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Evaluation: Habitats

Key Questions for Each Proposed Package

1. How well are key habitat types represented in proposed MPA packages?

2. What are the proposed levels of protection for these habitat types?

3. How well are habitats and levels of protection distributed across the study region?
Results: Habitat Representation

Similarities between proposals

- Strong convergence among 4 proposals in area in very high (SMR) protection
- All 4 proposals have extremely similar MPA design at the Farallon Islands, Point Reyes, and Point Arena
- All 4 proposals have similar area of rocky shore, sandy beach and surfgrass in very high (SMR) protection
- All 4 proposals have similar protection of estuarine habitats

SAT Guidelines: Levels of Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Protection</th>
<th>MPA Types</th>
<th>Activities associated with this protection level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high SMR</td>
<td></td>
<td>No take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SMCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>In water depth &gt;50m: pelagic finfish (H&amp;L) salmon by troll only, coastal pelagic finfish (pelagic seine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod-high SMCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dungeness crab (traps/pots); squid (pelagic seine); in water depth &lt;50m: pelagic finfish (H&amp;L) salmon by troll only, coastal pelagic finfish (pelagic seine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate SMCA SMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>salmon (non-troll H&amp;L); abalone (diving); halibut, white seabass, striped bass, shore-based finfish, croaker, and flatfishes (H&amp;L); smelt (H&amp;L and hand/dip nets); clams (hand harvest); giant kelp (hand harvest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod-low SMCA SMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urchin (diving); lingcod, cabezon, greenling, rockfish, and other reef fish (H&amp;L); surfperches (H&amp;L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SMCA SMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>bull kelp and mussels (any method); all trawling; giant kelp (mechanical harvest); mariculture (existing methods in NCCSR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR = state marine reserve  SMCA = state marine conservation area  SMP = state marine park
Results: Habitat Availability

Deep soft bottom is the most abundant habitat in all subregions

More rocky shore and shallow rocky reef in the north subregion

More shallow soft bottom in the south subregion

Kelp is only mapped in the north subregion

More estuarine area in the north, but more eelgrass in the south

Results: Habitat Representation

Shoreline Habitats

All proposals have roughly 20% of surfgrass and rocky shore at very high protection. Additional areas allow some salmon and crab, shorefishing, abalone, halibut and urchin take.

Protection of sandy beach is still generally lower than protection of rocky shoreline across all proposals
Results: Habitat Representation

Rock Habitats

A high proportion of protected areas are in SMRs.

Protection of kelp closely mirrors protection of shallow rock

Prop 4 protects the greatest proportion of all three rocky habitats at very high protection.

Large areas of deep rock in mod-high protection due to salmon and crabbing.

Some shallow rock and kelp areas in moderate due to shorefishing and abalone and low due to urchin harvest.

Soft Bottom Habitats

Lower representation of soft bottom habitats relative to rocky habitats.

Area of shallow sand in very high protection similar across proposals.

Area of deep sand in very high, high and moderate-high protection similar across all 4 proposals.

Large areas of deep sand in high protection due to deep water salmon trolling and mod-high protection due to crabbing.
Estuarine Habitats

All four proposals have almost identical protection of estuarine habitats.

Low ☐ protection due to mariculture

Identical MPA shapes across all proposals

Results: Habitat Representation

Drakes and Limantour Esteros
Esteros San Antonio and Americano

Low protection due to aquaculture

Only Proposal 4 has an MPA in Tomales Bay

Effects coastal marsh representation

Low ☐ protection due to aquaculture
Results: Habitat Representation

Summary

- All habitats except shallow sand have at least 10% representation at very high protection in all 4 proposals.
- Consistent ranking of stakeholder proposals in percent of habitat protected (4 > 1-3 > 2XA), with exception of shallow sand at very high and high protection.
- For most habitats, proposal IPA protects more area than 2-XA but less than 4 at very high protection.
  - IPA falls between 1-3 and 4 in area of rocky shore, shallow rock, kelp, and deep sand protected at very high protection.
  - IPA falls between 2-XA and 1-3 in area of surfgrass and deep rock protected at very high protection.
- Exceptions – IPA protects less area of sandy beach and shallow sand than any stakeholder proposal.

Methods: Habitat Replication

Guidelines for replication:

- 3-5 replicates of habitat per biogeographic region.
- MPA or cluster must meet the minimum size guidelines (9 square miles).
- Habitat must meet the threshold identified to encompass 90% of biodiversity in that habitat type.
- Estuarine MPAs do not have to meet size guidelines but must contain at least 0.12 mi² of estuarine habitat.
- Some small estuaries (Gualala and Garcia rivers, Pescadero Creek) contain less than the minimum 0.12 mi², but protection of these habitats still has conservation value.
Replication: Very High Protection

- Beaches
- Rocky shores
- Surfgrass
- Soft 0 - 30m
- Soft 30 - 100m
- Hard 0 - 30m
- Hard 30 - 100m

Replication: High Protection

- Beaches
- Rocky shores
- Surfgrass
- Soft 0 - 30m
- Soft 30 - 100m
- Hard 0 - 30m
- Hard 30 - 100m
Replication: Mod-high Protection

- Beaches
- Rocky shores
- Surfgrass

Replication: Estuarine Habitats

- Estuary
- Marsh
- Eelgrass
- Tidal flats

Most habitats with 2-4 new replicates
Greater replication of eelgrass than CCSR
No estuarine habitats in mod-high or high LOP
Replication: Estuarine Habitats

As before…

Estuaries too small to meet size criterion add conservation value

Additional replicates that meet habitat size criterion

Results: Habitat Replication

Summary

Fish No marked differences among proposals

Fish Levels of replication similar to CCSR for most habitats at highest and moderate-high levels of protection