like recognition of stewardship of the land. (GF)
- Wrecks are a great resource enhancement. Educate the public on the positive aspects of artificial reefs. (GF, MB)
- Certify agricultural growers along stream with programs such as such as “salmon safe.” (GF)
- Would like to see kayak companies (outfitters) required to obtain permits to operate within GFNMS so they understand the impacts to the ecosystem. (GF)
- Provide incentives to farmers, etc. to comply with sanctuary regulations to enhance water quality. (GF)
- Regulate future and current houses upstream to protect the creek waters. (GF)
- Need to coordinate with NMFS in the recovery plan for coho salmon. (GF, MB)

BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS:

Issues:

- Don't understand why is there a gap between the Monterey and Channel Island Sanctuaries. (MB)
- Concerned that if boundaries are moved south, the protected status will cause a local increase in human visitation and impacts, as occurred in the Channel Islands. (MB)
- Concerned that if boundary were extended southward to Morro Bay, the existing wastewater outfall would be problematic. (MB)
- Concerned with environmental degradation along San Luis Obispo coastline. Sanctuary should protect this area. (MB)
- Agricultural community has more in common with MBNMS than GFNMS in regards to the boundary issues. (MB/GF)
- Affiliation of communities to Sanctuary (identity). Not a good idea to combine all 3 sanctuaries to one name. (All)
- MBNMS does not have the resources to care for our marine environment with its extensive range from Cambria to San Francisco. GFNMS is a small sanctuary and is willing to work on marine issues in the region from the Southern tip of San Mateo County, to current northern boundary of MBNMS. (MB/GF)
- MBNMS is too busy to deal with San Mateo County marine resources. (MB/GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Moss Landing Harbor should be included in the Sanctuary boundaries, to protect Elkhorn Slough. (MB)
- Do not combine the Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuaries, into one large sanctuary. (All)
- Do not include any buffer or exclusion zones. (All)
- Do not change boundaries. (MB)
- Do not reduce current boundaries of MBNMS. (MB)
- Expand boundaries to include seamounts and more of the continental shelf. (MB)
- Boundaries should be defined by ecological data. (MB)
- Sanctuary should implement buffer zones around recreational/urban areas. (MB)
- Move Sanctuary boundary south to Point Sal. Move Sanctuary boundary south to Point Sal. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not expand its boundary southward. (MB)
- Need to investigate the pros and cons for all stakeholders and the general public of extending the MBNMS South to protect the San Luis Obispo coast. The Management Plan should clearly discuss these pros and cons. (MB)
- Sanctuary boundary should be expanded further offshore. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Current uses (power plants, commercial fishing, etc.) should be grand fathered into the management plan, if the boundaries change. (MB)
- Expand the Sanctuary boundary south to the Gaviota Coast or Pt. Conception. (All)
- Expand the current MBNMS sanctuary boundary south to the Santa Barbara County line. (MB)
- The Sanctuary boundary should be extended 1.5 miles south. (MB)
- Consider including harbors as part of Sanctuaries. (MB)
- Sanctuary boundaries should be moved to protect San Luis Obispo coast from offshore oil drilling. (MB)
- The economic impact of the Sanctuary is positive; boundaries should be adjusted to include the San Luis Obispo area. (MB)
- Sanctuary should articulate why current boundaries are located where they are.
- Sanctuary boundary should be extended south, to protect the “Harmony Coast” between Cambria and Cayucos. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should adopt buffer zones for all harbors. MBNMS is currently restricting natural human activities in harbors. Buffer zones should be 2 miles (rough estimate). (MB)
- The Southern boundary of GFNMS should be extended to include Pillar Point Harbor, because it makes sense geographically. (MB)
- The Southern boundary of GFNMS should be moved to Año Nuevo, for political, geographical, and ecological reasons. Also because GFNMS already has a presence there in the form of education programs, oil incidents response, and about 30 volunteers in San Mateo County. (MB/GF)
- The southern boundary of GFNMS should be extended to Pigeon Point, because it is an easily identifiable point for fisheries and research. (MB/GF)
- The “doughnut hole” in the northern MBNMS (off Pacifica and San Francisco) should be included in the GFNMS. Boundary of GFNMS should be moved south to San Mateo/Santa Cruz County line. (MB/GF)
- The Davidson Seamount should be included within the boundaries of MBNMS, to protect abundant seabirds and marine life, and to preserve its current pristine state. (MB)
- Do not include the Davidson Seamount as part of the MBNMS. (MB)
- Southern boundary of the MBNMS “doughnut hole” should be moved as far north as possible. (MB)
- Extend the GFNMS boundary South to the point where it is being co-managed.
- Sanctuaries should explore the feasibility of adopting marine zones where no human activities are allowed, with the exception of research. (MB/GF)
- All three sanctuaries should be combined into a “Central California Sanctuary” which manages all these areas. (All)
- Año Nuevo reserve should remain part of MBNMS. (MB)
- GFNMS boundary should be moved southward to just north of Santa Cruz. (MB/GF)
- Close the donut hole off of San Francisco. (MB)
- Resolve the donut hole issue. (MB)
- Do not expand Sanctuary boundaries with out comments from local communities. Especially from fishermen. (All)
- Extend boundaries of MBNMS to Channel Islands NMS (Create a California Sanctuary). (MB)
- San Francisco and Marin areas should be part of GFNMS. (GF)
- Small staff of Cordell Bank could benefit by joining Sanctuaries into 1. (GF/CB)
- Sanctuary boundaries should be changed to include the near shore waters off of the City of Santa Cruz. (MB)
- Extend Sanctuary to the Oregon border. (All)
- Extend the MBNMS boundary to the southern range of the California Sea Otter. (MB)
- Resolve the issue of joint management of the northern MBNMS, this joint management does not optimize resource protection, and revised management plans should definitively establish jurisdiction of this area. (MB/GF)
- Extend Sanctuary protections into areas above mean high tide line for inter-tidal, wetland, related habitats (such as dunes) and inlet areas. (MB/GF)
- GFNMS boundaries should be expanded to include the area from Santa Cruz County to the Mendocino-Humboldt County line. (GF).
- Do not increase existing boat marina boundaries. (MB)
- Is sanctuary status is to be considered for San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara Counties, then it should be a stand alone sanctuary, and not an expansion of MBNMS. (MB)
- Area from mussel rock at the North end of Pacifica, to San Pedro Point at the South end should be included in the GFNMS. (GF)
- Have GFNMS boundary extend into the SF Bay and up to Sacramento. (GF)
- Reexamine the boundaries to be a more realistic representation to oceanographic conditions. (GF, MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Consider changing the boundary to inland areas and watershed areas. (GF, CB).
- Would like to see sanctuary boundary extended north. (GF, CB)
- The GFNMS boundary should be extended to the south to incorporate the entire Marin coast. (GF)
- Cordell Bank should be extended northward considerably and extend inward to the coast as the other two sanctuaries do. (CB)

COASTAL ARMORING:

Issues:

- Concerned about coastal armoring. (MB/GF)
- Armoring of the shoreline can lead to loss of sand flow to beaches, beach erosion, impact to surf breaks, loss of public access to beach, and aesthetic impacts. (MB/GF)
- Thirty percent of the coastline in northern Monterey Bay is already armored. Hardening of the coast disrupts natural processes, and sometimes destroys sensitive habitat. (GF/MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should ensure that shoreline armoring is appropriately carried out. Sensitive areas where armoring should not occur must be identified, as should more developed areas where armoring is appropriate. (MB)
- Shoreline armoring should be prohibited in the sanctuaries, because it leads to the transfer of wave energy to another location and encourages development too close to the water. (GF/MB)
- Sand from the Guadalupe oil field cleanup project, could be used for beach nourishment projects. (MB)
- No emergency permits should be given for coastal armoring projects. (MB/GF)
- Concerned that riprap being used on the golf course at the Ritz-Carlton is causing erosion of adjacent land. (MB)
- Stronger regulations against coastal armoring. (MB)
- Create Sanctuary wide policy (with other agencies) to address shoreline management in a manner that protects and restores natural shorelines and processes. (MB)
- Investigate alternatives to coastal armoring. (MB/GF)

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT:

Issues:

- Concerned about large coastal development projects (Hearst Corporation), and their impacts on coastal ecosystems. (MB)
- Concerned with existing facilities such as Diablo Canyon and Morro Bay, and how they should be dealt with if the MBNMS is expanded southward.

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should be involved with keeping coastline as free as possible from further development. (MB)
- Sanctuary should be active in preventing the impacts of population growth. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuaries should be more involved in coastal development issues such as golf courses and sea walls. (MB/GF)
- All development (commercial, private or public) should be halted on coastal wetlands around the Sanctuary on state land. (MB)
- Keep Big Sur wild. (MB)
- Big Sur residents want to preserve the area in its current state. Resist any external forces from changing that. (MB)
- Support for preserving natural state of coast; keep natural without any more structures, or development on coast. (MB/GS)
- Resist any effort to relax sanctuary regulations around areas of high population density or activity. These are precisely the areas where the most protection is needed. However, work with cities and harbors to accommodate their needs to the greatest possible. Permits may be granted for prohibited activities from time to time (e.g., piling replacement). (MB)
- No wharf extensions or additional breakwater structures. (MB)
- Oppose public access on any privately held land. (GF, MB)
- Sanctuaries should be strong voice for alternatives to development along coast. (GF, MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

COMMUNITY OUTREACH:

Issues:

- More community communication is needed. (All)
- Sanctuary is doing a good job with the management plan review process, in reaching out to the public to get input. (MB)
- Concerned about erosion in public support for the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Appreciates regional approach to scoping process, to capture local issues. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuaries should increase general awareness of their programs, as well as education about issues such as water quality. (All)
- Increased sharing of information with the public and other agencies.
- Sanctuary should market itself more, and should work collaboratively with local businesses, for outreach. (All)
- Sanctuary should increase outreach to general public. (All)
- Sanctuary messages need to be short, simple and positive. (All)
- Conduct more outreach through restaurants, industry posters, airports and public libraries. (All)
- Sanctuary should conduct more outreach to bring diverse user groups together. (All)
- Sanctuary should concentrate on community relation efforts in order to optimize the education program. (All)
- Increase outreach to civic organizations, volunteer groups, and local neighborhood establishments. (All)
- Sanctuary should better promote, package, and distribute accomplished products. (All)
- Sanctuary should extend education and outreach to inland areas. (All)
- Sanctuary should conduct outreach on the effects of marine mammal populations on fishery resources. (All)
- Sanctuary should publish a handout regarding respectful viewing of marine wildlife at sea or on land such as “Guidelines for Responsible Whale Watching”. (All)
- Sanctuary should establish an interpretive center in the Cambria region for the 800,000 plus tourists that visit the area each year. Involve the business and tourism sectors in establishing this visitor center. (MB)
- Sanctuary should utilize existing interpretive centers (Hearst Castle), for education and outreach, by setting up exhibits or video documentaries. (MB)
- Concerned about over-harvesting of intertidal invertebrates, by certain ethnic communities. Sanctuary should do outreach to these communities to help address this issue. (MB)
- MBNMS should build visitor centers, and consider co-locating with other visitor centers. Fitzgerald Marine Reserve would be an ideal location. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should do a better job in distributing educational materials to Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and other recreational sites. (All)
- Great GIS/Ed materials coming out of CINMS; duplicate for northern Sanctuaries. (All)
- Sanctuary should investigate increasing nation-wide education and outreach efforts. (All)
- Sanctuary should identify regional contacts for communities. (All)
- Sell apparel/gear to advertise. (All)
- Need a MBNMS license plate. (MB)
- The Sanctuary needs to be clear in informing the public, on management plan review activities, so they can get involved and influence any major decisions. (All)
- Sanctuary should involve community, to arrive at solutions. (All)
- Sanctuary should attempt to increase a sense of personal responsibility among the public, for resource protection. (All)
- Sanctuary should increase its attention of the San Mateo Coast. The San Mateo Coast does not get much overall attention from MBNMS (in terms of regulations, education etc.). (MB)
- Increase education, outreach and media exposure for the JMPR process. (All)
- Would like to see more outreach to communities and schools as part of the extension and development of the Beach Watch Program. This would increase awareness and perhaps draw in more volunteers and donations. (GF)
- Consider lowering the minimum age for Beach Watch volunteers to draw in more participants. (GF)
- Sanctuary needs to work on linking people “living” in the Sanctuary. More comprehensive/interactive outreach. (All)
- Acknowledge that harbors are the access corridors to the Sanctuary for commerce, education, research, and law enforcement. (MB)
- Increase knowledge of volunteer efforts within the region. (MB)
- Develop visitor centers in each county. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- GFNMS should expand the publication of the Adopt-A-Beach program so that all schools and major businesses in the San Francisco Bay Area get notifications about the program and its benefits. (GF)
- Results of Beach Watch and similar projects should be more widely publicized, through press releases to newspapers and television. (All)
- GFNMS should work with chamber of commerce to offer educational seminars to adults. (GF)
- Expand sanctuary lecture series and make it more accessible to the public. (GF)
- SEALS programs should continue in GFNMS. (GF)

CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Issues:

- Improved technologies for location of shipwrecks and other cultural resources could make existing cultural resources within sanctuary waters new targets for recovery. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Characterize and protect cultural resources. (All)
- Within the Sanctuary boundaries are very rich culture and communities. Sanctuary program should work on enhancing those cultures to preserve their traditional activities that are now within sanctuary boundaries. (GF, MB)

EDUCATION:

Issues:

- Scenic trail could be better equipped with interpreters and signage. (MB)
- Appreciates Sanctuary Currents Symposium and education program. (MB)
- Provide leadership for regional marine education through effective connections with education community.

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- More education and outreach in general. (All)
- Focus on ongoing education of user groups about the Sanctuary. (All)
- More multicultural education programs. (All)
- Provide leadership for regional marine education through effective connections with education community. (All)
- The Sanctuary needs to educate people about kelp life cycles and natural processes. (MB/GF)
- The Sanctuary should try to write more articles for the local papers. (MB)
- More education (kiosks) must occur surrounding tide pool issues, and the impacts that occur from extraction of organisms. Kiosks that distribute brochures should be placed strategically at tide pool locations. (All)
- Utilize a Sanctuary-wide network of volunteers for public education. (All)
- Educate the public on why the Sanctuary was created. (MB)
- Develop a Sanctuary visitor center in Santa Cruz County, as well as implement the Sanctuary scenic trail in Santa Cruz County. (MB)
- Develop a visitor center in the City of Monterey. (MB)
- The Sanctuary needs more education staff and an increase in the budget. (All)
- More support for existing non-profit educational programs such as clean boating. (MB)
- More outreach and education about what people can do to help. (All)
- More education about sustainability and the balance of ecosystems. (All)
- More education on the environmental impacts related to population growth. (All)
- Improve educational material on website regarding regulated and prohibited activities. (All)
- Sanctuary should conduct a study on the effectiveness of education vs. regulation in changing behaviors. (All)
- Increase public support for the Sanctuary through more education.
- Increase education of schoolchildren. (All)
- More K-12 educational materials for classroom curricula, including audio/visual, and Internet. (All)
- Utilize all available outlets for education, including public access cable. (All)
- More education of politicians and elected officials. (All)
- More interpretive displays. (All)
- Increase education on resource protection issues and specific regulations. (All)
- Focus on educating communities/groups that are not currently involved with the Sanctuary. (All)
- Sanctuary should educate people who live inland, about how their actions can affect the ocean. (All)
- Utilize models and hands on exhibits for education throughout Sanctuary area. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Investigate the possibility of hosting a series of regularly scheduled presentations in Cambria and other areas on any subjects related to the ocean environment. (MB)
- Sanctuary/NOAA should support Sea Lab Monterey Bay, and make it a model program for all sanctuaries. (All)
- Expand the Team Ocean program. (MB)
- Hold workshops that bring people together to discuss common objectives. (All)
- Sanctuaries should increase resources for developing programs in schools, to educate about ecosystems, and interconnectedness between human and biological communities. (All)
- Sanctuaries should develop better educational programs in schools to equip children with the knowledge to address issues. (All)
- Sanctuaries should increase education that relates specifically to consequences of actions, and what people can do to help. (All)
- Sanctuaries should use more on-site educational tools like visitor centers and signage. (All)
- Need public education regarding gas use and drilling connection. (All)
- Sanctuaries should encourage more marine biology education at the high school level. This education should include more technical programs such as shoreline monitoring. (All)
- Sanctuaries should support academic/science competitions e.g. “National Ocean Science Bowl”. (All)
- Maintain GFNMS, MBNMS, and CBNMS education programs, but improve funding and staff (especially GFNMS). (All)
- Sanctuaries should encourage increased marine biology education opportunities to average or disadvantaged high school students, as well as more in-class guest speakers on marine related topics. (All)
- Sanctuaries should hold more public forums on research within the sanctuaries. (All)
- Sanctuaries should conduct more watershed education. (All)
- Public Education-lots of people with different skills-need to reach out to them and get them involved. Example –artist. (All)
- Continue use of political figures for message delivery. (All)
- Need signs on Coast Highway. When crossing boundary lines, cite stats: population of species, area, etc. (MB/GF)
- A Team Ocean kayak team (minimum of 2 person) should be stationed in Monterey, Elkhorn Slough, and Santa Cruz. A study should be done to assess the need for additional teams at San Simeon and Half Moon Bay. (MB)
- Not happy with Sanctuary education program’s lack of focus on fishing. Sanctuary should emphasize positive aspects of fishing (food, jobs, recreation). (MB)
- Develop and implement a regional education plan. (MB)
- Sanctuary should develop a network of regional interpretive facilities to convey Sanctuary messages. Would provide a hub of marine education and send visitors to partners, and provide a tangible location for information dissemination.
- Reduce threats through resource issue education. (All)
- Sanctuary should infuse current scientific information in education programs. (All)
- Increase public awareness and educate the public about current research. (All)
- Articulate and educate the public about the meaning of the concept "Sanctuary." Also help the public understand the various meanings of conservation, protection, and preservation, and maybe have a simpler set of definitions. (All)
- Define more clearly as well the concept "stewardship" which is used in various documents (local and NOAA) - how does this relate to conservation, protection and preservation. (All)
- In general, I think we need to be clearer and more consistent on our uses of some terms, and try to educate the public about them. (All)
- Sanctuary should put out a newsletter that could be included in local newspapers. Would be geared towards informing readers about what is going on in the National Marine Sanctuaries, what they can do to help, giving opportunity to discuss concerns with the public. (For sample newsletter see “The water Down Under” in the comment letters). (All)
- GFNMS educational efforts should focus on: endangered marine mammals, fishing, pollution, and a new visitor center. (GF)
- Estuary Action Challenge program (EAC) should be expanded to educate all students in middle schools and high schools all over the bay area. Local chambers of commerce in all major cities of the SF Bay Area should conduct training programs to educate adults on the same material covered by EAC. (GF)
- Utilize high school and college in Northern California to do specific research projects on items of concern to Sanctuary. (GF)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Educate the California Legislature and Federal Government about accomplishments and issues of concern to sanctuary. (All)
- Posted regulations at marinas. (MB, GF)
- Offshore sanctuaries should use technology to bring the sanctuary to the public. (GF, CB)
- Adopt program like FKNMS' school education program (ensures every schoolchild in FK visits the FKNMS). (GF, MB)
- Need education for private landowners to protect wildlife. (MB, GF)
- Continue Beach Watch. (GF)
- Agriculture plan/ outreach extended to Sonoma County. (GF)

ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS:

Issues:

- In situations requiring immediate attention, more enforcement and evaluation of issues is needed. (All)
- State should regulate, not Sanctuary. (All)
- New regulations and enforcement should be uniform across the board for all user groups. Sanctuary must acknowledge need for fairness, and should not specifically target certain users (i.e. Commercial fishers). (All)
- Need more enforcement—"eyes" for the Sanctuary. (All)
- Never restrict surfing. (All)
- Permitting process should be more streamlined when permits are required by different agencies. (All)
- Sanctuary should not have a regulatory or permitting program, should concentrate only on data collection and dissemination. (All)
- Permitting process has too many layers and should be simplified. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not be involved in permitting of activities. It is better left to agencies like the California Coastal Commission. The Sanctuary should serve an advisory role to other agencies. (All)
- Concerned about additional regulations in inter-tidal habitats, that are not scientifically substantiated. (GF, MB)
- Not sure who investigates and enforces Sanctuary violations. (All)
- Concerned that additional regulation would become an obstacle to harbor maintenance. (MB)
- It is not clear what constitutes "harm" to Sanctuary resources. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Involve the Coast Guard in enforcement of Sanctuary regulations. (All)
- Up-stream enforcement should be a priority. (All)
- Loosening of the language would allow Sanctuary Manager to use discretion in permit language will fix most of the problems faced by harbor administrators. (For specific recommendations on rewriting CFR sections see Santa Cruz Port District letter attachment). (MB)
- More Sanctuary enforcement on resource protection issues. (All)
- Do not increase enforcement. (MB)
- Assist with enforcement cases in getting them to the level of adjudication and prosecution. (All)
- Sanctuary should develop more voluntary compliance programs, and focus on self-regulation. (All)
- Increase funding for enforcement. (All)
- Increase enforcement staff. (All)
- Increase enforcement of kayakers. (MB)
- A land-based officer should patrol the coast along the sanctuaries. (All)
- Sanctuary should be more proactive and creative in enforcement. (All)
- More regulation of recreational users. (All)
- Consider cross deputization with other agencies, for enforcement. (All)
- Utilize the "polluter pays" principle. (All)
- More Sanctuary enforcement on resource protection issues. (All)
- More enforcement of Sanctuary regulations. (All)
- The Sanctuary needs to clarify its regulations, especially with regard to fishing practices. (MB)
- Generally, the Sanctuary should not add another layer of permit regulation if other Federal/State/Local/permit authorities are already in place. (All)
- Sanctuary should help expedite any multi-agency permit process. (MB)
- There should be an appeal process for MBNMS permits, and other public concerns/issues. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should keep the existing regulations on jade collection. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Regulate emissions from boat engines. (All)
- Sanctuary should regulate discharge into ocean by industrial plants/facilities. (MB)
- MTBE discharge should be prohibited in the Sanctuary. Jet fuel discharge should also be prohibited. (All)
- Avoid duplicative regulations or excessive “red tape”. (All)
- Regulations should be changed to treat sediment as a nutrient, and not a pollutant, as it is currently considered. (MB)
- MBNMS should evaluate current regulations, and eliminate restrictive policies that are not forwarding the goals of Sanctuary. (MB)
- GFNMS should remove permit requirements for researchers. (GF)
- Public should apply for access permits the same way researchers do. (All)
- The regulations for all National Marine Sanctuaries should be the same. They should all be standardized. (All)
- GFNMS regulatory structure should be maintained; enforcement must be adequately funded and staffed. (GF)
- Would like assistance from Sanctuary in the form of technical assistance help instigate a permit process for restoration projects –Help with navigating through the permitting process. (MB)
- Regulations should be made available in the most frequently used languages. (All)
- Evaluate whether Sanctuary needs to be a regulating authority for dredging. (MB)
- Sanctuary should develop adequate enforcement capability and follow-through on all violations that occur. In addition, there should be a comprehensive reporting system and an ability to compile violations and track enforcement actions. (All)
- The revised management plans should clearly describe the statutory authorities applicable to sanctuary water quality, and how these laws will be enforced. (All)
- Create a comprehensive reporting system with an ability to compile violations and track actions. (All)
- Sanctuaries should look at their existing regulatory activities, maintain those that are solely within Sanctuary jurisdiction and eliminate those that overlap other agencies’ authority. If these other agencies are deemed ineffective in their stewardship of the environment, then some mechanism should be devised by which the sanctuary can step in and effect positive changes. (MB)
- MBNMS should not engage in conduct or regulation that would impair or prevent ocean-dependent commercial enterprises or recreation activities from continuing. (MB)
- The Sanctuary’s regulatory process is not well defined. The Sanctuary’s interpretation of its regulations creates duplication and sometimes inconsistencies with other state and federal policies. Better define this process in the updated management plan. (MB)
- GFNMS needs an enforcement officer. (GF)

EXOTIC/INTRODUCED SPECIES:

Issues:

- Non-native invasive species can cause displacement of native species and adverse ecosystem change. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Concerned about invasive and introduced species – the Sanctuary should educate the public about how to dispose of seaweed used to pack bait and species in bilge water. (All)
- Sanctuaries should be more active in the prevention of the proliferation of non-native invasive species. (All)
- Perform an assessment of introduction pathways for non-native invasives in the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Develop prevention and contingency plans and work with aquariums, marine labs, and mariculture operations to filter water before disposal. (MB)
- Update Water Quality Protection Program to include invasives. (MB)
- Support outreach programs for boaters regarding hull cleaning and boat washing. (MB)
- Create policy on discharges and invasives associated with cruise ships. (MB)
- Develop alternative ways of eliminating the transmittal of invasive species through ships’ ballast water, such as sterilization, or other more sophisticated means. Consider working through EPA and State Water Resources Control Board to address the issue. (All)
- Aquaculture (shellfish) operations in Tomales bay introduce disease and alien species. (GF)

FISHING and KELP HARVESTING:

Issues:

- Concerned about impacts from fisheries. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Fisheries are currently being micro managed, and regulation has increased, while practices have remained the same. (All)
- The fishing community supports programs such as the Salmon Stamp Program. (MB)
- The Gulf of the Farallones NMS was a good model for working with fishermen. (GF)
- There would be a loss of credibility (the Leon Panetta promise) if the Sanctuary gets involved in fishery regulation. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should realize that commercial and recreational fishing interests are two separate entities, and are not in agreement on all issues.
- The Sanctuary should not be involved in the State's MLPA process. (All)
- Concerned about impacts from the live fish fishery on fish populations. (MB)
- Concerned about decline in catches by recreational fishermen. (All)
- Concerned about the live fish fishery, and depletion of fisheries by marine mammals. (All)
- Concerned about declining fish populations. Sanctuary should play a role in preserving fish populations, while preserving fishery lifestyles. (All)
- If marine reserves must occur, then they should not be located short distances from harbors, boat launch ramps, or boat rental facilities. These are the most practical, easily accessible, and popular areas to fish. (All)
- Concerned about impacts to fishes from catch and release recreational fishing. (All)
- Existing DFG/NMFS rules on by catch are wasteful. Sanctuary & Fisherman could work together on this. (All)
- Alternative foods (to kelp) are available for abalone aquaculture operations. (MB)
- Concerned with the inadequate discussion on sea otter/kelp harvesting issues, potential impacts of harvesting on the entire ecosystem, and the failure to adequately address legal issues. (MB)
- Concerned because there is a significant lack of studies documenting the impact of kelp harvesting on local sea otter populations and other marine mammals. (MB)
- Trawling alters Benthic organisms and bottom habitats, causes displacement of rocks that serve as cover for fish and invertebrates, disruption of bottom affects species diversity, abundance, and distribution. (GF/MB)
- Concerned with over fishing of geoducks and Horse neck clams. (GF)
- Concerned about over fishing such as abalone. (GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- The Sanctuary should not regulate fishing. (All)
- Concerned about agricultural runoff and its impacts upon fisheries. (All)
- The current language in the Federal Register with relation to fisheries regulation in the Sanctuary should remain. (MB)
- More resource protection regulations including no-take reserves. (All)
- The knowledge of members of the fishing industry should be utilized for data collection and research purposes, as well as for environmental monitoring. (All)
- The Sanctuary should focus efforts on other activities, which impact fisheries (farming runoff and oil), leaving fisheries regulation to the California Department of Fish & Game and the National Marine Fishery Service. (All)
- The Sanctuary should explore fisheries regulation only in offshore federal waters, not State waters. Existing agencies do a better job, and more regulation is not necessary. (MB)
- The Sanctuary research program should provide fisheries data to California Department of Fish and Game. (All)
- Sanctuary should assist CDFG with enforcement, but should not create new regulations. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should seriously consider the contribution of sport fishing to the area's economy. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should adopt marine reserves. (All)
- The Sanctuary should restrict trawling. (All)
- Investigate the possibility of a consumer "fish tax". (All)
- Use money from fishing industry to fund monitoring and replenishment projects. (All)
- Any fishing regulations that are developed should support the fishing community. (All)
- Any zones or regulations proposed by the Sanctuary which affect fishing should only occur if they are the result of a cooperative effort with the fishing and or aquaculture communities and they have the support of those communities. (All)
- The Sanctuary should be used as a model for researching new fishing techniques. (MB)
- Sanctuary should regulate gill net fishing. (All)
- Sanctuary should not regulate fisheries in state waters. (MB)
- Sanctuary should increase education about fishing regulations. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Consider use of Individual Transferable Quotas. (All)
- Clarify language about fishing. (All)
- Sanctuary should regulate spear fishing, by requiring a license and increasing fines. (MB)
- Sanctuary should play an education role rather than regulatory role with commercial fishing. (All)
- The Sanctuary should not regulate fisheries, with the exception of trawling. (All)
- Sanctuary should not allow trawling. It caused significant degradation of seafloor. (All)
- Recommend changing terminology to “fishing culture” instead of “fishing industry” which has negative connotation. (All)
- Do not become another layer of bureaucracy in dealing with fishing and dredging. (All)
- Sanctuary should promote/educate community about commercial fishing efforts in the Sanctuary. (All)
- Fishing in the Sanctuary should be limited to techniques that do not produce by-catch, as do gill nets and bottom trawling. (All)
- The Sanctuary should endorse commercial fisheries within its boundaries. (All)
- The Sanctuary should ban all forms of net fishing. (All)
- Live fish fishery should be restricted or outlawed by the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Marine reserves in temperate environments are not effective. The sanctuaries should focus their efforts on partnering with other users to educate about impacts, and not on managing fisheries. (All)
- Sanctuary should assist CDFG with the MLPA process in banning fishing in Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. A 2-mile closure is too much, however a 1/2-mile closure would be better. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should “grow” marine reserves over the years. (All)
- Sanctuaries should require low impact gear for bottom trawling. (All)
- Fishers should be compensated for marine reserve areas that have been taken out of access. (All)
- Sanctuaries should give financial support to research on marine reserves. Creation of reserves should be based on “good science”. (All)
- Sanctuaries should actively support the State’s Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) process, in lieu of sanctuaries’ adoption of reserves. (All)
- Marine reserves established by the State, should be extended into federal waters by the National Marine Sanctuary Program. (All)
- There should be a marine reserve network across all three sanctuaries. Don’t wait for MLPA. (All)
- The Sanctuary should not regulate fishing. Language in the management plan should clarify that. (All)
- Fishing gear should be examined for problems: non-degradable, entanglement. Sanctuary should look for ways to partner with existing agencies to address issue. (All)
- Look to other regions with fisheries collapsing and learn. (All)
- Sanctuary could work with PFMC using existing regulatory structures. (All)
- Recognize in writing that Sanctuary policies affecting fishing may integrate with management tools promulgated by the state and federal governments, but are not intended to augment or supersede them. (All)
- MBNMS with California Department of Fish and Game, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the research community, fishermen and other stakeholders should 1) evaluate physical and biological impacts of bottom trawling within the Sanctuary and 2) ensure protection of species diversity, abundance and habitat. In working with CDFG and NMFS the Sanctuary and its sister agencies should consider gear selectivity if adverse effects of bottom trawling are identified. (All)
- Number of sport and commercial fishing licenses should be limited, quotas should be enforced, and spot checks should be performed on catch of sport fishermen. (All)
- Sanctuaries must seek out more ways to limit by-catch, making gill netting economically feasible today and in the future. (All)
- Sanctuaries should take a stronger stand against gill netting. (All)
- Only fishing techniques that do not harm marine mammals should be permitted in the Sanctuary. (All)
- All fishermen should be required to pass a test, before being given a license, to show that they know how to reduce environmental impacts. (All)
- Treat shore fishermen separate from commercial and sport fishermen in regards to management and possible fishing closures. (MB, GF)
- If kelp harvesting is to be allowed, then it should only occur at a set distance from shore (1 mile), and quantity should be regulated. (MB)
- Have separate regulations for mechanical and manual kelp harvesting. (MB)
- Fish and Game should manage kelp harvesting. (MB)
- Do not change existing kelp harvesting regulations. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Sanctuary should review the state kelp plan during their five-year review. (MB)
- Kelp harvesting should be restricted in a reserve along Cannery Row. (MB)
- Sanctuary should investigate the effects of kelp harvesting on a variety of kelp forest inhabitants, including sea otters. This should be adequately discussed in the final management plan. (MB)
- Sanctuary should further restrict kelp harvesting. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should prohibit mechanized kelp harvesting. (MB)

HABITAT ALTERATION:

Issues:

- Concerned about impacts to the seafloor from dredging and disposal and continued bottom trawling. (MB)
- Concerned about the current state of Bolinas Lagoon. It must be preserved and protected. (GF)
- Fiber-optic cables can cause benthic and water quality impacts associated with burial, repair and removal stages of cable project, potential for marine mammal entanglement, impacts of coastal landings (disturbance of marine mammals and birds) and impacts to commercial fisheries (such as gear entanglement).
- MBNMS contains large areas of hard bottom habitat and submarine canyons that would make cable burial very difficult if not impossible. (MB)
- For the past 10 years, the Monterey Bay Aquarium has removed an undocumented amount of rocks and substrate from the Pacific Grove Marine Gardens Fish Refuge. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not allow the gravel and sand mining operation at Piedras Blancas. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should focus on riparian restoration and protection. (MB)
- Do not allow fiber optic cables in Sanctuary. (All)
- Removal of sand and gravel should not be permitted at Piedras Blancas Hotel (San Luis Obispo County), both north and south of the facility. (MB)
- Why is there still an active sand mining operation just north of Marina? Sanctuary should investigate and address this operation. It should be stopped, and restoration measures should be considered. (MB)
- Fiber Optic cables running north and south should be located on land not in ocean. (All)
- Continue to allow disposal of clean fine-grained sand in sanctuary. (MB)
- Work with national NOAA to adopt fiber-optic cable installation policies including fees system that clearly discourages installation in sanctuaries. (All)
- If fiber-optic cable proposal is considered: require use of out of Sanctuary alternative where feasible; require showing of need for capacity; limit cable installation to corridors based on habitat sensitivity. (All)
- Build permanent moorings for canoes and sailboats (avoiding anchors tearing up the bottom). (GF, MB)
- Restore the indigenous flora and fauna to naturalize the coastline as much as possible. (GF, MB)

MARINE BIOPROSPECTING:

Issues:

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Bioprospecting should be addressed in all sanctuary management plans. Strict prohibitions should be established now. (All)

MARINE DISCHARGE AND DEBRIS:

Issues:

- Concerned about the significant amount of marine debris (including balloons) washing ashore. More education to various user groups (party boats) is needed. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary policy regarding harbor dredging does not account for naturally occurring, increased sediment volumes over time; does not allow scientific finding in ocean currents, wave forces, or bathymetry to alter dredge disposal techniques or location for the overall benefit of the harbor and/or the environment; does not recognize “beneficial use” of dredge material as a concept. This is a federally recognized course of study which seeks to re-use sediment in productive ways, and concurrently not to waste clean materials. (MB)
- Concerned about the impacts of dredging on natural resources. (MB/GF)
- Concerned because landslides occur frequently on the Big Sur coast, and feel that Sanctuary position that prohibits the dumping into the ocean is inappropriate. Ocean disposal should be considered a viable option. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Sanctuary is doing a good job working with Cal Trans on landslide issues, making good and conscientious progress. (MB)
- Sanctuary should consider economic needs of Big Sur residents regarding Highway 1 closures. Should consider marine disposal from time to time. (MB)
- Dissatisfied with the management style of the Sanctuary: MBNMS does not play well with others, particularly re: coast highway landslide disposal. Does not consider the needs of other stakeholders in many cases. (MB)
- Dredging and dredge disposal can cause burial of Benthic organisms; water quality impacts associated with suspended sediments, and contamination concerns.
- Disposal of landslide sediments can cause burial and increased sedimentation to tide-pools and other near-shore resources. Visual impacts and pedestrian access problems. (MB)
- Concerned about environmental degradation associated with water intake, discharge of brine, population growth issues and energy use related to desalination. (MB)
- Sanctuary view of dredging has been “painted with a single brush and single color”; this prejudiced view does not reflect the abundant science discriminating beneficial dredging from harmful dredging. (MB)
- Concerned about the proliferation of desalination plants and the potential expansion of offshore drilling. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Concerned about the effects of marine debris and trash. The Sanctuary should conduct an education program to address this issue. (All)
- Concerned about litter and trash generated by tourists. Sanctuary should develop and implement an educational program that includes signage, and impose fines for littering to address this issue. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should investigate potential negative impacts of desalination on resources, and provide more input to the Regional Water Quality Control Boards. (MB)
- Improve desalination technologies; investigate use of transportable desalination barges. (MB)
- Restrict small private project specific desalination plants; allow desalination only for public benefit. (MB)
- Encourage regional solutions regarding desalination. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should prohibit desalination, because brine discharge would affect the ecosystem. (MB)
- Desalination should be addressed in the revised management plan. (MB)
- Sanctuary should develop a regional desalination policy. (MB)
- Sanctuary should be open to the possibility of desalination (local communities need water). (MB)
- Beach nourishment and marine disposal should be addressed in the revised management plan. (MB/GF)
- Concerned about DDT in Moss Landing. Should be deposited at hazardous waste site. (MB)
- Streamline the permitting process for dredging. Sanctuary should establish an interagency dredging permit coordination process, based on the SF model. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not regulate dredging beyond other agencies. (MB)
- Harbor dredge spoils should be disposed of at land disposal facilities. (MB)
- Harbors should continue dumping dredge spoils into designated sites. (MB)
- Sanctuary should address issue of management of dredge spoils and DDT contamination. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should not require permits for dredging. (MB/GF)
- Sedimentation occurs naturally during storm events at Pillar Point Harbor. Sanctuary should allow harbor to dredge, and dispose of dredge spoils on the other side of the breakwater, where the beach area is eroding. (MB)
- Clarify that the Sanctuary does not regulate or issue permits for dredging. (MB)
- Any Sanctuary policy on dredging should be no more restrictive than other directly responsible regulatory agencies. (MB)
- Moss Landing should be dredged and deposited in the ocean. Onshore disposal costs too much, is labor intensive and highly polluting. More damage is caused by onshore disposal than is being protected. (MB)
- Consider using non-contaminated dredge materials for beach replenishment. (MB)
- Sources of sediment material from landslides should be examined; if the landslide is determined to be due to natural processes, then material should be disposed of in the Sanctuary. (MB)
- MBNMS must establish a reasonable protocol to clear landslide debris from roadways during sudden closures. (MB)
- Sediment disposal sites must be pre-designated in Big Sur. (MB)
- Sanctuary should take a proactive approach, in implementing emergency protocols during sudden road closures, to insure passage of emergency vehicles. (MB)
- Monitor Cal Trans activities and prevent disposal of landslide material into Sanctuary. (MB)
- No wholesale side-casting of landslide sediments. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Sanctuary needs to identify sensitive habitats where landslides must NOT be permitted, and sediments must not be deposited. (MB)
- Sanctuary should identify locations where beach replenishment is necessary to preclude shoreline armoring. Landslide sediment is an obvious source for beach nourishment materials. (MB)
- MBNMS should better coordinate with Cal Trans in regards to disposal of sediment from landslides. Sanctuary should listen to the geologists. (MB)
- No-discharge zones should be established in special sanctuary sites, such as Areas of Special Biological Significance established by the State of California. (All)
- Complete development of landslide disposal policy. (MB)
- Regarding landslide disposal activities: avoid impacting sensitive biological and archeological areas and resources. (MB)
- Prohibit disposal of highway landslide materials that exceed predicted natural inputs (i.e., differs in volume, composition, location, and timing from naturally occurring landslides in the area). (MB)
- More garbage and recycle containers needed at coastal sites. (GF, MB)
- Organized clean up parties to scour the beaches ASAP after yearly floods. (GF, MB)

MILITARY ACTIVITIES:

Issues:

- Concerned about Naval Post Graduate School's missile launching activities. (MB)
- Concerned about military over flights. MBNMS should exert greater influence regarding this issue. (MB)
- Opposed to Navy Sonar due to marine mammal impacts / migratory problems. (All)
- It is extremely important for the Navy to conduct operations "off" the waters of California. Activities currently carried out by the Navy within these sanctuaries are essential for the national defense. Continued unrestricted access for these purposes is not incompatible with the protection and proper management of sanctuary resources. (All)
- Concerned about pollution from military experiments. (CB, GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should continue to resist militarization in the area. (MB)
- Sanctuary should allow no automatic exemptions for military. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not condone or allow military use (including marine invasion drills). (MB)
- Sanctuary should prohibit: 1) all non-emergency military flights over Sanctuary wildlife zones, and 2) non-emergency underwater military ops. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not endorse marine invasion drills. (MB)
- All non-emergency military underwater operations in MBNMS and within behavior altering distance of Sanctuary resources should be prohibited. All other Military underwater operations within Sanctuary should require a discretionary permit and NEPA environmental review. (MB)
- Regarding military activities, revise the regulations to specify those activities, which are considered "pre-existing" in order to avoid continued ambiguity. (MB)

MONITORING:

Issues:

- Cambria locals have observed growth of new algae in the intertidal, and are concerned. Sanctuary should increase monitoring of coastal environments for change. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- The Sanctuary should concentrate on more monitoring of human activities. (All)
- More rigorous monitoring of water quality, and better access to results by public. (All)
- More monitoring of all types of pollutants. (All)
- Sanctuary should have monitoring data from all agencies and organizations, on the website. (All)
- Investigate the feasibility of testing deer for bioaccumulation of pesticides etc. (MB)
- More monitoring of runoff from golf courses. (MB)
- Increased monitoring of outflows from rivers, and desalination plants. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should help secure funds for additional water quality monitoring. (MB)
- Monitor the activities Monterey Bay Aquarium for fish deaths and extraction. (MB)
- Sanctuary should do more monitoring and tracking of non-point source pollution. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Sanctuary should conduct testing for pesticide residue. (All)
- Sanctuary should monitor water for detergents and conduct bacteriological sampling. (All)
- Utilize fishermen for monitoring efforts. (All)
- Sanctuary should investigate sources of non-point pollution for pathogens. (All)
- Sanctuary needs to be an advocate in ensuring that sewage outflows are carefully monitored. Septic systems (i.e. Garrapata) may overwhelm natural processes and require a sewage treatment plan. (MB)
- Not sure how MBNMS can effectively monitor 300 miles of coast. Sanctuary should investigate the use of volunteer surveys for monitoring. (MB)
- MBNMS should develop a policy and guidelines to monitor water quality in streams, rivers, creeks, etc. emptying into the Sanctuary. These should be clean enough to swim in. (MB)
- Use satellite technology to monitor health of the environment and observe possible harmful impacts (enforcement). (All)
- Sanctuary should work cooperatively with federal and state agencies on monitoring water quality. (All)
- Duke Energy facility should be monitored for potential impacts. (MB)
- A special adjunct to the Team Ocean program should focus on monitoring the Monterey Harbor/Cannery Row area for various petroleum-based spills. (MB)
- The NMSP should view the Monterey Bay Citizen Watershed Monitoring Network as a model for citizen monitoring efforts in other sanctuaries nation-wide. (All)
- The revised management plans should address continued support for, and expansion of citizen monitoring efforts such as the Snapshot Day and First Flush events as well as the Urban Watch Program. (All)
- Monitor target species, resources, key processes, and physical parameters. (All)
- Improve rapid response capacity to document impacts of specific events. (MB)
- Check status of red abalone in Bodega Bay (continue monitoring). (GF)
- Need monitoring of sea lion populations. (GF)
- Increase monitoring of radioactive barrels, mercury, and other pollutants. (GF)
- Need long-term monitoring of the rocky intertidal areas. (MB, GF)
- Expand SIMoN to include all three Sanctuaries. (GF, CB)

MOTORIZED PERSONAL WATERCRAFT:

Issues:

- Concern about the use of personal watercraft – no increase in use. (All)
- Environmental studies on PWCs have not been site specific. There is a lack of current science in the studies. New Technology in PWC is not being considered. (All)
- Concerned about the use of PWC in and around the surf zone, especially in areas where non-motorized recreational activities are common. (MB/GF)
- Pollution from PWC emissions is not an issue when compared to other sources of pollution. (MB/GF)
- Concerned about separations of seal pups from parent, and other impacts to marine mammals and waterfowl, from PWC operation. (MB/GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should ban all motorized personal watercraft and 2-stroke engines. (All)
- Strengthen motorized personal watercraft regulations. (MB)
- Modify motorized personal watercraft regulations to include 3-4 person craft. (MB)
- The current Personal watercraft zones should remain the same. (MB)
- There should not be a general ban on motorized personal watercraft (PWC) in Monterey Bay, Cordell Bank, or Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuaries; however offensive activities relating to PWC operation should be identified and banned where appropriate, and banned activities should be sufficiently enforced. (All)
- PWCs are a valuable tool for certain activities such as search and rescue, enforcement, and research, and their use for these activities in the sanctuaries should not be restricted. (All)
- Concerned because use of PWCs in the surf zone of Half Moon Bay is not safe. Enforcement of this activity must be improved. (MB)
- MBNMS should consider including Mavericks in the PWC use zone. (MB)
- PWC regulations for MBNMS should be the same as those for GFNMS. (MB)
- Concerned about the long-term impacts of PWC use in near shore areas. Sanctuaries should conduct environmental impact studies on this activity. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- PWC regulations in MBNMS should be made less specific, to prevent loopholes and other opportunities for circumvention of the regulations. (MB)
- If Motorized Boating is allowed in area, then Motorized Personal Watercraft (PWC) should also be allowed. (All)
- There should be a more collaborative process regarding PWC regulation similar to the Florida Keys. (MB)
- Apply a noise standard for the Sanctuary regarding PWCs. (MB)
- Consider seasonal zones for jet skis. And limited conditions. (MB)
- All three sanctuaries should have a consistent policy that allows for PWC use. (All)
- Site-specific environmental assessments should be conducted regarding PWCs, which should include air, water, and sound quality testing, and should consider those impacts in relation to any other activities that are permitted in the sanctuaries. (All)
- Strengthen motorized personal watercraft regulations. (All)
- Other than access lanes to PWC zones, no PWC should be allowed closer than 250 yards of the shore. (MB)
- PWCs should be banned from approaching within 200 feet of any non-motorized user of the MBNMS or within 200 feet of any non-human species at the surface of the waters of the MBNMS. (MB)
- PWC use in surf zone should be banned. (MB)
- Support a 3-year trial period of self regulation by big wave surfing teams at a small number of locations including Mavericks, and perhaps 3-4 other locations during the heaviest surf conditions only. If after this trial period, the NMSP determines that there are issues, then a rigorous licensing program should be implemented. (MB)

OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT:

Issues:

- MBNMS policy stopping oil drilling off the Central California Coast complicates foreign policy in regards to Muslim oil exporting nations after September 11th. (MB)
- Concerned about mineral extraction in sanctuaries. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Never allow drilling for oil in the Sanctuary. (All)
- Oil and gas exploration/Drilling in the Sanctuary should continue to be banned. (All)
- Oil and gas development should be permanently banned within GFNMS, MBNMS and CBNMS. (All)
- Concerned about the potential impact drilling outside the sanctuaries could have on sanctuary resources; NMSP should address this threat in the revised management plans. (All)
- Prohibit slant drilling into the Sanctuary. (All)

PARTNERSHIPS WITH AGENCIES:

Issues:

- Need a better means of coordinating and working with other agencies to develop solutions and notify local businesses and the public, including posting of access points when sewage spills occur. (All)
- The positive accomplishments of the Sanctuary Program should be actively supported and lauded by the City of Monterey. The creation of Sanctuary-related signage along the recreation trail is an example of a way the City could actively support the Sanctuary educational goal. (MB)
- State rights more important than federal. (All)
- Fishery management agencies should work more cooperatively together on issues. (All)
- Concerned because CDFG Sea Otter Game Refuge regulations overlap with Sanctuary regulations. Evaluate whether both agencies should be required to regulate or protect this area. (MB)
- MBNMS needs to be more accommodating of management styles and priorities of other agencies. (MB)
- More cooperation should occur between the State and Federal governments in setting up marine reserves. (All)
- The Sanctuary should support watershed groups –Sanctuary won't come to meetings and won't fund watershed group projects. (MB)
- Need to clarify which agencies have jurisdiction over tide pools, and life in tide pools. This is currently not clear and there appears to be a lot of overlap between agencies. (MB/GF)
- The Ag and Rural Plans need to have more flexibility in how they are carried out by different agencies. (MB)
- Need better coordination/ interaction with San Francisco Bay/ Delta (pollution, invasive species). Melting of government bodies to oversee water issues. (MB/GF)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Update MOA with State incorporate NPS Plan, Oceans Plan, Storm Water, BTTP, Consolidated THS, and TMDL Programs. (MB)
- Sanctuary should attend quarterly Blue Circle meetings (of all watershed groups).
- Use US Environmental Protection Agency authority to enforce environmental regulations within the Sanctuary. (All)
- The Sanctuary should be involved in Ricketts underwater park and the State Marine Life Protection Act process. (MB)
- Better coordination must occur between the Sanctuary and Asilomar State Park, especially in addressing impacts to rocky intertidal habitat. (MB)
- Sanctuary should give input to the City of Salinas on the update of its general plan. (MB)
- Work more with other agencies to achieve a goal of watershed protection. (All)
- Regulatory jurisdiction needs to be streamlined– making for better collaboration and less confusion about overlapping regulations. (All)
- Sanctuary should help cities and municipalities obtain funding for infrastructure and urban runoff and water quality improvement efforts. (MB)
- Work with local jurisdictions to remove impediments in streams and preserve habitats. (MB/GF)
- MBNMS should continue working as a key participant in the Big Sur multi-agency council and the Coast Hwy Management Plan (CHMP). (MB)
- More collaboration with state and local regulatory agencies on sewage discharge. (All)
- Continue involving State in management plan issues. (All)
- More interaction with the California Coastal Commission. (All)
- Sanctuary should provide advice to city planners on how to address the problems of storm drains, sewage treatment plants. (MB)
- Sanctuary should coordinate better with other agencies and landowners regarding management of waterways. (MB)
- Sanctuary should better coordinate with other local agencies, specifically Morro Bay National Estuary. (MB)
- More cooperation and collaboration with existing regulatory agencies should occur, not more regulations. Sanctuary should examine current interactions and explore ways to improve coordination. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary could provide information and advice concerning marine ecosystems, to other government agencies and the public, to facilitate sounder resource management decisions. (All)
- Continue current degree of communication and cooperation with other resource management agencies. (MB)
- Increase communications among all regulatory agencies. (All)
- Increase partnerships with the regional water quality boards. (All)
- Sanctuary should serve as a neutral facilitator in issues involving overlapping jurisdictions. (MB)
- More coordination/collaboration and active problem solving among agencies, to address the issue of sediment management. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should be involved in the state Coastal Sediment Management Working Group. (MB)
- In cases where multiple agencies overlap in their jurisdictions, more Memoranda Of Understanding (MOU) are needed. MOU should determine a lead agency to oversee natural resource issues. (All)
- Sanctuary should increase collaboration with other agencies regarding wastewater treatment and water purification systems. MBNMS should take primary role in this collaboration, and should develop model education and implementation Programs. (MB)
- Sanctuary should work collaboratively with BLM, which is also in planning for its California Coastal National Monument. This is a great opportunity to work collaboratively. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuaries should increase cooperation with other agencies, especially regarding estuaries. (All)
- Sanctuaries should examine the overlapping regulatory structure and investigate ways to streamline the process. (All)
- Sanctuaries should become mandatory members of the Coastal Commission. (All)
- Sanctuaries need to ensure that planning commissions are aware of their regulations. (All)
- Sanctuaries should work in tandem with other agencies to enforce water quality regulations. (All)
- Sanctuaries should coordinate with other agencies to create one joint interpretive center, rather than 1 center for each agency. (All)
- Coordinate master planning efforts and share data with USFWS regarding refuge mgmt plans. (All)
- Work with State Water Resources Control Board on coordination and encourage survey of resources through monitoring – S.W.A.M.P. Program. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Sanctuary should discuss with USACOE to make improvements to harbors and improve technology for dredging. (MB)
- Need stronger MOUs to tie all jurisdictions together. Need to have all agencies work together. (All)
- Require the city and County of San Francisco public works departments to comply with Sanctuary standards so that waters off Ocean Beach can be included in the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Expand out joint management plan model to other agencies. (All)
- Sanctuary should work closely with the California Department of Fish and Game, Pacific Fisheries Management Council, fishermen, divers, conservationists, and the public to establish marine reserves within Sanctuary waters. (All)
- AMBAG (and MBNMS) should convene a staff level local governments and affected special districts liaison group (similar to Urban Runoff Task Force), to address upcoming MBNMS programs/projects. The purpose of the group would be to assist Sanctuary in early identification of issues affecting local governments. (MB)
- MBNMS should utilize the local elected officials forum provided through the AMBAG Board of Directors to obtain policy input on all sanctuary issues affecting local governments. (MB)
- MBNMS should contract with AMBAG to develop and maintain an ongoing local government liaison and outreach program. (MB)
- Explore opportunities for collaboration between MBNMS and Morro Bay National Estuary Program, perhaps regarding research, public education, or resource management. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should engage as a full and active partner in the MLPA and PFMC MPA efforts, which should include roles in decision making, providing assistance such as scientific research, socioeconomic data collection, resource protection recommendations, stakeholder outreach and involvement, monitoring and enforcement, but not to defer to marine reserve processes under the jurisdiction of other agencies. (All)
- Sanctuaries should improve coordination among themselves. (All)
- MBNMS, CBNMS, and GFNMS should be working closely with relevant state and federal agencies, to ensure that marine reserves and other MPAs provide adequate protection of marine biodiversity and habitat within the sanctuaries' boundaries. (All)
- Sanctuary should integrate with the statewide study on state waters that will be initiated in 2003.
- New Management plan needs to consider updating the MOU on the Water Quality Protection Program and integrate with the state wide WQ program. (MB)
- New management plan should reflect a closer collaboration between sanctuary and Elkhorn Slough NERR. Issues to address collaboratively include tidal scour, invasive species, recreational use of the slough, and water quality issues. (MB)
- Sanctuary should develop a comprehensive plan to educate, encourage support of, and coordinate activities with all local governments and community organizations. Plan would address such topics as water quality, urban runoff, catch-basin improvements, street sweeping, best restaurant practices, posting for beach closures, Zone 5 practices, and sewage spills. (MB)
- Sanctuary Program should support the State's Marine Life Management Act, by coordinating input to management plans from research institutions around the bay. (All)
- Existing cooperative relationships and management activities should be described in detail, to help the public better understand the significant degree and complex nature of joint management activities in sanctuaries. (All)
- Update of management plan should include a renegotiation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between various State and Federal agencies. The MOU should reflect the *Plan for California's Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program* that has received federal approval since Sanctuary designation. (All)
- Sanctuaries should work with local jurisdictions, county health departments, regional water quality control boards, and other agencies to study nearshore water quality. (GF, MB)
- Better coordination between sanctuaries and Coast Guards/Navy/Commercial planes during breeding season on Farallones Islands. (GF)

PARTNERSHIPS WITH COMMUNITY GROUPS:

Issues:

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- More partnerships with businesses that use or cause impacts to the Sanctuary. (All)
- Sanctuary should work more closely with ports and harbors to identify reasonable prudent approaches to dredging, that allow for safe operation of those ports with minimal impacts to Sanctuary resources. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Should work collaboratively with the City of Salinas, and environmental groups regarding water quality in creeks that flow into the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Work with local communities on habitat restoration projects. (MB/GF)
- Increase public involvement. (All)
- Sanctuary should work collaboratively with diverse user groups, to reach consensus on issues. (All)
- Sanctuary should be more proactive with the tourism industry in future years. (All)
- The Sanctuary should work more closely with, and utilize the business and tourism sector. (All)
- There needs to be better collaboration and communication between the Sanctuary, Hearst Castle, and visitors regarding opportunities to see the elephant seals. (MB)
- Sanctuary should work with harbors and marinas, on a program promoting alternatives to toxic bottom paints. (MB)
- Maintain collaboration between Farm Bureaus and MBNMS. The Sanctuary now works effectively with the coalition of farm bureaus in reducing siltation and transport of pollutants. The MBNMS had added staff to work with this coalition, and there is concern that we will lose this staff if the MBNMS boundary moves south to the county line. (MB)
- Continue working in collaboration with the agriculture industry, utilizing a non-regulatory approach. (MB)
- Collaboration between the staffs of MBNMS and Fitzgerald Marine Reserve should be improved. (MB)
- Sanctuary needs to partner with local organizations to educate the public. Need resources to make happen on a larger scale (higher priority). (All)
- Santa Cruz County Office of Ed needs to be better linked to Sanctuary. (MB)
- Terrwiliger Nature Center and Audubon Canyon Ranch Visitor are developed as pilot programs, perhaps they can share information, create partnerships. (MB)
- Sanctuary should be the leader of all regional groups/institutions. (All)
- Sanctuaries should work with Chambers of Commerce and hotels, in educating the public. (All)
- Input from local users is overshadowed by academic input. Sanctuary should involve and work directly with local users and those that would be regulated. (All)
- Encourage more local involvement with Sanctuary. (All)
- Sanctuary should work more with volunteers. (All)
- JMPR needs to include a thorough re-visitation of the Sanctuary's commitments to the original communities of interest that supported the formation of the Sanctuary (i.e., agriculture, fishing, harbors etc.). (All)
- Sanctuary needs to be more accommodating of the needs of Big Sur residents. (MB)
- Big Sur residents are not currently threatened by MBNMS, things should continue to be this way. (MB)
- Surfrider has had positive experience working and communicating with the MBNMS. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should develop more full their working relationships with affected stakeholders. Potential cooperative studies that could aid in protection of sanctuary resources include fisheries stock assessments, impacts of commercial fishing and particular gear types to the wildlife and habitat of the sanctuary, impacts of permitted discharges into sanctuary waters, and effectiveness of habitat restoration efforts. (All)
- MBNMS should actively support practices, which will ensure the continuance of the goals of the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project (STEP), and should recognize STEPs' unique productive work. (MB)
- Participate in regional/national science and resource management initiatives.
- Participate in regional cabled observatory development. (MB)
- Coordinate regional research and monitoring – add value to existing programs and help avoid duplicative efforts. (MB)
- NMSP should support the continued development of the Monterey Bay Citizen Watershed Monitoring Network, as well as specific programs such as First Flush, Urban Watch, and Snapshot Day. (MB)
- The sanctuary should work with the Steinhart Aquarium. (GF)
- Surfrider is interested in working at Ocean Beach with the Sanctuary. (GF, MB)

RADIOACTIVE WASTE:

Issues:

- Concerned about the radioactive waste barrels that are decaying out in the ocean. (GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- GFNMS should continue efforts to assess the potential impacts of the radioactive material disposal site on Sanctuary resources. (GF)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Consider further collaboration with the U.S. Navy to develop a formal assessment of the extent of the disposal site, and an analysis of options such as removal or capping, for addressing the waste. (GF)
- Sanctuary should petition the Federal Government to spend the money needed to monitor radioactive dumpsite. (GF)
- Assess potential impacts of historic dumping of radioactive materials on resources of the GFNMS. (GF)
- Do biological and ecological survey of barrels, sediments and fish/ invertebrate/ algae. (GF)
- Bottom trawling should cease at once in radiation-affected areas. (GF)
- Funds allocated by responsible parties to characterize the nuclear disposal site, develop a clean up plan. (GF)
- Sanctuary should be educating the public about radioactive dumping. (GF)

RESEARCH:

Issues:

- It is not realistic for the Sanctuary “to maintain the natural biological communities”...and “restore and enhance”. This is impossible because there is not enough of an understanding of the natural history of the area. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- The Sanctuary should continue to conduct research on resource management issues. (All)
- The Sanctuary should promote balance between different species by supporting research into coastal streams and fish stocks interaction with marine mammals. (All)
- The Sanctuary should promote research to assess natural versus human caused changes in rocky intertidal and near-shore ecosystems. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should conduct a study on the effectiveness of education vs. regulation in changing behaviors. (All)
- Fully fund SIMoN and integrate it into the Management Plan. SIMoN should be the top priority. (MB)
- Investigate sea otter disturbances by kayakers and other recreational users. (MB)
- Sanctuary should utilize commercial fishermen for collecting data/research. (All)
- Sanctuary needs to conduct research to assess the current biological condition of the resources today. It is necessary to have these baseline data in order to measure future success. (All)
- Sanctuary should investigate the effects of bottom trawling for potential environmental changes. (All)
- Sanctuary should conduct research on dynamics of fish populations and ecosystems. Need to understand ecosystems better in order to make wise management decisions. (All)
- The Sanctuary research program should provide fisheries data to California Department of Fish and Game. (MB)
- Sanctuary should investigate the decline of steelhead populations in San Carpoforo Creek (Cambria). (MB)
- Sanctuary should establish a “Monterey Bay NMS South” research center in the Cambria area. (MB)
- Need to investigate impacts to marine life and seabirds, from dogs that are not kept on a leash. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary studies and research findings must be subject to scientific peer review. (All)
- SIMoN program is an example of good research –database to not be redundant in efforts in the region. (MB)
- Need research initiative on shelf break area. Re: whales, krill, fish, birds. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should investigate erosion rates along San Mateo coast. (MB)
- Sanctuary should conduct research on tide pools, in order to better understand ecosystem dynamics. (MB)
- Sanctuary should increase research and public access to information on the resources. (All)
- GFNMS and Point Reyes National Seashore should immediately launch a rapid assessment of the region’s marine biological diversity. (GF)
- Provide additional support to build the scientific underpinnings for more effective resource management policies, in particular, through SIMoN (Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network) program. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should serve as outdoor laboratories where current and future generations can study biological and marine sciences and the application of scientific knowledge to improving marine resource conservation and management. (All)
- Revised management plans should include language, which expands SIMoN to include MBNMS, CBNMS and GFNMS. (All)
- Revised management plans should include research action plans that identify research and monitoring programs (with timelines) focused on conservation issue -i.e., research that directly guides management decisions. (All)
- Conduct paleo-ecological and archeological studies to determine historic conditions. (All)
- Identify, locate, analyze, archive and, when possible build upon historical data sets. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should be a conduit for provision of additional funding for research. (All)
- Characterize water flow, erosion processes, and monitor key biological communities in Elkhorn Slough. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Assess, quantify extractive and non-extractive human impacts. (All)
- Assess, quantify effectiveness of regional marine reserves at the ecosystem level. Investigate financial impacts to fishermen, resulting from reserves. (All)
- Understand transport and sinks of pollution (particularly in sediments, water, and through the food web). (All)
- Post research findings on web site. (MB)
- Update the MBNMS Site Characterization. (MB)
- Enhance and promote Ecosystem Observations and Sanctuary Currents. (MB)
- Integrate regional research with national program. (MB)
- Support growing research needs with MBNMS research vessel and remotely operated vehicle. The research vessel must be of sufficient size to reach all corners of the sanctuary. (This may mean a vessel of 100 ft. length or larger). (MB)
- Prioritize joint taxa inventory within GFNMS with Point Reyes National Seashore. (GF)
- Encourage white shark research e.g. and other biosystems study. (GF)
- Study the effects of chumming on sharks. (GF)
- Water quality- research needed to identify how much pollution coming from SF Bay (especially industries). (GF, CB)
- Would like to see more research on the effects of pollution on the food chain in GFNMS. (GF)
- GFNMS and CBNMS should play a coordinating role relating to research activities on sanctuary resources. (GF, CB)

SAC:

Issues:

- The SAC is a great tool. It acts as the eyes and ears for the Resources Agency and is a two way street in terms of informing the public and informing agencies. (All)
- The SAC is experiencing growing pains but just needs its role firmed up. (MB)
- SAC Agendas and correspondence should not need NOAA concurrence. (All)
- SAC rules too constraining. (MB)
- The number of public agency seats on the SAC, relative to communities of interest seats seems disproportionate. (MB)
- Changing the advisory council to a management council is an extremely bad idea. Having SAC members elected by the community is also a bad idea.
- The Superintendent's perceived selective appointments to the SAC raises serious questions about conflicts of interest. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Business and Tourism Advisory Panel should become active in education. (MB)
- Sanctuary should reconsider the appointment process for its Advisory Council. (MB)
- Sanctuary should reconsider the role of the SAC. (MB)
- Recreational fishing should be represented on the Sanctuary Advisory Council. (MB)
- There should be a separate "fishing working group". (MB)
- SAC should remain an advisory body. (MB)
- SAC protocols regarding congressional relations must be reevaluated. (MB)
- Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) members should be chosen by their constituency rather than by the Sanctuary, and the SAC. Selection committees should be avoided. (MB)
- Sanctuary should advertise SAC seat openings better, to get a larger pool of applicants. (MB)
- Multiple gear types for fishing should be represented on the SAC. (MB)
- Sanctuary Advisory Councils should be strengthened, and should better represent the local voice regarding local issues. (All)
- The Sanctuary Advisory Council should have a representative from the military to increase awareness of proposed military activities. The Sanctuary could also take advantage of certain military expertise and opportunities. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should not control or overrule SACs, nor should they choose SAC members, or "censor" SAC issues/positions. (All)
- MBNMS should make SAC meetings more accessible to working public. (MB)
- SAC Charter and Protocols should be changed to allow the SAC freedom in setting agendas and drafting correspondence (including to members of Congress). SAC communication to members of Congress should be

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

limited to policy issues, not include “grass roots” lobbying for increased funding, and only occur if representing a majority view of the SAC. (MB)

- If the SAC Charter and Protocols cannot be changed, then SAC should not be organized within NOAA, but rather under State law, or through a local joint powers arrangement or MOU. (MB)
- A conflict of interest disclosure statement should be required of SAC members, similar to what is required of public officials throughout California. (All)
- The Sanctuary and NOAA should be completely removed from the SAC appointment process for all SAC seats. The appointment process needs to be turned over to an independent review panel with no input from the Sanctuary and NOAA. (All)
- SAC Charter and Protocols should be changed to allow the SAC to set its own agenda and write letters without Sanctuary Superintendent concurrence. (MB)
- Sanctuary regulations should be changed to declare that employees or principles of companies or corporations that have a direct financial interest in SAC and Sanctuary decisions are ineligible to become SAC members. This financial interest would also include companies or corporations that receive Sanctuary Foundation money or perform any work or services for, or with, the Sanctuary. Certain SAC seats like commercial fishing, business, and tourism would be allowed a variance but the appointee would have to show that the applicant is an officer in an associated industry group representing the industry. (MB)
- Strengthen the SAC membership, while clarifying and reaffirming its proper advisory role as currently constituted. (MB)
- Emphasis should be given to appointing on the Sanctuary Advisory Council, members that represent (in an official capacity, if feasible) their area of interest. Each group on the Sanctuary Advisory Council should recommend nominees to be seated in specific classes. (MB)
- SAC should not micro-manage Sanctuary staff. (MB)
- Sanctuary should consult with specific communities that are represented by a SAC seat, and ask them to develop a process to select a SAC representative. (MB)
- Regarding SAC appointment process: Sanctuary should identify either all or at least the major organizations that represent each community that is represented by a SAC seat, and consult with them in making SAC selections. For example the appointment of a fishing representative should be made by joint selection from the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen’s Associations, the Alliance of Communities for Sustainable Fisheries, and United Anglers of California. For the business seat the Chambers of Commerce should jointly make the appointment. For tourism, the various visitor and convention bureaus should select, and the agriculture seat should be selected through a consensus of the three farm bureaus. The conservation seat should be selected through the membership of the Conservation Working Group, the research through the RAP, and the education seat through the SEP. The at-large seats should be appointed by the board of supervisors of their counties. (MB)
- SAC should include representatives from each recreational user group, such as recreational boaters, windsurfers, kite surfers etc. (All)

SPILL RESPONSE AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING:

Issues:

- Oil spills are always a danger and a plan should be developed in case of an oil spill within Sanctuary boundaries. (All)
- Concerned about the lack of cohesiveness regarding emergency response to coastal incidents (oil spills etc.). (All)
- Concerned about potential impacts of oil tanker spills. (All)
- Concerned about Sanctuary’s vulnerability to ship spills, break-ups and collisions. A major event could potentially wipe out sea otter population. (MB)
- Multitude of small spills from smaller boats, etc. is a concern. (All)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should investigate the occurrence of oil/tar balls. Sanctuary should work with OSPR to identify sources, and clean-up when found. (All)
- Sanctuaries must be consistent in their response to oil spills. (All)
- Sanctuary should develop a dispersants policy, improve oil response capabilities for the Big Sur and Cambria coast, develop an interagency plan to minimize the numbers and reduce impacts of small wrecks and groundings and address vessel and debris removal. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Revised management plans should contain stricter penalties for at sea discharges of oil by ships, enhancement of spill-source tracking efforts and a process with timeframes for review of the adequacy of oil spill response throughout sanctuary waters, particularly in more remote areas such as the southern end of MBNMS. (All)
- Sources of oil/tar balls on beach should be investigated to determine whether from natural seeps or anthropogenic sources. (All)
- Sanctuary should consider supporting programs for rapid response to new threats. (All)
- Sanctuaries should encourage the adoption of state and federal energy and transportation policies that foster a shift away from current high levels of petroleum use, and educate the public about the connection between high levels of petroleum use in our society and the oiled beaches, and animals that inevitably follow the release of oil into the ocean. (All)
- Must stage adequate oil spill response supplies in Bodega Bay, not just San Francisco Bay. (GF, CB)
- Vessel traffic lanes pushed out to address oil spill impacts at Farallon islands and impact to sea bird colonies and pinnipeds. (GF)

USER CONFLICTS:

Issues:

- Facilitation of multiple uses should be a higher priority for the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Need to balance human use with resource protection. Might need to restrict some activities. (All)
- Sanctuary is managing human activity more than managing resources. (MB)
- Concerned about the impacts from recreational use off Elkhorn Slough. (MB)
- Kayaking is lower impact in ocean waters than in Elkhorn Slough. (MB)
- Concerned about marine mammals approaching kayaks. Monterey Bay Aquarium has tried to teach avoidance behaviors tootters which have been in their care. (MB)
- Since it is nearly impossible for human activity not to create some impact on Sanctuary resources, there is concern that this will lead to more and more restrictions on human use of the Sanctuary, given the current language in the management plan that “multiple uses” are allowed as long as they are consistent with resource protection. (MB)
- The facilitation of human use of the Sanctuary is a stated program goal, yet very little has been done to promote this goal. (MB)
- Intensive agricultural development carries increasing adverse impacts. (GF)
- Concerned about allowing divers and sportsmen into the Sanctuary with out regulating them. (MB, GF)
- “Extreme sports” not compatible with sanctuary protections. (GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Need to investigate impacts from research, diving, kayaking, and spear fishing. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not restrict access to habitats or resources. (All)
- Increase public access. (All)
- Concerned about the impacts of too many kayakers, increase in tourists, and growing population in general. Sanctuary should restrict use to a sustainable level. (MB)
- Never restrict surfing. (MB/GF)
- GFNMS needs to resolve conflicts between commercial, recreational and research users at the Farallones Islands. (GF)
- Sanctuary should protect the rights indigenous people (traditional users). (MB)
- Conscientious (through education) use of the Sanctuary should be as much of a goal as research and conservation. (All)
- JMPR process should include an analysis of jurisdictional issues. This analysis should consult with all coastal jurisdictions and property owners, and be available for public comment. The benefits of the Sanctuary status for very near shore urban areas should be weighed against any jurisdictional issues. If jurisdictional problems are evident, a possible solution would be to create an ‘urban buffer zone’ which would still be within the Sanctuary boundary and would continue to allow for Sanctuary education, conservation and research programs, but which would not be subject to Sanctuary Permit Authority. (MB)
- Clarifying language needs to be added to the Management Plan to allow for human uses as long as there is no significant and sustained impact that permanently damages the resource, (i.e. allow for minor impacts). Include a guidance statement to help Sanctuary staff define major/minor impacts. (All)
- Need regulatory and educational signage at harbor launch ramps for kayakers– signage reaches more people than brochures. (MB/GF)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- MBNMS to preserve areas of recreation to better accommodate recreational users: outstanding surf breaks, SCUBA areas, wetlands, and dunes systems are examples of places that should be preserved for recreational and education use. (MB)
- All divers should be prohibited from killing, removing, or otherwise harming any plants or animals in the sanctuaries. (ALL)
- Limit recreational use to non-motorized vessels such as wind surfing, kayaks, skin diving, and sailing. (MB)
- Sanctuary should be as thorough in protecting fishing heritage, surfing culture, kite surfing, windsurfing, boating and other recreational activities as it is in protecting the endangered species in the Sanctuary. (All)
- Need to ensure that uses by others (hikers, kayakers) do not impact wildlife on ranches. (GF)
- Consider whether regulations on kayaks and boats in Tomales Bay are necessary. (GF)

VESSEL TRAFFIC:

Issues:

- Concerned about cruise ships and similar activities in the Sanctuary that currently are not an issue, but have the potential for impact. Sanctuary should adopt a proactive approach regarding these activities. (All)
- Concerned about diesel exhaust pollution from large shipping vessels. (All)
- Worried about oil transportation over Cordell Bank. (CB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Sanctuary should support the use of environmentally sensitive vessels for transportation. (MB)
- Only specific vessels that don't impact Sanctuary resources should be allowed, such as hovercraft. Avoid vessels that pollute. (MB)
- Sanctuary should require liners on oil tankers. (MB)
- Oil vessel traffic should only occur outside Sanctuary boundaries. (All)
- Sanctuaries should require that all vessels enter the San Francisco Bay from the westbound lane. (MB)
- Need to prohibit the dumping of bilge water in the Sanctuary. (All)
- Keep cruise ships out (docking) because of pollution, noise, quality of experience). (MB)
- Sanctuary should develop a method to enforce and monitor vessel traffic for compliance with recommended tracks. (MB)
- There should be some method of testing vessel operators for drug or alcohol use while they are working. (All)
- Two-stroke engines should be prohibited in Sanctuary waters. (All)
- Passage of oil tankers should be banned, except between Point San Pedro and Rocky Point. (MB)
- Commercial traffic that traverses Sanctuary should have to pay a fee that could be used to enhance the coastal ecosystem. (All)
- Need to add tug escorts especially at potato patch. (GF)
- Safety should be considered in westbound land for ships, fishing vessels, and all watercraft. (GF)

WATER QUALITY:

Issues:

- Sewage plants-should have proper pre-treatment. (MB/GF)
- Concerned about repeated sewage spills and quality of water. (All)
- Concerned about sewage spills at San Carlos beach, which cause monthly closures. (MB)
- Sanctuary should regulate point and non-point sources of pollution in bay, to protect wildlife. (MB)
- Concerned about water quality of sub-watersheds and Elkhorn Slough. (MB)
- Concerned about impacts of storm drains to water quality, and the lack of public awareness about this issue. Sanctuary must address this issue. (MB)
- Concerned about sewage issue in Pacifica area. (MB)
- Concerned about the lack of water flowing through some creeks. (MB)
- Concerned about 2-stroke engines polluting Sanctuary waters. (All)
- Water Quality partnership is a model for how the Sanctuary should operate. (All)
- Sanctuary has done a good job with water quality program and reaching out to others. (MB)
- Concerned about the beach closures and water quality in San Mateo County. There are not enough sampling sites to adequately notify people of conditions. (MB)
- Dolan Road / Elkhorn Slough – Xmas court hazardous fluids pouring into slough. (MB)
- Nutrient levels should be reduced in our coastal waters. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Concerned about soap in runoff reaching the ocean. (All)
- Water quality affects surfing businesses and is their “bread and butter”. (MB/GF)
- Concerned about pollutants along Cannery Row. (MB)
- Concerned about sewage issue in Pacifica area. (MB)
- Concerned about the dumping of hundreds of tons of sediment annually by CAL Trans into MBNMS at the Waddell Bluffs area. (MB)
- Concerned about sewage from San Simeon Acres and Ragged Point Inn and Restaurant. These locations have inadequate sewage treatment. (MB)
- Concerned about dumpsites for hazardous material and dredged material in Sanctuary waters. (MB)
- Concerned about farm runoff at surfing locations (3 mile north of Santa Cruz). (MB)
- Sanctuary should mitigate urban and agricultural runoff. (MB)
- Concerned about scrubbing of heavy metal bottom paint; Paint residue ends up in the water. (All)
- Concerned about cumulative effects of continuous discharges such as that from desalination plants or power plants. (MB)
- Concerned about oil sheen in harbors. (MB/GF)
- Problem with inadequate notification of beach closures. (MB/GF)
- Concerned that harbors are not in Sanctuaries and subject to pollution. (MB/GF)
- Concerned about the effect that energy production has on water quality. (MB)
- Staff vacancies have seriously interfered with the Water Quality Protection Program’s ability to accomplish its goals. (MB)
- Concerned about the Union Pacific railroad line, which runs alongside the Elkhorn Slough. The Parson’s Slough Bridge is in poor condition and there is the threat of a toxic spill with potentially severe environmental damage. (MB)
- When the Sanctuary was being negotiated, harbors were told that the Sanctuary would not have permit authority over dredging, but it does. (MB)
- The existing language characterizes all dredging as bad and does not allow for minor impacts. (MB)
- Existing language concerning dredging seems to constrain the staff from being as helpful to harbors as they could be. (MB)
- Concerned about the effect of certain activities, such as improper disposal of cat litter and introduction of contaminants into coastal waters, on southern sea otter populations.
- Concerned about water quality and habitat in Estero de San Antonio. (GF)
- Concerned about the Petaluma Mushroom Farm dumping into Americano creek. (GF)
- Concerned about transportation-related run-off. 80% of non-point source pollution is from roads (tires and pipes of autos). (GF)
- Water-borne pollutants come from the watersheds into SF bay and then into the GFNMS. (GF)
- Watershed issues in Bodega Bay and Esteros. (GF)
- Be aware of Pacifica’s new water quality system. (GF, MB)
- Erosion at San Francisco’s sewage treatment plant is an issue. (GF, MB)
- Sewage from the village of San Simeon Acres is contaminating Sanctuary waters. (GF)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Different measures should be taken against large polluters versus uneducated members of the public. Expand awareness through beach cleanup or other programs, which would incorporate education (in terms of what exactly are the violations). (MB/GF)
- What extent is data from Urban Watch being used? Make information more available to public through education, PSA, Nova, public broadcasting. General public needs information readily available without seeking Sanctuary. Possibly use a monthly newspaper insert. (MB)
- Sanctuary should educate public equally on all forms of water pollution. (All)
- Sanctuary should distinguish between past and current sources of contaminants in describing pollution in outreach materials and programs. (MB)
- The existing water quality action plans should be incorporated directly into the revised management plan. Don’t start over with the next management plan. (MB)
- More rigorous monitoring of water quality. (All)
- There should be language put in the management plan that reflects the positive benefits of harbors. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should better address land based point and non-point source pollution. (MB/GF)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Beach closure information should be made more readily available to the public. Better posting of water quality alerts at beaches and access points for swimmers, surfer, divers and kayakers. (MB/GF)
- More regulation of activities that affect water quality. (All)
- MBNMS should investigate all forms and sources of contaminants, not just agriculture. (MB)
- Sanctuary needs to do WQ monitoring in an ongoing program. (All)
- Marine Sanctuary's main job is to protect resources, should increase water quality protection projects. (All)
- Concerned about the effects of MTBE that has been found leaking into local streams. This could impact the immune systems of marine mammals. Sanctuary should investigate the effects of MTBE and other spills and discharges on aquatic species. (MB)
- Sanctuary should prioritize which water quality issues are most important and pursue them. (All)
- Sanctuary should lobby at all levels for improved water quality. (All)
- Implement and staff the Water Quality Protection Program. (MB)
- Expand Citizen Monitoring Network. More funds or resources to implement water quality protection program. (MB)
- Dedicate more effort to investigating and preventing point and non-point source pollution. (All)
- NMSP should adopt a Water Quality Protection Program for CBNMS and GFNMS, and should work with local regional water quality control boards to review discharge permits and waivers for these 2 sanctuaries. (CB/GF)
- Water quality standards should be established in all federal waters within the sanctuaries. (All)
- Within state waters, water quality standards should be comprehensively reviewed to ensure that they adequately protect sanctuary resources. (GF/MB)
- Include on website, water quality data on various river systems affecting the Sanctuary. (All)
- Concerned about near-shore water quality. Sanctuary should conduct education and outreach regarding wastewater issues. (All)
- The revised management plan should emphasize the importance of fully implementing the recommendations contained in the Water Quality Protection Plans. Management plan should also identify additional WQ plans yet to be completed such as one dealing with point sources and one addressing riparian and wetland issues. (MB)
- Concerned about the effects of cooling water from the Duke Moss Landing power plant. Other options should be investigated that have less impact (sewage water).
- Concerned about near-shore water quality. Sanctuary should conduct education and outreach regarding wastewater issues. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuaries should investigate the root causes of water quality degradation. More resources should be made available for infrastructure of sewage treatment facilities. (All)
- MBNMS should develop a policy and guidelines to monitor water quality in streams, rivers, creeks, etc. emptying into the Sanctuary. These should be clean enough to swim in. (MB)
- Sanctuary should develop and implement a plan addressing riparian/wetland resources. (MB)
- Sanctuary should conduct a strong and diligent review and comment on all NPDES permits and projects in and affecting the Sanctuary. (MB)
- Expand GFNMS Beach Watch program to include water quality monitoring and subsequent beach posting advisories when state water quality standards are exceeded for water contact recreation.
- GFNMS focus watershed protection efforts locally. More support (financial, technical, programmatic, fiscal, staffing). (GF)
- Review permits for city and county of San Francisco for discharge. (GF, MB)
- Engage in and support proactive efforts in Marin County to adhere to the Clean Water Act. (GF)
- Regulate future and current houses upstream to protect the creek waters. (GF)

Point Source

- Sanctuary should be concerned about the impacts of desalination plants from construction and brine effluent discharge. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should encourage jurisdiction partnerships to combine desalination facilities, for public use only. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should work with harbors and marinas, on a program promoting alternatives to toxic bottom paints. (MB)
- Sanctuary should increase collaboration with other agencies regarding wastewater treatment and water purification systems. MBNMS should take primary role in this collaboration, and should develop model education and implementation Programs. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Concerned about intake pipelines for power plants. Entrainment and impingement kill millions of larvae and small species. Sanctuary should impose limitations or measures to reduce these types of impacts. (MB)
- Sanctuary should address the issue of run off occurring from restaurants. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should take a far more active role in reviewing point source discharge permits issued by the regional water quality control boards to ensure that permit conditions are sufficiently stringent to protect sanctuary resources (especially with respect to storm water runoff). (All)
- Sanctuary should explore progressive technology for purification of private and municipal wastewater. (MB)/GF)
- Tertiary treatment should be required for all sewer systems that empty into sanctuaries. (All)

Non-Point Source

- Sanctuary should conduct a study on nutrient runoff. (MB)
- Consider a ban of all pets from beaches in the National Marine Sanctuary as part of the Resource Protection Program. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should regulate the use of fertilizer through a permitting system. Should investigate alternatives and mitigation. (MB)
- Dogs should not be allowed off their leash in Spanish Bay and Pebble Beach, due to potential impacts to water quality. (MB)
- Sanctuaries should hold accountable, operations such as golf courses and nurseries that use chemicals or other pollutants, which enter into the ocean. (All)
- Utilize volunteers to educate dog owners and encourage leash use. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should conduct more education programs for informing farmers about agricultural runoff and pesticide use. Should encourage coastal farmers to incorporate organic methods. (MB)
- MBNMS agriculture action plan should have a specific timeline, goals, and audits. It should be open to the public, and not be self-regulating. (MB)
- The existing Agriculture Action Plan should not be changed, in order to maintain momentum that has already built up. (MB)
- NOAA should continue to support the implementation of the Agricultural Action Plan and commit all necessary resources to ensure the success of its implementation. (MB)
- Storm water discharges from new and existing development into the sanctuaries should be stringently controlled under the Clean Water Act. (All)
- Concerned about harmful algal blooms. Cooperative research should occur in the Sanctuary to learn how such blooms relate to non-point source pollution, and the consequences of such blooms in the Sanctuary. (All)
- Sanctuaries should develop programs to address the pollution that enters the sanctuaries from San Francisco Bay. (All)
- Sanctuaries should work with local jurisdictions, county health departments, regional water quality control boards, and other agencies to perform studies on near shore water quality to assess human health risks from the viral pathogens that have been documented on the shoreline. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuaries should assess the effect of pollution on the near shore ecosystems and to determine the sources of pollution and identify methods of prevention and control. (All)
- Recommend a halving of the amount and significant reduction of the toxicity and persistence, of pesticides, which are used in the Salinas, Carmel, and Pajaro Valleys, because of their immediate harm to Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed anadromous species. (MB)
- Sanctuary should mitigate urban and agricultural runoff. (MB/GF)
- Sanctuary should conduct a study on pesticide runoff from agriculture and golf courses. (MB)
- Increase funding for sewage system/storm drain infrastructure improvements. (MB/GF)
- No new regulations that will affect agriculture industry. (MB)
- Heavy metal concentration in fish should be addressed by guidelines set on discharges from any source on these metals. (All)

WILDLIFE DISTURBANCE:

Issues:

- Snowy Plover education and presence is good. (MB)
- Concerned about peregrine falcon populations in Monterey Bay. (MB)
- Concerned about peregrines feeding on shorebirds, while fishermen are taking the blame. (MB)
- Sanctuary should address overpopulation of pinnipeds, which cause destruction of property, and financial loss to fishermen. (MB)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Concerned about commercial feeding of marine mammals. (All)
- Concerned about the poor quality of some of the marine mammal studies. On the water studies can be very limited. (All)
- Concerned about overpopulations of pinnipeds. Sanctuary should investigate the feasibility of controlling these populations. (All)
- Concerned about white shark disturbances in GFNMS, due to people approaching them too closely, and using inappropriate means to attract them. (GF)
- Concerned about the vagueness of the GFNMS regulations regarding white sharks. (GF)
- Concerned because of lack of shells on the beach after storms. There are far fewer than there used to be, which might indicate that these invertebrate species are dying out. Sanctuary should investigate the cause for the decline. (MB)
- Concerned about seabirds being harmed by recreational fishing on Santa Cruz Wharf. (MB)
- Would like to get anadromous fish back up the streams. (MB)
- Concerned that harbor seals in the rivers are eating the salmon. (MB)
- Concerned about the current status of tide pools. They used to be teeming with life, but are now desolate. Sanctuary should concentrate on more protection of tide pool areas. (MB)
- Concerned about the influx of people who utilize tide pools as a food source at Pfeiffer Beach, Kirk Creek, and Pebble Beach. (MB)
- Concerned with non-native salmonid smolt stocking (Feather R. system) on ecosystem. Research is needed on effects. (MB)
- Concerned about the growing number of diseased and unhealthy marine mammals off the West Coast and especially in GFNMS. (All)
- For the past 10 years, the Monterey Bay Aquarium has used the Pacific Grove Marine Gardens Fish Refuge to gather kelp, invertebrates, and fin fish. (MB)
- There have been recent reports of canine distemper among harbor seals in Monterey Bay. (MB)

Suggested Strategies and Tools:

- Must have more regulations/guidelines for public shark viewing, similar to those for whale watching. (All)
- More interpretive signage at kayak launch sites and dive entry points in regard to marine mammals viewing etiquette (especially otters). (MB)
- There should be a “season” on sea lions, like there is a season for salmon, to bring the ecosystem back into balance again. (MB)
- Sanctuary should increase conservation and protection for sea otters. (MB)
- Sanctuary should increase protection for all wildlife. (All)
- Investigate the impacts that pinniped populations are having on fishery resources. (MB)
- Sanctuary should investigate and address the effects of feral animals acting as disease vectors, and their connection to sea otter mortalities. (MB)
- Heavy metal concentrations in fish should be addressed by guidelines set on discharges from any source of the metals. (All)
- Extend MBNMS and CBNMS regulations regarding white sharks to cover GFNMS, or implement a new rule for limited entry for charter boats. (GF)
- Sanctuaries should potentially implement minimum approach distances and approach speed limitations for white sharks. (All)
- All sanctuaries should prohibit the attraction and harassment of white sharks. (All)
- More education of the public and recreational boat operators regarding etiquette for shark viewing and interaction. (All)
- Shark chumming should be banned in GFNMS. All shark-related activities should be permitted through the manager. (GF)
- Sanctuary should help implement management practices that allow the expediting of the required permit processes utilized by STEP. (MB)
- Need to investigate impacts to marine life and seabirds, from dogs that are not kept on a leash. (MB)
- GFNMS is the older sanctuary but has a better regime for birds. (All)
- Sanctuaries should adopt a set of standards for all wildlife viewing. This should include a “controlled speed perimeter” for recreational boaters and wildlife watchers. (All)
- Sanctuaries should consider adopting a limited entry policy and code of conduct for commercial wildlife watching vessels. (All)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing



- Sanctuaries should strive to reach a balance between research and wildlife viewing. (All)
- Shark attraction should be banned completely in GFNMS (including research). (GF)
- Sanctuary should support City of Santa Cruz in closing wharf to fishing to protect the Brown Pelicans from being entangled in fishing hooks/lines during times when sardines are there. (MB)
- Concerned with the current status of abalone in California, including habitat loss, over harvesting, and illegal poaching. Sanctuaries should support the California Department of Fish and Game's Abalone Recovery and Management Plan. (All)
- Sanctuaries should do whatever is necessary to restore original population of birds (such as the Ashy Storm Petrel, Rhinoceros Auklet and Double Crested Cormorants), on Farallones Islands. Sanctuaries should reinstall structure of cables, or another effective setup to decrease gull predation. (All)
- Concerns about tide pool trampling. Sanctuary awareness should be increased, possibly education through local schools. (MB)
- Too many overlapping jurisdiction regarding over flight regulation. This issue needs to be resolved. (MB)
- Over flight restriction should be more specific, "blanket prohibition" of over flights below 1000 feet should be changed. (MB)
- Sanctuary should assess the constitutionality of its over-flight regulations and fines. (MB)
- Concerned with Sanctuary denial of over flight permits. (MB)
- Over flight regulation should be based on realistic potential for disturbance of marine life. Current regulations often restrict flights that would have no impact on marine mammals or seabirds. (MB)
- The FAA over flight restrictions of 500 feet are adequate, MBNMS regulations are excessive. (MB)
- Is noise is an issue then boat traffic should be addressed instead of aviation. Sound from boat engines travels considerable distances underwater, while most general aviation airplanes are not major noise generators. (MB)
- Aircraft restrictions being proposed are a violation of the federal commerce clause and only able to be imposed by the FAA and Congress. (MB)
- Over flight restrictions should be expanded to cover entire Sanctuary. Limits should be raised to 2000 or 3000 feet. (MB)
- Sanctuary should conduct more education and outreach to pilots about flight regulations. (MB)
- Sanctuary should not regulate aviation activities. The FAA regulations are sufficient. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should work with the FAA on developing over flight regulations. (MB)
- Sanctuary should collaborate with the FAA to get the regulations placed in the FAR. (MB)
- Over flight regulations need to be changed, they should be based on realistic probabilities of marine mammal and seabird disturbances, not an arbitrary altitude limit. (MB)
- Aerial flights don't seem to disturb marine mammals; over flight regulations should be reevaluated. (MB)
- The Sanctuary should work with the FAA on developing over flight regulations. FAA should make the final call. The FAA is qualified to deal with this issue while the Sanctuary is not. (MB)
- Navy jets, Marine helicopters, and very low flying private aircraft should be restricted from flying along the coast. (MB)
- Removal from documentation of prohibitions and fines with respect to over flight will show good faith. (MB)
- If penalties are to be imposed for violation of over flight regulations, then regulators should explain how they are going to determine altitude of violator. (MB)
- All non-emergency military flight operations over the Sanctuary, and within behavior altering distances of Sanctuary resources should be banned. All other military flight operations should require a permit. (MB)
- Don't take away fireworks on July 4th. (MB)
- Sanctuary should refer to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), and develop and implement an educational campaign regarding harassment/disturbance of marine mammals, especially on beaches/rookeries. Participate in education campaigns to influence fishers regarding compliance with MMPA.
- Concerned about the fate of the harbor seals in the GFNMS. (GF)
- GFNMS should become adopt reserves to increase natural seal populations and protect pupping beaches; and should continue to work to reduce stress on seal populations (from pollution habitat destruction, etc.). (GF)
- Concerned about fate of seabirds in GFNMS. (GF)
- Concerned about wildlife disturbances in Elkhorn Slough, from increasingly heavy kayak use. Sanctuary should coordinate a study of these disturbances. (MB).
- Sanctuary should adopt a policy of serious enforcement of the Endangered Species Act. (All)
- Send coastal communities a brochure informing them about the need for lagoon habitat, water flow and restrictions on breaching sandbars at river mouths for threatened and endangered anadromous fish. Brochure should also inform them on penalties involved with such activities. (MB/GF)

APPENDIX 1: Full List of Issues Raised at Scoping Meeting and in Writing

- Sanctuary should have in place science based policies to address the contentious issues of expansion of the range of the Southern Sea Otter (such as interaction with fishermen and their target species), to ensure unimpeded recovery of this species. (MB/GF)
- Would like to see kayak companies (outfitters) required to obtain permits to operate within GFNMS so they understand the impacts to the ecosystem. (GF)
- Limited viewing entry to boats that target White Shark feeding events
- Protect the Gulf of the Farallones Sanctuary tide pools and estuaries from overuse by limiting visitor numbers. (GF)
- Better coordination between sanctuaries and Coast Guard /Navy/Commercial planes during breeding season on Farallon Islands. (GF)
- Blinds for non-invasive wildlife viewing. (GF, MB)
- Create a buffer region of at least four nautical miles around the islands. (GF)

Appendix 2 - Proposed Joint Management Plan Review Process (CB, GF & MB NMSs)

You are here !
Summary Document pertains to Step 4



Step 6. Continued

Step 7. Public Comment on DEIS/MP

Step 8. Produce FEIS/MP

