

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

Total Number of Comment Sheets Received: 135

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
21	All			We are interested in the draft providing the most protection of habitat and ecological diversity. Follow the best science.		Captain Wally Rentsch PhD - Marine Audobon
120	All			Prop #2 I find proposal #2 is one of the weakest among all of the proposals - Prop #4 I feel is one of the best proposals!	I feel you have put out public notice about meetings - 3 weeks PRIOR to meetings. I disagree with one of the public comments where MLPA group has not put out advanced notice of meetings!	David Moore
127	All				I have grave concerns about the "TRANSPARENCY" of this process when the SAT creates new level of protection for salmon fishing when they have no concrete data to support any change. I am concerned there will be excessive emphasis on the amount of territory rather than the overall effectiveness of each pageage with the overall impact to various interests are minimized. Environmentalists are gaining much in this process while fishermen are sacrificing much. This can only benefit the ocean as a whole. I would like to stress moderation in the end process because in five years MPA's will be evaluated and adjusted	Matthew Plut
141	All				I am not a fisherman. Kayak and boat along the coast and only concerned about access to beaches w/o disturbing animals. All kayakers from "Bay Area Sea Kayakers" are leave no trace campers if they take longer than one day trips along the shore. I sample ocean & creeks for SRCHD (volunteer as a Surfrider member) and am more concerned about run off from creeks. Beaches are posted, but what about the animals in the ocean.	Dolf Hofmeyer

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
149	All			Sub-region #1 No Comment Sub-region #2 No Comment Sub-region #3 Prefer in order #2 - #4 Sub-region #5 Prefer in order #3 - #2		Roger Thomas
177	All	Specific Area to protect as SMR include Fitzgerald Marine Reserve - for the reestablished murre and harbor seal colonies.	Subregion 4 - Draft Proposal 4 (JC) I think we should extend the Duxbury SMCA to include Bolinas Lagoon, due to varied bird life there. Request creating an additional SMCA to include steep Ravine Beach South, including Slide Ranch. Reason: This is a feeding area for well established Heron rookeries, it is the habitat of many bird species. Pt San Pedro south to Pillar Point very much approve of this protection - would only ask, if possible, extend the SMR to replace the SMCA. Subregion 3, Proposal 4- these come from Pt. Reyes Headlands to Double Point. request making two unprotected area an SMCA.	1) I prefer Draft Proposal 4 (JC) because it represents the most protection along the San Mateo Coast, where I live.	I did not know this was happening until a few days before - but am very glad to see you made a high effort to get the information out to so many interest groups	Mary Keitelman

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
178	All			<p>I am suggesting that two additional MPA be added to all the proposal. Though I prefer Draft Proposal 4 (JD) for Subregion 2, it does not include ANY MPA to improve the Biodiversity and marine life presence for non-consumptive recreational diving, particularly SCUBA diving. Of the Top half dozen available SCUBA diving sites, Gerstle Cove and Fort Ross are the most popular SCUBA Diving area. These two sites allow for Gear drop off and the ability to enter the water with weight belts and scuba tanks. In all of the Draft Proposals none address the needs of non-consumptive scuba diving. Gerstle Cove should be extended South to improve the non-comp experience in the "State Park" area.</p> <p>Draft Proposal 4 JC should extend to N38 33.5 LAT W12319.65.</p> <p>A Fort Ross SMR should start at N3831.24 W12316.22 and extend to N3830.21 W12314.76. South of this point is Reef Camp which allows for Ab diving and other consumptive use. North of this is Still Water Cove, another popular consumptive area.</p>	<p>having a dive Rep that advocates for both consumptive and non-consumptive use, neuters the non-comp representation.</p>	Jesus C. Ruiz
29	All				<p>I think the use of usual or navigational range markers should be implemented to allow recreational fishermen to know whether or not they have passed over a reserve boundary. Possibly a red/green color system could be implemented so when a fisherman was in the open to fishing zone this could see a green light and when they have passed into a reserve red would be shown.</p>	Ryan Moore

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
30	All				Navigational range markers should be used to mark the boundaries of the protected areas. On the land, the range markers would designate the Northern and Southern boundaries of the protected area. A color system could be used where the green sector of the range would denote that it is ok to fish and outside the protected area, & the red sector would denote the closed area.	Brandon Wanlers
101	All				Let science dictate where the MPA's are placed so the resource will be preserved	Susan Bechtel
1	N		Black Point: With a relatively immobile resource, like Abalone, concentration of effort would absolutely have a negative impact on the Resource. We have properly managed this resource for over 50 years. On average, we still have approximately 8,000 Abalone per hectare, We have cut our bag limits from 10 per day, to 7, to 5, to 4, to 4 and 100 per year, and now to 2 and 24 per year, to manage the resource for abundance. Keeping the very limited access we have, is essential for proper management of the Resource. This is our area of primary concern	SCAN will support the SMF and the SMCA as pictured in Proposal 2 (JD) and the SMCA, which is shown in 2 (JD) as an SMP		Milo Vukovich (SCAN)
2	N	SCAN will oppose any SMR in the Salt Point area from 38* 30', as a South boundary, just below Ft. Ross Campground, to 38* 38'.	Salt Point: SCAN will oppose any SMR in the Salt Point area from 38* 30', as a South boundary, just below Ft. Ross Campground, to 38* 38'.	Same as above for Salt Point providing it is open to Recreational take, and excludes only Commercial take. We do not support the SMP in this area.		Milo Vukovich
3	N	We will support the existing SMR at Gerstle Cove, if it is to be retained, and excludes Commercial take.	Gerstle Cove			Milo Vukovich

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
4	N		Horseshoe Cove: This area is our main Public access. There are many areas both North and South of our access area, which are Natural Marine Reserves created by Lack of Public access. These areas are created by large amounts of private property, cliffs, distance from roads, distance from inflatable and kayak access. Our access areas are relatively small. To remove any of our limited access would unduly concentrate effort on the remaining areas.			Milo Vukovich
5	N	SCAN can support the Pt. Arena SMR and SMCA as pictured in Proposal 3 (TC).	Pt. Arena	SCAN can support the Pt. Arena SMR and SMCA as pictured in Proposal 3 (TC).	Stornetta should never be included in a Reserve as 1 Million Dollars of SFTA, Tackle Tax money and fisherman's money was used to purchase Stornetta	Milo Vukovich
6	N	Russian River: The take of Abalone or Rock Fish does not impede returning Salmon. If this SMCA were to be proposed as an SMR, we would support it as long as it eliminated any SMR in the Salt Point or Black Point area.	Russian River: The take of Abalone or Rock Fish does not impede returning Salmon. If this SMCA were to be proposed as an SMR, we would support it as long as it eliminated any SMR in the Salt Point or Black Point area.	We support an SMCA, as in Proposal 3 (TC), that would allow for the take of Abalone and Rockfish.		Milo Vukovich
7	N	Bodega Head: We can support the SMR & the SMCA as in Proposal 1	Bodega Head	We can support the SMR and the SMCA as in Proposal 1 (EC)		Milo Vukovich
12	N		Salt Point: (1) Access - Salt Point has the safest access along the Sonoma coast. With 9 diver related deaths in 2007 this is a major concern. (2) State Owned land makers for the least expensive access. As a kayak diver/fisherman the cost increases when a kayak is used from a private location. (3) Ease of access. Too far of an access point leaves little opportunity to use a kayak. (4) With the prevailing South winds, kayaking South of Gerstle makes for a very dangerous kayak trip.	Proposal 4 is too restrictive and will negatively affect the remaining open areas due to the increased/focused pressure.		Santino Bernazzani

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
14	N		Russian River, Gualala and Garcia estuaries: More Red areas! It is critical to create sanctuary that are complete ecosystems. The science is clear on this now. Also, protection of the Russian, Gualala and Garcia estuaries is critical. This includes protection from negative impacts from upstream water quality impacts. The trade process for these rivers should be accelerated to benefit both the estuary and the off shore fishery. The sediment plume that comes out of the Russian and blankets the ocean from Jenner South is an impact that must be addressed. The time process on the south fork of the Garcia has been a success and this successful process areas to be applied elsewhere and soon. Anecdotally, it is clear that offshore fishing is best on the edge of reserves. Even small ones like at the Bodega Marine Lab. Larger sanctuaries will create fantastic fishing on there perimeters. Let's do it.	Proposal 1 is the best		Brian Hines
15	N		Subregion 1: Alder Creek to Horseshoe Point	Support Draft Proposal 2 (JD), and External Proposal A; 1 (EC) looks too restrictive, although it may serve the purpose of breaking up the 1,000+ trap dungeness strings which take a lions share of the opening catch.	As a young and dedicated long-term commercial fisherman, I favor large SMCA's which allow for sustainable commercial harvest of non-threatened species such as dungeness crabs. These could be coupled with smaller "no take" zones centered around creekmouths, estuaries, and offshore reef areas.	Brian Hines

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
16	N		Please do not completely restrict the Sonoma Coast. I know small-scale dungeness fishermen who sell crabs from their boats. These operators only catch what they need, and are a model for future fisheries management. Corporate-owned mega-boats, fish farms, and pollution are the most important issues to be addressed. Subregion 2: Horseshoe Point to Bodega Head. Due to lack of time I would like to emphasize to the science team the importance of creating sustainable commercial fisheries in the Central Coast area. Please allow access to restricted areas for family-oriented local sustainable operations.		Research maximum sustainable yields for commercial species and allow for rht establishment of a local sustainable fishery.	Chris Calvi
20	N	Please allow the fishing of halibut on and around the South East end of Point Arena.	Subregion 3: SouthEast end of Point Arena		I operate the f/u B. Phyllis out of San Francisco - Salmon, Halibut & Crab. I also own the coast café restaurant in Bolinas, CA. The focus of the restaurant is local seafood. I buy & rely on the fish brought in by the local fisherman. Josh, Jeremy, Rob & myself. Not counting crab. There are only four fisherman left. Please don't put them out of business.	David Liebenstein

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
22	N		Fisk Mill and Salt Point areas and geography create perfect locations for spearfishermen of all levels to safely enter the water and enjoy the ocean	Fisk Mill and Salt Point areas and geography create perfect locations for spearfishermen of all levels to safely enter the water and enjoy the ocean This is why the MLPA Proposal 2 and 4 should not be allowed. Recreational spearfisherman will no longer be able to utilize some of our North Coast's best and safest access areas.	I have been raised in and around the ocean since childhood. My father introduced me to what the ocean has to offer and it has become on the the largest passions in my life. As a lifeguard, surfer, diver, fisherman and current student at the California Maritime Academy my love for the ocean has taught me that it is one of our most valuable resources and that we need to protect it. But we need to do so in the correct ways. I believe it is important for todays youth to be able to enjoy our pristine north coast and be able to spearfish within it as I did growing up. There's no better way of bonding with a child as there is taking them diving and teaching them a respect for our ocean. I am convinced that as a youth spearfishing kept me out of a lot of trouble. While my peers were out partying and getting into trouble I focused my efforts on the ocean and keeping my body healthy for diving. While attending college in Vallejo, my friends and I enjoy diving athe Salt Point areas on a weekly basis. Free dive spearfishing is the (continued in next row)	Roy T. McDennon Jr.

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
22 (cont'd)	N				most challenging and environmentally friendly forms of fishing. As a spearfisherman in Sonoma county, we enter the frigid 50 degree water wearing a thick wetsuit, 20 lbs of weight, a mask, snorkel, fins and a speargun. The water visibility is often no greater than an arms length, but still we continue. Using a single breathhold, we stalk our fish and are completely aware of which species we selectively take. Unlike all other forms of fishing, before we take our shot we know the size and species of the fish we are catching, thus eliminating any chance of bycatch. When I am lucky enough to catch a nice fish I am thankful because I know that success is not always the case. I often find myself standing empty handed on the shoreline. There is no other reward like catching and preparing your own food from our wonderful ocean.	Roy T. McDennon Jr. (cont'd)
23	N	I prefer to see at most, a SMCA designated adjacent to the Entire Salt Point State Park coastline. DP 1 (EC) - shift reserve to southern boundary north of Horseshoe Point and replace Salt Point SMP with a MSCA; DP 2 (JD) - Replace Salt Point SMP with a SMCA; DP 3 (TC) - Same as above; DP 4 (JC) - See comments regarding DP1 (EC); Ex Prop A - fine as is.	Subregion 2: Salt Point State Park offers me one of the few public access areas to the ocean on the Sonoma coastline. It offers both fishermen and divers the solitude opportunity to commune with nature.	DP 1 (EC) - shift reserve to southern boundary north of Horseshoe Point and replace Salt Point SMP with a MSCA; DP 2 (JD) - Replace Salt Point SMP with a SMCA; DP 3 (TC) - Same as above; DP 4 (JC) - See comments regarding DP1 (EC); Ex Prop A - fine as is.		Tom Krebs

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
24	N	As President of the Nor Cal Skindivers and as the Secretary of the Richmond Pelicans, I am here on behalf of these organizations to support the MLPA option to maintain open access, fishing and fishing-related activities in areas of Salt Point State Park ranging from Gerstle Cove and North. We urge the committee to consider these impacts when deciding the location of MLPA's and their use. Enforcement of boundaries will be problematic for the average sportsman. While effort has been made to create simple straightline boundaries based upon landmarks and by latitude many (most) do not have a GPS to determine latitude coordinates. "Sighting" of landmarks are also difficult from the water especially in adverse weather such as in foggy days. There should be physical bouy markers placed to clearly indicate MLPA boundaries.	Subregion 2: Collectively we are divers numbering over 50 who have reequented this region of Sonoma since the early 1960's. We visit these locations oten numerous times per month to enjoy recreational sport activities ahat include breathhold spearfishing, abalone/sea urchin/scallop diving, as well as kayak, motorboat fishing and boating. These sporting activities are highly dependent upon maintaining the current regulations that allow for the regulated take of marine life and our ability to access the rugged coastline. With respect to the latter, there are very few readily accessible areas that allow for boat and kayak launching. There are 5: Ross, Timber Cove, Stillwater Cove, Ocean Cove and Gerstle Cove. By taking away the GERstle Cove entry a significant portion of the coast will prevent kayak access to areas south (halfway to Ocean Cove and to a large region 12 miles north extending to Gualala. With access limited via Ocean Cove, an additional 2 miles of kayaking is necessary to reach the current launching area at Gerstle Cove. (continued in next row)	Of all 4 planned options I favor Proposal 2 (JD) which will best accomplish the MLPA and satisfy the issues stated above and attached.	Safety is a consideration. Frequently seas and winds unexpectedly change during the course of the day. It is not uncommon for beautiful calm oceans in the morning to turn to rough and windy by midday. Finally, this coastline region is heavily used by shorebased users. These line fishermen, spearfisherman and abalone divers will be impacted even more than boaters with the loss of easy shore access. Thank you for this open forum. This is a very constructive method to hear in-depth all of the views of stakeholders and internet individuals.	Brian Ishida
24 (cont'd)	N		Very few are capable of paddling this distance to reach current areas accessed through Gristle Cove. Without Gerstle Cove, the few who venture North are unlikely to exit at Gerstle Cove increasing the possibility of capsizing and exposure result in potential injury and loss of life.			Brian Ishida (cont'd)

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
25	N		North Central SR 1	I support draft proposal 3 (TC) as is.	At Petaluma, Feb. 4, 2008 - staff stated "MLPA does not deal with land and access issues." I think land/shore and access should be given considerable importance when creating reserves along shoreline where public access is limited and where there are by default existing reserves adjacent to shore access only users. Also when considering restrictions on recreational fishers (shoreline/kayak line/shore diver) that existing state, county and federal park lands are intended to allow recreational access to the ocean for activities such as recreational fishing. Please do not further restrict public access to recreational fishing.	David Whittington
26	N	would support continuation of Gerstle Cove as a "SMR"	SR 2: Gerstle Cove	I support draft proposal 3 (TC) but would support continuation of Gerstle Cove as a "SMR"		David Whittington
27	N		For example in Bodega Bay: should consider allowing prawn fishing where crab is proposed to be allowed.		In any proposal where crab fishing is proposed, I'd like to see prawn take included as well.	Edward Senf
28	N	The proposals in all drafts are excessive exclusion of shore/kayak fishers at the Bodega Head areas. I propose an SMR with North boundary at Mussel Point extending West to 123° 06' - South to Western; a line parallel to and running east to Bodega Head southern tip but not restricting southern Bodega Head beach access to shore fishers.	SR 3: Bodega Head			David Whittington
31	N				Create more state marine park areas that are more friendly to environmentally friendly fishing that is low impact. In specific, spearfishing. Also band spearfishing with "SCUBA" that gives the fisherman an extreme advantage. Since free diving, spearfishing is the most environmentally friendly way to fish.	Dunn Alexander

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
32	N		Saunders Reef	External A has no protection for Saunders Reef. This is a highly productive area of rock shoals with high habitat diversity.	I want to see high protection MPA's on our coast. Scientific consensus states that MPA's combined with fish species regulation are the only way to provide sustainable fisheries. A small number (> 4% of CA population) of recreational fishermen seem to demand and no closures of the majority of state residents desire a protected coast. Please implement the MLPA guidelines to the fullest extent possible.	Name withheld for fear of dockside retribution
33	N			I support Alternate Plan A. None of the other proposed plans look at two important aspects - safety and direct economic impact to the community. As much of the available area needs to remain open to allow the safe recreational harvest of abalone. Swell direction may change and the protected areas are prohibited that will force people to abalone dive or rock pick at potentially dangerous sites	Economic impact of any closures and reduced abalone grounds will greatly impact local communities dependent upon abalone diving. Ask any campsite and they will tell you they fill 100% when abalone season open. Abalone diving is the economic lifeblood of coastal Sonoma and Mendocino counties.	Kevin Sakuda
41	N		Fisk Mill needs to remain open for divers	I have been freediving the Sonoma County coast since 1972. From this background, I am strongly opposed to proposals 1 and 4 because they create no-take areas in the most easily accessible and most protected from high surf spots. Without these access points, more divers will have fatal experiences.		Doug Reynolds
42	N	Russian River in Proposal 3: against proposal because it closes down the area just north of the Russian River. This area is important to shore fishermen and divers.	Russian River	I am also against proposal 3 because it closes down the area just north of the Russian River. This area is important to shore fishermen and divers who can't spare the time & money involved with the long drive farther up the coast. Proposal 2 is the best compromise. It allows the majority of the people the best way to experience our resources.		Doug Reynolds
43	N			The impact of MPA's on other areas - what study was done on draft proposal 4 (JC). It is one of the most productive areas on the North coast.		Roy Spadoni

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
44	N			We support proposals 1, 3 and 4 with some reservations about 1's extensive SMRMA's - we want to make sure all coastal area armourins, seawalls, jetty's etc. are banned, yet all non-invasive recreational activities (surfing for example) are allowed without regulation. Any activities altering the natural changes of sand, reef movement should be restricted particularly in the Area 3		Michael Frey
46	N	Salmon Creek Estuary: support Proposals 1, 3 and 4 for SMR and SMCA	Salmon Creek Estuary	Support 1, 3 & 4 proposals for SMR & SMCA. Feel it is duplicated to have SMR go to the shoreline as it includes Salmon Creek Estuary where we are trying to restore the habitat for andronomous fish.	I found the single purpose attack mode, of the abalone divers very descriptive.	Norma Jellison
47	N		The strong protection west and south of Bodega Head is very good, especially because of the nearby marine lab.	The extension of SMR to the Salmon Creek Estuary is vital (Plan 3&)		Joe Mortenson
48	N	Russian River: SMR up the river are critical as in proposals 1 & 2 for over wintering birds and for otters.	The strong protection of the Russian River mouth and estuary will preserve conriorant colonies, the major sonoma county bird loafing site, as well as the harbor seals. That is wonderful.	Russian River: SMR up the river are critical as in proposals 1 & 2 for over wintering birds and for otters.		Joe Mortenson
49	N		What troubles me is the loss of protection of the steller sea lion colony at sea lio rocks, north of For Ross		As far as I know, this is the most southernly healthy colony of these sea lions in the world. This species has suffered decimation at both the Northern and Southern ends of its range. It suffers from boats that come too close to the rocks. (I know this is species mgt, but this is a very important site in a historically depleted marine mammal)	Joe Mortenson
50	N		Please make sure when evaluating option for Sea Ranch area, you look at enabling legislation that created public access there. The Bane Bill to insure what the access is allowed there. The Bill may have some requirement to allow recreational activities and sport fishing activities.			Jim McCray

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
51	N		Tomales Bay: "Conserving ecosystems" does not equal no activity" that disturbs any member of the ecosystem." Example: what is the rationale for restricting hunting waterfowl in south end of Tomales Bay? The harvest effect is already controlled by regulation. Potential disturbance of shore birds is momentary and could not have an effect on the ecosystem.			Mat Keller
52	N		Salt Point: Keep Salt Point state park open for recreational fishing and diving, facilities and safe access is most important.	Proposal 2 (JD) is somewhat agreeable	On the ground enforcement of these areas is critical. Don't create a poachers paradise. A budget, equipment & manpower should be top of the list issues	Dave Sereni Sr.
53	N	Oppose closure of Clam Island in Tomales Bay.	Oppose closure of Clam Island in Tomales Bay.			Dave Sereni Sr.
54	N		Subregion 1: It is important to keep Salt Point open to fishing, spearfishing, etc. given the existing access points, allowing the public safe and protected areas for use. Sea Ranch has limited public access with 5 public access areas with only 4-5 parking spots each.			Steve Werlin
55	N		Subregion 3: Tomales Bay	Proposal 1 (EC) which requests closure of Clam Island makes no sense. As a long time resident and user of Tomales Bay the use of Clam Island does impact on and has affected the seal population or seal haul-out which has gone on successfully for decades. Proposal 2(JD) allows ongoing recreational use for salmon, crab and halibut in this important accessible area.		Steve Werlin

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
56	N	I see the JC and EC have large SMR'S near Black Point and encompassing all state waters. This is some of this regions most productive crab grounds and will create a socioeconomic hardship on the local fishing ports, namely Bodega Bay. This area also has a large Kelp bed 20 miles long on either side of this SMR. This kelp will tear off in heavy swells and drag hundreds of pots into this SMR. Normally fishermen will drive through this area and clean up these pots before July 1st. How will this cleanup happen if boats can't fish or pull traps in this SMR?? If several pots of one vessel are lost accidentally in this area, will this person receive a citation? I see enforcement (or lack of) being a major issue on this whole process.	Black Point		Fast Tracked	Erik S. Owen
57	N	It seems like a much larger percentage of area is taken north of Pt. Reyes rather than south of Pt. Reyes	Pt. Reyes		Fast Tracked	Erik S. Owen
58	N	Clamming, fishing and crabbing etc. should be left along in Tomales Bay	Tomales Bay			Cameron Vogler
59	N	Clam Island State Marine Recreational Management Area - bad idea unless you want to shift current clamming activities to new areas including Tomales Point and eelgrass beds further in bay. Existing clamming activities pose no threat to resources as there has been an increase in clams and seals in area over last 50 years even though numbers of people have increased.	Subregion 3	Draft Proposal 1 (EC)		

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
60	N	Therefore proposal 2 is acceptable if the Salt Pt. SMP is changed to a SMCA that allows public fishing and diving	The salt pt. vicinity (Black Pt. to South of Salt Park) is an important recreational/public access area.	Proposal 2 (JD) is somewhat agreeable		Mike Malone
61	N		Bodega Head: This is the only safe access for small skiffs between SF and Ft. Bragg.	All of the proposals provide enormous impact local bottom fishing areas. The proposals appear to have a bias favoring the UC Davis Marine Lab. I would propose that the "lab be provided: with the area west from Mussel Point to just north of the Bodega head parking lot.		Mike Malone
62	N			This late in the process it appears the political process is alive and well. The 5 proposals SHOULD be given equal weight and one should not be singled out as Proposal 1, 2, 3, 4 and of course the external A. Proposals #2 (JD) and External A seem to be the best balanced and should be 2 of the 3 that will be submitted.	The MPA disrupts the Democratic process by allowing external funding. 1) Yes a law was passed. 2) No the state has not provided full funding. Basic civics class teaches to kill laws. One method is to not fund it. If Californians wanted the MPA's the citizens would demand the state to fund it, not the Packard foundation. Since the state did not fully fund this, are the private organizations going to continue to fund after the MPA's are created? With the state closing parks and cutting wardens it seems unlikely they will fund this going forward. The expectation is a sustainable fishery otherwise the DFG should not be managing this. If these are ecosystem reserves the DFG has a conflict of interest. I believe the MPA process is necessary to provide a long-term sustainable fishery. This should not be a NIMBY political process like we saw with the central coast MPA's. If the DFG, enforcement and management is not funded fully now and in the future, the MPA's will become a poachers paradise. (continued in next row)	Doug Wilgis

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
62 (cont'd)	N				A 3-5 year review is too long for the initial reviews. Just look to the Delta pumping that was supposed to not impact the delta. Just 5-6 months later the ecosystem is crashing. The initial review needs to be every 6 months for the first 3-5 years and then look at the science to set the ongoing frequency. The Oceans need a SINGLE steward not a piecemeal approach. I am amazed we have bottom trawling just 3 miles outside of the golden gate. Talk about an elephant in the room...	Doug Wilgis (cont'd)
63	N	Sustainable fishing is part of ecosystem. Aren't the closed seasons effectively 100% SMR. Why do we need more?	Subregion 1: Proposal 1 - this proposal does way too much. Simply not needed because most smaller boats can't even go that far. Proposal 2 - appears to meet the guidelines of the MLPA without over restrictions.	Given that the entire MLPA process is funded by external groups, I do not understand why you only call option 5 "external proposal A." It kind of makes it look like a black sheep proposal. Proposal 4 extends too high on the salt to black point SMR. This area receives lite use just based on the distance from any landing. Recreational fishing should be allowed.	There is a lot of distrust of this process. The fear is that the hard work of the regional task force will be ignored by the BRTF or the DFG commission.	Eric Petereit
69	N	See Point Arena Fisherman's proposal				Allan Jacobs
70	N				Besides goals, what needs improvement in the sea life in these areas? That would be a basis for understanding future fish and marine life...and for making MPA's. Transit with legal caught fish through red zones also important	Dave Tettleton
72	N		Richardson Ranches (Salt Pt. to Black Pt.): By closing the entire 6 mile stretch of Richardson Ranches (Salt Pt. to Black Pt.) does absolutely nothing to enhance fish populations. If it hasn't done so in the last 125 years, then what could possibly make anyone thing that it could in the future?	I am affected by the Saunder's Reef Proposal.	It is a slap in the face to an old established hard working ranch family who has protected and maintained an abundant eco system for 125 years. Not to allow them to continue to sustain themselves by catching their own food. Then to turn around and expect them to stand guard over "your reserve." How dare you! They keep the balance.	Cate Carre

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
73	N		Subregion 1: Point Arena to Horseshoe point - External proposal A does the least amount of damage to everyone.	Thank you for considering Allan Jacobs Proposal (Point Arena). He has lived and fished here for some 25 years. I think it takes that combination of knowledge about our fishery and coastline to put something as difficult as this together.	We need our small commercial fisherman, who can't possibly be interfering with the eco system. They supply our local grocery stores, restaurants and people on the street with fresh fish. The more they distribute locally, the less we have to ship in by dirty diesel trucks pounding up/down Hwy. 1 on our delicate crumbling Jenner Grade. I fish too. The fish I catch, my vegetable garden and orchard are very very important to me. As with many of us who live here on the coast who are trying to be as "green" and self sufficient as possible. We can't afford nor do we want to buy fish that's been shipped in from Canada, Alaska, etc.	Cate Carre
74	N	Alder Creek to Horseshoe Point - Proposal 2 (JD) - Black Point SMCA could be moved farther north to protect Seal Rookery, birds that nest off of Gualala Point and migratory steelhead at the mouth of the Gualala River. Point Arena SMF could be made a little smaller, "Allen Jacobs Proposal" is best for this area.			Not near enough local people on the "stakeholders" group who are knowledgeable about our small delicate communities, fisheries, history, poaching problems, lack of enforcement problems, etc. Too many stakeholders with no ears.	Cate Carre
75	N		Proposal 1 (EC) Sea Ranch to Salt Point SMR - This proposal is down right greedy. To not be able to take anything in an area so abundant cannot be healthy either.			Cate Carre
76	N				I hear a lot of talk about SMR's, SMCA's, etc. but without a huge increase of game wardens enforcing the law in the field that all this is talk. Closing all SMR's to crossing if you have legally caught fish, abalone on board. You are giving poachers an open hand. During low visibility you could enter a SMR then bump out to a legal zone fisherman on a general when a strict limit or close zone is implemented and will self regulate.	Vince Kreger

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
77	N		<p>I have some concern over the comment made regarding the Stornetta Ranch. Not only am I a member of the Richardson Family, I am also a member of the Stornetta Family as well. Growing up on the coast I was fortunate to be a part of two great family's that made conservation their first priority when it came down to managing their properties.</p> <p>I cannot speak for the Stornetta family, however I do know that after all their years of hard work keeping the ranch pristine and preserving the marine ecosystem, they did not expect or intend for divers to rape and pillage the property when it became open to the public.</p> <p>I am very concerned and determined to see this property put into an completely protected area. I do not feel that the state should bend over backwards to allow divers to continue to degrade this property in this manner.</p>			Kelly Richardson
78	N		<p>The Stewarts Point area has been stewarded for generations and is in excellent resource health. To punish these actions by closing these areas to the very people that have protected it is a travesty which should not be allowed to happen here.</p>		<p>I have lived and worked on a ranch bordering a proposed control area for 30+ yers. In that time I have seen the impact on public access areas surrounding our ranch. It seems to me those areas are what the primary goal fo the MLPA that is "to benefit" the eco system should be focused. To create a reserve in an area which one already exists seems redundant.</p>	John M. Browne
79	N		<p>Fish Rock Island and Anchor Bay area: The process is looking good. My concern is about the birds's on Fish Rock Islands. If you make it a SMR it would hurt the Anchor Bay area.</p>			Rod Rodinsky

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
80	N	Salt Point SP should remain open (as a SMP) for divers etc. Areas already protected by (defacto) limitations to take, such as private property, should be made into SMR's. If State Park areas are completely protected, take will increase in areas limited by private property access, essentially reversing the ecological status of the two areas.			Additionally the socio economic impacts to the small towns in this area that rely on recreational divers would be great. This process seems like one of "manufacturing consent." The leadership at the top of this initiative have already a plan. They just need to make the public agree.	Dave Wright
81	N				I do not own ocean property and don't fish or dive. There were many questions raised about allowing property owners/recreational use of the beaches and shallows (ribbon concept). Suggest you find a way to allow "ribbons." You need to build in enforcement. Large groups from out of the area swarm here on weekends to poach abalone - no enforcement. Local people want to conserve resources. DFG should be perceived as help, not as the enemy. Get buy-in from the locals by thinking of them in your planning.	Laurie Mueller
82	N		If you close the majority of the Sea Ranch off to off-shore fishing and abalone diving, have you thought about the impact that it would make to the city of Gualala - Restaurants, lodging, specialty shops, etc. A lot of recreation ocean people come to this area to dive and fish.		Why take public access away from the public who wish to fish from the shore or go into the water from the shore to obtain abalone. Private property owners also should be able to fish from the shore and go into the water from their shoreline to go for abalone. Can you consider putting the boundary lines when set away from the shore (50-100 yards) so shoreline can be used. Someone came to the table and talked about the ribbon concepts - sounds like the answer.	Susan Walton
83	N		I have been using the ocean from Bodega to West Port since 1941 for sport fishing abalone, camping and swimming. I would like my grandkids to have the same use. If you cut into abalone and rock fishing in Gualala area it will dry up and blow away			Howard E. Fisher Jr.

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
84	N	Please keep areas with safe public shore access open for the public to enjoy consumptive uses, provided that ecocystems can be equally protected. I recommend putting an SMR along Stewarts Point vs.putting it at Sea Ranch.	Stewarts Point / Sea Ranch			Jack Likins
85	N		The Sea Ranch	External proposal A has the worst impact on public safety if the Sea Ranch access are closed to fishing		John C. Nelson
86	N	Some areas to the South of Black Point now have limited access and could naturally best fit SMR's don't unnecessarily stop shore based fishing/abalone diving	Black Point	Draft Proposal 4 makes the most sense but would be better to include more of the area just north of senner.		John C. Nelson
87	N	For all proposals: No placement of new MPA's off the Sea Ranch from Black Point North, or the Salt Point Northern boundary to Southern boundary of Fort Ross State Park. This maximizes public use and access from shore and still allows adequate areas for MPA placement.	The Sea Ranch, North of Black Point, Salt Point State Park, South to the South boundary of Fort Ross State Park	For all proposals leave those areas that have historically been accessible to the land based public, open for recreational fishing and diving. There is adequate coastal areas to meet the goals of the MPA where the shoreline is not accessible to the land based public doe to geographical barriers to private property. This provides access to the largest population of the public, which is the shore based public.	There is a lack of input from local public safety agencies who will have to deal with the aftermath of these MPA placements. If public access is denied to areas that have historically been open to the land based public, human behavior will change in ways you may not anticipate.	Roger V. Rude
88	N				MLPA to be preserves just off shore and leave inland shore for recreation fishing. Make all near shore fishing closed for 2 years, open 1 year, then close for 2 years. Rotate all fishing rights. Leave outside for commercial. Limit reduction instead of MLPA. Why MLPA's in fron of private lands only. They are already protected better than anything.	Gregg Warner
89	N	Sea Ranch recently added a safety dimension not provided by private property.	Public access is mandated at Sea Ranch. Private land does not do this! A ribbon narrow to shoreline for Abalone			Lee Walter

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
90	N		Point Arena	A proposal by the fisherman and people of Point Arena was submitted on 2/5/08. It is my belief this will be the best proposal to consider as it was prepared by the real people that is going to be affected and have to make a living in this area they are compromising and trying to bargain. They are very well informed and conscious of the impact of environment on this area. As alternative proposal 1 (EC)		Yolanda Orozco
91	N		The committee has to listen to the public (local) input on Subregion 1 regarding safety issues. Having the only public boat ramp in the middle, surrounded by reserves. The next public boat ramp is 30 miles North, 50 miles South.	All proposals give too much percentage to reserves.		Jason Spanegler
93	N		Sea Ranch		Two areas South of Del Mar State perserve are 2 harbor seal rookeries (named Green Cove and Tidepool Rookeries) - birthing/nursing are non-consumptive/educational/protedted ecological interests. The 12 year harbor seal pupping docent program is asking for a seasonal closure of all extractive activity at those 2 sites-April & May. I don't see it on the maps, even as proposed? Please get this input to a group or discipline who might do this.	Sandra Bush

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
94	N	The Saunder's Reef area is very windy in the Spring and Summer. There is little impact on this area from recreational fishers. It is presently <u>ade facto</u> SMR. Sail Rock is a distinctive landmark in the southern part of the proposed SMCA's. This Sail Rock would make a good southern boundary for the SMCA at Saunder's Reef. The differences are small between the proposed SMCA and similar SMCA with Sail Rock as the Southern boundary. The fishers from Anchor Bay Campground and elsewhere would find it easier to orient to the SMCA and not violate the SMCA	The Anchor Bay Campground Fishery for all species appears to be sustainable and the people that come there to enjoy it, weather permitting, bring about \$600,000 per year to the local economy. Because strong spring and summer winds and high seas created by them keep recreational fishers and divers off the water except for 60-100 days each year, the fishery remains sustainable. In the winter, the winter sea and swell wash out the sand beach and it becomes impossible to store small boats on the beach and launch them over the exposed rocks. Because there are no winter protected launch areas north of the Russian River, there is little take from this area in winter months		The RSG, SAT & BRTF appear open to public input to the MLPA process. They have acted positively to preserve the sustainable and local economic value of the Anchor Bay Campground Fishery.	Jerry Norton
95	N				How were the areas designated? Why were they placed in areas already protected by private landholders? If the MPA's are placed there, will the commission evaluate the areas to allow some recreational take in these areas? How are you going to enforce these areas when there are no game wardens on the coast due to cost of living and housing. Is enforcement going to be involved in placing the areas? There needs to be some enforcement guidance in enforceable points of location of boundaries not just GPS on some chart on water. Has there been stucied done of the effects on tourism in these local area businesses?	Danny Reno
96	N		Stewarts Point/Sea Ranch		Tweek existing Fish & Games rules and laws to adjust problem areas rather than shotgun approach. SMR should be able to walk on beach or swim when ever safe	Tom Falk

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
97	N			Proposal 0 is my first choice; External A is my first choice if we have to have a change in zoning; I like JD if you move the red zone near Sea Ranch to the North end of Sea Ranch; EC needs to redo the red zone in the southern part of subregion 1. Try moving red zone into northern Sea Ranch and mouth of Gualala River. Blue Zone allowing fishing and abalonying South of Sea Ranch and in Southern Sea Ranch.; JC - Saunder's Reef fishing and abalone - protected by landowners. Move red zone to Northern end of Sea Ranch & blue zone South of Sea Ranch with abalonying and shore fishing - protected by landowners.	Regional stakeholders are doing a great job so far. But more tweaking is necessary to resolve the excess red zones that punish all users of the <u>public</u> trust resources.	Nancy Ratcliff
98	N		Adjusting the placement of MPA's to total around 20% per subregion. Evaluation of the Point Arena Fisherman proposal by the SAT and integration of this proposal by the NCCRSO. Keeping the area west of 123.45.00 open to salmon trolling at latitudes 38.56.40 to 39.00.00 N. (Public comment made at the Gualala MLPA meeting on February 5 08 by harbormaster Peter Bogdahn		The Point Arena Harbormaster's office requests that the following items be taken into consideration in further Draft designs of MPA's in subregion 1: Resolution No. 2008-01 passed by our city council on January 29, 2008. Additional language in MPA descriptions, legalizing the transit of protected areas with catch on board.	Peter Bogdahn - Point Arena Harbormaster's Office
99	N		North Subregion: What about "long line" fishermen - boats close to shore taking all fish on stringer lines with hundreds of hooks non-discriminating small fish/large fish?	I support Alan Jacobs Pt. Arena proposal; Second choice draft proposal 2; Third choice draft proposal External A.	I am a coastal property owner and have with my fellow owners kept our property as a conservation area with very little usage of any kind - limited fishing and abalone gathering since 1965 - it is gated and protected the land has small access to the beach, and we tread very lightly on the land itself with no excesses.	Pauline (Polly) Dakin
100	N		Sea Ranch	None of the proposals except A seem to address that area at all and A is a year round proposal.	What happened to the request for some partial-year protection for the seal rookeries on the Sea Ranch Coast?	Elaine Lawson

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
102	N			I encourage proposals 0, 2(JD) and External Proposal A (in that order); Proposal 1 (EC) this proposal is protecting areas that are already protected by private property owners; Proposal 3 (TC) same as above; Proposal 4 (JC) this proposal is targeting the Richardson properties.	What needs to happen to increase the abundance of Marine life along the North coast is to shut off public access areas which have the heaviest impact. Leave open the other areas that have no public access. That will increase populations. There is no scientific data that represents the goals of the MLPA or future goals. COMMON SENSE!!! There is no need to protect areas that are already protected by private property. These areas are rich in marine life more so than areas with public access. There needs to be more scientific data to better represent the MLPA.	Daniel Falk
103	N			I like Allen Jacob's proposal for our area.	As a newby to this whole protection act, I am very impressed with the passion on both sides. I like the idea of the committee's ears to hear all the issues and hardship of our area. With that in mind, I can see no reason, once all is heard and proposed that we cannot reach a proposal to fit each needs. I thank this committee for all the time and commitment put into view to reach everyone's passion	Theresa Cannon
104	N		On all options set the southern boundary of the Saunder's Reef area at Sail Rock 38* 50`	I support the Point Arena Fishermen's proposal. This option provides safe fishing areas that have been and are very productive.	Due to current stringent regulations on rockfish and the limited number of days the area is fishable due to frequent high winds and wakes, the rockfish resource is not threatened. Allow some key areas to allow a "ribbon" that allows rockfishing. These could just be a few key coves, not entire property lines.	Craig Bell MCF&GC
106	N		I would just like to let the panel know that no less than 33% of my business is from fishing and ab diving. I am willing to share the last five years of my books to show this. Most of this comes from the Sea Ranch.			Yvette White - Gualala Sport & Tackle

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
107	N		Subregion 1	I support draft proposal 1 because it includes protection for Arena Rock yet still allows commercial salmon trawling west of 123.45.00. However it is essential to allow transit over protected areas with protected organisms legally caught. Personally, I support the protection of Sea Lion Cove as seen in Draft Proposal 4. Draft Proposal 2 has a preferable southern border to the Saunder's Reef SMCA at 38° 50' which coincides with Sail Rock.		Leslie Dahlhoff
108	N		I am a property owner in Gualala and Point Arena. Like so many of us, we moved here to live a more healthy life by growing and gathering our own food. Our goal is to attain a lifestyle which is centered on eating foods within our own foodshed. Now our access to these resources may be greatly limited by the enforcement of the Marine Life Protection Act. Furthermore, The implementation of the MLPA will have negative economic impacts on Pt Arena & Gualala. If fishing grounds are limited & we have less fisherman - the Pt Arena Pier will not be able to support itself. This will also impact businesses at the pier. Coastal residents will lose their ability to purchase fresh, local fish. The MPA proposals show that they want at least 50% of our coastline from Pt Arena to Gualala. Doesn't it make sense that instead of restricting our area which has low populations & high resources to focusing on those areas which are densely populated & whose resources are more threatened. (continued in next row)	I have attended numerous meetings and conferences in the last few weeks to learn about the Marine Life Protection Act, the proposed areas for preservation, and how the implementation of these proposals will effect our community and my lifestyle. I am very concerned that the MLPA proposals will drastically limit the accessibility of commercial and sport fishing and diving grounds. I believe in the goal of the MLPA which is to develop and maintain a network of marine protected areas to protect our waters from the threat of coastal development, water pollution and other human activities. However after hearing and seeing the proposed areas I feel like they are trying to take too much of our most premium areas.	I feel the decision process is being presented as if it were fair but in reality they picked their own judges (Blue Ribbon Task Force) and jury (Stakeholders). It seems the decisions have already been made and the public has no influence. I don't feel I can trust the process which is over weighted by big government bureaucracy and kelp hugging scientist. PS: MLPA web page server is always down. How can there be Public involvement????	Chris SanGiovanni - Independent Coast Observer

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
108 (cont'd)	N		Due to wind and tide elements, the predominant fishing grounds for Pt Arena fisherman are just north of Pt Arena Cove - this is the same area that the MLPA are proposing to close. If our fishing grounds were closed to the north it would force us to fish south of the Cove. Due to the winds and currents this could inhibit our safe return. This would also force fisherman to go around the preserve areas which would be more costly and a greater risk..			Chris SanGiovanni - Independent Coast Observer (cont'd)
116	N			Prop -4: As a recreational abalone diver I strongly encourage the Fish and Game Commission to adopt proposal 4. Proposal 4 provides the strongest protection for the future of the abalone fishery.		Sarah Lenz
123	N		Most important is the access for Salt Point Arena for fishing and abalone.	I would urge acceptance and preference status for proposal JD.		Allen Bushnell
124	N		The nearby Sea Ranch closure makes more sense though I would prefer no closures. Sea Ranch has far less public access and is geographically situated so as to provide less protected conditions, hence less			Allen Bushnell

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
158	N			All proposals encompass Bodega Head! This is major harbor with may small boats some as small as 12' long with small motors. Doran Park (Sonoma County) is the launching point. The proposals 1, 3 & 4, have SMR & SMCA at Double pt. & Pt Reyes all the proposals bypass <u>Tomales Pt.</u> which is a <u>State Park</u> a few folk fish off of shore, but it is rarely fished because of strong NW winds. If people are forced to fish off Tomales because the area off Bodega Head is closed you will end up with safety issues. this makes no sense? Are there special Rocks off Bodega Head? Also, the major Salmon run occurs inshore in this area in June, July & August. Lots of small boasts fish this inshore Salmon run! I see no logical reason if spacing requirements need to be met to have Tomales Pt protected vs. Bodega Head. As it seems that Pt Reyes & Double pt. are about the same distance from each other.		Mike LaRocco
159	N	Draft Proposal 4 Tomales Bay State Marine Reserve there is motion of phasing out Duck hunting with a separate regulation process? Is the State proposing this or the drafters of the proposal? I will contact California Waterfowl Assoc. & CA Outdoor Heritage Alliance about this			The proposed 50m "Rule" (to reduce by catch?) on Salmon trolling in SMCA and how a few of the scientist on the SAT pushed it through without <u>any</u> science! More folks than you know are following the antics!	Mike LaRocco
160	N			As an NCKA member I support proposal #2 (JD).		Angel Reyes
161	N			I feel good about plan 2 (JD) & plan 3 (TC) in that order		Ernest Mumez

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
162	N		Close Pt. Reyes as it's remote and pristine keep Salt Point and Sea Ranch open. Pt Arena is the most important ecological site on the coast if it is taken away 100% there can be no valid scientific direct comparison between reserves and non-reserves.	External A is the best. Abalone diving and kayak fishing is very important economically and there areas look to take ten away. I think they should put reserves towards Pt. Reyes and not impact important economically easy access locations. External A is the best.	ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM= the MLPA process disproportionately impacts blue-color and middle class citizens. The MLPA implementation is funded by Trust money and not by taxpayers.	Mike Hatchor
163	N		Arena Rock - this area has the only boat launch within 2 hr. drive of the area . Propose leaving this open with restrictions, (labor day to memorial day) or open in summer - one option would be to have it open even years only.			David Graham
164	N			Prop 1 (EC): Too protective and a huge loss at Salt Point. Prop 2 (JD) Our favorite! Prop-p 3 (TC): Has little impact to us w.minor constraints around Salt Point. Okay! Prop 4 (JC): No way! Losses near Salt Point & area sought of Golden Gate too big.	I moderate an online kayak fishing community. Safe access points are important and our range is limited. Our environmental impact is relatively low compared to commercial & recreational fisherman on power boats.	Chuck Espirity
165	N			Member of Nor Cal kayak anglers (NCKA.ORG) I support Prop 1 (EC) and prop 2 (JD)		Joel Lotilla
166	N			Member of Nor Cal kayak anglers (NCKA.ORG) I support Prop 1 (EC) and prop 2 (JD)		Joel H. Lotilla
167	N			As a member of the Norcal Kayak Anglers (NCKA) I support JD over the other initiatives. I want to voice my extreme concern with access to the areas. I feel that proposal EC is going to be detrimental to safe usage of the resources.	It is also disappointing that the meetings are only being held on the coast regions. I live in the Central Valley. It absurd to expect the public will be able to attend weekday meetings 2 - 4 hrs from where we live a& work. Typically we Central Valley users will spend a larger amount of money because the usage trips are weekends to weeks at a time.	Brian Gardner

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
168	N				<p>This process should <u>not</u> be decided by "they have money and private property should have to pay also". Example I heard was targeted at Sea Ranch cuz they have and we don't. California law should not be decided by private property. Also Leopold stated a century ago (The father of conservation) "That may wild game stocks will eventually harbored on private property The reason was because private property owner have their property resource controlled for their long term interest". This transcribes to private property along the coast as well. Apparently - So just because one was controlled their area up till now - let's close it <u>isnot</u> good science. You need to adjust abalone based on their resource numbers not on private property hatred. Suggestion move the closure out and abalone way from <u>where</u> the populations are strong. snide mope - How can we control /enforce an MLPA when a lack of abalone on any north coast area is <u>due</u> to poaching.</p>	Rick Copeland
169	N			I am in preference of the <u>JD</u> proposal for all of the subregions. I am a kayak fisherman of Northern California and safe access is very important.		Adam Coca

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
170	N	I'll keep my comments to a narrow focus. I would encourage each proposal to keep Salt Point State Park open to recreational fishing in this entirely as is done in Proposal A, TC and JD. This would allow the current recreational activities to continue to economically support the area. I would also keep open safe access in an area that is currently policed by State Park Personnel. the park has it's own rules as well as being covered by DFG regulations, so at the least DFG regulation should protect the area to maintain sustainable Sea Life populations				Dale DellaRosa
171	N			I believe proposal #3 to be the best. Fish mill is a safe place to enter & exit the water even on rough days (abalone Diving). The public access is already in place that launching boats from Ocean Cove (an at least go a bit further than Salt Point. By going north it makes for a safer ride back because of the afternoon swell & winds. Going south can be hazardous when the winds come up (when you try to return)		Dwayne Dinecci
172	N				I would like to see public access to share fishing and diving kept open for people that do not own ocean front property. I believe that we should meet the MLPA objectives. Conservation is our /my duty and concern. The dynamics behind the selection process is compromise and balance. If they close Sea Ranch with safe public access points safety should be a concern. If they close private property such as Richardson Ranch, it impacts the public much less. Also, closing private property would drastically lower property values.	Alan Jay

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
173	N			I strongly oppose draft proposal 4 (JC) I suggest proposal 3 (TC). As a recreational fisherman and abalone diver, proposal 4 closes of access to dive spots that provide a safe & sheltered entry when dive conditions may be dangerous else where. Specifically Fish Mill is sheltered from Northern swells making it safe. By closing this area, you will be forcing divers to take some unnecessary risks by going into areas. When at least two people drown a year during abalone season, shutting off Fish Mill may cause more accidents.		Albert Larcina
174	N			Proposal 1 (EC) 2nd Best choice " 2 (JD) 3rd best option " 3 (TC) 4th Best option " 4 (JD) 1st choice External P.A Don't consider	Based on recent studies the protection of large areas will have a long term economic - positive effect for the consumptive users who are effected in the short term. The whole area has many areas which will remain open to consumptive use. The protected areas will provide necessary recruitment and protected habitat for breeding age species to gather in concentrations which promote maximum spawn to replenish the "take areas". Please Fund adequate enforcement!	James Wilson
175	N		Salt Point in my opinion is one of the top 2 kayak fishing areas in Sonoma County.	I support plans that meet the MLPA objectives while providing reasonable access for recreation fishing. I feel Salt Point State Park waters should be put in a recreational only MPA (preferably a conservation MPA) so shore and kayak recreational fishermen continue to be able to enjoy safe & inexpensive access to fishing fun. It appears plans 2 & 3 leave this area open. I would ask plans 1 & 4 to considering moving their Salt Point Reserve southern boundary to approximately latitude N 38° 37 which is the approximate northern boundary of Salt Point State Park.		Dave Edlund

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
155	N	Tomales SMR (Proposal 4), the reference to the "phasing" out of duck hunting. That language needs to definitely be struck! Who is going to initiate this regulatory process? The drafters of the proposal or the State of CA? Please tell me so I can direct Calif Waterfowl Assoc. and the CA Outdoor Heritage Alliance attorneys to the proper channels!			Most all of them include Bodega Head, is this because the marine lab s there? Tamales Pt. would be a better site, all you will accomplish is giving people citations for fishing in a highly populated & congested area? The major Salmon Run is June - Aug. and may small boats (12' - 16') fish . This run . What are they trying to protect? This area is "over fished" in Regards to Rockfish vs. Tamales Pt. A marine Reserve at Bodega Head will destroy the only Salmon fishing people who don't have "Big Boats" have! Want more letter? You will get them!	Mike LaRocco
39	N				Abalone take areas - the major/majority of concerns voiced tonight. Any closure of(Public Access Area) will put additional pressure on remaining public areas - thus devastating those remaining areas. I believe that limiting the number of punchcards per zone (as defined on the cards) would be a great resourse management tool. The deer tag application process for controlling the deer head could be used to manage the number of abalone taken per area.	Ed Schulze
40	N			I am in the favor of Proposals 0 and External A	I think Fish and Game has done a good job protecting the abalone fishery and should not be further restricted. Is there going to be any management of predators. Fifty years ago we had lots of salmon and not many seal and sea lions. There needs to be some management. I still think adjacent coast land owners should be part of the stakeholders group.	Al Gerhardt
34	N		Will the undersea canyon off Salt Point be considered for an underwater park?	Proposal 3 (TC) and (south) proposal 3(TC) are a start	Has any consideration of protected areas being considered at the discharge area of smaller coastal streams?	Bill Kortum
35	N		Will the underwater ridge offshore above the VC Bodega lab be considered			Bill Kortum
36	N		Will the underwater ridge between Bodega Head and the north tip of Point Reyes be considered			Bill Kortum

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
37	N		Protection of Gerstle Cove is a classical reason and example for protection.			Bill Kortum
128	N & F				Why don't we look at the S. F. Bay as part of the problem.	Gino Guerre
13	N & F		I am an eco tour operator, my concerns involve the Farallon Islands and both North and S.E. I am worried about closures of the islands as it stands I operate one of the dedicated shark viewing boats and off season we dive recreationally. Closure would shut us down, resulting in lost jobs and worse, loss of our educational opportunity we supply. We run a full educational program including biologists, naturalists and literature.	Draft proposal 1 (EC) and 2 (JD) seem decent.	We actually promote several of the goals of the MLPA and should be utilized rather than penalized. Read goal #3 on the MLPA handout. Things are getting lost in the cracks in some cases and we are a good example. The eco tour operators as a rule haven't gotten much coverage.	Greg Barron
156	N & S	With regard to individual MPAs I will only comment on Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. This stretch of the coast - from Pillar Point up to Shelter Cove - is a particularly habitat -rich species-rich area. We would like to see strong ("very high") protection for a large portion of this area as we feel that it could particularly benefit and see great recovery.			Surfrider Foundation encourages the adoption of a proposal that scores high marks with the SAT in the categories that pertain to the biological strength of the network, was low economic impacts, and enjoys broad-based support. Right now, it seems that proposals 1,3 & 4 come closest to meeting those goals. While I appreciate the effort to engage the larger public w/ this 3 day workshop series, I personally feel it is grossly inadequate. There are many members of the public who are not represented (or don't consider themselves represented) by the RSG or various clubs *Have more evening/weekend workshop opportunities!*	Sarah Corbin
38	N & S				Abalone should not be restricted any more than it currently is restricted. It should be allowed in all areas which are not in an existing "reserve". Even in areas where abalone diving is allowed, they are protected at depths deeper than divers can dive ~ 30 ft. So...the ecosystem is protected in areas where abalone are taken. Abalone diving is as low impact as most "non consumptive" uses.	Dennis Viglienzone
8	S	Point Reyes: We can support the SMR as in Proposal 1 (EC)	Point Reyes	We can support the SMR as in Proposal 1 (EC)		Milo Vukovich

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
9	S	Fitzgerald: We support the SMR and SMCA as shown in 2 (JD)	Fitzgerald	We support the SMR and SMCA as shown in 2 (JD)		Milo Vukovich
17	S		Subregion 3: Bodega Head to Double Point Support protect for estuaries including Drakes, San Antonio and Americano. Ditto for Duxbury Reef and Double Point with provisions for halibut fishing.	Support protect for estuaries including Drakes, San Antonio and Americano. Ditto for Duxbury Reef and Double Point with provisions for halibut fishing.	My main general comment is respect for all of the time and work that has gone into the process to try to do the right thing. We are facing a great deal of uncertainty due to climate change. So it is essential that we take this opportunity to build in the highest possible level of protection for species and habitats that will be facing huge pressures due to global warming and consequent changes in the California current. I understand that local fishermen will also be facing (and are facing) pressures as a result of warming. But if we don't protect the habitats the fish rely on, they won't be left to fish.	David Loeb
18	S		Point Bonita Cove and Bird Island		Add special closure zone (no transit) around Bird Island around Pt. Bonita and including Point Bonita Cove to protect harbor seal haul-out in Point Bonita Cove, and seabird nesting and roosting on Bird Island. Significant disturbance in both areas is the result of boating too close to these sensitive resources. Bird Island is inaccessible from land, and Pt. Bonita Cove has been closed to access by land to protect the harbor seals. Recommend 1,000 ft. from shore and Bird Island be incorporated in special closure zone.	Daphne Hatch
19	S		San Pedro Rock & Devil's Slide Rock including mainland: Special closure zone needed to protect seabird nesting colonies. Recommend 1000 ft No-Transit Zone to be incorporated in this area			Daphne Hatch
45	S		Pt. Reyes	Note, rather than just Marinie proposals in #1 should specify harbor seals as the Russian River colony is second largest after Pt. Reyes. With respect to Russian River # 1&2 includes more than mouth in the SMR which is very important to the bird & marine mammal species that depend on the upriver portions of the estuary. Support 1 & 2 Russian River		Norma Jellison

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
66	S		Pt. Reyes		The issue of Drakes estero has been contentious exacerbated by the questionable science advanced by the NPS at Point Reyes. That fraudulent science has appeared in the MLPA scientific supporting data, even as the NPS themselves have removed those claims from their website. It is unacceptable that the MLPA has ignored the fact that the California Coastal commission has entered into consent decree and is satisfied with the stewardship of the DBOC. Lastly, the commercial oyster farm should remain indefinitely. There is not supporting science (valid and peer reviewed) that proves the farm is doing any damage at all. Lastly it is disgraceful that Sarah Allen has not recused herself from these proceedings, pending the outcome of the investigation by the inspector general of the department of the interior. Likewise, Don Neubacher is being investigated for wrong-doing by his department. Both should be removed from these proceedings.	Michael Greenberg
65	S		Pt. Reyes (chimney rock & south beach) to the first rocks is vital to the halibut fishermen in the area. Halibut is a low catch - high economic importance fish, critical to the survival of local communities.	Current proposals will threaten this fragile community fishing.		Jeremy Dierks
67	S		I am very concerned that the first 4 draft proposals designate Drakes Estero as a "no take" area where oyster farming has existed sustainably for over 80+ years. The science I believe the SAT is basing their recommendations on has been documented as flawed and needs to be re-reviewed with updated information/data. (I would be happy to provide your staff with this info.		I also find it alarming that two staff members from the PRNS sit on the SAT and Stakeholders groups respectively and are both being investigated by the National Academy of Sciences and the Dept. of the Interior Inspector General's office for scientific misconduct and data quality issues. I respectfully ask that they be excused from serving on MLPA project.	Donna Yamagata
68	S		Point Reyes Headlands - need chimney rock and west end where rock meets the beach FOR HALIBUT FISHING			Anonymous

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
109	S				I support the MPA's and the process. Thank you for the hard and comprehensive work. The educational outreach is working and more people are talking and involved which is good. There is a way for everyone to be happy -- NOT ECSTATIC - But happy enough to go on with life and be moving towards our shared goals of a Harmony Ocean Ecosystem. Thanks	Steven Harman
110	S		San Mateo coast & Peninsula: Primarily access points between Pescadero and the Pigeon Point Light House for rockfishing. Linda Man beach, north of Pedro Point for salmon, crab and rockfish. The Half Moon Bay, Pillar Point Harbor, is also a key access point for more or less experienced angler because of the weather protection.	Proposal (2) JD best suits my needs.	As a Kayak Angler/Spearfisherman/AB diver shore access to productive grounds is imperative. Due to our limited mobility and weather susceptibility our impact is limited. I reside in the South Bay and my primary launch areas are within the San Mateo Coast and Peninsula.	Arture Garcia
111	S		Fitzgerald: I have fished this area in the past and believe it's a good candidate for an MPA. The north boundary should remain near Montana State Beach to allow kayak anglers access to areas south of Pedro Point.		Weekend meetings would encourage participation from more stakeholders	Arture Garcia
112	S			Prop -4 California Coast Keeper Alliance (CCKA), represents twelve Waterkeeper organizations from the Oregon border to San Diego. We strongly support the MLPA process and support the highest level of protection through marine reserves. We support Proposal 4 (JC) because it meets the science standards and creates the highest percentage of marine reserves.		Angela Haren, CCKA
113	S			Prop -2 As a recreational, conservation minded, fisherman I want to continue to assure my children's access to a sustainable fishery. I would prefer Proposal 2 as it stands to the other proposals. I support a recreational vertical hook and live fishery techniques. I do not support, trawling, gillnetting or long lining. I believe that "bottom draggers" should be shut down & bought out that would be a better use of RLFF money.	My children enjoy the fishing outings because of the rest of the wildlife viewing, seals, whales, dolphins, etc. However without the prospect of catching wild fish we are not likely to make the effort to go out.	Jeff Richards

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
114	S			Prop -2 I support the lack of MPAs in the Bolinas and Duxbury Reef area.		Jeff Richards
115	S		As a small boat fisherman who fishes with his children I need Pillar Point and South open from MPAs. Pillar Point is my primary access point & I need to be able to fish close to the harbor for quick and safe return in the event of weather degradation.		I appreciate all of the effort that the MLPA team has devoted to the implementation process. I lament the need for private money funding the science. I greatly fear the ignorance of the well intentioned conservationists regarding the actual condition of these areas of California waters. They need to get better educated & less emotional.	Jeff Richards
117	S			Prop -4: I strongly encourage the Fish and Game Commission to adopt draft proposal 4. Proposal 4 includes the most diverse habitats which will provide protection for a wide diversity of species. This is our chance to preserve fishing for our future. the slow growing species need the largest possible area to recover their populations. The San Gregorio SMR provides important connectivity to other SMR's. Fitzgerald SMR is extremely important to foster recreational, educational and study opportunities. As a recreational abalone diver I have seen the extreme differences between not take zones (Gerstle Cove SMR) and take zones. I would like more opportunities to enjoy larger State Marine Reserves. Proposal 4 provides the best protection for marine mammals, seabirds and marine ecosystems.		Sarah Lenz
118	S		Sub -5: Specifically Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. I would like to see the boundary extended to South to the North end of the jetty. (South Maverik Beach)			Edmundo Larenas

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
119	S		The entire San Mateo Coast is an outstanding resource for wildlife education. It's visited by thousands of students from schools & colleges throughout the years. Some of these classroom trips are boat trips from Pillar Pt. Harbor. As one of the most diverse & accessible regions in California the San Mateo Coast is recognized by schools throughout the State as a valuable research & educational resource.	Prop -4 I want to support proposal #4 it gives the best science basis protection for 5 species of seals and sea lions, numerous marine bird species whales, dolphins, The Fitzgerald Marine Reserve at Moss Beach has been recognized by scientists from a cross the county as one of the most biodiversity of all California Ecosystems exceeded only by Point Lobos.	the near shore and intertidal region of the California Coast is one to the richest in the world, probably exceeded only by tropical coral reefs.	David Moore
121	S		I think the Pillar Point SMP Southern Boundary should be moved north at Tad, in order to open up the west side of Pillar Point	Again of any of these plans, I would have to support proposal JD.		Allen Bushnell
122	S				From discussion groups it was apparent the fishermen are alienated by the biological scientific methods. Complaints about scientific surveys being untimely (example given that canary rockfish are now abundant but this information is not known by "scientists" because recent surveys have not been done). Distrust in the scientific community (example given about biologists only surveying a site twice a year, whereas a fisherman is exposed to that site regularly so is better informed, in their opinion, about that site). Recommendation to educate fisherman about biological science so "environmentalists" and "fishermen" are working together with a common goal.	Amansba Jobbins

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
125	S		<p>Subregion -4 As a resident of Shelter Cove which is at Point San Pedro I witness the accessibility to fisher men and recreational use daily. It is a difficult area to access due to erosion of the main "private" road, as well as the no trespassing request of the owner. With this fact there are limited numbers of fishermen the fish along San Pedro Point. San Pedro Point is also federally protected by the BFLM(??) Historical Landmark Bureau(??) I don't know what type of protection this deems but I do know the limited access is positive to that need of protection. I also have the interest of local fishermen in mind because of my upbringing and friends that fish. I think this would limit them but also leave areas still open for them to use a draft that allows certain fishing</p>			Lizell Saure

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
126	S		<p>As a naturalist biologist and marine science educator there are many biological areas that are kept pristine around San Pedro Point and Shelter Cove because of limited access. There are tidepools, in shelter Cove that still have a range of species that have thrived. On the San Pedro Point Rock there are a few species of birds that breed and ween as well as rooksof seals. Along the rocks is a rich bed of kelp. Because this area is not commonly visited it could'nt hurt to make it a Marine Reserve to protect these ecosystems. If my definition of marine reserve does not limit recreational and some fishing and limits collecting.</p> <p>As far as I know from living at Shelter Cove & Pacifica for over 20 uears I don't know of much use between Graywhale Cove to Shelter Cove. There are some surf breaks & some fishing spots but again access is limited. As a surfer a reserve wouldn't affect those opportunities. Why does Draft 3 have to stop at Gray Whale Cove if the area between it & Shelter Cove isn't used much <u>BUT</u>, access to boat fishing should be accessible.</p>		I don't know but I think it's a useful way to educate and very important to share different points of view. My definition of a reserve was unclear before I wrote this.	Lizell Saure

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
131	S			<p>Proposal 4- preferred - most based on the science. Scientist recommend minimum of 9+ square miles, which 4 provides</p> <p>San Gregorio provides connectivity from Fitzgerald to Ano Nuevo</p> <p><u>Pescadero</u> is a rare, fairly intact estuary which should be preserved.</p> <p>We should preserve (to the greatest extent) irreplaceable resources such as <u>Fitzgerald</u>, very rich in diversity and serves as a breeding area for many species.</p> <p>#2 -Smallest area of highly protected area, this is a problem!</p> <p>Re-fishing - unlike mammals, the older and larger fish are the best breeders by far and taking larger fish decreases chances of continued fishery</p> <p>Catch and release has an 6% mortality which is cumulative and should <u>not</u> be allowed in no take area.</p> <p>#4 meets scientific standards compared to central Coast (South?) The economic impact of <u>all</u> of these - including #4 is <u>MUCH LOWER</u> than other areas, so maximum protection still preserves majority of economic value.</p> <p>(continued in next row)</p>		Wendi Shafir
131 (cont'd)	S			<p>For really long term - to reverse the catastrophic decline of fisheries we should take this opportunity - including San Gregorio - since this is an adaptive process - if fisheries recover, can re-open to some kinds of fishing Note - Species in this area are long - lived so recovery is not expected in only 5 years - more like 20. San Gregorio - benefit - low impact upland - jacent water quality + sewage out fall also replication - if Fitzgerald or Ano Nuevo fails need S. G.</p>		Wendi Shafir (cont'd)

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
133	S			#2 is the best balance for fishermen and conservation #1 + 3 take too much of the northern reefs that are the backbone of the small boat fishermen. In #4 the San Gregorio area is not needed for spacing and closes some of the better deep water area.		Mike Girauda
134	S			Of the draft proposals available, draft proposal 2 (JD) Jade D offers the best balance of habitat protection vs access and socio costs. I support Jade D strongly.		Steve Dillon
135	S			#2 (JD) is the best proposal for all fisherman, shore, boat and kayakers. #1 + 3 close off too much of the northern area reefs, this would have a negative impact on small boaters, kayakers and share fisherman. #4 pretty much the same as for 1 + 3. the San Gregorio area. San Gregorio provides reefs and the spacing is not needed. #2 presents the best balance for habitat protection and conservation.		Riev Bisio
136	S			Given the close proximity of Fitzgerald to and N. (approx 30 miles) I don't think a reserve or protected area at San Gregorio is necessary. I strongly support <u>proposal 2 (JD)</u> <u>Kayak fisherman need to have open access to fishing area that are close to our put-in spots</u>		Pierre Granier

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
137	S				I would like to see MPAs adopted that best protect diverts of species, and consider the long - term sustainability of the marine ecosystems as the overarching guiding principles. The MPAs need to be based on the best science and not on consumptive (extractive) uses	Lennie Roberts
138	S			California Trout does <u>not</u> support draft proposal (3 CTC) with respect to "No take" rules for Pescadero Estuary. Our reasons are outlined in the attached letter- Please realize there are already <u>very</u> restrictive rules on fishing for Steelhead. Further restriction will undercut local efforts at habitat restoration. If people cannot even "catch and release" Steelhead, they will not work on habitat restoration.	See attached letter - Re: NCCRSR Proposals for Pescadero Marsh From: Jerome Yesavage	Jerome Yesavage
139	S			I endorse proposal 4 (JD) because it appears to give the most protection to FMR. I would like to see the Pescadero Estuary added. Many, many students use this area too for outdoor ed- programs.	I am not a scientist. I am an educator. I run a nonprofit that takes students to Ano & FMR. We have sponsored 10,000 underserved students in 8 years. We take students to the coast because these field trips readily complement state content standards. Concepts such as adaptations in physical structure, food webs, environment determines survival rates -- all of these are beautifully explained in the intertidal our coastal area is a gift. It is precious & unique. We need to protect it. We may never have another chance.	Tina Conway
140	S			I support draft proposal #2 (JD)		William Smith

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
142	S			1) Catch & release fishing for wild Steelhead is allowed per DFG throughout Central & Northern Calif. - Pesc. Estuary is proposed in Proposal 3 as a SMR due to impact I catch & release fishing currently allowed by DFG regulations - I believe this proposed restriction will offer only negligible benefit but eliminate a recreation (opportunity which is unique in SMCA. and contradicts current DFG regulations elsewhere.	2) Recreational fishing on the sandy beaches of SMCA (share bode) targets 2 species - barr perch & stripped bass. The primary focus are stripped bass from March to Nov. This non native species is not a species noted to benefit from the MPA process - Can there be an allowance to fish from the shore for these non native species on sandy beaches n SMCA.	Tim Frahm
143	S				Also, please refer to public comments on file submitted by: CAL TROUT Northern Calif. Federation of Fly Fisher, Tim Frahm, Native Sons of the Golden West	Tim Frahm
144	S				There should be an endowment for adoptive management	Tim Frahm
145	S		Specifically, subregion 4 is my local area and we need to keep the area between Double Point and Duxbury Reef open without major restrictions.	As a sportfisherman, I'm concerned with both conservation and access to fishing grounds & ability to take fish. As such, Draft Proposal 2 (JD) is the most feasible proposal. Specifically, subregion 4 is my local area and we need to keep the area between Double Point and Duxbury Reef open without major restrictions.	Personally, I'm mostly a non-motorized fisherman (kayak) and those of us who do that have relatively little impact on the environment. It's extremely important that we maintain the ability to fish and share the experiences with our families.	Aaron Van Arsdale
146	S			Another area of particular importance is the San Mateo Coastline. I implore you to limit the restrictions there. Agreeably the Fitzgerald Reserve needs to be protected. However, we need to be careful not to be too extreme in those restrictions. Again Proposal 2 (JD) is the best option.		Aaron Van Arsdale

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
147	S			Subregion 4 preference for Draft proposal 2 (JD) 3(TC) or Ext. proposal A. We represent a small boat dock operation at the South end of San Pedro Bay. This operation has probably been active for @ 100 yrs. Approx 27 + small skiffs now entirely recreational, fish outside of this rock including So. of the Big Point -Pedro Pt. which is, for several miles, minimally accessible by foot (little impact) I will be contributing more comments as I become more aware of what's being put forth.		Richard & Penny Keating
148	S			I prefer Draft proposal 4 for Subregion 5. Enforcement is a concern of mine, I support "no take" policy, more conducive to education efforts and the most extensive protection area (I believe reflected by Draft Proposal 4)		Melosa Girahda
150	S	What is most important to me is the most extensive reserve along the coast for Fitzgerald. Therefore, proposal 4 is the best for Fitzgerald SMR.	Fitzgerald Devils Slide (Prop 4) is very important because of protection north of Grey Whale State Cove. I have seen harbor seal pups frequently (albeit intermittently) in either Grey Whale Cove State Beach or Montana State Beach. I want to see these areas part of a SMR, to give, greater habitat protection. I'd like the common murre habitat north of Grey Whale Cove to be afforded state marine reserve (SMR) protection.	I strongly favor Draft Proposal 4 (JC). This is especially important to me in Subregion 5, because of the expansion of protection for Fitzgerald-Devils Slide SMR from Pillar Pt to San Pedro Pt.	I work as a volunteer naturalist at Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. I find that the current "take" rules has a confusing and negative impact on the education of school kids, who are told to take not even shells but see people taking eels and pails of fish. This inconsistency can breed some deep cynicism about MPA protection and other resource regulations. It also makes enforcement very difficult.	Janet Hathaway
151	S	Draft Proposal 4 in Subregion 5, it appears that the San Gregorio SMR won't be needed because there is a large reserve at Ano Nuevo to the south & proposed Moss Beach SMR to the north.	Subregion 5, San Gregorio: This area nearshore is all sandy beach and great spot for striped bass fishing from shore if this area is closed there would be very limited sandy beach fishing in southern San Mateo County.	I prefer External Proposal A. IT would be within the guidelines.		David Modena
152	S			I favor Draft Proposal 3. This gives additional protection to Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and makes the "no take" more consistent. In addition, this allows the historic fishing community in the south end of San Pedro Bay in Pacifica to continue their livelihood.		Isidore Szczepaniak

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
153	S			My personal preference JD followed by TC; although the Farallon restrictions in TC seem to be excessive. JD meetings the needs of Kayak anglers the best.	I would like to thank you for the opportunity to give feedback!	Scott Gee
154	S			I would support draft proposal 2 with reservations.	MPAs promise more fish only by restricting fishing. Fishing is only one factor. Populations of fish are affected by irregular spawning success, especially for rockfish.	Gene Kramer
157	S			I support the implementation of a proposal that meets the science guidelines and provides the strongest ecosystem protections for the North Central Coast. I believe that draft proposals 1 & 4 currently do the best job of providing high protection. Draft proposal 2 and external proposal A both provide a much weaker network. I urge the stakeholders to take their charge seriously & recommend one of the stronger network for implementation of the MLPA. Thank you for your dedication to making these protections a reality.		Keith Weissglass

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
176	S			<p>Subregion 5: Out of the six proposal I feel draft proposal 4 (JC) is best for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Defines Pillar Pt. North to Pt. San Pedro as a SMR, FMR and including waters north, would maximize protecting key marine habitats: -Sandy Beaches, Rocky Head Lands & Points, Coves. - Deep and shallow water reefs, exposed pinnacles, soft bottom, gravel and cobble substrates.</p> <p>2) Extensive and rich inter tidal habitat, surf grass community, mussel and urchins beds. Also found with in this proposed areas.</p> <p>3) Harbor Seal rookeries, - Nest common murrees</p> <p>4) Nesting Brants cormorants. A wide range of roosting and foraging sea and shore birds.</p> <p>5)FMR historically and current used for study this research by our nations universities, colleges has schools, and by many stakeholders (national marine sanctuary; CDFG. ECT... This area is classified as "area of special 310 logical significance - is one of Calif critical coast area pilot programs. (continued in next row)</p>	<p>I truly believe in the MLPA process. I would like to thank the CDFG and the BRTF for allow myself and other to take part in this important process. I would also like to thank the Stakeholders Committee and SAT for all of their may hours of hard work.</p>	Steven j Durkin

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
176 (cont'd)	S			6) NCC study region:Subregion 5: Propose 4 (JC) by creation A SMR in this area would help to protect the Harbor seal rookery and nesting sea bins sites. This proposal clearly defines boundries. So as no to confues sport fisherman. 7) Enforcement of this site?? county, State and Federal allowances. 8) CDFG would have boat launching abilities out of Pillar Pt. Hargor, for enforcement, research and evaluation procedures.. 9) This SMC area, would allow commerical and short range of definer species. * This would be one of the MLPA Act success stories. For these and may more reason I recommend proposal 4 (JC) subregion 5.		Steven j Durkin (cont'd)
132	S & F		I think that the inclusion of San Gregorio is important to provide connection between Fitzgerald and Ano Nuevo, and a replication of the protection at Fitzgerald. I understand that some people will not be able to continue fishing activities they and their ancestors have enjoyed, but it's time to put the interests of the non-human residents at the forefront... not because they're non-human, but because they have no voice and their populations have shrunk due to inadequate protection in the PAST.	I support proposal 4's protection of Fitzgerald and the area to the North. Of the proposals, it provides maximum protection for the species there that have been depleted by decades of fishing. I've heard scientists say that complete protection in important areas, as provided by proposal 4, is essential to restoring these species.	It seems extremely well-organized, conscientious, and responsive to our input.	Larry Arndt
10	F	Farallon Islands: We support the SMR & SMCA shown in Proposal 2	Farallon Islands	We support the SMR and the SMCA as shown in 2 (JD)		Milo Vukovich

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
11	F			Proposal 1 and 2 - Workable; Proposals 3 and 4 Against; Proposal A takes away too much water to the SE of the main Island. As an Ecotourism operator, I am scared to death of a special closure around the island without an associated permit process for professional ecotourism operators. Loosing access to as much area as we will loose is going to hurt a lot (financially) but if I loose my whale and bird and shark watching trips I will loose my livelihood - my way of life. There neesa to be a (permit) process in place to proted the critters, but also provide access to show the general public what it is that is so important to protect.	The thing to remember about the fisherman (and occasionally their attitudes) is that in this process, they have nothing to win and everything to loose. The other guys have nothing to loose and everything to win.	Mick Menigoz
64	F		Farralon Islands to Port of Bolinas		New regulations regarding a VMS (vessel monitoring system) will eliminate access to the Farallon Islands to the Port of Bolinas. How will the MPA process re-establish a community dependent on this fishing when it is gone.	Jeremy Dierks
71			Stewarts Point is a preserve currently and doing fine as a preserve		Financial impact - why implement state taxes, long term care, studies on land that is already stewarded properly. Do not penalize those who have taken care of their land. MPA's should be spread out and never across one landowners entire parcel. Overall, beautifully protected historic ranches that have been well maintained should not be panelized for their stewardship	Julie Browne
92	N		Point Arena	Use some common sense and adopt the Point Arena fishermen's proposal		Alfred D. Phillips

California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
105				Proposals JD & A are the only 2 of the 5 that I would support	Very poor or even stakeholder representation. I have noticed that some won't bend, budge or listen. But cry & whine when pressured or confronted. A Shame! The MLPA process has preached "size & spacing" throughout the sessions. Unfortunately this is not the proper & correct way to lay out MPA's for the betterment of the ecosystem & those who use it for any & all reasons. Studies: All fish, all sea life & all usage of this system changes within a mile on this coast. A "baseline" study should have been completed before this process started. The way things are going the last study region to be tackled "might" be the closest to being a perfect plan. Directives from higher up should root change throughout the process. All information, rules, guidelines should be "consent" for all study regions. MPA's adjacent to private lands should have been respected as "ex-facto" reserves & not punished or taken away if the marine take is or was low. This is a "MLPA" not a "RPA" (recreational fisherman protection act). (continued in next row)	Archer J. Richardson (cont'd)
105 (cont'd)					No one should be 100% dissatisfied, it could work for all with a ribbon of some sort for adjacent landowners. Urchin (comm) divers, a minority have been given special attention. That is a few, which marine take is exported. The NCSR should not hve included the SF Bay area. It should have been from Bodega Bay to Fort Bragg. Leaving the politics in the city and the country in the country. "Growth" is a factor that should have been in this equation. "Greed" is a factor that we have seen, disguised as "stakeholder." When growth and greed finally come together in the 5-year eevaluation plan you will see this system has failed to meet its goals. By the way, what are it's goals?	Archer J. Richardson

**California MLPA North Central Coast Project
Public Comments on Draft MPA Proposals Received at
February 4-6, 2008 Public Workshops in Petaluma, Gualala and Pacifica
Revised February 20, 2008**

#	Subregion ¹	MPA-specific comment ²	Subregion or Area comment ³	Proposal comment (eg. Proposal 1) ⁴	Other comment	Participant's name
129				1) Draft proposals O/EC/JD/TC/JC all product compromise - are similar - If these were CEQA alternatives, <u>A Writ of Mandamus</u> would be successful since not a reasonable range of alternatives. 2) Interest groups are extractive oriented nobody said they represented the Marine Resources, only entities or economic interests		Herman Kalfen, JD, REA
130				I vote 4 DP #4 - it protects marine habitat and gives our oceans a time to heal. While we have made progress as the fishermen in the group state - they are comparing it to 1960s - that is a fake comparison - need to go back further because 1960s were a time of declining fish stock. Let's take the time <u>now</u> to clean up the mess made by all humanity's ocean related activities. We have made a mess of our planet and need to do what we can now, so we do not pass this mess down to future generations.		Karen Rosenstein

Key for Field Headings

- ¹ N = North Subregion, S = South Subregion, F = Farallon Islands, All = Comments apply to NCC Study Region
² These comments are focused on individual MPAs listed in any of the five draft proposals.
³ These comments are focused on subregions (e.g., 1-5) within the study region or particular geographic location (e.g., Salt Point, Point Reyes)
⁴ These comments are regarding a specific proposal (Proposal 1, 2, 3, 4 or External Proposal A)