



## California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

c/o California Resources Agency  
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**To: MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG)**  
**From: MLPA I-Team**  
**Subject: MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) Motions on April 23, 2008**  
**Date: April 30, 2008**

---

During the April 22-23, 2008 MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) meeting in San Rafael, the BRTF made a series of motions. North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) members have expressed interest in receiving the details of these BRTF motions; this memo summarizes three motions made and unanimously adopted by the BRTF. The tables presented in this memo are supplemental to a full "template" the I-Team is compiling that describes the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal.

This document is not a full summary of the BRTF meeting, which will be available on the MLPA website in the near future; in the interim, a key indexed version of the meeting video is already available. Precise language of each motion can be obtained by reviewing the archived video at <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp>.

Tables 1 and 2 provide the sources for boundaries and allowed uses of MPAs within the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal (preliminary maps are included as an attachment), while Table 3 and Figure 1 provide preliminary area calculations.

### **Motion #1 – April 22, 2008**

Understanding that the BRTF will consider, deliberate, and vote on a preferred alternative tomorrow, and in recognition of the incredible work that each of the [NCC]RSG groups and every member of the RSG has contributed to at least one of the remaining three proposals that are before us, and honoring the fact that:

1. All are expected to result in well under 10% additional economic impact;
2. All proposals conform to the SAT guidelines;
3. Each of these proposals shows only minor deviations from the department's feasibility recommendations; and
4. There are more similarities between, and among, these proposals than they are differences;

I move that we forward each of the three proposals in their current form that were developed by the [NCC]RSG to the [California] Fish and Game Commission.

**First:** Meg Caldwell. **Second:** Cathy Reheis-Boyd. **Vote:** 5-0

## **Motion #2 – April 23, 2008**

I would like to make the following motion that is to allow the [NCC]RSG groups, who have put forward Proposals 1-3, 2-XA and 4, the opportunity to harmonize their marine protected areas' goals and objectives for each of the MPAs with the actual regulations that they are proposing for each of those MPAs. This is in direct response to the [California] Department of Fish and Game's evaluation and observations regarding the lack of harmony between those two in several instances. I believe the stakeholders indicated yesterday that was something they were prepared to do and wanted to do. Essentially, the proposals will move in a cleaned up fashion that honestly reflects what the stakeholder groups [RSG] actually intended when they [the proposals] go forward to the [California] Fish and Game Commission.

The second aspect of this motion is that I believe also that there were two very technical boundary changes that need to be made to reflect the original intent of the MPAs proposed in 2-XA in the Point Arena area [and Drakes Estero]. Staff can correct me and Dr. Gleason, I believe, has this information. This was just an instance where staff didn't quite get the lines right and we want to make sure that the proposal as it moves to the [California] Fish and Game Commission actually has the lines accurately depicted.

I believe an appropriate amount of time to allow these groups to make these conformity changes to their actual intent would be two weeks.

**First:** Meg Caldwell. **Second:** Don Benninghoven. **Vote:** 5-0

## **Motion #3 – April 23, 2008**

I move that the BRTF:

- 1) Adopt as its preferred alternative for the north central coast [study] region the collection of marine protected areas and special closures that are described in the draft preliminary BRTF motion document that is up on our screen [Table 1], and the companion document that lists the special closures [Table 2],
- 2) To incorporate into this array of marine protected areas the derivative objectives that were developed by the RSG for those marine protected areas that we have taken wholesale and adopted into the preferred alternative, and
- 3) To instruct staff to work on harmonizing those objectives pursuant to the advice that we have gotten from [the California] Department of Fish and Game to ensure that the MPAs and the objectives actually match one another.
- 4) Further, for those marine protected areas for which we have changed boundaries and made alterations, to develop draft objectives for us to review via e-mail so that we can actually review those, provide some feedback and that we have a coherent network of marine protected areas,

special closures, and objectives that move forward to the [California] Fish and Game Commission.

**First:** Meg Caldwell. **Second:** Cathy Reheis-Boyd. **Vote:** 5-0

**Table 1: Source of Boundaries and Allowed Uses for the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**

<b>Individual MPAs and MPA Clusters</b>	<b>Source of Boundaries</b>	<b>Allowed Uses</b>
<b>Point Arena SMR/SMCA</b>	Include from Proposal 1-3	SMR is no take SMCA allows salmon only (Proposal 1-3 regulations)
<b>Sea Lion Cove SMCA</b>	Include from Proposal 4	SMCA allows everything except invertebrates and algae (Proposal 4 regulations)
<b>Saunders Reef SMCA</b>	Include from Proposal 1-3 and Proposal 4  Include DPR boundary change (move northern boundary south 0.1 mi so as not to split Schooner Gulch Beach)	SMCA allows urchin and salmon. (Proposal 4 regulations)
<b>Del Mar SMR</b>	Include from Proposal 4	SMR is no take (Proposal 4 regulations)
<b>Stewarts Point SMR</b>	Include from Proposal 4  Include DPR boundary change (move southern boundary north 0.7 mile)	SMR is no take (Proposal 4 regulations)
<b>Salt Point SMP</b>	Include from Proposal 4  Include DPR boundary change (move northern boundary north 0.7 mile)	SMP allows abalone and finfish (Proposal 4 regulations)
<b>Gerstle Cove SMR</b>	Consensus design for boundaries (same in NCCRS proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)	SMR is no take (same in Proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)
<b>Russian River SMR/SMCA</b>	Consensus design for boundaries (same in NCCRS proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)	SMR is no take SMCA allows crab and surf smelt (Proposal 1-3 regulations)
<b>Bodega Head SMR/SMCA</b>	Include from Proposal 2-XA	SMR is no take SMCA allows pelagic finfish, squid, crab (Proposal 2-XA regulations)

**Table 1 (continued): Source of Boundaries and Allowed Uses for the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**

<b>Estero Americano and Estero San Antonio SMRMAs</b>	Consensus design for boundaries (same in NCCRS proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)	No take of marine resources; waterfowl hunting allowed. (Proposal 2-XA regulations)
<b>Point Reyes SMR/SMCA</b>	Consensus design for boundaries (same in NCCRS proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)	SMR is no take SMCA allows salmon and crab (Proposal 1-3 regulations)
<b>Drakes Estero SMCA/ Estero de Limantour SMR</b>  <b>MPA names revised as indicated, per DFG recommendation</b>	Consensus design for boundaries (same in NCCRS proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)	SMR is no take SMCA allows oyster mariculture and recreational clamming (Proposal 1-3 regulations)  Proposed language for SMCA is: "All take is prohibited, EXCEPT shellfish mariculture and recreational clamming. If at any time, it becomes feasible to create an SMR at Drakes Estero, this proposal recommends doing so."
<b>Duxbury SMP</b>	Include from Proposal 2-XA	SMP allows recreational shore-fishing and abalone. (Proposal 2-XA regulations)
<b>Montara SMR/Pillar Point SMCA</b>	Include from Proposal 2-XA.  Boundary change: move SMR northern boundary south 0.3 mile and move southern boundary of SMR south to next whole minute (37 30.0)	SMR is no take SMCA allows pelagic finfish, squid, and crab. (Proposal 2-XA regulations)
<b>North Farallon Islands SMR and Southeast Farallon Island SMR/SMCA</b>	Consensus design for boundaries (same in NCCRS proposals 1-3, 2-XA, and 4)	SMRs are no take SMCA allows salmon only (Proposal 1-3 regulations)

**Table 2: Special Closures in the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**

<b>Special Closure Location</b>	<b>Extent and Seasonality</b>	<b>Source*</b>	<b>Additional Boundary Detail</b>
<b>Point Reyes Headlands</b>	1000 ft; year round	Proposal 1-3 and Proposal 4	
<b>Point Resistance</b>	300 ft; year round	Proposal 2-XA	
<b>Stormy Stack</b>	300 ft; year round	All three NCCRS proposals	

**Table 2 (continued): Special Closures in the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**

<b>Devil's Slide</b>	300 -1000ft ft; year round	New conical shape created at meeting	300 feet around egg rock, and also includes the area between Egg Rock and the mainland as defined by two points. No transit allowed between Egg Rock and mainland (between defined two points).
<b>North Farallon Island</b>	1000 ft; year round	Proposal 1-3 and 4	
<b>Isle of St James</b>	300 ft; year round	All three NCCRS proposals	
<b>Southeast Farallon Island</b>	300 ft; year round, with eastern portion seasonal	Proposal 1-3 and 4, modified to include a seasonal closure	300 ft around Southeast Farallon, excluding Fishermen Bay and East Landing. Seasonal closure (from Dec. 1 through Sept. 14) between Fishermen Bay and East Landing (including Shubrick area), and from east landing to southwest side of Saddle Rock.

\* The BRTF used a recommendation by the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary as a starting point for proposed special closures and modified that recommendation as necessary during its meeting.

**Table 3: Preliminary Area Calculations for the Integrated Preferred Alternative MPA Proposal**

	<b>Number of MPAs</b>	<b>Area (square miles)</b>	<b>Percentage of Study Region</b>
<b>State marine reserve</b>	11	88.15	11.55%
<b>State marine conservation area</b>	9	63.75	8.36%
<b>State marine park</b>	2	3.79	0.50%
<b>MPAs Total</b>	22	155.69	20.41%
<b>State marine recreational management area</b>	2	0.24	0.03%

Figure 1: Preliminary Comparison of Area Totals for MPA Proposals by Designation Type

