

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
 VOICE (415) 904-5200
 FAX (415) 904-5400
 TDD (415) 597-5885



W-33b

May 7, 2008

TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Public

FROM: Peter M. Douglas, Executive Director
 Sarah Christie, Legislative Coordinator

SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE REPORT FOR MAY 2008

CONTENTS: This report provides summaries and status of bills that affect the Coastal Commission and California's Coastal Program as well as bills that staff has identified as coastal-related legislation.

Note: Information contained in this report is accurate as of 4/23/08. Changes in the status of some bills may have occurred between the date this report was prepared and the presentation date.¹ Current status of any bill may be checked by visiting the California Senate Homepage at www.senate.ca.gov. This report can also be accessed through the Commission's World Wide Web Homepage at www.coastal.ca.gov

Legislative Calendar

Feb. 22	Last day for bills to be introduced
March 13	Spring Recess begins upon adjournment
March 24	Legislature reconvenes
April 18	Last day for Policy Committees to hear and report 1 st House fiscal bills to the Floor
May 2	Last day for Policy Committees to hear and report 1 st House nonfiscal bills to the Floor
May 16	Last day for Policy Committees to meet prior to June 2
May 23	Last day for Fiscal Committees to hear and report fiscal bills to the Floor
May 27-30	Floor Session only. No committees may meet
May 30	Last day to pass bills from house of origin
June 2	Committee meetings may resume
June 3	Statewide Primary Election
June 15	Budget must be passed by midnight
June 27	Last day for Policy Committees to hear and report bills to the Floor from the second house
July 3	Summer Recess begins at the end of session if Budget Bill has been enacted
Aug. 4	Legislature reconvenes
Aug. 15	Last day for Fiscal Committees to meet and report bills to the Floor
Aug. 18-31	Last day to amend bills on the Floor
Aug. 31	Last day for any bill to be passed. Final Recess begins on adjournment of session
Sept. 30	Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before Sept. 1

¹ Terms used in this report relating to bill status. 1) "On Suspense" means bill is held in Appropriations because of potential costs to state agency. Bills usually heard by Appropriations near Fiscal Committee Deadline in June. 2) "Held in committee" means bill was not heard in the policy committee this year. 3) "Failed passage" means a bill was heard by policy committee but failed to get a majority vote. Reconsideration can be granted by the committee.

PRIORITY LEGISLATION

AB 837 (Levine) Oil and gas leases

This bill would prohibit the State Lands Commission (SLC) from issuing any new leases or lease extensions for the extraction of oil and gas from existing platforms in the Santa Barbara Channel, unless the SLC determines that issuing or extending a lease would not result in spillage or seepage of oil, or destruction of aesthetic values. The practical effect of this legislation is precluding future slant drilling from Platform Holly.

Introduced 02/22/07
Last Amended 09/07/07
Status Senate NR&W Committee.

AB 1066 (Laird) Coastal resources; local coastal planning

This bill would require the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop guidelines, in consultation with the Coastal Commission, relating to planning for sea level rise for local governments to use when updating their general plans. The bill would require the Ocean Protection Council to convene and inter-agency task force, which would include the Coastal Commission, to gather existing information on sea level rise projections to inform the OPR guidelines.

Introduced 02/23/07
Last Amended 07/03/07
Status Senate Appropriations Committee, Suspense File.

AB 1074 (Houston) California State Conservation Permit

This bill would require the Secretary of the Resources Agency to establish the California State Conservation Permit, with a permit specific to each of the 7 regions of the Department of Fish and Game. The permit would apply to projects by private landowners to implement conservation measures that enhance and restore wildlife habitat, improve water quality and quantity, or protect endangered or threatened species; that complies with the Natural Resources Conservation Service's Conservation Practice Standards and Specifications; and that uses funds from specified federal programs.

Introduced 02/23/07
Last Amended 05/08/07
Status Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee.

AB 1338 (Huffman) Public resources: local coastal programs: nonpoint source pollution

This bill would require local governments to include an element on reducing nonpoint source pollution, when preparing or amending an LCP for Commission certification.

Introduced 02/23/07
Last Amended 08/21/07
Status Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee.

Commission Position Support

AB 1776 (Devore) Energy: nuclear powerplants

This bill would repeal the current prohibition against building new nuclear power facilities in the state. This bill would allow new nuclear power facilities to be built, providing they are not located in active seismic areas. This bill would prohibit new nuclear power facilities with ocean outfalls for once-through-cooling within 5 miles of a designated Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS). This bill would require the Energy Commission to consider dry-cask storage as an appropriate method of storage for radioactive nuclear waste.

Introduced 01/14/08
Last Amended 02/19/08
Status Failed Passage, Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

AB 1850 (DeVore) Office of public-private partnerships

This bill would create the office of public-private partnerships within the Office of the Governor. The purpose would be to facilitate public-private partnerships for the construction and maintenance of state infrastructure.

Introduced 01/29/08
Status Failed Passage, Assembly Business and Professions Committee.

AB 1991 (Mullin) Subdivisions: tentative maps

This bill would implement the terms of a negotiated settlement agreement between the City of Half Moon Bay and the owners of the Beachwood Subdivision. The terms of the settlement allow the development of 129 homes on 37 acres in Half Moon Bay, exclude the subject properties from the coastal zone and the Coastal Act, as well as CEQA, Porter Cologne, and the Fish and Game code.

Introduced 02/14/08
Last Amended 04/21/08
Status Assembly Local Government Committee, Hearing set, 4/30/08
Commission Position Oppose

AB 2013 (Krekorian) New construction: water-permeable pavement

This bill would authorize and encourage the use of semi-permeable for paved surfaces in new construction.

Introduced 02/15/08
Last Amended 04/22/08
Status Assembly Appropriations Committee

AB 2031 (Hancock) Oil spill prevention and response

This bill would amend the Lempert-Keene Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act to require the OSPR administrator to train and certify a local emergency responder designated as a "local spill response manager" by a local government with jurisdiction over or directly adjacent to marine waters. The bill would require the administrator to authorize a local spill response manager to train and certify volunteers to work under his or her direction. This bill would require the OSPR administrator to offer grants to a local governments with jurisdiction over or directly adjacent to marine waters to provide oil spill response and cleanup equipment.

This bill would also require the Office of Emergency Services to notify appropriate local government agencies when an oil spill has occurred.

Introduced 02/15/07
Status Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 2032 (Hancock) Oil spill prevention and response

This bill would amend the Lempert-Keene Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act to regulate any vessel that carries oil in a single tank with a capacity of greater than 50,000 gallons. The bill would increase the limit on the Oil Spill Response Trust Fund, which is funded through a uniform fee on specified vessels, from \$109,750,000 to \$200,000,000 adjusted annually for inflation.

Introduced 02/23/07
Status Assembly Appropriations Committee

AB 2935 (Huffman) Oil spill prevention and response

This bill would require the OSPR administrator to develop an annual review process for updating oils spill contingency plans to incorporate “best achievable protections” technologies and practices; create a searchable online data base of information pertaining to Oil Spill Response Organizations (OSROs); require the Director of Fish and Game to close certain fisheries in the event of an oil spill.

Introduced 02/22/08
Last Amended 04/21/08
Status Assembly Appropriations Committee

AJR 49 (Nava) California gray whales: assessment: protected

This measure would request the United States Congress and the President of the United States to direct the National Marine Fisheries Service to undertake an immediate, comprehensive assessment of the California gray whale population. It would also request the California Fish and Game Commission to add the California gray whale to the State Endangered Species List, if warranted by the comprehensive, scientific assessment.

Introduced 02/28/08
Last Amended 04/21/08
Status Assembly Water Parks and Wildlife Committee.

Commission position Support

SB 242 (Torlakson) Claims against the state

This bill would appropriate \$493,342.76 from the General Fund to the Dept. of Justice for payment of specified claims against the state, including a judgment of \$64,530 against the Coastal Commission in the case of Habitat for Hollywood Beach v. California Coastal Commission.

Introduced 02/14/07
Last Amended 01/29/08
Status Assembly Desk

SB 375 (Steinberg) Transportation planning: travel demand models

This bill would require the California Transportation Commission to develop regional transportation models for regional transportation agencies to incorporate into their transportation plans. This bill would set standards for evaluating projects eligible for state funding according to their consistency with these plans, and other “sustainable community” guideline. This bill would create CEQA exemptions for certain projects that are consistent with General Plan policies, provided those general plans have been updated in accordance with the provisions of the models and guidelines contained in the bill.

Introduced 02/21/07
Last Amended 03/24/08
Status Assembly Appropriations Committee

SB 412 (Simitian) State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission: LNG terminals

This bill would require the CEC to conduct an LNG Needs Assessment Study to be completed by November 1, 2008. The study shall include an assessment of future demand and supply, as well as a determination whether it is feasible to meet California's future natural gas needs without construction LNG terminals. It directs the CEC, in consultation with state and federal agencies (including CCC) to evaluate any proposed LNG project.

Introduced 02/21/07
Last Amended 08/20/07
Status Senate Rules Committee.

Commission Position Support

SB 821 (Kuehl) Land use: water supply planning

This bill would require the California Research Bureau, by July 1, 2008, to provide a report to the Legislature covering the 2004, 2005, and 2006 calendar years that includes information relating to how existing water subdivision planning law is addressing the provision of adequate water supplies for proposed residential developments.

Introduced 02/23/07
Last Amended 05/01/07
Status Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 965 (Lowenthal) Ports: navigation systems

This bill would establish the California Physical Oceanographic Real Time System (CalPORTS) of integrated marine sensors that provide critical information on tides, winds, currents, salinity, water and air temperatures for the purpose of safe navigation and the prevention of vessel collisions and oils spills. This bill would amend the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention Act to authorize the Legislature to appropriate funds from the Oil spill Prevention and Administration Fund for the purpose of hiring staff and purchasing equipment to administer the CalPORTS program, in cooperation with and building on the existing PORTS program administered by NOAA/NOS.

Introduced 02/23/07
Last Amended 01/16/08
Status Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 1056 (Migden) Oil spill prevention and response

This bill would amend the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act to require the Office of Emergency Services to notify the Bay conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma, and the City and County of San Francisco of any oil spill occurring within the jurisdiction of (BCDC). It also sets standards for response time at 2 hours or less, and requires the state to reimburse local jurisdictions for associated costs.

Introduced 01/07/08
Last Amended 04/02/08
Status Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 1185 (Lowenthal) Land divisions: tract maps

This bill would extend by 24 months the life of any vesting tentative tract map that has not expired by the date that this bill takes effect.

Introduced 02/12/08
Last Amended 03/24/08
Status Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 1295 (Ducheny)

This bill would amend Section 30625(a) require the Coastal Commissioners to provide written comments to a local government in order to appeal a coastal development permit.

Introduced 02/19/08
Last Amended 04/02/08
Status Failed Passage, Senate Natural Resources Committee.

SB 1473 (Calderon) Building standards; green building

This bill would require local governments to charge a minimum fee for processing applications for “sustainable” or “green” building projects. Ninety percent of this fee would go to the California Building Standards Commission. Funds would be used by the Commission to create, adopt and update green building standards, and promote public education.

Introduced 02/21/08
Last Amended 04/21/08
Status Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 1618 (Hollingsworth) Public resources: defensible space

This bill would add Section 20253.5 to the Public Resources Code to declare that vegetative clearance of up to 300 feet around any structure is consistent with Coastal Act if the clearance is proposed in the local land use authority has an NCCP approved by the Department of Fish and Game, or if the local land use authority has obtained an incidental take permit for a federally listed threatened or endangered species or a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act, or if more than 50% of the land in the county in which the project is located is owned by the federal government.

Introduced 02/22/08
Status Failed Passage, Senate Natural Resources Committee

SB 2911 (Wolk) Oil spill prevention and response: wildlife contamination

This bill would make funding available to the oiled wildlife care network, upon appropriation by the Legislature, from the Oil Spill Prevention and Administration Fund. This bill would also require the OSPR Administrator to expand and enhance the funding, activities and capabilities of the oiled wildlife care network.

Introduced 02/22/08
Last Amended 03/25/08
Status Senate Appropriations Committee

SCR 71 (Yee)

This resolution would designate a portion of State Highway 1 in San Mateo County as Tom Lantos Tunnel at Devil's Slide. The resolution would also request Caltrans, upon receiving adequate funding in the form of private donations, to erect signs to that effect.

Introduced 01/23/08
Status Assembly Desk.

SCR 85 (Kuehl) Pacific bluefin tuna

This resolution would seek the assistance of the Governor, the Fish and Game Commission, the Department of Fish and Game and the Ocean Protection Council, NMFS, NOAA, PRFMC and other agencies and organizations to cooperate in a robust stock assessment an international effort to enforce catch limits and combat illegal, unreported and unregulated overfishing of bluefin tuna in the Exclusive Economic Zone.

Introduced	02/26/08
Last Amended	04/02/08
Status	Senate Appropriations Committee
Commission Position	Recommend Support, analysis attached

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400
TDD (415) 597-5885



BILL ANALYSIS
SCR 85 (Kuehl)
As amended, April 2, 2008

SUMMARY

SCR 85 would call upon the Governor, Fish and Game Commission, Ocean Protection Council, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA), the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Council to work with the Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council to undertake a comprehensive stock assessment for the purpose of enhancing conservation efforts, and to address the unreported, illegal take of bluefin tuna.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the resolution is to enhance efforts to protect and conserve bluefin tuna stocks.

EXISTING LAW

- 1) The Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 established the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) as one of eight regional councils that manage fisheries in US waters, from 3-200 miles offshore.
- 2) The Fish and Game Code allows the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to regulate fishing practices in State waters, review fishery management plans and Marine Protected Area proposals, and to seek advice from interested parties to effectively regulate emerging fisheries.

Neither the PFMC nor DFG have conservation regulations for the commercial harvest of bluefin tuna. While Pacific bluefin tuna is identified as a managed species under the PFMC's highly migratory species fishery management plan, there are no commercial catch limits, and all permits (issued by NMFS) are "open access," meaning there is no cap on the number of permits issued, nor the number or tonnage of fish that can be caught. Recreational "bag limits" were adopted by PFMC in 2006.

BACKGROUND

The Pacific bluefin tuna is a highly migratory, slow-growing fish that travels thousand of miles between North America and Japan. They migrate in large schools and spawn in specific, limited areas, making the species quite vulnerable to large-scale, industrial purse-seine fishing techniques that rapidly deplete stocks. Since 1975, the Pacific bluefin population has decreased by 80%. All other bluefin tuna species are listed as endangered or critically endangered by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. In 2007, NMFS called for a moratorium on the take of Atlantic bluefin tuna. Because it is highly prized for sushi and sashimi, as stocks plummet, the price of bluefin tuna continues to rise. Earlier this year, a single bluefin tuna sold for \$55,700 at the Tokyo Fish Market.

In addition to the wild-caught bluefin that are sold directly to fish markets, immature bluefin, typically less than 2-years old, are captured and reared in "tuna ranches" in Baja California until they reach an optimal market weight. The number and size of tuna ranches has expanded in the last 10 years. Removing young stock from the population before they have a chance to reach maturity and reproduce raises significant questions about the long-term sustainability of this fishery. The National Marine

Fisheries Service (NMFS) issues “transshipment” permits authorizing the capture and export of live fish from California to Mexico, however, there is little or no tracking monitoring, and reporting that takes place after the permits are issued. While in each of the last four years, fishing vessels have requested and been granted transshipment permits from NMFS, the agency has not made available information on whether the permits were used and how many fish were caught.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

None.

ANALYSIS

Even with the limited amount of data available, most indications point toward a species in serious decline with respect to the Pacific bluefin. No commercially harvested species can be expected to survive such extreme market forces, particularly in the absence of a strong and rigorously enforced regulatory framework. While NMFS and DFG count “landings” for both commercial and recreational fisheries, respectively, they do not limit or otherwise regulate the actual numbers. The “open access” permits issued to licensees do not cap catch limits or tonnage, nor is there any meaningful restriction on the number of permits granted. NMFS also issues “transshipment permits” for the capture and export of live bluefin, but they do not monitor the actual catch, or at least they have not made those numbers available to the PFMC nor the public. Members of the public who have requested information have been reportedly told to file FOIA requests.

Aside from the obvious impacts to the bluefin population associated with over-fishing, their declining numbers has removed an important predator from the marine food chain. A sharp rise in the number of Humboldt squid (*Dosidicus gigas*), a primary prey species for bluefin, is occurring alongside the bluefin’s decline. This, in turn, is putting additional pressure on the squid’s preferred prey species, causing significant secondary impacts and throwing the whole food chain out of balance, as is the case whenever a keystone predator is removed from the ecosystem.

The International Scientific Committee that reviews the status of Pacific tuna species has recommended that, based on the best available science, current levels of fishing efforts should not be increased on bluefin tuna. Under the Marine Life Management Act, California is directed to take a precautionary approach towards fisheries management. As a participant at the Regional Fishery Management Council and in international regulatory processes, California should be advocating a precautionary approach consistent with its general policies, particularly in light of the absence of a full stock assessment for these fish.

Clearly, the state has an interest in conserving the Pacific bluefin stock, and has an important role to play with respect to federal regulatory agencies. SCR 85 sets forth a plan of action for the state to coordinate within its own departments, and actively engage with federal agencies and other stakeholders to halt illegal, unreported fishing activities, undertake a robust stock assessment, and impose (and enforce) catch limits for Pacific bluefin in the US Exclusive Economic Zone.

RECOMMENDED POSITION

Staff recommends the Commission **Support** SCR 85.

SUPPORT/OPPOSITION (as of 4/08/08)

Support for SCR 85:

Natural Resources Defense Council
World Wildlife Fund
Monterey Bay Aquarium
National Environmental Trust
Blue Ocean Institute
Tuna Research and Conservation Center
Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute
Hopkins Marine Station
National Ocean Economics Program
National Marine Fisheries Service
Adaptive Defense
Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Ocean Conservancy
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association

Opposition to SCR 85:

August Felando, J.D.
Svein Fougner

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 2, 2008

Senate Concurrent Resolution

No. 85

Introduced by Senators Kuehl, Migden, and Wiggins

(Coauthors: Assembly Members DeSaulnier, Feuer, Jones, and Saldana)

February 26, 2008

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 85—Relative to the Pacific bluefin tuna.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SCR 85, as amended, Kuehl. Pacific bluefin tuna.

This measure would seek the assistance of the Governor, *the Fish and Game Commission*, the Department of Fish and Game, ~~and the Ocean Protection Council in initiating, at the highest international level, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Council to work with the Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council and other appropriate authorities to achieve the cessation of illegal, unreported, and unregulated bluefin tuna overfishing, the creation of marine protected areas~~ *implementation of a robust stock assessment of Pacific bluefin tuna to evaluate and enhance conservation efforts for the status of this highly valuable resource, and the imposition and enforcement of catch limits for countries fishing for Pacific bluefin tuna in the United States Exclusive Economic Zone.*

Fiscal committee: yes.

- 1 WHEREAS, The Pacific bluefin tuna is rapidly approaching
- 2 the fate of the collapsed Atlantic bluefin tuna population, which
- 3 ~~has diminished by 90 percent in the Atlantic Ocean and in the~~

1 ~~Mediterranean Sea~~ *has declined by more than 80 percent since*
2 *1975, due to overfishing and the lack of effective conservation*
3 *and protection efforts; and*

4 ~~WHEREAS, The coastal economic losses for California as a~~
5 *WHEREAS, The economic losses for California coastal*
6 *communities as a*

7 *WHEREAS, The populations of all other bluefin tuna species,*
8 *except Pacific bluefin tuna have been declared overfished and*
9 *have been designated as “endangered” or “critically endangered”*
10 *by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN);*
11 *and*

12 *WHEREAS, Complete information on the status of the Pacific*
13 *bluefin tuna requires further study while emerging data suggests*
14 *the fishing pressure on this species is likely to increase due to the*
15 *high worldwide demand for bluefin tuna and the decreased supply*
16 *from Atlantic and Southern bluefin tuna populations; and*

17 *result of the diminishing bluefin tuna population in the Pacific*
18 *Ocean include decreased security of the pelagic (open ocean)*
19 *seafood market and fishing industry, decreased reliability and*
20 *productivity of coastal goods and services, and depletion of jobs*
21 *and income for those communities and stakeholders involved in*
22 *the pelagic seafood fishing industry; and*

23 *WHEREAS, The commercial catch of Pacific bluefin tuna for*
24 *California’s coast from 1950 to 1998 averaged 11,434,390 pounds*
25 *per year; however, since 1999, the average catch has spiraled down*
26 *to an average of 294,544 pounds of tuna per year, a devastating*
27 *drop; and*

28 ~~WHEREAS, Overfishing of the Pacific bluefin tuna, sparked~~
29 ~~by increasing demand by countries around the world, poses an~~
30 ~~imminent threat to California’s coastal economy that has created~~
31 ~~a need for global solutions to preserve the population of the species~~
32 ~~for California; and~~

33 *WHEREAS, Overfishing has caused dramatic shifts in bluefin*
34 *tuna populations that have pushed the species closer to extinction*
35 *on a global scale; and*

36 *WHEREAS, The potential crisis facing the Pacific bluefin tuna*
37 *population could portend future oceanic ecological losses because*
38 *of the loss of habitat and the inability of the ocean environment to*
39 *recover from a biological disruption of such significance that could*
40 *adversely affect the sustainability of current marine life; and*

1 ~~WHEREAS, Without the abundance of the Pacific bluefin tuna~~
2 ~~serving as predators along California’s coastline, an environment~~
3 ~~is provided for the Humboldt squid (*Dosidicus gigas*) to invade~~
4 ~~and devour marine life~~

5 ~~WHEREAS, The declining tuna population off California’s coast~~
6 ~~is one of several factors accounting for the rising numbers of its~~
7 ~~prey, the Humboldt squid (*Dosidicus gigas*), which can invade and~~
8 ~~devour marine life in the tuna’s absence, thereby drastically~~
9 ~~altering the composition and structure of the pelagic community~~
10 ~~for the coast of California; and~~

11 ~~WHEREAS, Tuna swim in enormous schools, often numbering~~
12 ~~in the thousands, that allow modern fishing nets to scoop up which~~
13 ~~allows the capture of entire schools of bluefin tuna, threatening~~
14 ~~the survival of the global bluefin tuna population populations and~~
15 ~~significantly facilitating overfishing of the bluefin tuna; and~~

16 ~~WHEREAS, The Pacific bluefin tuna is a slow growing,~~
17 ~~long-lived endothermic fish that migrates thousands of miles across~~
18 ~~the open ocean to feed and spawn; and~~

19 ~~WHEREAS, The Pacific bluefin tuna is endangered caught by~~
20 ~~the fishing fleets of nations that capture the tuna at their spawning~~
21 ~~areas near Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines before they have a~~
22 ~~chance to spawn, which further decimates the Pacific bluefin tuna~~
23 ~~population; and~~

24 ~~WHEREAS, The Pacific Fishery Management Council, which~~
25 ~~manages fisheries that include highly migratory species, like tunas,~~
26 ~~in the Exclusive Economic Zone, three to 200 miles off the coasts~~
27 ~~of Washington, Oregon, and California, has difficulty enforcing~~
28 ~~the federal Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and~~
29 ~~Management Act and other laws that affect fisheries management~~
30 ~~and which dictate catch limits of the Pacific bluefin tuna; and~~

31 ~~WHEREAS, Research institutions that support and promote~~
32 ~~bluefin tuna protection through governance stewardship include~~
33 ~~the Monterey Bay Aquarium, the Monterey Bay Aquarium~~
34 ~~Research Institute of Science and Engineering, the Blue Oceans~~
35 ~~Institute, the National Environmental Trust, the World Wildlife~~
36 ~~Fund, the Tuna Research and Conservation Center, Hopkins Marine~~
37 ~~Station of Stanford University, the Ocean Conservancy, the~~
38 ~~California Coastal Commission, the National Oceanic and~~
39 ~~Atmospheric Administration, the Natural Resources Defense~~

1 Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
2 Nations, and the National Marine Fisheries Service; now, therefore,
3 *WHEREAS, Research institutions, agencies, and organizations*
4 *that support and promote bluefin tuna protection range from local*
5 *research institutes and state agencies, to federal organizations*
6 *and nonprofits, to international councils and committees; and*

7 *WHEREAS, The current national and international regulatory*
8 *structure of undeclared fishing stocks is failing to provide*
9 *prospective management and protection for the Pacific bluefin*
10 *tuna population against growing pressures due to a lack of*
11 *sufficient data which would allow full analysis of current and*
12 *future threats throughout the migratory range of the species and*
13 *help to prevent the collapse of the Pacific bluefin tuna as has been*
14 *found in other bluefin tuna populations; now, therefore, be it*

15 *Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, the Assembly*
16 *thereof concurring, That the state Legislature acknowledges the*
17 *devastation to the pelagic community off California's coast from*
18 *the mismanagement of the seriously imperiled Pacific bluefin tuna*
19 *potential devastation to the Pacific bluefin tuna species, and*
20 *supports efforts to recover and preserve the population; and be it*
21 *further*

22 *Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of*
23 *this resolution to the Governor, the Fish and Game Commission,*
24 *the Department of Fish and Game, and the Ocean Protection*
25 *Council, to seek their assistance in initiating, at the highest*
26 *international level, the cessation of illegal, the Ocean Protection*
27 *Council, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,*
28 *the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Inter-American Tropical*
29 *Tuna Commission, and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries*
30 *Council to seek their assistance in working with the Pacific*
31 *Regional Fishery Management Council and other appropriate*
32 *authorities for the cessation of illegal, unreported, and unregulated*
33 *bluefin tuna overfishing, the creation of marine protected areas*
34 *implementation of a robust stock assessment for Pacific bluefin*
35 *tuna to evaluate and enhance conservation efforts for the status*
36 *of this highly valuable resource, and the imposition and*
37 *enforcement of catch limits for countries fishing for Pacific bluefin*

- 1 ~~tuna in the~~ *catch limits for Pacific bluefin tuna in the United States*
- 2 Exclusive Economic Zone.

O