

**To: MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)**  
**From: MLPA I-Team**  
**Re: Attached draft responses to science questions**  
**Date: January 3, 2008**

Attached to this memo are draft responses to science questions posed at MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) meetings in October, November and December of 2007. The agenda for your January 8, 2008 meeting is very full, so please review these questions and responses and be prepared to discuss and potentially approve the responses that are provided.

Below are highlighted new questions and responses that require further SAT review and approval. At the SAT meeting we will again highlight new questions and responses but will only discuss those that you feel need further discussion.

### **1. Draft Responses to Questions received at the October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG meeting**

Many of these questions were either policy in nature or previously addressed by either the SAT or MLPA staff. Responses to questions that require SAT consideration are:

1. Would allowance of shore-based angling along a broad (100 yard) ribbon of the coast be acceptable and what impact would this have on the protection level of an MPA? (see SAT response)
6. Is an MPA that protects Farallon rockfish likely to increase the abundance of juvenile rockfish in the Farallon subregion?
7. The NCCRSG would like the SAT to (re)consider and comment on the following as possible additions to the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs.
  - a. Salmonids - SAT response to NCCRSG questions (revised Oct 12), "Placing a protected area in the coastal waters offshore of the river mouth will protect salmon during a crucial life stage."
8. Would the designation of a state marine reserve or other MPA around the mouth of a major estuary make a significant contribution to protection of anadromous fish that spawn upstream?
  - a. Does the SAT have comments on what size and setback is likely to be protective? Would a fairly narrow boundary accomplish resource protection?
9. What impact would the delineation of "vessel no traffic zones" of varying widths have on the level of protection assigned to an MPA?
  - a. What would be the specific benefit to seabirds and marine mammals? (see SAT response)

### **2. Draft Responses to Questions received at the November 28, 2007 NCCRSG meeting**

All of the responses to the November 28, 2007 questions require SAT review and have not been presented to the SAT previously. However, several questions are addressed in the *Draft MLPA Evaluation Methods for MPA Proposals* document or previous questions to the SAT.

The NCCRSG is especially in need of a response to Question 1: For no-disturbance zones for seabird and mammal species likely and most likely to benefit from MPAs, what are the

seasons that need to be incorporated to protect these species (range of time)? The table attached to the draft response was developed by a work group of the SAT.

**3. Draft Responses to Questions received at the November 28, 2007 NCCRSG meeting**

The question from the December NCCRSG meeting is both a science question and a policy question, thus requiring both SAT and MLPA staff response. This question will require SAT members to assist in developing a response.