

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
2	Florence Sloane <i>(Conference call notes sent as an e-mail attachment to Commission from J. Horenstein on 01/16/2014)</i>	E-mail 12/04/2013 Conference Call 12/10/2013	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed subsection 550(i)(3), Title 14, CCR states that dog trials are “not authorized” for the Hollenbeck Canyon Wildlife Area. This implies that dog trials are prohibited at this property, which would be a significant change from the existing rules. 2. Existing subsection 551(q)(62)(E) specifies that camping on the Los Banos Wildlife Area is allowed at the main office parking area during organized events. Proposed subsection 551(m)(18) does not specify this. This is a significant change in use. 3. The Finney-Ramer Unit of the Imperial Wildlife Area is treated as both a Type A and a Type C area in different subsections of the proposed regulations. 4. At the Finny-Ramer Unit, there is no facility for the collection of day pass fees and the fees have never been collected there, so this should not be required in the proposed regulations. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. In the existing general regulation for dog trials on wildlife areas (subsection 550(b)(14), Title 14, CCR), dog trials require a special permit in order to be an authorized activity. Most wildlife areas, including Hollenbeck Canyon, do not currently have an additional site-specific regulation that addresses dog trials. However, some wildlife areas do have site-specific regulations that explicitly “prohibit” dog trials. Others have a site-specific regulation that explicitly “allows” dog trials, although even in these cases, a special permit is required. The term “not authorized” was used in the table in proposed subsection 550(i) for properties that have an existing site specific regulation for dog training, but no existing site specific regulation for dog trials (potentially creating a blank cell in the table). “Not authorized” is meant to convey that dog trials are not a designated use such as hunting, fishing or wildlife observation and that special permission is required in order for trials to be “authorized.” It is not meant to convey that dog trials are prohibited. This is not an ideal solution, and the Department will attempt to improve this language in the next update of the land regulations. 2. Disagree. Camping during organized events is typically covered in the terms and conditions of Special Use Permits, so this regulation is unnecessary. Throughout the State, camping has been allowed as part of Special Use Permits for wildlife areas that do not have a site-specific regulation that allows camping during organized events, and this will not be different for Los Banos Wildlife area. 3. Disagree. In the proposed regulation subsections where “Type” of wildlife area is specified, the Finney-Ramer Unit is

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
				<p>consistently treated as a Type C area. (see proposed subsections 551(a),(q) and (r)).</p> <p>4. Disagree. Under existing subsection 551(q)(75)(B)(4), day passes are required for visitors that do not have a hunting, fishing or trapping license. That requirement was carried forward into the proposed regulations. Fish and Game Code Section 1745, which took effect on January 1, 2013 requires the Department to review and expand the day pass program. Instituting a day pass program that is logistically feasible and facilitates a higher rate of compliance will be an objective of the next update of the land regulations in Title 14, CCR.</p>
3	Robert Smith	Conference Call 12/06/2013	<p>1. Special Use Permit fees should be phased in over multiple years.</p> <p>2. The Department should issue Special Use Permits that are valid for multiple years.</p>	<p>1. Agree. Subsection 703(a)(2) was modified to phase in Special Use Permit fees over three years. The full fee will not be charged until January 1, 2017. This change was noticed on March 24, 2014.</p> <p>2. Disagree. The environmental conditions and administrative issues (e.g. staffing levels) may change. It would be inappropriate to issue special use permits for a given site that are valid for more than one year.</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
4	Mark Hennelly	Conference Call 12/06/2013 Email 12/09/2013 Oral Testimony 12/11/2013 Email 12/23/2013	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-profit conservation groups should receive a discount on Type III (large event) Special Use Permits for events they hold on the Department lands 2. Non-profit conservation groups should not be required to pay an additional fee or percentage of gross receipts if fundraising events are held on the Department lands. 3. A subsection should be added that ensures that waterfowl hunting opportunities at the proposed Liberty Island Ecological Reserve do not decrease from current levels in the future. 4. The number of hunters per reservation allowed at the Colusa and Sutter National Wildlife Refuges was recently changed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This change is not reflected in proposed subsection 551(x), Title 14, CCR. 5. Clarify that bikes are allowed at Los Banos and Willow Creek Wildlife Areas and the Joice Island Unit of the Grizzly Island Wildlife 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree. The Department is directed by the legislature to recover its costs for issuing permits. 2. Disagree. Proposed subsection 550.5(d)(4)(D) allows this additional cost to be waived for events that are co-sponsored by the Department. This is often the circumstance for events that are initiated by non-profit organizations that assist with conservation, recreational and environmental education activities on Department lands. In situations where the Department is not a co-sponsor of the event, the criteria for determining the minimum fee or percentage of gross receipts include whether or not the sponsor of the event is a non-profit organization and “other considerations as appropriate”. Other considerations may include whether the organization’s activities complement the purpose of the subject property and/or activities conducted by the Department. 3. Disagree. It is not appropriate for the Commission to commit to a particular level of hunting for the future. The level of hunting on Department properties is determined by environmental and administrative factors that may change over time. 4. Agree. In response to this concern, edits have been made to proposed subsection 551(x), Title 14, CCR to conform to the recent changes made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These edits were noticed on March 24, 2014. 5. Disagree. The Department’s opinion is that proposed

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			Area.	subsection 550(bb), Title 14, CCR is clear that bikes are prohibited on Department lands except as allowed in sections 551, 552 and 630. Subsection 551(j) states that on Type A and B wildlife areas, bicycles may be used on roads and levees between parking lots and hunting areas during the waterfowl season. Site-specific regulations for bicycles in the existing regulations were retained during this update of the land regulations. They are found in proposed subsection 551(j) for wildlife areas
5	Mark Hennelly Roger Mammon (unable to participate in conference call on 12/10/2013)	Conference Call 12/10/2013 Oral Testimony 12/11/2013 02/05/2014 E-mail 02/03/2014 E-mail 12/10/2013 Oral Testimony 02/05/2014	1. Do not delete existing subsection 551(q)(47)(E) which allows the Regional Manager to determine if decoys may be left in the field for the duration of the waterfowl season at Lower Sherman Island Wildlife Area.	1. Comment noted. Per direction from the Commission, subsection 550(i)(3), Title 14, CCR was added to the proposed regulations. This authority was moved from subsection 551(q) to 550(i) because of the reorganization of the regulations. This change was noticed on March 24, 2014.
6	Florence Sloane	Conference Call 12/10/2013 Oral and Written Testimony 12/11/2013	1. Hunting dog training, trialing and testing should be incorporated into the definition of hunting in proposed subsection 550(b)(10) 2. Proposed subsection 550(m)	1. Disagree. Training and trials enhance the performance of hunting dogs in the field, but they are not activities that define hunting. Many people participate in hunting without the use of dogs. Many people who participate in the training, trialing and testing of hunting breeds do not participate in hunting.

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
		<p>Letter 12/12/2013</p> <p>Email 01/02/2014</p>	<p>should not require dogs to be leashed on wildlife areas. This is a significant change in use.</p> <p>3. In proposed subsection 550(n), clarify how and where dogs being used for hunting training and trialing are to be controlled on wildlife areas when they are outside of parking lots and hunter check-in stations. In existing and proposed regulations dogs must be leashed on wildlife areas when in parking lots or hunter check-in stations. Dogs being used for hunting, training or trialing should be treated differently than dogs that are on the wildlife area in their capacity as pets.</p> <p>4. Opposes approval of the proposed regulations because it will result in a significant loss of access for hunting dog training, trials and tests. There are wildlife areas with designated dog training areas that are not included in the proposed subsection 551(i), Title 14, CCR.</p> <p>5. The original intent of the regulations was to allow area</p>	<p>2. Disagree. Unless otherwise stated in site specific regulations, dogs are currently allowed to be either hunting or under “immediate control” on wildlife areas (existing subsection 550(b)(14), Title 14, CCR). In the Department’s experience, the term “immediate control” has a variety of interpretations, and it is very difficult to enforce. It can mean anything from a dog that is on-leash to a dog that is running far from its owner, but will come when it is called. In the latter scenario, many dogs are not 100% obedient. Allowing dogs to run loose through wildlife habitat when they are not engaged in authorized hunting, training or dog trials is inconsistent with the conservation purpose of wildlife areas (CA Fish and Game Code Section 1525). Under the proposed subsection 550(m), dogs that are on wildlife areas in their capacity as pets are required to be on a leash, which is a clear and enforceable form of “immediate control”. Language in that subsection directs readers to subsection 550(n) for regulations about dogs used in hunting, training, trials or tests. While dogs are engaged in those activities, they are clearly not required to be on a leash.</p> <p>3. Agree. The following sentence was added to subsection 550(n): “On wildlife areas, while in transit between parking lots or check stations and the areas where authorized hunting, training or dog trials take place, dogs may be off leash but must be kept within ten feet of their owner or handler.” This addition was among the edits that were noticed on March 24, 2014</p> <p>4. Disagree. The proposed regulations do not change the number of areas within Department lands that are</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			<p>managers flexibility to designate wildlife areas for dog training, but the current regulations eliminate that flexibility.</p>	<p>designated for dog training, and they do not change the location, acreage or timing of access for any of those areas. The term “designated” in the regulations has been problematic because it has been used in a variety of ways, at varying levels of authority, from an informal “designation” made by a wildlife area manager to a regulation approved by the Commission. Because hunting dog training is a significant and frequent use of certain Department lands, and group dog training, in particular, impacts the ability of other visitors to use parts of those lands and has the potential to have significant environmental effects, it is appropriate for the Commission, under their statutory authority (Fish and Game Code Sections 1526 and 1580) to regulate where that occurs under the APA process. Hunting dog training also includes the ongoing management problem of professional trainers using Department lands for a commercial use without permission from, and compensation to, the Department. The Department and the Commission have publically committed to consider adding dog training to additional wildlife areas in the near future. Dog training is not currently allowed by staff at the three wildlife areas cited in Ms. Sloane’s letter dated 12/12/2013: Eel River, Elk River and South Spit, which is not to say that individuals do not from time to time enter the area and conduct unauthorized training. Eel River and South Spit are small wildlife areas that include or are very near critical habitat for the snowy plover, a federally-listed bird. It is unlikely that dog training sites will be designated on those areas.</p> <p>5. Difference between 2004 FSOR and proposed text</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
				<p>regarding where dog training is allowed on CDFW wildlife areas</p> <p>In the proposed regulations there has been an effort to become consistent with Section 1525 of the Fish and Game Code, which gives authority to the Fish and Game Commission to designate public uses of wildlife areas. Under Section 1525, area managers (who are often entry level managers), do not have the authority to designate new uses for wildlife areas. The real intent of the 2004 FSOR is to explain that on properties where dog training has been allowed by the Commission, the area managers can change which part of the property dog training is conducted on, according to on-the ground circumstances.</p> <p>For example, if a state-listed endangered species establishes a new population in a field that had been used for dog training, the area manager does have the flexibility to move the dog training to a different field.</p>
7	Bill Gaines	Oral Testimony 12/11/2013	<p>See Comment 3.1</p> <p>1. Special Use Permit fees should be lower for persons who have a hunting license and organizations in which many members have a hunting license.</p>	<p>See Response 3.1</p> <p>1. Disagree. As explained in the Initial Statement of Reasons for this regulation package, the Department is required to recover its costs for issuing Special Use Permits. Revenue from the sale of hunting licenses will not be redirected from wildlife management and law enforcement to cover the cost of issuing Special Use Permits for hunting dog trials and tests.</p>
8	Ed Worley, Tom Pedersen	Oral Testimony 12/11/2013	<p>1. Ensure that the regulations in Title 14, CCR are consistent with the CA Penal Code with regard to the possession of firearms.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. It is understood that regulations must not conflict with statutes. The proposed regulations have been reviewed and approved by the Department Office of General Counsel and the Department Law Enforcement</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
				Division.
9	Janette Vosburg, Patricia McPherson	Oral and Written Testimony 12/11/2013 (Patricia McPherson did not submit the PowerPoint Presentation that was referenced in her testimony.)	<p>1. The proposed regulations are not as protective for the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve as the existing regulations.</p> <p>2. Commenters oppose a proposed project at the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve currently undergoing CEQA review. They also are opposed to existing drainage infrastructure on the Reserve</p>	<p>1. Disagree. Proposed Section 630 emphasizes the role of the protection of special status species and habitats in the management of ecological reserves, and <u>includes the existing site-specific regulations</u> for the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve. The regulations and the associated public uses for the Ballona Wetlands are not changing as a result of this update of the land regulations in Title 14, CCR. The “applicable laws” that are referred to in the excerpt included in the memo spell out the purposes of ecological reserves and the types of appropriate uses. Additionally, proposed Section 550 requires that uses designated by the Commission must be consistent with those same statutes.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. The discussion in this testimony regarding the on-going environmental review for a proposed project at the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve is not within the scope of this regulation package. Future regulation packages may include proposed changes as a result of the proposed project.</p>
10	Lakenna Dewald Rebecca Fordyce	<p>E-mail 12/18/2013 04/01/2014</p> <p>E-mail 01/02/2014</p>	<p>1. Ensure that Section 550, Title 14, CCR clearly applies to the Department fishing accesses.</p> <p>2. In her e-mail, Ms. Fordyce expressed her concern about environmental degradation caused by homeless encampments on the Department’s Bear River Fishing</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. Proposed subsection 550(b)(1)(E) does include the Department’s fishing accesses in the definition of “Department lands”.</p> <p>2. In an immediate sense, this seems outside of the purview of the Commission and the scope of this regulation package. It appears to be more of a matter for Department or local law enforcement staff. However, an on-going law enforcement obstacle here is that, although the</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			Access and requested that the Commission help end this problem.	Department's legal staff have provided opinions that Section 550, Title 14 CCR, applies to small public access properties under the Department's jurisdiction, the regulations lacked clarity in this matter. Under the proposed regulations, Section 550 clearly applies to these properties, as well as to the larger types of properties (i.e., wildlife areas and ecological reserves).
11	Jennifer Mitchell Luke Mitchell	E-mail 01/06/2014	See comment 6.4	See response 6.4
12	B.J. Patterson	E-mail 01/07/2014	See comments 6.2 and 6.4 See comment 1.1	See responses 6.2 and 6.4 See response 1.1
13	Amy Friend	E-mail 01/09/2014	See comments 6.2 and 6.4 1. All wildlife areas should generally be open to hunting dog training and only the more sensitive areas on wildlife areas should be closed to training.	See comments 6.2 and 6.4 1. Disagree. Currently hunting dog training is only allowed on wildlife areas with designated areas for dog training. Opening all wildlife areas to dog training would be a significant change in use that would require an environmental analysis that is beyond the scope of the current update of the land regulations.
14	Annie Erwin	E-mail 01/22/2014	See comments 1.1, 6.2 and 6.4	See responses 1.1, 6.2 and 6.4
15	Scot Huffman	E-mail 01/23/2014	See comments 1.1 and 6.4	See responses 1.1 and 6.4
16	Pamela King Smith	E-mail 01/23/2014	See comments 1.1, 6.2 and 6.4	See responses 1.1, 6.2 and 6.4
17	Scott McMorrow	E-mail 01/23/2014	1. Supports the continuation of waterfowl hunting in the Tomales Bay Ecological Reserve.	1. Comment noted. The proposed regulations would not change the existing hunting program at this reserve.
18	Florence Sloane	E-mail 01/23/2014	1. Opposes the proposed regulations because they will significantly alter designated public	1. Disagree. The public uses that have been previously designated by the CA Fish and Game Commission will continue on wildlife areas. The existing and proposed

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			uses of wildlife areas and because they ignore the distinctions between wildlife areas and ecological reserve.	regulations for public uses reflect the statutory purposes of wildlife areas described in CA Fish and Game Code Sections 1525, 1528 and 1745; and of ecological reserves described in CA Fish and Game Code Sections 1580,1584, 1585 and 1745.
19	Joyce Dillard Douglas Fay	E-mail 01/24/2014	1. Commenter asserts that the existing and proposed regulations for the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve address areas that are outside of the Reserve boundaries. 2. No other uses should be allowed on the Reserve	1. Disagree. The regulations in Title 14, CCR that apply to the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve only apply to lands under the Department's jurisdiction. 2. Comment noted. No changes in public uses for the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve are proposed in this regulation package.
20	Helen Graves	E-mail 01/24/2014	See comment 1.1	See response 1.1
21	Judith Asher	E-mail 01/25/2014	See comments 1.1 and 6.2 1. Dog training should be allowed in perpetuity on the After Bay area.	See responses 1.1 and 6.2 1. Comment noted. There is no wildlife area designated the "After Bay Wildlife Area." The commenter is probably referring to the Oroville Wildlife Area. Both the existing and proposed regulations for the Oroville Wildlife Area allow for hunting dog training in a designated area from July 1 through March 15 (existing subsection 551(q)(31)(E); proposed subsection 551(i)(10)).
22	Nelson & Elisabeth Lampert	E-mail 01/28/2014	See comments 1.1, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4 1. Remove the requirement in proposed subsections 550(n)(2) and 550.5(d), Title 14, CCR, to	See responses 1.1, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4 1. Disagree. This requirement is in existing subsection 550(b)(14), as well as in the proposed regulations. Special Use Permits allow the Department to ensure that hunting dog trials occur where and when they are appropriate and

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			obtain a Special Use Permit for hunting dog trials.	that they are conducted in a manner that does not damage the subject property, harm wildlife or conflict with the use of the property by other groups or individuals.
23	Annie Erwin Florence Sloane	E-mail 01/28/2014	See comments 6.2 and 6.4	See responses 6.2 and 6.4
24	Jeanne Collier	E-mail 01/28/2014	See comments 1.1, 6.2, 6.4 and 22.1	See responses 1.1, 6.2, 6.4 and 22.1
25	Michael MacGregor	E-mail 01/31/2014	<p>The commenter:</p> <p>1. supports that bicycles are no longer grouped with motor vehicles (compare existing subsection 630(a)(4), Title 14, CCR, to proposed subsections 550(y) and (bb)),</p> <p>2. supports that the proposed regulations do not propose to prohibit bike riding from any Department lands where it is currently a designated use, and</p> <p>3. requests that bicycle riding be added as a designated use to nine specified ecological reserves and the access for bikes be expanded</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Disagree. Adding bicycle riding to nine ecological reserves and expanding bicycle riding at a tenth reserve is beyond the scope of the current update of the regulations.</p> <p>4. Disagree. CA Fish and Game Code Section 1580 grants the authority to designate uses for ecological reserves to the CA Fish and Game Commission.</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			<p>on a tenth ecological reserve.</p> <p>4. Requests that the Commission delegate the authority to allow bicycle riding on each ecological reserves to the reserve manager.</p>	
26	Bennett Ellington	E-mail 02/02/2014	See comments 1.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, and 22.1	See responses 1.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, and 22.1
27	Garret Fereira Anthony Macaluso Ken Fowler Douglas Adams Harold Church	Oral Testimony 02/05/2014	<p>See comment 5.1</p> <p>See comment 6.3</p>	<p>See response 5.1</p> <p>See response 6.3</p>
28	April Wakeman	Oral Testimony 02/05/2014	<p>See comments 6.4 and 13.1</p> <p>See comment 6.2</p>	<p>See responses 6.4 and 13.1</p> <p>See response 6.2</p>
29	Bill Gaines	Oral Testimony 02/05/2014	<p>1. Does the following sentence, proposed to be added to subsection 550(n)(2), <u>only</u> apply to the area in-between parking lots or hunter check-in stations and the parts of the wildlife areas where visitors actually use their dogs for hunting, training and trialing? “On wildlife areas, while in transit between parking lots or check stations and the areas where</p>	1. Yes.

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
			authorized hunting, training or dog trials take place, dogs may be off leash but must be kept within ten feet of their owner or handler.”	
30	Lori Jacobs	Oral Testimony 02/05/2014	See comment 1.1	See response 1.1
31	Sarah Thompson	Oral Testimony 02/05/2014	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commenter opposes any regulations that prohibit dogs on any Department lands. 2. See comment 6.3 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. In Title 14, there are existing site-specific regulations that prohibit dogs on a small minority of Department properties, at least for part of the year. These subsections were moved as part of the reorganization of the regulations, but their content did not change, nor did we add new regulations that prohibit dogs on any properties. 2. See response 6.3
32	Rhonda Reed	Oral and Written Testimony 02/05/2014	<p>See comments 1.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 13.1 and 22.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commenter opposes the proposed regulations because they require dogs to be on a leash while they are hunting, training or trialing. 	<p>See response 1.1</p> <p>Disagree. This is a misinterpretation of the proposed regulations. In response to this comment, the following sentence was added to proposed subsection 550(n)(2) for the sake of clarity: “While engaged in authorized hunting, training or dog trials, dogs may be off leash.” This addition was among the edits that were noticed on March 24, 2014.</p>
33	Kelly Moroney, Refuge Manager Sacramento River Nat’l Wildlife Refuge	E-mail 03/27/2014	1. Can new uses for and recently acquired units be added to the regulations for the SRNWR (proposed subsection 552(a)(6), Title 14, CCR), in the current update the land regulations?	<p>Neither of these comments are responsive to the notice on March 24, 2014.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of these changes can be addressed in the next phase of updating the land regulations. A couple of the Changes proposed by the refuge manager are not yet federal regulations and are currently undergoing

	Name of Commenter (SRNWR)	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
34	Mike Malone	E-mail 04/04/2014	<p>2. Why does the strikeout and proposed regulation text for the SRNWR contain different content from what was published in the Department's 2013/2014 booklet for hunters: "CA Waterfowl and Upland Game Hunting and Department Lands Public Use Regulations?"</p> <p>1. Commenter opposes the closure of the Cooper Rd. Unit of the Laguna Wildlife Area to hunting (proposed subsection 551(o)(29), Title 14, CCR).</p> <p>2. Commenter opposes the reduction in the number of days per week for hunting on the</p>	<p>environmental review. Other more minor changes proposed by the refuge manager already have the force of federal law by having been posted according to the terms the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1997 (16 USC 668dd-558ee). It is difficult to address the "regulation change by posting" type of changes from year to year in Title 14, but the Department will refer the public to information sources for these types of changes in federal rules in the booklet that the Department publishes annually for hunters: "CA Waterfowl and Upland Game Hunting and Department Lands Public Use Regulations."</p> <p>2. In early 2010, there was a proposal to update the site-specific regulations for the SRNWR through the Section 100 process which addresses administrative changes to the California Code of Regulations. In anticipation of those regulations being adopted, they were pasted into the booklet that was prepared for the 2010/2011 hunting season. However, those proposed Section 100 changes were never approved and the booklet was not revised accordingly. Inadvertently, those changes have remained in the booklet ever since, but were not discovered until this comment was submitted. The situation will be rectified with the publication of the 2014/2015 edition of the booklet. Neither of these comments are responsive to the notice on March 24, 2014.</p> <p>Responses to 1 & 2: The Cooper Rd. and Occidental Rd. Units are small areas adjacent to the town of Sebastopol in Sonoma Co. The Cooper Rd. Unit has no parking and a difficult public access situation. There is no deeded land access for the Occidental Unit. Hunters may only legally</p>

	Name of Commenter	Type/Date	Summary of Comments	Response
35	Mike Post	Oral Testimony 04/16/14	<p>Occidental Road Unit of the Laguna Wildlife Area from seven days per week to only hunting on Saturdays, Sundays and Wednesdays. (proposed subsection 551(q)(8)).</p> <p>1. Supports the proposed update of the land regulations</p> <p>2. Recognize that there may be a need to further modify the land regulations in the future.</p>	<p>access the Occidental Unit by boat when a seasonal waterway that enters the property is navigable. In spite of regular patrol by law enforcement, both units generate many complaints from neighboring landowners regarding trespassing, hunters' vehicles blocking driveways, noise, and assorted public safety and wildlife management concerns. The Department is working with interested parties to attempt to resolve the problems.</p> <p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p>
36	Wayne Raupe Bill Gaines	Oral Testimony 04/16/14	See comment 35.1	See response 35.1