

**CENTRAL COAST MPA PROPOSALS RECEIVED FROM
 SOURCES EXTERNAL TO THE CCRSG BY
 OCTOBER 15, 2005**

This is a brief summary of MPA proposals from organizations and individuals external to the Central Coast Stakeholder Group. The entire proposals are available on the MLPA web site (<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/mlpa/>). Please review the original proposals for complete details.

Proposals of Complete Arrays

Proposer	Date Received	Geographic Extent	Summary Description of Proposal and Rationale Provided by Proponent	MPAs Proposed (#, type, and location)
Kate Wing / Karen Garrison, Natural Resources Defense Council	10/15/05	Entire Study Region	[Except from proposal] <i>“Starting with the available maps of substrate, biological conditions, species and oceanographic features, we focused on MPA size and spacing, as well as location. We identified areas that were unique or representative of the region such as the slot canyons on the Big Sur coastline, coastal marshes and eelgrass beds in Morro Bay, persistent kelp beds of nereocystis or macrocystis, and pinnacles off the Monterey peninsula. We considered the home ranges of resident rockfish, upwelling sites, the foraging ranges of threatened or endangered seabirds, the placement of adjacent terrestrial protected areas and monitoring sites. Where possible, we replicated sites and provided for reference sites for various types of studies, including evaluation of the effects of climate change, fishing and other factors on marine ecosystems. We designed a range of MPA sizes covering deep and shallow waters, spaced no more than 30 miles</i>	Proposed 22 MPAs: 15 State Marine Reserves, 4 State Marine Conservation Areas, and 3 State Marine Parks. In total covering approximately 250 square miles. [see their map and site by site descriptions] 1. Ano Nuevo SMR 2. Ano Nuevo SMCA 3. Sand Hill Bluff SMR 4. Elkhorn Slough SMR 5. Soquel Canyon SMCA 6. Portuguese Ledge SMR 7. Monterey Bay Shale Beds SMP 8. Edward F. Ricketts SMR 9. Hopkins SMR 10. Pacific Grove SMCA

			<p><i>apart from each other. Our MPAs range in size from less than one square mile to more than forty, with an average of twelve square miles. A few of the proposed MPAs are below the Framework's recommended minimum size of 3 to 12.5 miles in coastal extent. Those sites are generally intended to meet the recreation, education, study or natural heritage goals of the MLPA, not the Act's biological network goals. Other MPAs are near the recommended minimum coastline length to support a biologically connected network. Some of these MPAs may need to be expanded to meet scientific criteria and network guidelines. However, our typical spacing of 20 miles or less may compensate for the relatively small size of those MPAs, while taking into account the Framework recommendation that spacing may need to be closer than the maximum distance of 30 to 60 miles in areas of high larval retention. In our view, these MPAs, taken as a group, address Goals 1, 2, 3, 4 of the MLPA. It is too early in the process to determine whether they meet all of Goal 5. We are looking forward to guidance from the SAT as to whether this proposal adequately addresses Goal 6 as well as the other goals"</i></p>	<p>11. Cypress Pinnacles SMR 12. Carmel Bay SMP 13. Pt. Lobos SMR 14. Big Sur SMR 15. Big Creek SMR 16. Piedras Blancas SMR 17. Cambria SMP 18. Cambria SMR 19. Morro Bay Estuary SMR 20. Pt. Buchon SMR 21. Pt. Sal SMR 22. Pt. Arguello SMCA</p>
Susan Murray, Oceana	10/15/05	Entire study region	<p>[Excerpt from proposal] <i>"Our overall approach in developing this preliminary proposal consisted of the following steps:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Identify key ecological criteria based on goals and objectives of MLPA</i> <i>2. Gather and analyze datasets to identify features meeting key criteria</i> <i>3. Identify important ecological areas in the Central Coast study area based on overlapping features in</i> 	<p>Identified 12 areas of Ecological Importance – see map – divided into subareas and categorized by level of importance. Did not propose specific types of MPAs for these areas. The areas include: (1) Año Nuevo, (2) Monterey, (3) Point</p>

			<p><i>datasets</i></p> <p><i>4. Analyze and subdivide each area in detail based on ecological features</i></p> <p><i>5. Identify potential anthropogenic impacts to identified features to the extent information is available</i></p> <p><i>6. Assign specific management objectives to each sub-area to protect identified ecological features</i></p> <p><i>7. Evaluate the entire network based on each objective</i></p> <p><i>This proposal was explicitly designed to include areas of high diversity and density. The preliminary proposal includes 12 Important Ecological areas throughout the Central Coast of California. Each area is divided into several “sub-areas” which are identified on maps and included in a matrix. Each sub-area is classified by its ecological significance as “relatively important” “important,” or “very important.” These classifications are based on the degree of overlap between multiple key ecological criteria and the significance of the features relative to other areas of the Central Coast. While all three classifications warrant additional management measures and protections, our intention is that the level of additional protection and management objectives will reflect these classifications. The largest distance between each of the 12 Important Ecological Areas of this proposal is 14 miles.”</i></p>	<p>Sur, (4) Partington, (5) Cape San Martin, (6) Piedras Blancas, (7) Cambria, (8) Atascadero to Morro Beach, (9) Point Buchon to San Luis, (10) Oceano to Point Sal, (11) Purisma Point, (12) Point Arguello to Point Conception.</p>
<p>Don Canestro/ Marla Morrissey</p>	<p>10/15/05</p>	<p>Entire Study Region</p>	<p>These stakeholders asked for evaluation of the Initial and Revised Draft Concepts from the 2001 MLPA effort. The revised draft concept was completed after extensive public comment on the initial draft concept. This is not a Department proposal, nor was it ever completed. The maps</p>	<p>Initial Draft Concept: 8 State Marine Reserves (SMR), total 39 square nautical miles in the region 1 State Marine Park (SMP), 55 square miles in the region.</p>

		<p>were in the process of being revised by the Master Plan Science Advisory Team based on the results of a series of small group meetings and public comments on the Department's Initial Draft Concepts.</p> <p>Initial Draft Concept: [Excerpt] <i>“The procedures used by the Planning Team for developing these draft concepts were designed to meet the requirements of the MLPA and have been applied to each marine region. The use of three levels of protection for MPAs addresses the need to consider socio-economic issues while providing adequate protection for all or some forms of marine life in certain areas. To meet the MLPA goals, the MLPA Planning Team employed the following criteria in developing the draft concepts for regional networks of MPAs for California. Design elements included MPA location, shape, size, number, association with existing MPAs and other area-based regulations. The criteria are organized into three categories: 1) habitat; 2) size and spacing; and 3) practicality.”</i></p> <p>Revised Draft Concept [Excerpt] <i>“This reduces the total area within MPAs by 60% compared with the Initial Draft Concept, but still contains a wide variety of habitat, including replicates for submarine</i></p>	<p>13 State Marine Conservation Areas (SMCA), total 95 square miles Total of 22 Marine Protected Areas, 189 square miles, equivalent to 22 percent of all state waters within the region.</p> <p>SMRs: Año Nuevo, Natural Bridges, Hopkins (includes Ed Ricketts), Point Lobos, Julia Pfeiffer Burns, Big Creek, Salmon Creek, Cambria SMPs: Conception SMCAs: Año Nuevo, Natural Bridges, Soquel Canyon, Portuguese Ledge, Pacific Grove, Carmel Bay, Point Lobos, Point Sur, Big Creek, Piedras Blancas, Cambria, Point Buchon, Purisima</p> <p>Revised Draft Concept: 11 State Marine Reserves, total 26.9 square miles in the region 0 State Marine Parks 10 State Marine Conservation Areas, total 48.7 square miles Total of 21 Marine Protected Areas, 75.6 square miles. Total area excluding Elkhorn Slough is 73.9 square miles, equivalent to 8.6% of all state</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p><i>canyons, and retains a network component design, with spacing between centers of MPAs ranging from 5 to 25 miles within the region, with the exception of the primarily soft bottom habitat area from Avila Beach to Vandenberg. Among the 21 proposed MPAs, most include hard and soft bottom habitat within the intertidal and 0-30 m depth ranges. Fifteen of these contain hard and soft bottom habitat within the 30-100 m depth range, six of these contain hard and soft bottom habitat within the 100-200 m depth range, and four (Soquel, Carmel Bay, Big Creek, and Partington Canyon) contain hard and soft bottom habitat greater than 200 m. All but four (Soquel, Elkhorn Slough, Portuguese Ledge, and Piedras Blancas Intertidal) contain some kelp habitat, at least three (Pt. Lobos, Garrapata, and Big Creek) contain pinnacle habitat, and three (Soquel, Carmel Bay, and Partington Canyon) contain submarine canyon habitat). This represents more than a 10-fold increase in the total area within MPAs for the region compared with existing MPAs (the latter encompass approximately 6.8 square miles). ”</i></p>	<p>ocean waters in the region. SMRs: Sand Hill Bluff, Elkhorn Slough, Hopkins (excludes Ed Ricketts), Asilomar, Point Lobos, Big Creek, Salmon Cone, Piedras Blancas Intertidal, Cambria, Diablo Canyon, Conception SMCAs: Soquel Canyon, Portuguese Ledge, Ed Ricketts, Pacific Grove, Carmel Bay, Garrapata, Big Sur, Partington Canyon, Julia Pfeiffer Burns, Vandenberg</p>
--	--	---	--

Initial Staff Evaluation of Proposals of Complete Arrays

Representative	Natural Resources Defense Council	Oceana	Stakeholders - Initial and Revised Draft Concepts from 2001 MLPA Effort
Proposer	Kate Wing / Karen Garrison	Susan Murray	Don Canestro / Marla Morrissey
Complete Array?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Process: lists participants in development	Yes	Yes	Yes
Process: lists sources of information	No	Yes	No
Gap: Explains how relates to existing MPAs	Yes	No	Yes
Gap: Targets under-represented habitats	Yes	Yes	Yes
Explains relation to CCRSG goals and objectives	Yes	Yes	Yes
Explains spacing	Yes	Yes	Yes
Explains level of protection (type of MPA)	Yes	Specifies levels of protection, but not of types of state MPAs	Yes
Explains allowable uses	Yes	No	Yes
Proposes management measures	No	No	No
Proposes specific elements of a monitoring program	No	No	No
Incorporates recommendations for research	No	Yes	No

Incorporates recommendations for education	No	No	No
Outlines enforcement needs	No	No	No
Explains funding needs and sources	No	No	No
Integrates management at state, federal, and local levels	No	No	No
Explains socio-economic impacts	Yes, to the extent that they can	No	Yes
Explains species likely to benefit	Yes	Yes	Yes
Study Region coverage	Spans entire region	Spans entire region	Spans entire region
Does the proposal identify specific MPAs?	Yes	No	Yes
Number of specific MPAs proposed	22	12 areas (not MPAs)	22, 21
Initial Evaluation	This is proposals includes 22 different MPAs that span the entire region. Size, spacing, designation, and allowable uses within each MPA are outlined and identified in relation to CCRSG goals and objectives. Species likely to benefit and underrepresented habitats are discussed.	This proposal is a preliminary assessment of areas of ecological importance throughout central coast region. Underrepresented habitats captured and species likely to benefit are discussed, as well as how protection of each area relates to CCRSG goals and objectives. Spacing and	The initial draft concept contains 22 MPAs and the revised draft concept contains 21 MPAs. The proposals outline MPA size, spacing, allowable uses, and relation to the existing MPAs. CCRSG goals and objectives are discussed. Underrepresented habitats and species of concern are targeted.

	<p>The proposals lacks a discussion of monitoring and management, research and education opportunities, enforcement and funding needs, and integration of management on the state, federal, and local levels.</p>	<p>level of protection of MPAs are discussed, however, specific MPA designation and allowable uses are not.</p> <p>This proposal lacks discussion of monitoring and management, opportunities for education (research opportunities are discussed), enforcement and funding needs, socio-economic impacts, and integration of management at state, federal, and local levels. In addition, this proposal does not discuss how it incorporates existing MPAs.</p>	<p>These proposals lack management and monitoring measures, recommendations for research an education, funding and enforcement needs, and integration of management on the state, federal, and local levels.</p>
--	---	--	--

Proposals of Individuals MPAs or Groups of MPAs

Proposer	Date Received	Geographic Extent	Summary Description of Proposal and Rationale Provided by Proponent	MPAs Proposed (#, type, and location)
Julie Thayer, Point Reyes Bird Observatory	10/14/05	Ano Nuevo area	[Excerpt from proposal] <i>“The proposed MPA would protect a productivity and biodiversity hotspot in central California. The area between Pigeon Point and El Jarro Point contains multiple habitat types, including an important upwelling plume that provides nutrients for Monterey Bay, results in large amounts of primary and secondary production, and supports important fishes, marine mammals and seabirds further up the food web. Año Nuevo Island (ANI) and the surrounding islets and cliffs provide breeding and haul-out habitat for over 18,000 marine mammals and 9,000 seabirds, including the threatened Steller Sea Lion, endangered Brown Pelican, and species of special concern such as Rhinoceros Auklet, Cassin’s Auklet and Ashy Storm-Petrel. California Current endemics Brandt’s Cormorant and Western Gull also have large breeding colonies there. Coastal kelp forests, eelgrass beds, rocky reefs, and both hard and soft substrates in this area provide habitat for the threatened Southern Sea Otter and overfished groundfish species (Sebastes spp., lingcod), as well as foraging opportunities for other marine mammals, birds such as the endangered Marbled Murrelet, and listed White Sharks. An existing</i>	2 alternate MPAs proposed (type not specified) Proposed Alternative MPA 1: would protect a wedge-shaped area along the coast directly south from Pigeon Point and out to 3 miles west of El Jarro Point, extending towards Año Nuevo and Ascension Submarine Canyons Proposed Alternative MPA 2: would encompass a smaller area between boundaries extending due southwest from Franklin Point and from Greyhound Rock, out to 3mi

			<p><i>Invertebrate Area Special Closure at Año Nuevo would also be included in this MPA. The Gazos, Waddell and Scott Creek watersheds and estuaries support populations of the endangered Snowy Plover and Coho Salmon, and threatened Steelhead, species that are dependent on both healthy terrestrial and marine habitats.”</i></p>	
<p>Dan Robinette, Point Reyes Bird Observatory, Vandenberg Field Station</p>	<p>10/14/05</p>	<p>Array of MPAs in the Santa Maria basin</p>	<p>[Excerpt from proposal] <i>“The objective of this proposal is to establish a network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) within the Santa Maria Basin (SMB). The network we propose will be adjacent to Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB), an area with a history of receiving little fishing pressure. Our proposed network will therefore protect native species and habits existing in a natural setting. Fish and invertebrate species that will benefit from this MPA network are on state and federal lists of “overfished”, threatened, and endangered species (see lists in the ‘Individual MPAs’ section). Additionally, the MPA network will contain areas that are hot spots for foraging seabirds and marine mammals and will therefore be protecting areas of high trophic transfer.</i></p> <p><i>Creating a network of MPAs in this natural setting will address requirements of the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) by protecting the natural diversity and abundance of marine life and helping to sustain, conserve and protect populations of exploited species of the central California coast. Additionally, creating a network of</i></p>	<p>This proposal includes 5 proposed MPAs: 3 SMRs and 2 SMCAs:</p> <p>Point Sal State Marine Reserve: Mussel Rock (north) to Lion’s Head (south) and offshore to 3 nm. Area: 55 km² Shoreline Length: 11 km</p> <p>Purisima Point SMR San Antonio Creek mouth (north) to Seal Beach (south) and offshore to 3 nm. Area: 42 km²_Shoreline Length: 8 km</p> <p>Purisima Point SMCA Seal Beach (north) to Lompoc Landing (south) and offshore to 3 nm. Area: 15 km². Shoreline Length: 3 km.</p> <p>Arguello Promontory State</p>

			<p><i>multiple large MPAs across a large stretch of coast (as opposed to creating only one MPA along the same stretch of coast) will help protect the structure, function, and integrity of a coastal marine ecosystem. Furthermore, this network of MPAs help fulfill the requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act by protecting critical foraging and haul-out habitat of harbor seals and California sea lions. Finally, it will help fulfill the requirements of the Endangered Species Act by protecting roost and foraging habitat of the California Brown Pelican, breeding and foraging habitat of the California Least Tern, foraging habitat of the California sea otter, and coastal habitat of the Chinook salmon. Overall goals of the proposed MPAs: To protect critical seabird and marine mammal roost/haul-out habitat and to protect the prey of seabirds and marine mammals foraging in this area."</i></p>	<p>Marine Reserve: Point Pedernales (north) to Sudden Canyon (south) and offshore to 3 nm. Area: 42 km² Shoreline Length: 14 km Expands upon existing Vandenberg SMR.</p> <p>Boathouse State Marine Conservation Area: a 3.7 km² area extending 1.0 km south and 3.5 km east of the Boathouse jetty. Shoreline Length: 4 km. Expands upon existing Vandenberg SMR.</p>
David Dilworth, Executive Director, Helping Our Peninsula's Environment	10/15/05	Entire Study Region	<p>The goals of this proponent include the following [Excerpt from proposal]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>"Protect rare, threatened, and endangered species including gray whale, sea otter, CA sea lion, harbor seals, stellar sea lion, and Elephant seal</i> - <i>Protect outstanding imperiled gene pools, populations, species, communities, habitats and ecosystems that do not exist anywhere else</i> - <i>Protect connections between habitat</i> 	<p>Proposal includes 2 large State Marine Reserves:</p> <p>Monterey Peninsula Marine Reserve: from Monterey's Shale Beds around Pacific Grove and Pebble Beach to Carmel, extending out to 3 mile state limit.</p> <p>Central Coast Marine</p>

			<p><i>types, including shallow and deep communities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Protect areas that are biologically productive and multiple habitats</i> - <i>Area has been subject to heavy extraction, expect species populations and sizes to rebound"</i> 	<p>Reserve: to encompass all Sea Otter Habitat extending 1 mile out or to 150m depth, whichever is greater</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Initial Staff Evaluation of Proposals of Individual or Group MPAs

Representative	Helping Our Peninsula's Environment	Point Reyes Bird Observatory	Point Reyes Bird Observatory, Vandenberg Field Station
Proposer	David Dilworth, Executive Director	Julie Thayer	Dan Robinette
Complete Array?	No	No	No
Process: lists participants in development	Yes	Yes	Yes
Process: lists sources of information	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gap: Explains how relates to existing MPAs	No	Yes	Yes
Gap: Targets under-represented habitats	Yes	Yes	Yes
Explains relation to CCRSG goals and objectives	No	No	Explains how relates to MLPA goals, attempts to address regional goals, but fails to specify which ones
Explains spacing	No	No	Yes

Explains level of protection (type of MPA)	Yes	No	Yes
Explains allowable uses	No	Yes, but in limited detail	Yes, but in limited detail
Proposes management measures	No	Yes	No
Proposes specific elements of a monitoring program	No	Yes	No
Incorporates recommendations for research	No	Yes	No
Incorporates recommendations for education	No	Yes	No
Outlines enforcement needs	No	Yes	No
Explains funding needs and sources	No	No	No
Integrates management at state, federal, and local levels	No	No	No
Explains socio-economic impacts	No	Yes	Yes
Explains species likely to benefit	Yes, a few SOC are targeted.	Yes	Yes
Study Region coverage	2 MPAs, one spanning the entire region, the other focused on Monterey Peninsula	Only one MPA proposed in a small part of the study region	Network of 5 MPAs that covers the Santa Maria Basin, a relatively small portion of the study region
Does the proposal identify specific MPAs?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of specific MPAs proposed	2	1	5
Initial Evaluation	This proposal spans the entire region and contains two MPA concepts. Level of protection is discussed and underrepresented	This proposal contains only two alternatives for a single MPA in a small portion on the study region. Monitoring and management measures,	This proposal spans a single region of the central coast, the Santa Maria Basin, and contains a network of 5 MPAs that “stripe” the coast in this

	<p>habitats included, as well as a few species likely to benefit. However, this proposal lacks much of the in-depth analysis required, including: relation to CCRSG goals and objectives, explanation of spacing, and discussion of management and monitoring, research and education, enforcement and funding, socioeconomic impacts, and integration at the state, federal, and local levels. In addition, this proposal does not discuss how it incorporates existing MPAs.</p>	<p>as well as research and education opportunities are all discussed. In addition, enforcement needs and socioeconomic impacts are outlined. Though species likely to benefit are discussed and underrepresented habitats are targeted, this proposal does not designate level of protection or allowable uses in detail for the proposed MPAs. Also, this proposal does not cover which CCRSG goals and objectives it addresses, nor does it discuss integration of management on the state, federal, and local levels.</p>	<p>area. MPA designations and spacing are described, though allowable uses in the SMCAs are not discussed in great detail. Goals of the MLPA are discussed, though relation to specific CCRSG goals is not. The proposal targets species likely to benefit, underrepresented habitats, and discusses socioeconomic impacts, but lacks description on management measures, monitoring, research and education opportunities, enforcement and funding needs, and integration of state, federal, and local management levels.</p>
--	--	--	--