

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
<b>Resource Protection Issues/Threats:</b>						
A01	Climate Change	A1. Climate change effects: Reduce carbon footprint of sanctuary operations. See 2.1, 3.8	<p>"By "sanctuary operations" I assume you mean sanctuary-owned vessels, planes, etc., not privately-owned craft operating within the Sanctuary. Sanctuary should not require that only visitors with certain engine types can enter sanctuary waters."</p> <p>"Low priority, and could work against other priorities."</p> <p>"This should not include any reductions in operations such as enforcement, research, or access. It could focus on things like ensuring plant-based meals and snacks at meetings, using less paper, etc."</p> <p>"Important overall, as with fighting global climate crisis, in all forms possible."</p> <p>"Important but I imagine this is an ongoing process."</p> <p>"As an agent in support of resource conservation CINMS should endeavor to set the bar, demonstrating the possible and learning the trade-offs first hand."</p> <p>"I would use caution here to ensure that vital operations are not hindered with such a goal (e.g. boat days for research). However, if there are other ways to reduce emissions and maintain operations/efficiencies, that could be included more specifically (e.g. cut down on travel by using technology for remote meetings)"</p> <p>"Reducing the carbon footprint of sanctuary operations should be a primary responsibility of the CINMS."</p> <p>"This is so important it can't be a NO, but we also must be practical. You can't be mandated to reduce carbon footprint when you and the NPS don't control your budgets and give you the freedom/funding to buy electric vehicles, boats, solar panels, etc."</p>	8	10	18
A02	Climate Change	A2. Climate change effects: Sequestration of atmospheric carbon within the sanctuary. See: 2.2, 2.3.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"Could happen as a part of other efforts but should not be a focus."</p> <p>"The healthier the waters and islands are, the more carbon that will be naturally sequestered."</p> <p>"Vital to returning to normal if at all possible, based on all noaa models regarding climate crisis and impacts in the future. Sanctuary should become a leader in advising and trying to mitigate impacts."</p> <p>"BMPs for this are appropriate, 2.2 makes sense, since having long term goals seems appropriate for management plan. But is restoration? Seems to me one of the sanctuary benefits is to let nature take its course and get out of the way of it doing so. Bit no to artificial reefs in the sanctuary. Again, the idea behind MPAs is to allow them to work."</p> <p>"It would be good to have a physical oceanographer address how carbon is permanently sequestered by and within marine ecosystems. The comments themselves suggested a limited understanding, one which is likely common."</p> <p>"Carbon sequestration may be a positive outcome of conservation and restoration efforts, through an increase in abundance of biomass within the sanctuary. However, I would be cautious of this as a general goal in the plan, as it may unintentionally imply support for activities beyond the scope of restoration and conservation (e.g. creation of an eel grass bed where one would not occur naturally; aquaculture)."</p> <p>"Aquaculture has been suggested as a way to address sequestration of atmospheric carbon within the sanctuary. Though the CINMS should seek to address the larger issue of climate change, CINMS should address it using methods consistent with its broader goal of protecting resources within the sanctuary."</p> <p>"don't do this; it's covered by A5."</p>	7	6	13
A03	Climate Change	A3. Climate change effects: Develop flexible climate action plan to guide mitigation, adaptation, and response to acute events (such as marine heatwaves, HABs) and to monitor/study/address ocean acidification effects. Implement rapid assessment, monitoring and response/mitigation to climate-related threats and changes in species/habitats. See 3.1, 3.2, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 3.13.	<p>"I'm all for science and monitoring, but with regards to response/mitigation, I see this as a way for someone to recommend closing the sanctuary to fishing, or perhaps all motor-propelled visitation. Let's not pretend that certain factions will not see this as an opportunity or justification for such a recommendation."</p> <p>"This should be the highest priority to position the CINMS to handle challenges of the next decade."</p> <p>"This is not easy but a worthwhile goal."</p> <p>"See above."</p> <p>"Useful to consider all possible impacts in mgmt. plan and to outline research/information needs w respect to response. I'm not really sure what a response to heatwaves would be other than to investigate impacts. "Consider HABS" hmmm...ok but what does that mean?. I think SLR is less of a problem except to consider for infrastructure such as docs, piers, etc."</p> <p>"3.1—Adaptation of management is likely the most important piece for CINMS. For example, have strategies in place for adaptive management as resources shift spatially and management needs change."</p> <p>3.7—both present and potential, updated as more information arises</p> <p>3.9—continued monitoring through partnerships is important to understand changes</p> <p>3.10—yes, among other adaptive management measures</p> <p>3.13—may be outside of scope but could consider supporting partners, as feasible."</p> <p>"Development of a climate action plan for the sanctuary makes sense. Whether it should be part of the management plan revision process warrants further discussion."</p> <p>"don't do this; it's covered by A5."</p>	8	10	18

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A04	Climate Change	A4. Climate change effects: Address sea level rise in CINMS. See 3.3.	<p>"Hmmm... CINMS is all water. So a sea level rise makes it deeper water. I'm in favor of science and monitoring, but not for using the issue to keep anglers and our boats out of the sanctuary."</p> <p>"There are limits as to what can be done to prepare for this overwhelming eventuality. We should not build sea walls, artificial reefs, or other such mitigation strategies that are being considered in various ports, cities, and beaches."</p> <p>"Combine with A3."</p> <p>"See above."</p> <p>"Sea level rise will have very little impact in the next 10-20 years. Not sure how the Sanctuary could "Address" this in management."</p> <p>"See above."</p> <p>"I would emphasize partnership with NPS."</p> <p>"Sea level rise is an issue that coastal government entities have to address as a result of climate change. CINMS should project estimated impacts of sea level rise on sanctuary resources, and develop policies to address these impacts."</p> <p>"This is a practical thing that must be done, or the docks go underwater, building foundations get eroded, etc. This is bad and could limit access both by the public we serve and staff in their duties even if there were no guests"</p>	8	5	12
A05	Climate Change	A5. Climate change effects: partnership development for monitoring, mitigation, and public education campaign. See 3.4, 3.5.	<p>"I'm in favor of science and monitoring, but not for using the issue to keep anglers and our boats out of the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Two different ideas here. Partnering for monitoring and mitigation might make sense; public education campaign not the highest priority."</p> <p>"We should absolutely be doing this to urge people to reduce their carbon footprint as much as possible."</p> <p>"Too vague, combine with A3"</p> <p>"See above."</p> <p>"Emphasis on partnerships and building climate change into education materials."</p> <p>"Climate change effects will present a growing number of issues to the sanctuary. Participating in public education campaigns and developing partnerships to address these issues should be a priority of the management plan."</p> <p>"Good and practical summary item."</p>	8	9	17
A06	Invasive Species	A6. Invasive Species: Conduct research and monitoring, and support partners with the same. See 7.1, 7.3, 7.4.	<p>"This is essential work that must be explored. We stand the chance of losing the entire kelp forest ecosystem due to the invasive undaria and sargassum marine algae. The effects could be catastrophic."</p> <p>"Important."</p> <p>"Considering A6 and A7 together, research and monitoring are vital, esp given potential climate impacts on species. Partnerships are key."</p> <p>"We should know what's going on irrespective of our ability to change it."</p> <p>"Focus on supporting partners that already monitor (UCSB/NPS)."</p> <p>"The CINMS is supporting partners in this effort today."</p> <p>"Good and practical summary item."</p>	9	8	17
A07	Invasive Species	A7. Invasive Species: Develop response plan for control, management, culling, etc. See 7.2.	<p>"Would require more resources than we have money in the budget for. So, is this a reason to ask for more federal money and increase local staff? I'm against that, but read on... I believe we can and should study each invasive specie, consider the probability and reliability and process of total eradication and come up with a price tag for consideration by sanctuary headquarters in DC."</p> <p>"The invasive species could be catastrophic to the waters of the Sanctuary."</p> <p>"Combine with A6."</p> <p>"We have seen that coordinated response is almost impossible, but we have to keep trying to address this if we can find partners."</p> <p>"I don't think "control" and "culling" are feasible."</p> <p>"Knowing of new recruitment events is important. However, major restrictions and costly mitigation efforts with little likely benefit should be avoided. It is without a doubt the future holds greater local diversity with lesser global diversity, as we carry species around the world with us wherever we go. Expending major effort against well established species should be avoided."</p> <p>"Support partners and consider CINMS analysis on how to deal with new events through cooperative response."</p> <p>"Invasive species, particularly in the absence of any natural predators, can have a detrimental impact on sanctuary resources. Development of a response plan seems like the minimum that should be done to address this arising issue. The UCSB study of the presence of Undaria pinnatifida within the sanctuary demonstrate that this is an issue that cannot be ignored."</p> <p>"Good and practical summary item. This item also ties to the items on what to do with oil and gas oil platform decommissioning. For example, if there are invasive species happily living by the oil platforms, which would have no home if the oil platforms are removed, would these invasive species swim over to the Sanctuary and eat all the fish there? This is an example of an area where the sanctuary has a good, valid, reasonable, and important role in looking beyond its borders to ensure something doesn't move through the water to the sanctuary with negative effect."</p>	8	7	16

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A08	Hazardous	A8. Hazardous Waste: In the disused dumping area south of Santa Cruz Island (outside the CINMS boundary), assess deterioration of radioactive waste containers and monitor potential impacts to marine life. See 12.1.	<p>"Yes, IF, the source areas to be studied are within CINMS. If the source areas are outside the CINMS, it becomes an issue for another federal agency."</p> <p>"Outside the boundary but could be something to look at."</p> <p>"We would need more information on the location and history of this waste site (if it exists) to assess this comment."</p> <p>"Since this could impact the Sanctuary it should be looked at."</p> <p>"First I've heard of this."</p> <p>"Outside our jurisdiction but we need to be aware of effects of this in our sanctuary."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Important but marked as M since the research required may be outside scope and capability of sanctuary staff science. Maybe an issue for RAP to think about."</p> <p>"Is this true?"</p> <p>"Could follow up with responsible agencies to determine if this is a potential threat to CINMS, but not likely relevant for management plan."</p> <p>"CINMS could assess to issue as to potential impacts upon the sanctuary. However, as this is outside of the CINMS boundary, this should be a low priority."</p> <p>"If this is a valid concern, the Sanctuary should ask whoever is responsible for the area to act."</p>	6	4	10
A09	Marine Debris	A9. Marine Debris: Work with the marine debris community to address sources of marine debris; pursue partnerships with entities that produce, distribute, or discharge marine debris material. See 16.1, 16.2.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"Marine debris is a major threat to wildlife in the Sanctuary. Most of this is from sport and commercial fishing that takes place within the boundaries of the Sanctuary, which frankly, should not be allowed in the first place. All 'user groups' should at least be educated on how to reduce and mitigate marine debris."</p> <p>"The trap tagging and removal projects are going in the right direction."</p> <p>"No brainer. Considering A9, A10, A11, A12 together."</p> <p>"Get to the source and examine existing legislation. Addressing littering and poor disposal practices by simply banning products from use rather than supporting proper disposal practices can be wasteful, and rife with costly unintended consequences, impacting public health and sanitation."</p> <p>"Removal of marine debris in partnership with outside organizations would be more cost effective and provide an opportunity for both education and public outreach."</p> <p>"If this is a valid concern, the Sanctuary should ask whoever is responsible for the area to act."</p>	9	10	19
A10	Marine Debris	A10. Marine Debris: Improve understanding of marine debris sources, types, locations, and impacts. Track changes in marine debris quantity and distribution. Assess marine debris threats and focus efforts on response actions. See 16.4, 16.7.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"This is a major threat."</p> <p>"Combine with A9."</p> <p>"We already know this and can easily find further information."</p> <p>"See above."</p> <p>"This could be a first step in limiting debris that ends up on the island. Could partner with TNC, which is doing a research study on Santa Cruz Island."</p> <p>"Assessing the impacts of marine debris within the sanctuary is crucial to continued protection of marine resources. Using these efforts to focus efforts on response actions should be a goal of this management plan."</p> <p>"A9-13 are all really good. They are practical and important because marine debris isn't just an abstraction to the Sanctuary, it's coming ashore on the beaches and if it's rusty oil drum it could have hazardous material."</p>	9	9	17
A11	Marine Debris	A11. Marine Debris: Support and/or conduct microplastics research with specific relevance to the Santa Barbara Channel and the Channel Islands. Apply existing microplastics work by the UCSB Bren School and NCEAS. See 16.5.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"The research presented on this to the CINMS has been interesting and useful here and widely to the scientific community. This should be continued."</p> <p>"Others are doing this. Might support with ship time."</p> <p>"Relevant."</p> <p>"It's good to know the costs of pollution, but nanoplastics seem unrecoverable. Once in this state, we've already missed our best opportunities to mitigate the problem."</p> <p>"Could be a good partnership opportunity, esp. for shared boat time if researchers are collecting data samples."</p> <p>"CINMS should at support research on the impacts of micro plastics on Santa Barbara Channel. The presentation given to the sanctuary advisory council was very informative, and highlights the importance of this type of research. Funding of research depends on sanctuary budget constraints."</p> <p>"A9-13 are all really good."</p>	8	9	17
A12	Marine Debris	A12. Marine Debris: Conduct or fund more marine debris removal in partnership with fishermen, NGOs, tour operators, volunteers, and the public (including high school students for their community service requirements). Create citizen science opportunity. See 16.6, 16.8.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"At least this helps people see the impact of the damage and destruction, so yes, this should be done regularly."</p> <p>"Others are doing this. Might support with ship time."</p> <p>"More actual removal projects are always beneficial."</p> <p>"Fisheries management changes have dropped the proverbial hammer on fishers losing gear. Fixed gear fishers either report trap loss or lose the ability to replace lost traps."</p> <p>"Continue effort to haul lobster traps off beach and see if lobster fishermen are willing to expand this effort on their time."</p> <p>"Removal of marine debris in partnership with outside organizations would be more cost effective and provide an opportunity for both education and public outreach."</p> <p>"A9-13 are all really good and this one is good and ongoing. The notion of high school students goes with C21 and my recommendation below it."</p>	9	9	18

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A13	Marine Debris	A13. Marine Debris: Provide better information to the public on marine debris impacts in the sanctuary. See 16.9.	<p>"Kind of a waste of money."                      "This may help people understand the impacts worldwide as well."                      "Falls under education."                      "Maybe partner with others but not an essential sanctuary function."                      "This could be an interesting campaign, especially if marine debris from boaters, mainland sources, etc. can be identified so individuals know how they can reduce their impact."                      "The impact of marine debris, e.g. fishing nets and lobster traps can be a real threats to sanctuary resources. Education of these impacts may decrease certain practices that result in debris in the sanctuary, as well as encourage cleanup activities similar to coastal cleanup days."                      "A9-13 are all really good."</p>	8	10	18
A14	Noise	A14. Noise: Continue to monitor and assess ocean noise in order to implement strategies to mitigate impacts. See 18.1.	<p>"Not if done in a way that certain factions use it to limit access to the sanctuary by certain motor types of recreational or commercial (I'm thinking CPFV) vessels."                      "Underwater noise is detrimental to marine mammals and fish. More should be learned and what is already known should be applied to this sensitive ecosystem. We probably have too many ships and too much activity in the Sanctuary."                      "Others are doing this. Might support with ship time."                      "Not sure about potential "mitigation" but monitoring ocean noise is reasonable."                      "This is an important effort to help with other management strategies, such as managing vessel traffic."                      "Collecting more data in order to establish policies/procedures to address the issue of ocean noise aligns with the goals of CINMS and should be continued."                      "Only as it applies to the Sanctuary."</p>	8	9	17
A15	Noise	A15. Noise: Expand existing Area to be Avoided (ATBA) or the sanctuary's outer boundary to increase the area of noise protection. See 18.2.	<p>"Not if done in a way that certain factions use it to limit access to the sanctuary by certain motor types of recreational or commercial (I'm thinking CPFV) vessels."                      "Without defining what "noise protection" represents, it would be difficult to justify expansion of ATBA or Sanctuary."                      "This would be a good start to mitigating the issue."                      "We do not recommend any boundary changes or new regulations."                      "This would be good. It's a process."                      "This has a dual benefit of reducing noise within the sanctuary and decreasing the impact of shipping on whales."                      "The existing ATBA was designated by the IMO in 1991. Expansion of the ATBA is something that the CINMS could provide input on, but may in general fall outside of the scope of the responsibilities of CINMS."                      "Only do this if science supports it and there isn't an overarching negative impact from some other reason, such as limiting DoD test operations."</p>	6	5	11
A16	Light	A16. Light: Analyze artificial light emissions and implement strategies to mitigate light pollution. See 18.3.	<p>"If this is aimed at the commercial squid fleet, or recreational boats which use lights to attract bait and fish, I am against it."                      "Not the highest priority."                      "Artificial light is a hazard to birds, bats, and other animals. Any lighting on the islands and in the area should be compliant with the Dark Skies Initiatives."                      "We can not do it all. Resources are limited and better used on Climate Crisis or other."                      "There is no terrestrial light pollution source at the islands. This would likely be dealing with squid vessel lighting, which is regulated by CDFW."                      "Important issue in general. How important in Sanctuary?"                      "If from light within the sanctuary (e.g. squid boats) this would be an important thing to manage. If this is related to mainland light pollution, I would think this is out of the scope of the sanctuary, though it would be helpful to know what type of negative impacts it has on sanctuary resources."                      "Monitoring issues that affect the sanctuary makes sense. However, are there any known issues in the sanctuary due to light pollution?"                      "Only as it applies to the Sanctuary."</p>	6	4	10

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A17	Shipping	A17. Shipping Impacts: Vessel Speed Reduction (VSR): Expand VSR program to include more participants, including cruise ships, and Port Hueneme. Increase public outreach. Seek third-party funding, such as through corporate sponsorships, for incentive payments. Incorporate elements of U.S. Representative Alan Lowenthal's proposed Blue Whales and Blue Skies Act. Continue to engage with Air Pollution Control Districts and the California Air Resources Board. See 28.1, 28.3, 28.4, 28.7, 28.8, 28.9.	<p>"Good priority."                      "High priority to address; mechanism to address could vary."                      "Must consider impacts if this action on other users if this were to be included in the Sanctuary Management plan."                      "This program is not working in my opinion. This is a great example of 'greenwashing' by the shipping corporations who have a single goal- PROFIT. We must recognize this. Until then we are simply giving them money they don't deserve. They are killing whales and disturbing other marine mammals. We should be working very hard and pushing for MANDATORY SPEED REDUCTION in the Sanctuary and surrounding waters and FORCE the shipping lanes outside the islands. Continual monitoring of whales by air has shown that the whales and ships are all inside the Channel and that there are many fewer whales OUTSIDE (South) of the islands."                      "Not clear if these other parties are a problem. Good idea to pursue money for greater incentives, but public recognition may be more effective."                      "These are solid, established programs, that are making an impact."                      "We do not recommend any boundary changes or new regulations."                      "Yes strong. A17-20 together."                      "Great success here both with regard to whale strikes and air pollution reduction. Need to keep this one rolling. While this started with us, it would be great if it outgrew us to the point the program was a stand-alone or we handed the program to a coast-wide or greater authority."                      "Support for considering ways to expand program, while these comments may be a bit specific."                      28.3—Expanding the program should be done with consideration of how to maximize limited resources. Perhaps this is by bringing more ships in but could also be increasing &lt;10 knots transits by current participants.                      28.4—It is unclear how the plan would incorporate the proposed Blue Whales and Blue Skies Act. Should an awards program be created through legislation or another means before the plan is drafted, we would support the plan including ways to support that program.                      28.7—Yes                      28.9—Yes, to working with partners to identify new sources of funding."                      "The VSR program has been a great success with the limited funding it has already received. Third-party funding and public outreach may be a way to extend the life of the existing program, as well as increase the diversity of participants. This should be a primary goal of the management plan."                      "All good and practical ideas."</p>	9	10	19
A18	Shipping	A18. Shipping Impacts: Vessel Speed Reduction (VSR): In management plan NEPA review, discuss the VSR program's environmental benefits, including to air quality. See 28.5.	<p>"Good priority."                      "Good suggestion."                      "Same as above. No more tinkering around with this topic. We need MANDATORY SPEED REDUCTION until the shipping lanes are moved outside the islands."                      "Would be nice to see an annual update on the program, vessels and companies involved, pollution avoided."                      "Can use results from previous years."                      "Climate change represents the most important issue that we will see in our lifetime. Reduction of GHGs is vital. The VSR is exactly the type of collaborative process between governmental agencies and commercial industries that should be encouraged. Information gathered by the VSR will help inform the NEPA review process."                      "All good and practical ideas and keeping whales and air quality coupled is good."</p>	9	9	18
A19	Shipping	A19. Shipping Impacts: Address ship impacts by working with National Marine Fisheries Service on their Draft Revised Recovery Plan for the Blue Whale. See 28.10.	<p>"Good priority."                      "I believe this recovery plan is about putting a species on a path to removal from Endangered Species classification. I'm concerned about emphasizing that goal at a time when climate change poses new and unpredictable threats."                      "The more data we can get will most likely show that we need Mandatory Speed Reductions."                      "Yes, the CINMS should be working with NMFS to ensure that the efforts of the VSR program and the Marine Shipping Working Group (among other CINMS and partner efforts) are integrated into the recovery plan. However, I am not sure that this is within the scope of the management plan."                      "The CINMS may have data/information that the National Marine Fisheries Service may find of use for the purposes of their Draft Recovery Plan for the Blue Whale. Collaboration on this effort makes sense."                      "All good and practical ideas."</p>	8	8	16
A20	Shipping	A20. Shipping Impacts: Expand Area to be Avoided (ATBA); consider the work of the CINMS advisory council's Marine Shipping Working Group. See 18.2, 28.11.	<p>"For commercial shipping and perhaps cruise ships, yes, but I'm against limiting sanctuary access to recreational fishing or commercial fishing vessels."                      "Although it is appropriate to consider the work of the Marine Shipping Working Group, expanding the ATBA would require additional information and discussion before it could be considered an effective protective measure."                      "The data shared with the Sanctuary shows that this is necessary."                      "Not much came from this group."                      "This would be really challenging, but worth the long term process and investment, in saved whales and cleaner air."                      "This was a widely accepted management strategy (no opposition). It would have multiple benefits and should move forward."                      "The work of the Marine Shipping Working Group is important. Their input on this subject should be further discussed among the advisory council."                      "Before we expand the ATBA (and need to be sure we're talking about the same one, need to ensure the science supports it and there aren't overarching negative effects."</p>	8	6	13

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A21	Shipping	A21. Shipping Impacts: Move shipping channel (Traffic Separation Scheme) further offshore; move TSS to the south side of the islands; consider the work of the CINMS advisory council's Marine Shipping Working Group. See 28.11.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"While moving the TSS could be considered this could be a huge time investment and would take longer than some of the other solutions."</p> <p>"The available fine scale data for whale distribution is heavily skewed toward the Santa Barbara Channel. There is no evidence to suggest that moving the shipping lanes would reduce whale strikes although it may result in fewer detections of whales struck by ships. The Sanctuary should work harder on education related to the variables and data gaps to be considered when making decisions of this nature."</p> <p>"This should be our PRIORITY and we need to strongly advocate and INSIST upon this in order to protect the whales, which are federally and internationally protected by a variety of laws and treaties."</p> <p>"Not in our scope."</p> <p>"This is not feasible and conflicts with military uses. Moving the TSS to the South side of the islands would not benefit whales."</p> <p>"Shipping group made recommendations; not sure what more can happen since this requires multiple agencies."</p> <p>"Moving the TSS further offshore was also a widely accepted management strategy (no opposition) and should move forward. Moving the TSS to the south side of the Channel Islands did not have unanimous support. We agree that there are multiple management measures that came out of the working group that had broad support and should move forward. The VSR program is one tool and we hope to see the spatial management ideas implemented as well."</p> <p>"The work of the Marine Shipping Working Group is important. Their input on this subject should be further discussed among the advisory council."</p> <p>"1) Regarding shipping channel further from the islands: The TSS is in the middle, so further offshore from the Islands will put it closer to the mainland and the oil platforms and increase risk on that side. What evidence is there that this will help anything?"</p> <p>"2) Regarding shipping channel south of the islands: Moving the TSS south of the islands negatively impacts critical U.S. Department of Defense test operations for sure, and the work of the MSWG was unable to determine any location, for sure, that was better to route the lanes. This test area is the only one DOD has that can test weapons through their full envelopes (surface to surface/air/land, air to surface/air/land, and subsurface to surface/air/land). Thus, the lanes, for now, are based on safe shipping that puts the ships in deep water, going in straight lines, in predictable ways, which reduces risk of collision, grounding, oil spills, and loss of life for sure."</p> <p>"3) Regarding the MSWG, yes, it's work remains a valuable body of reference material and recommendations based on best information at the time."</p>	6	4	10
A22	Shipping	A22. Shipping Impacts: Establish speed limits for vessels within the sanctuary. See 28.12.	<p>"For commercial shipping and perhaps cruise ships, yes, but I'm against limiting speed within sanctuary waters for recreational fishing or commercial fishing vessels."</p> <p>"Vessels are not within the sanctuary for much distance. Speed limits for transiting near the sanctuary could be considered as one of the possible tools."</p> <p>"There should be MANDATORY SPEED REDUCTIONS in the entire Bight, which may force the ships outside the islands."</p> <p>"What problem does this address?"</p> <p>"What kind of vessels? Needs to be limited to large ship and considered along with potential for ships to alter routes with worse impacts."</p> <p>"Multiple agencies."</p> <p>"Not a good idea, limits operators flexibility and could negatively impact safety, especially aboard smaller vessels which rely on their speed to make safe crossings and avoid wind events."</p> <p>"If this comment is focused on VSR program, yes. If this comment is directed towards vessels that are fishing, recreating, etc., I do not know if this is of current concern. It would be nice to get more information if it is."</p> <p>"The Vehicle Speed Reduction program has been a large success, but it was only funded as a pilot program. CINMS should encourage that this program become permanent through financial or other types of support."</p> <p>"Good and appropriate speed limits should be established (if they don't already exist), in the sanctuary based on safety of navigation, wake damage, preserving the habitat, etc. That said, MANDATORY speed limits OUTSIDE the sanctuary where it's open water would need to be very carefully established. Whether it's a water skier, jet-skier, thrill seeker in speedboat, or the largest ship, open waters need to be protected as such for the pleasure and commerce of all. THAT SAID, VOLUNTARY speed limits OUTSIDE the sanctuary can be OK, as is done now for air quality coming and going from the ports of LAL, and the various VSR initiatives in the SB channel associated with whales."</p>	7	5	12
A23	Shipping	A23. Shipping Impacts: Expand sanctuary boundary into more of the Santa Barbara Channel to reduce shipping traffic or lower ship speeds (i. e., regulate ship speeds (10 knots) or reroute shipping outside the sanctuary). See 18.2, 28.6, 28.12, 33.1.	<p>"Hell NO, do not expand the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Should be considered in the plan with the understanding it's not a near-term solution."</p> <p>"This makes sense since there are a tremendous number of whales and other marine mammals in these areas that need protection. They are not currently being protected at all. They are only protected if the shipping companies choose to protect them. This is nonsense."</p> <p>"Yes but I realize it is unlikely to succeed. Maybe better to put resources to other projects."</p> <p>"We do not recommend any boundary changes or new regulations."</p> <p>"Multiple agencies required for this; not something NMS can do alone. While investigation may be worthwhile, this ship might have sailed."</p> <p>"Deceitful method and purpose. We should take the high road."</p> <p>"Expanding the sanctuary boundary would have multiple benefits in addition to shipping impacts."</p> <p>"The Vehicle Speed Reduction program appears to be working to reduce the speed of shipping traffic. Rather than expanding the boundary of the sanctuary, a more effective way to address this issue is to provide additional resources to support the VSR, an already established program."</p> <p>"Before we expand the sanctuary, need to ensure the science supports it and there aren't overarching negative effects."</p>	6	3	9

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A24	Offshore Oil & Gas	A24. Offshore Oil & Gas: Conduct monitoring to track impacts of oil and gas activity on sanctuary resources, including deep sea corals. Increase public awareness of oil and gas activity near the sanctuary and its impacts. See See 19.2, 19.3, 19.5.	<p>"Great priority."                      "There are more urgent priorities."                      "All fossil fuel extraction should be immediately halted in the entire Bight. This research and monitoring would be a good start."                      "Not sure how to do this."                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "The CINMS should continue to monitor and track impacts of oil and gas activity, though the specific request about coral may be too detailed for the plan. Staff should choose the most effective ways to monitor these impacts depending on the situation. Increasing public awareness is likely the role of partnering agencies."                      "This is already a function of CINMS. Monitoring should be continued."                      "It's not the Sanctuary's job to actively track impacts of things that are as carefully regulated as oil and gas."</p>	6	5	11
A25	Offshore Oil & Gas	A25. Offshore Oil & Gas: Assess potential impacts, and monitor and mitigate actual impacts, of new proposed oil and gas development near the sanctuary. See 19.4.	<p>"Yes, providing the "mitigation" does not restrict recreational or commercial fishing within the sanctuary."                      "Already going on."                      "This should not be allowed and we need to find all possible legal avenues to stop it, including igniting the public."                      "Might be beyond our scope."                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "There should be no development in sanctuary."                      "Yes, if it happens."                      "The CINMS should continue to monitor and respond to oil and gas proposals. (Mitigation is outside of scope)."                      "The effect of any potential activity that may affect the sanctuary is something that CINMS staff routinely do, and report on to the advisory council."                      "This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, NEPA, EIR, etc. etc., not a special program."</p>	7	5	13
A26	Offshore Oil & Gas	A26. Offshore Oil & Gas: For oil spill rapid response, use FEMA planning approach as a model. See 19.6.	<p>"Okay."                      "Already going on."                      "Seems like a good idea as it is probably well researched."                      "Ignorant of this."                      "When was FEMA rapid?"                      "Continue oil spill response. Not familiar with FEMA planning approach or if this is appropriate."                      "A variety of approaches should be considered when developing an oil spill rapid response."                      "Leave this to the experts. There is an entire federal system set up to handle this."                      "Regarding CINMS Response to Emergencies: Sanctuary staff should be trained in FEMA Incident Command System (ICS) up to levels appropriate for their position that will better enable them to participate in any natural or man-made disaster, oil spill, etc."</p>	7	6	13
A27	Offshore Oil & Gas	A27. Offshore Oil & Gas: Add a no-leasing buffer around the sanctuary, possibly by expanding sanctuary boundaries. See 19.7.	<p>"Hell NO, do not expand the sanctuary."                      "Worth exploring as other priorities allow."                      "Absolutely necessary to fully protect the Sanctuary so we don't end up with a Deep Water Horizon type of event."                      "Might be beyond our scope."                      "This is redundant and resources are needed elsewhere."                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "Interesting to consider."                      "Support for sanctuary expansion or another method to limit oil extraction near the sanctuary (such as responding in opposition to leasing that would be near and potentially impact sanctuary resources)."                      "This may be the wrong forum for these efforts."                      "This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, NEPA, EIR, etc. etc., not a special program"</p>	6	3	9
A28	Offshore Oil & Gas	A28. Offshore Oil & Gas: Advocate for increased fuel economy requirements. See 19.1.	<p>"Okay, but understand that high ethanol ratios destroy engine components."                      "Not the job of the CINMS."                      "Always a good idea to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels."                      "Beyond our scope."                      "Do not advocate for issues outside of scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "Role of sanctuary?"                      "Likely outside of appropriate scope."                      "As of 2020, the IMO will ban ships from using sulfur content of above 0.5%. Further requirements should be addressed in other forums."                      "Other than this making us feel good, what direct benefit would this be to the sanctuary or harm would it prevent."</p>	5	3	8

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A29	Offshore Oil & Gas	A29. Offshore Renewable Energy Development: Take a proactive and precautionary role in responding to floating offshore wind energy proposals. See 23.1.	<p>"I'm willing to consider offshore, renewable energy development, providing it does NOT create areas where recreational anglers cannot go."</p> <p>"Already part of the planning process, but maybe worth referencing in the plan."</p> <p>"Yes, while renewable projects may seem to be a partial solution to the climate crisis, we need to be careful in terms of where projects such as large wind turbines are located. None should be located inside the Sanctuary boundaries for a variety of reasons such as impact on resident and migratory birds."</p> <p>"Might be beyond our scope."</p> <p>"Focus on issues in our jurisdiction. Letters of support for reducing climate crisis impacts."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"In areas surrounding sanctuary, not in sanctuary; assume this will not be within sanctuary boundaries."</p> <p>"If likely to impact the CINMS."</p> <p>"As with platform decommissioning, CINMS should actively monitor and participate in the public process for any proposed floating wind energy proposals."</p> <p>"This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, NEPA, EIR, etc. etc., not a special program."</p>	7	6	13
A30	Aquaculture	A30. Aquaculture: Consider potential ecosystem benefits, especially for shellfish and kelp, of allowing aquaculture in and around the sanctuary with strict permitting standards. See 22.1.	<p>"I'm okay with aquaculture providing no areas are closed to recreational fishing. If an area is proposed to be closed, then before the closure, the permittee should be required to gain permits and construct reefs of equal or greater fishing value to the area being closed to fishing."</p> <p>"This should NOT be allowed. Aquaculture often turns detrimental to wildlife. People need to learn to eat a plant-based diet and STOP eating fish, shellfish, etc. There is no reason to eat these animals when we can live perfectly healthy lives eating nutritious plant-based options."</p> <p>"Consider benefits and costs."</p> <p>"We need to consider all options for food production and carbon sinks."</p> <p>"Inconsistent with Sanctuary goals and objectives."</p> <p>"Not inside sanctuary boundaries, but outside."</p> <p>"I see this as unlikely or too far outside the SAC for serious consideration here. Same for below A items."</p> <p>"The NMS program's goal is to 'protect important natural and cultural places.' Aquaculture should not be part of the CINMS, as this does not support this goal. There may be other areas (unprotected) more appropriate for such a use."</p> <p>"Though there may be potential benefits to shellfish and kelp, commercial aquaculture within the sanctuary may lead to conflicts with other sanctuary protection goals."</p> <p>"This is different from oil, gas, and renewables above because the aquaculture water/animals/plants move around and interact with natural animals and plants, so there may be benefit, and I would argue potential HARM, for aquaculture in and adjacent to the sanctuary."</p>	6	5	11
A31	Aquaculture	A31. Aquaculture: Be cautious of allowing any aquaculture near the sanctuary due to the risk of pathogen introduction, pollutants, and exotic species. See 22.2.	<p>"To be studied and will be a permit-by-permit issue."</p> <p>"NO AQUACULTURE should be allowed anywhere near the Sanctuary."</p> <p>"Combine with A30."</p> <p>"This would be regulated by others."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Yes."</p> <p>"This could be linked to issues involving invasive/non-natives."</p> <p>"Analyzing the risks of any potential projects (including aquaculture) near the sanctuary is something that CINMS staff should be doing."</p> <p>"This is different from oil, gas, and renewables above because the aquaculture water/animals/plants move around and interact with natural animals and plants, so there may be benefit, and I would argue potential HARM, for aquaculture in and adjacent to the sanctuary"</p>	7	9	17
A32	Water Quality	A32 Water Quality: Cruise Ships: Test graywater and other discharges from cruise ships. See 32.1.	<p>"Good priority but only within CINMS so that it is not outside the scope of CINMS."</p> <p>"Better done by others."</p> <p>"Only small expedition ships should be permitted to enter the waters of the Sanctuary and they need to be carefully and strictly regulated in terms of where to anchor, discharge waste, etc."</p> <p>"Let ChannelKeeper do this."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Is this sanctuary function? Can work with others."</p> <p>"Rely on / work with partnering agencies for this."</p> <p>"The speed reduction program has been successful in reducing the air pollution of vessels within the sanctuary. However, Graywater and discharge from cruise ships present a different pollution issue. To address this issue, the CINMS should consider funding additional enforcement efforts."</p> <p>"This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, etc. for these operations, not a special program."</p>	5	5	10

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
A33	Water Quality	A33 Water Quality: Add buoys near ports to observe ocean chemistry. See 32.4.	<p>"Good priority but probably outside the scope of CINMS."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "More data is always useful to help make thoughtful scientific decisions."                      "Might be beyond our scope."                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "Not sanctuary function but a good idea in general to keep in communication with ocean observing operations."                      "Outside of scope but an opportunity for partnership."                      "As demonstrated by recent presenters to the advisory council, buoys can provide a bevy of important data that is of great value to both researchers and the public at large. However, deployment of buoys can be expensive."                      "Only do this if someone has a hypothesis to prove or disprove, or part of a broader study on this or that."</p>	5	5	10
A34	Water Quality	A34 Water Quality: Desalination: Study the potential impacts of desalination projects proposed in Santa Barbara and other areas near the sanctuary. See 32.5.	<p>"Good priority, but probably outside the scope of CINMS."                      "Better done by others."                      "This should NOT be allowed. We already know that larvae will be destroyed in the process."                      "Let ChannelKeeper do this"                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "Work with other entities."                      "Outside of scope but an opportunity for partnership."                      "It is not CINMS's role to address this issue."                      "This is different from oil, gas, and renewables above because the water moves around and changing salinity near plants, which then mixes with other water, could have positive or negative effect to the sanctuary."</p>	5	4	9
A35	Water Quality	A35 Water Quality: Port Dredging: Monitor the water quality impacts of dredging near Port Hueneme. See 32.6.	<p>"Probably outside the scope of CINMS."                      "Better done by others."                      "This is an area of concern. There is a lot of activity in the port, which is close to the Sanctuary."                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "Not sanctuary function. Monitor other agencies with this responsibility."                      "Rely on / work with partnering agencies for this."                      "Though this is certainly a worthy thing to monitor, it may not be the role of CINMS to lead this."                      "This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, etc. for these operations, not a special program"</p>	4	4	8
<b>Human Use Management:</b>						
B01	Recreational Fishing	B1. Recreational Fishing: Do more to promote this activity, including: working with partners on island facility developments tailored to this use; advertising and outreach to the sportfishing public; educational activities (classes, lectures, presentations to sportfishing organizations); inclusion of sportfishing as a primary activity in all CINMS public outreach materials. See 5.1, 31.5. See also this letter and this form letter.	<p>"Top priority."                      "This is a time to maximize protection of species in the sanctuary."                      "I don't see why Sanctuary resources should be used to promote business activities that result in destruction of the fish and habitats in the Sanctuary. In fact, allowing fishing in the Sanctuary makes a mockery of the term 'Sanctuary.'                      "The area should be protected from this activity and the fish should be allowed to live there in peace."                      "Not clear why this should be a central focus of CINMS activity."                      "Recreational fishing is already promoted by fishing supply manufacturers and providers. Increase spending and resources on non-consumptive recreational opportunities."                      "To be inclusive of this interest, this is ok and is already being done"                      "Absolutely. Fishing appears to support the greatest number of boater hours to the Sanctuary. The outstanding fishing opportunities within the CINMS draws anglers from around the state and beyond. Catching and growing one's own is as direct as one's connection to nature as it gets. Marine environments produce the greatest amount of protein for the least level of ecosystem change, and that at the Channel Islands has always been one of the most productive regions."                      "Increased education/outreach is always positive. Including infrastructure on the Channel Islands is likely outside of scope (more of an NPS ask)."                      "Public use of the sanctuary in all of its forms should be included in CINMS outreach materials. Inclusion of recreational fishing in particular would be beneficial to the public, as it is an opportunity to educate a wide variety of users of the sanctuary what activities are permissible within the sanctuary."                      "Before doing this, we need to be sure we're not overfishing, and then define how much more rec. fishing the sanctuary can support to be sustainable."</p>	6	7	13

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
B02	Recreational Fishing	B2. Recreational Fishing: Alter the Gull Island, Footprint, and Santa Barbara Island marine reserves to allow for take of pelagic fish species. See 5.3.	<p>"Top priority"</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"The reason to expand the No-Take areas should be to for the purpose of improving fishing outside the areas. That should not be a goal."</p> <p>"Do not allow any fishing in no take zones or allow reduction of any boundaries."</p> <p>"No change to MPA regulations is needed at this time. If changes are considered must be done in close collaboration with CDFW."</p> <p>"Certainly the Footprint for surface waters –as it is quite deep in this area. Adaptive management. Increased fishing opportunity is beneficial to the CPFV fleet. Opening up fishing for pelagic fish species would have a marginal impact on sensitive species (like corals) and could serve as an economic benefit to the 12 vessels that fish the region."</p> <p>"We should be striving to maintain, or even increase protections of MPAs, as research/ monitoring has shown a clear benefit to the ecosystem and fishing (e.g. increased abundance and size of fishes)."</p> <p>"Decreasing the protection of sanctuary resources is counter to the goals of CINMS. Without a compelling reason, this should not be pursued."</p> <p>"Before doing this, we need to be sure we're not overfishing, and then define how much more rec. fishing the sanctuary can support to be sustainable."</p>	4	3	8
B03	Recreational Fishing	B3. Recreational Fishing: Expand no-take areas of marine reserves and marine conservation areas to enhance the beneficial "spillover" effects for recreational fishing. See 5.4.	<p>"Hell NO, do not create more MPAs where fishing is limited or restricted. The spillover effect has not been proven to benefit anglers, in fact as one of the most experienced anglers in the CINMS, I say we do NOT benefit from spillover. It was a false promise."</p> <p>"My "Y" is based on the assumption that this means increasing protection."</p> <p>"The reason to expand the No-Take areas should be to for the purpose of improving fishing outside the areas. That should not be a goal."</p> <p>"We should increase no take zones throughout the chinms."</p> <p>"No changes to Sanctuary or other boundaries or regulations is recommended."</p> <p>"Worth examination."</p> <p>"Spillover is better enhanced by increasing the edge to area ratio of MPAs. Making fishing closures larger reduces the edge to area ratio. Larger MPAs offer greater protection from being caught. Given fisheries managed for optimal sustainable production, the optimum proportion of habitat to set aside for purely fisheries benefits modeled at just 5 percent of the total area. Already the MPAs within CINMS exceed that, providing for values other than fishing. We have Marine Parks benefiting the species fishing normally competes with."</p> <p>"See B2."</p> <p>"The issue of no-take areas has been been a controversial subject, particularly between preservationists and recreational fishermen. There is good cause to explore expansion of protected areas, as they have proven to be effective in rebuilding species population. However, the economic cost of expansion should also be a consideration."</p> <p>"B2 wants to allow Take, B3 wants the opposite, to expand No Take. B4 wants more fishing but doesn't articulate Take or No Take. Need a plan."</p>	6	4	9
B04	Recreational Fishing	B4. Recreational Fishing: Change state marine reserve regulations to allow visitors to fish at Scorpion Anchorage. See 5.5.	<p>"Great priority."</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Absolutely NOT. This is a highly protected area that is showing resilience to invasive species due to its level of protection. This level of protection should be provided to the entire Sanctuary."</p> <p>"See no scientific justification for this."</p> <p>"Way too much visitation in this area. Scorpion needs to remain a no take zone with the current boundaries or expand no take zones in that area."</p> <p>"No changes to Sanctuary or other boundaries or regulations is recommended."</p> <p>"Scorpion Anchorage is one of just a handful of sites more commonly visited by those looking for non fishing recreational opportunities. It should be held aside from fishing so those who come to see what's underwater get to see the greatest abundance of critters the area can support."</p> <p>"See B2. If any changes are made to Scorpion because of its access via the pier, this should be done in consideration of the entire network, so we do not reduce the overall spatial extent of protected areas."</p> <p>"See B2. If any changes are made to Scorpion because of its access via the pier, this should be done in consideration of the entire network, so we do not reduce the overall spatial extent of protected areas."</p> <p>"Public participation in the sanctuary should always be something that is promoted and encouraged by the CINMS. If this is to be addressed as part of the revised management plan process, the potential impacts to sanctuary resources should be given equal weight."</p> <p>"Wrap B-1 through B-4 up in to: Conduct appropriate studies to determine the appropriate level of Recreational Fishing in various fishing spots in the sanctuary including take and no take areas of which species, and sustainable levels. Conduct appropriate outreach"</p>	4	3	8

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
B05	Military Activities	B5. Military Activities: Maintain exemptions to sanctuary regulations for military operations and training activities. See 6.1.	<p>"I believe in the value of a strong military."</p> <p>"It might be necessary at some point to change this. If possible Management Plan could leave the door open for consideration of changes."</p> <p>"All current activities/exemptions should be carried over to the new proposed plan."</p> <p>"They should not be exempt. The military should be required to follow the rules like everyone else and in fact, they should help with enforcement."</p> <p>"Ongoing. I don't really like this but assume it is out of Sanctuary control."</p> <p>"Keep status quo on this. There isn't much within CINMS and conflicts are minimal."</p> <p>"Military exemptions should not negatively impact the protected resources of the CINMS."</p> <p>"The military has been an important member of CINMS. Continued use of exemptions may facilitate a good working relationship with the military and gives CINMS the opportunity to work in collaboration with the military to limit impacts to sanctuary resources in terms of their operations and training activities."</p> <p>"These 2 military ones should be moved away from fishing."</p>	7	7	14
B06	Military Activities	B6. Military Activities: Clarify or define sanctuary processes that support DOD infrastructure (e.g. fiber optic cables). See 6.2.	<p>"I believe in the value of a strong military."</p> <p>"Not sure what is meant by this. If it's just a matter of more transparency about what is going on currently, then could be a good idea. But I would be concerned that it's first step to allowing more invasive infrastructure."</p> <p>"The Sanctuary plan should describe how actions proposed within Sanctuary boundaries are to be processed and evaluated and specifically address maintenance of existing DOD resources within Sanctuary boundaries."</p> <p>"This should not be a priority. I can't really imagine that all of this is required in order to maintain our national security."</p> <p>"Ongoing."</p> <p>"Again, if this does not negatively impact the protected resources of the CINMS."</p> <p>"Transparency of the process should be a clear goal of the management plan. Barring any classified information considerations, this makes sense."</p> <p>"These 2 military ones should be moved away from fishing."</p>	8	8	16
B07	Commercial Fishing	B7. Commercial Fishing: Make more areas available for harvest of groundfish; do not close any additional areas to groundfish harvest. See 4.1, 4.2.	<p>"Do NOT create more MPAs where fishing is limited or restricted."</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Absolutely not. Commercial fishing is highly destructive to fish populations and by-catch. We hear a lot about their efforts to 'reduce' by-catch, which implies that there is a lot of it. This is a barbaric practice. I agree with Dr. Sylvia Earle in that we need to stop exploiting the oceans for fish. We need to transition to a plant-based diet instead and allow the oceans to heal."</p> <p>"See no scientific justification for this."</p> <p>"Reduce fishing areas in the sanctuary and increase no-take boundaries."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"This is a PFMC/GAP/NMFS issue."</p> <p>"See B2."</p> <p>"Any effort to decrease the levels of protection of marine resources within the sanctuary for the purposes of commercial fishing should be discouraged."</p> <p>"Before doing this, we need to be sure we're not overfishing, and then define how much more rec. fishing the sanctuary can support to be sustainable. See Kip recommendation."</p>	5	4	8
B08	Fishing Activity	B8. Fishing Activity: Expand no-take areas, without exceptions for fishing for pelagic species. See 10.3.	<p>"Hell no, do not expand or create MPAs where fishing is limited or restricted."</p> <p>"Assuming this means increasing protection."</p> <p>"Yes, there should not be exceptions for pelagic species. They are there for a reason and should not be exploited. They are contributing to the ecosystem and natural food chain – that humans are NOT a part of."</p> <p>"No expansion of no-take areas as established. Increase MPAs."</p> <p>"No changes to regulations or boundaries is recommended."</p> <p>"These exemptions are few in the CINMS, just the MPA north of West Anacapa Island. We need to see similar policy implemented out at the Footprint MPA."</p> <p>"See B2."</p> <p>"The issue of no-take areas has been a controversial subject, particularly between preservationists and recreational fishermen. There is good cause to explore expansion of protected areas, as they have proven to be effective in rebuilding species population. However, the economic cost of expansion should also be a consideration."</p> <p>"Before doing this, we need to be sure we're not overfishing, and then define how much more rec. fishing the sanctuary can support to be sustainable. See Kip recommendation."</p>	6	4	9

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
B09	Fishing Activity	B9. Fishing Activity: Use fisheries management approaches such as prohibiting certain types of gear (e.g., nylon driftnets), using temporal zoning, and setting quotas based on fish censuses in/out of MPAs. See 10.4, 10.5, 10.8.	<p>"NOAA Sanctuaries should NOT be engaged in fisheries management. NOAA fisheries has the science, advisory bodies and stakeholder processes to do fisheries management. This is outside of the scope of CINMS."</p> <p>"I believe that this should be stopped entirely but since that is probably unlikely then this seems like a good first step. The more regulation of the fisheries the better in order to protect the fish and the environment."</p> <p>"Not in our capacity."</p> <p>"This is outside the scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Fishing gear not specifically a sanctuary function is it? Working with fishing regulators is good."</p> <p>"Already being done at the fisheries management level, across the entire West Coast."</p> <p>"This would likely be more appropriate for a partnering agency but CINMS staff may be able to inform partners if a certain gear type is known to be an issue in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"The CINMS should study the use of a variety of fisheries management approaches."</p> <p>"Before doing this, we need to be sure we're not overfishing, and then define how much more rec. fishing the sanctuary can support to be sustainable. See Kip recommendation."</p>	7	6	12
B10	Enforcement	B10. Enforcement: Increase enforcement of MPAs; Expand MPA enforcement cooperation and coordination law enforcement agencies. See 10.1, 14.1.	<p>"MPAs should be enforced with existing enforcement resources. Do not increase budget for MPA enforcement."</p> <p>"Absolutely. We don't have a Sanctuary without enforcement."</p> <p>"Always good to support compliance so good guys don't lose out to the cheaters. The Sportfishing Association of California (SAC) is in support of increased MPA enforcement and monitoring."</p> <p>"NOAA law enforcement could use additional resources to better enforce sanctuary regulations."</p> <p>"Policies and laws that govern the protection of sanctuary resources are only as good as the strength of enforcement activity. Expanded cooperation and coordination with law enforcement agencies should be a top priority of the CINMS."</p> <p>"Expanding enforcement through cooperation and coordination can have great benefit without expending more resources because partners do you work for you because you find work that is in mutual benefit."</p>	8	9	17
B11	Enforcement	B11. Enforcement: Expand cooperation and coordination with law enforcement agencies to improve enforcement of discharge and seafloor disturbance regulations. See. 14.1.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"Yes. This is an important project. We need to protect the seafloor from destructive practices."</p> <p>"A continuing effort larger than CINMS."</p> <p>"It is likely beneficial to improve cooperation/collaboration among agencies to improve enforcement efficiency."</p> <p>"Policies and laws that govern the protection of sanctuary resources are only as good as the strength of enforcement activity. Expanded cooperation and coordination with law enforcement agencies should be a top priority of the CINMS."</p> <p>"Expanding enforcement through cooperation and coordination can have great benefit without expending more resources because partners do you work for you because you find work that is in mutual benefit."</p>	8	10	18
B12	Decommissioning	B12. Decommissioning of Oil & Gas Platforms: Actively monitor sanctuary resources to assess impacts of decommissioning activities, and develop spill contingency plans. See 20.1, 20.2.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"This is already occurring."</p> <p>"This has the potential to be detrimental to the Sanctuary so it should be carefully monitored."</p> <p>"Too vague."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Taking B-12-13-14-15 together. Work with public and other agencies."</p> <p>"Yep."</p> <p>"The sanctuary has and should continue its involvement in oil spill response and engage in decommissioning activities, as appropriate and if they impact sanctuary resources."</p> <p>"Decommission of oil and gas platforms presents a unknown in terms of impacts on sanctuary resources. Continued monitoring of sanctuary resources to assess the impacts of these types of activities should be a given."</p> <p>"This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, NEPA, EIR, etc. etc., not a special program. As said above, it's not the Sanctuary's job to develop plans for oil spills when the threat is low probability and far away."</p>	8	8	15

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
B13	Decommissioning	B13. Decommissioning of Oil & Gas Platforms: Identify infrastructure that should be left in place as habitat. See 20.4.	<p>"Infrastructure should be not only left in place, but enhanced with reefing at the base, sea bird nesting habitat at the top and pinniped haul-out platforms at sea level."</p> <p>"Not CINMS role."</p> <p>"This issue should be studied."</p> <p>"Let others do this"</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Not a strictly sanctuary function; work with collaborators."</p> <p>"Yep, but no such structures within CINMS."</p> <p>"This is outside the scope of CINMS management, as there are no oil platforms within the sanctuary boundary. Should the boundary expand to include existing infrastructure, this issue could be taken up then."</p> <p>"Potential artificial reefs as a result of decommissioning of oil and gas platforms is an issue that will be decided outside of this process."</p> <p>"I'm not a fish expert but it seems a fish living by an oil rig in the SB channel just swim over into the sanctuary. Because of this nexus, I do support and believe the Sanctuary has an appropriate role and voice in what happens to decommissioned oil platforms."</p>	6	4	10
B14	Decommissioning	B14. Decommissioning of Oil & Gas Platforms: Remove decommissioned oil platforms near the sanctuary; ensure removal of spent jackets and other platform components. See 20.5, 20.6.	<p>"Do not kill sea life by removing habitat."</p> <p>"Management Plan should include weighing in to minimize impact of decommissioning activities on sanctuary."</p> <p>"Yes, this should be done in order to keep the Sanctuary natural."</p> <p>"Let others do this"</p> <p>"Leaving viable structures for artificial reef as good fishing and marine habitat."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Long conversations going on about this. Work with collaborators."</p> <p>"No such structures within CINMS. It's a strange dynamic that many environmentalists find themselves advocating the killing of vast amounts of marine life."</p> <p>"See B13. Outside scope."</p> <p>"It will be important to ensure that removal of decommissioned oil platforms do not disrupt or harm sanctuary resources. CINMS should involve itself in any public process that discussed the process of decommissioning."</p> <p>"This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, NEPA, EIR, etc. etc., not a special program."</p> <p>"Recommendation for wrapping up B-12 through B-14: Properly participate in the discussion and actions regarding the decommissioning of oil and gas platforms to help ensure the best outcome for the Sanctuary. There are strong arguments and opinions for what happens to the platforms and associated plants and animals."</p>	5	5	9
B15	Decommissioning	B15. Decommissioning of Oil & Gas Platforms: Following decommissioning of rigs/platforms, expand sanctuary boundaries to encompass areas previously precluded from designation by the presence of oil platforms. See 20.7.	<p>"Hell no, do NOT expand the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Pursue in the long term as other priorities allow."</p> <p>"Yes, the presence of the platforms is probably one of the reasons the Sanctuary boundaries are fixed where they are. The Sanctuary should be expanded to include those areas now."</p> <p>"Interesting idea."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Certainly worth exploring."</p> <p>"See B13. Outside scope."</p> <p>"If the preclusion of these areas was due to the presence of oil platforms only, then expansion may be warranted. Further discussion needed."</p> <p>"This should be done as part of the ongoing participation by the Sanctuary in the approval of permits, proposals, NEPA, EIR, etc. etc., not a special program."</p>	6	5	11
B16	Unmanned Systems	B16. Unmanned Systems: Address the use of unmanned aircraft systems/drones in the sanctuary. See 24.1.	<p>"Unmanned systems may benefit science, but should not be used for enforcement."</p> <p>"Must include security concerns when considering regulation of unmanned systems."</p> <p>"This is essential. I am an FAA Part 107 commercial drone pilot and understand all of the implications of drone activity. It should not be permitted anywhere in the Sanctuary unless for specific and carefully monitored research purposes."</p> <p>"Vague, but probably should be considered."</p> <p>"This is outside scope of Sanctuary authority. Need to coordinate with existing FAA regs."</p> <p>"Prohibited already by NPS. Consider rules in NMS."</p> <p>"Is this not already addressed by overflight rules?"</p> <p>"Continue partnership with NPS and other agencies."</p> <p>"The use of recreational drones has vastly increased over the past few years. We have seen conflicts with the use of drones with firefighting air vehicles during the recent local fires. Disturbance of sanctuary resources is a possibility with these types of unmanned aircraft systems, and should absolutely be addressed."</p> <p>"I think better wording would be "develop appropriate protocols and approvals for use of UAS in the Sanctuary.""</p>	8	10	18

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
B17	Research Use	B17. Research Use: Remove permitting barriers to access and specimen collection. See 27.1.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species and habitats in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"The rules related to collecting 'specimens' should be MORE strict not less."</p> <p>"Are there burdensome barriers?"</p> <p>"Examine and reduce if possible."</p> <p>"Consider processes with CDFW."</p> <p>"Legitimate scientific collecting can handle the rules. RAP can follow this."</p> <p>"There already is a permitting system for both state and federal waters. Perhaps some formal consolidation system is in order."</p> <p>"Unknown if this is a problem for researchers."</p> <p>"The sanctuary provides a great opportunity for researchers. However, removal of permitting barriers may encourage bad behavior."</p> <p>"I think better wording would be 'review policies regarding specimen collection and update if/as necessary to reflect modern science and technology.'"</p>	6	4	10
B18	Research Use	B18. Research Use: Work with the Channel Islands National Park, The Nature Conservancy, and universities to continue to allow research activity in and around the sanctuary. See 27.2.	<p>"Agree, providing that recreational fishing is not limited or restricted."</p> <p>"Already occurring."</p> <p>"Depending on the activity, this is already allowed."</p> <p>"Research conducted by these organizations is essential to our mission and to better protect the Sanctuary."</p> <p>"Consider processes with CDFW."</p> <p>"Already do this."</p> <p>"Yes, for example, the MPA network offers key research opportunities."</p> <p>"Research within the sanctuary is something that CINMS currently encourages and participates in, and this practice should be continued."</p> <p>"I think better wording would be 'review policies regarding research activity in and around the Sanctuary and update if/as necessary to reflect modern science and technology. Work with appropriate partners.'"</p>	9	10	19
B19	Visitation	B19. Visitation: Expand the number of transportation providers for recreational access to the sanctuary. See 29.6.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"This should not be allowed. We should instead focus on the quality and safety of the operators such as the dive boats, which are in a sub-standard state and a inferior compared to those that operate in other dive areas around the world."</p> <p>"Is there a need?"</p> <p>"There are enough now and plenty of opportunity through current process"</p> <p>"This is a National Park issue."</p> <p>"Need to first study carrying capacity for visitors."</p> <p>"A National Parks issue primarily, but within the CINMS. We should consider this given the park's limited public access. Scheduled island runs from Santa Barbara Harbor as Island Packers offers out of Ventura Harbor would be a plus."</p> <p>"Unknown if there is demand for this, but likely outside of scope of the sanctuary and more aligned with NPS."</p> <p>"Increased access to the sanctuary is a primary function of CINMS. It is imperative, however, that any additional transportation providers be educated in the special protections of the sanctuary."</p> <p>"I don't know what problem this solves. Is the input to increase the number of firms providing the service while keeping the total visitation count the same? This could lead to a price war between 2 firms leading to lower quality, reduced safety, etc. However, if the input is to have the same number of people go but the transportation provider must come from more ports to ease land-side travel which would make the Sanctuary more accessible to underserved populations, give more access to mass transit to the ferries, etc., that could be very attractive. Potential wording: 'Review transportation to and from the Sanctuary and update policies and procedures regarding providers, routes, schedules is/as necessary to best meet the Sanctuary's mission.'"</p>	5	4	10
B20	Visitation	B20. Visitation: Conduct a demographic study of visitation to the sanctuary. See 29.2.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"Not a priority at this time."</p> <p>"Not sure what this would tell us."</p> <p>"See 29.3 for this purpose, a good idea for equity and diversity."</p> <p>"It would be good to know sector contributions to CINMS visitation, both in dollars and in hours. Is CINMS more of a recreational fishing destination, a commercial fishing place or a tourism destination. CINMS should be managed for its greatest values. Staff needs to know what those actually are."</p> <p>"Could help identify education and outreach needs, as well as opportunities to get more diverse groups into the sanctuary or at least exposed to its resources."</p> <p>"This may help further identify underserved populations and their ability to visit the sanctuary. This will help tailor outreach efforts for future 'Get Into Your Sanctuary' events."</p> <p>"This should be done consistent with NOAA/Federal guidelines regarding this sort of survey. That said, I think it could be fascinating to see if a particular demographic has relative impact to the Sanctuary than another. Is it kayakers, snorkelers, hikers, campers, recreational fishing, commercial fishing, recreational boating that is eco-friendly and quiet such as sailing vs. power boats and jet skis? What's the relative impact of a cruise ship delivering a group of tourists/hikers vs. Island Packers? This could help you say yes or no regarding permits, etc. This could be coupled with B-20, C-10, C-11, and C-12."</p>	8	10	17

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
<b>Programmatic Focal Areas</b>						
C01	Artificial Reefs	C1. Artificial Reefs: Develop sanctuary permitting framework. See 5.2, 11.13.	<p>"Top priority."</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species and habitats in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"These should not be allowed in the Sanctuary unless CAREFULLY studied first."</p> <p>"I would say we should begin a study of the possibility of adding reefs, not yet establishing a permitting process."</p> <p>"Positives include: more non consumptive and fishing opportunities, as well as buffering against climate crisis issues."</p> <p>"Outside scope of Sanctuary authority. Would need to work with CDFW."</p> <p>"In general, seems inappropriate for sanctuaries except for possible restoration."</p> <p>"Yes, but limited to the area south of Anacapa Island and north of Santa Cruz island in depths of 100 to 300 feet. These are the areas that lack much sub-sea structure and natural reefs."</p> <p>"The NMS's goal is to "protect important natural and cultural places." Artificial reefs are in opposition of this goal. Proposals for artificial reefs should focus on areas outside of MPAs (including the sanctuary)."</p> <p>"Section 922.72 of the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations lists "abandoning any structure, material, or other matter on or in the submerged lands of the sanctuary" as a prohibited activity. Artificial reefs within the sanctuary should not be allowed."</p> <p>"Why? See my recommendation at C3."</p>	5	5	10
C02	Artificial Reefs	C2. Artificial Reefs: Propose, design and develop restoration reefs at a variety of island locations to help depleted marine species. See 5.2,	<p>"Top priority."</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species and habitats in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"I would need to see more data and studies on this. I know that there are success stories with similar restoration projects with tropical corals."</p> <p>"Too early for this."</p> <p>"See above."</p> <p>"Outside scope of Sanctuary authority. Would need to work with CDFW."</p> <p>"No. Restoration can easily be a Trojan horse for other agendas. Seems to me one of the sanctuary benefits is to let nature take its course and get out of the way of it doing so. Bit no to artificial reefs in the sanctuary. Again, the idea behind MPAs is to allow them to work."</p> <p>"See C1. A restoration project should be considered if true restoration is needed (for example, removal of invasive algae and restoration of eelgrass). We should not be implementing artificial reefs under the guise of "restoration" when it is meant as enhancement for a specific activity, such as recreational fishing."</p> <p>"Section 922.72 of the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations lists "abandoning any structure, material, or other matter on or in the submerged lands of the sanctuary" as a prohibited activity. Artificial reefs within the sanctuary should not be allowed."</p> <p>"Why? See my recommendation at C3."</p>	5	5	10
C03	Artificial Reefs	C3. Artificial Reefs: Design reefs to promote kelp forest growth in response to climate change effects. See 2.3.	<p>"Top priority."</p> <p>"This is a time to maximize protection of species and habitats in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"I would need to see more data and studies on this. I know that there are success stories with similar restoration projects with tropical corals."</p> <p>"Too early for this."</p> <p>"See above." "Outside scope of Sanctuary authority. Would need to work with CDFW."</p> <p>"Ditto."</p> <p>"Plenty of suitable substrate to be found in the appropriate depths at the islands."</p> <p>"If this is for restoration, then it should be called out as such. Mitigation activities that are not considered restoration should be proposed in areas outside of MPAs, unless best available science backs up the need for them to be in a specific location."</p> <p>"Section 922.72 of the National Marine Sanctuary Program regulations lists "abandoning any structure, material, or other matter on or in the submerged lands of the sanctuary" as a prohibited activity. Artificial reefs within the sanctuary should not be allowed."</p> <p>"Recommendation to wrap up C1-C3: Since artificial reefs can help with restoration of plant and animal species, support science and studies to determine if artificial reefs could be part of solutions to problems within the Sanctuary"</p>	6	5	10
C04	Deep Sea Exploration	C4. Deep Sea Exploration: expand ROV exploration of deep sea corals. See 11.4.	<p>"Agree, within sanctuary waters. Beyond that is the jurisdiction of other federal agencies."</p> <p>"More research and data in this area would be useful in terms of better protecting them."</p> <p>"Costly; take opportunities to partner."</p> <p>"I know from experience there likely exists many more areas with vast spreads of sponges and soft corals. The Footprint and Piggy Bank are not unique in that."</p> <p>"This has been a priority of the sanctuary and it would be great to see this effort continue."</p> <p>"ROV provides an unique opportunity for research in the sanctuary. CINMS has already deployed ROV."</p> <p>"This is fine but should be expanded to "Expand ROV exploration of relevant scientific research in and adjacent to the Sanctuary including deep-sea coral, shipwrecks, invasive species, dumping, etc.""</p>	7	10	17

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C05	Restoration	C5. Pursue Active Restoration: of eelgrass beds. See 11.5.	<p>"Great priority."                      "Restoration activities must not be intrusive."                      "I would need to see more data and studies on this. I know that there are success stories with similar restoration projects with tropical corals."                      "Maybe."                      "And kelp seeding."                      "In general, restoration ideas should be aired. But reserves need a chance to fulfill their functions without tinkering."                      "Eelgrass is ephemeral and responds to ecosystem-wide changes largely beyond our control. The exception is where the beds are exposed to excess siltation due to dredging or other sources within secluded bays and estuaries. Beds within CINMS are in open waters and negative impacts to them are beyond our ability to mitigate."                      "C5-C8: Restoration of any species/habitat should take place as needed/appropriate and in partnership with relevant agencies/universities. Perhaps an overview of restoration activities and potential projects would be a good SAC item."                      "This warrants further discussion by SAC."                      "Why? Only if supported by the science without a negative impact."</p>	8	10	17
C06	Restoration	C6. Pursue Active Restoration: of abalone (in collaboration with relevant partners). See 11.5, 11.7.	<p>"Great priority."                      "Restoration activities must not be intrusive."                      ""This would have a positive effect based on the research and work that has been done so far. I would not support this if it were to move toward allowing of collecting of the animals by divers for sport or commercial purposes, however."                      "In some places restoration of various species maybe warranted but need to fully consider the range and scope of efforts and how they interact. Work with others."                      "Booming back already, but good to keep tabs on. Active restoration may come with the risk of becoming a vector of disease, however."                      "C5-C8: Restoration of any species/habitat should take place as needed/appropriate and in partnership with relevant agencies/universities. Perhaps an overview of restoration activities and potential projects would be a good SAC item."                      "This warrants further discussion by SAC."                      "Why? Only if supported by the science without a negative impact."</p>	8	10	18
C07	Restoration	C7. Pursue Active Restoration: of sea otters. See 11.5.	<p>"I'm against it. They are gluttons and ruin too much life that we care about and want to restore."                      "Restoration activities must not be intrusive."                      "This would be a project that would probably benefit the entire ecosystem."                      "It has been determined that the best way to increase sea otters is through natural expansion."                      "Ditto."                      "The state abrogated a commitment to keep otters from expanding to the Channel Islands, in exchange trying to establish an otter colony at San Nicolas Island. CINMS should be hands off with respect to otters and leave that fight to the state."                      "C5-C8: Restoration of any species/habitat should take place as needed/appropriate and in partnership with relevant agencies/universities. Perhaps an overview of restoration activities and potential projects would be a good SAC item."                      "This warrants further discussion by SAC."                      "Why? Only if supported by the science without a negative impact."</p>	6	4	9
C08	Restoration	C8. Pursue Active Restoration: consider habitat restoration within and around MPAs. See 11.9.	<p>"I'm for habitat restoration around MPAs. Within MPAs however seems like breaking the very rules of MPAs."                      "Restoration activities must not be intrusive."                      "I would need to see more data and studies on this. I know that there are success stories with similar restoration projects with tropical corals."                      "Maybe."                      "Not consistent with MPA designations and habitats do not need to be restored."                      "Ditto."                      "The MPAs are all about a hands-off approach and letting nature nurture."                      "C5-C8: Restoration of any species/habitat should take place as needed/appropriate and in partnership with relevant agencies/universities. Perhaps an overview of restoration activities and potential projects would be a good SAC item."                      "This warrants further discussion by SAC."                      "Why? Only if supported by the science without a negative impact. This goes with the Artificial Reef Items C1-3 above."</p>	7	8	15

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C09	Research/Monitoring	C9. Research/Monitoring Focus: MPAs: Develop indicators to measure consequences of management actions in the MPA network; use indicator species to evaluate MPA effectiveness; apply attributional science on human activity to evaluate effectiveness of management actions, including the MPA network.support collaborative research and monitoring of MPAs with CDFW and other partners; support research on role of MPAs in mitigating climate change effects. See 11.6, 11.7, 23.6, 23.7, 3.12.	<p>"Conceptually sound, however the truth is... any studies of MPAs by the parties (agencies and organizations and academia) who fought to bring them about will always show MPAs to be beneficial, no matter how much socioeconomic damage they cause and ignoring the fact that many MPAs no longer receive much human visitation. They are just for the benefit of those who submit grant requests to study them and those are the very people who put on the studies which result in claims that they are beneficial."</p> <p>"Yes, this would provide more data in which to make better informed decisions."</p> <p>"Others are doing this. Might support with ship time."</p> <p>"High YES."</p> <p>"Just do the darned promised monitoring!!! That's barely getting done, some years with funding, others on a shoestring with scraps. Still, it's a lot more robust than in the rest of the state."</p> <p>"With the ten year review coming up in 2022, communicating the impacts of MPAs on management of sanctuary resources should be a top priority, including robust collaboration with other responsible agencies."</p> <p>"Monitoring of MPA effectiveness should be a continuous effort by CINMS."</p> <p>"Outstanding."</p>	9	10	19
C10	Research/Monitoring	C10. Research/Monitoring Focus: Socioeconomic Value: Use socioeconomic reports/studies/research to highlight the benefits of protecting sanctuary resources. See 9.4.	<p>"Agree, but also use the same socioeconomic reports/studies/research to highlight the damages done by over-protection of sanctuary resources (e.g. MPAs)"</p> <p>"Not the highest priority at this time; might be worth doing as other priorities allow."</p> <p>"This should not be a major consideration. Sorry. The work we do for the Sanctuary should be PRIMARILY focused on protecting the ecosystem."</p> <p>"Might be useful."</p> <p>"This has value when communicating the benefits of and looking for increased support for sanctuaries."</p> <p>"The CINMS has included these types of studies as part of its latest condition report, resulting in interesting and useful data. This type of information strengthens the argument to protect sanctuary resources."</p>	8	10	18
C11	Research/Monitoring	C11. Research/Monitoring Focus: Fishing and Vessel Use Activity: Collect higher resolution data to monitor fishing; monitor vessels with data acquisition from radar stations, drones, satellites, electronic monitoring, AIS recorders; consider a mobile app for recording vessel sightings (e.g. like WhaleAlert). See 10.6.	<p>"Every time agencies and organizations want more details about where we fish, the goal is to take areas away from us and close them to fishing, so this item causes loud alarms to go off. And spy drones are not what recreational anglers want. "</p> <p>"This is essential in order to protect the Sanctuary otherwise it is a Sanctuary that exists on maps and in the minds of those of us who hope that people will make better decisions to protect the natural world."</p> <p>"Do we have the capacity to do this?"</p> <p>"Giving it an "M" because should be in collaboration with other agencies."</p> <p>"Yes, but a challenge to distinguish primary activity using most of the suggested methods here."</p> <p>"Monitoring vessel activity has myriad benefits. Many methods could be used, as appropriate."</p> <p>"Information collection is crucial. However, access and cost may be prohibitive."</p> <p>"This could be coupled with B-20, C-10, C-11, and C-12."</p>	7	9	16
C12	Research/Monitoring	C12. Research/Monitoring Focus: Study impacts of human activity and how to mitigate. See 11.11.	<p>"Mitigate for human activity? Is the sanctuary considering limiting human visitation? Restricted visitation? Limiting fishing?"</p> <p>"As other priorities allow."</p> <p>"Human activity should be CAREFULLY monitored. Getting more people to use the Sanctuary should not be a primary goal as it seems to be."</p> <p>"Vague."</p> <p>"In general, yeah duh."</p> <p>"Assumes all human activity has a negative impact on the resources. Too broad."</p> <p>"CINMS actively studies the impacts of human activity in the sanctuary, including marine debris, impacts of ships on whales, etc."</p> <p>"This could be coupled with B-20, C-10, C-11, and C-12."</p>	8	9	17
C13	Research/Monitoring	C13. Research/Monitoring Focus: Seabirds: Expand partnership with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to monitor migratory birds. See 11.8.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"As other priorities allow."</p> <p>"This is an important area of research."</p> <p>"As needed"</p> <p>"USFW is an important member of CINMS advisory council. Their expertise would provide valuable data on migratory birds."</p> <p>"Core Sanctuary function, and partnerships are good. I'm always wary of the word "expand" because the partnership may be at it's practical and natural limit already."</p>	8	8	16

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C14	Research/Monitoring	C14. Research/Monitoring Focus: Air Quality: study the impact of pollutants [from ship traffic] on air quality in Ojai and Simi Valley. See 15.1.	<p>"Seems outside the scope of CINMS."                      "Not CINMS role."                      "There are many highly negative impacts on people, animals, and the environment from the pollution from ships. I'm not sure this is within the scope of the Sanctuary, however."                      "Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."                      "Not sanctuary function; communicate w air district regulators."                      "Too Narrow and outside the CINMS wheelhouse."                      "Outside of scope."                      "Although the impacts of pollutants from ship traffic on air quality in Ojai and Simi Valley are undoubtedly implant, this falls outside the scope the mission of the CINMS."                      "Way outside of Sanctuary scope. Let appropriate entities do this (CARB, Counties, etc.)"</p>	4	3	7
C15	Research/Monitoring	C15. Research/Monitoring Focus: Deep Sea Coral: study/monitor corals to track impacts of hydrocarbon extraction, including methane hydrate harvesting. See 19.3.	<p>"Agree, within the sanctuary, but not beyond, where it becomes a task for another agency."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "Yes as this is a highly destructive practice. The deep sea environment is often overlooked because people can't see it."                      "No methane hydrate near us."                      "Too hypothetical."                      "Potential research partnership."                      "A study of deep sea coral was presented to the advisory council. Such a study would align with the goals of CINMS."                      "Good one."</p>	7	4	11
C16	Education	C16. Education Focus: Increase visitor education on potential impacts of recreational use. See 11.12.	<p>"Recreational use of the sanctuary should be a goal, not something to educate people on adverse impacts of. Make it a positive, not a negative."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "Yes. Visitors need to understand the uniqueness and fragility of the areas. In the work I have done with divers I have found that many do not know a lot about the Sanctuary but are conservation-minded and are glad to learn more."                      "Education should be part of the management plan. Combine ideas from C16-C27."                      "Yes if visitors have more information they will act better (you hope)."                      "Outreach re the rules?"                      "Education and outreach opportunities seem to be nearly limitless, so staff must prioritize. While all the ideas presented in this table have merit, perhaps staff could take these ideas and analyze which ones may have the largest benefit to overall education and outreach goals. The "M's" in this section mean that it is a good idea that staff should consider in such an analysis/discussion."                      "C16-C35: Education and outreach opportunities seem to be nearly limitless, so staff must prioritize. While all the ideas presented in this table have merit, perhaps staff could take these ideas and analyze which ones may have the largest benefit to overall education and outreach goals. The "M's" in this section mean that it is a good idea that staff should consider in such an analysis/discussion."                      "Continue and increase as needed."                      "Public campaigns on the potential impacts on our resources fit the education goals of CINMS. However, the focus should be broader than just recreational use of the sanctuary."                      "Very good one. It's so easy to say that if X students to visit the sanctuary is good that 2X is twice as good, bring your friends. I think letting the X students know the impact they make is important, so if X students could do 1/2 X impact to the Sanctuary by walking on paths rather than through the grass, taking only pictures and leaving all plants/animals, and bringing their own water rather than using limited Sanctuary resources, etc., then 2X students could come with NET ZERO impact! Scouts BSA has this concept at the big Philmont Scout Reservation in New Mexico, so every morning, everyone, adults included, had to crawl around on their hands and knees to "fluff the duff" and bring the grass you squished by sleeping back upright; you can't tie a rope to a tree directly. You have to carry or find sticks to put vertically around the tree and wrap the rope around that because the dead sticks take the chafe of the rope rather than the live bark of the tree... that sort of crazy stuff, but good stuff that lets them have 3-5K scouts and adults backpacking around a 50x100 mile area PER DAY!"</p>	8	10	18
C17	Education	C17. Education Focus: Increase science training or funding to K-12 schools and other education providers such as museums and nonprofits. See 13.1.	<p>"Provide staff speakers, as CINMS does for my fishing classes at SBCC. I'm not in favor of seeking greater budget for increased science training or funding to K-12 schools, museums and nonprofits."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "We truly need this. The schools do not have the financial resources nor the expertise to accomplish this."                      "With partners. It would be great to have more funding; this is more likely to happen with strong partnerships."                      "Funding outside of scope. Continued and enhanced partnerships could expand outreach."                      "Excursions on research vessels for teachers as well as students have been successfully used in the past to further the education goals of CINMS. Further expansion, particularly for underrepresented communities, would be a great opportunity to expose you to a resource they may not otherwise have access to."                      "Increasing can only be done if resourced and based on requirements and validated positive benefit."</p>	7	6	13

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C18	Education	C18. Education Focus: Expand educational programs to provide ongoing (not one-time) experiences (e.g., beach cleanups, letter writing to officials, citizen science, broader integration with curricula). See. 13.1.	<p>"Agree, within current budgets. Meaning to do more of this, give up something else."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "Yes, this would fit well with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), which are required to be implemented in California. On the first state tests on this last year, the students in Ventura County did poorly across the board. We can help with this."                      "This is a broad topic. It is not clear how we should expand."                      "With partners."                      "Partner with organizations already doing this type of education."                      "Educational programs will be vital to the continued health of the sanctuary. Ongoing programs may not be viable due to budget constraints."                      "Expanding can only be done if resourced and based on requirements and validated positive benefit."</p>	8	9	17
C19	Education	C19. Education Focus: Engage in more opportunistic outreach opportunities, including with new partners/collaborators (e.g., Patagonia). See 13.5.	<p>"Agree, but be very careful about partners influencing outreach messaging. An example is to never let a partner put out a message in favor of MPAs just because they believe in MPAs and are willing to ignore the socioeconomic damage done by MPAs."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "These would be useful partnerships."                      "Yes on partnerships for education."                      "As staffing allows."                      "CINMS should seek new partners in order to expand outreach and education opportunities."                      "More can only be done if resourced and based on requirements and validated positive benefit."</p>	8	9	16
C20	Education	C20. Education Focus: Use the Channel Islands Boating Center to offer more hands-on learning to high school and community college students. See 13.6.	<p>"Agree, within current budget. Meaning to do more of this, give up something else."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "If interesting programs are offered, this would be good."                      "Continue to utilize this resource."                      "The boating center already has interactive sanctuary kiosks and exhibits for outreach and education in Ventura County. Expansion of these existing resources should be explored."                      "Great idea... what it was built for and it's no impact to the Sanctuary itself."</p>	8	8	15
C21	Education	C21. Education Focus: Tap into youth climate movement as a conduit for sanctuary conservation messages. See 13.10.	<p>"Agree, providing the sanctuary does not limit motor types for visiting vessels."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "This would be a great opportunity. Many high schools have clubs focused on this and we don't know about them and their work and they don't know about our work."                      "Interesting idea."                      "Deceitful strategy."                      "See note above in C16 regarding overall education and outreach focus"                      "CINMS should seek to engage with a wide variety of populations, including youth."                      "This is in line with other line items that talk about strengthening partnerships, cooperation, etc. to accomplish good goals."</p>	7	9	16
C22	Education	C22. Education Focus: Conduct public outreach campaigns based on highlighting profiles of sanctuary users (e.g., such as port workers, scientists). See 13.8.	<p>"Agree, providing public outreach campaigns target recreational anglers as an obvious group to grow, since we are already your primary visitor."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "This might be interesting to high school students who are starting to think about college and careers."                      "Not sure what this looks like"                      "Great idea – who does what in the CINMS."                      "See note above in C16 regarding overall education and outreach focus"                      "A campaign highlighting different users of the sanctuary would certainly align with the outreach goals of CINMS. Social media would be a great method to deploy this messaging."                      "Recommend instead" Tap into youth at all levels as a conduit for sanctuary conservation messages". C-21 can be broadened to any valid movement that youth support and will advocate for."                      "I like this one and recommend it extend to SAC members also. What is a day/week/month in the life of a commercial fisherperson, or Capt. Bacon? Or a Ranger?"</p>	7	7	14
C23	Education	C23. Education Focus: Learn from and engage with a broader range of potential educational partners/programs; help other organizations to develop their ocean environmental agendas. See 13.7, 13.11.	<p>"Agree, and include our two local chapters of Coastal Conservation Association."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "Yes. This should be a core part of our mission."                      "Defer to C22."                      "Expanding partnerships is great, as feasible for staff."                      "CINMS should seek new partners in order to expand outreach and education opportunities."                      "Good one and I like the fact that it's 2-way... Sanctuary learning from others and teaching others."</p>	8	8	16

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C24	Education	C24. Education Focus: Marine Debris: Provide better information to the public on marine debris impacts in the sanctuary; help message the need for broader action. See 16.9.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"We should do this and focus on inland communities where much of the debris results from such as discarding cigarette butts and litter. ALL dive, fishing, and tourist boats should be required to have RECYCLING containers and waste containers with lids so things don't blow into the water. They do not all have these now."</p> <p>"Again, this could be especially useful if marine debris from boaters, mainland sources, etc. can be identified so individuals know how they can reduce their impact."</p> <p>"Public outreach on the impacts of marine debris in the sanctuary is messaging that the CINMS current does, and should continue."</p> <p>"Good one."</p>	8	7	16
C25	Education	C25. Education Focus: Diversity & Inclusion: Ensure all aspects of education and outreach include strong consideration and inclusion of diverse audiences. Work with other government agencies to be more inclusive of minorities and language minorities. See 29.1, 29.3.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"This is absolutely necessary in order to reach everyone."</p> <p>"Limited resources. New translation services are becoming active to help all."</p> <p>"This should be a priority that is reflected throughout the management plan."</p> <p>"Expansion of educational opportunities for underrepresented communities would be a great opportunity to expose you to a resource they may not otherwise have access to."</p> <p>"This is important, but Sanctuaries and National Parks are federal entities and so this should be done consistent with federal guidelines and funding constraints."</p>	9	10	19
C26	Education	C26. Education Focus: Diversity & Inclusion: Explore new partnerships to expand on-site education, nonconsumptive recreation, and other visitation opportunities for underserved populations. See 29.4.	<p>"Agree, however I'd like to include subsistence anglers as an underserved population, so let's drop the "nonconsumptive" stipulation."</p> <p>"We should work to make this part of our regular work."</p> <p>"Should be a top priority as this user is most likely to return, has positive economic impact and uses no marine life resources."</p> <p>"Support for programs that focus on underserved populations."</p> <p>"Expansion of educational opportunities for underrepresented communities would be a great opportunity to expose you to a resource they may not otherwise have access to."</p> <p>"This should be paired with C-29."</p>	8	10	18
C27	Education	C27. Education Focus: Explore partnerships to promote water safety skills for underserved populations. See 29.5.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"I think we already know this but it may be worth doing."</p> <p>"This is important but I don't think this is part of our work. It should be the work of the Coast Guard and Lifeguard agencies, I believe."</p> <p>"Seems like a good fit with the oxnard boating center to offer water safety classes to youth."</p> <p>"Great idea, but an Island Packers based initiative for water safety when visiting CINMS. However, supporting the USCG and State safe boater programs would broaden."</p> <p>"Great idea. I will just add that not everyone who visits the sanctuary gets in the water, so there may be other ways to introduce sanctuary resources to underserved populations. (Even school visits to aquariums)."</p> <p>"Enrichment programs for underserved populations are sorely needed, and such a partnership would facilitate many of the education and preservation goals of CINMS."</p> <p>"Water safety skills are important but not the job of the Sanctuary. This can and should be done at the local city pool so the Sanctuary can focus on C-26 above. You can learn how to paddle a kayak and wear a PFD in a city pool, but you can't see fish, animals, etc. don't water down (pun intended) the wonder of what can only be done in the Sanctuary with what can be done elsewhere."</p>	7	6	12
C28	Outreach	C28. Outreach Focus: Conduct an assessment of how to most effectively raise public awareness about the sanctuary. See 31.7.	<p>"Agree, but within current budget."</p> <p>"I think we already know this but it may be worth doing."</p> <p>"Vague."</p> <p>"We are always working on raising awareness of sanctuary."</p> <p>"Ongoing, not a new initiative."</p> <p>"Just get the word out."</p> <p>"This would help prioritize the many education and outreach suggestions."</p> <p>"This be encouraged for two reasons: a) to raise awareness of this resource so others (including school children and people from disadvantaged populations have more of an opportunity to visit the sanctuary, and b) to educate the public as to which activities are prohibited within the boundaries of the sanctuary, hence further protecting the resources within it."</p> <p>"Only be done if resourced and based on requirements and validated positive benefit that raising awareness is has value."</p>	7	6	13

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C29	Outreach	C29. Outreach Focus: Target lower income constituencies with promotional outreach efforts to share information on how to access sanctuary resources. See 31.3.	<p>"Good priority."                      "This would be great."                      "We are already promoting access to all constituencies."                      "Islands out of reach."                      "Would be best if this outreach is able to point people to programs that help reduce cost."                      "Lower income constituencies often do not have access to sanctuary resources. Targeting this demographic would align with the educational goals of CINMS."                      "This should be paired with C-26. Recommendation merging C26 and 29 as similar and complementary: Explore new partnerships to increase promotional outreach efforts to share information on how to access sanctuary resources, expand on-site education, expand non-consumptive recreation, and other visitation opportunities for underserved and lower income populations and constituencies."</p>	7	7	14
C30	Outreach	C30. Outreach Focus: Target sanctuary resource users to increase regulatory compliance. See 31.4.	<p>"Agree."                      "Yes, compliance should be 100%."                      "Want to see the full list of rules easily accessible. It appears to be a matrix of forbidden activities with multiple exemptions. No Sanctuary resources can be removed – but: Recreational and Commercial fishing removals are allowed if they comply with state and federal regulation... you can take a live kelleys whelk but not a shell? Taking a shell isn't allowed under the letter of the law, but we won't enforce it? However if you're over 18 and you take a whole bag full or try to sell them you're in trouble? It's indeed mind bending to wrap one's head around and even harder to answer questions about."                      "Continue."                      "Regulatory compliance should be a key component of sanctuary messaging. However, access to the resource itself holds just as much importance."                      "This has 2 parts to me, and both are important but can be done in parallel and relatively independently. First is targeting the user so they know the rules and follow them. That can be done by volunteers walking docks handing out flyers, posters at fishing spots, and education/outreach teaching the right thing "use reusable water bottles, and if you use a disposable, ensure you recycle it rather than throw it into the ocean or trash." The second part is officers enforcing the law and writing tickets. Hopefully #1 reduces #2!"</p>	8	9	17
C31	Outreach	C31. Outreach Focus: Recreational Fishing: Do more to promote this activity, including: advertising and outreach to the sportfishing public; educational activities (classes, lectures, presentations to sportfishing organizations); and inclusion of sportfishing as a primary activity in all CINMS public outreach materials. See 31.5.	<p>"Top priority"                      "We should not be using Sanctuary resources to promote businesses such as this that are overall destructive. The fish in the Sanctuary should be protected – ALL of them."                      "We are already doing enough to promote rec fishing."                      "More a function of the interest groups...though partnerships are valuable ways to ensure compliance."                      "Yes. Recreational fishing in CINMS seems to get lost in the matrix of public knowledge. The common conundrum is the idea of fishing within a "Sanctuary." So often the confusion seems to be supported rather than clarified, as if to discourage new participation. We need to fix this. It's a sanctuary from industrial exploitation, mining, drilling for oil. It's a place preserved for traditional uses there at the Islands. We need to do what we can to fix misconceptions about fishing in CINMS."                      "Yes, to continuing to educate people about recreational fishing rules. While recreational fishing is a popular use of the sanctuary, I do not know if it is the sanctuary's responsibility to actively promote this, or any other specific activity. Staff works to educate people about the resources, uses, and encourage people to visit and learn more about the sanctuary, but encouraging a specific use seems outside the scope."                      "All public access to the sanctuary should be promoted by CINMS, including recreational fishing."                      "Only do more promotion if the fish stock can support it and is sustainable."</p>	6	7	13
C32	Outreach	C32. Outreach Focus: Newsletter: Consider resurrecting the Alo'koy (printed sanctuary newsletter) or similar outreach materials. See 31.6.	<p>"Agree, but a newsletter is a very time-consuming project, with limited outreach potential. Stay within current budget."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "Printed materials waste money and resources, and are a source of pollution. Many are discarded. Instead, suggest making electronic version that is widely available to communities, students, schools and teachers, etc."                      "Not sure if this would be effective these days."                      "Print consumption of media is trending downward. Carbon impacts are increasing across all sectors, even from print. We need to spend on other resources."                      "Only if done in an electronic (not-printed) format."                      "A sanctuary newsletter would align with CINMS goals of increasing outreach efforts. However, consider a digital/e-newsletter to reduce waste."                      "Only if it is electronic rather than paper and if we really see the effort is worth the benefit. Today, for this sort of thing and this sort of audience, I think putting the time/money/effort into the Sanctuary website and social media would have more benefit."</p>	5	5	10

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C33	Outreach	C33. Outreach Focus: Lectures: Create a lecture series for local audiences. See 31.8.	<p>"Agree, but stay within current budget."                      "As other priorities allow."                      "We might try it and see if people might come. Bringing in keynote speakers of interest such as Dr. Sylvia Earle, Bill Nye, and others might be a great draw."                      "This already exists at Park, perhaps engage in it?"                      "Question is how to increase, build and diversify audiences."                      "Neat idea. Any volunteers?"                      "Could partner with local groups or tap into existing lecture series."                      "CINMS already does this in a fashion, as advisory council meetings are open to public. This allows for participating (in the form of public testimony) of every presentation given to the council members."                      "Only if there is customer demand and some sort of market survey said the public would come."</p>	7	6	13
C34	Outreach	C34. Outreach Focus: Visitor Center: Build a sanctuary visitor center. Or increase CINMS presence at existing visitor centers. See 31.9.	<p>"don't build it at UCSB because it limits access by the general public (think about parking). Anyplace else would be exceedingly expensive"                      "Not a priority to build a visitor enter. Increasing presence at existing ones (C35) could be done as other priorities allow."                      "Increasing our presence at existing locations would be good. Having exhibits of photography, art, etc. that has a Sanctuary or ocean theme may be good to hold at existing venues such as museums. I imagine the funds to build a visitor center would not be available and this would be expensive to maintain. The funds would be better put towards research and enforcement."                      "Good idea."                      "The latter. A visitor center would be nice but is it a wise expenditure? Worth investigating with partners and collaborators. Seek partnerships."                      "Neat idea. Any volunteers?"                      "There continues to be a need for increased visibility of the sanctuary. The plan could highlight improved collaboration at harbors with increased facilities/information. The CINMS could also partner with NPS / Sea Center / etc. to have more sanctuary messaging in existing visitor centers / educational facilities. Continue effort to finish the ocean education building at UCSB."                      "Visitor centers present good opportunities to interact with the public. Outreach material and participation in center events could boost knowledge of the existence of the sanctuary and the how to engage with it. However, building a visitor center is likely cost prohibitive (with cost to build and staff)."                      "1) Build: Only if there seems to be a need and what it would do differently than NPS and the facility in Oxnard.                      2) Expand: I think this is well done so far, but perhaps "Review the CINMS presence at NPS and other visitors' centers and update/renew/expand as necessary."                      C-34 and 35 go together."</p>	6	4	10
C35	Outreach	C35. Outreach Focus: Visitor Center: Increase CINMS presence at existing visitor centers. See 31.9.	<p>"Agree, but stay within current budget."                      "Increasing our presence at existing locations would be good. Having exhibits of photography, art, etc. that has a Sanctuary or ocean theme may be good to hold at existing venues such as museums."                      "This already exists."                      "Neat idea. Any volunteers?"                      "See C34. While the UCSB building is a great opportunity for outreach and education, it has limitations based on its location. It would be great to increase visibility in both SB and Ventura focused on the general public."                      "Visitor centers present good opportunities to interact with the public. Outreach material and participation in center events could boost knowledge of the existence of the sanctuary and the how to engage with it."                      "Expand: I think this is well done so far, but perhaps "Review the CINMS presence at NPS and other visitors' centers and update/renew/increase as necessary. C-34 and 35 go together."</p>	8	9	17
C36	Volunteer Programming	C36. Volunteer Programming: Continue to support the work of the Channel Islands Naturalist Corps. See 13.12, 31.13.	<p>"Agree, but instruct Naturalist Corps volunteers (as a requirement for support) not to say negative things about recreational or commercial fishing. We do have a problem with this."                      "This program is valuable and highly successful. We should continue to support this."                      "A popular and viable going concern. Keep it as long as the boats will continue to support it."                      "Strong support."                      "This is something that CINMS already does. Continued support would be appropriate."                      "Great cause."</p>	9	10	19

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C37	Volunteer Programming	C37. Volunteer Programming: Place volunteers into new citizen science roles, including removal and recording of island marine debris. See 16.8.	<p>"Agree"</p> <p>"If this is done well it could be a great resource. Utilizing organizations such as Reef Check, Channel Islands Restoration, and Channel Keepers would be effective and efficient."</p> <p>"Neat idea. Any volunteers?"</p> <p>"Support for utilizing citizens science where feasible."</p> <p>"Citizen science is such an important part of collaboration between CINMS, NGOs, non-profits, and individual members of the public. If volunteer resources allows for it, the removal of marine debris would align with the goals of CINMS to protect resources within the sanctuary."</p> <p>"If it makes sense. Need appropriate training and equipment, training, and disposal process/place/facility if dealing w/ debris that may be hazmat or dangerous (rusty metal, hypodermic needles, oil cans, etc.)"</p>	8	9	17
C38	Volunteer Programming	C38. Volunteer Programming: Support youth involvement in community engagement through internships, volunteer opportunities, and job skills training. See 13.9.	<p>"Agree. Note that our Santa Barbara Chapter of Coastal Conservation Association has a Youth Advisory Panel. This might be a good place to start."</p> <p>"We are missing chances here. Ventura County high schools should be included in allowing students to apply for a variety of summer internships."</p> <p>"CINMS staff already does a lot with students. This seems to be beneficial to both the students and the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Public outreach is an important component of CINMS. However, job training would fall outside the focus of this particular organization. However, there are many partners of CINMS who may want to support this type of program."</p> <p>"Good one and goes with others in same theme."</p>	8	9	17
C39	Volunteer Programming	C39. Volunteer Programming: Consider citizen science opportunities for private aircraft owners. See 31.12.	<p>"Agree, but not for enforcement monitoring. Leave the public out of that, to avoid problems such as misinformation."</p> <p>"Could encourage more private flights over sanctuary waters; would not necessarily result in more info."</p> <p>"I think this is best done by professional researchers, however, if proper training and permitting is done, researchers could fly along with private pilots. This might also be used for enforcement."</p> <p>"Waste of resources."</p> <p>"Neat idea. Any volunteers?"</p> <p>"With safety considerations"</p> <p>"Disturbing marine mammals or seabirds by flying motorized aircraft at less than 1,000 feet over the waters within one nautical mile of any Island, except to engage in kelp bed surveys or to transport persons or supplies to or from an Island is prohibited. Opportunities may be limited as a result."</p> <p>"Since the islands are offshore and you must fly 20 miles over water to get there this is a particularly bad idea. If you want to do this partner with the USCG Auxiliary and/or USAF Civil Air Patrol, who has training and qualification programs to do this sort of thing, but it's doubtful they will have the resources."</p>	6	6	12
C40	Chumash	C40. Chumash Collaboration: Work with interagency and other appropriate partners to incorporate Chumash input into interpretive signage on the islands. See 17.2.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"As other priorities allow."</p> <p>"This would be excellent! You see this when you travel to Ireland and Wales. Signs are required to be in native languages of those areas."</p> <p>"We don't do this?"</p> <p>"Enthusiastic yes."</p> <p>"Public education has been both a policy and tradition within the MPA. The incorporation of Chumash input to interpretive signage will give visitors another layer of understanding of the history of the land/sea within the MPA."</p> <p>"Great idea"</p>	9	9	18
C41	Chumash	C41. Chumash Collaboration: Collaborate and/or consult with all Chumash bands, regardless of Federal recognition status, on sanctuary management. See 17.3.	<p>"Limit this to Chumash visitation rights/privileges. Do not give the Chumash management authority over other sanctuary users, such as recreational and commercial anglers."</p> <p>"Should be taking direction on this from the band we currently work with."</p> <p>"I'm not familiar with this issue but increasing collaboration with Chumash would be a positive thing."</p> <p>"We don't do this?"</p> <p>"General support for this idea."</p> <p>"Engagement with all Chumash bands is something that all local governmental agencies are being encouraged to do. In the spirit of engagement with diverse populations of people, this practice is something that CINMS should be engaging in."</p> <p>"Great idea"</p>	8	9	17

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
C42	Chumash	C42. Chumash Collaboration: Understand and remove barriers to the continuation of indigenous traditional knowledge; use best practices from NOAA Sea Grant Report, "Traditional and Local Knowledge: A Vision for the Sea Grant Network". See 17.4.	<p>"Limit this to Chumash visitation rights/privileges. Do not give the Chumash management authority over other sanctuary users, such as recreational and commercial anglers."</p> <p>"This seems like it would be a good idea in keeping with the goals of the Sanctuary."</p> <p>"There are barriers?"</p> <p>"Discuss with Chumash. Expand to bands that were not included in this report."</p> <p>"The most recent condition report incorporates a voice of the Chumash people. The response has been great, and this type of collaboration should be fostered as part of the new management plan."</p> <p>"Great idea"</p>	9	9	18
C43	Chumash	C43. Chumash Collaboration: Officially define Chumash rights, claims, and privileges with respect to sanctuary resources. See 29.7.	<p>"Agree, but do not allow the Chumash to limit or restrict other sanctuary users, such as recreational and commercial anglers."</p> <p>"If careful not to reduce protection of species and habitats."</p> <p>"It is important that the Sanctuary is protected and respected by all peoples and I do not believe that anyone should be given extraordinary rights to use of resources such as fishing, extraction, etc."</p> <p>"Claims evolve from lawsuits, focus resources elsewhere, let the other agencies focus on rights."</p> <p>"This is not within Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Sounds painful, potentially fraught with a winners and losers dynamic."</p> <p>"Would want more information and thoughts on this directly from Chumash reps."</p> <p>"The Chumash people are of this land. As many of the Chumash have not had the opportunity to even visit the MPA area, further collaboration is a must. An official definition of rights, claims, and privileges with respect to sanctuary resources will be an important discussion to have."</p> <p>"Conceptually fine, but the word "officially" could run into treaty, federal law, etc. boundaries"</p>	7	6	13
C44	Partners	C44. Partnerships & Community Engagement: Increase support to partners (including Channel Islands Naturalist Corps Volunteers, Native American Chumash, University of California-Santa Barbara ocean sciences, other national marine sanctuaries, the Sierra Club, Surfrider Foundation, and other organizations), and Continue to collaborate with the community on planning and management. See 31.13, 31.2.	<p>"Agree, but stay within current budget."</p> <p>"Support and collaboration are already in place."</p> <p>"The existing Sanctuary Advisory Council is already well positioned to engage and collaborate amongst partners."</p> <p>"Working with these groups could be value-added to our work and engage more people in a positive way to protect the Sanctuary rather than to exploit it."</p> <p>"Vague, but should be in the plan."</p> <p>"Yes on building partnerships. Not sure what "Increase support" is meant to do...this statement is too broad to support."</p> <p>"Don't follow what this entails. Are we talking more money? Boat time? what, exactly?"</p> <p>"Support both to and from partners to more effectively collaborate"</p> <p>"This is already a primary function of the CINMS. Continuation of these collaborations aligns with the goals of the organization."</p> <p>"OK but as discussed before, the word "increase" always worries me for the 3 reasons discussed before: 1) These things may be at the maximum practical level. 2) What is the measurable benefit of "increased" support? 3) NOAA is a federal agency. If they aren't funded for this increase but mandated to do it, they might have to cut something else that is of more value."</p>	8	9	17
C45	Partners	C45. Partnerships & Community Engagement: Continue to partner with the UCSB Bren School on projects that inform sanctuary management. See 31.11.	<p>"Agree, however not when it comes to fisheries management. NOAA-Fisheries and CDFW have the infrastructure to manage fisheries. NOAA Sanctuaries and Bren School do not."</p> <p>"Already in place."</p> <p>"This has been an extremely valuable partnership in terms of research and protection."</p> <p>"Works"</p> <p>"Public awareness and understanding is an important strategy for the CINMS. The Bren School has been a valuable partner, and continuation of this relationship should be continued."</p> <p>"Great idea... seems low cost and great benefit. I've worked w/ the Bren Students for 7 years and enjoy it immensely."</p>	9	10	19
C46	Partners	C46. Partnerships & Community Engagement: Continue to partner with CDFW on creating outreach materials on sanctuary and state resources. See 31.1.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"Ongoing."</p> <p>"Most of this has been useful except where work is done to promote fishing, which is a destructive practice in the Sanctuary."</p> <p>"See C30."</p> <p>"I would include the MPA Collaborative network as well."</p> <p>"CDFW is an important partner, and have vital experience and data that will result in more accurate and informative outreach material."</p> <p>"Good idea. Partnering is good."</p>	9	10	19
<b>Regulatory Actions Suggested</b>						

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
D01	Reg: Boundaries	D1. Boundaries: Expansion of sanctuary outer boundaries in consideration of a variety of issues. See 3.11, 3.15, 8.1, 9.3, 10.2, 11.2, 19.7, 20.7, 25.2.	<p>"Hell no, do not expand the sanctuary."                      "Worth including in the Management Plan as something that could be explored."                      "Any effort to expand the Sanctuary will require extensive coordination, communication and environmental review (EIS)."                      "We should be actively promoting an expansion of the Sanctuary boundaries and the establishment of new sanctuaries to adjoin CINMS. More importantly, we should be restricting the existing areas to be 100% Marine Reserves that are NO TAKE."                      "It would be good to see a study of the options and consequences."                      "No changes to boundaries or regulations is warranted."                      "Overly broad; need to be explicit about what issues would be addressed Examination of boundaries is worthwhile."                      "Sanctuary designation has not visibly helped fisheries -- historically and presently a primary public use of the Channel Islands area. Thus fishing constituents continue to be reluctant to support any expansion of Sanctuary authority or space. The Sportfishing Association of California (SAC) supports the Council's position on no expansion at this time."                      "This was thoughtfully considered years ago, and it may be time to revisit an expansion."                      "This issue was considered as part of the 2009 management plan, and boundary expansion was not acted upon at that time. Not enough information to warrant expansion at this time."                      "Why? Only if a valid reason consistent with expanding Sanctuaries."</p>	6	5	11
D02	Reg: Boundaries	D2. Boundaries: Maintain current sanctuary boundaries. See 25.1, 25.3, 14.3	<p>"Maintain or perhaps reduce the size of the sanctuary."                      "I favor maintaining and considering expansion of boundaries. If this is being set up as alternative to D1, I do not favor."                      "The boundaries should be expanded."                      "Support maintaining current boundaries and supporting NMS program. But not if this means NOT exploring expansion."                      "See D1."                      "Support of expansion but not reductions."                      "This issue was considered as part of the 2009 management plan, and boundary expansion was not acted upon at that time. Not enough information to warrant expansion at this time."                      "Correct, assuming that science and technology don't guide us to a change."</p>	8	10	18
D03	Reg: MPAs	D3. MPAs: Do not create additional fisheries closures, including for commercial rockfish. See 4.1	<p>"Agree."                      "Closures may need to be considered."                      "All fishing should be closed in order to completely protect the ecosystem and the fish that inhabit it."                      "Too early for alterations at this point."                      "See D1 and B7."                      "We should be striving to maintain, or even increase protections of MPAs, as research/ monitoring has shown a clear benefit to the ecosystem and fishing (e.g. increased abundance and size of fishes)."                      "MPAs were implemented to help rebuild depressed populations, restore biodiversity, ad improve ecosystem health. This should be the primary goal of CINMS."                      "As discussed elsewhere, things like openings, closing, increasing, etc. must be supported by science and balanced with other priorities such as DOD. Are more closures needed for sustainable fisheries?"</p>	6	8	14
D04	Reg: MPAs	D4. MPAs: Increase the amount of area open to commercial fishing for groundfish. See 4.2.	<p>"Add recreational fishing to this, so that it benefits both commercial and recreational fishers and their families/friends. This is especially timely because cowcod stocks have been declared healthy and other rockfish species of concern have been rebuilding faster than anticipated."                      "All areas should be closed to fishing, ESPECIALLY commercial fishing. Frankly, this activity makes a joke of the entire concept of a marine sanctuary."                      "Outside Sanctuary authority."                      "See D1 and B7."                      "We should be striving to maintain, or even increase protections of MPAs, as research/ monitoring has shown a clear benefit to the ecosystem and fishing (e.g. increased abundance and size of fishes)."                      "Species population is increased within the MPA. Existing regulations within the MPA on commercial fishing should be maintained."                      "As discussed elsewhere, things like openings, closing, increasing, etc. must be supported by science and balanced with other priorities such as DOD. Increase only if supported by sustainable fisheries."</p>	4	3	8

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
D05	Reg: MPAs	D5. MPAs: Alter the federal portions of the Gull Island, Footprint, and Santa Barbara Island marine reserves (no-take zones) to allow for recreational take of pelagic fish species. See 5.3	<p>"Top priority."</p> <p>"This should not be allowed. The No-Take zones should be expanded not contracted."</p> <p>"Do not allow any fishing in no take zones or allow reduction of any boundaries."</p> <p>"No changes to boundaries or regulations warranted."</p> <p>"Certainly for the Footprint MPA. See B2 and B8. Increased fishing opportunity is beneficial to the CPFV fleet. Opening up fishing for pelagic fish species would have a marginal impact on sensitive species (like corals) and could serve as an economic benefit to the 12 vessels that fish the region."</p> <p>"We should be striving to maintain, or even increase protections of MPAs, as research/ monitoring has shown a clear benefit to the ecosystem and fishing (e.g. increased abundance and size of fishes)."</p> <p>"Species population is increased within the MPA. Existing regulations within the MPA on commercial fishing should be maintained."</p> <p>"As discussed elsewhere, things like openings, closing, increasing, etc. must be supported by science and balanced with other priorities such as DOD. Increase only if supported by sustainable fisheries."</p>	4	3	8
D06	Reg: MPAs	D6. MPAs: Change state marine reserve regulations to fishing at Scorpion Anchorage. See 5.5.	<p>"Good priority."</p> <p>"No, this area needs to be protected as a marine reserve and in fact, the area should be expanded. I have noticed a marked difference in both the size and number of fish inside and outside this particular area at Santa Cruz Island."</p> <p>"Way too much visitation in this area. Scorpion needs to remain a no take zone with the current boundaries or expand no take zones in that area."</p> <p>"No changes to boundaries or regulations warranted."</p> <p>"See B4."</p> <p>"See B2. If this is included, the conversation should also include replacing that MPA with one in another, equally beneficial location."</p> <p>"State legislative actions should be addressed through local state assembly members and senators."</p> <p>"As discussed elsewhere, things like openings, closing, increasing, etc. must be supported by science and balanced with other priorities such as DOD. Increase only if supported by sustainable fisheries."</p>	4	4	8
D07	Reg: MPAs	D7. MPAs: Expand no-take areas of marine reserves and marine conservation areas, for a number of reasons: to enhance the beneficial "spillover" effects of these areas for recreational fishing, to increase species density/diversity/abundance, to increase recreational value, to protect whale habitat and migration areas. See 5.4, 9.2, 10.3, 11.3,	<p>"Spillover" was an unfulfilled promise of MPAs. It didn't happen. I'm a highly experienced professional charter captain within the sanctuary and I say spillover isn't real. MPAs are not about fisheries management, so expanding them because of fisheries management reasons is not an acceptable argument."</p> <p>"Assuming the overall effect is increased protection."</p> <p>"The MPA Marine Reserves should be expanded. This is what a marine sanctuary is truly supposed to be and what the public wants and expects. Most people I talk with are shocked at what is allowed within the Sanctuary boundaries."</p> <p>"Too early for alterations at this point."</p> <p>"Vital to species resilience"</p> <p>"No changes to boundaries or regulations warranted."</p> <p>"Worth consideration and research."</p> <p>"See B3. Spillover is better enhanced by increasing the edge to area ratio of MPAs. Making fishing closures larger reduces the edge to area ratio. Larger MPAs offer greater protection from being caught. Given fisheries managed for optimal sustainable production, the optimum proportion of habitat to set aside for purely fisheries benefits modeled at just 5 percent of the total area. Already the MPAs within CINMS exceed that, providing for values other than fishing. We have Marine Parks benefiting the species fishing normally competes with."</p> <p>"We should be striving to maintain, or even increase protections of MPAs, as research/ monitoring has shown a clear benefit to the ecosystem and fishing (e.g. increased abundance and size of fishes)."</p> <p>"The 2016 condition report shows that biomass and abundance of targeted species are increasing. Any decisions on how to proceed should indeed be made in consultation with CDFW."</p> <p>"As discussed elsewhere, things like openings, closing, increasing, etc. must be supported by science and balanced with other priorities such as DOD. Increase only if supported by sustainable fisheries."</p>	6	3	9
D08	Reg: MPAs	D8. MPAs: Changes to the Channel Islands MPA network are not needed at this time; any consideration of future changes should be done with CDFW. See 14.3.	<p>"Agree, except there is reason to reduce MPA to lessen socioeconomic damage."</p> <p>"No changes that decrease protection. Changes that increase protection can be considered. This item is ambiguous."</p> <p>"Changes are needed and the boundaries should be expanded. CDFW should not be part of this discussion."</p> <p>"Increasing boundaries should be considered even if it risks the other side winning."</p> <p>"Many more partners would need to consider. don't think this is an appropriate statement for mgmt. plan."</p> <p>"I assume CINMS will work with CDFW for the 2022 review."</p> <p>"Maintaining the status quo is certainly one way to move forward. The 2016 condition report shows that biomass and abundance of targeted species are increasing. Any decisions on how to proceed should indeed be made in consultation with CDFW."</p> <p>"Correct, assuming that science and technology don't guide us to a change."</p>	6	7	13

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
D09	Reg: MPAs	D9. MPAs: Designate a "marine preserve" at the site of the M/V Conception tragedy. See 17.1.	<p>"No way. We don't need more MPAs. We need less MPAs."</p> <p>"This would be a great way to honor the memory of the people who perished in this tragedy."</p> <p>"Resources should be used elsewhere."</p> <p>"This would be a very meaningful memorial."</p> <p>"This is incredibly sensitive and should be considered with great caution and inclusion of the impacted families."</p> <p>"Recognizing the Conception tragedy would fit within the CINMS's emphasis on maritime heritage. Whether a marine preserve is the best method for recognition of this tragedy warrants further discussion."</p> <p>"I concur something should be done but defer to experts what the "what" should be."</p>	5	6	11
D10	Reg: MPAs	D10. MPAs: Exclude drilling and boating from MPAs. See 18.4.	<p>"No, we need to travel through MPAs for efficiency and safety, to keep fuel costs and engine hours down and to avoid weather and rough water."</p> <p>"isn't this already done?"</p> <p>"Drilling is one thing and boating is another. Exclude drill, yes."</p> <p>"Drilling is already prohibited but I don't think that boating should be. It is not the boats but the activities that take place from the boats that are probably more destructive. Boaters, however, MUST be made to adhere to the rules. I believe that more work should be done about where boats should be allowed to anchor. Perhaps placing permanent moorings in some areas would be a good idea to look at."</p> <p>"Drilling already prohibited."</p> <p>"I don't understand this. You can't drill in the sanctuary and you must be able to boat in the sanctuary."</p> <p>"Drilling is already excluded and boating is not a harmful impact."</p> <p>"I put no because drilling and boating are completely different. Exclude drilling but not boating."</p> <p>"?"</p> <p>"Existing regulations are appropriate. (Drilling prohibited, boating allowed)"</p> <p>"This warrants further discussion by SAC."</p> <p>"Only as appropriate and use established process to determine the yes and no activities. MPAs vary and drilling is quite different from boating; one may be OK and the other not depending on what's being protected."</p>	4	4	7
D11	Reg: Sanctuary Regula	D11. Sanctuary Regulations: Maintain existing sanctuary regulations, for a variety of reasons. See 9.1, 11.10, 14.3, 19.8. Including existing exemptions for military activities. See 6.1.	<p>"Find ways to: 1) enhance recreational opportunities like fishing, 2) reduce MPAs and 3) permit reefing."</p> <p>"I favor maintaining (and even increasing) existing regulations but feel adjusting some of the exemptions for military activities might need to be considered at some future date."</p> <p>"No, it's time for a change to provide greater protections and there should not be exemptions for anyone or any entity."</p> <p>"Need to stay open to potential changes."</p> <p>"Y only if this means maintain without excluding consideration of other options."</p> <p>"This statement is too broad to answer thoughtfully, though I have no issue with the individual, corresponding comments for the first statement. "Maintain existing sanctuary regulations, for a variety of reasons. See 9.1, 11.10, 14.3, 19.8." For 6.1, my comment is the same as that of B5: "Military exemptions should not negatively impact the protected resources of the CINMS.""</p> <p>"CINMS should at a minimum maintain its current regulatory framework."</p> <p>"Correct, assuming that science and technology don't guide us to a change."</p>	6	10	16
D12	Reg: Fishing Regulatio	D12. Fishing Regulations: Use fisheries management approaches such as prohibiting certain types of gear (e.g., nylon driftnets), using temporal zoning, and setting quotas based on fish censuses in/out of MPAs. See 10.4, 10.5, 10.8.	<p>"When it comes to fisheries management. NOAA-Fisheries and CDFW have the infrastructure to manage fisheries. NOAA Sanctuaries and Bren School do not. Stay out of fisheries management."</p> <p>"If fishing is to be allowed, which is should not, it MUST be highly regulated in order to protect Sanctuary resources – mainly the fishes and others who live there."</p> <p>"Not in our scope."</p> <p>"Not within Sanctuary Authority."</p> <p>"Working with fisheries regulators."</p> <p>"CINMS should leave fisheries regulation to the State DFW and National Marine Fisheries Service."</p> <p>"See B9: "This would likely be more appropriate for a partnering agency but CINMS staff may be able to inform partners if a certain gear type is known to be an issue in the sanctuary.""</p> <p>"Prohibiting certain types of gear, temporary zoning, and quotas are all fair approaches to issues within the sanctuary. However, given the level of likely controversy over such policies, further discussion is warranted."</p> <p>"As discussed elsewhere, things like openings, closing, increasing, quotas, gear restrictions, zoning must be supported by science and balanced with other priorities such as DOD. Ensure sustainable fisheries."</p>	6	5	11

## Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
D13	Reg: Pollution Regulation	D13. Pollution Regulations: Prohibit plastic pollution. See 16.3.	<p>"This is too vague, and I fear that the implementation will make fishing and perhaps even visiting the sanctuary difficult or prohibitive."</p> <p>"Not sure this is CINMS role."</p> <p>"Encourage yes. Prohibit unrealistic."</p> <p>"This is vague. How will this be prohibited? How will it be enforced? How is this different from existing pollution laws?"</p> <p>"This is quite broad but this could be partially accomplished by REQUIRING RECYCLING and closed waste containers on all commercial boats who visit the Sanctuary, including dive boats, fishing boats, whale watching, hiking trips, etc."</p> <p>"Already prohibited?"</p> <p>"don't we already?"</p> <p>"This exists."</p> <p>"Duh. But how?"</p> <p>"Already prohibited under CINMS, State, Federal and International law."</p> <p>"This would already be prohibited as "discharge"."</p> <p>"This requires further clarification, but it may result in a needed legislative act."</p> <p>"It already is, which scores this a No, but as discussed education and outreach to keep the plastic out of the water is a big Yes."</p>	5	6	11
D14	Reg: Shipping	D14. Shipping: ATBA: Consider expansion of Area to Be Avoided (ATBA, a designation by the International Maritime Organization) for whale protection and noise reduction. See 18.2, 28.11.	<p>"Agree, if done for commercial shipping but excluding recreational and commercial anglers."</p> <p>"Absolutely. This should include the ENTIRE SB Channel."</p> <p>"No changes to boundaries or regulations is warranted."</p> <p>"See A20: This was a widely accepted management strategy (no opposition). It would have multiple benefits and should move forward."</p> <p>"The existing ATBA was designated by the IMO in 1991. Expansion of the ATBA is something that the CINMS could provide input on, but may in general fall outside of the scope of the responsibilities of CINMS."</p> <p>"As long as the word "consider" is in the sentence, and the answer is guided by science and technology, this is quite fine. Need to define what ATBA we are talking about and why it's created."</p>	6	6	11
D15	Reg: Shipping	D15. Shipping: Establish speed limits for vessels within the sanctuary. See 28.12.	<p>"Agree, if done for commercial shipping but excluding recreational and commercial anglers. We have much greater maneuverability and can avoid critters that commercial ships cannot."</p> <p>"Vessels are not within the sanctuary for much distance. Speed limits for transiting near the sanctuary could be considered as one of the possible tools."</p> <p>"Absolutely and STRICTLY ENFORCE this. No more handouts to shipping companies that are only looking for profits and are benefitting from greenwashing that this provides."</p> <p>"There is no shipping in the CINMS."</p> <p>"Limit to large vessels and consider potential route changes caused by regulations."</p> <p>"See A22. Not a good idea, limits operators flexibility and could negatively impact safety, especially aboard smaller vessels which rely on their speed to make safe crossings and avoid wind events."</p> <p>"See A22: If this is comment is focused on VSR program, yes. If this comment is directed towards vessels that are fishing, recreating, etc., I do not know if this is of current concern. It would be nice to get more information if it is."</p> <p>"The VSR program has already been successful in reducing the speed for commercial vessels within the sanctuary, and CINMS should look for funding sources to make this program permanent."</p> <p>"See A22."</p>	7	6	13
D16	Reg: Shipping	D16. Shipping: Move shipping channel (Traffic Separation Scheme) further offshore; move TSS to the south side of the islands; consider the work of the CINMS advisory council's Marine Shipping Working Group. See 28.11.	<p>"Agree."</p> <p>"The available fine scale data for whale distribution is heavily skewed toward the Santa Barbara Channel. There is no evidence to suggest that moving the shipping lanes would reduce whale strikes although it may result in fewer detections of whales struck by ships. The Sanctuary should work harder on education related to the variables and data gaps to be considered when making decisions of this nature."</p> <p>"YES! This is the best solution and the data is showing this despite the doubts that are consistently thrown out by the military and shipping interests."</p> <p>"See A20."</p> <p>"With the new fuel standards used in the shipping industry these shipping routes are changing due to economic factors."</p> <p>"Outside boundary and scope of Sanctuary authority."</p> <p>"Many agencies/interests would need to be engaged. No sure how feasible it would be to move TSS to south side. Too much opposition to get into that quagmire. But strong Y for considering work of Working Group."</p> <p>See A21: Moving the TSS further offshore was also a widely accepted management strategy (no opposition) and should move forward. Moving the TSS to the south side of the Channel Islands did not have unanimous support. We agree that there are multiple management measures that came out of the working group that had broad support and should move forward. The VSR program is one tool and we hope to see the spatial management ideas implemented as well."</p> <p>"The work of the Marine Shipping Working Group is important. Their input on this subject should be further discussed among the advisory council."</p> <p>"See A21"</p>	6	4	10

**Ratings Compilation Sheet: CINMS Advisory Council & Staff Reviews of Public Scoping Comments for Management Plan Revision Process**

March 19, 2020

For more information: [michael.murray@noaa.gov](mailto:michael.murray@noaa.gov)

See also: <https://channelislands.noaa.gov/manage/plan/revision.html>

Topic#	General Topic	Comment Summary	Advisory Council Member Comments	Scaled SAC Score	Scaled Staff Score	SAC + Staff
D17	Reg: Permitting	D17. Permitting: Remove permitting barriers to access/specimen collection. See 27.1.	<p>"Agree."                      "This should NOT BE ALLOWED. A sanctuary should be just that."                      "Is there a problem?"                      "Need to consult with CDFW."                      "Covered in another section. Scientific collecting understands need for controls."                      "See B17. There already is a permitting system for both state and federal waters. Perhaps some formal consolidation system is in order."                      "See B17: Unknown if this is a problem for researchers."                      "The taking of any marine mammal, sea turtle, or seabird within or above the sanctuary is currently prohibited. Permits for this type of work serve to protect resources within the sanctuary. The removal of these protections would be counter to the goals of a marine sanctuary."                      "I think better wording would be 'review policies regarding specimen collection and update if/as necessary to reflect modern science and technology.' See B17."</p>	5	3	8