

California Coastal National Monument

**Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**



Public Comment Meeting Summaries

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
Monterey Bay

Location: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, Moss Landing, CA

Date & Time: Thursday, October 14, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, The California State University

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Jeff Fontana, Northern California Public Affairs Office, BLM
- Aaron King, Marine Biologist, CCNM & NOAA-National Marine Protected Areas Center
- Rachel Saunders, Community Liaison, NOAA-Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) & BLM-CCNM
- Brad Damitz, Environmental Policy Specialist, NOAA-MBNMS & BLM-CCNM
- Mike Rushton, CCNM RMP Project Principal, Sacramento office, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

The meeting was opened by Dr. Greg Cailliet of the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML). Monument Manager Rick Hanks provided a 30-minute PowerPoint overview of the monument and the planning process, and then led a question/answer/comment session that ran for about an hour and 15 minutes. The total meeting ran about two hours and the tone was cordial.

The discussion was dominated by concerns from members of the Recreational Fishing Alliance (RFA), who were concerned that the monument plan will limit their recreational fishing activities. The meeting discussion and a meeting handout provided by Hanks seemed to increase their understanding about the monument and the intent of the management plan. Hanks also offered the RFA the opportunity to participate in the planning process and CCNM management as a collaborative partner. RFA spokesman Howard Egan said he is interested in participating at that level.

There were about 20 members of the public in attendance, including the contingent from the RFA. Not all of the meeting attendees signed-in. Bonnie Vantise, field representative for Congressman Sam Farr, attended and participated in the discussion. Genevieve Bookwalter, a reporter for the Santa Cruz Sentinel, covered the meeting. She

will file a story for the Saturday, Oct. 16, edition. Greg Aumann, BLM Central California Special Agent, was also in attendance. The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., staff, public, press, etc.) was about 30.

Public Comment Summary:

- Members of the RFA are concerned with the preferred alternative. They said the preferred alternative could lead to restrictions on fishing boat travel within the monument area, resulting in BLM having “de facto” jurisdiction over recreational fishing.
- The RFA detailed its concerns in a prepared statement that has been provided to the BLM.
- RFA: There is no threat to the rocks and islands of the monument, and therefore no need for new protections.
- Recreational fishing is a “valid existing right” that must be recognized in the CCNM plan/EIS.
- Preferred alternative language limiting monument recreation to “appreciating from afar” could limit fishing boat access near the monument rocks and islands, restricting fishing access.
- Fishermen need access near the rocks and islands; they are productive areas.
- The plan should specify that recreational fishing is an allowable low-impact activity.
- There were questions about the activities that threaten the rocks and islands and one suggestion that BLM provide a specific list of these activities.
- The draft RMP/EIS is fatally flawed. The planning process should start over with an improved public scoping process.
- BLM should clarify the meaning of “enjoy from afar.”
- There are no threats to the rocks and islands. “No boater in his right mind would take a boat near a rock in the ocean.” Another commenter: “I have never seen anyone on one of the rocks.”
- An increase in active management of the rocks and islands might actually have adverse impacts on the plant and animal habitats that the monument seeks to protect.

- The RFA objects to seasonal restrictions on access to rocks and islands, even if imposed out of concern for nesting seabirds, because of the concern that access limitations near the rocks and islands could constitute a restriction on recreational fishing.
- The plan and monument proclamation do not clearly define “reef.” Audience members noted that they define reefs as being submerged at all times (while the monument has jurisdiction over features above mean high tide).
- There was a question about what BLM will contribute to management of the rocks and islands (and coastal ecosystems) that other agencies and organizations are not already contributing.
- Discussion of the draft management plan should not be limited to BLM’s role, even though BLM is the agency developing the management plan. Because management of the CCNM will depend heavily on partnerships, all discussions of the draft should focus on the roles of all partners.
- There was a question about the source of scientific information used in the draft plan/EIS and about the sources of science and research for future management of the monument.
- There was a question about how the monument will encourage scientific research.
- There was a question about how the site characterization would be completed.
- No one attending the meeting (RFA member speaking) wants to harm the oceans or the environment. They appreciate the opportunity to participate in active – not reactive – way in the planning process.
- There were several concerns about language in the preferred alternative being vague and open to interpretation.
- Language in the draft RMP/EIS needs to be specific about vision and intent.
- Plan language needs to be especially clear in the area of access for recreational fishing.
- The executive summary does not paint a clear picture of the differences among the plan alternatives.

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
Point Arena

Location: Point Arena City Hall, Point Arena, CA

Date & Time: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: Point Arena Lighthouse Keepers, Inc.

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Jeff Fontana, Public Affairs Officer, Northern California, BLM
- Rich Burns, Field Manager, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Jonna Hildenbrand, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Brad Colin, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Larry Ames, Interpretive Specialist, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Walt Gabler, Law Enforcement Ranger, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Mike Rushton, CCNM RMP Project Principal, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

Jeff Gale, Executive Director of the Point Arena Lighthouse Keepers, Inc., opened the meeting. Monument Manager Rick Hanks provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the CCNM and the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. He then conducted a question and answer session. The following questions and comments were recorded on flip charts during the question/answer portion of the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received; they are not verbatim. Hanks encouraged meeting participants to submit comments in writing, through email, by fax, or using the on-line electronic comment form. He also added that the most useful comments are those that are specific to a particular sentence or page, or that provide reasonable suggestions about how to improve the draft plan.

There were eight members of the public attending. Julie Veran of the Independent Coast Observer arrived shortly after the beginning of the meeting. The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., staff, public, etc.) was 18 people.

Question and Comment Summary:

- There were questions raised about the impacts of seaweed harvesting on the rocks and islands.
- Native American tribes have a sovereign right to harvest seaweed.
- Will harvest of seaweed cause impacts to the habitat on the rocks and islands? Some types of sea plants anchor themselves to the rocks.
- The plan should be specific about seaweed collection. The plan should pay attention to minimizing collection activities that could damage the environment of the rocks and islands.
- Tide pools could be damaged with increased visitation associated with the monument.
- There were tribal concerns with the potential for changes in California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) regulations covering seaweed harvest.
- How does the draft plan address collection of rocks that wash ashore?
- The monument plan should take into consideration the fact that sea palm does not grow everywhere.
- The DFG should close abalone harvesting for four years statewide to allow populations to recover.
- Will permits be required for scientific research and testing? Will information gathered in this research be publicly available?
 - [Hanks: Yes.]
- What jurisdiction would the BLM have on activities below mean high tide that would affect birds and mammals that use the rocks and islands?
 - [Hanks: No direct jurisdiction, but issues could be addressed in working with monument partners.]
- Would scientists be allowed to study earthquake faults on monument features above mean high tide?
 - [Hanks: Yes.]

- Can the monument protect against offshore oil drilling?
 - [Hanks: The monument proclamation states that the monument does not affect oil and gas leasing off of the monument, but impacts to the monument would have to be considered any agency proposing to authorize off-shore oil and gas leasing.]
- Can the monument prohibit new leasing in US waters?
 - [Hanks: No, but all mineral entry is prohibited on the monument's rocks and islands.]
- Does the EIS consider the impacts of offshore drilling?
 - [Hanks: No. That would be a responsibility of the Minerals Management Service for federal off-shore leasing.]
- Will the Department of Fish and Game continue to regulate seaweed harvest in the monument area?
 - [Hanks: Yes.]
- The plan should contain more specific/stronger language to encourage that agency review of adjacent activities should consider impacts on the monument.

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
Elk

Location: Greenwood Community Center, Elk, CA

Date & Time: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: Mendocino District, California Department of Parks & Recreation

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Jeff Fontana, Public Affairs Officer, Northern California, BLM
- Rich Burns, Field Manager, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Jonna Hildenbrand, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Brad Colin, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Larry Ames, Interpretive Specialist, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Walt Gabler, Law Enforcement Ranger, Ukiah Field Office, BLM
- Renee Pasquinelli, Senior Regional Ecologist, Mendocino District, California Department of Parks & Recreation
- Pete Kalvass, Fisheries Biologist, Ft. Bragg office, California Department of Fish & Game
- Mike Rushton, CCNM RMP Project Principal, Sacramento office, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

Monument Manager Rick Hanks opened the meeting and provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the CCNM and the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. He then conducted a question and answer session. The following questions and comments were recorded on flip charts and in notes taken by the BLM public affairs officer during the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received; they are not verbatim. Hanks stressed importance for meeting participants to submit comments in writing, through email, or by fax. He also added that the most useful comments are those that are specific to a particular sentence or page, or that provide reasonable suggestions about how to improve the draft plan.

There were about 20 members of the public attending. Not all attendees signed the sign-in sheets. There was no news media coverage and no attendance by elected officials or staff. The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., staff and public) was over 30 people.

Question and Comment Summary:

- Some people in the region are not satisfied with the performance of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the California Department of Parks and Recreation in their efforts to protect coastal resources (one commenter). There is a question about why BLM has selected these agencies as core managing partners in the California Coastal National Monument.
 - [Hanks: BLM has long-standing management partnerships with these agencies and they have the authority to manage coastal resources and coastal state properties, important to a partnership approach to monument management.]
- How will the comments received in the draft plan be used in development of the final plan and environmental impact statement?
- Mendocino County has a new management plan that includes provisions for ocean conservation in a zone extending three miles out to sea.
- How will CCNM managers address issues important to coastal cities and counties?
- The management plan needs a clear list of definitions.
- Will the plan contain a prohibition against harvesting seaweed from among the monument's rocks and islands?
- What impact will the monument have on local economies? New regulations affecting seaweed harvest could have an impact on local businesses that rely on harvest to survive.
- Recreational fishing should be recognized in the management plan as a low impact activity consistent with monument management goals.
- What is the BLM's jurisdiction over activities that occur below the mean high tide line? How can the BLM, through the monument, regulate activities such as kelp and seaweed harvest and sea kayaking?
- The Recreational Fishing Alliance is concerned about the "reserve buffer area" around the rocks and islands referenced in the draft management plan. Control of activities in that buffer area by the DFG (or other monument partners) could lead to restrictions on recreational fishing.
- Managing partners in the CCNM have a poor track record of working with local governments and organizations to fight proposals for offshore oil drilling. In the

long term, will the CCNM management plan protect the area from offshore drilling?

- [Hanks: The proclamation creating the monument protects the rocks and islands from mineral entry such as oil drilling, or sale. The proclamation does not affect offshore oil leases. Existence of the national monument means that any proposals for offshore drilling would have to take into consideration, through the environmental review process, impacts to the CCNM.]
- Jones & Stokes is conflicted in the management plan contract with BLM. Jones & Stokes is simultaneously working with the California Department of Transportation which is constructing a highway retaining wall which damages the national monument viewshed.
- The monument management plan will be protested. The audience does not appreciate the way the plan is being “spoon fed to us tonight.” (one commenter)
- The plan needs a process to accept non-governmental organizations as monument partners
 - [Hanks: The plan contains those provisions in the three levels of monument partnerships.]
- What is driving the need for this management plan? Too much visitation? Too much use?
 - [Hanks: Creation of the national monument and BLM’s planning regulations require development of a management plan and analysis of a range of management alternatives.]
- There was a suggestion that BLM should choose the no-action alternative. (Why should BLM choose the preferred alternative?)
- “Sensitive resources” needs to be defined in the draft plan.
- The phrase “appreciate from afar” as used in the plan causes concern. It is not well defined and “causes alarm” in the community. There are questions about what kinds of uses constitute “appreciating the monument from afar.” BLM needs to understand the alarm that the phrase causes.
- People are not so much concerned about what the government agencies propose to do in monument management, but what the monument management plan “will keep us from doing.” There are concerns about the types of restrictions that could result from the management plan.

- [Hanks: These kinds of comments are valuable in helping the BLM to craft management plan language that is clear and easily understood.]
- There are members of the communities who want to see some kinds of restrictions and protections put in place.
- Members of the coastal communities all want to be part of the decision making and determinations of the kinds of uses that will be allowed.
- The plan needs to consider ways to conserve and protect plant communities.
- The California Fish and Game Commission sets fishing regulations. It should be considered as a monument partner.
- Who would have the regulatory authority to control boat transit near the rocks and islands?
- Effective management depends on funding. Will the federal government, through the monument, be able to provide funding for management partners?
- Will the monument work with the California Coastal Commission on protection of visual resources?
- The CCONM approach to using partnerships is good and creative. Expand it.
- The biggest potential threat to the monument is an oil spill. The management plan should assess the threat of an oil spill and contain a contingency clean up plan.
- The monument should find partners to help with development of an oil spill cleanup contingency plan.
- Can people who have lived and worked for years along the coast become stewardship partners?
- The city of Fort Bragg will soon own a mile of oceanfront. There are partnership opportunities between the city and the monument.
- Stewardship partners could work through other monument core managing partners such as the DFG or state parks.
- There is “de-facto” protective buffer around the rocks. The bird guano on the rocks will keep people away (fearful of being “bombed”) and the sharp, jagged rocks will keep boaters away.
- Strengthen local partnerships

- The rocks and islands are federal land. They are “our” rocks and islands.

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
Trinidad

Location: Trinidad City Hall, Trinidad, CA

Date & Time: Thursday, October 21, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: North Coast Redwood District, California Department of Parks & Recreation

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Jeff Fontana, Public Affairs Officer, Northern California, BLM
- Bob Wick, Planning & Environmental Coordinator, Arcata Field Office, BLM
- Dave Fuller, Fisheries Biologist, Arcata Field Office, BLM
- Amy Krase, Wildlife Biologist, Arcata Field Office, BLM
- Cliff Vancott, Administrative Officer, Arcata Field Office, BLM
- Steve Ortiz, Maintenance Chief, North Coast Redwood District, California Department of Parks & Recreation
- Illijana Asara, District Administrative Officer, North Coast Redwood District, California Department of Parks & Recreation
- Axel Lindgren, Maintenance Staff, North Coast Redwood District, California Department of Parks & Recreation
- Vicki Frey, Fisheries Biologist, Eureka office, California Department of Fish & Game
- Mike Rushton, CCNM RMP Project Principal, Sacramento office, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

Steve Ortiz of the California Department of Parks and Recreation's North Coast Redwoods District opened the meeting as the "Local Host." Monument Manager Rick Hanks provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the CCNM and the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. He then conducted a question and answer session. The following questions and comments were recorded on flip charts and in notes taken by the BLM public affairs officer and staff from the Arcata Field Office during the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received; they are not verbatim. Hanks stressed the importance for meeting participants to submit comments in writing, through email, or by fax. He also added that the most useful comments are those that are specific to a

particular sentence or page, or that provide reasonable suggestions about how to improve the draft plan.

There were about 62 members of the public attending. There was no news media coverage, though KIEM TV (NBC affiliate) did a pre-meeting advance story and a post meeting story. There was no attendance by federal or state elected officials or staff. Two members of the Trinidad City Council attended. The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., staff and public) was 73.

Question and Comment Summary:

- There were questions about the history and driving force behind the presidential proclamation creating the monument.
- The National Park Service should have been included as a collaborating partner.
- There is a concern that the monument will lead to more marine preserves. The references to buffer zones cause this concern.
- More government involvement (in management) is threatening.
- Federal management could supercede state and local control over use of the area.
- Establishment of the monument will lead to more future restrictions on use.
- It is important for members of the public to raise concerns early. That's why (Trinidad participants) are raising concerns now.
- Does the BLM have the responsibility for all federal land in the United States?
 - [Hanks: No. He summarized responsibilities of other federal land managing agencies.]
- Tax dollars would be better spent protecting the United States southern border. The rocks and islands will protect themselves.
- The plan needs to clearly define “low impact recreation” and “appreciate from afar.”
 - [Hanks: The reference was to viewing the monument from shore. The intent was not to limit activities such as fishing or diving.]
- Recreational anglers are concerned that “appreciate from afar” could create “no entry zones,” restricting their access to fishing.
- How can an individual become a collaborative partner?

- The CCNM could have a big impact on the community. The community did not have enough input into the process used to develop the draft plan.
- How much will this cost?
- The effort to protect animals on the rocks and islands will trigger the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to create “buffer zones.” This causes concern.
- There is a concern that confidential cultural resource information has been included in the draft plan. It should be removed. The management plan should not list confidential cultural resources information.
- Are there only four cultural resource sites in the monument, as described in the draft plan?
- There were questions about the timeline and the next steps toward developing the management plan.
 - [Hanks: Summarized the next steps toward a proposed management plan/final EIS, issuance of a record of decision and the protest procedures. He offered another informational public meeting in Trinidad; the same offer was made in the Elk public meeting, prior to issuance of the proposed plan/final EIS.]
- Will “Marine Life Protection Act Coordination” mean that the CCNM will establish more buffer zones for protection of marine mammals?
- What does “coordination with the California Department of Fish and Game” mean?
 - [Hanks: There are opportunities to look at CCNM management in relation to the Marine Life Protection Act and other DFG regulations. Additional protections may be needed, or they may not, depending on species and locations.]
- There were questions about land exchanges.
 - [Hanks: Clarified that the presidential proclamation creating the monument does not allow for sale or other disposition of the rocks and islands other than by exchange, but only if it furthers the protective purposes of the monument.]
- Does the DFG have any plans regarding management of areas above mean high tide?

- There are 1,100 miles of coastline. Much of the monument is inaccessible. Only 10 percent is accessible.
- There is a lack of detail and specific information in the draft plan.
- The plan needs to clarify information about three-mile and 12-mile jurisdictions off shore.
- What happens in the event of an oil spill?
- It seems as though the BLM has been given a tremendous amount of power to govern without public input. It's "scary."
- The preferred alternative should be specific about how objectives will be achieved and how management decisions will be made and implemented.
 - [Bob Wick: Pointed out that BLM resource management plans offer broad management guidance. Specific management actions are described in separate management plans (activity level plans) and environmental review processes.]
- What is the DFG contributing to the CCNM partnership?
- Anglers are concerned with limits being established on where they can travel on the water.
- DFG representatives who can answer questions should be present at public meetings.
- There is a concern that if a species of concern begins using a rock or island fishermen could lose access to the waters around that rock or island.
- The plan should look at different protection approaches for different areas.
- There are people who can find something (of concern) on every rock and island. Fisherman will continue to lose more and more access over the years.
- There are still too many unanswered questions (for one commenter) to make a comment.
- Can the DFG make fishing regulations through the CCNM?
- The proposal for recreation site development (page 2-49) on Trinidad's scenic drive south of the Trinidad Rancheria Casino would create traffic congestion.

- The road is already a problem due to slumping, potholes, and increased casino traffic.
- The plan alternatives need definitions about allowable activities? Sailing? Kayaking?
 - Commenters need to suggest elimination of plan language that they don't like.
 - Who makes the final decision?
 - [Hanks: The BLM's California State Director. The BLM national director would make decisions on protests.]
 - Will notification via the CCNM mailing list continue past EIS development?
 - There is concern with the DFG being a CCNM partner. They have not "been up front with us" in issues regarding the Marine Life Protection Act. They are "suspect."
 - Alternative C looks good.
 - Why have local stewards? What do they do?
 - Local groups need to establish MOUs with the BLM to be collaborative partners in the monument. This would give local groups the same standing as other groups.
 - Select the no action alternative. The rocks have been fine. Is there a chance the no action alternative would be selected?
 - [Hanks: Analysis of a no action alternative is required by the National Environmental Policy Act. In the case of CCNM it would mean managing the rocks and islands under the current MOU in place with DFG and California Department of Parks and Recreation.]
 - The plan should clarify references to the Marine Life Protection Act.
 - The plan may provide opportunities for the Marine Life Protection Act working group to collaborate on CCNM management.
 - There are concerns with language in alternative A that appears to suggest limiting kayaking. "Are you saying that you don't intend to limit kayaking in Trinidad Harbor?
 - [Hanks: There is no intent.]

- How will BLM implement the plan? We've never seen BLM presence.
- Do you intend to prohibit access to specific rocks?
- What is the limit for "low impact recreation?"
- Alternative A specifically addresses boating restrictions. It needs clarification.

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
San Diego

Location: Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, CA

Date & Time: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- John Key, Hazardous Materials Specialist, California Desert District, BLM
- Greg Hill, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office, BLM
- Janaye Byergo, San Diego Project Manager, Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office, BLM
- Joyce Schlacher, Wildlife Biologist, San Diego Project Manager, Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office, BLM
- Joe Funk, Law Enforcement Ranger, Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office, BLM
- Marilyn Fluharty, Fisheries Biologist, San Diego office, California Department of Fish & Game
- Michael Stevenson, CCNM Project Manager, Oakland office, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

Dr. Kevin Hardy, representing Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the “Local Host,” opened the meeting. Monument Manager Rick Hanks provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the CCNM and the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. He then conducted a question and answer session. The following questions and comments were recorded on flip charts during the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received; they are not verbatim. Hanks stressed the importance for meeting participants to submit comments in writing, through email, or by fax. He also added that the most useful comments are those that are specific to a particular sentence or page, or that provide reasonable suggestions about how to improve the draft plan.

There were about 11 members of the public attending. A U.S. Navy representative was present. There were no elected officials attending. BLM California’s Special Agent-in-Charge Roger Bruckner and State Staff Ranger Rich Smith also attended the meeting.

The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., staff, public, government agency representatives, etc.) was about 24.

Question and Comment Summary:

- What triggered the creation of the CCNM?
- Is there a management issue that needs to be addressed, or is this process a bureaucratic exercise required by regulations?
- The CCNM is already managed under its Ecological Reserve designation [A designation made by the California Fish & Game Commission in 1988]. Is a BLM RMP really necessary? Couldn't the necessary management changes be done through the Fish & Game Commission or through the previous designation [the California Islands Wildlife Sanctuary established by Public Land Order 6369 in 1990]?
- How far offshore does the Ecological Reserve designation extend? A half-mile or 3 miles?
- Did the Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation exist before the Proclamation?
 - [Hanks: Yes, the ACEC designation was done by BLM in 1990.]
- Will there be an inventory of rocks in the CCNM?
 - [Hanks: Next to developing and maintaining partnerships, the top priority for implementing the RMP is to conduct the CCNM Site Characterization Study and Survey that is intended to collect and synthesize all existing information and draft site descriptions for the CCNM, as well as conducting a detailed field survey of select segments of the CCNM by an inter-disciplinary team of academic scientists.]
- What will happen in the event of a dispute over ownership?
- Does management extend into the intertidal zone?
 - [Hanks: Management under the CCNM only extends into the upper intertidal zone. Management of the remainder varies, but is primarily the responsibility of the California State Lands Commission for the State jurisdiction from below the mean high tide line out three nautical miles and the U.S. Department of the Interior's Minerals Management Service for the Federal jurisdiction below mean high water from three nautical miles to 12 nautical miles out to the edge of the Federal territorial waters.]

- The CCNM boundary seems disjointed.
- Does the CCNM include reefs?
- Seal Rock in La Jolla is part of the CCNM, i.e., the portion above mean high tide.
- Is an EIS required if the no action alternative is chosen?
 - o [Hanks: The RMP/EIS is the process for making the determination as to which alternative will be chosen. Also, the “no action alternative” does not mean that no action will be taken. It does mean that the existing statutory and regulatory requirements and current management agreements and designations will remain in effect and will be followed. This, however, will be done without the framework of a RMP designed to maximize resource values for the public in a rational, consistently applied set of procedures to guide and control future management actions; the development of subsequent, more detailed plans for resources; and a set of procedures to ensure participation by the public and other stakeholders (i.e., partners)].
- Why not wait to write the RMP until the inventory is complete?
 - o [Hanks: The RMP provides the CCNM with the framework to ensure that a more comprehensive and efficient inventory of the physical, biological, and cultural dimensions of the CCNM is undertaken, i.e., CCNM Site Characterization Study and Survey.]
- Is there a requirement to share the results of the inventory with the public?
 - o [Hanks: The current design of the CCNM Site Characterization Study and Survey includes making the results available in a web-based format so that anyone can benefit from the results.]
- How will management decisions be made in the future based on the inventory of the CCNM?
 - o [Hanks: The current intent of the CCNM Site Characterization Study and Survey is to use its results to ensure that we are making future decisions based on sound resource information. It will help establish baseline data from which to make future management decisions.]
- Are there rocks south of La Jolla?
 - o [Hanks: Yes, including rocks off of San Diego’s Sunset Cliffs City Park on the northwest side of Point Loma.]

- Adequate regulation already exists, and there are no big threats. Commenters are concerned that the CCNM will add another layer of bureaucracy for fishermen and create a potential for further regulation of fishing in the future.
- What is the benefit of the CCNM to recreationalists?
- The CCNM should focus on coordinating enforcement of existing laws and regulations, not creating new regulations.
- Commenter is concerned about the use of public funds, and therefore supports the No Action alternative.
- Managing an area with multiple management entities can work well.
- Decisions that affect the use of boats near the CCNM are a *de facto* management of fisheries. Therefore, the commenter encourages coordination with the DFG and fishermen in such matters, since fisheries are under their jurisdiction. Then, because DFG's jurisdiction extends below the CCNM, there's an opportunity for seamless management of the entire ecosystem.
- Doesn't the Presidential Proclamation preclude using the No Action alternative, and if so, why present a No Action alternative if it cannot be adopted?
- Who approves the RMP?
 - [Hanks: The BLM's California State Director.]
- What happens if an entity destroys a feature of the CCNM?
- What is the cost of the Jones & Stokes contract?
- Will BLM manage habitat or wildlife?
 - [Hanks: BLM manages wildlife habitat, while the Federally protected species are managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service and the California Department of Fish and Game is responsible for the rest of the wildlife. BLM will, however, work in partnership with all three of these agencies regarding the management of both the wildlife and the wildlife habitat associated with the CCNM.]
- What is the importance of Table 2-6 if the BLM isn't planning on managing wildlife itself?
 - [Hanks: The information of Table 2-6 applies directly to wildlife habitat.]
- How will BLM work with partners? How will decisions be made?

- Clarify the difference between enforcement and management?
 - o [Hanks: From BLM's perspective, as it applies to the CCNM, enforcement is a part of management.]
- What does the ACEC designation mean in terms of management?

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
Long Beach

Location: Aquarium of the Pacific, Long Beach, CA

Date & Time: Thursday, October 28, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: Aquarium of the Pacific

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- John Key, Hazardous Materials Specialist, California Desert District, BLM
- Steve Razo, Public Affairs Chief, California Desert District, BLM
- Greg Hill, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office, BLM
- Janaye Byergo, San Diego Project Manager, Palm Springs/South Coast Field Office, BLM
- John Ottur, Game Warden, California Department of Fish & Game
- Marija Vojkovich, Assistant Manager, Marine Region, Santa Barbara office, California Department of Fish & Game
- Michael Stevenson, CCNM Project Manager, Oakland office, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

Jeff Schubel, CEO and Executive Director of the Aquarium of the Pacific, opened the meeting. Monument Manager Rick Hanks provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the CCNM and the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. This was followed by a question and answer period conducted by Hanks. The following questions and comments were recorded on flip charts during the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received; they are not verbatim. Hanks stressed the importance for meeting participants to submit comments in writing, through email, or by fax. He also added that the most useful comments are those that are specific to a particular sentence or page, or that provide reasonable suggestions about how to improve the draft plan.

There were about 18 members of the public attending. One representative each from NOAA Fisheries, the City of Long Beach, and the Pacific Fishery Management Council were present. There were no elected officials attending. Ken Weiss of the Los Angeles Times attended a portion of the meeting. Patty Wolfe, California Department of Fish and Games Marine Region Manager, and Greg Aumann, BLM's Central California Special

Agent, were also in attendance. The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., meeting staff, public, agency representatives, press, etc.) was at least 32 (not including the Aquarium of the Pacific staff that provided meeting and facility support, e.g., audio-video and front-door greeting).

Question and Comment Summary:

- What triggered the creation of the CCNM?
- Under the RMP, what does the phrase “recreation management” mean?
- Are there opportunities for comment on the RMP/EIS after December 16?
- Logistically, how can the BLM manage the CCNM with such a small staff? Why not give management responsibility to the state?
- Can the federal government share funding with California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) so that they can help with management?
- The commenter is interested in working with the BLM on improving and defining language in the RMP (e.g. “low impact”).
- Site characterization should come first, then consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies to determine management actions.
- Use of the term “subjective” with respect to determinations of resource sensitivity is problematic.
- Can the RMP explicitly state that fishing is allowed?
- Does the RMP give ability or funding for state agencies to conduct enforcement and education?
- Are there existing threats to CCNM resources?
- Are there any concerns related to islands north of San Miguel (i.e., Richardson Rock & Wilson Rock) that could restrict use?
- Taking inventory of the CCNM resources should be part of Alternative A, not Alternative C.
- Will the RMP institute a federal approval process for Local Coastal Programs and other local plans?
- How will the RMP affect local government and how will partnerships be articulated?

- What will the entrance fee for the CCNM be?
- Is Castle Rock off of San Clemente Island of concern, due to military target practice?
- How could the RMP affect diving and fishing opportunities around the rocks?
- Is recreation acknowledged as a legitimate use of the CCNM?
- Insert language that would recognize recreation use that does not conflict with resource protection.
- Clarify that BLM does not manage fisheries.
- With no survey of marine resources, how can BLM develop a plan?

California Coastal National Monument
Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Public Comment Meeting
San Francisco

Location: Fort Mason, Golden Gate National Recreational Area, San Francisco, CA

Date & Time: Thursday, November 4, 2004 (7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.)

Local Host: Golden Gate National Recreational Area, National Park Service

Meeting Staff:

- Rick Hanks, Monument Manager, California Coastal National Monument (CCNM), Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- Greg Aumann, Special Agent, Central California, BLM
- Aaron King, Marine Biologist, National Marine Protected Area Center, NOAA
- Bob Pera, Game Warden, California Department of Fish & Game
- Sara Peterson Azat, Fisheries Biologist, Belmont office, California Department of Fish & Game
- Michael Stevenson, CCNM Project Manager, Oakland office, Jones & Stokes

Meeting Summary:

Monument Manager Rick Hanks opened the meeting and provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the CCNM and the Draft RMP/Draft EIS. He then coordinated a question and answer session. The following questions and comments were recorded on flip charts during the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received; they are not verbatim. Hanks stressed the importance for meeting participants to submit comments in writing, through email, or by fax. He also added that the most useful comments are those that are specific to a particular sentence or page, or that provide reasonable suggestions about how to improve the draft plan.

Nineteen people signed the sign-in sheet. Not all attendees signed in. There were about 18 members of the public attending. Kevin McKay of the National Park Service represented the “local host” Golden Gate National Recreational Area. A representative from Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey’s office was in attendance. There were no news media members present. The total number of meeting attendees (i.e., staff, public, etc.) was about 25 people.

Public Question & Comment Summary:

- Why use a “balanced” approach to management when the Presidential Proclamation is about protection?
- What are the threats to CCNM resources?
- Use targeted protection measures rather than blanket restrictions.
- Many coastal recreationalists coexist with wildlife and observe laws.
- Use signage to identify sensitive areas of the CCNM.
- Restrictions around CCNM features will adversely affect recreation activities such as fishing.
- There are known conflicts between kayaks (and other recreational uses) and CCNM wildlife, such as seabirds and pinnipeds.
- Exclusion zones around rocks are necessary.
- Are there specific areas needing new regulation?
- Lack of funding to support detailed research will lead to “lazy” management and thus blanket regulations.
- The core partners lack funding.
- The history of increased regulation of coastal recreation causes heightened concern regarding the management of the CCNM.
- The commenter is concerned that Alternative A increases access without providing funding for education and enforcement to ensure that resources are not degraded.
- Give more description of the characteristics of buffers and how the buffers might be encouraged/enforced through partnerships.
- How will the BLM react if partners step outside of their roles or misinterpret the jurisdictional boundaries of the CCNM?
- Are there areas where the BLM will work with/encourage recreation businesses? Concern regarding the increased potential for resource degradation as a result of encouraging such businesses.

- Don't create opportunities for harm of CCNM resources.
- Explicitly state in the RMP what topics (e.g. fishing, flyovers) aren't being addressed by the BLM, and identify who addresses these issues (e.g. FAA, DFG).
- The RMP can be an educational opportunity for users of coast. This avoids problems such that restrictions aren't needed.
- The demographic profile of coastal users is broad, and not all users understand what activities degrade CCNM resources.
- Kayak manufacturers could provide printed educational materials tagged directly onto their kayaks.
- Don't regulate activities that are not harmful (e.g. seals playing with divers or kayakers).
- There is a difference between a seal in the ocean versus a seal at a haul-out.
- There are many new haul-out sites now.
- The concept of CCNM serving as a vehicle for its partners to use to help with the coordination of joint management efforts along the entire California coast does not come through in the RMP.