From:	Christine OceanHaven
To:	TSP comments
Subject:	Rocky Habitats
Date:	Wednesday, April 7, 2021 3:56:08 PM

Ocean Greetings good folks appointed to the Rocky Working Group and the Ocean Policy Advisory Council as well as, all the agency staff assigned to support the work of the Group and Council.

I support the designation of Marine Conservation designation of Crook Point/Mack Reef and Blacklock Point under the Oregon Rocky Habitat Management Strategy, as well as all other proposals. All are important, unique habitat areas of specific value in need of protection.

I have been a business owner on the central Oregon Coast since 1997. I was on the committee to create and establish the Cape Perpetua Marine Reserves and Marine Protected Areas. I am a member of Oregon Shores Coalition, Audubon, ORCA, Surfriders and the Pessimist Society. In the past, I have been a county, city, state, non-profit and federal employee and a volunteer.

Through my affiliation with Oregon Shores and Audubon, I had the opportunity to enjoy the beauty of Blacklock Point and Crook Point/Mack Reek and assisted in review of the proposals to protect these gems of the Oregon Coast with specific state Rocky Habitat designations.

As a Central Oregon Coast business owner, I served people from all over the world who traveled to spend their domestic and foreign monies on the Oregon Coast. Most traveled the entire coast. Their primary reason to travel to the Oregon Coast was for the public access to pristine beaches, diverse with tidal life, abundant pelagic bird colonies, marine life and the multitude of state and national parks. As a business owner and volunteer, I vouch for the necessity of establishing protections of Rocky Habitats to ensure the future of tourism, other Oregon economic venues and for the future of a healthy environment that is not allowed "loved" to death by tourist and Oregonians.

As a member of the Pessimist Society I wonder who is feeling insecure about their job, occupation, maybe their reputation or disdain for the environmental protections they feel will be at the expense of their needs? Maybe it is someone pressuring the Group and Council to

concede to their needs? And what was the with the bizarre proposal deadline of December 25?

As far as my experience as a non-expert, but with a Master's in Science background and invested in the Rocky Habitat protections proposals, it was different than any of my previous experience of grant writing and proposal requests. Consequently, I believe it is necessary to ask for the Group and Council's help to work with us non-Group and non-Council members in the site proposals we submitted. I re-read and reread and reread the questions of the proposals multiple times and had friends and family scientist members read and reread the questions. As was the primary case, I could not determine why a proposal question was being asked multiple times in multiple ways. My Pessimist mind thought someone is trying to trick us by tiring us out in giving an inconsistent answers. And all the time the stress ticking of the December 25 Christmas deadline with Santa coming to deliver a lump of coal for our inadequacies of the proposal submission loomed in my consciousness. Such a deadline seemed to cloud my best judgment in guessing how to adequately answer and compare the duplicative information and responses in a consistent manner. I am thinking this was a possibility for most proposers. Granted, some information was absolutely impossible to scientifically be accurate. So, the choice was state the obvious to a scientist and risk offending a non-scientist who may have written the question and possibly offend the questions maker (e.g. how many species or number-how does one count the microscopic? grid estimate? the questions to be answered did not give instructions.) In several cases there had not been previous research or review of the remote sites and there was no instruction of what to do in this case. How does one count all the species that may be or have been and now extinct or moved on to a more adaptable environment. Will they return on a time when the proposers are not there and hence inaccurate information may be submitted? Having talk with other volunteers involved in submitting proposals, I found out I was not alone in my quandary.

Now, with my experience as a past grant reviewer, I expect the Group and Council want accurate responses to the written proposal questions. Therefore, I ask you all to work with the site proposers, (primarily community volunteers) to clarify the information submitted in the initial public view version of the site proposal evaluation summaries. I have faith being that you all choose a day of some people's faith (December

25) for the proposals to be submitted, you all want any accidental misinformation to be corrected. Or, please publicly explain why you want to evaluate accidental misinformation that was submitted either do to the inexperience of the community volunteers or more likely due the the the writer's of the questions not providing sufficient instruction for community volunteers submitting accurate answers.

My experience with the Marine Reserve establishment process was many of us continually emphasized for the group not to evaluate proposals based on funding of agencies staffing and funding support. AND NOW WE KNOW THIS WORKED! As also with the establishment of the Oregon Health Plan, the Beach Bill and with many other innovative first ever Oregon initiatives. The evaluation of the Rocky Habitat proposals should ONLY be as the initiative warrants. Does this site need enhanced protection? Not, does it need protection only if corresponding responsible agencies staff are available or if there is money found to support enforcement?

I am proud of eight Oregon Communities that have committed to work together despite their diversity in interests and livelihood for the good of protecting Rocky Habitats. The MCA proposal communities of Ecola Point, Chapman Point, Cape Lookout, Cape Foulweater, Blacklock Point and Crook Point/Mack Reef. The MRA proposal community of Cape Blanco. The MGA proposal community of Coquille Point. I am confident you all share my pride of the hours of work, support, expert input and share goals these communities committed. Please commend them and support the communities goals to create Rocky Habitat protections. This also will build on and continue the efforts and recommendations of the 1994 Rocky Habitat Management Strategy so not to just to be a bureaucratic waste of community time and energy.

I commend the Rocky Habitat Working Group and the Ocean Policy Advisory Council work in establishing Rocky Habitat protections along the Oregon Coast. This process which brought together the volunteers, community members, scientific experts and coastal economic stakeholders should be valued by accepting their request to provide you with the accurate and updated information you need to create the necessary protections for the sustainable future of the Oregon Coast.

Respectfully Submitted, Christine DeMoll