

California Department of Fish and Game
Summary of Marine Protected Area Proposal Analyses
Joint California Fish and Game Commission &
Blue Ribbon Task Force Meeting
June 11, 2008

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) conducted analyses of MPA proposals forwarded to the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) by the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF). These analyses focused on the feasibility of proposals to be effectively implemented and on proposals' abilities to achieve the goals and objectives of the MLPA. The feasibility guidelines used were outlined in the document titled, "*Statement of feasibility criteria for use in analyzing siting alternatives during the second phase of the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative*" (Department Memo; June 11, 2007). A second memo, "*Department of Fish and Game update of feasibility criteria for use in analyzing siting alternatives during the second phase of the Marine Life Protection Act*" (Department Memo; February 11, 2008), was also created to clarify feasibility issues that arose during the North Central Coast study region process, and was also used to evaluate the current draft MPA proposals.

The Department found few concerns with the BRTF Integrated Preferred Alternative (IPA) and only four MPAs not meeting the Department's guidelines. Similarly, North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRS) MPA proposals responded to many of the issues frequently observed in the first two rounds of draft proposals, and were greatly improved. Some concerns remain in all of the proposals forwarded by the BRTF to the Commission. The most frequent concerns noted were:

- Unclear or difficult to enforce boundaries in some areas
- Allowed take regulations which are too complex, confusing, or which allow most existing uses to continue and creating MPAs unnecessary to fulfill the MLPA mandate or that offer inadequate protection
- MPA designations that are inconsistent with existing and continuing uses of the area

Table 1 below summarizes Department concerns with all proposals forwarded by the BRTF to the Commission. A more detailed analysis of concerns and, in some cases, recommendations for methods to alleviate or eliminate the stated concerns can be found in the Department evaluations of the BRTF IPA, the stakeholder MPA proposals, and the evaluation of existing MPAs for the NCCSR.

Table 1. Summary of Department concerns by proposal (BRTF IPA; stakeholder proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4; and existing MPAs - proposal 0). For more detailed explanations, see the BRTF IPA Department feasibility evaluation, the feasibility evaluation of stakeholder MPA proposals, and the evaluation of existing MPAs for the NCCSR.

Proposal	MPA with Feasibility Concern	Type of Feasibility Concern			
		Boundaries	Allowed Take	MPA Designation	MPA Name
BRTF IPA	Russian River SMR	-	-	X	-
	Saunder's Reef SMCA	-	X	-	-
	Salt Point SMP	-	X	-	-
	Duxbury SMP	X	-	-	-
1-3	Saunder's Reef SMCA	-	X	-	-
	Del Mar Landing SMP	X	X	-	-
	Bodega Head SMCA	X	-	-	-
	Estero de Americano SMR	-	-	X	-
	Estero de San Antonio SMR	-	-	X	-
	Drakes Estero SMR	-	-	-	X
	Double Point SMCA	-	X	-	-
	Duxbury Reef SMCA	X	X	-	-
	Montara SMCA	-	X	-	-
2-XA	Black Point SMCA & SMR	X	-	-	-
	Russian River SMCA	-	X	-	-
	Duxbury SMP	X	X	-	-
4	Salt Point SMP	-	X	-	-
	Bodega Head SMR	X	-	-	-
	Estero de Americano SMR	-	-	X	-
	Estero de San Antonio SMR	-	-	X	-
	Drakes Estero SMR	-	-	-	X
	Duxbury SMCA	-	X	-	-
	Agate Beach Intertidal SMCA	X	X	-	-
0	Manchester and Arena Rock SMCA	X	X	-	-
	Del Mar Landing SMP	X	-	-	-
	Salt Point SMCA	X	X	-	-
	Fort Ross SMCA	X	X	-	-
	Sonoma Coast SMCA	X	X	-	-
	Bodega SMR	X	-	-	-
	Tomales Bay SMP	X	X	-	-
	Point Reyes Headlands SMCA	X	-	-	-
	Duxbury Reef SMCA	X	X	-	-
	James Fitzgerald SMP	X	X	-	-
	Farallon Islands SMCA	X	X	-	-