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Primary Guiding Documents

• Marine Life Protection Act
  – Provides goals and elements
  – Describes Master Plan
  – Provides required elements of preferred network

• Department Feasibility Criteria
  – Describes how Department will review
  – Provides examples of appropriate design

• Master Plan Scientific Guidance
  – Relates MLPA Goals to network design
  – Provides ranges of appropriate size and spacing
  – Provides details on key habitats
MLPA Guidance

• Section 2853
  – 6 Goals
  – 5 Elements: Includes “improved (no-take) component”

• Subsection 2856(a)(2)
  – Describes Master Plan components
    • Need to review Master Plan guidance

• Subsections 2857(b)-(d)
  – Describes desired and mandatory features of preferred alternative
  – Notes the need to account for commercial kelp beds (none in north central region)
Department Statement of Feasibility Criteria

• Criteria to consider when designing MPAs
  – Based on specific goals and objectives
  – Identify existing boundaries and jurisdictions and incorporate as appropriate
  – Science guidelines should be considered
  – MPA classification (SMR, SMP, or SMCA) should be consistent with the desired regulations
  – Consider existing fishery management and incorporate as appropriate
  – Accessibility, enforceability, and regulatory simplicity should be addressed
Department Statement of Feasibility Criteria

- Design elements that increase feasibility
  - Straight lines that run along cardinal coordinates and connecting easily identified latitude and longitude lines
  - Recognizable, permanent landmarks
  - Delineate multiple zone boundaries preferably in an alongshore fashion or, secondarily in an inshore/offshore fashion
  - Consistency in regulations within MPA boundaries
  - Clear and concise boundary descriptions
Department Statement of Feasibility Criteria

• Design elements that decrease feasibility
  – Undulating boundary lines or contours
  – “Doughnut zones” = areas completely surrounded by differing level of protection
  – Depth contours or distance from shore boundaries
    • Note that MPAs extending to state water line are okay
  – Boundary lines diagonal to lines of latitude and longitude
  – Intertidal MPAs that do not connect with subtidal areas
Boundary Examples

Good!

Doesn’t use lat/long – Irregular

Doesn’t use straight lines

Doesn’t use major landmarks

Pt. Norte

Pt. Sud

Pt. Norte

Pt. Sud
Zoning Examples

- Good!
  - "Doughnut" design and doesn’t use lat/long

- Doesn’t use straight lines

- O.K.
Scientific Guidance

No single optimum network design

Habitats/Replication

- Every ‘key’ marine habitat should be represented
- MPAs should extend from the intertidal zone to deep waters offshore
- "Key" marine habitats should be replicated in multiple MPAs
- At least three to five replicate MPAs should be designed for each habitat type within a biogeographical region
Scientific Guidance

**Size**

- Alongshore span of 5-10 km (3-6 m or 2.5-5.4 nm) of coastline and preferably 10-20 km (6-12.5 m or 5.4-11 nm)
- Larger MPAs would be required to fully protect marine birds, mammals, and migratory fish.

**Spacing**

- MPAs should be placed within 50-100 km (31-62 m or 27-54 nm) of each other.
- Placement of MPAs should take into account local resource use and stakeholder activities.