



JOINT MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW

Scoping Comments: Ecosystem Protection – Krill Harvesting

The MBNMS received approximately 7,000 comments from the public and specific comments from the MBNMS Advisory Council during the management plan review scoping process that directed the Sanctuary to actively pursue protection of the ecosystem and enhance biodiversity through management strategies. The Sanctuary also received a large number of comments pertaining to the Sanctuary's role in fishing. A summary of these comments is presented below:

Scoping Comments received regarding Ecosystem Conservation

- 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.
- Need more conservation in general.
- Goal of MBNMS should be to protect and preserve.
- 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.
- Concerned about loss of species biodiversity and abundance, impacts to habitat, impacts to predator/prey interactions.
- Management should strive for long-term sustainable use
- The Sanctuary needs to find the right balance between use and protection.
- More protection is needed in general for the ecosystem and biodiversity.
- Resource protection should be the main priority.
- Strengthen resource protection; do not allow local control to undermine this.
- Expand sanctuary concept to unify and make consistent resource protection, for better management of resources.
- Sanctuary should look at the big picture of overall environmental impacts, and manage the resources appropriately.
- Sanctuaries should ensure comprehensive coverage with overlapping jurisdiction, to improve resource protection.
- Use of precautionary principle for protection of natural phenomenon.
- 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.

- 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.
- Think as long term as possible. This plan is designed to last 5 or 10 years, but maybe we also need to identify issues that are considered 50 or 100-year issues.
- 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.

Scoping Comments Received Regarding Fishing

- Concerned about impacts from fisheries. (All)
- Concerned about declining fish populations. Sanctuary should play a role in preserving fish populations, while preserving fishery lifestyles.
- The Sanctuary should not regulate fishing. (All)
- The current language in the Federal Register with relation to fisheries regulation in the Sanctuary should remain. (MB)
- 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)
- Sanctuary should assist CDFG with enforcement, but should not create new regulations. (MB)
- 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)
- Sanctuary should not regulate fisheries in state waters. (MB)
- Clarify language about fishing. (All)
- 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)
- Do not become another layer of bureaucracy in dealing with fishing and dredging. (All)
- Fishing in the Sanctuary should be limited to techniques that do not produce by-catch, as do gill nets and bottom trawling.
- The Sanctuary should endorse commercial fisheries within its boundaries. (All)
- The Sanctuary should ban all forms of net fishing.
- The Sanctuary should not regulate fishing. Language in the management plan should clarify that.

- Look to other regions with fisheries collapsing and learn.
- Sanctuary could work with PFMC using existing regulatory structures.
- 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.
- Fishery management agencies should work more cooperatively together on issues.

Comments Received from the Sanctuary Advisory Council

Biodiversity Protection and Ecosystem Conservation

- Revised management plan and future actions must focus on primary goal of resource protection, and Management should focus on long term sustainability. The health of the marine ecosystem is vitally important. The local communities must work closely with the Sanctuary to ensure that they do not have a negative impact upon the Sanctuary, and are engaging in activities that promote resource protection.
- Management should focus on long term sustainability. Ensuring long term sustainability is the underlying bedrock principle of a healthy ecosystem including habitat structure, species management, ecological processes and human use patterns. The sanctuary allows for multiple use but the use must be cooperatively and affirmatively (pro-actively) managed for use that is compatible and allowable to the limits of sound resource protection.
- Clearly and strongly do all Sanctuary work in context of resource protection. Need to think and act BIG and DEEP, with a systems view of the whole habitat. Promote marine reserves as a tool of conservation.

Fishing

- Clarify that the Department of Fish and Game and NMFS are the agencies responsible for these regulations as per the original intent when the Sanctuary was designated. Any regulations or zone or advocacy for regulations for zones proposed by the Sanctuary should only occur if they are the result of a cooperative effort with the fishing and aquaculture communities and they have the support of these communities.
- Abide by existing language in Designation Documents and FEIS to limit role in fishing. Existing fisheries management agencies, tools and regulations should continue without overlaying yet another level of as of yet unproven regulation by the Sanctuary. Sanctuary's supporting educational and research roles should continue as complement to fisheries management agencies.
- Abide by existing language in designation documents and FEIS to limit role in fishing. The endorsement by the fishing industry of the creation of MBNMS was given with the understanding that California Fish & Game, NMFS, and the PFMC would be the lead agencies to regulate fishing activities within the MBNMS. These are the agencies that have the experience and resources to perform that task, not the sanctuary. If the sanctuary were to get involved with fishing regulation it would be comparable to reinventing the wheel and would

waste limited taxpayer funds that could be better used in other conservation areas. It would, more importantly, signal to the fishing community that the commitment made to influence our decision to endorse the creation of the sanctuary was made in bad faith and would diminish any trust remaining between the fishing community and the MBNMS.

- Fishing Enforcement: The Coast Guard, as a federal Law Enforcement agency has no position on whether MBNMS involves itself in fisheries regulation. However, we would urge that any change in the current status consult with the various stakeholder LE agencies (Cal F&G, NMFS, USCG, etc).
- The sanctuary needs to leave fishery management to the bodies already involved in regulating it. The new management plan needs to clearly articulate that the sanctuary will not be involved in fishing regulation.