

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
# 1 Garrick Chang Putah Creek Trout O - 8/6/09 Commission (FGC) meeting	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	Support noted.
# 2 350 Form letters E - 9/6/09 to 11/9/09 L - 9/9/09	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.
# 3 Signature list of 144 people from Putah Creek Trout L - 10/14/09	A. Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.  B. Requests no regulation change for Lake Solano.	A. See Response 1.  B. Lake Solano is included in the present regulations, and the wild trout population can freely migrate into and out of Lake Solano. With the present no-stocking status of these waters, exclusion of Lake Solano will reduce the effectiveness of the proposed zero bag limit on the protection of the wild trout population. The Department can't support excluding Lake Solano until more information is known about the wild trout population status in Putah Creek.
# 4 Curtis Knight, California Trout L - 7/31/09	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.
# 5 Libby Earthman Director, Putah Creek Council L - 8/6/09 & 10/8/09	A. Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.  B. Requests no regulation change for Lake Solano.  C. Requests no stocking from hatcheries infected with New Zealand Mud Snail.	A. See Response 1.  B. See Response 3B.  C. This comment does not address Putah Creek sport fishing regulations and cannot therefore be addressed in this particular regulatory procedure.

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
# 6 Bob Schneider, Tuleyome L - 9/23/09	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.
# 7 Vance Russell, Audubon California L - 10/13/09	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.
# 8 Trevor Hall E – 11/9/09	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.
# 9 34 Form letters from California Sportfishing Protection Alliance E - 9/20/09 to 9/30/09	A. Supports Putah Creek, Alameda Creek, Nacimiento River, Lake Sonoma, and Lake Perris proposed changes.  B. Supports Pacific lamprey, Sacramento splittail, sunfish and crappie and tilapia proposed changes.	A. See Response 1.  B. See Response 1.
# 10 Jeff Miller, Alameda Creek Alliance and 9 other groups O – 11/5/09 FGC meeting L – 9/29/09	Supports Alameda Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
# 11 Dougald Scott Northern CA Council of the Federation of Fly Fishers (NCCFFF) O – 8/6/09 & 10/1/09 FGC meetings L – 9/21/09	A. Requests a complete steelhead closure of all Southern SF Bay streams.  B. Supports Nacimiento River proposed changes  C. Supports Alameda Creek proposed changes.	A. Alameda Creek is already under consideration for closure and the rest of this proposal will not be addressed during this triennial regulatory action due to limited staff time. The Department will be reviewing all steelhead regulations in the near future, and the other streams in the NCCFFF proposal will be addressed at that time. The statewide alignment of hatchery trout and steelhead take is the first phase of this review being address as part of this triennial cycle.  B. See Response 1.  C. See Response 1.
# 12 Mondy Lariz Santa Clara County Creeks Coalition L – 11/2/09	Supports a complete steelhead closure of all Southern SF Bay streams.	See Response 11A.
# 13 Martin Seldon CA Fisheries Restoration Foundation L – 11/3/09	Supports a complete steelhead closure of all Southern SF Bay streams.	See Response 11A.

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
<p># 14 Andy Harrison E - 9/27/09 L - 9/27/09 E - 10/15/09 L - 10/15/09</p>	<p>A. Does not support the Nacimientto River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Disagrees that the Nacimientto River contains listed steelhead.</p> <p>C. Disagrees with the decision to stop stocking of the Nacimientto River.</p> <p>D. The Department's draft Hatchery EIR/EIS report supports his view that Nacimientto River doesn't contain listed steelhead.</p> <p>E. Want the Nacimientto River included on the list of streams to be stocked for fish.</p>	<p>A. Comment noted.</p> <p>B. The commenter believes only one angler contributing to all of the listed steelhead genetic samples taken from two different watersheds during the NMFS 2002-2005 study. This personal view is not supported by any other information.</p> <p>C. This comment does not address Nacimientto River sport fishing regulations and cannot therefore be addressed in this particular regulatory procedure.</p> <p>D. The draft report information reflects current sport fishing regulations and does not include any of the triennial sport fishing proposals presently under Commission review. The final Hatchery EIR/EIS report will be updated to reflect the final regulations adopted by the Commission from this regulatory action.</p> <p>E. See Response 14C.</p>
<p># 15 Greg Schallen E - 9/29/09</p>	<p>A. Does not support the Nacimientto River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Disagrees that the Nacimientto River contains listed steelhead.</p> <p>C. Disagrees with the decision to stop stocking of the Nacimientto River.</p>	<p>A. See Response 14A.</p> <p>B. See Response 14B.</p> <p>C. See Response 14C.</p>
<p># 16 Ray Belknap E - 10/9/09</p>	<p>Does not support the Nacimientto River proposed changes.</p>	<p>See Response 14A.</p>

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
# 17 James Crescenzi E - 10/11/09	<p>A. Does not support the Nacimiento River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Disagrees that the Nacimiento River contains listed steelhead.</p> <p>C. Disagrees with the decision to stop stocking of the Nacimiento River.</p>	<p>A. See Response 14A</p> <p>B. See Response 14B.</p> <p>C. See Response 14C.</p>
# 18 Ed Steinbeck E - 10/20/09	<p>A. Does not support the Nacimiento River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Disagrees that the Nacimiento River contains listed steelhead.</p>	<p>A. See Response 14A.</p> <p>B. See Response 14B.</p>
# 19 Jim McCormick E - 10/20/09	<p>A. Does not support the Nacimiento River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Disagrees with the decision to stop stocking of the Nacimiento River.</p>	<p>A. See Response 14A.</p> <p>B. See Response 14C.</p>
# 20 Pete Reed E - 10/20/09	<p>A. Does not support the Nacimiento River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Disagrees that the Nacimiento River contains listed steelhead.</p> <p>C. Disagrees with the decision to stop stocking of the Nacimiento River.</p>	<p>A. See Response 14A</p> <p>B. See Response 14B.</p> <p>C. See Response 14C.</p>
# 21 Lincoln Gray, Chico Area Flyfishers L - 10/6/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes because the Feather River Hatchery has not made its migration goal in 2008 and 2009.	The Department agrees with the public request and is recommending the “no change” option for the hatchery trout and steelhead bag limits for the Feather River.
# 22 Jack Fennel E - 10/26/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
# 23 Valerie Bowlby E - 10/26/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.
# 24 Jim Gaumer E - 10/26/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.
# 25 Jeff Kuhn E - 10/27/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.
# 26 Donna Murrill E - 10/27/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.
# 27 Dana Miller E - 10/27/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.
# 28 Chuck Kitterman E - 10/30/09	<p>A. Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.</p> <p>B. Requests other bag limit changes and gear restrictions not covered in the existing proposal.</p>	<p>A. See Response 21.</p> <p>B. These public recommendations will not be addressed during this triennial regulatory action. These recommendations will be held over until the next Commission's review of sport fishing regulations unless the Commission directs the Department to take action sooner.</p>
# 29 Lionel Valley E - 11/6/09	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
<p># 30 Thomas Weseloh California Trout O - 8/6/09 &amp; 10/1/09 FGC meetings L - 10/7/09</p>	<p>A. Supports add Smith River to Salmon Report Card.</p> <p>B Supports barbless hooks all year on the Smith River.</p> <p>C. Supports option for annual limit of five wild Chinook on the Smith River.</p> <p>D. Supports option for zero bag limit of wild trout or steelhead on the Smith River.</p> <p>E. Supports Option 1 (2 fish bag with 4 fish in possession) for Smith River.</p> <p>F. Requests Option 1 also apply to the Eel River steelhead regulations also.</p> <p>G. Supports Steelhead Report Card proposed changes.</p> <p>H. Supports proposed changes to Putah Creek and Lake Sonoma.</p> <p>I. Supports proposed low flow regulation changes for Mad, Eel and Smith rivers.</p>	<p>A. See Response 1.</p> <p>B. See Response 1.</p> <p>C. Support for annual limit of five wild Chinook noted.</p> <p>D. Support for zero bag limit of wild trout or steelhead noted.</p> <p>E. Support for Option 1 noted.</p> <p>F. The Department will be reviewing all steelhead regulations in the near future, and this Cal-Trout proposal will be addressed during this review. The statewide alignment of hatchery trout and steelhead take is the first phase of this review being address as part of this triennial cycle.</p> <p>G. See Response 1.</p> <p>H. See Response 1.</p> <p>I. See Response 1.</p>

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
<p># 31 Ben Taylor O - 8/6/2009 FGC meeting E - 9/28/09 &amp; 12/4/09</p>	<p>A. There is no Smith River monitoring, creel survey, watershed coordinator, or restoration resources.</p> <p>B. Supports option for zero bag limit of wild trout or steelhead on the Smith River.</p> <p>C. Supports zero bag limit for Chinook on Smith River.</p> <p>D. Ban the use of roe on the Smith River.</p> <p>E. Concerned about the possibility of an angler purchasing a second salmon report card to circumvent the annual take limit for wild Chinook.</p>	<p>A. This comment does not address Smith River sport fishing regulations and cannot therefore be addressed in this particular regulatory procedure.</p> <p>B. See Response 30D.</p> <p>C. The proposed annual limit on wild Chinook will provide adequate protection and addition of the Smith River to the Salmon Report Card will yield needed angler catch and effort information to further assess the population status.</p> <p>D. A prohibition on the use of natural baits is not necessary to control harvest of salmon and steelhead. Harvest is controlled by gear restrictions, by area, seasonal, and low flow closures, and by daily and annual bag limits. If an angler wishes to practice catch-and-release fishing, the Department encourages the angler to not use bait to prevent deep hooking and facilitate the release of fish. Additionally, artificial lures with barbless hooks are required on the Smith River main stem, Middle, North, and South Fork anadromous fish reaches from the fourth Saturday in May through August 31.</p> <p>E. This issue exists with all report cards, such as steelhead, abalone, and sturgeon, where there is an annual take limit. There is no data to suggest that current anglers purchase a second steelhead report to circumvent the existing Smith River annual wild steelhead take limit. The implementation of the Automated License Data System will allow the license issuer to check if a report card has been previously purchased and the Department with the ability to accurately monitor and track this issue. The Department will continue monitoring this issue and will be making regulatory changes as needed.</p>
<p># 32 Friends of Del Norte L - 8/1/09</p>	<p>A. Request the Smith River be closed to all salmon fishing.</p> <p>B. Supports barbless hooks all year on the Smith River.</p> <p>C. Ban the use of roe on the Smith</p>	<p>A. See Response 31C.</p> <p>B. See Response 1.</p> <p>C. See Response 31D.</p>

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
	<p>River.</p> <p>D. Supports option for zero bag limit of wild trout or steelhead on the Smith River.</p> <p>E. Close the Smith River to all fishing when the flow rate drops below 800-1,000 cfs.</p>	<p>D. See Response 30D.</p> <p>E. There is no justification for a change to the low flow closure trigger flow. This will not address illegal fishing activity, and is not necessary to adequately control harvest of salmon and steelhead.</p>
<p># 33 Dave Ford, NCCFFF O - 8/6/09, 10/1/09 &amp; 11/5/09 FGC meetings E - 10/14/09</p>	<p>Requests low flow restriction for all Central Valley streams similar to the North Coast low-flow regulations.</p>	<p>See Response 28B.</p>
<p># 34 Charles Buccaria, NCCFFF O - 8/6/09, 10/1/09 &amp; 11/5/09 FGC meetings L – 10/22/09</p>	<p>A. Requests no take of female salmon on the Smith River.</p> <p>B. Request that when one daily bag limit for any salmonid is reached, all fishing must cease on the Smith River.</p> <p>C Requests action on the NCCFFF proposal for a complete steelhead closure of all Southern SF Bay streams.</p> <p>D. Requests action on the NCCFFF for Central Valley low-flow restrictions.</p> <p>E. Supports zero bag limit on wild</p>	<p>A. This proposal is not enforceable and could lead to excessive hook and release mortality of female salmon.</p> <p>B. The proposed redefinition of daily salmonid bag limit would unnecessarily reduce angling opportunities and is not needed to control the harvest of salmon and steelhead. This measure was tried on the Klamath River and lead to higher hook and release mortality since anglers would continue to release fish to keeping on fishing.</p> <p>C. See Response 11A.</p> <p>D. See Response 28B.</p> <p>E. See Response 30D</p>

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
	trout or steelhead on the Smith River.	
# 35 April Wakeman, Sport Fishing Coalition O - 8/6/09 & 10/1/09 FGC meetings	Supports removal of wearing fish license on the outer clothing.	See Response 1.
# 36 Steve Karr, Putah Creek Trout O - 10/1/09 & 11/5/09 FGC meetings	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.
# 37 Mark Rockwelle NCCFFF O - 10/1/09 FGC meeting	Southern SF Bay regulations need to be consistent with steelhead listing	Present steelhead sport fishing compliance with measures developed concurrently with the federal steelhead listing. The Department will be reviewing all steelhead regulations in the near future. The statewide alignment of hatchery trout and steelhead take is the first phase of this review being address as part of this triennial cycle.
# 38 Eric Seed, Chico Area Flyfishers O - 11/5/09 FGC meeting	Does not support the Feather River proposed changes.	See Response 21.
# 39 Kurt Alan Gordon E – 9/10/09	Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.	See Response 1.

## Public Comments on Proposed Regulatory Changes and Department Responses For 2009 Inland Sport Fishing Regulations Triennial Review Cycle

Number, Name, Type(s), Date(s)	Summary of Public Comment	Department Response
# 40 Jeff Miller, Center for Biological Diversity, L - 11/4/09	Supports a larger sturgeon closure on the Sacramento River from Shasta Dam to the City of Sacramento.	Green sturgeon are not able to freely migrate above Keswick Dam and extending the closure down to the City of Sacramento will result in a minimal increase in protection over the proposed closure areas. The new expanded proposal would also require additional public notice and delay enacting the needed protection for green sturgeon in March 2010.
# 41 Lois Wolk, State Senator 5th District, L - 11/10/09	A. Supports Putah Creek proposed changes.  B. Requests no regulation change for Lake Solano.	A. See Response 1.  B. See Response 3B.
# 42 Tom Raftican, Sport Fishing Coalition O – 12/10/09 FGC meeting	Supports removal of wearing fish license on the outer clothing.	See Response 1.