

State of California
Coastal Impact Assistance Program

FINAL PLAN 2009

APPENDIX E
Summary of Public Comments Received on Revised Draft
California Coastal Impact Assistance Plan

Summary of Public Comments Received on Revised Draft California Coastal Impact Assistance Plan

Commenter	Nature of Comments	Response
<p>Robert S. Hoffman, Assistant Regional Manager for Habitat Conservation, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)</p>	<p>NMFS commented that they believe that the projects identified in the Plan meet the five categories of authorized uses for CIAP funds.</p> <p>They support the use of the Ocean Protection Council's Five-Year Strategic Plan as one of the CIAP project selection criteria.</p> <p>They identified a number of projects in the Plan that closely overlap with NMFS priorities.</p>	<p>No response was required.</p>
<p>Linda Krop, Chief Counsel, Environmental Defense Center (EDC)</p>	<p>EDC commented that they were pleased to learn that the Plan no longer included a proposal pertaining to oil and gas platform decommissioning.</p> <p>In addition, EDC made several comments on two specific projects proposed by Santa Barbara County - the Goleta Beach Park Coastal Access and Recreational Enhancement project and the Gaviota Coast Acquisition project.</p> <p><u>Goleta Beach Park:</u> EDC contends that the project is inconsistent with the CIAP funding criteria, is publicly controversial and opposed by environmental groups, and has not been approved or even accepted for permitting processing by the California Coastal Commission.</p> <p><u>Gaviota Coast Acquisition:</u> EDC supports the project but believes that it should be elevated from a Tier 1 project to a Tier 2 project.</p>	<p>MMS Pacific OCS Region office determined that Goleta Beach Park project was consistent with CIAP funding criteria and that Coastal Commission approval was not required for the project to be included in the Plan. No workable project alternative was developed because of the limited scope of the project.</p> <p>MMS indicated to EDC that placing a CPS project on a Tier 2 list verses a Tier 1 list was at the discretion of the CPS and not the state.</p>