

## Draft Proposed Phase 1 Categorization of Marine Protected Area Petitions

In 2023, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) publicly released the first 10-year [comprehensive review](#) of California's Marine Protected Area (MPA) Network that included [28 adaptive management recommendations](#) prioritizing strategies for the next decade of MPA management. One of the near-term priority recommendations called for applying what was learned from the comprehensive management review to support proposed changes to the MPA Network and Management Program. To advance this recommendation, the California Fish and Game Commission (CFGC) requested that MPA regulation change petitions be submitted for their December 2023 meeting. CFGC received [20 petitions](#) with over 80 unique requests for changes to the MPA Network.

At their February 14-15, 2024 meeting, CFGC referred the 20 MPA petitions received to CDFW for review, evaluation, and recommendation. In addition, they requested CDFW provide an administrative update at their March 19 Marine Resources Committee (MRC) meeting on the approach they would take to evaluate the petitions. After discussion and input from interested stakeholders, the MRC recommended approval of CDFW's [proposed 3-phase approach](#) to evaluate MPA petitions, and the CFGC approved the approach at their April 17 meeting. CDFW has completed Phase 1 of the 3-phase approach and will present the proposed binning of petitions for discussion and consideration at the July MRC meeting. In addition to the MRC's regularly scheduled July 18 meeting, the CFGC approved a separate day on July 17 be added to the meeting for this discussion. There will be an update about the outcomes from this meeting at the August 14-15 CFGC meeting.

Petitions are categorized into two bins (Tables 1 and 2) using the criteria outlined below to determine which petitions can be evaluated in the near-term (Bin 1) and which petitions will require additional policy guidance, information, and/or resources prior to evaluation (Bin 2). The proposed binning of petitions by CDFW are recommendations for the MRC to consider at their July 17 meeting. It is anticipated the MRC will make a recommendation on the binning of petitions for the CFGC to consider at their August meeting. ***Inclusion in Bin 1 does not automatically mean the requests in any given petition will be granted.*** Following approval of the binning of petitions by CFGC, CDFW will move forward with the evaluation of Bin 1 petitions for subsequent discussion and consideration by the MRC and CFGC.

**Bin 1:** Petitions that can be evaluated in the ***near-term*** must meet all the following criteria:

- Policy direction not needed for next phases: The requested changes are consistent with existing policies regarding the MPA Network.
- Within CFGC authority: CFGC has clear regulatory authority over the changes requested in the MPA petitions.
- Immediate evaluation possible: Information and resources are available to evaluate petitions in the near-term
- Limited clarification needed from petitioner: The changes requested in the petitions are clear and understandable.
- Limited controversy anticipated: Changes that have limited impact on human uses and network design, such as minor boundary changes and/or updating regulatory language, are expected to cause limited controversy.



**Bin 2:** Petitions that do not meet all the above criteria are categorized into Bin 2. The analysis of these petitions will be more complex as they will likely require additional policy guidance, information, and/or resources *before* they move forward into the evaluation phase. Bin 2 petitions that could move forward based on CFGC guidance will be evaluated in the *longer-term*. In addition, due to the larger breadth and scope of these petitions, they will likely require more extensive coordination with California Native American Tribes, other government agencies, partners, and stakeholders.

The tables below outline the proposed Bin 1 and Bin 2 petitions. There are brief justifications following each table that describe why a metric was met or not, and why petitions are categorized into Bin 1 or Bin 2. CFGC is seeking feedback on the draft proposed binning of petitions into either Bin 1 or Bin 2. Comments should be sent directly to CFGC to inform the discussions scheduled for July 17, 2024 at the MRC meeting. Written comments must be received by CFGC by July 5 to be included in the July MRC meeting materials. The CFGC website includes [instructions for how to submit written comments](#) and a [schedule of upcoming Commission meetings](#).



**Table 1: Proposed Bin 1 Petitions.** N=No, Y=Yes. Y/N in the “Within CFGC Authority?” column indicates that some of the actions proposed in the petition do fall within the regulatory authority of the CFGC, while others are non-regulatory requests. MPA designations state marine reserve (SMR), state marine conservation area (SMCA).

CFGC Tracking No.	Name of Petitioner	Short Description	Policy guidance needed?	Within CFGC Authority?	Evaluate in the near-term?	Clarification needed from petitioner?	Limited controversy anticipated?
2023-22MPA	Wendy Berube, Orange County Coast Keeper	Change color coding on outreach maps, add language to tidepool take prohibitions, modify definition of tidepools, and allow research, monitoring, restoration, and education in Orange County MPAs, with the exception of Upper Newport Bay (Bolsa Chica, Laguna Beach, Crystal Cove, and Dana Point)	N	Y/N	Y	N	Y
2023-25MPA	Burton Miller	Change color designation of Blue Cavern Onshore and Casino Point SMCAs, change boundary of Long Point SMR, and remove allowance for feeding fish and Lover's Cove and Casino Point SMCAs.	N	Y/N	Y	N	Y
2023-26MPA	Lisa Gilfilan, WILD Coast	Shift Swami's SMCA south from the lifeguard tower to the State/Solana Beach line to cover tidepools on the south side and change map color of no-take SMCAs at Batiquitos Lagoon, San Elijo Lagoon, and Famosa Slough from purple to red.	N	Y/N	Y	N	Y
2023-30MPA_1	Robert Jamgochian	Change gear restrictions within Big River SMCA to only allow Type A hoop nets that are compatible and eliminate the hoop net Type B option (rigid frame) from general provisions, reduce the number of set traps allowed from 10 to 5, and reduce the bag and possession limit for recreational take of crabs from 10 to 5.	N	Y	Y	N	Y
2023-31MPA_1	Ashley Eagle-Gibbs, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin	Subsume Drake's Estero SMCA into Estero de Limantour SMR to create a single SMR.	N	Y	Y	N	Y



## Justifications for Proposed Bin 1 Petitions

Proposed Bin 1 petitions do not need policy direction from the CFGC to move forward with evaluation, are within CFGC regulatory authority, can be evaluated in the near-term, require minimal follow-up with the petitioner, and limited controversy is anticipated regarding petition requests. Justifications for each criterion are outlined below.

**Petition Number:** 2023-22MPA

**Petitioner:** Wendy Berube, Orange County Coastkeeper

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (N):** Changes requested do not require policy guidance from CFGC.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y/N):**
  - Modifying the descriptions of specific MPAs and updating regulatory language are within CFGC authority.
  - Changing the color of a purple no-take SMCA to red *on outreach materials only* is a non-regulatory request. However, alternative pathways for this and other similar non-regulatory requests may be explored as a part of the 3-phase approach to evaluate petitions.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (Y):** Related information and data needed to evaluate petition are currently available.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (Y):** Limited controversy anticipated because the requested changes are to simplify and clarify regulatory language.

**Petition Number:** 2023-25MPA

**Petitioner:** Burton Miller

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (N):** Changes requested do not require policy guidance from CFGC.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y/N):**
  - Boundary clarification at Long Point SMR, and the proposed removal of fish feeding from the regulations all fall within the CFGC's authority.
  - Changing the color of a purple no-take SMCA to red *on outreach materials only* is a non-regulatory request. However, alternative pathways for this and other similar non-regulatory requests may be explored as a part of the 3-phase approach to evaluate petitions.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (Y):** Related information and data needed to evaluate petition are currently available.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (Y):** Limited local controversy is anticipated regarding the request to end fish feeding within the Lover's Cove and Casino Point SMCAs.



**Petition Number:** 2023-26MPA

**Petitioner:** Lisa Gilfillan, WILD Coast

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (N):** Changes requested do not require policy guidance from CFGC.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y/N):**
  - Changing the boundaries of an MPA is within CFGC authority.
  - Changing the color of a purple no-take SMCA to red *on outreach materials only* is a non-regulatory request. However, alternative pathways for this and other similar non-regulatory requests may be explored as a part of the 3-phase approach to evaluate petitions.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (Y):** Related information and data needed to evaluate petition are currently available.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (Y):** Limited local controversy is anticipated regarding the proposed boundary shift.

**Petition Number:** 2023-30MPA

**Petitioner:** Robert Jamgochian

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (N):** Changes requested do not require policy guidance from CFGC.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** The proposed amendments to the allowed take and gear type are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (Y):** Related information and data needed to evaluate petition are currently available.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Limited clarification with the petitioner may be necessary to determine the request for Type A hoop nets only.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (Y):** Limited local controversy is anticipated regarding proposed change in Dungeness crab take regulations.

**Petition Number:** 2023-31MPA

**Petitioner:** Ashley-Eagle Gibbs, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (N):** Changes requested do not require policy guidance from the CFGC. The requested redesignation aligns with the intent of this MPA identified during the north central coast marine life protection act (MLPA) Initiative design and siting process to redesignate as an SMR once the pre-existing aquaculture lease was terminated.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** The proposed amendments to the allowed take and gear type are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (Y):** Related information and data needed to evaluate petition are currently available.



- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (Y):** Limited local controversy regarding ending recreational clamming. This petition is consistent with the recommendation of the northcentral coast MLPA regional stakeholder group at the end of the MLPA Initiative design and siting process.



**Table 2: Proposed Bin 2 Petitions.** N=No, Y=Yes. Y/N in the “Within CFGC Authority?” column indicates that some of the actions proposed in the petition do fall within the regulatory authority of the CFGC, while others are non-regulatory requests. MPA designations state marine reserve (SMR), state marine conservation area (SMCA).

CFGC Tracking No.	Name of Petitioner	Short Description	Policy guidance needed?	Within FGC Authority?	Evaluate in the near-term?	Clarification needed from petitioner?	Limited controversy anticipated?
2023-14MPA	David Goldberg, California Sea Urchin Commission	Allow commercial take of sea urchins in 9 SMCAs.	Y	Y	N	N	N
2023-15MPA	Blake Hermann	Reclassify three SMRs in the northern Channel Islands, Santa Barbara County, as SMCAs and allow either the limited take of highly migratory species and possession of coastal pelagic species, or allow the take of pelagic finfish.	Y	Y	N	N	N
2023-16MPA	Richard Ogg	Reclassify Stewarts Point and Bodega Head SMRs and SMCAs to allow commercial take of salmon by trolling.	Y	Y	N	N	N
2023-18MPA	Greg Helms	Create small SMCA within Vandenberg SMR; modify multiple MPAs within the Santa Barbara Channel to allow range of activities, from changes to take of natural resources restrictions to vessel landing requirements.	Y	Y/N	N	N	N
2023-19MPA	Sam Cohen, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians	Designate new Chitaqwi SMCA with a tribal take-exemption for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians along the central coast.	Y	Y	N	Y	N
2023-20MPA	Sam Cohen, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians	Add a tribal take exemption to Point Buchon SMCA for co-management with Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, and modify northern boundary of the Point Buchon SMR.	Y	Y	N	Y	N
2023-21MPA	Rosa Laucci, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation	Modify take allowances in Pyramid Point SMCA to no-take with tribal exemption and change northern boundary to align with California/Oregon border.	Y	Y	N	Y	N



CFGC Tracking No.	Name of Petitioner	Short Description	Policy guidance needed?	Within FGC Authority?	Evaluate in the near-term?	Clarification needed from petitioner?	Limited controversy anticipated?
2023-23MPA	Keith Rootsart, Giant Giant Kelp	Reclassify three SMCAs as SMRs, designate Tanker's Reef as an SMR, allow kelp restoration in these four MPAs as follows: allow unlimited urchin take, allow outplanting of kelp, kelp spore dispersal, and kelp canopy pruning without a DFW scientific collecting permit (SCP). Proposes several actions to support kelp restoration such as placement of buoys at restoration sites, establishing a new process for restoration permits in DFW SCP program, designating "adopted reefs," and others.	Y	Y/N	N	Y	N
2023-24MPA	Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition	Extend Laguna no-take SMCA southern boundary to the southern border of City of Laguna Beach, which will require modification of northern boundary of Dana Point SMCA.	N	Y	N	N	N
2023-27MPA	Azsha Hudson, Environmental Defense Center	Reclassify Anacapa SMCA as an SMR or reclassify the portion of the SMCA from shore to at least 30 meters deep.	Y	Y	N	N	N
2023-28MPA	Lisa Suatoni, Natural Resources Defense Council	Designate a new SMR around Point Sal in central California and consult with tribes first to determine whether an SMCA with exemptions for cultural and subsistence purposes.	Y	Y	N	N	N
2023-29MPA_1	Lisa Suatoni, Natural Resources Defense Council	Designate Mishopshno SMCA, a California-Chumash co-management MPA that allows take by members of Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians for traditional, ceremonial, cultural, and subsistence purposes.	Y	Y	N	Y	N
2023-32MPA_1	Ashley Eagle-Gibbs, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin	Change Duxbury Reef SMCA to an SMR, extend the southern boundary further south, and extend the northern boundary to the Double Point Special Closure.	Y	Y	N	N	N
2023-33MPA_1	Laura Deehan, Environmental California Research and Policy Center and Azul	Expand boundaries of SMCAs and SMRs, and designate new MPA.	Y	Y	N	N	N





CFGC Tracking No.	Name of Petitioner	Short Description	Policy guidance needed?	Within FGC Authority?	Evaluate in the near-term?	Clarification needed from petitioner?	Limited controversy anticipated?
2023-34MPA_1	Laura Deehan, Environmental California Research and Policy Center and Azul	Reclassify Point Buchon SMCA as an SMR, and modify regulations of Farnsworth Onshore and Offshore SMCAs to allow only recreational spearfishing.	Y	Y	N	N	N



## Justifications for Proposed Bin 2 Petitions

Petitions that do not meet the above criteria for Bin 1 petitions are categorized into Bin 2. The analysis of these petitions will be more complex as they will likely require additional policy guidance, information, and/or resources, before they can be evaluated. Below are brief justifications that describe why a metric was met or not.

**Petition Number:** 2023-14MPA

**Petitioner:** David Goldenberg, California Sea Urchin Commission

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding changing take regulations in SMCAs over a large geographic scale.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):**
  - Requested changes will require coordination with other management priorities such as the Kelp Restoration, Recovery, and Management Plan (KRMP) and updates to invertebrate take regulations.
  - A more in-depth examination of the original MPA design guidance will be needed for this petition before staff can analyze the proposed change.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Changing take regulations in several MPAs statewide is likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-15MPA

**Petitioner:** Blake Hermann

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding re-designation of entire SMRs into SMCAs.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require in-depth analysis of many resources and extensive coordination with external partners, including but not limited to the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuaries, National Parks Service, and National Marine Fisheries Service.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Redesignating SMRs to SMCAs is likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-16MPA

**Petitioner:** Richard Ogg

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding re-designation of entire SMRs to SMCAs.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.



- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require coordination with other management efforts regarding the ocean salmon fishery.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Redesignating SMRs to SMCA is likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-18MPA

**Petitioner:** Greg Helms

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding partial designation change of an SMR to an SMCA and modifications to special closures.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y/N):**
  - Creation of an SMCA and modifications to, or removal of, an existing state MPA or special closure are within CFGC authority.
  - Continued support of M2 radar is a non-regulatory request. Changing the color of a purple, no-take SMCA to red *on outreach materials only* is a non-regulatory request. However, alternative pathways for this and other similar non-regulatory requests may be explored as a part of the 3-phase approach to evaluate petitions.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Evaluation of this petition will require coordination with many external partners including National Marine Sanctuaries and the National Park Service. A more in-depth examination of the original MPA design guidance will also be needed to analyze the proposed changes.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** The partial redesignation and changes to special closures around the Channel Islands are likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-19MPA

**Petitioner:** Sam Cohen, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding approach to co-management of MPAs with California Native American Tribes and creation of new MPAs.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require coordination with the California Natural Resources Agency, other state and federal agencies, local jurisdictions, and other partners regarding policies for co-management of the state's natural resources with California Native American Tribes.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (Y):** Additional clarification needed from the petitioner regarding the definition of tribal co-management in the context of this petition and proposed regulation changes.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Establishing a new MPA is likely to be controversial.



**Petition Number:** 2023-20MPA**Petitioner:** Sam Cohen, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance on approach to co-management of MPAs with California Native American Tribes and changes in take regulations of an SMCA.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require coordination with the California Natural Resources Agency, other state and federal agencies, local jurisdictions, and other partners regarding policies for co-management of the state's natural resources with California Native American Tribes.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (Y):** Significant clarification is needed from the petitioner regarding the definition of tribal co-management in the context of this petition.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Decreasing the level of protection of an SMCA and proposed differences in take allowances by diverse sectors are likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-21MPA**Petitioner:** Rosa Laucci, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance on approach to co-management of MPAs with California Native American Tribes and the creation of a tribal take-only MPA.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require coordination with the California Natural Resources Agency, other state and federal agencies, local jurisdictions, and other partners regarding policies for co-management of the state's natural resources with California Native American Tribes.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (Y):** Clarification is needed from the petitioner about the tribal take exemption.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Creating a tribal-take only MPA and proposed differences in take allowances by diverse sectors are likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-23MPA**Petitioner:** Keith Rootsart, Giant Kelp Restoration

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding redesignation of entire MPAs and creation of new MPAs.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y/N):** Several requested changes are within CFGC authority, while many are non-regulatory requests.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Several requested changes will require coordination with other management priorities such as the KRMP and updates to statewide invertebrate take regulations. Evaluation of the requested changes will require in-depth analysis and coordination with many partners including National Marine Sanctuaries and several other state agencies.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (Y):** The scope of changes requested in this petition are extensive and complex and will require extensive coordination with the petitioner.



- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Establishment of new MPAs is likely to be controversial. Stakeholders in the Monterey area have consistently provided public comments on prior CFGC actions like those proposed within the petition, indicating a high degree of anticipated controversy on other petition components.

**Petition Number:** 2023-24MPA

**Petitioner:** Mike Beanan, Laguna Bluebelt Coalition

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (N):** Changes requested do not require policy guidance from the CFGC.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** A more in-depth examination of the original MPA design guidance will be needed for this petition to analyze the proposed change.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Public comments/letters have already been received by CDFW and CFGC about this petition, indicating a high degree of anticipated controversy.

**Petition Number:** 2023-27MPA

**Petitioner:** Azsha Hudson, Environmental Defense Center

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding re-designation of SMCA to SMR. The requested change does not align with the intent of this MPA identified during the Channel Islands planning process and would affect current tribal take allowances.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory Authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Evaluation of this petition will require coordination with the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians and many external partners including National Marine Sanctuaries, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the National Park Service. A more in-depth examination of the original MPA design guidance will also be needed to analyze the proposed changes.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Re-designation of entire MPA, effects on tribal take exemptions, and effects of proposed changes to the commercial and recreational lobster fisheries are likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-28MPA

**Petitioner:** Lisa Suatoni, Natural Resources Defense Council

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding the creation of new MPAs.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.



- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require coordination with the California Natural Resources Agency, other state and federal agencies, local jurisdictions, and other partners regarding policies for co-management of the state’s natural resources with California Native American Tribes.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Establishment of a new MPA is likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-29MPA

**Petitioner:** Lisa Suatoni, Natural Resources Defense Council

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding the creation of new MPAs.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Requested changes will require coordination with the California Natural Resources Agency, other state and federal agencies, local jurisdictions, and other partners regarding policies for co-management of the state’s natural resources with California Native American Tribes. A more in-depth examination of the original MPA design guidance will be needed for this petition before staff can analyze the proposed change.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (Y):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Establishment of a new MPA is likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-32MPA

**Petitioner:** Ashley Eagle-Gibbs, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding the redesignation of an SMCA to an SMR that does not align with MLPA design process intent of the MPA and expansion of the existing MPA.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** A more in-depth examination of the original MPA science design guidance will be needed to analyze the proposed change.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Due to this site being a popular area for human use, a designation change and boundary expansion are likely to be controversial.

**Petition Number:** 2023-33MPA

**Petitioner:** Laura Deehan, Environment California Research and Policy Center and Azul

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance regarding the redesignations of SMCAs to an SMRs that do not align with MLPA design process intent of the MPA, creation of a new MPA, and expansion of existing MPAs.



- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Because this petition's stated intent is to assist in kelp forest recovery, this petition will need to be evaluated in concert with the KRMP, which is not yet complete.
- **Is clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N)** Creation of a new MPA and large expansion of existing MPAs are likely to be controversial. There has already been significant local stakeholder discussion regarding the proposed Pleasure Point MPA in Santa Cruz County.

**Petition Number:** 2023-34MPA

**Petitioner:** Laura Deehan, Environment California Research and Policy Center and Azul

- **Is policy guidance needed for the next phase of evaluation? (Y):** Requires guidance on the redesignation of the SMCA to an SMR that does not align with MLPA design process intent of the MPA.
- **Does the petition fall within CFGC regulatory authority? (Y):** All requested regulatory changes are within CFGC authority.
- **Is immediate evaluation possible? (N):** Analysis will require a more in-depth examination of the original MPA design guidance regarding the proposed changes.
- **Is Clarification needed from the petitioner? (N):** Changes requested are straightforward and do not require detailed clarification from petitioner.
- **Is limited controversy anticipated? (N):** Anticipated to be highly controversial with the recreational and commercial fishing communities in the areas of the proposed changes.

