

| Comment # | Name, Organization | Comment Format & Date | Topic(s) Raised | Summary of Comment | Response |
|-----------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| 1 | David Goldenberg, Executive Director, California Sea Urchin Commission | Letter to the Commission, 09/29/2017 | Entire Regulatory Proposal | The letter explains the history and rationale behind every regulatory change proposed in the ISOR as well as provides general support for the entire regulatory package. | Support noted. |
| 2 | Nathan Rosser, CSUC Commissioner | Letter to the Commission, 09/28/2017 | Entire Regulatory Proposal | a. Reduce the capacity of the sea urchin fleet and issuing new permits under the new lottery system would ensure that the fishery remain sustainable. | Support noted. |
| | | | | b. Extra dive day would increase safety, improve market, and would have negligible environmental impact. | |
| | | | | c. General support for the regulatory proposal. | |
| 3 | Nick Herzik, CSUC Commissioner | Letter to the Commission, 10/01/2017 | Entire Regulatory Proposal | a. Capacity reduction is necessary for the long-term sustainability of the fishery. | Support noted. |
| | | | | b. Extra dive day would give divers more flexibility in choosing safer weather windows for trips as well as ensuring better quality products. | |
| | | | | c. General support for the regulatory proposal. | |
| 4 | Christopher Nelson, Fisherman | Letter to the Commission, 10/02/2017 | Entire Regulatory Proposal | a. Capacity reduction would ensure the long-term sustainability of the sea urchin fishery. | Support noted. |
| | | | | b. General support for the regulatory proposal. | |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 5 | Lance Maassen, Fisherman | Letter to the Commission, 10/05/2017 | Entire Regulatory Proposal | General support for the entire regulatory proposal. | Support noted. |
| 6 | Terry Herzik, Fisherman | Letter to the Commission, 10/06/2017 | Capacity Reduction and Additional Dive Day | a. Support for capacity reduction and additional dive day. | Support noted. |
| | | | | b. Weekend Restrictions should be removed altogether. | No action taken. The option of repealing all seasonal restriction was not put forth by the CSUC and therefore not included in this rulemaking. The Commission encourages the CSUC to continue to explore further possibility of improving the sustainability and effectiveness of the fishery. |
| 7 | Bob Bertelli, Fisherman and former CSUC Chairman | Letter to the Commission, 10/06/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the entire regulatory proposal. | Support noted. |
| 8 | Miles Wallace, Fisherman | Letter to the Commission, 10/09/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the entire regulatory proposal. | Support noted. |
| 9 | John Hoadley, CSUC Commissioner | Letter to the Commission, 10/11/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the entire regulatory proposal. | Support noted. |
| 10 | David Goldenberg, Executive Director, CSUC | Commission Testimony, 10/12/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the entire regulatory proposal. | Support noted. |
| 12 | Robert Vanderhook, Citizen | Commission Testimony, 10/12/2017 | Entire Proposal | Otters should be replanted into Southern California, which would control urchin population and improve kelp coverage. | No action taken. The comment is outside the scope of the regulatory proposal. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 13 | Paul Weakland, Fisherman | Commission Testimony, 10/12/2017 | Sea Urchin Fishery Generally | a. The Department and the Commission should account for their expenditure managing the urchin fishery. | Both the Commission and the Department are dedicated to transparency, but this topic is outside the scope of the regulatory package. A fee to enter the drawing for sea urchin dive permit is proposed, and the justification for the fee is included as part of this package. |
| | | | | b. The Department attempted to cull sea urchin in the past by lining submerged rock with quicklime. | No action taken. This comment is unrelated to the proposed changes and outside the scope of the regulatory proposal. |
| 14 | Matt Pressly, CSUC Commissioner | Commission Testimony, 12/07/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the package. | Support noted. |
| 15 | Cliff Hawk, CSUC Commissioner | Commission Testimony, 12/07/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the package with special emphasis on how extra day would give divers flexibility to haul in smaller loads for local Saturday markets, which would command higher price. | Support noted. |
| 16 | Nick Herzik, CSUC Commissioner | Commission Testimony, 12/07/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the package with special emphasis on how a new cohort of divers is on the horizon that could potentially spike landing. | Support noted. |
| 17 | Bernie Sauls, CSUC Commissioner | Commission Testimony, 12/07/2017 | Entire Proposal | General support for the package with special emphasis on the need for capacity reduction as ocean environment changes over coming years. | Support noted |
| 18 | Tony Cho, Recreational Fisherman | Commission Testimony, 12/07/2017 | Sea Urchin Permitting Generally | Concerns over the difficulty for new divers to enter the fishery; suggests an option for a more expensive and more restricted permit. | CSUC commissioners, with input from Department staff, have deliberated the additional potential burden on prospective entrants to the fishery who do not have a history in the fishery against the need for proactive conservation, as well as regard for prospective entrants that are potentially more qualified to enter the fishery. The current package was the result of the compromise, and other alternatives were ultimately rejected by the CSUC. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| 19 | Paul Weakland, Fisherman | Commission Testimony, 12/07/2017 | Entire Proposal | a. The fact that urchin permits are still not transferable is a contradiction. | a. The transferability of commercial urchin diving permits is outside the scope of this package. |
| | | | | b. Landing fee from sea urchin does not go into the state's budget, and the cost of managing the fishery is not transparent. | b. No action taken. The commenter is mistaken, and the state does receive landing fees from sea urchin landings. |
| | | | | c. It is inequitable for sea urchin divers in southern California to benefit from an extra diving day during the restricted season and not divers in northern California. | c. The option for an additional day was offered to commercial sea urchin divers in northern California, but were rejected; the CSUC, the Department, and the Commission did not wish to impose such regulatory change without industry support; the Commission and the Department would welcome further recommendation from the CSUC should such support materialize. |