To: **MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group**

From: **MLPA I-Team**

Re: **Attached responses to science questions**

Date: **December 10, 2007**

Attached to this memo are MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) responses to science questions from your August 22-23, 2007 meeting as well as MLPA staff and preliminary SAT responses to questions from your October 16-17, 2007 meeting.

SAT responses to questions from your August 22-23 meeting have all been provisionally approved by the full SAT pending a few minor revisions and additional language. There are two responses that still require those minor revisions and those are labeled as such in the document

The responses provided to questions from your October 16-17 meeting have been addressed by MLPA Initiative and California Department of Fish and Game staff where those questions were either management or policy in nature. Science questions will be responded to by the SAT; where available, draft SAT work group responses are provided. The full SAT will review all draft responses at its next meeting and will continue to develop responses to questions that do not yet have a response.

California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team
Draft Responses to Science Questions Posed by the NCCRSG at its August 22-23, 2007 Meeting
Revised December 9, 2007

The following are draft responses of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) to questions posed by the MLPA North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) at its August 22-23, 2007 meeting. These draft responses have been prepared by work groups of the SAT.

1. **Are the deep water benthic habitats and water column habitat around the Farallon Islands unique as well as worthy of inclusion?**

   This response was adopted by the SAT at its October 1, 2007 meeting.

   Response: The SAT has identified the intertidal, subtidal, and water column habitats around the Farallon Islands as unique. (Please refer to the response to Question 2 from the list of questions from the NCCRSG July 10-11, 2007 meeting.) Habitats that are unique are, according to the regional goals and objectives, worthy of inclusion.

2. **Specifically – where does the subtidal start? For MLPA purposes does it only span to the extent of state waters or does it extend to XX depth (and if so what depth)?**

   This response was adopted by the SAT at its October 1, 2007 meeting.

   Response: The subtidal includes all habitats deeper than the mean lower low water level, including state, federal, and international waters (Please refer to the response to Question 2 from the list of questions from the NCCRSG July 10-11, 2007 meeting).

3. **What level of protection would you assign to marine protected areas (MPAs) that allow take of salmon, abalone, urchin, clams, *halibut, white seabass, and crab*?** (Mark Carr, Ray Hilborn)

   Draft Response: This response is incorporated in the *SAT Draft MLPA Evaluation Methods for MPA Array Proposals* document and requires further discussion before being adopted.

4. **What is range and pattern of movement for the various life-stages of yellow-eye rockfish, surfperch, greenling, cabezon, [monkeyfaced prickleback (a.k.a. monkeyfaced eel, *Cebidichthys violaceus*)] and [rock prickleback, (*Xiphister mucosus*)], halibut, and white seabass?** (Mark Carr, Jan Freiwald)

   This response was adopted by the full SAT at its November 13, 2007 meeting pending the addition of reference to the time frame of the studies and clarification of surfperch habitats.

   Draft response: A literature review conducted by Jan Freiwald shows that 75% of tagged individuals of the following species moved less than 0.5 km during the study period:

   - yellow-eye rockfish (*Sebastes ruberrimus*)

- surfperch (*Embiotoca jacksoni* and *E. lateralis*)
- greenling (*Hexagrammos decagrammus*)
- cabezon (*Scorpaenichthys marmoratus*)
- monkeyface prickleback (*Cebidichthys violaceus*)*

* A study on monkeyface prickleback movement was excluded from the literature review analysis because fewer than 10 individuals were tagged. However, all tagged individuals moved less than 3 km.

The SAT was unable to find information on the movement of rock prickleback or white seabass.

References

Coombs, C. I. 1979. Reef fishes near Depoe Bay, Oregon: movement and the recreational fishery. Oregon State University.

DeMott, G. E. 1983. Movement of tagged lingcod and rockfishes off Depoe Bay, Oregon. M.S. Thesis Oregon State University.

DeWees, C. M., and D. W. Gotshall. 1974. An experimental artificial reef in Humbold Bay, California. California Fish and Game 60.

Freiwald, unpublished

Helm, R. C. 1990. Population dynamics of an intertidal eel blenny, Cebidichthys violaceus: Diet, growth, homing, and avian predation. Ph.D. Thesis. University of California Davis.

Hixon, M. A. 1981. An experimental analysis of territoriality in the California reef fish Embiotoca jacksoni (Embiotocidae). Copeia 1981:653-665.

Lea, R. N., R. D. McAllister, and D. VenTresca. 1999. Biological aspects of nearshore rockfishes of the genus sebastes from Central California with notes on ecological related sport fishes Fish Bulletin 177.

Matthews, K. R. 1985. Species similarity and movement of fishes on natural and artificial reefs in Monterey Bay, California. Bulletin of Marine Science 37:252-270.

Miller, D. J., and J. J. Geible. 1973. Summery of blue rockfish and lingcod life histories; a reef ecology study, and giant kelp, Macrocystis pyrifera, experiments in Monterey Bay, California. Fish Bulletin 158:137.

Ralston, S. L., and M. H. Horn. 1986. High tide movements of the temperate-zone herbivorous fish Cebidichthys violaceus (Girard) as determined by ultrasonic telemetry. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 98:35-50.

California Halibut (Paralichthys Californicus)

Tagging studies of California halibut indicate that the majority of individuals remain in a localized area for extended periods of time, while others move long distances along the coast (Domeier and Chun 1995, Posner and Lavenberg 1999). In the Posner and Lavenberg study, 65% of recaptured halibut were recaptured within 5.5km of their release site (this is the highest resolution of movement provided by the data). In the Domeier and Chun study, 60% of recaptured halibut moved less than 2 km during the study period. The authors note that most recaptured fish were at liberty for fewer than 100 days likely due to a high rate of tag loss; however, even within that 100 days, some individuals moved more than 300 km.

Any distinctions between adult and juvenile patterns of movement are still unclear, as few of the halibut in these tagging studies were larger than the sport fishery size limit of 56 cm total length (17% in the Domeier and Chun, only 3% in Posner and Lavenberg). In the Domeier and Chun study, halibut larger than 50 cm (approx 30% of sample size) tended to travel markedly greater distances than halibut smaller than 50 cm.

A study focusing on juvenile California halibut settlement revealed preference either for bays or the open coast. However, almost all coastal settlers entered and used the bays as nursery areas during their first year of life, or else they died (Kramer 1991).

References

Domeier, ML and CSY Chun 1995. A Tagging Study of the California Halibut (Paralichthys Californicus). California Department of Fish and Game, CalCOFI Rep., Vol. 36

Kramer, SH 1991. Growth, mortality, and movements of juvenile California halibut Paralichthys californicus in shallow coastal and bay habitats of San Diego County, California. Fishery Bulletin 89(2) 195-207

Posner, M and RJ Lavenberg 1999. Movement of California halibut along the coast of California. California Fish and Game, Vol. 85(2) 45-55

5. **In the central coast study region the recommendation to extend MPAs to the three mile state water limit to cover the range of depths and species that utilize the range of depths made sense, but the north central coast study region is largely homogenous out to the three mile limit, so does it still require MPA extension to the three mile state water boundary?**

This response was adopted by the SAT at its November 13, 2007 meeting.

Draft response: The SAT recommends that MPAs be designed to extend from the intertidal to the boundary of state waters to encompass the depth-related movements of various species across the range of depths in state waters. The SAT recommends that MPAs in the 30-100 m depth range encompass as much of this depth range as possible out to the boundary of state waters, thereby protecting the collective number of species that occur there and accommodating their depth-related migrations.

In the case that the habitat is homogeneous (uniform substrate and uniform depth ±5m) across a broad area, MPAs should be designed to encompass adult neighborhood sizes and movement patterns in both alongshore and cross-shore directions. In the MPA design guidelines, the SAT recommends that MPAs span a minimum of 3 miles alongshore to encompass adult movement patterns. In cases where habitat is homogeneous across a broad area, adults are likely to extend their movement in both alongshore and cross-shore directions; therefore, MPAs should also extend a minimum of three miles seaward (towards the state waters boundary) to encompass these movements. The SAT notes that extending MPA boundaries to the edge of state waters has the added benefit of allowing for connections with possible future MPA designations in federal waters.

(For additional information please refer to the response to Question 4 from the list of questions from the NCCRSG July 10-11, 2007 meeting.)

6. **How do you evaluate proposals relative to Goal 2, Objective 2 for the protection of foraging, nursery and rearing areas?**
   a. **Specifically, also considering seabirds, mammals, and sharks.**

This response was adopted by the SAT at its November 13, 2007 meeting.

Draft response: (Question 6) Fish and invertebrates use habitats already named in the master plan for MPAs goals and objectives (such as estuaries and kelp forest/rocky reefs) for their foraging, nursery, and rearing activities. Therefore, evaluating proposals for protection of these habitats will suffice to evaluate protection of foraging, nursery and rearing areas for most fish and invertebrate species.

Draft response: (Question 6a – reference to sharks) An analysis of available information about shark breeding, forage, and nursery areas indicates that sharks largely use habitats already named in the master plan for MPAs goals and objectives (such as estuaries and soft bottom) for these activities (see table below). Therefore, evaluating proposals for protection of these habitats will suffice to evaluate protection of foraging, nursery and rearing areas for most shark species in the study region. The special importance of estuarine habitats for certain species of shark should be noted. Proposals that protect a high proportion of the available estuarine habitats will be especially protective of these species.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Forage Areas	Breeding Areas	Nursery Areas
Sevengill shark	*Notorynchus cepedianus*	San Francisco Bay (SFB)	SFB birthing	SFB
Spiny dogfish	*Squalus acanthias*	SFB	(season: Sept-Jan)	young occupy pelagic
Angel shark	*Squatina californica*	soft flat bottoms near vertical relief	unknown	unknown
Basking shark	*Cetorhinus maximus*	near-surface filter feeders: areas of abundant plankton	unknown	thought to be in plankton-rich oceanic waters at higher latitutdes and far away from coastal areas

Common Name	Scientific Name	Forage Areas	Breeding Areas	Nursery Areas
White shark	*Carcharodon carcharias*	Farallons, Bodega Headlands, Ano Nuevo	unknown	warm-temperate areas
Leopard shark	*Triakis semifasciata*	SFB, Tomales, Drakes Estero	(in spring) SFB birthing within eel grass beds	SFB, Tomales, Drakes Estero
Brown smoothhound shark	*Mustelus henlei*	SFB, Tomales	unknown	SFB, Tomales
Soupfin shark	*Galeorhinus galeus*	demersal and pelagic	(in spring)	SFB, Tomales (# has declined to since fishery of 30's-40's, still under historic levels)
Torpedo ray	*Torpedo californica*	sandy bottoms, near kelp beds, around rocky reefs	unknown	unknown
Big skate	*Raja binoculata*	coastal benthic	unknown	unknown
California skate	*Raja inornata*	nearshore soft bottom benthic	unknown	unknown
Longnose skate	*Raja rhina*	on or near reefs with vertical relief	unknown	unknown
Starry skate	*Raja stellulata*	nearshore benthic	unknown	unknown
Bat ray	*Myliobatis californicus*	SFB, Tomales, Drakes Estero	unknown	SFB, Tomales, Drakes Estero
White-spotted chimaera	*Hydrolagus colliei*	benthic mud or cobblestone near vertical relief	(maximum spawning during spring and summer) egg cases deposited on mud or gravel substrate	Cordell Banks
Salmon shark	*Lamna ditropis*	Nearshore to deep oceanic waters, from the surface to depths of 375m	Ovoviviparous, breeding occurs in fall and birthing in late spring (2-4 pups); gestation is believed somewhat less than one year	Central California is the most common area for ages zero and one; selected nursery areas offer rich feeding and relatively few potential predators

Draft response: (Question 6a – reference to birds and mammals) This response is incorporated in the *SAT Draft MLPA Evaluation Methods for MPA Array Proposals* document and requires further discussion before being adopted.

7. **Provide an estimate of number of pinnipeds in the area and an estimate of weight of fish taken.**
   a. **Also want to know what impacts range expansion of Humboldt squid has and how that should be considered.**

This response was adopted by the SAT at its November 13, 2007 meeting.

Draft response: (Question 7) Five pinniped species commonly occur in the north central coast study region: harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*), California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*), Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*), northern fur seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*), and northern elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*). Of these species, only harbor seals are year-round residents; other species visit the region seasonally or are migratory. Peak abundance estimates for these species in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region are:

Harbor seals: ~8000—during the breeding season
California sea lions: ~2000—most are male winter visitors to the study region
Steller sea lions: ~250—southern limit of the species, with small breeding colonies in the study region
Northern fur seals: ~250—this species migrates through the region primarily offshore of state waters, but there is a small breeding population at the Farallons
Northern elephant seals: ~3000—migratory and present in the study region during breeding and molting seasons, likely do not feed in the area

These numbers are the best available average peak population estimates, and actual numbers can vary greatly. Furthermore, abundances and behaviors vary among seasons and among species.

Population fluctuations and seasonal variation in feeding intensity make it difficult to provide accurate estimates of the total weight of fish taken in the study region by pinnipeds. Current estimates are that actively feeding pinnipeds consume from 4% to 10% of their body weight each day, with an average of 6%. Juveniles and pregnant females consume a higher percentage of their body weight than non-pregnant adults. It is important to note that not all pinnipeds are actively feeding during the breeding season. Also, many pinnipeds target juvenile or mid-sized fish, not large mature individuals. Average pinniped body size and a rough estimate of the weight of fish consumed daily are presented in the table below.

Species	Avg. Female (lbs)	Avg. Male (lbs)	Weight of Prey Consumed (lbs/day)	Prey Species
Harbor Seal	180	180	10	Fish, squid, octopus
Cal. Sea Lion	180	600	10-35	Fish, squid, octopus

Steller Sea Lion	580	1250	30-75	Fish, squid, octopus
Northern Fur Seal	100	525	10-30	Small fish, invertebrates

Northern elephant seals likely do not feed in the area, instead migrating to Alaska and the north Pacific gyre to feed.

References

Lowry, M.S., J.V. Carretta, and K.A. Forney. 2005. Pacific harbor seal census in California during May-July 2004. NMFS SWFSC Admin. Report LJ-05-06.

Manna, J., D. Roberts, D. Press, and S. Allen. 2006. Harbor seal monitoring, San Francisco Bay area. Annual report, NPS.

Sydeman, W.J. and S.G. Allen. 1999. Pinniped population dynamics in central California: correlations with sea surface temperature and upwelling indices. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 15: 446-461.

Personal communication: Sarah Allen (Point Reyes National Seashore), Beth Phillips (Marine Wildlife Veterinary Care and Research Center), Jacquie Hilterman (The Marine Mammal Center, and Dede Sabbag (The Marine Mammal Center).

Note that a similar question was asked during the MLPA Central Coast Project; that question and response are:

Question: What are historic and recent population trends (spatial and temporal) of marine mammals (sea lions, harbor seals and sea otters specifically)? What are their diets? What is the impact of their feeding on commercially and recreationally important species?

Efforts to protect and rebuild marine fish and shellfish populations within marine protected areas by restricting or prohibiting fishing may be undermined by consumption of species of concern by top-end predators, chiefly marine mammals. Some stakeholders believe that the effect of such predation should be evaluated and, where possible, steps taken to address possible impacts of top end predators on MPAs.

Relation to the MLPA and MPF (Master Plan Framework) and Other Relevant Law: The MLPA and the MPF are silent on the impact of marine mammals and other top-end predators. Predation by marine mammals is not one of the major threats identified in the act. Nor does the act single out particular species or groups of species. Instead, the act focuses upon ecosystems. Passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act in 1972 and the Endangered Species Act in 1973 pre-empted the management authority of individual states over marine mammals and species listed under the Endangered Species Act. With few exceptions, both acts prohibit the taking of species under their jurisdiction. Taking includes intentional and unintentional hunting, harm, harassment, or injury. Under the ESA, these prohibitions may be extended to species listed as threatened, as they have been for the southern sea otter. Exemptions to these prohibitions are very limited, generally to taking by Native Americans for certain purposes, taking for scientific research, public display, or enhancement, or taking incidental to commercial fishing or other non-fishing activities. The regulatory requirements for the use of these exemptions are very rigorous.

Both the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act emphasize the role of marine mammals, and other species, in maintaining healthy ecosystems. Similarly, the MLPA takes an ecosystem-based approach, rather than an ecosystem management approach, which would suggest that we have the knowledge and experience to manage ecosystems through manipulation of species.

Recommendation: Below, MLPA Initiative staff have provided a summary of available information on population trends and diets of California sea lions, harbor seals, and southern sea otters. While the California sea lion population continues to grow, harbor seal and southern sea otter populations have remained relatively steady. Although estimates are available for total consumption rates by California sea lions, no analysis has been conducted on the short-term or long-term impact of this consumption on populations of prey. As discussed in the response to another information request of the CCRSG, it does appear that southern sea otters have had an impact on the abundance of some invertebrate populations. The State of California does not have management authority for marine mammals or species listed under the Endangered Species Act. Staff recommends that in designing and evaluating MPAs, the CCRSG take note of the presence of marine mammals in MPA areas and, if appropriate, include the impacts of marine mammals on species of concern in recommended targets for monitoring. Like other monitoring information, this information should be used to monitor the effectiveness of an MPA and to manage it adaptively in the future.

Further information: The following responses emphasize information from central California over information from other regions. Little to no information on historical abundances was available for California sea lions, harbor seals, and southern sea otters, although some early estimates are included for the purposes of comparison with later systematic censuses.

California sea lions: The range of California sea lions extends from the Pacific coast of Baja California to southern British Columbia. These animals breed primarily in the southern part of their range from the Gulf of California to San Miguel Island. Commercial hunting in the 19th and early 20th centuries likely reduced California sea lion populations. In the late 1920s, only 1,000-1,500 California sea lions were counted on the shores of California. Since a general moratorium on hunting marine mammals was imposed with passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) in 1972, the population has grown substantially to a current estimate of 237,000-244,000 animals. Between 1975 and 2001, the population grew at an average annual rate of 5.4%. California sea lions are plastic specialist predators—that is, they feed on specific species of prey, which change as different species become more abundant seasonally or from year to year. In the case of California sea lions, these species include Pacific hake, northern anchovy, Pacific sardine, spiny dogfish, and squid. In a recent study at Año Nuevo Island, sea lions were found to feed on rockfishes, Pacific whiting, market squid, Pacific sardine, northern anchovy, spiny dogfish shark, and salmonids (Weise and Harvey 2005). Based on this research, Weise and Harvey estimated sea lions in central California consumed 8,406 - 8,447 tons of prey species in 2001-2002, of which 450 tons-1,525 tons were salmonids. In recent years, salmon fishermen have increasingly complained about damage to gear and catches by California sea lions. Between 1997 and 1999, Monterey Bay commercial fishermen suffered estimated losses that ranged from $18,031 to $60,570 for gear and $225,833 to $498,076 in salmon (Weise and Harvey *in press*). For the same period, Weise and Harvey estimated that sea lions fed upon hooked salmon at rates that ranged from 8.5% to 28.6% in the commercial fishery, 2.2% to 18.36% in the CPFV fishery, and 4.0% to 17.5% in the personal skiff fishery. Predation rates were highest in the El Niño year of 1998 when the abundance of other prey was reduced.

Harbor Seals: Harbor seals in the eastern Pacific range from the Pribilof Islands in Alaska to Isla San Martin off Baja. Between the Mexican and Canadian borders, harbor seals have been managed as three separate stocks, of which one is the stock off California. After passage of the MMPA in 1972, harbor seal abundance grew rapidly until 1990, when stocks leveled off. There has been no net population growth in California since 1990 (Caretta *et al.* 2004). In 2002, the population was estimated at 27,863 animals. Harbor seals eat a wide variety of pelagic and benthic prey, including small schooling fishes such as northern anchovy, many species of flatfishes, rockfishes, and cephalopods (Antonelis and Fiscus 1980, Weise and Harvey 2001 and references therein). Diet studies of harbor seals in central California did not find evidence of predation on ocean-swimming salmonids, though they were found to eat small salmonids returning to spawning streams in central and northern California (NMFS 1997; Weise and Harvey 2001).

Southern Sea Otters: Once ranging from northern California to Punta Abreojos in Baja California Sur, with few exceptions, southern sea otters are now found only from Point Año Nuevo in Santa Cruz County to Purisima Point in Santa Barbara County (USFWS 1995, 2003). Commercial hunting severely reduced sea otter populations in the 18th and 19th centuries. By 1914, the California population of sea otters may have numbered as few as 50 animals. Between 1983 and 1994, the sea otter population grew at an average annual rate of 5-6%, and reached a maximum observed population size of 2,377 individuals in the spring of 1995. Sea otter numbers have fluctuated since then. Since 1998, the population has increased at a rate of 0.9%, based on the three-year running average. Though recent estimates indicate that the population is growing, recovery is still inhibited by a variety of factors that contribute to otter mortality including: incidental drowning in gill and trammel nets, oil spills, toxic contaminants, other human impacts, and disease (Hanni *et al.* 2003, Miller *et al.* 2004, USFWS 2003). Otters have been shown to be a keystone species, exerting strong top-down control on their prey species (Estes and Palmisano 1974, Estes and Duggins 1995). Their predation on sea urchins has been shown to limit urchin abundance, allowing for the growth of kelp forests and associated species (Estes and Palmisano 1974, Estes and Duggins 1995). Sea otters have a varied diet consisting of benthic invertebrates such as red sea urchins (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*), red (*Haliotis rufescens*) and black abalone (*H. cracherodii*), kelp crabs (*Pugettia producta*), clams (*Gari californica*), and cancer crabs (*Cancer spp.*) (Ostfeld 1982). Expansion of sea otter populations, following protection from harvest, resulted in conflicts with commercial and recreational abalone fisheries that had developed when otter numbers were depressed and abalone were abundant (Estes and VanBlaricom 1985). In some locations, predation by otters may have a larger effect on red abalone populations than current human harvest rates (Fanshawe *et al.* 2003). **–End of MLPA Central Coast Project response-**

Draft response: (Question 7a) Though observational field data shows a recent increase in the number of Humboldt squid (*Dosidicus gigas*) in the California Current ecosystem, it is currently unknown whether these observations represent a permanent range expansion or a temporary intrusion into the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region at the limit of its range. There is insufficient information on Humboldt squid abundances and feeding habits to accurately predict how increases in their numbers (whether temporary or permanent) can impact local ecosystems. However, as Humboldt squid are predators of commercially-important fish species, as well as being prey of species at higher trophic levels, impacts are conceivable. For the purpose of the MLPA initiative, however, Humboldt squid will probably have negligible direct impacts, as they occur outside of state waters in areas deeper than 200m.

References

Field, J.C., K. Baltz, A.J. Phillips, and W.A. Walker. 2007. Range expansion and trophic interactions of the jumbo squid, *Dosidicus gigas*, in the California Current. In press.

Gilly, W.F., U. Markaida, C.H. Baxter, B.A. Block, A. Boustany, L. Zeidberg, K. Reisenbichler, B. Robison, G. Bazzino, and C. Salinas. 2006. Vertical and horizontal migrations by the jumbo squid *Dosidicus gigas* revealed by electronic tagging. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 324: 1-17.

Pearcy, W.G. 2002. Marine nekton off Oregon and the 1997-98 El Nino. Prog. Ocean. 54: 399-403.

Waluda, C.M., C. Yamashiro, C.D. Elvidge, V.R. Hobson, and P.G. Rodhouse. 2004. Quantifying light-fishing for Dosidicus gigas in the eastern Pacific using satellite remote sensing. Rem. Sens. Envir. 91: 129-133.

Zeidberg, L.D. and B.H. Robison. 2007. Invasive range expansion by the Humboldt squid, *Dosidicus gigas*, in the eastern North Pacific. PNAS 104: 12948-12950.

8. **Request a finer gradation of the chart Steve Gaines presented on species home range of 10-100 kilometers. *[Is it possible to disaggregate the 10-100 km category for home ranges into a finer set?]*** (Mark Carr, Jan Freiwald, Rick Starr)

   This response requires further review before being adopted by the SAT.

   Draft response: Robust studies of the movements of west coast fish and invertebrates are limited, but a thorough review of available literature conducted by Jan Freiwald, enabled a refinement of the adult movement chart

Adult Movement of West Coast Fish and Invertebrates

Move 0-1 km	Move 1-10 km	Move 10-100 km
0-0.5 km striped surfperch pile surfperch Pacific staghorn sculpin painted greenling kelp greenling kelp bass kelp rockfish black-and-yellow rockfish widow rockfish vermillion rockfish yelloweye rockfish olive rockfish monkeyface prickleback* cabezon black surfperch red irish lord brown rockfish copper rockfish quillback rockfish starry rockfish* grass rockfish* rosy rockfish* treefish*	**1-5 km** gopher rockfish blue rockfish bocaccio California halibut** walleye surfperch* greenspotted rockfish*	**10-20 km** Dungeness crab lingcod yellowtail rockfish black rockfish **20-125 km** canary rockfish

* studies of this species had fewer than 10 individuals

** see the response to question 4 in this document for more information

9. **The master plan for MPAs science guidelines suggest that marine assemblages may differ depending on the substrate type, even within the broad 'hard bottom' category. Specifically they suggest there may be differences in assemblages in and over granitic and sedimentary substrate on the central coast. In this regard:**
    a. **Does the same hold true for granitic, sedimentary, and Franciscan substrate on the north central coast?**
    b. **If so, does the SAT know of some way to predict where these substrates occur given the Rikk Kvitek data or otherwise?**
    c. **Can the SAT provide more information on what the composition of the assemblages is likely to be in and over these different substrate types? *(so regional stakeholders know what they're trying to protect, if necessary)***

This response was adopted by the SAT at its October 1, 2007 meeting.

Response: (Question 9a) In general granitic rock forms high relief, broad, dome-shaped reefs relative to sedimentary rock, which tends to form narrow linear ridges, while the relief and morphology of Franciscan formations is highly variable and tends toward isolated sea stacks. In the central coast region, studies have shown that substrate relief influences fish assemblages. There is no data in the NCCSR to determine if such species-habitat relationships occur in the north central region, however, it is likely that reef relief influences fish assemblages in the region, as it does elsewhere.

Response: (Question 9b) Interpretation of multibeam imagery of the ocean floor by Dr. Guy Cochrane (U.S. Geological Survey) and Irina Kogan (Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary) in combination with other geological resources indicates that hard substrates in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region include granitic and sedimentary rocks of the Salinian terrace, sedimentary rocks of the Great Valley Complex, and metasedimentary and metavolcanic rocks of the Franciscan Complex.

- From Pigeon Point (southern boundary of the study region) north to Elephant Rock (just south of Tomales Point) coastal substrate is largely sedimentary rock. Exceptions include:
  - Granite in Montara
  - Franciscan metasedimentary and metavolcanic rocks between Point San Pedro (Pacifica) and in Daly City where the San Andreas fault cuts across the coastline
  - Franciscan rocks (mix of rock types like in the Big Sur coast) between the Golden Gate and eastern Bolinas Lagoon (Wentworth 1997, USGS Open File Report 97-744 Part 5)
- Rock formations from Elephant Rock to Mussel Point and extending offshore to the northwest are granitic.
- From north of Mussel Point to Northwest Cape along the mainland (east of the San Andreas Fault) the substrate is metamorphic Franciscan.
- Rock formations from Northwest Cape to Point Arena are sedimentary (Great Valley Complex turbidite sandstone and conglomerate) (Blake et al. 2002, USGS Miscellaneous field studies map MF-2402).

Response: (Question 9c) There are no data in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region to allow the science advisory team to predict how fish assemblages may vary across the three available substrate types. Based on studies conducted in the MLPA Central Coast Study Region, it is likely that sedimentary formations will support relatively more foliose red algae than benthic invert cover due to the friable/erodable nature of the rock which does not provide a firm substrate for invertebrates. It is also likely that the softer sedimentary substrate will support a greater proportion of burrowing species (e.g., Pholad clams).

California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team
Draft Responses to Questions Received at the October 16-17, 2007 NCCRSG Meeting

Revised December 7, 2007

The questions listed below were received at the NCCRSG meeting on October 16-17, 2007. MLPA I-Team staff and the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) co-chairs have reviewed the questions and determined that some are policy/management based, others are science-based, and still others have both policy and science components.

This document contains responses to all of these questions. I-Team staff has provided responses to the policy/management questions, while the SAT has provided responses to the science questions. Some questions contain both policy and science responses.

1. **Would allowance of shore-based angling along a broad (100 yard) ribbon of the coast be acceptable and what impact would this have on the protection level of an MPA?**

   Staff response: Each of these areas will, by definition, be classified as state marine conservation areas or state marine parks (SMCAs or SMPs) and will be evaluated against the California Department of Fish and Game's (DFG's) feasibility criteria as well as be given a level of protection by the SAT. DFG's recommendation is to propose an SMCA or SMP that allows fishing from shore. A boundary distance offshore is not recommended since 100 yard fishing zones are not easily enforced and this could negate the intent to allow only shore-based fishing. DFG recommends against a separate narrow SMCA that allows fishing sited adjacent to and inshore of an SMR or other designation. This creates an abrupt change in regulations, multiple designations in a small area, is difficult to enforce, and creates difficulties for public understanding. DFG recommends that the SAT provide input on the ecological impacts of shore-based fishing on the overall level of protection of the area.

   Draft SAT response: A draft response to this question is still being formulated.

2. **Where is the sewer outfall from San Francisco in relation to the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary?**

   Staff response: The outfall for San Francisco's treated sanitary wastewater is outside of the Gulf of the Farallones and Monterey Bay National Marine sanctuaries. The outfall is approximately 5 nautical miles west of the San Francisco/San Mateo County boundary, near the 20 meter depth contour. The eastern boundary of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary is approximately 4 nautical miles west of the outfall. The eastern boundary of the Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary is approximately 8 nautical miles west of the outfall.

   Reference: Oceanside Biology Laboratory. August 2007. Southwest Ocean Outfall Regional Monitoring Program 2006 Data Report. Prepared for San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Natural Resources and Land Management Division.

Accessed online 1 November 2007 http://www.mbnms-simon.org/docs/project/100212_2005_report.pdf

3. How should the NCCRSG consider or deal with international telecommunication cables that are being installed and may cross MPAs or future wave farms that may not allow access?

Staff response: A policy memo from the California Department of Fish and Game will be provided to the NCCRSG addressing the issue of other management measures, such as wave farms, which may impact the NCCRSG's deliberations.

4. Have any wave farms been proposed for this study region?

Staff response: Four wave energy proposals for California are currently under review by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Additionally, one tidal energy proposal is under review. None of these proposals are within the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region, though at least two border the region closely. The proposals are:

1. Pacific Gas & Electric: "WaveConnect" pilot project off Humboldt Bay and Fort Bragg. The FERC application is for a 136 square mile study area off Humboldt Bay and 68 square mile area in Mendocino. The actual test sites could be about 1-4 square miles in area and would test multiple types of devices for a period of 3 years. They are not considering any on- or near-shore devices. The pilot project could be near 3 miles offshore.
2. Chevron: Two 40-megawatt wave farms off Fort Bragg are proposed.
3. Finavera: Planning to apply for a preliminary permit for the area north of Trinidad (Big Lagoon area). Finavera's plan is to install and test 4 buoy systems to generate 250 megawatts, on average. The four buoys would take up an area of ocean bottom approximately 950' by 200'.
4. Fairhaven Wave Energy: Proposal to place 40 to 80 wave energy converters (20 megawatts) in a site approximately ½ mile wide by 4 miles long northwest of Eureka.
5. Golden Gate Energy: Proposal is to develop a tidal current energy system. The system would be installed below the Golden Gate Bridge and use existing infrastructure for placement.

5. Can the SAT analyze displacement effects?

Staff response: This question was responded to at the NCCRSG meeting both by staff and SAT member Astrid Scholz; it is additionally addressed in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review of the central coast MPAs. It is extremely difficult to predict human behavior and response to fishery closed areas. At present, the spatial data necessary to effectively conduct this analysis is not available; such an analysis requires high precision small scale data on catch and fishing behavior. Monitoring efforts of the recently implemented central coast MPAs may in the future provide some insight into fishing behavioral shifts and displacement effects.

Reference

Jones & Stokes. 2006. *Environmental Impact Report: California marine Life Protection Act Initiative Central Coast marine Protected Areas Project.* Draft. November. State Clearinghouse #2006072060. (J&S 06682.06) Oakland, CA. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Game, Marine Region, Monterey, CA.

6. Is an MPA that protects Farallon rockfish likely to increase the abundance of juvenile rockfish in the Farallon subregion?

This response still requires review and further clarification by the full SAT before being adopted.

Draft SAT response: The interaction between adult and larval rockfish numbers within the Farallon subregion is a complex issue that depends on a number of physical and biological conditions. Though protecting adult rockfish in the Farallones should increase larval production through increased survival, growth, and age of adults, it is unclear if those larvae will be exported from the subregion or survive to adulthood if they are retained there. Complex current patterns around the Farallones could retain larvae near the islands or advect them inshore, where they could replenish populations along the coast, particularly those in the lee of Point Reyes due to the established current gyre in that area.

However, a growing number of studies indicate a surprising rate of local retention of larvae associated with islands (Hellberg et al. 2002, Kingsford et al. 2002, Sponaugle et al. 2002, Swearer et al. 2002, Thorrold et al. 2002, Warner & Cowen 2002). If larvae are retained at the Farallones, their contribution to adult rockfish populations depends on the size of the initial adult populations. Since adult rockfish prey on young rockfish (Hallacher & Roberts 1985), low initial adult populations (presumably due to fishing and marine mammal predation) would lead to higher juvenile survival. High numbers of adults (presumably due to protection from fishing) would decrease the survival rate of juvenile rockfish due to predation. However, predation might eventually increase larval production by providing increased growth and fecundity in adults. Due to natural variation in larval production and the uncertain role played by local currents, quantifying increases in larval production due to protection of adults in the Farallon subregion will be difficult.

References

Hallacher, L.E. and D.A. Roberts. 1985. Differential utilization of space and food by the inshore rockfishes (Scorpaenidae: *Sebastes*) of Carmel Bay, California, USA. Env. Biol. of Fishes 12: 91-110.

Hellberg, M.E., R.S. Burton, J.E. Neigel, and S.R. Palumbi. 2002. Genetic assessment of connectivity among marine populations. Bull. Mar. Sci. 70: 273-290.

Kingsford, M.J., J.M. Leis, A. Shanks, K.C. Lindeman, S.G. Morgan, and J. Pineda. 2002. Sensory environments, larval abilities and local self-recruitment. Bull. Mar. Sci. 70: 309-340.

Sponaugle, S., R.K. Cowen, A. Shanks, S.G. Morgan, J.M. Leis, J. Pineda, G.W. Boehlert, M.J. Kingsford, K.C. Lindeman, C. Grimes, and J.L. Munro. 2002. Predicting self-recruitment in marine populations: biophysical correlates and mechanisms. Bull. Mar. Sci. 70: 341-375.

Swearer, S.E., J.S. Shima, M.E. Hellberg, S.R. Thorrold, G.P. Jones, D.R. Robertson, S.G. Morgan, K.A. Selkoe, G.M. Ruiz, and R.R. Warner. 2002. Evidence of self-recruitment in demersal marine populations. Bull. Mar. Sci. 70: 251-271.

Thorrold, S.R., G.P. Jones, M.E. Hellberg, R.S. Burton, S.E. Swearer, J.E. Neigel, S.G. Morgan, and R.R. Warner. 2002. Quantifying larval retention and connectivity in marine populations with artificial and natural markers. Bull. Mar. Sci. 70: 291-308.

Warner, R.R. and R.K. Cowen. 2002. Local retention of production in marine populations: evidence, mechanisms, and consequences. Bull. Mar. Sci. 70: 245-249.

Personal communication: Dr. Mark Carr and Dr. Pete Raimondi.

7. **The NCCRSG would like the SAT to (re)consider and comment on the following as possible additions to the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs.** (An NCCRSG workgroup was tasked to come up with a list and rationale for review of particular species – see additional discussion points in Appendix I)
   a. Flat abalone, *Haliotis walallensis*, and Northern abalone, *Haliotis kamtschatkana (see Rogers*-Bennett, 2007, Sloan, 2004, and Gladstone, 2002)
   b. White sharks - SAT response to NCCRSG questions (revised Oct 12), "Since little is known about the breeding locations of white sharks, protecting forage species in areas where white sharks aggregate (e.g. the Farallones, Tomales Point) would likely benefit them."
   c. Salmonids - SAT response to NCCRSG questions (revised Oct 12), "Placing a protected area in the coastal waters offshore of the river mouth will protect salmon during a crucial life stage."

   Draft SAT response: A draft response to this question is still being formulated.

8. **Would the designation of a state marine reserve or other MPA around the mouth of a major estuary make a significant contribution to protection of anadromous fish that spawn upstream?**
   a. Does the SAT have comments on what size and setback is likely to be protective? Would a fairly narrow boundary accomplish resource protection?
   b. Is there a risk of boats "fishing the line" if the boundary is drawn tight to the mouth of a river?

   Draft SAT response to question 8: A draft response to this question is still being formulated.

   Draft SAT response to question 8a: A draft response to this question is still being formulated.

   Staff response to question 8b: It is the California Department of Fish and Game's (DFG's) experience in the Channel Islands and elsewhere that fishing effort is often exerted near the boundaries of area-based fishery closures. DFG enforcement staff are, however, very familiar with enforcing boundary line regulations for both MPAs and other management. If the intent of a protected area is to protect fish returning to a specific spawning location, the area should be large enough to protect the congregation of animals around that location.

9. **What impact would the delineation of "vessel no traffic zones" of varying widths have on the level of protection assigned to an MPA?**
    a. What would be the specific benefit to seabirds and marine mammals?

Draft SAT response to question 9: A draft response to this question is still being formulated.

Staff response to question 9: The California Department of Fish and Game has issued a memo to the NCCRSG on the use of "special closures." This memo provides information to supplement the SAT response still being formulated.

Staff response to question 9a: This question was previously addressed. Please see the response to question 6 from the NCCRSG July 10-11, 2007 meeting.

Appendix I. Additional rationale and discussion provided by the NCCRSG for considering the species listed in Question 7.

a. Flat abalone, *Haliotis walalensis*, and Northern abalone, *Haliotis kamtschatkana (see Rogers*-Bennett, 2007, Sloan, 2004, and Gladstone, 2002)

   Rationale for this is based on the above scientific literature. Both species are under threat because of ocean warming contracting the southern portion of their ranges, the expansion of the sea otters range, and for the flat abalone, a commercial fishery in Oregon. They would also be a good candidate for "flagship" species that would highlight the need for kelp bed community conservation (Sloan, 2004). Gladstone (2002) included them with other mollusks as important indicator assemblages. In the mid- 90s, flat abalone were routinely observed at Saunder's Reef (*Lance Morgan, pers. comm., Oct. 2007)*.

b. White sharks - SAT response to NCCRSG questions (revised Oct 12), "Since little is known about the breeding locations of white sharks, protecting forage species in areas where white sharks aggregate (e.g. the Farallones, Tomales Point) would likely benefit them."

   The following provides additional rationale and discussion for and against the inclusion of white sharks to the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs. These discussion points were summarized from email discussions among the NCCRSG about this topic.

   Discussion and rationale against inclusion of white sharks to the list of species likely to benefit:

   1. White sharks are already protected from fishing therefore would not benefit any further.
   2. The forage base of white sharks is marine mammals, which are also fully protected.
   3. Since little is known about the breeding locations of white sharks any considerations of MPA placement for benefiting white sharks would entail a ‘shotgun’ approach which is unacceptable for all other MPA requirements.
   4. The feeding grounds for white sharks are very broad. “They eat whenever and where ever they want” therefore would not benefit from MPAs aimed at protecting forage.
   5. There is no need to minimize human disturbance to foraging behavior. Seals have been known to board vessels to escape feeding white sharks. Therefore, white shark feeding behavior is not disturbed by vessel presence.

   Discussion and rationale for inclusion of white sharks to the list of species likely to benefit:

   1. Although white sharks are protected they would still gain benefit from additional protective designations such as MPAs since interactions with humans may still result in some level of take.

2. White sharks are internationally recognized as threatened and appear on the IUCN's red list and in CITES appendices.
3. There are only four places where white sharks congregate in central and north central California. Three of those locations lie in the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region.
4. It has been suggested that research is beginning to show there are limited numbers of white sharks and that some individuals may move between all four sites described above.
5. As apex predators white sharks have small population sizes and are highly susceptible to human disturbance and impacts.
6. White sharks mature late and have low fecundity.
7. The Farallon Islands are an important white shark study area due to location and low human impact.
8. Allowing take of other organisms increases risks to white sharks.
9. White sharks frequent the same foraging grounds annually, therefore protecting forage grounds increases protection to white sharks.
10. As an apex predator they promote ecosystem health and can be an indicator species.

c. Salmonids - SAT response to NCCRSG questions (revised Oct 12), "Placing a protected area in the coastal waters offshore of the river mouth will protect salmon during a crucial life stage."

   No additional rationale was provided.