

**California Department of Fish and Game**  
**Executive Summary- Feasibility Analysis**  
**BRTF Meeting February 13 – 14, 2008**  
*(revised February 11, 2008)*

An evaluation was completed by the Department of Fish and Game for the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) which provides detailed feedback on the feasibility for the suite of draft marine protected area (MPA) proposals received. The feasibility guidelines used were outlined in the document titled, "*Statement of feasibility criteria for use in analyzing siting alternatives during the second phase of the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative*" (CDFG Memo; June 11, 2007). A second memo, "*Department of Fish and Game update of feasibility criteria for use in analyzing siting alternatives during the second phase of the Marine Life Protection Act*" (CDFG Memo; February 11, 2008), was also created to clarify feasibility issues that have arisen during the North Central Coast study region process, and was also used to evaluate the current draft MPA proposals.

Many of the feasibility issues frequently observed in the first round of proposals were greatly improved for this round. For example, most of the draft proposed MPAs currently have clearly stated goals and objectives and clear and simple regulations. Also, in contrast to the previous round of MPA arrays, the recommended use of whole number minutes of latitude and longitude or easily recognizable landmarks was observed for most proposed MPAs. However, feasibility concerns do remain in the current set of draft proposals. Many of the design elements that decrease MPA feasibility that were frequently noted include:

- Multiple zoning (created when many regulatory changes occur over a small area)
- Doughnut designs (which occurs when MPAs surround one another)
- "Floating corners" in offshore waters that are not at readily determined lines of latitude/longitude, which are difficult to enforce and understand
- Unanchored diagonal lines (diagonal lines may be feasible when they follow the angle of the coastline and are anchored at whole minute points of latitude and longitude)

Marine Protected Areas that follow the feasibility guidelines will help to ensure that these areas are readily enforceable and ease public understanding. This evaluation was prepared utilizing the Department's feasibility guidelines described in the Department's memos on the subject, as well as detailed input from the Department's enforcement personnel, especially from wardens who patrol these areas. A summary of the evaluated draft MPA proposals is provided in Tables 1 & 2. These evaluations will help guide NCCRSG to create MPAs that are easy for the public to understand and are readily enforced.

Table 1. Summary of the percentage of the NCCSR MPA proposals that have stated goals and objectives, and simple and clear regulations.

| Draft MPA Array Name | Total # of MPAs | Goals Defined (%) | Objectives Defined (%) | Simple & Clear Regulations (%) |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Proposal 1 (EC)      | 26              | 100%              | 100%                   | 96%                            |
| Proposal 2 (JD)      | 22              | 73%               | 73%                    | 100%                           |
| Proposal 3 (TC)      | 30              | 100%              | 100%                   | 93%                            |
| Proposal 4 (JC)      | 25              | 100%              | 96%                    | 92%                            |
| External A           | 20              | 95%               | 95%                    | 95%                            |
| Average              | 25              | 94%               | 93%                    | 95%                            |

Table 2. Summary of the percentage of the NCCSR MPA proposals that meet the feasibility guidelines for boundaries and the percentage of proposals with frequently seen feasibility concerns (multiple zoning, doughnut designs and floating corners).

| Draft MPA Array Name | Total # of MPAs | Meets Boundary Guidelines (%) | MPA's with Multiple Zoning & Doughnut Designs (%) | MPAs with Floating Corners (%) |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Proposal 1 (EC)      | 26              | 50%                           | 12%   | 19%                            |
| Proposal 2 (JD)      | 22              | 36%                           | 27%   | 36%                            |
| Proposal 3 (TC)      | 30              | 43%                           | 27%   | 17%                            |
| Proposal 4 (JC)      | 25              | 36%                           | 28%   | 32%                            |
| External A           | 20              | 40%                           | 20%   | 35%                            |
| Average              | 25              | 41%                           | 23%   | 28%                            |