

**California Marine Life  
Protection Act Initiative**

**Public Comments to  
November 15, 2007**

From: Jerry Tidwell [<mailto:jerry.tidwell@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2007 8:04 AM  
To: MLPACComments  
Cc: Arch Richardson  
Subject: Marine Life Protection Act initiative - Sonoma County / Mendocino County

Responding directly to the points posed on the Department of Fish and Game site "Why the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative?", I would like, as an opener to make the following points. I write from the perspective of one who was both born and raised in the coastal areas of southern Mendocino and northern Sonoma counties and one who has family and friends in these areas that I frequently visit; these frequent visits invariably involve accessing and using, for a wide variety of activities, these coastal areas.

1. "...threatened by coastal development, water pollution, and other human activities."

- Any current development must go through both a local and state level or multiple level process of approval already. This has been incrementally the case, and has expanded, since the passage of the Coastal Protection Act in 1972.

- Water pollution, tied to development, is also part of the regulation and state policing activities that already take place.

- Human activities include exactly what - people walking on the beach? using trails? taking fish or shell fish? If there are human activities, like littering, those need to be and are supposed to be policed by the public coastal land authorities or the private property owners. Those private property owners, it has been and continues to be my experience, are the best stewards of the land to begin with.

2. "The U. S. Commission on Ocean Policy ..."

- What is "crisis"?

- What relevancy to this initiative?

3. "The 1999 Marine Life Protection Act mandated ..."

- If it was mandated in 1999, without having read this act, then why is the state just now getting to this?

- We have marine reserves, marine parks and marine conservation areas already in place in these areas, some of which have been in place for decades

- In addition, the state, broadly defined, already has a number of layered controls or plans regarding fishing, pollution, development, and access that, to my opinion, already highly regulate the use of both public and private lands in both northern Sonoma and southern Mendocino counties coastal areas.

- Another point, referenced above in the first paragraph, is that we continue to pass laws regulating the myriad of human activities that take place in and around the coastal waters of the state. We must first look at the applicability of these current laws and their enforcement. That it appears to not be an issue or concern here; the solution, apparently, is to pass another, very broad and impactful, law that has far-reaching and improper impacts.

4. "The Governor is committed to ..."

- The Governor, without trying to get any more political than this statement already has, has also supported other ideas, some of which were successes and some of which were abject failures; those failures included overwhelming rejection by the voters on several issues.

- Having worked at a high level in a state organization, the Governor's support or statements related to that issue, are often times used by agencies under his control, such as Fish and Game, as part of their internal political functions; I suspect that is true in this case.

5. "The Resources Agency and ..."

- Does this mean that the public comment period, meetings and the chance like this to express my opinion as a citizen and resident are meaningless?
- If "committed to implementing the MLPA" means what any neutral reading of that statement would indicate, then what is the purpose of going through this or any process?
- This cannot stand; the Department of Fish and Game cannot just implement rules and regulations of such import with taking into account all reasonable factors, including public input and concerns.

6. "The state is leveraging public money with private resources ..."

- What private resources? Are we talking land, money, other resources?
- Are these from interest groups that would prefer that humans not be able to enjoy the pleasures afforded by our coast or mountains or deserts? In other words, are these focus groups that the state, at least in this case, is in agreement with that seeks to control private property for their definition of the greater "public good". That is not for them to say - we do not need an entity which is not accountable, under our system, to the people; nor should we allow any such groups, working through compliant and complicit government bodies or officials to push their agendas over the rights of the greater populace.

7. "The Initiative is founded on solid public leadership ..."

- Reference all the points made above.
- In addition, if the "Resources Agency and the Department of Fish and Game are committed to implementing the MLPA through a new approach", is that really consistent with this statement?
- If, as it seems more and more apparent, the decisions are already made or the process is being manipulated to justify the desired goal, then this statement another example of government speak, consistent with the concept that the government will take care of all of us and decide what is best for our lands and our interests in using these lands.

8. "The Initiative will be an open and transparent process" ...

- Again, reference all the points made above.

Finally, if there are valid, verifiable issues with overuse, pollution, overfishing then the state should first look to the controls or the ability to re enforce those efforts that are already in place to address those issues. This is more difficult, but certainly much less intrusive and improper, than trying to just make draconian, ill-conceived dictates that will not do anything more than shrink the public's right to use these areas and the property owners rights and responsibilities to their lands.

---

**From:** CAPT.CAM [mailto:magicmac@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 09, 2007 2:52 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:**

Please stop all involved from indicating that these MLPAs our fair to all Californians. IT IS NOT FAIR TO ALL only the fisherman and our coastal fishing communities will be sacrificing there livelihoods and business for these MLPAs.  
 Capt. Cameron Smith

CAPT. CAM'S CATCH. WE USED TO GO CATCHIN'.  
 CAPT. CAM~~~ <\*)(((((<><

---

**From:** Hilary Wood [mailto:abalone2000@mchsi.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 06, 2007 9:11 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA plan

To Whom It May Concern,

In perusing your MLPA website, I would like to point out the lack of serious consideration for alternatives concerning the proposed closure of the Richardson Ranch for the proposed MPA. The arguments in favor of this closure make absolutely no sense and the consequences outweigh the positives in this case. Historically, the landowners have done a tremendously good job in patrolling their property, maintaining it and blocking access to the public. Enforcement of an MPA takes money which is better spent on public land which is severely neglected. The landowners, by virtue of their sentinel stance on public access have already protected marine life and will continue to do so. Enforcing an MPA on Salt Point State Park and areas north and south is a much better solution and I'm not even sure there is a real problem here. Complete protection may not be warranted for some resources. We have plenty of State Marine Preserves.

My children grew up fishing, socializing and playing on Richardson property. The ocean and its resources are an integral part of who they are. As a very tight community, we even held many memorials for those of us who passed away, along the Richardson shoreline. The very heart of tradition, custom and heritage is at stake here. Recreational fishing is all part of it.

I am appalled that the landowners have no voice in the upcoming decisions. If this is not illegal, it should be. That an agency can make these decisions minus land owner's rights or input is frightening.

I urge you NOT to site SMCA's and SMR's adjacent to and on privately held property. There are other MPA's that need attention and other areas that would benefit far more than an area of private property that is already protected by the land owners.

Hilary Wood  
504 Las Posas St.  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555  
760-382-7558

---

**From:** Henry Thornhill [mailto:henry.thornhill@hazardcanyon.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 05, 2007 8:23 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA maps should not include private property

Dear MLPA Folk,

We are alarmed at the prospect of creating SMCA's and SMR's along private property, and omitting areas that have long had public access. We have owned property on The Sea Ranch for the past 27 years and are intimately familiar with the degradation of the marine resources there over the past 20 years. This is a perfect example of an area that should be protected: Land that has long had, and will continue to have, public access. Such areas need to be protected before they are totally depleted.

The inherent conservation practices on private lands make it redundant to include them in preservation efforts, and would be a form of unnecessary condemnation. It doesn't make any sense to protect areas that are, and will continue to be, rich in marine resources, and not protect the areas that will continue to be over-used.

Henry and Kathy Thornhill

---

**From:** bluewaterhunter@comcast.net [mailto:bluewaterhunter@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 05, 2007 7:31 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** Eric White; Arch Richardson; Reva; Dave; Dan Bier  
**Subject:** MLPA plan

To Whom It May Concern,

My friend, Arch Richardson, has recently sent me information concerning the possible closure of the Richardson Ranch for the proposed MPA. Having reviewed the material and read some of the arguments in favor of such a closure at the Richardson Ranch I felt compelled to comment on what I feel would be a gross miscarriage of the intent of this plan.

The first thing that occurs to me is that the nature of this private property and the limited access that has been in place for generations (this fact alone may be a rub for those in favor of closing this area because of their inability to gain access to it for their quest of the trophy ten inch abalone) has provided, for the surrounding waters, unmolested spawning for abalone, fish and other invertebrates for decades...isn't this what the MPA is supposed to accomplish?

The fact that the Richardson Ranch was open to local Native Americans for the gathering of seaweed and other bounties of the ocean in a time of close mindedness and out right discrimination shows what true stewards of the land these families have been over the years.

Having seen first hand the beauty of this area, from an underwater perspective, I can tell you that there is no place like it on the North Coast. The decimation of abalone populations that I have witnessed since first diving this area in 1979 makes me wonder why the powers that be wouldn't close down areas like of Salt Point, Still Water Cove, or the countless other spots that so desperately (and obviously) need the respite.

Why penalize the private property owners of this area by enacting an MPA when in fact we should all see them as protecting an area that would have otherwise been overrun and depleted years ago. I guess I just don't understand why you wouldn't enhance what seems to be an existing MPA (there is a negligible impact on the marine life in this area because so few people, over the years, have had access to it) and create zones outside of these areas in places that clearly need the help of a MPA. That's just my two cents worth.

Sincerely,  
Tommy Harris  
38 Massasoit Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
415-515-0361

---

**From:** Walter [mailto:wwratcliff@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 05, 2007 3:08 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA for Gerstle Cove to Pt Arena

To Whom It May Concern:

Having reviewed the "packages" of conservation areas and marine reserves on the North Coast published on your MLPA website, I would like to voice concern over the seeming lack of attention to important principles embodied by some of these proposals.

**SMCAs, and in particular SMRs, should NOT be sited adjacent to private land** for the following reasons:

1. **Enforcement.** Some proposals show SMCAs or SMRs adjoining Richardson Ranch and Sail Rock Ranch property. These properties are steep bluffs and hidden intratidal zones. They will be very labor intensive to patrol, especially by those unfamiliar with the land. Additional enforcement staff will never enable adequate oversight of private lands. Siting next to public or semi-public land makes enforcement more realistic—given enough staff. This principle is realistic and enforceable laws strengthen public respect for law.
2. **Public Education.** A patchwork of protected areas is shown by some maps. Enforcement will be hindered by lack of understanding by fishers and other users. Even with a significant and ongoing investment in public education, the public will not know where each protected area starts and stops. It will be equally difficult for DFG staff to enforce. Cat and mouse games with GPS devices will ensue. Make it simple: Blanket protection can be implemented better.
3. **Landowner Involvement.** There are no coastal landowners--who are affected by some of these packages--serving in any capacity on MLPA. Fishermen and kayak companies have a voice, but not the landowners affected by these proposals. Last I heard landowners were solely responsible for taxes on adjoining property. This was not critical in MLPA Phase 1, perhaps due to the comparative wealth of public lands. The principle is taxation with representation.
4. **Stewardship.** No trespassing laws have been the primary means of protecting intratidal zones adjacent to private land. These laws are only effective when they are enforced by landowners. Where private lands have been opened and no trespassing laws not enforced, the intratidal zone has suffered greatly. Coastal landowners have felt a stake in the protection of ecosystem values. However, by both excluding them from the MLPA process and locking them out of the intratidal zone, as SMR 'no go' status appears to do, these folks will increasingly look at protection as a state function. Ironically, the state is in no position to do as good a job as these stewards have done. This is a shame, because one of the primary reasons for biodiversity on the North Coast is the protection that individual landowners have provided. This principle is wise use of human and natural resources.
5. **Local knowledge.** Why are there so many errors in naming coastal features on MLPA maps? Two dynamics are at work: a) a belief that higher values must be pressed on uninformed locals and b) that if an itinerant person (fisher, kayaker, biologist, administrator) discovered it, it must be theirs. Luckily, places come with history and local knowledge. It would be a happy state of affairs if the MLPA process actually honored local knowledge.
6. **Property rights.** On the North Coast, for the first time, MLPA attempts to set a precedent of locating SMCAs and SMRs adjacent to privately-held land. Has staff investigated the legality of doing so adjacent to some private land but not other private land? Why should members of Anchor Bay Campground or Sea Ranch have their properties excluded simply because they make the biggest show? One is left with the impression that a quid pro quo of public access is at the root of these special dispensations. This principle is equal protection under the law.

Again, I urge you NOT to site SMCAs and SMRs adjacent to privately-held land.

Walter Ratcliff  
Sail Rock Highlands LLC

---

From: Jeannine Jacobs [<mailto:earthawake@sbcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2007 9:24 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Marine Reserves funding

Hello Great People,

I applaud the work you are undertaking to protect our aquatic species, through a moratorium from fishing, in the form of reserves. I wish we had done that for the Sardine species, in Monterey, when the moment arrived. I remember reading that the Black Abalone was in danger, also.

I do find, though, that scientific groups can be rather opportunistic with these kinds of allocations. When I noticed that coastal floor mapping would be funded---I couldn't help but imagine what THAT would cost. The only reason I find this

necessary, would be for boat and ship navigation, in the case of radar being prohibited in these areas. Other than that, this seems quite excessive; whereupon the same money might be used elsewhere, or conserved for future reserve funding.

I would like to see fisherman given some relief jobs, in lieu of their loss of territory or amount of catch. I always thought that more fish hatcheries could be developed, or some classroom workshop service where students learn from the fishing trade.

What my heart tells me, whenever I walk the beach at Leffingwell Landing in Cambria, is that some of the fresh seaweed or sea pickles (from bull kelp) should be encouraged to be harvested: to be boiled, dried, canned (even though it is a protected area), perhaps a bucket per person, per month. It seems a waste and a tragedy that people aren't taking advantage of these "gifts from the sea". Seaweed offers all the minerals one could ask for, iodine, too. It helps hair growth and regulates the Thyroid gland. I has been reported to have anti-viral properties. It has more protein per ounce than beef, and even takes gas out of a pot of beans. Well, what a food!

And in the Finhorn Garden of Scotland, it was used as one source in their fertilizer mix.

Good Luck with the funding, and may the schools flourish!

Jeannine Jacobs  
Earth Awake

---

**From:** Marva Jacobs [mailto:gbcottage@mcn.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2007 8:12 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Allan Jacobs' full text of pulbic response

This is the full text of my prepared statement – amended only by spell check, corrected grammar and punctuation and completed sentences - the original copy was a handwritten rough draft in a semi-outline format.

I have BA degree in chemistry with minors in biology and mathematics; a secondary teaching credential; and approximately sixty post-graduate units mostly in a variety of science and related areas. I retired from teaching after 31 years in 1998. 28 of those years were at Point Arena High School where I taught a variety of math and science classes including Marine Science and Ecology.

Beginning in 1973, I was also a commercial fisherman during the summer, working out of Arena Cove in my own boat, for twenty seasons.

During my years in this community I have participated in many local groups, some formal and some informal, that have added to my knowledge and experience in issues relevant to the MLPA

After retiring, I successfully ran for School Board Trustee and served a full term.

I have always been an avid sport fisherman.

So I understand the science of the MPLA and I know something must be done. However, I disagree with some of the methodology and the extent and location of proposed closures.

I appreciate the difficult job you have ahead of you. It will not be possible to please all people and all user groups (aka stakeholders). There must be compromises by all.

The Organization of the committees and staff and the way the MLPA program is working is much better than the previous attempts. But as a member of the part of the public who will be most directly affected by the end result, I have a major objection to the lack of availability to the public of maps, data, and other documents that were used and/or referred to during the meetings. This has not only made it difficult or impossible to follow the proceedings, but also made it virtually impossible to

accurately report back to our peers, and/or to make specific comments when appropriate. My experience working with government agencies has made me very familiar with the “Ralph M. Brown Act.” If your group was part of a city, school district, county, or any other “legislative body” of a “local” agency, you would have been required to have ALL documents immediately available to the public. Apparently there is a loop-hole...

In order to maintain a good relationship with the public you are serving, I appeal to the committees and staff to adopt the “Brown Act” rules and provide the public and media copies of all maps and documents used and/or referred to in your public meetings.

I will close by reading the first five sentences of the “Ralph M. Brown Act 1999.”

“In enacting this chapter, The Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this state exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.

P.S. This took me 3 minutes and 45 seconds to read using good lighting, a podium and no microphone in my right hand. Remember I was initially allowed a short 2 minutes for my share of the public input, so I mostly winged it.

Thank you for this second opportunity to make my point more clearly.

Allan Jacobs  
gbcottage@mcn.org  
Oct. 19, 2007

---

**From:** Nancy Wood [mailto:nncyndmk@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 16, 2007 12:20 AM  
**To:** fgc@fgc.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Establishing and managing marine preserves on North California coast

To: John Carlson  
Executive Director California Fish & Game Commission  
October 15, 2007

Dear Sir,  
This week marks public meetings in Gualala, California in regards to increasing marine preserves that would impact commercial and recreational fishing off shore. As I am unable to attend, I wanted to voice my opinion on how important I feel the recreation and healthful pastime of gathering and fishing off our coast is for us in this modern age. The time of corporate management of all our food sources is coming under fire, and more and more people want to return to sustainable and untainted foods grown near where they live.

The idea of coastal access and keeping wild areas accessible to the public is a cornerstone concept of all American hero's, from past presidents to literary giants to artists, and this includes our

basic idea of freedom. When the working man only has his cubicle of an overpriced house and his job to go to in California, I don't see much point in living near all this natural beauty that will be "off bounds".

I would rather see the commission work in tandem with law enforcement (including the department Fish & Game and The Coast Guard) to monitor illegal taking of marine life, as I see that as the real culprit that can impact marine populations. Keeping oil platforms off our coast and cleaning up our waterways that feed into the ocean may be more the answer we seek in securing healthy marine life, not just for the sport fisherman and food suppliers, but for generations to come.

Is it the goal of the Commission to make the entire coastline of California off limits to fishing?

Sincerely yours,  
Nancy Jo Wood  
16600 Watson Rd.  
Guerneville, Ca. 95446  
707/869-3301  
[nncyndmk@comcast.net](mailto:nncyndmk@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Eric Dahl [mailto:snogoose@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2007 2:01 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Central Coast and MLPA's

Dear Sirs: Please do not continue to stop shore fishing entirely in the next round of rules for the MLPA's. I have enjoyed fishing for years off of the shoreline in the area between San Francisco and south to Franklin Point. I always respected and followed the take and limits laws, and still over the years very seldom even came close to being in possession of the maximum limits. Having a few days a year to sit on the rocks or beaches and fishing has been some of the best days of my life. It seems to me that the number of shore fisherman is insignificant to drastically effect the overall health of the marine fishery. I would much prefer that perhaps you would consider certain months, or a limited number of times during the months that we would be allowed to still enjoy this great pastime.

I fear that so many decisions are being made by people who do not fish. I personally do not want to go out on party boats, as I much prefer the solitude of sitting alone fishing as a way to relax. It also seems to me that rather than outlaw fishing from shore in it's entirety, as was recently done as of Sept. 21 in that MLPA, a better plan that allows those of us who do enjoy fishing, could be implemented.

I read some comments that were posted on the MLPA website, I must say I did find it odd, that the only posted comments were from people who were in favor of closing the entire area to fishing and the overall goals of the MLPA commissioners. How about some fairness here. I don't believe that the only comments you received were favorable. Additionally, how about holding the open meetings for public comment on days and times and at places were ordinary working people could actually attend. Or is it your intent to make it as difficult as possible for people not to attend. Holding the meeting at SFO International Terminal at 10 AM on a Tuesday morning....that is not even remotely reasonable.

Regards, Eric C. Dahl  
472 Madera #4 Sunnyvale, Ca 94086  
(210) 834-7345

---

**From:** Dennis Viglienzzone [mailto:caesarsam@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 25, 2007 3:55 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Abalone

My suggestion is that you make no changes to further restrict/regulate abalone diving within the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region.

Further this recommendation is made for the entire region of California north of the Golden Gate where red abalone can currently be taken.

Dennis Viglienzone  
[caesarsam@sbcglobal.net](mailto:caesarsam@sbcglobal.net)

1651 Cunningham Way  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 542-1458

---

**From:** King, Patricia L. [mailto:Patricia.L.King@ssa.gov]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 25, 2007 2:42 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Second Phase California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative - Steering Committee Members, Staff and Contractors.

Patricia Lynne King  
3521 Morningside Dr.  
Richmond, California 94803

August 23, 2007

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger  
Attn: San Francisco Office  
455 Golden Gate Ave, Suite 14000  
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Second Phase California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative – Steering Committee Members, Staff and Contractors.

Dear Governor Schwarzenegger,

We as voters place our trust in our elected officials to appoint wise, educated and proper staff that will in turn hire employees that are worthy of both the public's trust and confidence to execute the needed work for state responsibilities. When observance of a confirmation of this progression in reality is noted; and achieving extraordinary worth, I deem we have a compulsion to identify this practice.

I would like to praise the Steering Committee Members, Staff and Contractors of the Second Phase California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative. Their professionalism, dedication and execution of their collective duties is of superb and evident merit. It is noticeable that all share a commitment to the process and exhibit consideration and finesse to all participating stakeholders, alternate stakeholders and members of the public. Also of notable importance is the outstanding facilitation of processes and accountability measurements employed by staff of the contract agency –Concur. Involvement by all these factions characterizes a very crucial advantage to the union and achieves worth to allocated funds spent on their contribution.

As an alternate stakeholder, I articulated in my letter of interest that we as the civic community when asked for contribution in projects like the MLPA have an obligation to honor this request because of the profound significance the conclusion of implementation of this initiative will have on California. I believe that involvement is both an honor and privilege and symbolizes core principles of our democratic structure of government. Excellence and distinction displayed by the: Second Phase California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative – Steering Committee Members, Staff and Contractors makes this interaction to be a superb and gratifying encounter.

I appeal to you to take the time to personally thank the Steering Committee Members, Staff and Contractors of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of the MLPA initiative. I also encourage you to assign your staff to support this committee. You have publicized that your political platform supports and validates the MLPA procedure. You have suggested that results of this accomplishment will be part of your legacy to the state left by your administration. To further this *raison d'être* please take the time to express gratitude and sustain the serious effort that is being applied to make this happen. I solicited that you do this now while the process is ongoing and not wait as is traditional for when the itinerary is complete and the end product is proclaimed.

Sincerely,

Patricia King  
Your Constituent and Fellow State Resident

Cc: First Lady Maria Shriver  
L.Ryan Broddrick – Director CA Fish & Game Department  
CA Fish & Game Commission  
MLPA Initiative – California Resources Agency

---

**From:** Bailey Agent [mailto:agentmail@baileyproperties.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2007 2:28 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLP-concerns

The Marine Protection Act is too strict for the benefit of what? Closing several of these areas for the benefit of scientific study allows the scientist and their crews to remain in business (usually there is an affiliation with an University who are taking grants as financial support) while taking away some of the best fishing areas in the state. Why couldn't they chooses areas along the coast where no take is already in affect due to poor accessibility? Why are they choosing areas where there is easy access? And why not stick to only the fish that are in need of protecting (most of which are already protected)?

So, I am no longer allowed to fish in many of these areas with my kids so some University program backed by the state and the subsequent affiliated staff can create job security. Great.

Thanks for creating a blue ribbon minefield for fisherman to navigate through..by the way, I am concerned there no end time for the California's Marine Life Protection Act. Surly, if these studies show fish stocks are ok closed areas should be reopened even if it means University staff will have to collect unemployment benefits.

Darren Houser  
Santa Cruz Resident  
Fisherman, while it's still legal

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE  
PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE**

**Public Comments to October 12, 2007**

---

**From:** Eric Dahl [mailto:snogoose@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 11, 2007 2:01 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Central Coast and MLPA's

Dear Sirs: Please do not continue to stop shore fishing entirely in the next round of rules for the MLPA's. I have enjoyed fishing for years off of the shoreline in the area between San Francisco and south to Franklin Point. I always respected and followed the take and limits laws, and still over the years very seldom even came close to being in possession of the maximum limits. Having a few days a year to sit on the rocks or beaches and fishing has been some of the best days of my life. It seems to me that the number of shore fisherman is insignificant to drastically effect the overall health of the marine fishery. I would much prefer that perhaps you would consider certain months, or a limited number of times during the months that we would be allowed to still enjoy this great pastime.

I fear that so many decisions are being made by people who do not fish. I personally do not want to go out on party boats, as I much prefer the solitude of sitting alone fishing as a way to relax. It also seems to me that rather than outlaw fishing from shore in it's entirety, as was recently done as of Sept. 21 in that MLPA, a better plan that allows those of us who do enjoy fishing, could be implemented.

I read some comments that were posted on the MLPA website, I must say I did find it odd, that the only posted comments were from people who were in favor of closing the entire area to fishing and the overall goals of the MLPA commissioners. How about some fairness here. I don't believe that the only comments you received were favorable. Additionally, how about holding the open meetings for public comment on days and times and at places where ordinary working people could actually attend. Or is it your intent to make it as difficult as possible for people not to attend. Holding the meeting at SFO International Terminal at 10 AM on a Tuesday morning....that is not even remotely reasonable.

Regards, Eric C. Dahl  
472 Madera #4 Sunnyvale, Ca 94086  
(210) 834-7345

---

**From:** zennerbiz@aol.com [mailto:zennerbiz@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 06, 2007 4:28 PM  
**To:** Ken.Wiseman@reources.ca.gov; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMarta@dfg.ca.gov; Jugor@aim.com  
**Cc:** Jugoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Please leave Sea Ranch off the MPA list!

To whom it may concern,  
I am writing to you regarding the MLPA process for the Pillar Point to Pt. Arena area. Specifically I am writing to request that the Sea Ranch to Gualala area NOT be included in an MPA's. I would prefer to see the Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch area become an MPA. The economic impact on The Sea Ranch community would be devastated by creating an MPA there as the number of renters in those homes that are also divers is very, very high. There are also several shops in the town of Gualala (dive shop, sporting goods, kayak rentals) that derive the bulk of their business from Sea Ranch divers. They too would be adversely impacted. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.  
Kind Regards, Jim Zenner

Jim & Pauline Zenner  
Karon Properties  
1103 Mission St.

Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Jim's Cell: 831 247-6025  
Pauline's Cell: 831 247-4767  
Fax: 831 477-1057

---

**From:** John and Michelle Grant [mailto:norcalgrants@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 10:24 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** keep salt point open

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,  
John Grant  
San Francisco

---

**From:** Gayle & Wanda [mailto:swender@wildblue.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 3:50 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** North Central Coast Project

I understand that there is a strong possibility of Salt Point State Park being closed for sport fishing in order to comply with the MLPA Initiative.

I live locally and kayak fish from the Gerstle Cove access. I urge you to consider all other options of coastal closures to sport fishing as Salt Point provides a safe access and convenient area for cleaning fish, public bathrooms and shower. It would be a shame to lose such an ideal set-up for fishing, when other areas of the coast, without such accommodations, could be officially designated as protected areas just as easily.

Thank you for your consideration.

Wanda Swenson  
[nighteen35@yahoo.com](mailto:nighteen35@yahoo.com)

---

**From:** C Paterson [mailto:cpkayak@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 1:30 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** mlpa

I have just been made aware that a proposal is being considered to close one of two sections of California's northern coast to fishing, either Sea Ranch to Gualala or Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch. I strongly urge you to leave Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch open to diving and fishing. This area provides safe and accessible diving and fishing while Sea Ranch to Gualala is largely inaccessible.

Please leave the area from Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch open to recreational fishing and diving.

sincerely Chris Paterson

---

**From:** Jim [mailto:j.gustin@eatec.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 1:27 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Closures of Black to Gualala

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,  
Jim Gustin  
925-478-9156  
Pleasant Hill Ca

[j.gustin@eatec.com](mailto:j.gustin@eatec.com)  
(P)510-899-7338  
(F)510-594-9091  
Eatec Corporation  
[www.Eatec.com](http://www.Eatec.com)

---

**From:** Gary Masters [mailto:5masters4him@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 1:20 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** North Coast MLPA

Dear Mrs, Miller-Henderson

Please do not include the Salt Point Area in the upcoming MLPA. I have been camping, hiking, kayaking, and diving this area for 35 years. Some of the safest access points for fishing and water sports are in these waters. The Gristle Cove Marine Reserve, one of the states first underwater parks, not only has had a good environmental effect but still allows for safe access to points outside the reserve for fishing, kayaking, diving and other water use.

The area of coast from Sea Ranch to Gualala has less recreational impact than the Salt Point area. Salt Point State Park is a highly used park that brings a source of revenue to the local community as well as, I would imagine, to the State. A major use of all the facilities both private and public is generated by the water sports mentioned above. Although Sea Ranch and Gualala admittedly has water sports use, the financial impact would be much less. The people currently using this area could easily go north or south to enjoy their sport or love of the ocean, but this area could not sustain the flood of use if the Salt Point area were closed. There is not enough adequate public access and parking in the Sea Ranch/Gualala area. Salt Point State Park has well developed sites representing a large investment by the state stretching for miles along the coast. South Gerstle Cove, Gerstle Cove with its beautiful underwater

park, Stump Beach, and Fisk Mill Cove are well planned and developed sites with ample parking and facilities for public use. A majority of that use being represented by fishermen and water sports enthusiasts.

I wish I had more time to defend my view. I love all of the coastline being considered. I think on a practical note, keeping the Salt Point Park area open for water use, with the financial investment already made by the State and the effect the loss of fisherman and water sports enthusiasts revenue will have on the community as well as the Park, the best decision is to set the MPLA boundary as the Sea Ranch to Gualala zone.

Thank You For Your Time,

Gary Masters

---

**From:** J. Havemann [mailto:jmsh80@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 1:08 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman  
**Subject:** MLPA Initiative

Greetings,

I would like to bring to your attention that the area from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving along the entire Sonoma Coast.

Salt Point State Park is maintained by taxes and park fees, which are largely paid by divers and fishermen. The state park provides the largest public ocean access in that area. To close that area to fishing would unfairly deny fishing access to thousands of tax payers and park users who have financially supported the park for years.

In contrast, Sea Ranch has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or fishing. For the above stated reasons, a closure of "Black Point to Gualala" causes far less restriction to the fishing public and potentially causes less economic impact on the already struggling State Park System. As you know, our State Park System lost millions of dollars in this year's budget process. Please leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Thank you for your time and efforts in this regard.

Sincerely,

John Havemann  
Ukiah Valley

---

**From:** myrel and christine [mailto:myrel\_willeford@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 10:12 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** No new MLPA Comments have been posted

I have been diving and fishing this area of the coast since I was a child, I take my children there every chance I get. If a section of the coastline must be closed for a MLPA please close from Black Point to Gualala. The closure of this area would have a much smaller public impact then closing a section of the coast used by hundreds thousands of people each year. Sea ranch is a private community which locks up

over 10 miles of coast line for their private use except for about 4 public access points with small parking areas and a long walk to the water. This area would be easily converted to an MLPA and would take little state resources to manage due to its limited public access. By closing a seven mile stretch which has very good public access you would force the people using this area to go further south putting heavy stress on this area. By closing Black Point to Gualala which has a much lighter usage you will be able to protect our resources for future generations and keep our public beaches open to fishing and diving.

Thank you  
Myrel C. Willeford

---

**From:** Joe Grandov [mailto:[jag@dtdjobshop.com](mailto:jag@dtdjobshop.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2007 9:52 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MLPA Initiative

If you must close some of the Coast, let it be Sea Ranch to Gualala. The other side has many more businesses that would be adversely affected.

Joe Grandov  
Sales/Customer Service  
510-534-7050 x217  
510-534-0454 Fax  
[jag@dtdjobshop.com](mailto:jag@dtdjobshop.com)

---

**From:** Lou Castleberry [mailto:[lou@bbprodiver.com](mailto:lou@bbprodiver.com)]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 30, 2007 3:23 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MLPA on the Sonoma Coast

I am writing as a avid diver and dive business owner on the Sonoma Coast. I would respectfully encourage you to KEEP SALT POINT STATE OPEN to DIVING AND FISHING!! This area allows access to the public who enjoy the use of the ocean along the Sonoma Coast. It is an area vital to the diving and fishing community. A much better option would be the area from Sea Ranch to Gualala.

Thanks

Lou Castleberry  
Bodega Bay Pro Dive  
Bodega Bay CA  
[bbprodiver.com](http://bbprodiver.com)

---

**From:** John and Cyndie Morozumi [mailto:[j4zumi@isp.com](mailto:j4zumi@isp.com)]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 30, 2007 9:04 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Initiative

To Whom It May Concern:

Please designate an MPA at Sea Ranch, California and /not/ from Gerstle Cove to Black Point.

I understand that there is a debate about areas considered for closure in the MLPA. Some folks are advocating an MPA from Gerstle Cove to Black Point. In my opinion the area from Gerstle Cove to Black Point offers the best diving on the Sonoma coast.

As an avid spearfisherman and abalone diver I dive this stretch of coast often. Since much of the area between Gerstle Cove and Black Point is owned by the state parks there is a huge section of coast line open to the public for shore diving. Fisk Mill Cove is one of the most sheltered coves from a north west swell on the Sonoma coast and would fall in this stretch of coast line. On some days Fisk Mill Cove is the only place safe enough to dive between Fort Ross and Gualala.

Closing this area would create a safety problem as many divers would dive more exposed areas which can be quite dangerous. Sea Ranch on the other hand has very poor public access and is mostly exposed to the typical north west swell.

I urge you to please designate an MPA at Sea Ranch, California and /not/ from Gerstle Cove to Black Point.

Respectfully Yours,

John M. Morozumi, PharmD.  
Sebastopol, CA 95472

---

**From:** cdougbell [mailto:cdougbell@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 30, 2007 8:24 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Salt Point Area

The area from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving along the Sonoma Coast. Salt Point State Park is maintained by taxes and park fees, which are largely paid by divers and fishermen. The state park provides the largest public ocean access in that area. To close that area to fishing would unfairly deny fishing access to thousands of tax payers and park users who have financially supported the park for years. Sea Ranch has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or fishing. A closure of "Black Point to Gualala" causes far less restriction to the fishing public and causes far less economic impact on the State Park System. The State Park System lost millions of dollars in this year's budget process. Please leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Douglas Bell  
Livermore, California

---

**From:** JENNIFER KIMBERLY [mailto:scubajen57@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 30, 2007 12:20 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** pending North Coast fishing closures

I understand that a choice is being made between closing one of two North Coast diving areas for fishing. Please keep the Salt Point State Park area open for several reasons: 1, it has safer, more protected access for human activity near shore, and 2, park service and rescue can more easily monitor and access those divers and recreational users if necessary.

Additional comments:

I hope that long-lining and gill netting is now banned. Wasteful fishing techniques together with poaching is what is damaging our ecosystem along with other environmental changes caused by man. I am all for the closures but feel sorry for the honest fisherman and the least damaging form of fishing: spearfishing, as the spearfisherman can see what he plans to take. I hope these closures will reduce the tons of fishing trash that washes upon California beaches every day in the form of nets, floats, and especially monofilament line. I find it everytime I scuba dive and it is usually strangling some hapless invertebrate. Who knows how much is stuck down there causing daily damage? Also, lead weights for both divers and fishermen should be coated, as it never washes up on shore. I'm sick of hiking on the rocks and seeing the trash left behind by line-casting fishermen. Thank you.  
Jennifer Kimberly

---

**From:** jim [mailto:lauraorjim@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 29, 2007 10:03 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** proposed MLPA closures

It is my understanding that there are currently two areas being considered as a designated MLPA area on the North coast. The two areas as I understand, are the coastlines between Gerstle Cove and Black Point, or the area between Black Point and Gualala. Choosing between these two areas I would strongly suggest the area between Black Point and Gualala. This area offers the least amount of access to the general public and as a long time diver I rarely if ever use the limited public areas in Sea Ranch. On the other hand my family and I, as well as many others, use the areas between Gerstle Cove and Black Point. While this area offers divers something for any skill level, it more importantly offers sheltered coves for the less experienced divers to enjoy safely. Also, if this area is closed it will force divers to use areas North and South of the closure, which are far less able to accommodate the large amount of divers that use the area.

Thank you for your consideration,  
James Christofferson  
19350 Valkenburg Ln  
Grass Valley, CA 95949

---

**From:** jim [mailto:lauraorjim@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 29, 2007 9:59 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** proposed MLPA closures

It is my understanding that there are currently two areas being considered as a designated MLPA area on the North coast. The two areas as I understand, are the coastlines between Gerstle Cove and Black Point, or the area between Black Point and Gualala. Choosing between these two areas I would strongly suggest the area between Black Point and Gualala. This area offers the least amount of access to the general public and as a long time diver I rarely if ever use the limited public areas in Sea Ranch. On the other hand my family and I, as well as many others, use the areas between Gerstle Cove and Black Point. While this area offers divers something for any skill level, it more importantly offers sheltered coves for the less experienced divers to enjoy safely. Also, if this area is closed it will force divers to use areas North and South of the closure, which are far less able to accommodate the large amount of divers that use the area.

Thank you for your consideration,  
James Christofferson  
19350 Valkenburg Ln  
Grass Valley, CA 95949

---

**From:** Janice Gardner-Loster [mailto:oyukwi@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, September 29, 2007 11:01 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Cc:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov

**Subject:** MLPA North Central Coast Study Region (Alder Creek/Point Arena in Mendocino County to Pigeon Point in San Mateo County)

To Members of the North Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCCRSG) and the MLPA Initiative Blue Ribbon Task Force:

I recently learned that a proposal is being considered to close one of two sections of California's northern coast to fishing, either Gerstle Cove to Black Point Beach/Sea Ranch or Black Point Beach/Sea Ranch to Gualala.

I strongly urge you to leave **Gerstle Cove to Black Point Beach/Sea Ranch** open to fishing and diving. This area provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving locations along the Sonoma Coast. Additionally, Salt Point State Park provides the largest public ocean access in this area and is maintained by taxes and park fees that are largely paid by fishermen and divers. To close the area to fishing would unfairly deny fishing access to thousands of taxpayers and park users who have financially supported the park for years.

Sea Ranch has five public access points with only four parking spaces each and provides very little safe fishing or diving. A closure of Black Point Beach/Sea Ranch to Gualala causes far less restriction to the fishing public and causes far less economic impact on the State Park system, which already lost millions of dollars in this year's budget process.

Once again, I urge you to leave **Gerstle Cove to Black Point Beach/Sea Ranch** open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,  
Janice Gardner-Loster  
San Leandro, CA

---

**From:** Shafer Richard [mailto:granitedive@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, September 29, 2007 7:30 AM

**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson

**Subject:** MLPA's

I recently heard that there is a debate over areas considered for closure in the MLPA. It is my understanding that some people are advocating a MPA from Gerstle Cove to Black Point. In my opinion the area from Gerstle Cove to Black Point offers the best diving on the Sonoma coast. As an avid spearfishermen and abalone diver I dive this stretch of coast line frequently. Since much of the area between Gerstle Cove and Black Point is owned by the state parks there is a huge section of coast line open to the public for shore diving. Fisk mill is one of the most sheltered coves from a north west swell on the Sonoma coast and falls in this stretch of coast line. On some days Fisk mill cove is the only place safe enough to dive between Fort Ross and Gualala. Closing this area would create a safety problem as many divers would be tempted to dive more exposed dangerous areas. This safety issue is really important. Several divers drowned just in this past spring and summer on the Sonoma coast. Closing Fisk Mill would almost certainly attribute to further drownings.

Sea ranch on the other hand has poor public access and is mostly exposed to a typical north west swell. Ensuring the safety of recreational fishermen and divers should be considered as well as environmental concerns.

Many people camp at Salt Point so they can abalone dive there; my family included. Closing the area north of Gerstle Cove would leave south Gerstle Cove as the only area in the park accessible for shore diving. I personally watched someone be rescued from that cove on opening day of abalone season. It is not a safe entry on a rough day.

Please keep the public areas of the coast open for public access as much as possible. There are huge sections of the north coast such as Sea Ranch and Richardson Ranch that could be protected without curtailing recreational opportunities and endangering divers. Making these sections MPA's would ensure proliferation of the underwater life and still leave public access open for people such as myself and my kids. Thank you.

Richard Shafer,  
Pacifica, CA

---

**From:** glyn jones [mailto:jonesz07@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 29, 2007 7:28 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MLPA

I would like to state my concerns for the proposed consideration of closing the coastal access to angling and diving, and I am urging you to consider the Sea Ranch to Gualala option over the Salt Point to Sea Ranch option.

Thank You  
Glyn Jones  
active angler and diver who appreciates the coastal access.

---

**From:** Andrew Bland [mailto:[blando3@yahoo.com](mailto:blando3@yahoo.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 9:19 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman; SAscraft@dfg.ca.gov; Melissa Miller-Henson; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Regarding Salt Point State Park

I have just been made aware that a proposal is being considered to close one of two sections of California's northern coast to fishing, either Sea Ranch to Gualala or Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch. I strongly urge you to leave Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch open to diving and fishing. This area provides safe and accessible diving and fishing while Sea Ranch to Gualala is largely inaccessible.

To park at Salt Point State Park, there is a \$6 vehicle fee which goes to park funding. A large number of people fish this region, and by closing this area to fishing, the park would lose much of its financial support.

On a personal note, I love this area of coastline and wish to see fish and abalone stocks preserved as much as the next person. However, law-abiding fishermen and divers are not threatening this coastline and closing it to us will not stop poachers from venturing in. If this area is made a preserve, it could potentially become a hotspot for poachers, as their will be less people to report them and fewer wardens patrolling the area to check catches.

Please leave the area from Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch open to recreational fishing and diving.

Thanks very much.  
Sincerely,  
Andrew Bland

---

From: Bill Pennington [<mailto:bill@ncka.org>]  
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2007 7:55 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Please leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving

The area from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving along the Sonoma Coast. Salt Point State Park is maintained by taxes and park fees, which are largely paid by divers and fishermen. The state park provides the largest public ocean access in that area. To close that area to fishing would unfairly deny fishing access to thousands of tax payers and park users who have financially supported the park for years. Sea Ranch has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or fishing. A closure of "Black Point to Gualala" causes far less restriction to the fishing public and causes far less economic impact on the State Park System. The State Park System lost millions of dollars in this year's budget process. Please leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

---

From: Eric Ye [<mailto:ericye@yahoo.com>]  
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2007 7:07 PM  
To: Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
Subject: leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open

Hi,

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.  
Sincerely,

Eric Ye  
Santa Clara, CA

---

**From:** kale Pastel [<mailto:kalesmailbox@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 6:55 PM

**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** North Coast MPAs

Greetings,

I am writing in regards to MPA locations on the Sonoma county coast. As I'm sure you are well aware of this area is a popular abalone diving and spearfishing location for many thousands of freedivers. I myself am a third generation California spearfisherman.

I have been informed on proposals to close some areas of the Sonoma coast that are invaluable recreational fishing areas. As I understand the MLPA mandates very large reserves every 30-60 miles. I would recommend that the area between Jenner and Gualala remain free from extensive no take reserves. Conservation areas would be better suited due to the volume of recreational divers, access and their economic importance to the small businesses in the area. Sea Ranch and Salt Point are the main two areas that I ask be left open for the future generations of divers to responsibly dive and fish as they have in the past.

Respectfully,  
Kale Pastel

---

**From:** Michael Hocker [mailto:Michael.Hocker@samc.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 6:07 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Fwd: mlpa map

To whom it may concern,  
It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public acces points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,  
Mike Hocker  
Fresno CA

-----  
Confidentiality Note: This e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail or the information herein by anyone other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy the original message and all copies.

---

**From:** Judy Rowland [mailto:JRowland@cablerocket.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 4:53 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAscraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** MLPA Pillar Point to Pt. Arena

Dear MLPA Initiative Staff,

I am writing to you regarding the MLPA process for the Pillar Point to Pt. Arena area. Specifically I am writing to request that the Sea Ranch to Gualala area NOT be included in any MPA's. I would prefer to see the Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch area become an MPA. The economic impact on The Sea Ranch community would be

devastating by creating an MPA there as the number of renters in those homes that are also divers is very, very high. There are also several shops in the town of Gualala (dive shop, sporting goods, kayak rentals) that derive the bulk of their business from Sea Ranch divers. They too would be adversely impacted.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Judy Rowland  
20380 Santa Cruz Hwy  
Los Gatos, CA 95033

---

**From:** John Morozumi [mailto:jmorozumi00@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 4:30 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** MLPA

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,

John P. Morozumi  
Los Gatos, CA

---

**From:** Douglas Reynolds [mailto:Douglas.Reynolds@jdsu.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 1:58 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA zones, Salt Point vs. Sea Ranch

This is in reference to the study for the pending MLPA closure on the North Sonoma County coast. My understanding is that the zone being considered to be closed to spear fishing and abalone diving has been narrowed down to either the strip of coast from Gerstle Cove in Salt Point to Black Point in Sea Ranch, or to the area from Black Point to Gualala.

I have been a resident of Sonoma County for more than thirty years. In that time I've come to appreciate the cold water of our coastline for its natural underwater beauty and its abundant fish and abalone. Over the years, both these areas have been favorite skin diving destinations for me, but if I were forced to give up one of them to the MLPA, it would be area from Black Point to Gualala.

To get to the water between Black Point and Gualala, one has to be a Sea Ranch landowner, know one of them, or pay \$5.00 to park at one of the too-few beach access lots. Once there, the conditions must be fairly calm to enter the water, or you'll wind up getting hurt by the waves pounding against the exposed rocky shore.

On the other hand, Salt Point's area north of Gerstle Cove is available to all the public, with free parking at hundreds of turnouts along Highway 1. And, most importantly, there are places along this stretch of coastline that are protected from the prominent North swell, making the entries and exits necessary to shore diving much safer for me and my fellow taxpayers than the exposed coast further north at Sea Ranch.

Therefore, it is my hope that the area between Gerstle Cove in Salt Point and Black Point will remain open to diving for fish and abalone.

-Doug Reynolds, Healdsburg, CA

---

**From:** Postmaster [mailto:Postmaster@kilkennysrb.com]

**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 11:35 AM

**To:** Postmaster

**Subject:** Attn: MLPA Initiative

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public acces points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Abel Tirre

---

**From:** Justin Smith [mailto:freedivesmith@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 11:26 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** MPA at Sea Ranch not Gerstle cove to Black point!

I recently heard that there is a debate over areas considered for closure in the MLPA. It is my understanding that some people are advocating a MPA from Gerstle Cove to Black Point. In my opinion the area from Gerstle Cove to Black Point offers the best diving on the Sonoma coast. As an avid spearfishermen and abalone diver I dive this stretch of coast line almost every weekend. Since much of the area between Gerstle Cove and Black Point is owned by the state parks there is a huge section of coast line open to the public for shore diving. Furthermore Fisk mill is one of the most sheltered coves from a north west swell on the Sonoma coast and would fall in this stretch of coast line. On some days Fisk mill cove is the only place safe enough to dive between Fort Ross and Gualala. Closing this area would create a safety problem as many divers would be tempted to dive more exposed areas which can be quite dangerous. Sea ranch on the other hand has poor public access and is mostly exposed to a typical north west swell. The abalone diving is good at sea ranch, but it is also good from Gerstle Cove to Black Point.

A marine protected area in sea ranch would not affect me as I rarely dive Sea Ranch since it has so few public access points. However a MPA from Gerstle Cove to Black Point would negatively affect me as well as thousands of other spearfishermen and abalone divers. I find it appalling that a MPA is even being considered in the Gerstle Cove to Black Point area. I wonder if the people who are suggesting this are qualified enough to represent the public. They are certainly not representing consumptive divers who greatly outnumber non-consumptive divers on the Sonoma coast. The motivation for a MPA in Gerstle Cove to Black Point is driven by something other then protecting our natural resources while still providing public access to the resource.

Justin Smith,  
Sebastopol Ca

---

**From:** Douglas Jones [mailto:dahonez@sbcglobal.net]

**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 11:17 AM

**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson

**Subject:** Sonoma Coast MPA

Gentlelady,

A MPA from **Gerstle Cove to Black Point** would negatively affect me as well as thousands of other spearfishermen and abalone divers. A marine protected area in **Sea Ranch** would not affect as much of the public as Sea Ranch has so few public access points and much of it is privately owned.

Please consider this in your upcoming decision.

Thanks!

Douglas Jones

---

**From:** smrolfing@aol.com [mailto:smrolfing@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 11:11 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Debate Over N. Coast MLPA map

To Whom it May Concern,

I was recently informed that there was a debate going on deciding which areas of the N. coast MLPA map were to be closed. It is my understanding that the areas from Gerstle cove to black pont, and Sea Ranch are being considered. The difference in public access between these two areas is considerable, and as I am an not a local resident to eaiter one of these areas it concerns me. I ask that you do not close the area from Gerstle cove to black point, doing so would close off one of the best and safest areas to dive in the region.

Steven Rolfing,  
Los Angeles, Ca

---

**From:** Sakuda, Kevin [mailto:KSakuda@stanfordmed.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 10:50 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** PUBLIC SAFETY OF MLPA's

RECREATIONAL ABALONE DIVING IS CRITICAL FOR THE HEALTH OF THE LOCAL SONOMA COAST ECONOMY. Please leave the most important recreational abalone diving areas open for recreational abalone and finfish take. This area is Reef Campground north to Fort Bragg. People will still abalone dive and if you limit them to unsafe areas exposed to high waves YOUR DECISION WILL KILL DOZENS OF RECREATIONAL ABALONE DIVERS.

KEEP RECREATIONAL ABALONE DIVING FROM REEF CAMPGROUND TO FT. BRAGG OPEN!!!

Thank-you,

Kevin

---

**From:** myrel and christine [mailto:myrel\_willeford@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 10:39 AM

**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Comments

If a section of the coastline must be closed for a MLPA please close from Black Point to Gualala. The closure of this area would have a much smaller public impact then closing a section of the coast used by hundreds thousands of people each year. Sea ranch is a private community which locks up over 10 miles of coast line for their private use except for about 4 public access points with small parking areas and a long walk to the water. This area would be easily converted to an MLPA and would take little state resources to manage due it its limited public access. By closing a seven mile stretch which has very good public access you would force the people using this areas to go further south putting heavy stress on this area. By closing Black Point to Gualala which has a much lighter usage you will be able to protect our resources for future generations and keep our public beaches open to fishing and diving.

Thank You

Myrel C. Willeford

---

**From:** Kevin Lynds [mailto:kevin.lynds@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 9:23 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Coast line closures - Please protect our right to enjoy these areas

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public acces points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Fishing and diving these and other areas is not just a great solo activity (such as hiking through the wilderness or mountainclimbing). It is also an important family activity that helps us teach our children not just self reliance and resourcefulness in nature, but also assists us in teaching them about conservation while giving them an appreciation for the ocean, the coastlines and its inhabitants.

Please help us protect our rights to enjoy these activities in these areas.

Sincerely,

--

Kevin Lynds

---

**From:** Adam Coca [[mailto:Adam\\_Coca@bio-rad.com](mailto:Adam_Coca@bio-rad.com)]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 9:17 AM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov;  
SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** MLPA Initiative

Dear Representatives,

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions.

I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,

Adam Coca@bio-Rad.Com

---

**From:** Sean Walker [mailto:seanw@datadistributing.com]

**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 9:06 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** MLPA NorCenCal

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the North Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with only 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,

Sean Walker

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail.

---

**From:** Hughes, Matt [mailto:MHughes@rpcity.org]

**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 8:15 AM

**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson

**Subject:**

If you must close an area for the MLPA, then PLEASE close Sea Ranch to Gualala.

Thanks,

Matt Hughes

---

From: Ken Boettcher [<mailto:kenboe@comcast.net>]

Sent: Friday, September 28, 2007 7:05 AM

To: Melissa Miller-Henson

Subject: FW: MLPA PROCESS

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Boettcher [<mailto:kenboe@comcast.net>]  
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2007 6:46 AM  
To: 'Ken.Wiseman@resources.ca.gov'  
Subject: MLPA PROCESS

I want to go on record in support of the proposal to establish the entire coast along the shoreline of SEA RANCH as part of the MLPA system and opposed to the inclusion of any area between Salt Point and Blacks Point in the MLPA system.

Sea Ranch with its "Private" shoreline with very limited and poor public access is the perfect place to monitor the impact of the eco-system approach to marine management while the area between Salt Point and Blacks point has some of the best and accessible fishing and diving area along the Sonoma Coast and the inclusion of that area would needlessly remove some of the best recreation opportunity in Sonoma County. SEA RANCH is the perfect place for the establishment of a Marine Reserve and the area between Salt Point and Blacks Point is an area which should not be included in the Marine Reserve System. The proposed Gerstle Cove Closure would have negative socio-economic impacts on the citizens of California while the Sea Ranch closure would not.

Kenneth D. Boettcher  
Yacht & Ship Broker License # B-03147-00001-SM  
707-544-8898  
Bodega Bay Boat & Maritime Services  
316 Candlelight Drive  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
Boats, Fishery Permits and Vessel Document Service.  
[www.gsiboat.com/cgi-bin/index.pl](http://www.gsiboat.com/cgi-bin/index.pl)

---

**From:** Greg Bennett [<mailto:gregoryben@earthlink.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 6:39 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** N. Coast MLPA vote

Dear Madam,

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public acces points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions.

I would like to vote for **Black Point to Gualala** as the MLPA area and leave **Gerstle Cove to Black Point** open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,

Greg Bennett  
Los Angeles

---

From: Steve Werlin [<mailto:divingdoc@hughes.net>]  
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2007 6:23 AM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Closure Areas

To whom it may concern,

I would like to comment on the proposed MLPA closure areas being considered for the northern California coast. The choice between closing Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs. Black Point to Gualala seems to pit the interests of the many against the interests of the view. Specifically, Salt Point and its environs provide excellent access, parking, and facilities to the many daytime visitors, campers, divers, kayak fisherman, and tourists who wish to use our coastline. It provides safe access to the shore for those with small, inflatable boats or kayaks and many safe areas to fish and dive. The Sea Ranch area, on the other hand, provides very limited public access and even more limited parking with fewer safe areas to fish and dive. Also, by keeping the Sea Ranch area open and closing the Salt Point area, you are really bowing to the pressures and desires of those in the Sea Ranch community who have unlimited parking and access to this area. There are several people who consider the Sea Ranch area their private domain for hunting for trophy abalone, etc. and their desire to keep this area open can not occur at the expense of those who do not live at Sea Ranch and who feel the Salt Point area is truly the area which serves the greatest common/public good.

Please keep the Gerstle Cove to Black Point area open and close the Black Point to Gualala area.

Thank you,

Steven Werlin, M.D.

---

**From:** Tote [<mailto:tote@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 28, 2007 4:25 AM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** North Coast MPLA

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public access points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,  
Mike Totaro

---

From: Kennedy, Brock P [<mailto:brock.p.kennedy@lmco.com>]  
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2007 12:32 AM  
To: Melissa Miller-Henson

Subject:

As a concerned user of Californias coastal resources I am voicing my opposition to the Gerstle Cove to Black Point closure plan. This area is used for recreational diving and fishing by many California taxpayers who deserve to have this public access stay open.

I don't agree with any closures as I feel that you are favoring special interest groups who want discriminate against certain types of people. This is the same as trying keep a neighborhood segregated by race.

I realize that no closures will not happen as there is too much money backing this plan. I would like to suggest closing areas that don't have good access for the public like San Francisco to Pt Reyes.

Please consider the options which keep the public access open and close areas that don't impact your taxpayers.

From my Blackberry  
Brock Kennedy  
Product Coordinator Lead  
Manufacturing Engineer  
Missile Defense  
Lockheed Martin Space Systems Company  
Desk (408)742-8934  
Cell(408) 203-7587  
Brock.p.kennedy@lmco.com

---

**From:** Joe Nguyen [mailto:joe@ipsglaw.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 11:36 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MPLA on Sonoma Coast

Dear Madame,

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public acces points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Best regards,

Joseph Nguyen, Esq.  
Patent Attorney  
[joe@ipsglaw.com](mailto:joe@ipsglaw.com)  
408-213-9540 X 101 (W)  
408-210-3170 (Cell)  
408-213-9541 (Work Fax)  
Intellectual Property Law  
IPSG, P.C. is a California Professional Corporation

This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain privileged, proprietary, or otherwise private information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original. Any other use of the email by you is prohibited.

---

From: Justin Smith [<mailto:freedivesmith@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2007 10:25 PM  
To: Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov;  
SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov; gwkc@adelphia.net  
Subject: MPA at Sea Ranch not Gerstle Cove to Black Point

I recently heard that there is a debate over areas considered for closer in the MLPA. It is my understanding that some people are advocating a MPA from Gerstle Cove to Black Point. In my opinion the area from Gerstle Cove to Black Point offers the best diving on the Sonoma coast. As an avid spearfisherman and abalone diver I dive this stretch of coast line almost every weekend. Since much of the area between Gerstle Cove and Black Point is owned by the state parks there is a huge section of coast line open to the public for shore diving. Fisk mill is one of the most sheltered coves from a north west swell on the Sonoma coast and would fall in this stretch of coast line. On some days Fisk mill cove is the only place safe enough to dive between Fort Ross and Gualala. Closing this area would create a safety problem as many divers would be tempted to dive more exposed areas which can be quite dangerous. Sea ranch on the other hand has poor public access and is mostly exposed to a typical north west swell. The abalone diving is good at sea ranch, but it is also good from Gerstle Cove to Black Point.

A marine protected area in sea ranch would not affect me as I rarely dive Sea Ranch since it has so few public access points. However a MPA from Gerstle Cove to Black Point would negatively affect me as well as thousands of other spearfishermen and abalone divers.

Justin Smith,  
Sebastopol Ca

---

**From:** Sasha Yavorski [<mailto:Sasha.Yavorski@clairmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 9:37 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov;  
SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov  
**Subject:** please consider my vote!

Hello,

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I would like to add my vote for the Sea Ranch to Gualala as the area to CLOSE for the MLPA and leave Salt Point State Park open for fishing and diving. Thank you for considering my vote.

Regards,  
-Alexander Yavorski.  
Recreational spearfisherman and freediver  
[syavorski@clairmail.com](mailto:syavorski@clairmail.com)

---

**From:** Dennis Haussler [<mailto:dennis@20fathoms.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 9:23 PM  
**To:** Ken Wiseman

**Cc:** Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov

**Subject:** FW: North coast MLPA

To whom it may concern,

It has come to my attention that the task force is about to make a decision on areas for closure in the salt point/ sea ranch area.

Given that sea ranch is 99% private, it would make sense to close that zone as opposed to gerstle cove and north region.

this would take away access for many sportsmen that utilize these different beaches, both from shore and by boat.

PLEASE, do not close this zone, instead opt for the sea ranch closure.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Dennis Haussler

Dennis Haussler  
Redwood City CA  
www.20fathoms.com

---

**From:** Brad Gallagher [mailto:gallagher777@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 7:14 PM

**To:** Ken Wiseman; JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; Melissa Miller-Henson

**Subject:** Salt Point State Park open for fishing and diving

Dear:

Ken Wiseman

Melissa Miller-Henson

Susan Ashcraft

Steve Martarano

John Ugoretz

My name is Brad Gallagher. I enjoy fishing and was recently told that there is some discussion about closing some more areas along the Sonoma Coast. I would prefer not to see any places close, but if something needs to go, can Sea Ranch to Gualala be flagged as the area to CLOSE for the MLPA and leave Salt Point State Park open for fishing and diving?

I apologize for the blanket letter, but I am not sure exactly who to send this request to.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully yours,

Brad

---

**From:** Trimbandit [mailto:trimbandit@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 7:10 PM

**To:** Ken Wiseman; Melissa Miller-Henson; SAshcraft@dfg.ca.gov; SMartara@dfg.ca.gov;

JUgoretz@dfg.ca.gov

**Subject:** RE: MLPA Initiative

Greetings,

Please keep the area from Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch open to fishing. For shore diving spearfishers, there are a limited number of safe access points on the north coast. This particular stretch of coast has many spots where we can enter and enjoy the water safely. We would much prefer that the stretch of coast from Sea Ranch to Gualala be closed. The number of places where we can safely and legally fish in California is quickly dwindling. Unlike H&L fishing, spearfishers are selective in our targets and only shoot the fish want; there is no by-catch. However, we are limited in the areas we can physically access, do to the rugged nature of the north coast.

Sincerely,  
Craig Gansheimer

---

From: David.R.Sereni@kp.org [<mailto:David.R.Sereni@kp.org>]  
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2007 6:39 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: mlpa map

It has been brought to my attention that there is debate going on over the N. Coast MLPA map. I believe the specific areas being debated for closure are Gerstle Cove to Black Point vs Black Point to Gualala. Our coastline from Gerstle to Black Point provides some of the safest and most utilized fishing and diving on that part of our coastline. Sea Ranch on the other hand has 5 public acces points with 4 parking spaces each and provides very little safe diving or kayak fishing in less than optimal conditions. I would like to vote for "Black Point to Gualala" as the MLPA area and leave Salt Point State Park "Gerstle Cove to Black Point" open for fishing and diving.

Sincerely,  
Dave Sereni  
Santa Rosa

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT: If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently delete this e-mail and any attachments without reading, forwarding or saving them. Thank you.

---

**From:** Zenner, Paul J [<mailto:Paul.Zenner@xerox.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 5:53 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MLPA

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you regarding the MLPA process for the Pillar Point to Pt. Arena area. Specifically I am writing to request that the Sea Ranch to Gualala area NOT be included in any MPA's. I would prefer to see the Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch area become an MPA. The economic impact on The Sea Ranch community would be devastating by creating an MPA there as the number of renters in those homes that are also divers is very, very high. There are also several shops in the town of Gualala (dive shop, sporting goods, kayak rentals) that derive the bulk of their business from Sea Ranch divers. They too would be adversely impacted.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Paul Zenner

---

**From:** John Zenner, IDEA Consulting Group, Inc. [mailto:johnz@ideaconsultinggroup.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2007 5:34 PM  
**To:** Melissa Miller-Henson  
**Subject:** MLPA Initiative

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you regarding the MLPA process for the Pillar Point to Pt. Arena area. Specifically I am writing to request that the Sea Ranch to Gualala area NOT be included in any MPA's. I would prefer to see the Gerstle Cove to Sea Ranch area become an MPA. The economic impact on The Sea Ranch community would be devastating by creating an MPA there as the number of renters in those homes that are also divers is very, very high. There are also several shops in the town of Gualala (dive shop, sporting goods, kayak rentals) that derive the bulk of their business from Sea Ranch divers. They too would be adversely impacted.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

John M. Zenner  
IDEA Consulting Group  
888-312-5900 X 1003  
Fax: 888-828-5389  
Visit us at [www.ideaconsultinggroup.com](http://www.ideaconsultinggroup.com)

CONFIDENTIAL TRANSMISSION The message included with this e-mail and any attached document(s) contain information which is confidential under applicable law (personal health information, financial data, research data, etc.). This information is intended only to be for the use of the recipient named in this e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient, note that any disclosure, photocopying, distribution or use of the contents of this e-mail information is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender immediately.

---

**From:** Dennis Viglienzzone [mailto:caesarsam@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 25, 2007 3:55 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Abalone

My suggestion is that you make no changes to further restrict/regulate abalone diving within the MLPA North Central Coast Study Region.

Further this recommendation is made for the entire region of California north of the Golden Gate where red abalone can currently be taken.

Dennis Viglienzzone  
[caesarsam@sbcglobal.net](mailto:caesarsam@sbcglobal.net)

1651 Cunningham Way  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 542-1458

---

**From:** Charlie Martin [mailto:cmartin5@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 24, 2007 10:54 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** NORTH COAST CONCERNS (NEW RESTRICTIONS)

**IT SEEMS THAT THE CONCERNS FOR THE PUBLIC HAVE GONE OUT THE WINDOW !  
I HAVE BEEN AN ABALONE DIVER FOR 30 YEARS ON THE NORTH COAST.  
THE PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO THE TABLE LOOKS TO ME TO REMOVE THE  
PUBLICS RIGHT TO FISH OR ABALONE DIVE.**

**WHERE IS THIS GOING TO STOP???**  
**I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE PUBLIC IS HARMING OUR FISHING GROUNDS OR DIVING  
AREAS SO HOW DO YOU JUSTIFY TAKEN THESE GOD GIVEN RIGHTS AWAY?**  
**WE SUPPORT BY PURCHASING PROPER LICENSES AND FISHING WITHIN THE REQUIRED  
LIMITS . PLEASE DON'T TAKE AWAY YET ANOTHER PASTIME THAT WE HAVE ALL ENJOYED.  
I CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE MY CHILDREN AFFORDED THE SAME OPPORTUNITIES AS I HAVE  
HAD ENJOYED FOR SO MANY YEARS.**

**I MAY BE CONTACTED AT THIS E-MAIL OR I CAN BE REACHED BY PHONE  
415 265-4339  
REGARDS,  
CHARLIE MARTIN**

**PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS DIRECTION OF CONSERVATION.**

---

**From:** revidnihcru [mailto:urchins@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 17, 2007 9:11 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Mendocino County Closure Proposals

Eric Wilcox  
31560 Sherwood Road  
Fort Bragg, Ca. 95437  
707-964-3168  
Commercial Urchin Diver  
F&G # L08650

The recommended closures of Cuffy's Cove and McKerricker State Park and Caspar Bay are unacceptable closures. As a diver working out of Albion, Cuffy's Cove is a safe harbor for urchin diving and we depend gravely upon this area for our livelihood. Caspar Bay is also a safe harbor for urchin diving. McKerricker is a highly productive area for sea urchin. Closing these areas will increase the urchin population to previous commercial harvest levels destroying the kelp beds of the future. At one point in recent history, the mayor of San Diego paid a bounty on each sea urchin due to their destructive nature to the kelp beds. Are we trying to repeat failures in history by restoring sea urchins to such destructive levels? With destroyed kelp beds due to an exploding urchin population also destroys the rock and finfish rookeries that depend upon the kelp beds for their reproduction and survival. Sea urchins also compete with abalone for tidal resource space and are more successful than

abalone, thus the MLPA is detrimental to a healthy abalone population. In essence the MLPA is more destructive than productive in the far future.

There are other areas that would be better suited for closures. Mendocino Bay has the most diverse terrain of rock and sand that supports a greater variety of species. Also, from Usal to Bear Harbor is a larger area that is less accessible to the public but not to commercial fishing, and also has a more diverse bottom of rock and sand that supports a greater diversity of species.

Science without practical experience from those who have spent 20 years diving the area is shoddy work based on theory without concern or thoughtfulness of the effects. We have a very different environment than Australia or New Zealand. We have some of the most productive sections of coast in the world, with the largest sea urchins and abalone. The sea urchin population has remained extremely sustainable with commercial harvest resulting in the healthiest kelp beds and rock fish nurseries in the last 150 years. The MLPA is a reversal of this health promising barren kelp forest with fewer rock and fin fish. How scientific is that? It seems to me that public sentiment is at action without knowledge of scientific data to implement real concern for the future of our coasts.

Look at the rock fish data since sea urchin harvesting has occurred along California's North Coast. Rock fish populations have boomed. Not until the unregulated live fish industry and dragging fishery did these populations fall. Now with proper regulation of these industries have rock fish populations have rebounded. But, without the kelp beds that the MLPA promises to destroy, rock fish populations in these areas will crash. This logic is science, yours is not, yours' is an agenda written by people in offices who have no working knowledge of how the ecosystem works and dooms any productivity it claims to failure.

Sincerely,  
Eric Wilcox

---

**From:** ThaiFurn@aol.com [mailto:ThaiFurn@aol.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, June 16, 2007 5:33 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** (no subject)

I would like to address Scientific Collecting, Abalone, and Kelp beds.. Scientific collecting has gotten way out of control... hammer and chisel? this method is used to take corals and gorgonians, all of which will not reproduce if taken all the way down to the rock... also, all commercial harvesting of corals was banned in the early eighties so why do we make exceptions for any reason, and if so , where are they reporting data and what controls.... trawl nets, intertidal harvesting, almost completely unregulated.... Abalone- Are there pinto and or flat Abalones in this zone , and why are they omitted from this data? The demise of abalone in the 1990's in S Cal is from diseased baby abalone (courtesy of the aquaculturist purchase of south african abalone) and water pollution, NOT commercial divers. ( they all disappeared,tiny babies and 7 1/4"plus) Allowing open water systems for raising abalone can allow another outbreak of disease and we are required by law to err in the favor of the fishes.... Kelp forest and all the brown algae.... Not only are the large beds of Nereocystis lutkeana, but also the Kombu , Laminaria, Wakame, etc., are reduced to a pittance if the sea urchins are not kept in check... The data in all the already closed areas within this zone should be scrutinized, (ie the population densities of the urchins vs abundance of brown algae, how the urchins maul kelp as soon as it blooms,etc)and making the commercial harvest of sea urchins possibly exempt in this zone or at least some season should be considered... thank you and good luck.... Mark Nicks..... commercial fisherman.....



**The Sea Ranch Association**

975 Annapolis Road  
P.O. Box 16  
The Sea Ranch, CA 95497-0016

Administration

tel: 707-785-2444  
fax: 707-785-3555

August 22, 2007

Mr. Ken Wiseman, Executive Director MLPA Initiative  
C/O California Resources Agency  
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: THE DEL MAR LANDING MARINE PRESERVE AREA, (MPA)  
THE SEA RANCH, CA**

Dear Mr. Wiseman:

The description of the Del Mar Landing MPA (Appendix V) of the ***Draft Regional Profile of the North Central Study Region Alder Creek/ Point Arena to Pigeon Point California, May 7, 2007*** contains the following:

*The Del Mar Landing MPA is an area where the degree of protection could be increased and site boundaries could be expanded with little opposition from consumptive groups. The community is very supportive of a state marine reserve in this area and would contribute to the effectiveness of local enforcement.*

This proposed expansion of the Del Mar Landing MPA appears to follow from the ***Draft Regional Profile*** section 9.3, which notes *the central coast scientific advisory team determined guidelines for size and spacing of MPAs: "... MPAs should have an alongshore span of 5-10 km (3-6 mi or 2.5- 5.4 nmi) of coastline, and preferably 10-20 km (6-12.5 mi or 5.4-11 nmi). Larger MPAs would be required to fully protect marine birds, mammals, and migratory fish..."* With a length of 0.7 mi, the Del Mar Landing MPA is well below the preferred MPA length.

In addition to being a state marine reserve, the Del Mar Landing MPA is also a State Water Quality Protection Area (SWQPA) subject to the provisions of the California Ocean Plan, as adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). About three years ago the SWRCB notified The Sea Ranch Association (Association) that it must cease storm water discharge into the Del Mar MPA or request an exception from the SWRCB to continue the discharges. The Association has requested an exception for two small storm water discharges into the Del Mar MPA, but the SWRCB has yet to take action on the request. Any expansion of this MPA, either north or south, would encounter additional storm water discharges and, if the SWQPA restrictions are included in the expansion, the expansion could result in the Association having to cease the discharges and/or engage in potentially costly mitigation and/or monitoring of the expanded MPA.

We see that water quality is part of the MLPA Initiative, as the Del Mar MPA is included in the **Draft Regional Profile** section 4.3, discussion on water quality issues and existing State regulations:

*Coastal water quality information is important in MPA planning to ensure that any potential threats to marine resources in MPAs from poor water quality can be identified and addressed through MPA siting or coordination with agencies with jurisdiction over water quality. The Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California (California Ocean Plan), prepared by the SWRCB, has been in effect since 1972. This plan outlines all of the requirements and implementation measures for management of waste discharge to the ocean.*

*Along with the SWRCB, under the California Ocean Plan, the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) manages Region 1. Each RWQCB has a unique “Water Quality Control Plan” (or “Basin Plan”). The SWRCB establishes “areas of special biological significance” (ASBSs) through the California Ocean Plan. These ASBSs are included in state water quality protection areas (SWQPAs) that are “designated to protect marine species or biological communities from an undesirable alteration in natural water quality...”. SWQPAs are one of six types of managed areas described in the Marine Managed Areas Improvement Act, and within SWQPAs waste discharges are prohibited or limited. There are 10 SWQPAs (I have only shown the Del Mar MPA is in the table below) in the north central coast study region (Table 7).*

*Table 7: SWQPAs in the North Central Coast Study Region*

<i>SWQPA Name</i>	<i>Area (sq mi)</i>	<i>SWQPA ID Number</i>
<i>Del Mar Landing Ecological Reserve ASBS</i>	<i>0.12</i>	<i>2</i>

*The California Critical Coastal Areas (CCAs), designated by the California Coastal Commission, significantly overlap with SWQPAs. These CCAs serve the dual goals of “improving degraded water quality, and providing extra protection from non-point source pollution (NPSP) to marine areas with recognized high resource value”. Seventeen areas (again, I have only shown the Del Mar MPA is in the table below) in the study region have been designated as Critical Coastal Areas (Table 8).*

*Table 8: Critical Coastal Areas in the Study Region*

<i>Critical Coastal Area Name</i>	<i>CCA ID Number</i>
<i>Del Mar Landing Ecological Reserve</i>	<i>ASBS 17</i>

It appears from the above that expansion of the Del Mar MPA could indeed result in a concurrent or subsequent expansion of the Del Mar SWQPA. As noted, the Association has already spent considerable staff time and about \$10,000 on studies to address SWRCB’s issue on storm water discharge into the existing Del Mar Landing MPA and to support the request for a discharge exception. Given that the SWRCB has not responded to this study or the exception request, it is as yet unclear what the Association’s responsibilities

will be with respect to water quality in the Del Mar MPA and, more importantly, what the financial implications of any expansion of the MPA will entail. Therefore, until the Association gains a clear understanding of the potential for SWQPA regulations in an expanded MPA, the Association must oppose any expansion of the Del Mar Landing MPA, as suggested in the ***Draft Regional Profile***.

The Association has long supported the protection of marine resources along our coastline. The Association has an active Seal Pup Docent Program, supports the study of shore bird populations in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management, and monitors two voluntary marine preserves in addition to the Del Mar MPA. Although the Association wishes to be cooperative with the addition of or expansion of marine protection areas, it must also be concerned with potential financial impacts.

We look forward to your reply to the Association's concerns at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "James A. Jordan, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

James A. Jordan, Jr., Ph.D., Chair  
Board of Directors  
The Sea Ranch Association

cc: Supervisor Mike Reilly  
Assembly Member Patty Berg

KENWISEMAN8/2007/DB/4410/4200