
A.2 DOCUMENTATION OF SCOPING PROCESS

APPENDIX A.2

DOCUMENTATION OF SCOPING PROCESS

Public involvement, through scoping, Sanctuary Advisory Councils, workshops, public hearings, submission of written comments, and other means, is vital to the management plan review process and helps Sanctuaries to identify resource management issues and possible solutions. Since CINMS initiated its management plan revision in 1998 the Sanctuary has received comments from thousands of individuals (see the scoping comments archive below). CINMS encourages members of the public to continue expressing their ideas and concerns about the management plan revision through numerous opportunities to comment and get involved.

A.2.1 PUBLIC SCOPING

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) requires Federal agencies to conduct scoping prior to preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a proposed action. According to CEQ regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations Section 1501.7), "There shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. This process shall be termed scoping."

CINMS conducted scoping prior to preparing an EIS as part of the management plan review process. From June to August of 1999 CINMS held seven public scoping meetings on management plan revision across Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles counties, as well as in Washington, D.C. During those meetings numerous individuals raised a wide range of local, regional and national resource concerns and management suggestions. In addition, the Sanctuary received numerous comments about management plan revision via letters, email, and fax. Sanctuary staff compiled these comments and suggestions in two formats: 1) in raw form organized by scoping meeting location, and 2) in synthesized form and organized by issue categories.

A.2.1.1 Public Scoping Comments - Organized by Location

Please note that these are the raw comments extracted from seven public scoping meetings (held from June to August, 1999) along with letters, faxes, and emails received during and after those meetings. These comments were edited for clarity where necessary.

Lompoc

- The Sanctuary needs to be proactive about terrestrial impacts on water quality, (including terrestrial runoff on islands and link to non-native species)
- The Sanctuary needs to evaluate current military activity and impacts on the environment
- Better education needed for recreational divers on their impacts on the resources (from both consumptive activities and the activity of diving itself)
- The Sanctuary should look at creating artificial habitats from out of commission oil rigs and the sinking of ships
- Improve education and outreach efforts to better educate the public about the Sanctuary, its boundaries and resources

- Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts
- The Sanctuary should help to improve marine education in the public school system
- The Sanctuary should focus on habitat needs (fisheries stocks and the physical/biological habitat) including preservation and restoration
- The Sanctuary should work better with other regulatory agencies in managing the resources
- The Sanctuary should consider its position with the expanding range of the sea otter
- Make any Sanctuary restrictions easy and logical for the public
- Keep access to the Sanctuary open to the public, make it smart and protect the resources for future generations

Santa Barbara

- Use adaptive management as the framework for the management plan
- Increase collaboration between agencies
- Adopt an ecosystem approach to management
- Increase and/or establish no take zones to protect biodiversity
- Evaluate accommodation and impacts of sea otters
- Evaluate level and effectiveness of enforcement of regulations
- Conduct a full inventory of species by habitat type, characterize habitats, assess health, look at natural fluctuations vs. human impacts - evaluate the condition of the resources from a scientific perspective
- Incorporate performance standards
- Address water quality issues including looking at impacts from outside Sanctuary boundaries
- Evaluate the impacts on the resources from commercial fisheries and consider no-take zones as a management tool
- Identify and evaluate recreational, military, oil and gas impacts, take steps to limit the uses found to create negative impacts, or mitigate if appropriate
- Refocus on resource protection rather than use
- Balance of protection and use based on scientific information instead of emotion (politics)
- Expand boundaries north to Santa Rosa Creek with goal of protecting biodiversity
- Study impacts of commercial fishing on the resources
- Include land use issues in management plan (non-point source pollution, etc.)
- Improve public education and outreach efforts
- Evaluate impacts from oil drilling including vessel strikes, pipes, platform blowout, other accidents, potential for increased drilling, impacts on tourism

- Evaluate commercial fishing impacts: ships and fleets from outside region, impacts of lights on marine mammals, separate impacts from El Nino from commercial fishing impacts, look at the impacts of squid fishing on dolphins and pinnipeds
- Evaluate the health of kelp, look at impacts from siltation, pollution, run-off, plumes
- Look at general issues of non-point source pollution
- Need to focus on research and include participation of commercial fisherman
- Look at sea otters and the disruption of the ecosystem, the use of mariculture to feed them
- Look at impacts from increasing population and decreasing resources
- Consider interconnections of habitats and ecosystem (reduce stresses on the system, examine impacts)
- Concerned about limitation on access or use of resources, willingness to accept limitations if guarantee continuation of access to fisheries
- Boundary expansion to include entire channel (safety, efficiency, information exchange, environmental reasons), and Santa Catalina
- Better coordination of agencies that share jurisdiction over the resources
- Increase support for Sanctuary by increasing education and awareness
- Sanctuary needs to work with Park Service on impacts on marine environment from terrestrial activities on islands (virus in mice, fox hunting, erosion, runoff)
- Expand boundaries northward because of richness, dynamic province, it may contribute to the Channel Islands ecosystems, strong upwelling components for overall system - threats include development, oil, mining, (even potential threats to health of the coastal zone)
- Make boundary determinations based on ecosystem perspective
- Management plan must call for an active role in oil/gas lease agreements/sales
- Sanctuary to consider effects of rigs-to-reef on surrounding environments
- Define more clearly the authorities of the Sanctuary, investigate possibility of accruing greater authority
- Sanctuary should partner with coastal water shed and water quality groups
- Need to understand what happens nearshore and inter-islands ecologically and with regard to water quality
- Resource management should be based on a thorough understanding of ecosystem management vs. species by species management
- Boundaries should expand to shore to encompass: ecosystem perspective, connection between ocean and land, water quality
- Sanctuary expansion should provide forum to merge interest groups and concerns
- As part of the management plan review process, maps of the islands and Sanctuary boundaries should be placed on the website with links to other interest groups. Do this to encourage public interest and ownership of the process, include: what Sanctuary is, what Sanctuary does and does

not do, maps showing resources, activities and issues. Do this in simple language, clear English, concept oriented

- Enhance outreach efforts to stimulate public involvement in management plan revision process, foster stewardship
- Understand dynamism of ecosystems and our role in monitoring, evaluate to result in adaptive management
- Increase funding to achieve objectives
- Use CalCOFI data and increase water quality data collection to CalCOFI stations and in between those stations (closer to shore and more offshore)
- Mooring systems for boaters who regularly visit islands (protect kelp and bottom)
- Better weather reporting (more sites, live cameras on islands, more real-time reports) to improve safety
- Provide hard copies of current management plan in public libraries
- Better enforcement and monitoring
- Northward boundary expansion to protect spawning grounds
- Revitalizing coastal Chumash culture, question of access to sacred areas (don't want any restrictions on access)
- Concern about threat of oil leases being exercised
- Marine reserves - for protection of sea otters/macro invertebrates
- Different jurisdictional authorities need to be identified, Sanctuary needs to have influence
- Sanctuary should be coordinating agency for other authorities and needs more regulatory authority
- Sanctuary should address water quality issues
- Sanctuary should make connections between watersheds and ocean systems through education and outreach
- Concern about oil/gas leases - include language (to maximize protection of the resources) in the reauthorization of renewal of existing leases
- Concern about increased use of the area, not more regulation of multi-use (ecotourism)
- If the SAC will be dealing with boundary expansion issues, then San Luis Obispo should be represented on Sanctuary Advisory Council
- Chumash would like to be represented on the SAC

Oxnard

- Interest in monitoring of abalone populations
- Concern about impacts from military activity and expansion plans (Navy Sea Test Range)
- Concern about discharge from fishing vessels

- Education/outreach should be a top priority: more resources and activities, focus on primary schools, expand programs outside of Santa Barbara, teacher workshops, develop this at early age, provide more direct interaction with the marine resources, interpretive enforcement (backed up by law enforcement)
- Investigate our use of terms such as "resources", "no-take zones"
- Take resource management out of the hands of the Dept. of Commerce
- Laws should be made adequate enough to protect the resources
- Limited entry for divers
- No-take zones with limited access demonize certain activities, no-take zones should be absolute, that don't let anyone in except for navigation
- Visitor use should be limited and appropriate such as the use of sea caves where there are nesting seabirds

Long Beach

- Concerned about protecting sea otters
- Opposed to oil and gas development in the channel
- Concerned about funding - adequate financial resources to carry out mission
- Concerned about impacts from recreational boaters, more education needed yacht clubs
- Need to address habitat enhancement for endangered species - should be a priority over human use
- Need to address the threat that non-native species pose to endangered species
- Need to take a look at maximum enforcement of regulations
- Need a comprehensive and complete management plan with research areas - no-take zones and ground truth areas for sampling
- Need to be strong about what is allowable and what is not
- The management should address terrestrial impacts on the Sanctuary - the relationship between human activities in the island watersheds and the effect on the intertidal
- Enforcement should allow for more than paper protection (need citations, fines, etc.)
- Concerned about aquaria collectors taking too many resources
- Need to recruit stewards of the Sanctuary
- The Sanctuary needs to engage in "gorilla" marketing (more aggressive self-promotion)
- Concerned about tanker traffic
- Concerned about water quality
- Concerned about the impact of kelp forests from urchin harvest

Ventura

- Interested (as a fisherman) what areas may be closed down
- Interested in seeing increased protection
- Would like to see water quality issues addressed in management plan
- Sea Test Range should be recognized as a use (having impacts on the Sanctuary)
- Coastal Ventura County is concerned with impacts in their area
- Need more offshore protection - need to sponsor a new bill for a new Sanctuary between Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary – concerned about: offshore oil, fishing, would also support expansion to existing boundary
- Want to see a rotating closure for sea urchin fishery - pollution is the biggest issue, an all out closure would kill the fishery
- Sanctuary should take into account and be prepared for significant increase in military activity
- Sanctuary needs increase in protection from radar activity and not plan as if the military doesn't exist
- Need more outreach and partnerships with agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and in particular DOD - look to other more recent sanctuaries and their relationship to Dept. of Defense - be staunch in our own defense
- Concerned with nearshore water quality: more pressure on fish in islands, plume from Santa Clara river, make CINMS concerns apparent to other agencies
- Provide more education opportunities for the public
- Navy stated that they would be willing to share information on marine mammals, air quality, etc. with the Sanctuary to use in their EIS
- Interest in authorities and priorities - very confusing: outreach problem - public needs to be educated, need information in a sound bit
- Expand Sanctuary boundaries - include coast, make as big as possible, more needs to be protected, address coastal water quality issues, boundaries are too arbitrary and don't address threats outside boundaries
- Otters will cause more conflict with people who rely on the resources, CINMS should be prepared

Washington, D.C.

- Need to spell and formalize (including relationships with other agencies) the process for the management plan and marine reserves
- Marine reserve issue needs to fundamentally be part of the management plan
- Need to realize impact of extractive activities on the decline of the marine resources (rock fish, giant sea bass, etc)

- Support for exploring various issues within the issues of boundary expansion - tie to rationale - water quality, oil & gas, critical in EIS to state how boundary expansion will address these other issues
- Issue of funding and resources if boundary expand, need to develop budget to support
- Implementing new management plan will require more resources
- If you do reach out to the nearshore, suggest you include impacts/events in programs
- Need to consider runoff from Channel Islands due to erosion
- First priority for management plan should be emphasis on activities within current boundaries and why marine reserves are a critical issue
- Need to consider dynamics of sea otters as functional part of original community in Channel Islands and the roll of CINMS in re-establishing populations

San Luis Obispo

- If CINMS expanded the boundary, what could you do
- Need to have more oversight of discharge in SLO (two power plants), and monitor intake as well
- Concerned about development of 40 oil and gas leases off of SLO County
- What can the sanctuary do that existing agencies don't already do
- Need local CINMS presence
- Need to maintain sustainable fisheries
- Would boundary redefinition change the focus/mission of CINMS
- Concerned about status of resources on Santa Lucia Bank. Marine living resources don't know boundaries - are found in between sanctuaries, they need protection in all areas
- Need to create new sanctuary for: 1) local presence and control, 2) Point Conception to Point Blanca, 3) local needs/concerns need to be presented, 4) different environment, need different sanctuary, 5) might want higher standard (stricter regulations) for this area
- Need connection between CINMS and MBNMS
- Pinnipeds are overpopulated is the sanctuary going to do anything
- Ban personal watercraft
- Sanctuary status gives one more level of protection
- Focus on issues and threats protection of resources is paramount
- Oil out - concern about impacts on environment, must extend far enough to include federal leases
- Allow compatible uses of resources, eliminate incompatible uses
- Concerned that without prohibiting oil, it will still be allowed
- Existing plots should be researched before being allowed to be developed
- Concerned about rigs-to-reefs

- Citizen action is critical
- Trust relations with governments, what has both MBNMS and CINMS done since regulation to protect resources
- Local sanctuary needed to meet and address this community's need
- Need to define process for local sanctuary
- Implement and support research projects
- Slow down oil lease/platform development process
- Education should be about the resources
- General concern for health of the ocean; sanctuaries offer an opportunity to protect; need for comprehensive protection - ecosystem management
- If boundary expanded or new one designated, need local office
- Need community representation
- Concern that decision making would not occur locally
- Concern over regulation of kelp beds, concerned the MBNMS regulation of kelp beds could affect CINMS
- Concern that public will be shut out of regulatory process
- International designation of biosphere reserve could increase regulation/authority affecting the state's/county's resources
- Concern about impacts from commercial and sport fishing
- Confusion over resource protection, what specifically does the Sanctuary do
- Concern over fishery management and potential for sanctuaries to become involved in this
- Would the establishment of a sanctuary stop existing oil and gas leases, new leases
- Concern over the development of 40 undeveloped offshore leases, is there something that can be done
- Concern about water quality and non-point source pollution
- Support for sanctuary designation to address non-point source pollution
- Need for specific language to address sediment loads and specific sources of pollution, near shore resources have been impacted
- Need for summarizing of research that decision makers and the public can understand
- Concerned about harbor maintenance activities being further regulated
- Concern that fishery regulations might be put in place at a later time
- Concerned about dredging regulations that would impact fisheries
- Concerned that vessel traffic regulations may affect fisherman
- Concern that prohibitions of new structures would affect fisherman
- Too many stakeholders - not all needs can be met

- Concern that a local office needs to be established to represent local people
- Concern that reauthorization is a blank check to make changes in the program that would detrimentally affect fisherman
- Does not believe there are the same water qualities as the east coast
- Does not support expansion of the CINMS boundaries
- Support for expansion of CINMS to SLO - sanctuary would offer opportunity to preserve resources
- Need for comprehensive representation
- Concern about no take zones in other sanctuaries
- Concerned about mistakes made by resource managers
- Sanctuary program would bring in more democracy – increase public involvement in management issues
- How would new boundaries be selected or developed
- If boundaries extend to shoreline, do regulations apply upstream
- How is the public specifically involved in the process to expand CINMS boundaries
- Will CINMS come back to SLO after DEIS to hear comments
- Concern about oil and gas development
- Concern about polluted runoff
- Concern about motorized personal watercraft
- Concern about water quality
- Concerned about commercial fisheries being sustainable
- If it isn't broke, why fix it, many regulations already in place
- Lack of education about resources with policy makers
- Collapse of certain fishery resources in spite of regulations
- Establishment of no take zones - what are effects on commercial fishing
- Define role of National Marine Sanctuary Program
- Will designation change oil leases and discharges
- Watershed issues - establishing protection for these areas
- Residents love coastline, looking for mechanism to protect it
- Concerned about restrictions of commercial fishing in Morro Bay and Avila Beach, want to protect livelihoods
- Need sustainable fishing resources, regulations are important to protect environment and marine inhabitants in general
- Need to be careful of selective protection

- Ecosystem based approach
- Is there a proposed expansion
- We don't have to make 1,000's of miles of oceans of private aquarium
- Consider boundary expansion alternative
- Balance between protection and commercial fishing
- Need local control an input
- Stop industrial assault
- Protection needs to come from existing national marine sanctuary
- Fishing industry concerned with trust, what does sanctuary do
- The following items need action now, not 5 years from now: oil, water quality, unregulated motorized personal watercraft
- Sanctuary provides umbrella
- Education of public is important, what is protection
- Does sanctuary designation improve water quality

Written Comments

- Establish the proposed Central Coast National Marine Sanctuary or expand CINMS to include waters from Pt. Arguello to the southern end of MBNMS
- Need local hearing on management plan in San Luis Obispo County
- Create a marine sanctuary off the coast of San Luis Obispo
- In favor of proposal to create a separate sanctuary for the central coast area
- Report from commercial fisherman in Oxnard: kelp is bouncing back, sea urchins = lots and a lot of legal picking size - the best in years, sea cucumbers- seeing alot in all sizes, Santa Rosa and Miguel = alot of abalone except where sport divers dive, alot of large sheephead and other fish are larger
- Support for extension of the area managed by CINMS to include, as a minimum, Santa Lucia Bank area in San Luis Obispo County with consideration to include the intertidal zone from Pismo Beach to Avila Beach
- The revised management plan should include a comprehensive, coordinated strategy for protecting resources from water quality impairment (land based pollution), efforts should include in increased public awareness, research and monitoring
- Develop water quality strategy that includes wastes from boats including no-discharge zones
- Include provisions for prohibiting discharge outside of Sanctuary boundaries that may impact Sanctuary resources
- Propose to designate more ecological reserves within the Sanctuary to protect marine biodiversity: maintain key processes in a relatively undisturbed manner, lessen impact of large

scale natural disasters, increase understanding of the marine environment, provide research opportunities

- '15 CFR 922.71' (exploring for, developing, and producing hydrocarbons), this section should be clarified so that any of these activities will be prohibited. Should also include prohibiting the exploration for, development, or production of minerals.
- Management plan should stress forming new partnerships with other federal and state agencies, research institutions, local governments, user groups, citizen groups, and others to implement a strategy for restoring and protecting Channel Islands ecosystem
- Expand the boundaries to improve protection of wildlife from pollution, expanding offshore oil drilling, and other potential threats
- Add language to Sanctuary regulations to govern the relationship with Dept. of Defense, regulations should require all military activities to avoid to the Maximum Extent Practicable any adverse impact to Sanctuary's resources or quality
- Urges National Marine Sanctuary Designation for the Central Coast
- A need for a new marine sanctuary covering the central coast area between Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
- Fight against the activation of new offshore oil leases
- Develop a fishery management program under the auspices of Sanctuary
- Consider expanding the boundaries of CINMS to include the resources already identified in the draft revision to the site evaluation list or expansion of sanctuary boundaries to be studied as an alternative
- Boundary expansion of CINMS to include the coastal waters of Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo County
- Need a permanent sanctuary on the Central Coast as protection from drilling (oil and gas)
- No commercial fishing or "taking" of any kind. There must be someplace where nature is truly safe from the wholesale destruction the human race specializes in. . . a place where nature is supreme
- Extend the boundaries northward into San Luis Obispo County, include the Santa Lucian Bank, a nursery for many marine species and San Simeon where the elephant seals nurse their pups.
- Extend the northern boundary to include the Santa Lucia Bank to protect an area critical to the life cycles of so many marine species of concern and preclude the imminent threat of new offshore oil development
- Of utmost importance is the need for the management plan to maximize the recovery of endangered and threatened species
- Consider the possibility of extending the boundaries of CINMS northward to include southern San Luis Obispo County and the Santa Lucia Bank
- NAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV requests the Sea Range operations that continue to utilize the CINMS waters and airspace above be recognized. This continued utilization is consistent with previous management plans and implementation regulations. These activities are conducted in compliance with all environmental and other regulations including stringent safety procedures to

ensure operating areas are cleared of all civilian air and ship traffic. Significant increases in the types and tempos of activities in the CINMS are not planned.

- Against all offshore drilling
- Urge consideration of expanding the CINMS northward to the southern boundary of the MBNMS, this expansion to include the Santa Lucia Bank
- Urge consideration of expanding the CINMS northward to the MBNMS, this expansion to include Santa Lucia Bank
- Concerned with nearshore water quality affects the entire region
- Coordinate with other federal and state agencies to improve nearshore water quality and restore critical habitat provided by the region's rivers and estuaries
- Concerned about current and future military operations within and directly adjacent to the sanctuary. The impact of this technology on marine mammals
- Recommend expansion of the CINMS boundaries to have greater control over regional influences that affect the sensitive marine environment
- Address the impacts of water pollution on the sanctuary and its wildlife
- Establish a network of sea life reserves to promote biodiversity, improve scientific understanding, maintain some areas of the oceans as wilderness
- Evaluate the advantages for the ecosystem by expanding the sanctuary's boundaries
- Improve coordination with federal and state agencies, particularly the Dept. of Defense
- Strengthen protections from expanded offshore oil and gas development and mineral extraction
- Coordinate fisheries research
- Highlight the significant need for increased federal appropriations to support existing and new responsibilities
- A plea to either extend the CINMS north to meet the southern edge of the MBNMS (Santa Rosa Creek at Cambria), or extend both to meet in the middle somewhere
- We request that an expansion of the Sanctuary boundaries be studied as an alternative and that it include development of a management plan that has quantifiable performance objectives
- The Navy objects to any proposed changes in the plan and regulations for the CINMS that would hinder Navy's ability to continue to train for combat readiness or test weapons systems in support of National defense
- The Santa Lucia Bank off of Point Sal causes upwelling of mineral-rich waters that provide nutrients to the CINMS, this would be an important addition to the ecosystem that is presently being managed with long-term sustainability in mind
- Marine sanctuary status would help us preserve this area as a renewal grounds for fisheries and the nearshore ecosystem. Fisherman would benefit from this in the long term
- Perception by fisherman that worldwide and local perceptions and concepts are driving fishery management decisions, not actual scientific information

- Concern about fishing access to the Channel islands area especially regarding the harvest refugia proposal. Constituents want to know whether reserves will be no-take or partial-take such as fishing for pelagic species but not benthic species. They also question how fair it is to keep humans out of no-take zones and not also consider marine mammal impacts.
- The impact of marine mammals (i.e., sea lions, harbor seals, sea otters) on coastal and pelagic species (i.e., northern anchovy, sardine, jack mackerel, Pacific mackerel) and recreational fish is a concern. There is a perception that the protection of marine mammals is having a devastating effect on fisheries on some of NMFS' constituents believe that marine mammals should be managed.
- Regarding the Channel Islands, some members of the public think there are enough marine reserves in California.
- Constituents also want to see economic studies performed on the effects of no-take areas
- Anecdotal information suggests that squid fishing operations working within sanctuary boundaries is altering the behavior of seabird species that roost and breed on the Channel Islands, resulting in increased nest abandonment and predation rates.
- Hazardous material spills resulting from activities within sanctuary boundaries, including leaks from commercial and recreational watercraft and spills from oil exploration or development activity could adversely affect many species and their prey bases. Oil spills are especially harmful to the endangered southern sea otter, as contact with oil decreases the southern sea otter's natural insulation against temperature loss and can result in hypothermia or death.
- The noise and vibrations from the operation of motorized watercraft or other heavy equipment may harass species and impair their ability to feed. This form of disturbance could cause individuals of many species to alter the behavior (e.g., activity periods, space use), resulting in increased risk of predation, reduces access to resources, and reduced breeding success.
- Disturbance from other recreational or commercial activities permitted within sanctuary boundaries, such as fishing, SCUBA diving, or snorkeling, could disturb species and affect their ability to forage or reproduce.
- Support expanding the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary to include the San Luis Obispo marine environment
- The status quo is simply too risky as periodic attempts are made to open up our coast to greater economic development.
- Urge you to support the extension of the Channel Islands Marine Sanctuary to our county (SLO).
- Support for the extension northward of the CINMS to include areas around and including the Santa Lucia Bank off the Santa Maria Basin, this is an area of extreme importance to fisheries and should in no case be exposed to risk by oil drilling and extraction operations by the development of existing lease sites
- Hold firm for the protection of the marine resources and let the politicians handle the lease issues
- I am in favor of expanding the CINMS boundary northward and am willing to dedicate my time and energy toward that reality

- Because of the biodiversity, it seems the central coast would be better served by creation of a completely new sanctuary, where a management plan can be developed to meet the unique challenges found here
- Would like to see expansion of the boundaries to Nipomo Dunes and Point Sal
- The purpose of this letter is to voice strong support for extending the CINMS to include the Central Coast islands
- Any material oil spill could have devastating effects and damage to these areas both north and south of the undeveloped leases. We strongly urge your CINMS group to sponsor such a study which would be extremely valuable information in getting marine sanctuary protection in this area. And it would be persuasive information for not allowing these undeveloped leases from being developed.
- I am convinced that it is extremely important to increase protections for the splendid CINMS. First, a revised management plan should clearly address the impact pollution has on the sanctuary's wildlife and water quality. Second, a revised management plan should establish effective sea life reserves within the sanctuary where human activities are limited and strictly monitored. Finally, it is essential that the new plan will study whether the current boundaries are appropriate to protect marine wildlife of the Channel Islands.
- I hope you will consider extending the boundaries of the CINMS northward to meet the MBNMS and eastward to the mainland. The possibility of future oil exploration and development poses a threat to the CINMS. The seismic survey, oil spills and vessel traffic that will result from such exploration and development can cause damage to the ecosystems and disturb marine life within the Channel Islands
- Support for efforts to increase protections for the spectacular marine life of the CINMS. The new management plan should clearly address the impact pollution has on the Sanctuary's wildlife and water quality. The management plan should establish effective sea life reserves, areas where human activities are limited, within the sanctuary and the new plan should study whether the current boundaries are appropriate to protect the marine life of the Channel Islands.

A.2.1.2 Public Scoping Comments Synthesis - Organized by Issue Category

Many members of the public provided comments on the same topical areas, or issue categories. These included: water quality; education and outreach; research, monitoring and enforcement; boundary redefinition; military activity; oil and gas; marine reserves; sea otters; and other management issues. Please note that Sanctuary staff produced this synthesis of comments based on raw comments extracted from seven public scoping meetings (held from June to August, 1999) along with letters, faxes, and emails received during and after those meetings. The raw comments are provided above in section A.2.1.1.

Water Quality

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding water quality were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Long Beach, Ventura, and Washington, D.C. Comments regarding water quality were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Increase public awareness about water quality through education

- A no discharge zone for boats
- Need comprehensive coordinated strategy
- Concern over discharge from fishing vessels
- Make connection between watersheds and ocean systems
- Increase water quality data collection stations
- Sanctuary should partner with coastal watershed and water quality groups
- Impact on kelp from siltation, pollution, runoff
- Look at impacts on sanctuary from outside of boundaries
- Include provisions for prohibiting discharges outside of sanctuary boundaries that may impact sanctuary resources
- Be proactive about terrestrial water quality impacts (including from the Channel Islands)

Education and Outreach

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding education and outreach were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Long Beach, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo. Comments regarding education and outreach were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Better education about sanctuary boundaries and resources
- Better recreational diver education
- Maps showing resources, activities and issues
- Enhance outreach efforts to stimulate stewardship
- Should be top priority: more resources and activities, focus on primary schools, and outside of Santa Barbara
- Sanctuary should work to improve marine education in the public schools
- More education needed for yacht clubs

Research, Monitoring, and Enforcement

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding research, monitoring, and enforcement were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Long Beach, and San Luis Obispo. Comments regarding research, monitoring, and enforcement were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Increase monitoring and enforcement efforts
- Evaluate effectiveness of enforcement of regulations
- Research should include participation of fisherman
- Understand dynamism and our role in monitoring

- Use CalCOFI data and monitor between stations
- Conduct full inventory of species by habitat type, characterize habitat, assess health, look at natural fluctuations vs. human impacts
- Study impacts of commercial fishing on the resources
- Need to summarize research for decision makers and public

Boundary Redefinition

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding boundary redefinition were: Santa Barbara, Ventura, Washington, D.C., and San Luis Obispo. Comments regarding boundary redefinition were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Expand north to Santa Rosa Creek with goal of protecting biodiversity
- Expansion to include entire Channel and Santa Catalina Island (safety, efficiency, information exchange, protect environment)
- Expand north to protect ecosystem, dynamic province, strong upwelling components, spawning grounds
- Expand to coast to make connection between ocean and land
- New sanctuary between CINMS and MBNMS, concerned about offshore oil and fishing (Central Coast Sanctuary)
- Expand to include waters from Pt. Arguello to MBNMS
- North to include Santa Lucia Bank
- Include coastal waters of Santa Barbara County and San Luis Obispo County
- Boundaries are too arbitrary and don't address threats outside sanctuary
- Question on whether boundary redefinition would change the focus/mission of CINMS
- Need to create new sanctuary from Point Conception to Point Planca
- Does not support expansion of CINMS boundaries
- How would new boundaries be selected or developed
- Support for extending CINMS to include Central Coast islands
- Boundary expansion to Nipomo Dunes and Point Sal

Military Activity

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding military activity were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Long Beach, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo. Comments regarding military activity were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Evaluate military activity impacts on environment
- Concerned about expansion plans from Navy Sea Test Range

- Need protection from radar activity
- Military activities to avoid to the Maximum Extent Practicable any adverse impact to Sanctuary resources
- Should take into account and be ready for increase in military activity
- Concern about the impact of this technology on marine mammals
- The Navy objects to any proposed changes in the plan and regulations that would hinder their ability to train for combat readiness or weapon systems in support of national defense

Oil and Gas

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding oil and gas were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Long Beach, Ventura, Washington, D.C., and San Luis Obispo. Comments regarding oil and gas were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Evaluate impacts from oil drilling including vessel strikes, pipes, platform blowout, other accidents, potential for increased drilling, impacts on tourism
- Concern about oil/gas leases - include language (to maximize protection of the resources) in the reauthorization or renewal of existing leases
- Opposed to oil and gas development in the Channel
- Concerned about development of 40 oil and gas leases off of SLO County
- Slow down oil lease/platform development process
- Hazardous material spills resulting from activities within sanctuary boundaries, including leaks from commercial and recreational watercraft and spills from exploration or development activity could adversely affect any species and their prey bases

Marine Reserves

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding marine reserves were: Santa Barbara, Oxnard, Long Beach, Ventura, Washington, D.C., and San Luis Obispo. Comments regarding marine reserves were also received in written format. Specific comments included the following:

- Increase and/or establish no take zones to protect biodiversity
- Evaluate the impacts on the resources from commercial fisheries and consider no take zones as a management tool
- Marine reserves needed for the protection of sea otters/macroinvertebrates
- No take zones with limited access demonize certain activities, no take zones should be absolute, don't let anyone in except for navigation
- Need a comprehensive and complete management plan with research area - no take zones as ground truth areas for sampling
- Marine reserves issue needs to fundamentally be part of the management plan

- Propose to designate more ecological reserves within the sanctuary to protect marine biodiversity: maintain key processes in a relatively undisturbed manner, lessen impact of large scale disasters, increase understanding of marine environment, provide research opportunities
- Establish network of sea life reserves to promote biodiversity, improve scientific understanding, maintain areas of ocean as wilderness
- There are enough marine reserves in California

Sea Otters

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding sea otters were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Long Beach, Ventura, Washington, D.C. Comments regarding sea otters were also received in written format. Specifics comments included the following:

- Sanctuary should take a position on the expanding range of the sea otter
- Evaluate accommodation and impacts of sea otters
- Marine reserves for the protection of sea otters
- Concern about protecting sea otters
- Otters will cause more conflicts with people who rely on the resources, CINMS should be prepared
- Need to consider sea otters as functional part of original community in Channel Islands and the roll of CINMS in reestablishing populations
- Concern about the impact of marine mammals on coastal and pelagic species

Other Management Issues

Communities in which individuals provided scoping comments regarding other management issues were: Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Long Beach, Ventura, Washington, D.C. Comments regarding other management issues were also received in written format. Specifics comments included the following:

- Adopt ecosystem management policies that allow for the evaluation of sanctuary regulations and programs and adaptation to new information
- Clarify the financial resources needed to meet current and future management needs
- Sanctuary should focus on habitat needs including preservation and restoration
- Should work better with other regulatory agencies in managing the resources
- Any restrictions should be easy and logical for the public
- Keep access to the sanctuary open to the public, make it smart and protect the resources for future generations
- Incorporate performance standards
- Refocus on resource protection rather than use

- Resource management should be based on a thorough understanding of ecosystem vs. species by species management
- Should be mooring systems for boaters who visit islands
- Improve coordination with federal and state agencies, and establish new partnerships and better collaboration between agencies across state/federal jurisdictions
- Need to address habitat enhancement for endangered species, should be a priority over human use
- Need to address the threat non-native species pose to endangered species
- Need to recruit stewards of the sanctuary
- Concern about tanker traffic
- First priority for management plan should be emphasis on activities within current boundaries
- Concern about public being shut out of regulatory process
- Too many stakeholders, not all needs can be met
- Concern about personalized watercraft

A.2.2 ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES TO COMMENT

CINMS welcomes your comments. Sanctuary constituents, including members of the general public, have additional opportunities to comment on the management plan revision process:

The Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC)

The SAC is composed of forty individuals representing various constituent groups and government agencies. The SAC provides a variety of opportunities for the public to comment on the management plan revision: commenting during public comment periods at bi-monthly SAC meetings, speaking to the SAC member(s) representing their interest area(s), or by applying to participate directly in the SAC as one of its members.

Public hearings

CINMS will host a series of public hearings after releasing the draft management plan and draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) to the public. Notices with information about public hearings will be posted in the Federal Register and also on the Sanctuary's website: <http://channelislands.nos.noaa.gov/welcome.html>.

Contact Sanctuary Management Plan Staff

CINMS welcomes your comments and questions about the management plan revision. Members of the public are welcome to contact our staff at any time using the information provided below. Thank you for taking the time to review these important planning documents and for providing your comments to us.

Management Plan Staff:

Management Plan Coordinator
Michael Murray
Phone: (805) 884-1464
Email: michael.murray@noaa.gov

Management Plan Specialist
Sarah MacWilliams
Phone: (805) 884-1469
Email: sarah.macwilliams@noaa.gov

Sanctuary Mailing Address/Fax/Phone

Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary
113 Harbor Way, Suite 150
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
Fax: (805) 568-1582
Phone: (805) 966-7107

Sanctuary Management Plan Website

<http://channelislands.nos.noaa.gov/manplan/overview.html>