

# California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force

## M E M O R A N D U M

Cathy Reheis-Boyd, Chair  
*Western States Petroleum Association*

William Anderson  
*Westrec Marina Management, Inc.*

Meg Caldwell  
*Stanford Law School*

Dr. Jane G. Pisano  
*Natural History Museum of L.A. County*

Gregory F. Schem  
*Harbor Real Estate Group*

Ken Wiseman, Executive Director

**To:** California Fish and Game Commission  
**From:** MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force  
**Subject:** MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal  
**Date:** December 8, 2009  
**Cc:** Secretary Mike Chrisman, California Natural Resources Agency  
Acting Director John McCamman, California Department of Fish and Game

---

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the work and outcomes of the California Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) deliberations on marine protected areas (MPAs) for the MLPA South Coast Study Region. The memo provides background information and rationale to support the recommendation that the California Fish and Game Commission adopt the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal (IPA) as its preferred alternative for the MLPA South Coast Study Region. This memorandum provides the commission with context for presentations and discussions scheduled for the joint meeting on December 9, 2009.

### Overview

Consistent with the BRTF's guidance on July 29, 2009, the MLPA South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) successfully completed all elements of its charge, including generating three MPA proposals for the MLPA South Coast Study Region. The SCRSG MPA proposals represent the culmination of months of intensive design, evaluation, facilitated negotiation among and across interest groups, and proposal refinement.

The MLPA South Coast Study Region presented some unique challenges for MPA planning, most notably 1) balancing the needs and interests of consumptive and non-consumptive representatives, 2) avoiding conflicts with military use areas, 3) avoiding areas of water quality concern, 4) addressing the limited availability of certain key habitats, and 5) incorporating new approaches for modeling connectivity between the mainland and island areas. As per guidance from the commission on December 11, 2008, the thirteen existing state MPAs that lie within the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary were

retained and included in all MPA proposals. However, there were many other existing state MPAs along the mainland coast and at Catalina Island that were evaluated and for which recommendations are made for either modifications or removal from the system.

The three final revised SCRSG MPA proposals (P1R, P2R and P3R) resulted from three iterative rounds of MPA proposal design, where the SCRSG considered BRTF guidance, the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) evaluations, MLPA Initiative staff evaluations, California Department of Fish and Game feasibility analyses, California Department of Parks and Recreation evaluations, and extensive public comment. While the three SCRSG work groups were given guidance to meet science and feasibility guidelines and to strive for cross-interest support, in the final round of proposal development each of the SCRSG work groups was also given specific guidance for how to focus efforts. As a result, the three SCRSG MPA proposals vary based on that unique guidance.

The three final SCRSG MPA proposals were forwarded to the BRTF for review and consideration at a meeting that took place on October 20-22, 2009 and November 10, 2009. The BRTF deliberated and took the following three actions during that meeting:

1. Recognizing that all three final SCRSG MPA proposals generally had some cross-interest support, met the science guidelines outlined in the *California Marine Life Protection Act Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas* where possible, and to a large extent minimized socioeconomic impacts, the BRTF unanimously voted to forward to the commission for its review and consideration all three final SCRSG MPA proposals with revisions submitted by the three SCRSG work groups after Round 3 was completed (referred to as P1R, P2R and P3R), as well as the no-action alternative (Proposal 0, existing MPAs).
2. The BRTF then adopted the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal (IPA) by integrating MPA elements from all three SCRSG proposals. The single, preferred alternative is intended to balance multiple considerations and bridge some of the remaining areas of divergence among the SCRSG proposals. While the IPA does not meet all the science guidelines, the BRTF carefully determined where the few exceptions to science guidelines should be made in an effort to garner further cross-interest support and reduce potential socioeconomic impacts. The BRTF unanimously approved forwarding the IPA to the commission as the preferred alternative for the MLPA South Coast Study Region.
3. The BRTF also identified for the commission additional recommendations to include with the transmittal of the IPA and SCRSG MPA proposals.

### **Developing the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**

The BRTF unanimously adopted the IPA which is largely based on MPAs from the SCRSG proposals and bridges some of the important areas of divergence among the revised SCRSG proposals 1, 2 and 3 by providing a balance between meeting science guidelines and minimizing potential socioeconomic impacts. While each of the final SCRSG MPA proposals has strengths and reflects intensive effort, none of the SCRSG proposals achieved the level of cross-interest support and balance of considerations to be adopted as the preferred alternative

by the BRTF. The BRTF carefully considered where to make explicit choices based on extensive study and deliberation; many hours of input from the public; and helpful discussions with members of the SAT and SCRSG on the underlying science and specific local economics at key geographies.

The process of integrating the SCRSG MPA proposals to generate the IPA was facilitated by both the structure and organization of the SCRSG and the hard work and commitment of the SCRSG members and many members of the public. The high degree of geographic convergence among proposals seen in prior study regions was not as pronounced and this required the BRTF to carefully weigh alternatives at several key geographies (most notably Naples Reef, Point Dume, Palos Verdes, the Orange County area, the San Diego area, and Catalina Island).

The SCRSG is to be commended for generating a diverse set of Round 1 MPA proposals in March 2009 (six internal arrays, complemented by three draft external proposals), which were then refined in May 2009 based on science guidance, close review of the Ecotrust analysis of potential socioeconomic impacts, and California Department of Fish and Game and California State Parks guidance (resulting in four draft proposals, as well as two external proposals in Round 2). Finally, consistent with guidance given by the BRTF, and in recognition of the need to forward a bounded set of options to the commission, the SCRSG succeeded in producing three final MPA proposals in September 2009 (Round 3) for BRTF consideration and deliberation.

The BRTF gave considerable guidance to the SCRSG in arriving at this milestone. The BRTF asked the SCRSG to give substantial weight to the science guidelines; to build proposals around a backbone of high level of protection MPAs of at least minimum (and where possible, preferred) size; to strive for broad cross-interest involvement and support in drafting and reviewing proposals; to minimize, where possible, significant potential socioeconomic impacts; to seriously consider the California Department of Fish and Game's feasibility criteria and California State Parks evaluations; and finally to give careful consideration to the broad range of public and stakeholder comments submitted verbally and in writing.

At the final round of proposal development, the BRTF gave additional specific guidance to each of the three work groups:

- SCRSG Work Group 1 direction: Continue to achieve a high level of cross-interest support and improve achievement of SAT guidelines [resulting in Proposal 1R]
- SCRSG Work Group 2 direction: Continue to seek efficiency of MPA design and improve achievement of SAT guidelines [resulting in Proposal 2R]
- SCRSG Work Group 3 direction: Continue to address SAT guidelines and strive to achieve *preferred* SAT guidelines [resulting in Proposal 3R]

The SCRSG worked very hard to take all this advice into account as the work groups crafted Round 3 MPA proposals. While there is some geographic overlap among the final SCRSG MPA proposals, all three have significant differences in their designs and balance among the many guidelines. The south coast study region presented many challenges to MPA planning,

and meeting science and feasibility guidelines, while also minimizing potential socioeconomic impacts, was a difficult task.

The IPA draws, in most cases, directly from the SCRSG proposals, makes a set of explicit choices at key geographies, and is designed to meet the goals of the MLPA and balance the interests of the resource users. The IPA includes a carefully crafted regional network of MPAs that represents a series of compromises and choices that took into account science, broad cross-interest support, and potential socioeconomic impacts. The IPA includes a total of 50 marine protected areas and pending military closures: 28 state marine reserves (SMR), 19 state marine conservation areas (SMCA), 1 state marine park (SMP), and 2 pending military closure areas at San Clemente Island that must go through a federal regulatory process to be adopted. The IPA is comparable to the SCRSG proposals based on the total number of MPAs included in the proposal and the total area that is captured in proposed MPAs (Table 1).

**Table 1. Comparison of MLPA South Coast Study Region Existing MPAs (P0), Round 3 Revised South Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (SCRSG) MPA Proposals (P1R, P2R and P3R), and the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal (IPA)**

Area Type	Proposals				
	P0	P1R	P2R	P3R	IPA
<b>Marine Protected Area (MPA)<sup>1</sup></b>					
State Marine Reserve	15 (6.9%)	33 (13.1%)	25 (12.0%)	30 (12.4%)	28 (11.7%)
State Marine Conservation Area	19 (0.8%)	16 (2.2%)	12 (2.5%)	9 (2.5%)	19 (3.2%)
State Marine Park	8 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)
<i>Total MPAs</i>	42 (7.7%)	50 (15.4%)	37 (14.5%)	39 (14.9%)	48 (15.0%)
<b>State Marine Recreational Management Area (SMRMA)</b>					
State Marine Recreational Management Area	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0%)
<b>Pending Military Closures</b>					
Military Closures <sup>2</sup>	0 (0%)	2 (1.6%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (2.6%)	2 (1.6%)

<sup>1</sup>Note: These are proposed MPA designations, NOT levels of protection assigned by the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team

<sup>2</sup>Note: The military closures do not allow fishing and would be formally designated through federal action

While most of the 42 existing state MPAs are proposed for inclusion in the IPA with some modifications to improve design, the BRTF recommends that several existing MPAs be removed from the system (including Refugio SMCA, Big Sycamore Canyon SMR, Point Fermin SMP, Doheny SMCA, Doheny Beach SMCA, Buena Vista Lagoon SMP, Agua Hedionda Lagoon SMR and San Dieguito Lagoon SMP).

The BRTF directed MLPA Initiative staff to work with the SCRSG members to harmonize the MPA goals and objectives in their proposals with the actual regulations that have been moved forward in these proposals; staff completed that work.

Additional BRTF recommendations for the IPA include:

- First, to encourage a formal naming process, by which both the State Park and Recreation Commission and the California Fish and Game Commission explore the use of Native American names that have been put forward for many of the MPAs that are included in the recommendation; it is beyond the mission of the BRTF to engage in that naming process.
- Secondly, to make it clear that it is not the BRTF's intent to limit boating in any of the MPAs. The BRTF also intends to include the lawful operation of municipal facilities within these MPAs.
- Finally, the BRTF recommends that memoranda of understanding (MOUs) be used among the various local, state and federal agencies and tribes, including the California Department of Fish and Game and California State Parks and local jurisdictions (some of whom already have existing MPA education and management capacity), to increase opportunities for effective enforcement and management of MPAs. These types of arrangements have been shown to work well in the Channel Islands and there is good will and experience in this region to promote better management.

More details about the specific MPAs in the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal are attached as an appendix.

We hope you find this information helpful.

Enclosure: Appendix A, Brief Description of Marine Protected Areas in the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal

**APPENDIX A**  
**Brief Description of Marine Protected Areas in the**  
**MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**  
*December 8, 2009*

This appendix provides a brief description of each marine protected area (MPA) identified in the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative (IPA) MPA Proposal; the description highlights the source(s) for each MPA design, purpose, considerations made, and rationale for any modifications in MPA design relative to the stakeholder proposals. In addition, key ecological and socioeconomic considerations are highlighted to provide additional rationale for the recommendation for these MPAs. For a complete description of ecological, socioeconomic, cultural and other considerations for each proposed MPA, please see the more detailed description of MPAs table for the IPA.

Note that the MLPA South Coast Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal also includes two military closures proposed for San Clemente Island as federal safety zones, where activities would be restricted to military training only; all three revised SCRSG proposals also included these two military closures. In addition, the thirteen existing state MPAs within the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary are included as part of the IPA, per guidance from the California Fish and Game Commission.

**Point Conception State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 1 (but high degree of geographic convergence among the three proposals)

**Key Purpose:** This MPA is the northern-most component of the "backbone" of the MPA proposal and is designed to meet the preferred science size. Contains all but two key habitats, provides connection to central coast MPAs.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from the Point Conception State Marine Reserve in SCRSG Proposal 1; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included a preferred size SMR off Point Conception with differences in how far east the SMR extended. The BRTF chose the smallest of the three SMR designs at Point Conception, due in part to the inclusion of a SMCA at Naples reef.

Selection of this geography for a very high protection MPA was an early consensus of most SCRSG members, although preferences regarding size and boundaries differed. The Point Conception SMR, being the smallest of the three final designs for this area, carries a low predicted economic impact to Santa Barbara harbor. SMR designation at this site retains important near-shore fishing opportunities nearby at St. Augustine reef and shelf rockfish grounds in adjacent deeper waters. Sport fishing use of this remote area is limited.

**Kashtayit State Marine Park**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** This 1.97 square mile state marine park is intended as a tribal heritage site with notable educational opportunities.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from the Kashtayit SMP in SCRSG Proposal 1; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** Minimal ecological protection and socioeconomic impacts due to small size, allowed uses and being primarily a MPA focused on MLPA Goal 3. Kashtayit SMP is contiguous to Gaviota State Park, and abuts the traditional Chumash village site of Kashtayit so provides a tribal heritage site with opportunity for collaboration/co-management with California State Parks. Tribal interests introduced this MPA design.

### **Naples State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Heritage site to provide protection to unique reef and near-shore system.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from the Naples SMCA in SCRSG Proposal 1; modifications were made to regulations to allow take of giant kelp by hand harvest and white seabass by spearfishing.

**Primary Considerations:** This shape originated in both SCRSG Proposals 1 (as an SMCA) and 3 (as an SMR), and is designed to provide protection for a highly productive and unique habitat and high species diversity. The SAT bioeconomic modeling showed this MPA to have high ecological value despite its small size.

Proposed SMCA allows kelp harvest specifically to provide local harvesters with access to abalone aquaculture feed, because such access would be foreclosed in the nearby Campus Point SMR where an existing lease is proposed to be discontinued. The SMCA is limited in size to retain fishing opportunities at nearby Refugio and Tajiguas reefs, as well as the Ellwood area, yet includes the pinnacle and cave system. This SMCA represents an important compromise between consumptive and conservation interests who debated tradeoffs among priority sites in the area (Naples Reef, Carpinteria Reef and Rincon Point).

### **Campus Point State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposals 2 and 3 (similar but slightly larger shape in SCRSG Proposal 1)

**Key Purpose:** A backbone reserve to protect key habitats and species in the Santa Barbara county area.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposals 2 and 3. Contains all but 3 key habitats, meets spacing guidelines to Point Conception and is only slightly over spacing guidelines to Point Dume cluster to the south.

**Primary Considerations:** This 10.4 square mile SMR forms a backbone reserve sited along the UC Santa Barbara campus and residential community; its design retains fishing opportunities at Black Rocks to the east and the Ellwood reefs to the west, along with shore access areas for consumptive users at Goleta Beach Park (this shore access was included within the SCRSG Proposal 1 shape). Originally proposed by the fishing community in External MPA Proposal A, an SMR at this site was featured in each proposal designed by the SCRSG,

with slight differences in shape and size; the proposed SMR is based on SCRSG Proposal 2's design.

### **Goleta Slough State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposals 1, 2 and 3

**Key Purpose:** Protect estuarine habitat that is located close to research institutions.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 2; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** Consensus among SCRSG proposals to place an MPA in this estuary.

### **Point Dume State Marine Reserve / Point Dume State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** This preferred-size, backbone MPA cluster is designed to capture a broad range of habitats, especially an upwelling zone, kelp persistence and deep submarine canyon habitat. Contains all habitats available in this geography; the hard 30-100 meter substrate is not available along this stretch of the coast. Spacing distance to the north (Campus Point SMR) is just over the guidelines, but meets spacing guidelines to the south for most habitats.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were derived from SCRSG Proposal 1; however, the SMCA/SMR boundary was moved to the west to better meet California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an MPA or MPA cluster in this geography. The Point Dume SMCA/SMR cluster is slightly smaller than that from SCRSG Proposal 3 (does not extend as far west and the SMR portion is smaller), but larger than the single SMCA included in SCRSG Proposal 2. Part of the decision to select a larger, more restrictive cluster of MPAs on Point Dume was based on the decision to select an MPA design at Palos Verdes that missed some key habitats for SAT guidelines, and to choose shapes that best met California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.

The Point Dume MPA cluster protects a high-value portion of the Malibu coast's diverse habitats, including kelp beds, and provides protection of the canyon off Point Dume, while retaining fishing opportunities for commercial and recreational fishing nearby, including important areas for kayak, spear and shore fishing. The design also retains access for fishing to one-half of Big Kelp Reef. While leaving areas open to fishing, it will impact commercial and recreational fishing, including kayak fishing and shore fishers at Zuma Beach. The Point Dume area is among the most visited areas in the study region; the SMR/SMCA cluster provides recreational benefits to non-consumptive visitors.

### **Point Vicente State Marine Reserve / Abalone Cove State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 2

**Key Purpose:** A backbone MPA cluster designed to meet most, but not all, science guidelines while minimizing socioeconomic impacts to local ports, harbors and consumptive resource users.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 2; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals had an MPA or MPA cluster around Palos Verdes, but the three proposals showed a high level of divergence in their designs. Selection of this design was a policy decision to balance science guidelines, socioeconomic impacts and California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines. Keeping in mind the larger MPA cluster at Point Dume, the BRTF chose to select the MPA cluster (from SCRSG Proposal 2) at Palos Verdes with the smallest socioeconomic impacts. The MPA cluster misses habitat replication and spacing for kelp persistence and hard substrate (30-100 meter). The Point Vincente SMR was designed to minimize impacts to recreational and commercial fisheries and local ports. The eastern portion of the Abalone Cove SMCA overlaps with DDT-contaminated sediments at White's Point.

### **Bolsa Chica State Marine Reserve and State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protect heritage site and estuarine habitats at Bolsa Chica

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 1, but modified to split into an SMR/SMCA complex.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an MPA at Bolsa Chica. By splitting the SMCA into an SMR/SMCA complex, a balance between the SMCA in SCRSG Proposal 2 and the SMR in SCRSG Proposal 3 was reached. The majority of the estuary is protected at a very high level of protection, while still allowing current fishing areas to stay open to shore fishers.

### **Upper Newport Bay State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 2 (all proposals included this site)

**Key Purpose:** Protect bay and estuarine habitats currently under restoration

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from Proposal 2; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an MPA in Upper Newport Bay. The BRTF chose the largest MPA design, and allowed some fishing to continue.

### **Crystal Cove State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protection of intertidal and nearshore invertebrates

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 1 and modified by moving Laguna SMR to the south and adjusting the SMCA boundaries to meet the SMR. Boundaries of the SMCA were adjusted to better meet California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an SMCA/SMR/SMCA cluster in this area with the SMCAs aimed at protecting the intertidal habitat, based on extensive comment from local communities and local managers (who wanted contiguous coverage of

MPAs along the coast). The modified SCRSG Proposal 1 SMCA/SMR/SMCA cluster offered the most protection for the lowest socioeconomic cost, while also addressing some access issues and concerns from California State Parks. This SMCA overlaps an existing MPA at Crystal Cove and will allow fishing activities that are prohibited under existing regulations, including recreational take of finfish by hook and line and commercial take of lobster.

### **Laguna State Marine Reserve / Dana Point State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Backbone of protection for key habitats and species

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 1 and modified by moving Laguna SMR to the southward to align the northern boundary with the boundaries of the cities of Newport and Laguna, with guidelines of California State Parks (including avoiding a planned camping facility and universal access location) and with a prominent rock for ease of recognition. SMCA boundaries were adjusted to meet new SMR boundaries in the north, and to better meet California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines in the south.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an SMCA/SMR/SMCA cluster in this area with the SMCAs aimed at protecting the intertidal habitat. Laguna SMR is minimum sized to meet spacing and habitat replication guidelines. The SMR is designed to minimize inclusion of offshore fishing grounds through a triangular shape that focuses protection along the shore.

This MPA cluster leaves open the area around Dana Point Harbor to minimize socioeconomic impacts, but does not capture nearby persistent kelp. The SMR here serves education goals and natural heritage goals. Strong existing management, enforcement and interpretative infrastructure exists for the entire SMCA/SMR/SMCA cluster, including dedicated marine protection officers from two cities, and extensive educational facilities, docent programs and signage.

### **Batiquitos Lagoon State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protect rare and important wetlands, and especially eelgrass habitat

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 1; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 3 included SMRs in this estuary. SCRSG Proposal 1 provided a high level of protection to the majority of the estuary while still allowing current fishing practices to continue.

### **Swami's State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 3

**Key Purpose:** Protect key sand and rock habitats and associated species. Southernmost backbone site for the MPA system.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 3; modifications were made to allow recreational take of Pacific bonito and white seabass by spearfishing.

**Primary Considerations:** Minimum sized backbone MPA at a high level of protection. The southernmost and only MPA that meets minimum size guidelines in the south mainland bioregion and, therefore, the last opportunity to meet habitat replication/representation and spacing guidelines on the mainland coast. This SMCA captures kelp persistence, which was missed at Point Vincente SMR/Abalone Cove SMCA. This SMCA captures all but two key habitats and has lower socioeconomic impacts for many fisheries than other proposals in the Del Mar area.

### **San Elijo State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 3

**Key Purpose:** Protect a tidally-influenced lagoon and adjacent marine habitats. In addition, hosts a larger assemblage of birds than neighboring estuaries.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 3; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** Two SCRSG proposals included this estuary, which is also an existing MPA.

### **San Diego-Scripps Coastal State Marine Conservation Area / Matlahuayl State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 3

**Key Purpose:** Maintain and improve existing MPAs, Goal 3 research and educational opportunities, protect a portion of Scripps Canyon.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 3; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 2 included the existing La Jolla SMCA shape, which was expanded to better meet California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines in SCRSG Proposal 3. This small SMCA/SMR cluster retains and improves the feasibility design of two existing MPAs. These areas are designed for legacy protection, while allowing some consumptive opportunities.

### **South La Jolla State Marine Reserve and State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protect high quality reef habitat and biodiversity at South La Jolla.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 1, with the boundaries modified to include an offshore SMCA to state waters and a nearshore SMR with the northern boundary moved south. Modified shapes were created by some of the co-leads for SCRSG Proposal 1 as an alternate to the MPA design in their actual proposal in an effort to gain broader support.

**Primary Considerations:** Similar but larger shapes in SCRSG Proposal 3. This 7-square-mile SMR/SMCA cluster does not meet minimum SAT guidelines, but, based on SAT expert feedback, provides key protection to some of the richest and most extensive near- and off-shore kelp forest in the study region. The below-minimum-size shape was chosen to serve natural heritage purposes while minimizing impacts on fishing opportunities. The offshore SMCA allows for limited fishing activity and for continued training activity by the U.S. Navy. The SAT identified that this area has higher quality habitat than that in Point Loma area.

### **Famosa Slough State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 2

**Key Purpose:** Protect a slough and wetland for educational and recreational opportunities

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 2; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 2 included shapes here, but the SCRSG Proposal 1 shape extended into the Mission Bay Channel. The BRTF chose the small Famosa Slough SMR designed to protect a 37-acre urban wetland along the San Diego River and provide for educational and recreational opportunities.

### **Cabrillo State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 2

**Key Purpose:** Preserve heritage site and protect intertidal and nearshore habitats

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were directly taken from SCRSG Proposal 1; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an SMR here, but SCRSG Proposal 3's SMR extended slightly north over a pipeline. The BRTF chose an SMR design that did not include the pipeline. Cabrillo National Monument has administrative jurisdiction that extends offshore and the National Park Service (NPS) is committed to managing the area in a manner consistent with the goals and values of both the NPS and the MLPA.

### **Tijuana River Mouth State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protect ecological linkages between the near-shore and estuary and between U.S. and Mexican waters.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 1, with the southern boundary extended to border of Mexico.

**Primary Considerations:** Both SCRSG Proposals 1 and 3 included SMCAs in this area, with SCRSG Proposal 3's shape extending farther to the north than the modified SCRSG Proposal 1 shape. This 2.9 square mile SMCA provides protection to the southernmost section of the study region and is designed to connect California habitats to important larval sources from outside the United States, including those critical to recruitment of commercially harvested species.

### **Blue Cavern State Marine Reserve / Bird Rock State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 2

**Key Purpose:** Backbone of protection for near-shore and deeper habitats at Catalina Island.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 2 and modified by moving the SMR/SMCA boundary north to include Bird Rock in the SMR.

**Primary Considerations:** All three proposals included an SMR here, though the size varied. This 10.29 square mile SMR/SMCA cluster provides a high-protection, backbone MPA cluster for Catalina Island's lee side, and expands the small existing USC Wrigley Marine Lab MPA. The offshore SMCA achieves protection for Bird Rock while allowing trolling for pelagic finfish.

### **Long Point State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 3

**Key Purpose:** Protect key habitats and provide recreational and study opportunities on the front side of Catalina Island.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 3; no modifications were made.

**Ecological and Socioeconomic Considerations:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 3 included shapes here, with the SCRSG Proposal 1 shape being larger (though both were under minimum size). The BRTF chose the smaller SMR here because it protects key habitats, while minimizing socioeconomic impact. This SMR is designed to include adequate representation of diverse habitats and minimize negative socioeconomic impacts by avoiding popular fishing areas and mooring coves from Avalon to Long Point and to reduce impacts to commercial and sport boats fishing offshore.

### **Arrow Point to Lion Head Point State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPA:** Existing Invertebrate Special Closure.

**Key Purpose:** Retain existing protection of invertebrates.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations match the existing invertebrate closure, but designation is proposed to change to SMCA.

**Primary Considerations:** Only SCRSG Proposal 1 included an MPA in this area and that included only part of the existing closure. The BRTF chose to maintain the existing protection for the entire area.

### **Cat Harbor State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPA:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protect eelgrass and reduce conflicts surrounding squid harvest.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 1; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** This small SMCA protects nearshore and eelgrass habitats and reduces the conflicts between local residents and squid fishers related to noise and light impacts.

### **Farnsworth Onshore State Marine Conservation Area / Farnsworth Offshore State Marine Conservation Area**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposal 1

**Key Purpose:** Protect unique pinnacle, nearshore and offshore habitats and species on backside of Catalina Island.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposal 1 and modified by splitting into two SMCAs, at approximately the 50-meter contour line, to allow additional gear types in the offshore SMCA.

**Primary Considerations:** All three SCRSG proposals included an MPA around Farnsworth Bank, but with variations in the chosen boundaries and allowed uses. The SCRSG Proposal 3 shape completely overlapped the smaller SCRSG Proposal 1 shape. The BRTF chose a MPA design that provided a high level of protection while minimizing socioeconomic impacts (e.g. allows major commercial squid fishing fishery to continue) and meeting California Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines. Based on concerns regarding the impact of anchoring on fragile purple hydrocoral, the BRTF recommends that the California Department of Fish and Game study the feasibility of installing a mooring system that can support commercial diving and fishing boats, and if feasible, install the system and prohibit anchoring at Farnsworth Bank.

### **Begg Rock State Marine Reserve**

**Source of Individual MPAs:** SCRSG Proposals 1 and 2

**Key Purpose:** Protection of intertidal, nearshore, and offshore habitats in a backbone reserve.

**Boundary or Regulation Modifications:** Boundaries and proposed regulations were taken from SCRSG Proposals 1 and 2; no modifications were made.

**Primary Considerations:** Two of three SCRSG proposals included this MPA, while a third considered a potential closure on San Nicolas Island. Socioeconomic impacts were smaller for Begg Rock compared to the San Nicolas military closure. Begg Rock also contains fewer key habitats than the San Nicolas military closure.