

1 **[Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Expansion]**

2

3 **Resolution amending Commission on the Environment Resolution 006-12-COE in**
4 **support of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Expansion.**

5 WHEREAS, The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (the Sanctuary) was
6 designated in 1992 for the purpose of understanding and protecting the coastal ecosystem
7 and submerged cultural resources of central California; and,

8 WHEREAS, The Sanctuary is home to one of the most diverse marine ecosystems in
9 the world, including 33 species of marine mammals, 94 species of seabirds, 345 species of
10 fishes, and numerous invertebrates and plants; and,

11 WHEREAS, The San Francisco-Pacifica Exclusion Area (commonly known as the
12 doughnut hole), that was left out when the sanctuary was created, is also home to myriad
13 seabirds, mammals and other marine species, including the rare sevengill shark and the local
14 stock of harbor porpoises that inhabits both the doughnut hole and San Francisco Bay; and,

15 WHEREAS, Conditions that led to the creation of the Exclusion Area, the marine region
16 stretching from Pedro Point in Pacifica to the Point Bonita Lighthouse in Marin County, have
17 significantly changed since 1992, suggesting that a review of the exclusion decision is now
18 appropriate; and,

19 WHEREAS, The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is
20 proposing to expand the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary to include the Exclusion
21 Area; and,

22 WHEREAS, The expansion of the Sanctuary could lead to more financial resources for
23 research, education, outreach and natural resource protection; and,

24 WHEREAS, While a number of federal and state agencies now have regulatory
25 responsibilities in this area, designating the Exclusion Area as part of the marine sanctuary

1 can provide the long-term coordinated and comprehensive planning and management needed
2 to protect its habitats and ecosystem; and,

3 WHEREAS, NOAA’s proposal to administratively adjust the Sanctuary boundaries to
4 include the Exclusion Area will: protect additional nationally significant seascape, wildlife,
5 shipwrecks and Native American artifacts; honor the seafaring community; and promote
6 ecotourism; and,

7 WHEREAS, The protection of marine wildlife is consistent with the Biodiversity Policy
8 of the SF Commission on the Environment; and,

9 WHEREAS, Many species of marine wildlife using the Sanctuary are also found within
10 San Francisco Bay; and

11 WHEREAS, The Commission on the Environment supports, at least in the near term,
12 the beach nourishment component of the Ocean Beach Master Plan developed by SPUR;
13 and,

14 WHEREAS, While the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission has made great
15 strides in reducing the incidents of primary-treated discharges into the ocean, there will still be
16 storm events when such discharges ~~are~~ may be necessary; and,

17 WHEREAS, The expansion of the Sanctuary Boundary would help celebrate
18 achievements in environmental awareness and management resulting in improved water
19 quality and the return of marine wildlife; now, therefore be it,

20 RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Commission on the Environment strongly
21 supports the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s proposal to expand the
22 Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary to include the Exclusion Area; and, be it,

23 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Commission on the Environment
24 urges NOAA to consider the feasibility and appropriateness of further expanding the
25 Sanctuary into San Francisco Bay to provide needed protection for the harbor porpoise, the

1 sevenshark, the leatherback sea turtle, and other species of concern that use or may use
2 the marine environment on both sides of the Golden Gate Bridge, and, be it,

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission does not view the environmental
4 protection goals of this Resolution as inconsistent with the potential development of
5 renewable energy resources in the future, subject to ~~accompanied by~~ appropriate
6 environmental review, ~~in the future,~~ and be it,

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission urges NOAA to incorporate provisions
8 into the boundary expansion language that clearly assure that the following will not be
9 precluded: the use of dredged sediment for beach nourishment and the use of managed
10 retreat as an adaptive management strategy as called for in the Ocean Beach Master Plan;
11 the Army Corps of Engineers' dredging of sediments from the outer bar and the beneficial
12 reuse of those sediments; the ability of the SF Public Utilities Commission to protect, maintain
13 and eventually replace, without an increased administrative burden, the Southwest Ocean
14 Outfall, the Lake Merced Tunnel, and/or other Oceanside infrastructures; and the discharge,
15 when necessary, of wastewater treated to the less-than-secondary level, and be it,

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission urges the San Francisco Public Utilities
17 Commission to continue to work to reduce stormwater inputs into the combined system and to
18 reduce the number and volume of cCombined sSewage dDischarges, and be it,

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission urges NOAA, as part of its NEPA review
20 of the proposed boundary expansion, to assess the environmental impacts of a range of
21 scenarios involving different numbers and volumes of combined sewage discharges. ~~GSD~~
22 number and volume scenarios.

23 I hereby certify that this Resolution was adopted at the Commission on the
24 Environment's Meeting on.

25 _____

1 Monica Fish, Commission Secretary

2 VOTE:

3 AYES:

4 NOES:

5 ABSENT:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25