

Dear BLM,
30, 2023

September

I'm writing to comment on the propose supplementary rule for public lands in the Cotoni-Coast Dairies unit of the California Coastal national monument in Santa Cruz county California. Filed 11/28/22.

Section V, rule number two. At this point, there are no designated roads within the monument for bicycles, therefore, the words "roads and " should be omitted from rule number two.

Section V. Rule number seven. I believe this is a mistake and is unclear. I believe it should read, "Use... Prohibited from sunset to sunrise." First, wildlife often reacts to increased daytime use by humans by hunting and being active later during the twilight hours and the night. Therefore, we shouldn't disturb them during any part of twilight. This will reduce impact on them. Second, it is sometimes ambiguous, or at least hard to tell when a half hour after sunset or a half hour before sunrise actually is. A more clear criterion is sunset and sunrise. This creates less ambiguity.

Section V rule number 19 should include a prohibition against unmanned, aerial vehicles, flying over any part of the national monument. It's not the specific act of taking off or landing that is impactful, but rather the presence and flying of unmanned vehicles on or **over** the monument.

Section V rule number 20. Similarly to rule 19, the impacts of hang gliders are not merely in the taking off and landing, but in the flying over the national monument land. This rule should be amended to prohibit, paragliding, etc. **over** the monument.

Section V rule number 22. The exemption for "any person whose activities are authorized in writing by the BLM." Should include a phrase that says that the person and the specific activities should be in writing, and should include a date or date for which this authorization is valid.

Besides my specific comments, I also want to state for the record that I concur and support the comments and changes proffered by Grey Hayes PhD as well as those comments and changes put forth by FONC, DNCA, and RBDA.

Finally, overall, there was a lot of excess verbiage, which made the rule somewhat opaque. In particular, I think all of section IV. Procedural matters could have been eliminated or put after the rules of interest. Mostly what I am concerned with is creating a barrier to access an understanding for the broad public.

Thank you very much for your time and effort,
Jacob Pollock, PhD.