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MLPA goals
Science guidelines for MPA design
Evaluation of preliminary proposals
1. To protect the natural diversity and function of marine ecosystems.
2. To help sustain and restore marine life populations.
3. To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities in areas with minimal human disturbance.
4. To protect representative and unique marine life habitats.
5. Clear objectives, effective management, adequate enforcement, sound science.
6. To ensure that MPAs are designed and managed as a network.
MLPA Goals - Habitats
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MLPA Goals:
1) Protect natural diversity and function of marine ecosystems
4) Protect representative and unique marine life habitats

SAT Approach
- Refined key habitats for north central coast
- Defined biogeographic subregions
- Refined and described level of protection designations
- Evaluated habitat representation in MPAs
SAT Guidelines - Goals 1 and 4

Identified Key Habitats Using:
- Bottom Type and Depth Categories
- Biogenic Habitats
- Oceanographic Features
### Key Marine Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seafloor Habitats</th>
<th>Depth Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rocky reefs</td>
<td>• Intertidal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intertidal zones</td>
<td>• Intertidal to 30 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sandy or soft ocean bottoms</td>
<td>• 30 to 100 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Underwater pinnacles</td>
<td>• 100 to 200 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submarine canyons</td>
<td>• 200 meters and deeper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biogenic Habitats</th>
<th>Oceanographic Habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Kelp forests</td>
<td>• Upwelling areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seagrass beds</td>
<td>• Freshwater plumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retention zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAT Guidelines - Goals 1 and 4

**Used GIS to Locate Habitats**

Identified geographic distribution

Estimated area of each habitat type for study area and subregions

Estimated area or linear extent of habitat in each MPA
Three subregions

- North (Point Reyes – Point Arena)
- South (Pigeon Point to Point Reyes)
- Farallon Islands

Based upon

- Species and community distributions
- Geomorphology
- Oceanography
SAT Guidelines – Levels of Protection

Designated levels of protection based on potential impacts of proposed activities

- **direct impacts**
  - habitat damage
  - incidental removal or mortality of non-target species

- **indirect impacts**
  - potential ecosystem effects caused by removing target or associated catch species
SAT Guidelines – Levels of Protection

The Question:

“Would there be a difference between ecosystems within an MPA that prohibits take of this species versus an area outside of the MPA where take is allowed?”

Yes if:

- habitat is damaged
- many species are removed
- removed species play an important role in the resident ecosystem (predator, prey, competitor etc.)

No if:

- no habitat damage
- little associated catch
- species removed are highly mobile so MPAs won’t change local abundance
<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</td>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>No take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>SMCA</td>
<td>salmon (troll H&amp;L in water greater than 50m depth), sardine, anchovy, and herring (pelagic seine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod-high</td>
<td>SMCA</td>
<td>salmon (troll H&amp;L in water less than 50m depth), Dungeness crab (traps/pots), squid (pelagic seine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>SMCA SMP</td>
<td>salmon (non-troll H&amp;L), abalone (diving), halibut, white seabass, shore-based finfish and flatfishes (H&amp;L), clams (hand harvest), giant kelp (hand harvest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-mod</td>
<td>SMCA SMP</td>
<td>Urchin (diving), lingcod, cabezon, greenling, rockfish, and other reef fish (H&amp;L), surfperches (H&amp;L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>SMCA SMP</td>
<td>bull kelp and mussels (any method), all trawling, giant kelp (mechanical harvest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMCA = state marine conservation area  
SMP = state marine park  
SMR = state marine reserve
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

- similarities in number, size and location of MPAs as well as the habitats they include
- clusters of MPAs with an inshore SMR and offshore SMCA that allows various fishing activities
- shoreline and shallow habitats are generally well represented in very high protection MPAs
- many MPAs located in rocky reef habitat
Results: Habitat Representation

Similarities between proposals

- Estuarine habitats are generally well represented in very high protection MPAs.

- Most proposals protected more of these habitats in the south subregion (Drakes Estero).

- Only two proposals specifically targeted large proportions of estuarine habitats in the north subregion (EA & EB).
Results: Habitat Representation

Shallow Bottom Habitats

Proposals target shallow rocky reef, especially in north subregion.

The lower proportion of shallow soft bottom included in MPAs reflects, in part, the large available area of this habitat.
Deep Bottom Habitats

Proportion of deep hard bottom in very high protection varies markedly between proposals.

Areas of deep rocky reef protected at mod-high and moderate levels of protection (m-h = crabbing/unspecified salmon, mod = halibut)

Large areas of deep soft bottom protected at mod-high and moderate levels of protection (m-h = crabbing/unspecified salmon, mod = halibut)
Results: Habitat Representation

Summary

- soft bottom habitats less represented in high protection MPAs, but assessment of shallow soft bottom habitat availability needs to be revisited (much unknown)

- several MPAs received lower protection level designations because of insufficient information (e.g., salmon gear, fate of existing mariculture activities)

- representation of some habitats varied across subregions:
  - better represented in south: tidal flats, eelgrass, estuaries, shallow soft bottom
  - better represented in north: deep and shallow rocky reef

- kelp habitat is not well mapped – need to know relationship between shallow rock and kelp
SAT Evaluation Process

Based on MLPA Goals and Master Plan Guidelines