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Where we are in the process?

- Regional Stakeholder Group – three cross-interest work groups have developed draft options for MPA arrays to gather initial feedback from the Science Advisory Team and Blue Ribbon Task Force
- Six work group draft arrays are not yet full proposals and have not been agreed to by all work group members
- Four draft proposals developed outside the work group process (“external”)
- Current evaluation of draft options for arrays and draft MPA proposals is the first of three iterations
Internal and External MPA Arrays

Staff and SAT evaluated 11 options or proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Group Draft Options for MPA Arrays</th>
<th>Draft “External” Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerald option “EA”</td>
<td>Proposal A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald option “EB”</td>
<td>Proposal B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade option “JA”</td>
<td>Proposal C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade option “JB”</td>
<td>Proposal D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turquoise option “TA”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turquoise option “TB”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Proposal Zero (existing MPAs)

Area analysis of internal draft options

Workgroup Draft Options and Existing MPAs (Proposal 0) by Designation
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Area analysis of external draft proposals

External Proposals and Existing MPAs (Proposal 0) by Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Study Region</th>
<th>Proposal 0</th>
<th>Proposal A</th>
<th>Proposal B</th>
<th>Proposal C</th>
<th>Proposal D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Considerations

Ecological/Socioeconomic Tradeoffs

- Meeting SAT guidelines
- Habitat representation – unique and representative habitats
- Size and spacing to promote connectivity
- Protecting ecosystem function and integrity
- Unique ecological features of region
Key Considerations

Ecological/Socioeconomic Tradeoffs

- Considering ports / areas of consumptive use
- Commercial fisheries – crab, salmon, urchin, rockfish, squid, and many others
- Recreational fisheries – abalone, shore-based fishing, small-boat fishing, party-boat trips
- Incorporating recent consumptive and non-consumptive data collection efforts

Key Considerations

Access

- Few public access locations, especially in northern portion of study region
- Access is key to both consumptive and non-consumptive use
- Access tends to be through public lands, state parks, private campgrounds and resorts
Key Considerations

Weather and Safety

- Strong winds and rough seas common
- Protected anchorages are important and few
- Small craft use important in the region
- Limited boat ramps/launch sites

Key Considerations

Marine Birds and Mammals

- Globally significant marine bird/mammal populations
- Existence of spatially discrete colonies/rookeries
- Potential use of “special closures” to provide protection from disturbance (seasonal or year-round no access areas)
### Key Considerations

#### Mariculture

- Leases for mariculture exist in Tomales Bay and Drakes Estero
- SAT has determined that allowing mariculture in an MPA constitutes a moderate or low level of protection
- Existing leases must be taken into consideration and can likely not be broken

#### Native American Tribal Use

- Several tribal groups within the study region (e.g. Pomo, Miwok, Ohlone)
- Traditional collection and gathering of marine resources for personal use – food, medicine, ceremonial use
- Entire shoreline of study region is important culturally to tribes
- Gathering information on areas of highest importance through workshops and meetings with local tribal members
Key Considerations

Meeting DFG Feasibility Guidelines

- Straight lines
- Major lines of latitude/longitude
- No “donuts”
- Simple regulations
- No intertidal only restrictions

Key Considerations

Existing MPAs and Other Regulations

- Existing MPAs
  - Modification of boundaries/regulations
  - Incorporation without change
  - Proposed for deletion
- Rockfish Conservation Areas and other fishery closures
Overlap Between Internal Workgroups

Overlap among 6 Internal RSG Workgroup Draft Options for MPA Arrays

Overlap Between All Arrays

Overlap among Internal Draft Options and External Proposals (n = 10)
Subregion 1

• Large upwelling center, fairly extensive rocky and kelp habitat (large near-shore reefs)
• Gualala and Garcia estuaries
• Port of Point Arena; Arena Cove
• Consideration of MPAs along private (Sea Ranch, etc.) vs. public land ownership
• Abalone fishery - Stornetta Ranch, abalone index site

Some Point Arena boundary options

All Options include SMR or SMCA in this region
Subregion 1

Some Haven’s Neck/Saunders boundary options
4 Options include MPAs in this area

Subregion 1

Some Salt Point boundary options
All options include an MPA in this area
Subregion 2

- Nearby port of Bodega Bay – recreational and commercial fisheries (salmon, crab, rockfish)
- Russian River estuary
- Four abalone index sites
- Four existing small MPAs

Subregion 2

Some Bodega boundary options
All options include an MPA in this area
Subregion 3

- Characterized by rocky, sandy, and estuarine habitat
- Numerous bird and mammal rookeries
- Numerous estuaries (Tomales, Drakes, etc)
- Port of Bodega Bay – rockfish, salmon, crab, halibut fishing
- Tomales Bluff and Point Reyes important ecologically and economically
- Mariculture leases

Subregion 3

Some Point Reyes boundary options
All options include an MPA around Pt. Reyes
All options include SMR in Drakes Estero

TB  D  EB
Subregion 4

- Influenced by output of SF Bay
- Ecologically/economically important Duxbury Reef
- Bird, mammal colonies
- Bolinas, San Francisco ports – rockfish, salmon, crab fisheries

Some Duxbury/Bolinas boundary options

Eight of Ten Options include an MPA in this area
**Subregion 5**

- Shallow sandy shelf; more limited rocky habitat
- Important seabird colonies (eg. Devils Slide)
- Pescadero Marsh
- Port of Half Moon Bay – salmon, crab, rockfish, squid
- Existing Fitzgerald SMP

---

**Subregion 5**

Some Fitzgerald boundary options
All options include an MPA in this area
**Subregion 6**

- Unique habitats: globally significant bird and mammal colonies; deep water habitat
- Socioeconomic importance – recreational and commercial
- Rough weather/ anchorages
- Existing fishery regulations already protect some depth zones

---

**Subregion 6**

Some Farallones boundary options
All options include an MPA in this area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>EA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Convergence

- NCCRSG members have expressed desire to converge to the extent possible
- Many areas of geographic overlap between arrays (though regulations and specific boundaries differ)
- Multiple array options attempt to address “key considerations” – BRTF and SAT guidance may facilitate winnowing