California Legislature
Senate Committee
on
Natural Resources and Water
DAVE MIN
CHAIR

KATHARINE F. MOORE
CHIEF CONSULTANT
GENEVIEVE M. WONG
PRINCIPAL CONSULTANT
CATHERINE BAXTER
CONSULTANT
SANDRA J. SANDERS
COMMITTEE ASSISTANT

1021 O STREET
SUITE 3220
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TEL (916) 651-4116

INFORMATIONAL HEARING

30x30: What is Next on the Pathway to Conserving 30 Percent of California's Coastal Waters by 2030?

March 12, 2024, 9:30 a.m.
1021 O Street, Room 2100

Background

Overview. California is home to one of the most diverse coastal and ocean ecosystems in the world, with over 1,100 miles of coastline. The coast and ocean are treasured by residents and visitors, and supported a marine economy of $41.9 billion in 2020, according to data from a 2023 report issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Yet, California's coast and ocean are threatened by the twin crises of climate change and biodiversity loss. In particular, California's coastal and marine ecosystems face threats from more frequent and intense disturbance (marine heatwaves, storms, etc.), sea level rise, ocean acidification, oxygen loss (hypoxia), disease, invasive species, harmful algal blooms, pollution, habitat destruction and loss, and, in some cases, overharvest of marine resources. For example, the state has already lost around 90% of its coastal wetlands due primarily to habitat destruction.

Threats to the state's ocean and coastal ecosystems fit into a larger global trend of losses of ecosystems and ecosystem services, and rapid rates of species extinctions. A United Nations report estimates that a quarter of all species face extinction, many within decades. There is broad consensus that, similar to climate change, this is human-caused and represents an existential threat to humanity. According to some scientists, the extinction crisis is the most serious environmental threat to the persistence of civilization. Every time a species or population vanishes, the associated ecosystem's capacity to function and provide services upon which we depend erodes. These effects are expected to worsen over time, as more irreversible extinctions occur.

Conserving the Earth's lands and waters can help to prevent extinctions and protect the biodiversity and ecosystem services upon which humanity depends. Specifically, the scientific community has identified a need to protect 50% of the Earth's surface by 2050 to achieve these goals. Scientists have called for a step goal of 30% by 2030 to help spur and measure progress toward the 2050 goal. Importantly, protections

must be combined with restoration and management efforts to protect the function and services of the Earth's ecosystems. Also, conservation, restoration, and improved management can avoid and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and sequester carbon, helping to advance climate goals.

To combat the biodiversity crisis in California, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-82-20 in 2020, which adopted a goal to conserve at least 30% of California's land and coastal waters by 2030. SB 337 (Min, Chapter 392, Statutes of 2023) later codified this goal. The state has already conserved 16.2% of its coastal waters through its Marine Protected Areas Network and 24.4% of lands. To reach the goal, it must conserve approximately 500,000 more acres of coastal waters, either through Marine Protected Areas or other options, like partnering with federal and tribal partners on marine conservation programs.

Hearing purpose. The Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water is convening this hearing to solicit updates from the Newsom Administration (Administration) on progress made toward the coastal waters goal, information on the Administration's strategy moving forward, and a discussion of a recent once-in-a-decade review of the Marine Protected Areas Network, including its findings and recommendations. Further, the hearing will ask stakeholders and the public to weigh in on these topics.

Marine protected areas (MPAs). Under existing law, there are marine managed areas and marine protected areas. The latter is a subset of the former. **Marine managed areas** are named, discrete geographic marine or estuarine areas along the California coast designated by law or administrative action, and intended to protect, conserve, or otherwise manage a variety of resources and their uses, including living marine resources and their habitats, scenic views, water quality, recreational values, and cultural or geological resources. **Marine protected areas** are a subset of marine managed areas that are specifically designated to protect or conserve marine life and habitat.

There are three main types of MPAs: state marine reserves, state marine parks, and state marine conservation areas. In general, **state marine reserves** do not allow any type of extractive activities, including fishing or kelp harvesting, except for scientific collecting under a permit, **state marine parks** do not allow any commercial extraction, and **state marine conservation areas** restrict some types of commercial and/or recreational extraction. More specifically:

- In a **state marine reserve**, it is unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living, geological, or cultural marine resource, except when authorized for research, restoration, or monitoring purposes. Generally, these areas are open to the public for enjoyment and study so long as the areas are maintained in an undisturbed and unpolluted state.

- In a **state marine park**, it is unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living or nonliving marine resource for commercial exploitation purposes. Generally all other uses are allowed, including scientific collection with a permit, research, monitoring, and public recreation, unless otherwise restricted.

- In a **state marine conservation area**, it is unlawful to injure, damage, take, or possess any living, geological, or cultural marine resource for commercial or recreational purposes in a manner that would compromise protection of the species of interest, natural community, habitat, or geological

features. These areas may permit research, education, and recreational activities, and certain commercial and recreational harvest of marine resources.

State marine recreational management areas and **special closures** also play a role in California's MPA Network.

- In a **state marine recreational management area**, which is not an MPA but a type of marine managed area, it is unlawful to perform any activity that would compromise the recreational values for which the area may be designated. Thus, in these areas, some take of marine resources may be allowed and legal waterfowl hunting is allowed, although restrictions vary by area.

- A **special closure** is not an MPA, but an area designated by the California Fish and Game Commission (FGC) that prohibits access or restricts boating activities in waters adjacent to sea bird rookeries or marine mammal haul-out sites. These special closures benefit marine mammals and seabirds by prohibiting human access and reducing disturbance around critical haul out and breeding sites.

Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA). Prior to passage of the Marine Life Protection Act in 1999, California's MPAs had been established on a piecemeal basis, and lacked a cohesive plan and rigorous scientific guidelines. Many of the MPAs lacked clearly defined purposes, effective management, and enforcement. As a result, the array of MPAs fell short of their potential to function as a network to protect and conserve marine life and habitat.

In response, the Legislature passed AB 933 (Shelley, Chapter 1015, Statutes of 1999), known as the Marine Life Protection Act. This law directed the FGC to redesign California's system of MPAs based on public input and the best available science to function as a network in order to increase the coherence and effectiveness of protecting the state's marine life, habitats, ecosystems, and natural heritage, as well as to improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems subject to minimal human disturbance. The MLPA established six goals for the MPA system:

1. Protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

2. Help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

3. Improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance, and manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

4. Protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in California waters for their intrinsic values.

5. Ensure California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

6. Ensure the state's MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a network.

The MLPA also mandated that the MPA system include the following elements:

- An improved marine life reserve component, in which all extractive activities are prohibited.
- Specific identified objectives, and management and enforcement measures, for all MPAs in the system.
- Provisions for monitoring, research, and evaluation at selected sites to facilitate adaptive management of MPAs and ensure that the system meets the MLPA's goals.
- Provisions for educating the public about MPAs, and for administering and enforcing MPAs in a manner that encourages public participation.
- A process to establish, modify, or abolish existing MPAs or new MPAs, as specified.

MPA Network roles and responsibilities. The FGC is the primary decision-making authority for California's MPA Network. It has authority to establish, modify, and abolish MPAs, and it regulates activities in MPAs, including commercial and recreational fishing and any other take of marine species. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is the lead managing agency for the MPA Network, implementing and enforcing regulations set by the FGC.

The MLPA requires CDFW to develop, and FGC to adopt, a master plan, which is subject to peer review, for the design, implementation, and management of California's MPA Network. The 2016 master plan formally established the MPA Management Program and a 10-year adaptive management review cycle to evaluate the ecological, socioeconomic, and governance aspects of the MPA Program and MPA Network. CDFW prepares the decadal management reviews with input from the FGC and other stakeholders. The first review was finalized in 2023. Based on the review, FGC may take adaptive management actions if data and information support such changes.

The Ocean Protection Council (OPC), since July 1, 2013, is the state's lead regarding MPA policy. OPC convenes the MPA Statewide Leadership Team to help guide program activities and ensure communication, collaboration, and coordination among entities that have significant authority, mandates, or interests that relate to the MPA Network.

The Department of Parks & Recreation (State Parks) and its Commission have some management and regulatory authority for some types of MPAs. Other regulatory and trustee agencies, such as the California Coastal Commission, State Lands Commission, and State Water Resources Control Board, have jurisdictions that overlap with MPA management activities, as does the West Coast Regional Office of National Marine Sanctuaries and the National Parks Service.

California's MPA Network. Following some trial and error after passage of the MLPA, the state established the MLPA Initiative, a public-private partnership of CDFW, the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), and Resources Legacy Fund, to implement the MLPA. From 2004 to 2012, this initiative directed and informed science-guided and stakeholder-driven MPA design and siting processes across the

state, divided among four coastal regions and the San Francisco Bay Area. The process included input from conservationists, fishermen, Native American tribes, agency representatives, scientists, and others. There was significant concern from some stakeholders, including fishermen and ocean businesses, that the MPAs would negatively impact their livelihoods. In 2012, California finalized the nation's first statewide, science-based network of MPAs. The initiative completed the planning process in the four coastal regions and left the San Francisco Bay region to another time.

Prior to the MLPA, California's MPA system covered 2.7% of the state's coastal waters. Today, the redesigned system is the largest ecologically-connected MPA Network in the world. 16.2% of the state's coastal waters are located within 124 MPAs across four distinct regions:

- The North Coast, from the California-Oregon border south to Alder Creek near Point Arena.
- The North Central Coast, from Alder Creek near Point Arena south to Pigeon Point.
- The Central Coast, from Pigeon Point south to Point Conception.
- The South Coast, from Point Conception south to the California-Mexico border.

These state-managed MPAs regulate fishing; approximately half of the MPAs are "no take" and half are open to limited fishing. 35 MPAs are located adjacent to 42 coastal State Parks units. The network locates MPAs in strategic proximity to each other, encompasses the full range of marine habitats found in California waters, and seeks to help preserve the connections and flow of life between marine ecosystems.

MPA Network Decadal Management Review (DMR) findings and recommendations. California reviews its MPA Network every 10 years to inform the MPA Management Program. CDFW, in partnership with OPC, finalized the first DMR in 2023. While measuring the performance of the MPA against the broader goals of the MLPA will take decades, the DMR provided compelling scientific evidence that MPAs are helping protect coastal and marine biodiversity while also highlighting the need for continued monitoring and evaluation. The DMR represents an important step to understanding the benefits of a connected network of MPAs by integrating MPA-focused information across habitats, domains, and program pillars. Specifically, the DMR found that:

- While the detection of many MPA effects is expected to take time, results already suggest that, for some species and habitats, California's MPAs support populations of bigger and/or more abundant fish and invertebrates. In particular, MPA age was strongly linked to an increase in the biomass of fished species: older MPAs tended to contain larger fish. Also, even where species size or abundance increased both inside and outside MPAs, the rate of increase was often higher inside MPAs.
- Preliminary modeling results suggest that the positive effect of MPAs on the size and abundance of species within their boundaries also enhances their contribution to larval connectivity outside their boundaries. Larval connectivity is critical for maintaining fish and invertebrate populations in the ocean that are genetically diverse and resilient to disruption.

- Updated connectivity models confirm that MPAs are more connected to one another and other parts of the coast than areas outside of MPAs.

- Some ecological communities demonstrated greater resiliency inside MPAs during a 2014-16 marine heat wave compared to those outside of MPAs and recovered more quickly after the heatwave.

Based on the findings and input from Native American tribes and stakeholders, the DMR also presented a series of recommendations and related management actions for MPA governance, the MPA Management Program, and MPA Network performance. Some of the recommendations include:

- Apply lessons from the DMR to support changes to the MPA Network and Management Program.

- Establish targets for meeting the goals of the MLPA.

- Develop a framework to evaluate and approve appropriate restoration and mitigation actions within MPAs and marine managed areas.

- Increase enforcement capacity.

- Develop and implement climate change research and monitoring priorities and metrics for California's MPA Network.

California's 30x30 initiative. Executive Order N-82-20 adopted a goal to conserve at least 30% of California's land and coastal waters by 2030. SB 337 (Min, Chapter 392, Statutes of 2023) later codified this goal. In 2022, CNRA published *Pathways to 30x30 California: Accelerating Conservation of California's Nature (Pathways)*, which identifies strategies and priority actions to achieve the goal.

California's coastal waters, which cover 3.4 million acres, are defined as state waters extending from the mean high tide line to three nautical miles offshore, including estuaries, bays, and offshore islands. *Pathways* defines conserved as "areas that are durably protected and managed to sustain functional ecosystems, both intact and restored, and the diversity of life that they support." *Pathways* identifies examples of the first part of the definition – durably protected areas – to include "areas under government ownership or control, primarily designated to protect species and their habitats; areas under perpetual easements that protect species and their habitats; or areas with species and habitat protection designations that have gone through a formal rulemaking or other enforceable decision-making process not subject to simple reversal."

However, the second element of the definition – sustaining functional ecosystems and species—is more complex. *Pathways* uses a definition of "healthy ocean ecosystems" provided in a 2021 advisory document, entitled *Advancing 30x30: Conservation of Coastal Waters*, as an appropriate benchmark. Specifically, "'healthy' ocean ecosystems are those that are able to independently and sustainably maintain critical organization (species richness, intricacy of interactions, food web complexity, social dynamics) and functions (the energy, productivity, activity, or growth within a system) over time in the face of external stress (resiliency)."

Based on these parameters, OPC has made initial determinations regarding (1) areas that should currently be considered conserved, (2) areas that could be considered conserved if biodiversity protections are enhanced, and (3) areas that require further consideration before a determination can be made about their conservation status. In particular, OPC has determined that only California's network of 124 MPAs fully meets the definition of conserved. This means the state has already conserved over 500,000 acres or 16.2% of its coastal waters through this network. To reach the 2030 coastal waters goal, the state needs to conserve approximately another one-half million acres of coastal waters.

30x30 coastal waters strategies. To achieve the state's 30x30 coastal waters goal, California has the following options:

- **Option I:** Expand the MPA Network by creating new MPAs and/or expanding existing MPAs.
- **Option II:** Partner with the federal government to strengthen biodiversity protections in National Marine Sanctuaries, which cover over 1.4 million acres or 40.6% of state waters.
- **Option III:** Partner with Native American tribes to create indigenous marine stewardship areas.
- **Option IV:** Explore opportunities for other effective area-based conservation measures.
- **Option V:** A combination of these four options.

The following explores these options.

Option I: Expand the MPA Network. Given the OPC's determination that California's MPAs fully meet the definition of conserved adopted in *Pathways*, action to expand the MPA Network would provide one pathway to reach the 2030 goal. FGC has sole authority to establish, modify, and abolish MPAs. Following the DMR, FGC solicited and received 20 petitions for 86 different changes to the MPA Network, including petitions to create new MPAs, abolish existing MPAs, modify the boundaries of MPAs, reclassify MPAs, and change allowed uses within MPAs. FGC has referred the petitions to CDFW for evaluation.

It is worth noting that while FGC will consider these petitions, *Pathways* states that MPAs are not the only way to achieve conservation in coastal waters, and the state does not consider sustainable commercial or recreational fishing to necessarily be incompatible with conservation of the state's coastal and marine biodiversity. *Pathways* further notes that the MPA Network only restricts fishing, which is just one of a multitude of threats and stressors faced by coastal and ocean ecosystems. These statements suggest expanding MPAs may not be a significant strategy from the Administration's perspective to get to the goal.

Option II: Strengthen biodiversity protections in National Marine Sanctuaries. The National Marine Sanctuaries Act of 1972 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to designate national marine sanctuaries that are of special national or international significance, and to manage these areas to maintain natural biological communities and protect natural habitats, populations, and ecological processes. While each sanctuary has its own unique set of regulations, there are some prohibitions that are typical for many sanctuaries, including:

- Discharging material or other matter into the sanctuary.
- Disturbance of, construction on, or alteration of the seabed.
- Disturbance of cultural resources.
- Exploring for, developing, or producing new oil, gas, or mineral deposits.

In addition, some sanctuaries prohibit other activities, such as the disturbance of marine mammals, seabirds, and sea turtles; operation of aircraft in certain zones; use of personal watercraft; mineral mining; and anchoring of vessels.

The National Marine Sanctuary System includes 15 national marine sanctuaries and two marine national monuments covering more than 620,000 square miles. National Marine Sanctuaries in California cover 40.6% of state waters and include the Greater Farallones, Cordell Bank, Monterey Bay, and Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuaries. This percentage would increase if the NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries approved the proposed Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary, discussed further below. It is worth noting that many of these sanctuaries include areas of exceptionally high biodiversity.

According to *Pathways,* while National Marine Sanctuaries offer durable protection, the extent to which their restrictions and protections help sustain healthy oceans and could therefore meet the state's definition of conserved is not well studied and remains unclear. As a result, *Pathways* notes that National Marine Sanctuaries in California waters will need to be individually assessed to determine if they count toward the goal and, if not, what additional protections might be possible that would qualify these sanctuaries for the goal.

Given the areas of exceptionally high biodiversity in National Marine Sanctuaries off of California's coast, *Pathways* identifies these areas as offering a natural place to focus conservation efforts and provide a pathway for the state to meet or exceed the 30x30 target while maintaining access and sustainable use. Therefore, as noted in Pathways, the state plans to prioritize a focus on strengthening biodiversity protections in these waters. Indeed, according to CNRA's 2023 30x30 Progress Report, OPC has already begun working with federal partners to strengthen conservation in California's federally managed National Marine Sanctuaries, and has kicked off an assessment of the biodiversity benefits of other spatial management measures in California's coastal waters.

Proposed Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary. In July 2015, the Northern Chumash Tribal Council submitted a proposal to NOAA to establish a Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary. The Department of Commerce formally moved the proposed sanctuary into the designation phase in November 2021. Specifically, NOAA is proposing to designate a national marine sanctuary that would stretch along more than 100 miles of the California coastline in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties. The 5,600-square-mile sanctuary would be the first indigenous-nominated marine sanctuary in the federal network. It would preserve biologically rich waters and submerged native burial sites in a space about the size of Connecticut.

Complicating matters, near the northern boundary of the proposed sanctuary sits a 400-square-mile zone that the Biden Administration has leased to three offshore wind developers to install 1,000-foot turbines 20 to 30 miles off the coast in federal waters. The turbines would float in deep water, anchored by cables to the sea floor. The developers want flexibility to lay cables through the proposed sanctuary. Morro Bay, the area at the heart of the issue, is one of the most sacred indigenous sites in the region and one of just two points where offshore developers can connect electric cables to the grid.

Option III: Partner with Native American tribes to create indigenous marine stewardship areas (IMSAs). Before Euro-American contact, Native American tribes managed and stewarded California's marine and terrestrial resources using traditional ecological knowledge and a wide array of traditional practices and techniques to maintain an environment capable of supporting large, thriving human, plant, and animal populations. Tribes continue to use these practices, are generally focused on ecosystem interconnectivity, and view humans as an integral part of the environment. California Native American tribes have never ceded their rights and responsibilities to take care of their land and sea resources, and continue to assert the existence of these rights in state and federal forums.

A core commitment of the state's 30x30 initiative as identified in *Pathways* is to strengthen tribal partnerships. Partnering with Native American tribes is fundamentally different than partnering with other entities because tribes are sovereign entities. *Pathways* acknowledges this by committing to government-to-government consultations with tribes for the protection, care, access, and stewardship of seascapes, among others. Further, the Administration committed in *Pathways* to sharing decision-making with tribes in identifying conservation areas and developing opportunities for meaningful and mutually beneficial tribal management and co-management within marine waters through formal agreements and other means.

A key strategy in *Pathways* is to prioritize and invest in tribal conservation. This includes:

1. Developing programs that provide stable, long-term support for tribal establishment and administration of tribally protected landscapes and other tribally managed or co-managed areas, terrestrial and marine.

2. Exploring administrative or regulatory mechanisms for California Native American tribes to establish IMSAs focused on enhancing biodiversity and resilience. Specifically, California Native American tribes would present IMSA proposals to CNRA, initiate a government-to-government process with relevant agencies, and come to an agreement on proposal scopes.

Tribal Nature-Based Solutions Program. Regarding the first, the Legislature appropriated $100 million to CNRA to fund California Native American tribes' priorities for multi-benefit nature-based solutions projects located within the state. CNRA released grant guidelines for this funding in 2023. Additionally, in 2023, OPC established a $1 million Tribal Small Grants Program to fund tribally led work that advances tribes' priorities for conservation, management, and stewardship in the coast and ocean.

Yurok-Tolowa-Dee-ni' IMSA. Regarding the second, the Resighini Tribe of Yurok People, Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation, and Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria established the Yurok-Tolowa-Dee-ni' IMSA in 2023. It is the first such designation enacted by tribal governments in the United States. Through the nearly 700-square-mile IMSA, the tribes aim to safeguard the area from threats, including sea

level rise and coastal erosion, by enhancing tribal stewardship and applying their indigenous knowledge to help improve poor water quality, reverse ocean acidification and species and habitat loss, manage offshore development, and mitigate other climate impacts affecting their communities. In identical proclamations issued by the three tribes, they invite the state, among other partners, to work with them in achieving their vision for reclaiming tribal stewardship. It is unclear how the tribes, in partnership with the state and other stakeholders, will manage uses in the IMSA moving forward.

Option IV: Explore opportunities for other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). *Pathways* adopts the United Nation's definition of OECM to mean a geographically defined area other than a protected area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in-situ conservation of biodiversity with associated ecosystem functions and services and, where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio–economic, and other locally relevant values. Examples of coastal water OECMs include closures and restricted areas established for the purposes of fisheries management. Further, other OECMs, like "de facto" MPAs, which are places where human activity is restricted by law for reasons other than conservation or natural resource management, may include military closures and marine renewable energy installations. While OECMs have the potential to contribute to the state's 30x30 goal, *Pathways* notes that their durability and biodiversity benefits require further study and potentially case-by-case assessment before determinations can be made about their conservation status. It is unclear how much OECMs will figure into the state's strategies to meet the 30x30 goal.

Assessing progress. In assessing the state's progress towards the 30x30 coastal waters goal and in reviewing the findings and recommendations of the DMR, Committee members may wish to consider the following:

Decadal Management Review

- One priority of the MLPA is to improve the system of marine life reserves, which essentially allow no take. The DMR finalized in 2023 represents the first comprehensive review of the MPA Network and Management Program since the MPA Network was completed in 2012, allowing the state to investigate the impacts of marine life reserves on biodiversity. *What does the DMR or other relevant long-term monitoring studies show regarding the impacts on biodiversity and community structure in no-take MPAs (like state marine reserves) vs limited take MPAs (like state marine conservation areas)?*

- *What opportunities are there, based on the findings and recommendations from the DMR, to improve protections in the MPA Network to support biodiversity and resilience? What are the challenges to this?*

Petitions to create, abolish, or modify MPAs

- FGC recently received, and referred to CDFW for review, 20 petitions requesting 86 changes to the state's MPA Network. *What frameworks or criteria are FGC and CDFW using or considering to guide the evaluation of these petitions? Does FGC plan to accept and evaluate another round of petitions before 2030?*

The MPA Network and climate change

- The MLPA does not address explicitly address climate change concerns. However, the MPA Network was designed with ecological connectivity principles in mind, which are thought to boost MPA Network resilience to climate change-driven events. *What actions can the state take to secure and improve climate resilience within the MPA Network? How can the state better protect marine habitats that serve as climate refugia? How does climate change factor into CDFW and FGC's review of the 20 petitions to the MPA Network?*

MPA Network economic impacts

- One goal of the MLPA is to help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted. For decades, commercial and recreational fishermen have harvested approximately 350 species from California's waters. Preliminary analyses have not shown a persistent decrease in catch following MPA implementation. Despite this, commercial fishermen generally believe that MPAs have had a negative effect on their livelihoods and well-being, and many have a negative opinion of the MPA Network. Further, many ocean businesses believe that MPAs have had a negative effect on their businesses. The DMR identifies a need for a research agenda to provide a more complete portrait of the economic effects of California's MPAs in order to better assess the MPA Network's performance against the goal identified above. *How will the state address this going forward?*

30x30 coastal waters goal strategies

- *Considering the current budget deficit, what strategies will the state pursue to meet the 30x30 goal this year and next year?*

- *What opportunities are there to expand the MPA Network? What types of MPAs? In which areas?*

- *Will the state conduct a thorough examination and evaluation to assess what biodiversity hotspots and areas of climate resilience need additional protection? Are there now-vulnerable habitats or climate refugia that scientists have identified that would benefit from protection under an MPA?*

- *What progress has been made to increase biodiversity protections in National Marine Sanctuaries? Which sanctuaries in particular? What are the next steps for this year and next year?*

- *How is the state thinking about opportunities to partner with Native American tribes in a manner that supports tribal sovereignty and jurisdiction to regulate uses and activities in future IMSAs? What can stakeholders expect from this type of designation? What are the opportunities and challenges?*

- *How has CNRA engaged on the Yurok-Tolowa-Dee-ni' IMSA? Have government-to-government consultations occurred? What types of restrictions are being considered? How would they be enforced?*

- *How has CNRA engaged with Native American tribes and the federal government on the proposed Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary? Are there opportunities to ensure this proposed sanctuary, if adopted, could count towards California's 30x30 coastal waters goal?*

Balancing 30x30 coastal waters goal with offshore wind

- California has set goals for offshore wind procurement of 5 gigawatts by 2030 and 25 gigawatts by 2045. Some estimate the latter will require roughly 2,500 square miles of sea space dedicated to offshore wind development. For perspective, the MPA Network covers 852 square miles. While much of this will be located in federal waters, there will be impacts in state waters related to transmission lines and some projects may be located in state waters. *How will the state balance its offshore wind goals with the 30x30 coastal waters goal and its corresponding objective to protect and restore biodiversity?*

Funding for the MPA Management Program and 30x30

- California is facing a substantial budget deficit, projected by the Legislative Analyst's Office in February at $73 billion. *How will the state meet its commitments to the MPA Management Program, including needs for research, monitoring, and enforcement, as well as the 30x30 coastal waters goal, in this fiscal climate? How much funding should come from state issued bond funds? For what types of projects? How much funding can the state expect to receive from the federal government, including from the Inflation Reduction Act and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act?*

Recent Related Legislation.

SB 1402 (Min, 2024) would require all state agencies, departments, boards, offices, commissions, and conservancies to consider the 30x30 goal when adopting, revising, or establishing plans, policies, and regulations. *This bill is pending in the Senate Governmental Organization Committee.*

AB 1284 (Ramos, 2024) to better define and put into action co-management of natural resources between Tribal Nations and the state of California. Sponsored by the Resighini Tribe of Yurok People and the Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation. *This bill is awaiting referral in the Senate Rules Committee.*

AB 2220 (Bennett, 2024) would prohibit the use of gill nets and trammel nets in all ocean waters of the state. *This bill is pending in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee.*

AB 2320 (Irwin, 2024) would expand the scope of CNRA's annual 30x30 progress report to include the identification of key wildlife corridors in the state, connections between large blocks of natural areas and habitats, progress on protecting additional acres of wildlife corridors, and goals for wildlife corridor protection in the next five years, as specified. *This bill is pending in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee.*

AB 2440 (Reyes, 2024) would, among other things, expand the actions CNRA must prioritize when implementing the 10 pathways in *Pathways* to include promoting and supporting partnering state agencies

and departments, including, State Parks, in the acquisition and responsible stewardship of state land. *This bill is pending in the Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee.*

AB 3023 (Papan, 2024) is a spot bill that would make a non-substantive change to the 30x30 law. *This bill is awaiting referral in the Assembly Rules Committee.*

SB 337 (Min, Chapter 392, Statutes of 2023) codified the state goal established in Executive Order N-82-20 to conserve at least 30% of California's lands and coastal waters by 2030.

AB 2278 (Kalra, Chapter 349, Statutes of 2022) requires the CNRA Secretary to submit annual reports to the Legislature on progress made toward achieving the goal to conserve 30% of state lands and coastal waters by 2030.

AB 3030 (Kalra, 2020) would have established land, water, and ocean protection goals, including to protect 30% of the state's land areas and waters by 2030. *This bill was held on suspense in the Senate Appropriations Committee.*