

COASTAL PELAGIC SPECIES ADVISORY SUBPANEL STATEMENT ON
REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FOR MARINE RESERVES IN STATE WATERS
OF THE CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY (CINMS)

The Coastal Pelagic Species Advisory Subpanel (CPSAS) heard a brief report from Mr. Jim Seger on the marine reserves process and associated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document prepared by California Department of Fish and Game submitted to the Council for comment. The CPSAS has the following recommendation and comments.

There was a consensus by the CPSAS that any panel which is created to review marine reserves issues should include members of each Council species advisory subpanel, not just Council members.

The majority of the CPSAS is concerned the CEQA document as presented fails to consider the body of scientific opinion both published and unpublished that finds only theoretical biological basis for 30%-50% set aside which is the foundation the preferred alternative is based on.

The majority of the CPSAS agrees with the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) the document fails to address adequately the environmental effects of reserves outside of the closed areas.

Generally, the majority of the CPSAS expresses concern the proposed reserves offer little or no biological benefit to CPS resources yet will produce extreme economic hardship on CPS fishermen by restricting their current access to fishing grounds.

The majority of the CPSAS strongly encourages using caution when moving forward with recommendations to the CINMS process without considering social and economic effects to consumptive user groups and without thorough review of all scientific opinion available.

A minority of the CPSAS is generally supportive of the reserve size recommendation as it relates to the biodiversity and sustainable fisheries goals as defined in the specific context of the CINMS, as was published in the November 2001 Supplemental SSC Report. A minority finds the proposed reserve recommendation went through a process that produced a thorough ecological and socioeconomic assessment that attempted to minimize short and long-term impacts and maximize the benefits. A minority supports the adequacy of the CEQA document and supports the preferred alternative.

PFMC
06/20/02

Heather Munro