

DATE	NAME	AFFLIATION	SUBJECT OF COMMUNICATION
12-19-05	Rod Fujita	Environmental Defense	Support for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System
11-30-05	Cathie Magowen	University of California Office of the President	Comments on the Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System
11-29-05	John Orcutt	Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System	Comments on the Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System
11-28-05	John Largier	UC Davis	Comments on the Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System
11-28-05	Heather Kerkering	Central and Northern California Ocean Observing System	A Response to the California Coastal Ocean Observing System: A Recommendation for Supporting State Ocean Observing Efforts
11-28-05	Kim Sterrett	CA Dept. of Boating and Waterways	Comments on the Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System
11-28-05	Clif Davenport	California Geological Survey	Comments on the Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System



ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE

finding the ways that work

December 19, 2005

The Honorable Mike Chrisman
Chair, California Ocean Protection Council
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for California Coastal Ocean Observing System (CalCOOS)

Dear Chair Chrisman:

On behalf of Environmental Defense, I am writing to express my strong support for the Coastal Conservancy's CalCOOS proposal before Ocean Protection Council.

As a scientist who has engaged in several large-scale ocean ecosystem conservation and management efforts ranging from the establishment of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary to the Channel Islands MPA Network and the Northwest Hawaiian Islands Coral Reef Ecosystem Reserve, I am acutely aware of the need for rational and coherent monitoring systems to coordinate and systematize the collection of data. This function is essential for producing data that is relevant to management needs and hence to the public demand for information and good conservation and management.

The Coastal Conservancy's CalCOOS proposal would achieve these goals for California. It would also ensure that California's ocean observing associations are speaking with one voice in both Sacramento and in Washington D.C., which will be the ultimate source of the funding that will be needed to sustain and expand upon these nascent efforts. Because of the relatively short life of the bond funds being used to start these critical efforts, the CalCOOS proposal should be adopted and implemented as soon as possible, so that there is an entity that can work to leverage existing funding to the maximum extent possible, and begin the task of seeking new funding that will carry current activities forward. The Coastal Conservancy is the appropriate entity to implement the recommendations in the report due to its unique familiarity with this issue, given its experience to date with managing the bond funding for ocean observing specifically, and for the Ocean Protection Council agencies and applicants more generally.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Rod Fujita, Ph.D
Senior Scientist

magowen

From: Cathie Magowan [cathie.magowan@ucop.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2005 5:19 PM
To: Sheila Semans
Cc: rebecca Verity
Subject: RE: Comments requested! Preliminary Cal Ocean Obs. Report

Dear Sheila,

Having spoken to colleagues within CeNCOOS, I have a few thoughts to share, and questions to ask, about the proposed CalCOOS model. While we applaud many of the goals of CalCoos, such as informing and educating the public regarding ocean observing systems, encouraging collaborations, and finding funding for ocean observing, we wonder whether CeNCOOS and SCCOOS themselves are not adequate to those tasks. The two RAs seem to be collaborating and communicating well. Would CalCOOS be performing redundant tasks, or serve as an additional bureaucratic layer? Would it perhaps be prudent to let CeNCOOS and SCCOOS mature into fully functioning entities before adding an additional entity?

Also, we have questions about both about review processes and lines of authority. The draft states that CalCOOS would identify "high priority potential beneficiaries" and "high priority potential applications." Would there be a review process to determine what is of high priority, and what would that process be? In regard to lines of authority, would CalCOOS have any type of authority over CeNCOOS and SCCOOS, and what would that authority be?

With apologies for the delay in getting these comments to you,

Cathie

Cathie Magowan, Ph.D.
Director, Science & Technology Research University of California Office
of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Office of Research, 11th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
510-987-0377
510-987-9456 (fax)

29 November 2005

Mike Chrisman, Chair
California Ocean Protection Council
California Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814



Comments on Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Coastal Ocean Observing System (CalCOOS)

On behalf of the Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System (SCCOOS), we are submitting these comments in response to the California Ocean Protection Council's *Preliminary Strategic Plan for the California Ocean Observing System*. We thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments, and commend you and your staff for the quality of the report. We believe that the goals of CalCOOS—to connect the myriad of statewide entities and needs with marine science and observations—are necessary.

SCCOOS Background

This letter represents a consensus position of senior personnel from the 11 different organizations responsible for the development and operation of an integrated coastal observing system in Southern California. SCCOOS is one of the two federally recognized regional associations (RAs) within the state that is supported by federal, private, and state funding to gather, manage, and interpret data to aid decision making. To ensure statewide interoperability with the other system in development in Central and Northern California (CeNCOOS), these organizations drafted and signed an MOU in February 2004 to establish the *Federation of California Regional Observing Systems*. A copy of this MOU can be found at the following weblink: <http://www.sccoos.org/docs/SCCOOSCenCOOS.pdf>.

We would like the Council to note that SCCOOS is not only a Regional Association (RA), but is also a regional coastal ocean observing system (RCOOS); we receive federal funding from the NOAA's Coastal Ocean Technology System (COTs), and leverage SCCOOS systems for funding from the National Science Foundation, Office of Naval Research, and Army Corp of Engineers, among other agencies. While we would welcome CalCOOS support in assisting NOAA and other federal agencies in their relationships with California observing systems, we believe that each OOS must work directly with NOAA, for example, in the grant process. To increase the overhead to NOAA would be detrimental to all.

Naming and Branding of CalCOOS

We are concerned, however, with the choice of "CalCOOS" as the name of this new organization. Because both existing regional observing systems in California, SCCOOS and CeNCOOS, have achieved high levels of recognition at state and

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE
UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
ANALYSIS, CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACION
CIENTIFICA Y DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR
DE ENSENADA

JET PROPULSION LABORATORY,
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE
ADMINISTRATION

SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF
OCEANOGRAPHY, UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA
DE BAJA CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SANTA BARBARA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
LOS ANGELES

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

federal levels, as well as with end users, adding “CalCOOS” to the already existing named ocean observing systems may produce confusion with potential customers, as well as with federal planning efforts. The “OOS” acronym is a marker to the ocean observing community of an existing and/or planned infrastructure; “CalCOOS,” as a name for an organization that will not include observing infrastructure may dilute the effectiveness of the “OOS” acronym for those already in existence. However, we feel that a name which implies a California-wide ocean observing entity would be positive, and would like to suggest that the Council consider alternate names that convey such a function without using the “OOS” acronym. In addition to the nearshore observatories that principally are designed to address state and local management issues, NOAA, academic partners, foundations, state fisheries agencies, and other organizations are developing an integrated Pacific Coast Ocean Observing System (PaCOOS) for the California Current large marine ecosystem that extends from Mexico to Canada.

A Role for a Statewide Coordinating Entity

We agree that CalCOOS could provide a mechanism for coordinating users, identifying and clarifying how they could benefit from ocean observations, and helping users to define priorities among the different observing strategies. CalCOOS could also serve as a primary (or perhaps sole) advisory body to observers like the RAs, and as a primary way to provide federal agencies with a report on the responsiveness of the RAs to user needs. CalCOOS could achieve economies of scale in coordinating users, ensure that overarching needs are given priority, and ease the political problems the RAs face in trying to devise a user-responsive governance system while working on the technical problems of implementing effective and efficient observing systems. How this is implemented will need to be closely coordinated with the existing outreach and product development efforts already underway by SCCOOS and CenCOOS to prevent confusion.

We feel that CalCOOS could be very helpful in linking users with observing system operators and in encouraging development of useful products, but would want to carefully explore any proposed oversight of this process. From our experience as an operational coastal ocean observing system, we have learned that science is needed to a) determine what observations are needed and b), to implement these observations, and c) to translate those observations into useful products. We have found this to be an iterative process, and that connecting with end-users and developing products must be included in our business plan, including budgeting at the state and federal levels, as well as when seeking other sources of funding. Separation of product development from observing system operations may lead to disconnect, inefficiencies, redundancy, and slow communication of technical developments, and we recommend instead a vertically integrated approach that uses the existing regional observing systems for operations, data management, and operational product development. A new statewide entity could identify observing system needs and markets within state agencies, communicate needs to the observing system developers, facilitate the flow of communication and encourage use of new decision making tools by state managers, and establish statewide

priorities for ocean information. SCCOOS and CeNCOOS are already working with local, state, and federal consumers of the data that have missions within state waters. For more information on SCCOOS outreach, see the enclosed 2004-05 annual report to NOAA. A recent year-end review of the SCC sponsored Coastal Ocean Currents Monitoring Program (COCMP) also included a number of products under development for ocean data users.

We have found that there are problems with RA activities being shaped primarily by local users; there are too many users to directly influence the objectives and strategies of the RA observations through any manageable and effective governance structure, and there are many practical problems like search and rescue, oceanic fisheries, and the ecological impact of climate variability that require an overarching organizing structure which will not be achieved with a “sum of locales” approach.

CalCOOS Organization Structure

We recommend that the entity created be within a state agency and not a 501c(3) not-for-profit. We feel that creating another non-profit organization may weaken the impact of the new entity, both within the state and at the federal level. We feel that most efficient structure would be one that is internal to the State Coastal Conservancy Ocean Program, and that functions that cannot be met by internal staffing should be out-sourced to pre-existing organizations; *i.e.*, California does not need redundancy. If this new entity is to engage the appropriate state agencies and managers, we feel that a 501c(3) organization will not have the appropriate authority—especially with staff within mission agencies—to develop a meaningful dialog with future consumers of the data and products from the observing systems in California.

CalCOOS Funding Model

We also request clarification be provided regarding the new entity’s role as a funding source; would it distribute state funds, or expect federal funds to flow through it to the RA’s? As mentioned above, we are concerned that the latter case would complicate federal funding, and increase overall costs (due to additional overhead). We also ask that the COPC request a funding model for CalCOOS in order to clarify how its existence might impact SCCOOS and CeNCOOS in seeking funding from state, federal and private agencies.

Omission of the Coastal Data Information Project

We recommend that the final report include the Coastal Data Information Project (CDIP) in both the “what are observing systems” and “how are they useful” sections of the report. CDIP, like the California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigation (CalCOFI), is a collaborative effort between state, federal, and academic organizations. (<http://cdip.ucsd.edu/>)

Closing

We have noted a few minor technical errors in the science used in the CalCOOS document, and would be happy to review the final document for scientific accuracy.

We encourage and support the creation of this new entity, and appreciate the efforts of the COPC on behalf of California's coastal oceans.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



John A. Orcutt
Chair, Board of Governors, SCCOOS
Deputy Director of Research, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

SCCOOS Board of Governors
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
California State University, Los Angeles
Centro de Investigacion Cientifica y de Educacion
Superior de Ensenada
Jet Propulsion Laboratory, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Scripps Institution of Oceanography,
University of California, San Diego
Southern California Coastal Water Research Project
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California
University of California, Santa Barbara
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Southern California

Attachment: NOAA Organization Report 2004-2005

largier

From: John Largier [jlargier@ucsd.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2005 9:36 PM
To: COPCpublic@resources.ca.gov
Cc: Susan Williams; Heather Kerkering; dennis Thoney; Sheila Semans; John Largier
Subject: Comment on "California Coastal Ocean Observing System"

28 November 2005

Mike Chrisman, Chair
California Ocean Protection Council

Dear Secretary Chrisman,

I am writing to comment on the draft document: "California Coastal Ocean Observing System: A Recommendation for Supporting State Ocean Observing Efforts".

My professional affiliation is with Bodega Marine Lab at UC Davis and I am a recently elected member of the Governing Council of CeNCOOS (Central and Northern California Ocean Observing System) as well as serving on the state's Clean Beach Task Force. I was involved in the initial phases of SCCOOS and have been involved in many research activities and ocean issues throughout the state.

I agree with and support the three purposes identified in the document: (i) overall design of an integrated ocean observing system for California, (ii) ensuring that observing systems benefit the people of California, and (iii) securing adequate funding for ocean observing.

However, the proposed solution has problems that need to be resolved before implementation.

-- the working name is so similar to CeNCOOS, SCCOOS and PaCOOS that it will only increase confusion as to aims of each body (confusing both benefactors and beneficiaries)

-- without much clearer definition of the roles of CalCOOS versus CeNCOOS and SCCOOS, this new body would be in competition with the existing regional associations (CeNCOOS and SCCOOS), in spite of good intentions

-- the purposes of CalCOOS are very similar to those of CeNCOOS and

SCCOOS, so that pursuit of the CalCOOS aims will take away from the nascent CeNCOOS and SCCOOS before they have had a chance to fill the gaps identified in this document (e.g., "ensuring that information from disparate observing systems is being integrated and translated into applications that meet the State's highest priority needs", p.19)

-- the nascent regional associations (CeNCOOS and SCCOOS) will focus on "the state's management priorities, benefit the greatest number of users, and be sustained over time" (p. 16 "missing element") if the state continues to support them to do so; indeed, this "missing element" is exactly what the regional associations should be doing

-- the regional associations (CeNCOOS and SCCOOS) see themselves as much more than "observing system operation" (p. 19) and to let them be just that would be a great loss of potential

-- the existence of two regional associations centered on the two major population centers does not represent a multiplicity of organizations and there is no clear reason why these two associations cannot work together in addressing state priorities in response to state mandates and funding.

An effective solution would achieve the following:

- (1) it would challenge/motivate the regional associations (CeNCOOS and SCCOOS) to rise up to meet the state needs identified in this document, not compete with them;
- (2) it would promote coordination within state government and thus advance the ability for the

largier

regional

associations (CeNCOOS and SCCOOS) to link with state government;

(3) it would develop a integrative vision of what California needs in the way of coastal ocean observing

systems, i.e., a "demand-side" vision of observing activities, rather than the present "supply-side" approach;

(4) it would include more focus on watersheds and estuaries that link the land to the ocean.

I suggest that two alternative solutions be considered:

EITHER something less ambitious, such as a Coastal Ocean Observing Task Force that can be established for a limited period to develop the vision (master plan) and to recommend actions that would achieve the above 4 points;

OR something more ambitious, such as a state agency or joint powers agency that addresses the broader

topic of ocean issues or, more limited, ocean information systems (observations, understanding, models,

tracking, etc.); this California Ocean Service would look at the needs for ocean information, the benefits

of information systems, and the funding of information systems that go well beyond "coastal ocean observing systems".

I trust that you will find these comments helpful and I remain available for further discussion on these issues.

Sincerely,

John Largier

////////////////////////////////////
John Largier Email jlargier@ucdavis.edu

Bodega Marine Lab Phone 707-875-1930
University of California, Davis Fax 707-875-2009
P.O.Box 247
Bodega Bay, CA 94923 BML phone: 707-875-2211
United States of America BML web: www.bml.ucdavis.edu

Dept Environmental Science & Policy ESP web: www.des.ucdavis.edu

////////////////////////////////////

A Response from the Central and Northern California Ocean Observing
System
to the
California Coastal Ocean Observing System:
A Recommendation for Supporting State Ocean Observing Efforts

Overall Reaction: A mixture of support and hesitancy

Outline

- I. CeNCOOS Support and CalCOOS Benefits
- II. Agreements, Disagreements, Overlapping Efforts, and Gaps in CalCOOS
- III. Overall Response

I. CeNCOOS Support and CalCOOS Benefits

The Central and Northern California Ocean Observing System (CeNCOOS) is supportive of California's statewide effort to help ensure ocean observing success. As the report states, 'a strong, integrated ocean observing system is vital to ensuring the sustained recovery of our marine ecosystems.' CeNCOOS is welcoming of a program to aid in this effort.

There are many advantages to developing an ocean observing program with a statewide perspective. The state is in need of a lead agency to coordinate the collection and integration of data to ensure that California's goals and priorities are addressed. California's two regional associations, CeNCOOS and SCCOOS, will benefit from CalCOOS' interest in working collaboratively to build a strong ocean observing system and in meeting the objectives of IOOS. The State's interest in promoting ocean observing is demonstrated in successful, collaborative, well-funded programs such as COCMP. The State's willingness to cooperate and share data with the regional associations has created numerous beneficial products for the state and its end users.

Generated in response to California's Action Strategy and need for a strategic plan, CalCOOS recognizes the need for a sustained ocean observation system. CeNCOOS is supportive of CalCOOS' interest in sharing data, making products available to those who can benefit from the information, and acquiring funding from sources other than federal. The goal of CeNCOOS is to meet national goals as well as serve the state and local end users. We are excited to have a program that will guide us in meeting the State's management priorities and will aid in sustaining an observing system over time.

Benefits of CalCOOS:

- Aid in data integration
- Increased access to data, products and tools for managers of ocean resources
- Increased support from the state's public end users
- Aid in collaboration among regional associations
- Assist in funding and improve technology
- Focus on issues pertinent to the state: for example, fisheries management, water quality, California's economics and growing populations, and beach erosion.
- Greater probability for a sustained ocean observing system

II. Suggested Changes, Agreements, Disagreements, Overlapping Efforts, and Gaps in CalCOOS

Although CeNCOOS does support the idea of a statewide entity to guide ocean observing, we are also recommending that many statements in the CalCOOS proposal be revisited and possibly changed. These issues are discussed in this document.

Name Change: CalCOOS

The name of the entity implies that 4 ocean observing systems will exist in California (CeNCOOS, SCCOOS, PaCOOS, and CalCOOS). The document states that CalCOOS will operate as a statewide system and not as a federal one, but work with IOOS on data integration and management. The OOS part of the name will confuse anyone interested in ocean observing systems (including CeNCOOS!), from local marine users to national bodies. This will only set us back and create anger among the other RAs that 4 OOSs exist in one state. It will also cause statewide frustration in determining who does what and may potentially decrease opportunities for RA funding.

CalCOOS Mission:

“To ensure that existing and new observing systems address the State's management priorities, benefit the greatest number of users, and are sustained over time.”

Benefits of the CalCOOS mission include a statewide perspective to ocean observing and a strong interest in helping to maintain new and existing systems.

Questions (didn't find answers in the body of the document):

- What are the State's management priorities?
- How much of your mission overlaps with CeNCOOS? (discussed below)
- How can you help sustain ocean observing programs? What ocean observing systems do you hope to sustain? How will your search for ocean observing funding not compete with RAs or IOOS?

In Agreement

- An overarching, coordinating entity that has a statewide perspective is missing in California. It is crucial that any RA in the California incorporate state agencies into their program. The development of CalCOOS would aid in this effort and help organize statewide interests.
- CalCOOS will contribute a much needed statewide perspective. It will aid in making sure developed products meet the needs of Californians and are sustained overtime. *Will CalCOOS determine the State's management priorities separate from existing ocean observing efforts?* .
- Meeting statewide priorities should help secure investments. The potential to secure funding is increased (although we should be conscious of limited organizations that supply funding for ocean observing programs).
- There is currently no monitoring network in place to track the status of our oceans, changes over time, or success of our management efforts (although existing ocean observation systems are trying to track the status of the oceans and changes over time).

CalCOOS and CeNCOOS: Overlapping Efforts?

Many goals/objectives stated in the CalCOOS document match the goals/objectives of CeNCOOS. We don't want to be redundant in our efforts and feel we need to secure some sense of individuality.

Examples of goals/objectives similar to CeNCOOS:

- Linking the users to the operators (to some degree)
- Creating observing systems and products to meet the needs of a broad base of users/stakeholders.
- Combining existing local, regional, and national observing systems, as well as newly developed ones, into a comprehensive network that will fill any data gaps, integrate data, and provide new data products to a wide range of clients.
 - Will we possibly be attempting to integrate the same data?
- Coordinating the collection and integration of data so as to ensure that state goals and priorities are addressed and that government agencies managing resources have access to data and products.
- All of your potential clients fall within the categories CeNCOOS is trying to work with, for example: resource managers (ex. NERR); maritime industry (ex. SF Marine Exchange); port and harbor districts (ex. SF Port); Scientists (half the CeNCOOS Council); educators (MBA; MBNMS); search and rescue (USCG); emergency response teams (OSPR, HAZMAT); and public health officials (ex. Water Resources Board).

- We also promote integration from coastal and ocean science systems and try to identify high-priority applications and subsequent development.
Your role that we don't do: identify high-priority potential beneficiaries to observing system information and encourage linkages.
- CeNCOOS has planned (but not funding at this point) to develop products addressing the California resource issues listed in appendix III.

Unclear Collaborative Efforts

- In what capacity will CeNCOOS, SCCOOS, PaCOOS and CalCOOS work together?
- How can we help each other while maintaining our individual strengths?
- This sentence, "having two regional associations means that the State must play a role in ensuring coordination across the various systems and regions."
 - Does this mean that you will guide our efforts as individual RAs?
 - Are you helping in outreach here?
- You set state priorities, determine what to fund and when (based on recommendations from the RAs?), and secure funding (from IOOS-related grants that we might apply for? There will inevitably be some potential for conflict.)
- Do the existing RAs *not* have an obligation to organize statewide interests? I thought that was part of our effort.
- If CalCOOS is to do all of the things listed on p. 18, how does that change the operation of CeNCOOS? For example, we've identified important information needs that can be met through coastal ocean observing systems by completing exhaustive end user research; identified existing coastal and ocean observation systems in the region; have the research to identify ocean observing needs and data gaps; we encourage collaboration among public and private entities (although we could use some assistance with this).
- We appreciate your interest in all of the areas listed on p.18, but think that the final four on the list are most applicable to CalCOOS.

Disagree:

- CeNCOOS does not operate observing systems – meaning, we have no ocean observing instruments that are technically for CeNCOOS.
- The primary focus of the two RAs 'should be on observing system operation.' (p.19)
Outreach is a huge component of CeNCOOS. We are nowhere near operational at this moment. What do you mean by 'observing system operation'?
- The role that you are attempting to fill isn't as empty as you claim. This section that reads:

"No agency, institution, or organization has focused on making information from this expanding (ocean observing) field more useful. There is no entity whose dominant

perspective is that of ocean observing system information clients. There is no entity concerned with ensuring that information from disparate observing systems is being integrated and translated into applications that *meet the State's highest priority needs, both public and private.* “

This is the goal of CeNCOOS and SCCOOS: data integration and useful product development to meet the needs of end users (California end users). It would be helpful to have more state direction and look at the state as an ‘end user.’

State v. Federal

- “The State should also participate at the federal level on issues related to integration and data management.”
 - What does this mean? In terms of QA/QC and metadata standards?
 - How separate should CalCOOS be as a state effort from the national effort?

CalCOOS Governance Structure

- Good to include management agencies and industries that benefit from OOS.
 - Are these only people that provide funding for OO work?
- You are asking for more personnel than CeNCOOS has! Lucky.
- Concern:
 - With all of the proposed committees (legislative, scientific, outreach/education), will there be many regional folks stretched too thin among the OOSs?
 - Housing CalCOOS at a state agency is best idea.

III. Overall Response

Positives

- A state agency that works to secure funding for ocean observing and represent statewide interests.
- Aid in product development, meeting end user and California needs, improving collaboration.
- Non-competitive with already operating RAs.

Negatives

- Confusion in the name.
- Redundant objectives/goals of CeNCOOS??

Fear

- Overlap of product development, funding sources, and committee members.
- Confusion across the board on the responsibilities/goals of OOSs in California.
- An additional OOS could potentially create obstacles in receiving funding on a federal level.

This response was written by Heather Kerkering, CeNCOOS Coordinator, with additional input from Francisco Chavez, Toby Garfield, Churchill Grimes, John Largier, and Mark Moline (all members of the Governing Council).

Sterrett

From: Kim Sterrett [mailto:STERRETT@dbw.ca.gov]

Sent: Monday, November 28, 2005 3:53 PM

To: rpollock@scc.ca.gov

Cc: Clifton.Davenport@fire.ca.gov; brian@resources.ca.gov; nfishman@scc.ca.gov; Ron Flick

Subject: Comments to "California Coastal Ocean Observing System: A Recommendation for Supporting State Ocean Observing Efforts,"

Hello Rebecca Pollock,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding the subject report. I'm the Program Manager for the CA Public Beach Restoration and the Beach Erosion Control Programs for the Department of Boating and Waterways. I have two comments.

1. Sec II, How are Ocean Observing Systems Useful?, Page 8, Erosion at San Francisco's Ocean Beach, paragraph 2: There are no studies that support the theory that "hardening" beaches is known to exacerbate beach erosion. If they did then every place in CA where a beach is backed by erosion resistant bedrock would not possess a beach. The O'Shaunessy Seawall located at the northern end of Ocean Beach was built in the early 1900's and it has a 300' wide beach in front of it. There are many places in CA where the shoreline is hardened by a seawall, rock revetment or bedrock cliffs and a beach still exists and there are many places that have no sandy beaches because there is no sediment supply, not because hardening has caused the loss of beach.

Also the City of San Francisco does not place sand on the beach, it uses the sand to rebuild its bluff for shoreline erosion protection. Currently the City is spending \$90k-100k annually for that purpose.

2. Appendix II, Coastal Resource Issues Facing CA, Sediment Management, paragraph 3: This entire paragraph is incorrect and should be deleted, except for the sentence, " These structures are often placed where there is significant wave action.". I would like to see your technical references that support this paragraph because I think you are using hearsay and anecdotal references.

If you have any questions I can be contacted by return email or at 916.263.8157.

Kim Sterrett

Public Beach Restoration Program

CA Dept. of Boating and Waterways

916.263.8157 ph

916.813.8157 cell

davenport

-----Original Message-----

From: Davenport, Clifton [mailto:Clifton.Davenport@fire.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2005 12:57 PM
To: rpollock@coastalconservancy.ca.gov
Cc: Kim Sterrett (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Comments requested! Preliminary Cal Ocean Obs. Report

Hi Rebecca,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment regarding the subject report. I work for the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW), which is attempting to resolve sediment issues (erosion and excess deposition) by gathering relevant information useful to coastal planners and making it easily available through web-based mapping and information repositories (ie website). My comments represent my opinions and not necessarily those of the CSMW.

The subject report is an important precursor to setting up the management systems we will need to protect our oceanic and coastal resources. The report focuses on available resources and future monitoring programs for the ocean, which are critical. Monitoring/observing of the nearshore is also important in understanding how we can protect our natural resources.

1- On Page 11, the list of "Initiatives for improving ocean and coastal management mandates" includes, for "Coastal erosion and sediment transport under the Public Beach Restoration Act" a link to www.calcoast.org/restprog/home.htm. A more comprehensive and informative link would be www.dbw.ca.gov/beach.asp

2- Section III- California Context: Ocean and Coastal policies and Initiatives" would benefit from a discussion of the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup and how this joint federal/state task force is developing regional solutions to coastal erosion and sediment issues that are protective of our natural resources. While we're not setting up a real-time monitoring network along the coast, our information would be helpful as background to planners & managers.

3- Page 17/18, #1 "To make sure California has a strong, integrated observing system", CalCOOS could coordinate with the CSMW to utilize GIS and other information gathered to identify/address coastal erosion/sedimentation issues. Perhaps the 2nd bullet under "to help ensure that existing and future observing systems benefit the people of California " (Page 19) would be an appropriate vehicle for such coordination?

Please contact me if you have questions or if I can be of further assistance.

Clif Davenport
California Geological Survey
Project Manager
Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup

135 Ridgway
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
707 576-2986

davenport



PO Box 3156, Fremont, CA 94539
(510) 770 9764 www.cacoastkeeper.org

December 15, 2005

The Honorable Mike Chrisman
Chair, California Ocean Protection Council
COPCpublic@resources.ca.gov

RE: Support for California Coastal Ocean Observing System (CalCOOS)

Dear Chair Chrisman:

On behalf of the California Coastkeeper Alliance, which represents Waterkeeper groups from the Oregon border to San Diego, I am writing to express my strong support for the Coastal Conservancy's CalCOOS proposal before Ocean Protection Council. As the only public stakeholder on the national Steering Committee for the development of the Global Ocean Observing System, I recognized the critical need for a unifying governance structure for the various ocean observing activities. This overarching governance structure is essential to ensure coordination of the observing activities and, more importantly, to ensure that the ultimate user of the information – the public – receives sustained, useful data products.

The Coastal Conservancy's CalCOOS proposal would achieve these goals for California. It would also ensure that California's ocean observing associations are speaking with one voice in both Sacramento and in Washington D.C., which will be the ultimate source of the funding that will be needed to sustain and expand upon these nascent efforts. Because of the relatively short life of the bond funds being used to start these critical efforts, the CalCOOS proposal should be adopted and implemented as soon as possible, so that there is an entity that can work to leverage existing funding to the maximum extent possible, and begin the task of seeking new funding that will carry current activities forward. The Coastal Conservancy is the appropriate entity to implement the recommendations in the report due to its unique familiarity with this issue, given its experience to date with managing the bond funding for ocean observing specifically, and for the Ocean Protection Council agencies and applicants more generally.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Linda Sheehan", written over a horizontal line.

Linda Sheehan
Executive Director

cc: Sam Schuchat, California Coastal Conservancy