

Proposal No. 13 – Mack Reef II

	Coarse Review Criteria	Score*	Narrative Analysis
MPA Sideboards	MPA sideboards met?	No	<p>Finding: The proposed MR has a diversity of habitats, is large enough to encompass home ranges of many species, and meets criteria for ecological significance. The proposed MPA is not needed for the MR to achieve ecological significance.</p> <p>This site analysis will focus on the <u>MR portion</u> of the proposal.</p> <p>NOTES:</p>
Ecological Significance	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Habitat representation 2) Size 3) Comparison area 4) Infrastructure 5) Adjacent protected areas 	High	<p>Criterion 1 Finding: The MR has an adequate variety of habitats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MR has a variety of habitats including rocky reef and sandy bottom habitat in both deep and shallow depth ranges, kelp beds, rocky intertidal areas, and 119 offshore rocks. The total depth range of the site is from the intertidal area out to 48 m (26 fm). <p>Criterion 2 Finding: The site is large enough to allow scientific evaluation of the ecological benefits of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 – 10 km size guideline The MR is 14.2 km (7.7 nm) in north-south length and extends from the shore to 48 m (26 fm) depth. • Habitats - Subtidal benthic habitat is primarily sand, with rocky reefs totaling approx. 5.6 km² (1,384 acres). The rocky areas are spread across both shallow and deep areas, potentially increasing the number of species benefited. The MR has about 12.8 km (6.9 nm) of rocky shoreline. Rocky intertidal habitat includes large boulder fields, wave-cut platforms. • Species home ranges - The MR is large enough to encompass the adult home ranges of the following species groups: attached algae, sessile invertebrates, many mobile benthic invertebrates, and fish species with limited home ranges (e.g., china, copper, quillback, black, blue, yelloweye, tiger, vermilion, brown, grass, black and yellow, gopher rockfish, kelp greenling, cabezon). The productive commercial fishery on the rocky reefs provides evidence of the area's abundant fish population. • Other features - The site has 95 seabird nesting colonies, including very large colonies at Hunter's Island, Crook Point, and Mack Arch, and three pinniped haulouts. <p>Criterion 3 Finding: Suitable comparison areas exist for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas to the south of the site provide suitable comparison areas. • Example research project: Spillover effects on the fishery to the south of the site.

* **Scoring Scale:** Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, High

			<p>Criterion 4 Finding: The proposal addresses the potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no dredge disposal sites, towlanes, outfall sites, cables or proposed ocean energy developments in the proposed MR. The proposed MR area, as well as the adjacent terrestrial area, is fairly undeveloped and relatively pristine in terms of human effects. • Pistol River estuary-flows into MPA <p>Criterion 5 Finding: The site is adjacent to protected areas in the terrestrial and marine environment; adjacent uses may affect the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial – Cape Sebastian State Park and State Scenic Viewpoint, Pistol River State Park and State Scenic Viewpoint, and the northern portion of Samuel H Boardman State Park are adjacent to the proposed MR. Cape Sebastian and Pistol River are fairly low use parks (Cape Sebastian received approximately 81,000 day-use visitors in 2007, Pistol River approximately 68,000), and neither park has a campground. Boardman is a higher visitation park, receiving approximately 809,000 day-use visitors in 2007. In addition to the state parks, Crook Point National Wildlife Refuge is adjacent to the proposed area. The refuge is closed to public access. The adjacent private land outside of the park and refuge areas is not very developed. • Estuarine – LCDC classifies the Pistol River Estuary as a “natural” estuary. • Marine – Offshore rocks and islands are part of the Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuge. <p>NOTES:</p>
Avoids Significant Economic/Social Impacts	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>2) Size</p> <p>4) Infrastructure</p> <p>6) Economic and social impacts</p>	Med-Low	<p>Criteria 2 and 6: Finding: The size, location and characteristics of the site do a medium-low job of avoiding significant adverse economic and social impacts. Further evaluation could be used to better understand economic and social impacts. Redesign/reconfiguration of site, including the MPA portion, during evaluation may be able to minimize negative impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good distance from both the ports of Brookings-Harbor and Gold Beach. Fairly remote area. Less recreational fishing occurs in this area compared to many other areas to the north and south. • This site limits the Brookings commercial nearshore limited entry fishery to fish within the black rockfish zone (with restricted daily trip limits of 200 lbs/day). • Dungeness crab high use fishing grounds and soft shell testing area. <p>Fisheries affected:</p> <p>Commercial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearshore limited entry (black rockfish, blue rockfish, other nearshore) • Dungeness crab • Urchin, historically important area with less effort now. • Flat abalone <p>Recreational</p>

* **Scoring Scale:** Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, High

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In past, some charter groundfish (much less currently) • One charter boat from Gold Beach will on occasion fish within the northern portion of the site • Some shore fishing: Cape Sebastian (surfperch, groundfish) and Pistol River (surfperch, groundfish) • Intertidal collection: butter clams south of Crook Point <p>Criterion 4: Finding: The proposal addresses potential impacts of existing or proposed infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site will protect the viewsheds off of State Park areas from offshore development • Safe harbor and anchorage at Mack Arch Cove would not be impacted • No other existing or proposed infrastructure known <p>NOTES:</p>
Community Collaboration	Criteria: 7) Community collaboration	Low	<p>Criteria 7</p> <p>Finding: This proposal was not developed by a collaborative community-based group. Level of collaboration on this proposed site was low and there is minimal support for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site proposed by Our Ocean staff • Review and input provided by a professor of natural science <p>NOTES:</p>
Other factors	Criteria: 8) Enforcement	High	<p>Criteria 8</p> <p>Finding: Enforceability of this site is high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good observation from land. • Good straight boundary lines. <p>NOTES:</p>
OVERALL READINESS OF SITE TO MOVE FORWARD FOR <u>FURTHER EVALUATION</u>:		Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site design needs further refinement to minimize impacts to ocean users • Minimal collaboration and support to date • Multiple proposals in same area of coast, system-wide criteria would limit site selection

* **Scoring Scale:** Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, High