

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Amend sections 3.00, 4.00, 5.00, 5.41, 5.85, 7.00, 7.50, 8.10 (add 5.84, 5.89, 7.40), Title 14, California Code of Regulations

I. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

During the initial public comment period (July 7, 2020 to October 14, 2020) for the proposed Simplification of Statewide Inland Sport Fishing Regulations, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) received a total of 56 comment letters and 232 specific written and oral comments, and work with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) in preparing responses.

Comment letters were organized by general topic, assigned a category code and then numbered sequentially. Each individual specific comment consistent with Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(3) was “bracketed” with a lowercase letter, and assigned a cross-reference code for specific response in this Attachment. All comments received (either written or oral) were numbered sequentially based on general topics.

Of note, the non-profit organization California Trout (CalTrout) submitted a letter and another 25 commenters submitted letters echoing the comments from CalTrout. Thus, General Response comments CT-A through CT-G, which are referred to frequently thereafter in the responses presented in this Attachment, were bracketed differently with uppercase letters and frequently referred to throughout the responses (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Summary of Comments Received on the proposed Simplification of Sportfishing Regulations, July - October, 2020.

General Topic	Letter Code	# Letters / Commenters	Number of Specific Comments
Letters on the Truckee River (echoing Montna proposal support)	T	6	16
CalTrout and other letters echoing CalTrout’s comments	CT	28	119
Letters on Lake Almanor tributaries	LA	5	19
Letters on the Owens River	OR	7	16
Letters for miscellaneous topics	M	12	41
Total		56	211
June, August, October Hearings (oral comments)	JH, AH, OH	12	21

The responses to all written comments are provided in **Table 3**. Three public hearings were held (Notice – June 25, 2020; Discussion – August 20, 2020; and Adoption – October 14,

Attachment A. Responses to Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

2020) on the proposed regulations, whereby comments were received, with responses provided in **Table 4**. Transcripts are indexed with each of these meetings.

II. GENERAL RESPONSES

Comments received during the comment period were grouped based on similarity in topic or concern. **General Responses CT-A** through **CT-G** to the public comments on the proposed regulations are concentrated on the following topics:

CT - CalTrout Comment Letter

- **CT-A – General Support for Statewide Regulation Changes and Overall Proposal**
- **CT-B – Truckee River Unified Regulation; Trout Creek to Prosser Creek Preferred Option A7 (from Trout Menu)**
- **CT-C - Truckee River Lake Tahoe to Trout Creek, and Prosser Creek to NV State Line Preferred Option A6 (from trout menu)**
- **CT-D – Upper Sacramento River Preferred Unified Regulation Option A3 (from trout menu)**
- **CT-E – East Walker River Preferred Regulation Option A6 (from trout menu)**
- **CT-F – Mokelumne River Preferred Regulation Option A6 (from trout menu)**
- **CT-G – East Fork Carson River Preferred Regulation Option A6 (from trout menu)**

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-A – GENERAL SUPPORT FOR STATEWIDE REGULATION CHANGE AND OVERALL PROPOSAL

Comment Summary: The current revised fishing regulations balance the goals of protecting wild trout and increasing angling opportunities. Specifically, CalTrout supports the revisions to Section 7.0 (Statewide Regulations) for streams and rivers making all trout streams catch-and-release with artificial lures only during the winter and early spring, when trout congregate to spawn.

Response: Support noted.

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-B – TRUCKEE RIVER UNIFIED REGULATION; TROUT CREEK TO PROSSER CREEK PREFERRED OPTION A7 (FROM TROUT MENU)

Comment Summary: The Truckee River trophy wild trout river should be managed by single regulation:

- year-round catch and release, barbless lures and flies *with a single hook* to reduce unintended hooking mortality or injury.

Attachment A. Responses to Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

As the Trout Menu doesn't include an option for single barbless hooks, CalTrout requests the following, for consistency with the existing fly-fishing only reach from Glenshire Bridge to Hwy 80 bridge:

- year-round catch and release, artificial flies with barbless hooks (Trout Menu Option A7) for the reach from Trout Creek to Prosser Creek

Response: The Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR) originally presented two options for the Truckee River. Significant effort and dialogue have occurred regarding the proposed regulations for the Truckee River to date. **Table 2** summarizes the options and compromise.

Table 2. Truckee River Regulatory Options and Compromise (Trout Creek to NV State Line)

Current

Truckee River	Daily Bag & Possession	Season	Gear Restrictions
7.50(b)(153)(B) From Trout Creek to Glenshire bridge	2 trout 0 trout	Last Sat in Apr. – Nov. 15. Min size limit: 14 inches total length (TL). Nov. 16-Fri preceding last Sat in Apr	Artificial lures with barbless hooks
7.50(b)(153)(C) (merged w/ (B)) From Glenshire Bridge to mouth of Prosser Creek	2 trout 0 trout	Last Sat in Apr. – Nov. 15. Min size limit: 14 inches TL Nov. 16-Fri preceding last Sat in Apr	Artificial flies with barbless hooks
7.50(b)(153)(D) From mouth of Prosser Creek to NV State line	2 trout 0 trout	Last Sat in Apr. – Nov. 15. Min size limit: 14 inches TL. Nov. 15 – Fri preceding last Sat in Apr.	Artificial lures with barbless hooks

Option 1 (CDFW)

Truckee River	Daily Bag & Possession	Season	Gear Restrictions
From Trout Creek to mouth of Prosser Creek	0 trout	All year	Artificial lures with barbless hooks
From mouth of Prosser Creek to NV State line	2 trout	All year	Artificial lures

Option 2 (Montna Farms)

Truckee River	Daily Bag & Possession	Season	Gear Restrictions
From Trout Creek to mouth of Prosser Creek	0 trout	All Year	Artificial flies with barbless hooks
From mouth of Prosser Creek to NV State line	0 trout	All Year	Artificial lures with barbless hooks

Attachment A. Responses to Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

Compromise*

Truckee River	Daily Bag & Possession	Season	Gear Restrictions
From Trout Creek to mouth of Prosser Creek	0 trout	All Year	Artificial flies with barbless hooks
From mouth of Prosser Creek to NV State line	2 trout 0 trout	Last Sat in Apr. – Nov. 15. Nov. 16 – Fri preceding last Sat. in Apr.	Artificial lures Artificial lures with barbless hooks

**adopted by the Commission at its August 20, 2020 meeting*

After the notice hearing, CDFW staff, FGC staff, and representatives of Montna Farms met and identified a compromise between the two options discussed in the ISOR and as noted in the Pre-Adopt Statement of Reasons (PSOR) that was acceptable to each party, which was introduced at the August 2020 Commission meeting.

The new regulation for the Truckee River from Trout Creek to Prosser Creek aligns with the compromise reached by CDFW and Montna Farms for year-round catch and release angling and also aligns with CalTrout’s proposal for artificial flies with barbless hooks. This compromise sought to balance conservation concerns on this stretch of the Truckee River which is designated as a Wild Trout water and geared more toward wild trout catch and release.

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-C – TRUCKEE RIVER LAKE TAHOE TO TROUT CREEK, AND PROSSER CREEK TO NV STATE LINE PREFERRED OPTION A6 (FROM TROUT MENU)

Comment Summary: The current proposal of artificial lures (allowing barbs) is inadequate to protect wild trout from unnecessary injury or mortality. From Lake Tahoe to Trout Creek in Truckee and from Prosser Creek downstream to the Nevada state line, CalTrout requests:

- year-round catch and release, artificial lures with barbless hooks (Trout Menu Option A6).

Response: As noted under Response CT-B, the compromise reached for the Truckee River maintains the existing regulations from Prosser Creek downstream to the Nevada state line, except for the removal of the 14 inch minimum size limit requirement and the barbless hooks requirement between the last Saturday in April through November 15 during which time the harvest of two trout is allowed. This stretch of river is managed for sustainable harvest to support anglers interested in harvest. This was an effort to strike a balance between conservation and providing opportunity for anglers to harvest fish.

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-D – UPPER SACRAMENTO RIVER PREFERRED UNIFIED REGULATION OPTION A3 (FROM TROUT MENU)

Comment Summary: Rather than using three different regulations for this river currently, CalTrout recommends a unified regulation to support this wild trout dominated fishery: year-round, 2 fish bag limit, artificial lures with barbless hooks only (**Option A3**). This would

Attachment A. Responses to Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

maintain harvest opportunities while adequately protecting the large spawning fish that migrate up from Shasta Lake and throughout the lower river downstream of Dunsmuir. This regulation will meet the primary management objective of the *2000 Fishery Management Plan for the Upper Sacramento River*.

Response: Significant deliberations were held regarding recovery/management of the fishery after the chemical spill in the 1990s. Although a robust wild trout fishery exists, significant local interest and associated harvest supports the need for supplementation in the area near the city of Dunsmuir. The existing and proposed regulations reflect an effort to strike a balance of both wild trout conservation and local interest/use. There is no data suggesting the current regulations/stocking is deleteriously affecting the wild trout population.

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-E – EAST WALKER RIVER PREFERRED REGULATION OPTION A6 (FROM TROUT MENU)

Comment Summary: CalTrout advocates for year-round catch and release, artificial lures with barbless hooks (**Option A6**) on this popular trophy wild trout fishery.

Response: Significant public concern has been raised since CDFW opened the East Walker River to catch and release angling in 2007. The fishery is heavily supported by supplementation, hence any increase in harvest from the increased bag limit is compensated through stocking. However, low flow conditions during the winter season can create trout aggregations in deep water habitat. These conditions have raised concerns from anglers regarding fair-chase, crowding, and increased winter mortality. Although CDFW has no biological data supporting effects at the population level, it respects the concern from anglers and supports closures during this winter period.

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-F – MOKELUMNE RIVER PREFERRED REGULATION OPTION A6 (FROM TROUT MENU)

Comment Summary: CalTrout advocates for year-round catch and release, artificial lures with barbless hooks (**Option A6**) from the Highway 49 Bridge downstream to Lake Pardee at Middle Bar Bridge. There are currently no catch and release fisheries in the Sierra Foothills, and it would serve to fill that gap.

Response: Surveys on the Mokelumne River have shown a highly migratory population of trout, likely supported by supplementation from the reservoir. Given the migratory nature and origins of these trout, CDFW supports and manages for harvest of these fish when present. Although CDFW recognizes the limited use of 0 bag limits for mid-elevation west slope Sierra Nevada waters, the use of regulations should be supported by the management goals and not parity. Low productivity along with short life spans makes these resident populations resilient to harvest and not conducive to manage for larger fish. Adfluvial (lake-run) fish provide anglers a chance at larger trout, however harvest of these fish in-river will likely have minimal effect on the overall population and persistence of these fish as they likely are spending most of their life foraging in the reservoir and are not available until seasonal runs into the river occur.

GENERAL RESPONSE CT-G – EAST FORK CARSON RIVER PREFERRED REGULATION OPTION A6 (FROM TROUT MENU)

Comment Summary: CalTrout advocates for maintaining year-round catch and release, artificial lures with barbless hooks (**Option A6**) below Hangman Bridge to the Nevada state line. Under this proposal, this trophy trout fishery will continue to draw anglers to contribute to the local economy of Alpine County and meet stated management goals of the 1979 *East Fork Carson River Wild Trout Management Plan*.

Response: The East Fork Carson River below Hangman’s Bridge has been formally removed from Wild Trout Designation based on the prevalence of stocked trout throughout the reach and planned management objectives. Extensive stocking in the upstream sections and associated tributaries results in a mixed stock fishery made up of large, stocked fish and smaller wild trout. This mix has been documented throughout the designated reach all the way to Nevada. CDFW supports both its own stocking and the local county efforts; however, it also believes harvest of these stocked fish is warranted and needed, based on biological considerations.

III. SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Table 3 includes the summarized comments received and the Fish and Game Commission’s response.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

Responses to Comments received during public comment period of July 7 – October 14, 2020.

Comments are paraphrased from the commenters for succinctness.

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
T01	<p>Mark Smith & James Stone</p> <p>Northern California Guides and Sportsmen’s Association</p> <p>Email, 5/16/2020 (Pre-notice input)</p>	<p>T01-a. Disagrees with the request by Al Montna to convert the proposed sections of the Truckee River to a barbless dry-fly fishery, and supports CDFW’s original proposal as outlined in draft simplification package.</p>	<p>T01-a. Refer to General Response CT-B and CT-C regarding the compromise reached between CDFW and Montna Farms.</p>
T01	<p>Smith & Stone, con’t.</p>	<p>T01-b. Guides are supportive of the Trout Creek to Prosser Creek CDFW recommended 0 fish bag limit, artificial lures.</p>	<p>T01-b. Refer to General Response CT-B.</p>
T01	<p>Smith & Stone, con’t.</p>	<p>T01-c. Commenters agree with Prosser Creek to State Line CDFW proposed 2-fish bag limit and barbed artificial lures.</p>	<p>T01-c. Refer to General Response CT-C.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
T01	Smith & Stone, con't.	T01-d. Supports all manners of fishing, even fly fishing guides in Tahoe agree that the proposed restrictions on the subject stretches of Truckee River (some of which are privately stocked) is too restrictive and reduces angler opportunity.	T01-d. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.
T01	Smith & Stone, con't.	T01-e. Supports CDFW original proposal on Trout Creek to Prosser, and Prosser to State Line, encouraging Commission to adopt the package as proposed.	T01-e. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.
T02	George Osborn Carmichael, CA Email, 6/20/2020 (Pre-notice input)	T02-a. The ISOR includes the Montna Farms option for the Truckee River, therefore supports the motion to move the ISOR to notice.	T02-a. Comment noted.
T02	George Osborn, con't	T02-b. Several organizations and property owners, fishing guides, elected officials and sportsmen's groups support stronger conservation measures along the stretch of the Truckee River from Trout Creek to Prosser Creek, and Prosser Creek to CA-NV State Line.	T02-b. The Commission received prior to the Notice period (commencing July 17, 2020) several letters on the Truckee River, including Senator Steven Glazer (June 9, 2020), and Senator Jim Nielsen, and Assemblyman James Gallagher (June 15, 2020), and the subsequent letters addressed in this Attachment by response by Cal Trout (letters CT01, CT26), Trout Unlimited (letters CT07, CT25), and other interested persons.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
T03	<p>Hardy Bullock Nevada County Board of Supervisors Elect District 5 Email, 7/15/2020</p>	<p>T03-a. Expresses support for the Montna Proposal presented in the ISOR.</p>	<p>T03-a. Comment noted, this was presented as Option 2 on page 14 the ISOR.</p>
T03	<p>Hardy Bullock, con't.</p>	<p>T03-b. Suggestions in Mr. Montna's proposal directly support efforts of the Truckee-North Community to invest in, care for, and promote a healthy river ecosystem. Several user groups support the proposal as well.</p>	<p>T03-b. Comment noted. Also refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.</p>
T04	<p>D. Stanley, T. Haddon, J. Heuseveldt, J. Beer, B. Burnside, M. Anderson, T. Kirschner, B. Slusser, P. Stanley, M. Heron Local Truckee Guides Email, 7/23/2020</p>	<p>T04-a. Proposed regulations on the stretch of Truckee River from Trout Creek to NV State Line are backtracking on past conservation efforts and conservative regulations. We request year-round, 0 limit, and flies only with barbless hooks.</p>	<p>T04-a. As noted in Table 2, neither Option 1 nor Option 2 of the proposal for the Truckee from Trout Creek to NV State Line included this full stretch to utilize artificial flies only, but rather, the stretch from Trout Creek to mouth of Prosser Creek only. Refer also to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
T04	Stanley, et al., con't.	T04-b. The Wild Trout status of the Truckee River below confluence of Trout Creek warrants more strict regulations. Just below Lake Tahoe to town of Truckee has regulations allowing bait and possession (this works because of ongoing stocking by the State). However, below Trout Creek there is no stocking by the state, and trout depend on natural reproduction, warranting additional protection.	T04-b. Comment noted. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C regarding the compromise reached in light of conservation.
T05	Richard Anderson Supervisor, District 5, Nevada County Email, 8/15/2020	T05-a. Commenter and constituents concerned about elimination for traditional trout season statewide. Also, does not understand Commission might specify a minimum fish length for some waters, yet also require use of barbless lures in such situations so as to reduce unnecessary harm to undersized fish.	T05-a. CDFW evaluated seasonal aspects of the regulations and potential effects in relation to spawning periods of both the spring and fall and found that if potential impacts on spawning fish were a concern then those fisheries would be managed under special regulations. However, for remaining statewide regulations, CDFW did not feel seasonal restrictions were warranted given the compensatory effects of limited access and general reduction to a zero bag limit and harvest would have negative effects across fisheries. However, in some cases across the state CDFW did move forward and recommend some seasonal regulations based on local interests associated with social and economic concerns. Minimum size restrictions provide protective measures to limit harvest on smaller/younger age classes to allow some adult spawning before allowable harvest. Harvest is considered 100% associated mortality as opposed to barbed hooking mortality which is generally compensatory to natural mortality and not a limiting factor at the population level.
T05	Richard Anderson, con't	T05-b. Appreciates effort of CDFW and Commission to simplify inland trout regulations.	T05-b. Support noted.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
T05	Richard Anderson, con't	T05-c. Supports catch and release proposals for Independence Lake, Little Truckee River, Martis Creek, Martis Lake tributaries, Milton Lake, Middle Fork Yuba, Prosser Creek, and Sagehen Creek. Also supports moving Martis Lake to statewide regulation for lakes and reservoirs. However, CDFW should stock this impoundment so to ensure it meets role as easily-fished lake with possession.	T05-c. Currently, CDFW is evaluating effective fish management for Martis Lake including but not limited to stocking and appropriate stocking levels to meet management goals.
T05	Richard Anderson, con't	T05-d. Supports year-round catch and release for Truckee River below confluence with Trout Creek, is outstanding for angling when certain pressures are eased.	T05-d. Refer to General Response CT-B.
T05	Richard Anderson, con't	T05-e. Year-round harvest could devastate this fishery; other stretches of Truckee (i.e., Lake Tahoe to Trout Creek) that offer opportunities for possession and keep fish. Release is a wiser approach below Trout Creek.	T05-e. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT01	Patrick Samuel Bay Area Program Manager, California Trout Email, 6/22/2020 (Pre-notice input)	CT-A through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.
CT02	Scott Waller Riverside, CA Email, 8/12/2020	CT-A through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.
CT03	Kelson Quan Email, 8/12/2020	CT-A through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.
CT04	Steve Schramm Email, 8/12/2020	CT-A through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.
CT05	Brad Gee Email, 8/15/2020	CT-A (not mentioned) CT-B through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT06	John Parsons Belvedere, CA Email, 8/12/2020	CT-A (not mentioned) CT-B through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-B through CT-G .
CT07	Jessica Strickland Director, Trout Unlimited California Inland Program Email, 8/14/2020	CT07-a. Supports making the mainstem Truckee River catch and release, artificial lures only from the confluence of Prosser Creek to the state border.	CT07-a. Refer to General Response CT-C .
CT07	Jessica Strickland, con't	CT-D through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-D through CT-G .
CT08	Caleb Holbrook Email, 8/14/2020	CT08-a. Truckee should be catch and release barbless artificial lures year-long, no exceptions.	CT08-a. The river and associated fishery is different from Lake Tahoe to Nevada and requires different management and considerations for all anglers. Areas of the river that are managed with stocking/supplementation support anglers interested in harvest and using bait. Other sections of the river benefit from more restrictive regulations that are geared more toward wild trout and catch and release. This balance allows for a mixed approach that affords angling experiences that would not otherwise be available. The habitat, productivity, and associated fishery are significantly different across the length of the river. These differences also support mixed management and regulations.
CT08	Caleb Holbrook, con't	CT08-b. East Carson River should remain catch and release, barbless hooks only downstream from Hangman's bridge.	CT08-b. Refer to Specific Response CT-G .

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT08	Caleb Holbrook, con't	CT08-c. Upper Sacramento River should be 2 fish limit, barbless artificial lures year-long.	CT08-c. Refer to Specific Response CT-D.
CT08	Caleb Holbrook, con't	CT08-d. East Walker River should be catch and release barbless artificial lures year-long.	CT08-d. Refer to Specific Response CT-E.
CT08	Caleb Holbrook, con't	CT08-e. Mokelumne River should be catch and release barbless artificial lures year-long from Hwy 49 Bridge downstream to Lake Pardee at Middle Bar Bridge.	CT08-e. Refer to Specific Response CT-F.
CT09	Ron Beltram President, Peninsula Fly Fishers Email, 8/13/2020	CT09-a. Manage the Truckee River with a single regulation mandating catch and release angling year-round with barbless lures and flies with a single hook.	CT09-a. Refer to Specific Response CT08-a above.
CT09	Ron Beltram, con't.	CT09-b. For the Upper Sacramento, recommend year-round 2 fish limit with barbless artificial lures or flies only instead of 3 different regulations.	CT09-b. Refer to General Response CT-D.
CT09	Ron Beltram, con't.	CT09-c. East walker River: catch and release angling year round with barbless lures and flies.	CT09-c. Refer to General Response CT-E.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT09	Ron Beltram, con't.	CT09-d. Mokelumne River: catch and release angling year round with barbless lures and flies.	CT09-d. Refer to General Response CT-F.
CT09	Ron Beltram, con't.	CT09-e. East Fork Carson River: catch and release angling year round with barbless lures and flies from Hangman Bridge to NV state line.	CT09-e. Refer to General Response CT-G.
CT10	Jim Mangels Santa Rosa, CA Email, 8/13/2020	CT10-a. Appreciates making all trout streams catch and release with artificial lures and flies only during the winter/ early spring season.	CT10-a. Comment noted; see also General Response CT-A.
CT10	Jim Mangels, con't.	CT10-b. Truckee River from town of Truckee to Nevada state line should be catch and release year round with barbless lures and flies with a single hook.	CT10-b. Refer to Specific Response CT08-a above.
CT10	Jim Mangels, con't.	CT10-c. A single regulation in the Upper Sacramento River should be year round barbless artificial lures and flies with a 2 fish limit, from Delta to the dam.	CT10-c. Refer to Specific Response CT-D.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT10	Jim Mangels, con't.	CT10-d. East Fork Carson trout section needs more protection, regulation should be catch and release year-round with barbless hooks and no limit, from Hangman Bridge to the Nevada state line.	CT10-d. Refer to Specific Response CT-G.
CT11	Bill Uyeki First Vice President and Conservation Chair, Peninsula Fly Fishers Email, 8/17/2020	CT11-a. Upper Sacramento River – Agree with new regulations, and disagree with Cal Trout’s proposal for one uniform regulation from Lake Siskiyou to Shasta Lake.	CT11-a. Support noted.
CT11	Bill Uyeki, con't.	CT11-b. East Walker River – agree with Cal Trout recommendation for year round 0 bag limit, 18” trout is trophy and should be protected from angler pressure.	CT11-b. Refer to General Response CT-E.
CT11	Bill Uyeki, con't.	CT11-c. East Carson River – agree with Cal Trout recommendation for year round 0 bag limit, must protect wild trout. Allowing 2 bag limit of 14” doesn’t support management plan.	CT11-c. Refer to General Response CT-G.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT11	Bill Uyeki, con't.	CT11-d. Reiterates concern in comment [M11-a] about arbitrary daily bag limits of hatchery trout in tailwater fisheries that aren't stocked with hatchery trout.	CT11-d. This comment does not address changes found in this rulemaking.
CT11	Bill Uyeki, con't.	CT11-e. Commends the simplification effort and protections passed, appreciates deadline extension for comments.	CT11-e. Comment noted; see also General Response CT-A.
CT12	William Martin San Francisco, CA Email 8/13/2020	CT12-a. Supports changes to Section 7.0 to make all streams catch and release during winter/early spring season.	CT12-a. Comment noted; see also General Response CT-A.
CT12	William Martin, con't.	CT12-b. Certain regulations do not adequately protect trout, including Truckee River – from Lake Tahoe to Nevada state line. Urges Commission to designate entire Truckee River as wild trout river, for catch and release by single barbless hooks on artificial flies.	CT12-b. Refer to Specific Response CT08-a above.
CT12	William Martin, con't.	CT12-c. Supports the most protective regulations possible for Upper Sacramento trout, which deserve protective regulations due to significant public access available.	CT12-c. Refer to Specific Response CT-D.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT13	Tom Butler Grover Beach, CA Email, 8/13/2020	CT13-a. Commends Commission on proposal to open all trout streams to year round fishing. Agrees with artificial lures only for winter/ early spring, and recommends they be single barbless to help individual fish and sustainability of population.	CT13-a. Comment noted; see also General Response CT-A.
CT13	Tom Butler, con't.	CT13-b. Upper Sacramento River – recommends year round catch and release, barbless artificial only and no take.	CT13-b. The upper Sacramento River contains both wild and hatchery trout. In the area near Dunsmuir, the river is managed with stocking/supplementation to support anglers interested in harvest and using bait. As a result, hatchery trout are intermixed with wild trout throughout the upper Sacramento River. There is no data suggesting the current regulations/stocking is deleteriously affecting the wild trout population. Refer also to General Response CT-D.
CT13	Tom Butler, con't.	CT13-c. Truckee River – recommends year round catch and release, barbless artificial only and no take.	CT13-c. Refer to Specific Response CT08-a above.
CT13	Tom Butler, con't.	CT13-d. Upper Owens River – recommends year round catch and release, barbless artificial and no take.	CT13-d. The regulations for the Upper Owens River from Benton Bridge road crossing upstream to Big Springs have been changed from a split season with a 2 fish bag limit from the last Saturday in April to November 15 to open all year with a zero bag limit, and artificial lures with barbless hooks only.
CT13	Tom Butler, con't.	CT13-e. Hot Creek – recommends year round catch and release, barbless artificial and no take.	CT13-e. CDFW did not propose any changes to the regulations for Hot Creek. Hot Creek will remain open to fishing all year with a zero bag limit, and only artificial flies with barbless hooks may be used.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT14	<p>Keith Anderson Oakland, CA Email, 8/12/2020</p>	<p>CT14-a. Supports Cal Trout position letter, specifically the Truckee - As the Trout Menu doesn't include an option for single barbless hooks, Cal Trout requests, for consistency with existing fly-fishing only from Glenshire Bridge to Hwy 80 bridge: year-round catch and release, artificial flies with barbless hooks (Trout Menu Option A7) for the Truckee Reach from Trout Creek to Prosser Creek.</p>	<p>CT14-a. Refer to General Response CT-B.</p>
CT15	<p>Peter Scheerlinck, MD Auburn, CA Email, 8/13/2020</p>	<p>CT15-a. Aligns with Cal Trout letter, supports changes to Section 7.0 for streams and rivers making all trout streams catch-and-release with artificial lures only during the winter and early spring, when trout congregate to spawn.</p>	<p>CT15-a. Refer to General Response CT-A.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT15	Peter Scheerlinck, con't.	<p>CT15-b. Recommends expanding proposed changes on Mokelumne to other foothill rivers, i.e., Middle Fork American River – current 4 trout limit is too lenient, recommends change to a 2 trout limit with artificial lures only above the confluence with the N. Fork American River.</p>	<p>CT15-b. The intent of these changes is for clarifying and simplifying the inland fishing regulations. CDFW recognizes the limited use of 0 bag limits for mid-elevation west slope Sierra Nevada waters, however the use of special regulations should support management goals. The Middle Fork American River supports migratory and resident populations of fish, and CDFW supports and manages for harvest of these fish when present. The Middle Fork American River is characterized by steep canyons with limited public access. Upstream of Auburn State Recreation Area many reaches have no public access without a kayak or raft. Although CDFW has not undertaken an extensive study to pinpoint areas of over harvest upon resident fish populations, what data do exist do not highlight fishing pressure and harvest as significant impacts to Middle Fork American River fish populations. Additionally, creating location specific and nuanced regulations is counter to the rationale for the regulation simplification process.</p>
CT15	Peter Scheerlinck, con't.	<p>CT15-c. To further simplify the process, recommends complete catch and release policy with artificial lures and barbless hooks (the current “winter policy”) year-round.</p>	<p>CT15-c. This type of approach would exclude many of the anglers interested in harvest and does not necessarily result in quality trophy trout opportunities. Without some level of mortality/removal/migration/refuge populations can shift to a smaller general size and greater densities limiting upper age class biomass. Currently, the Truckee River in the upper portions is managed for sustainable harvest (low to medium densities) and the lower for trophy wild trout (lower general densities and bigger fish).</p>
CT16	Trevor Heneveld Sacramento, CA Email, 8/18/2020	<p>CT16-a. Aligns with Cal Trout letter, supports changes to Section 7.0 for streams and rivers making all trout streams catch-and-release with artificial lures only during the winter and early spring, when trout congregate to spawn.</p>	<p>CT16-a. Same comment as CT15-a. Refer to General Response CT-A.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT16	Trevor Heneveld, con't.	<p>CT16-b. Recommends expanding proposed changes on Mokelumne to other foothill rivers, i.e., Middle Fork American River – current 4 trout limit is too lenient, change to a 2 trout limit with artificial lures only above the confluence with the N. Fork American River.</p>	<p>CT16-b. Refer to Specific Response CT15-b.</p>
CT16	Trevor Heneveld, con't.	<p>CT16-c. To further simplify the process, recommends complete catch and release policy with artificial lures and barbless hooks (the current “winter policy”) year-round.</p>	<p>CT16-c. Refer to Specific Response CT15-c above.</p>
CT17	<p>Brad Buter Los Angeles, CA Email, 8/12/2020</p>	<p>CT17-a. Wild trout fisheries on the Truckee, Upper Sac, East Walker, East Carson, and Kern need to be protected by these regulations. The regulations should be adjusted to ensure the health of the populations, as well as maintain economic benefits.</p>	<p>CT26-a. Comment noted. CDFW will continue to monitor waters and evaluate the effects of the new regulations on the fisheries with resources available.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT18	Brad Thompson Santa Monica, CA Email, 8/13/2020	CT18-a. Wild trout fisheries on the Truckee, Upper Sac, East Walker, East Carson, and Upper Kern need to be protected in different ways than stocked rivers. The regulations should be adjusted to ensure the health of the populations, as well as maintain economic benefits.	CT18-a. Refer to Specific Response CT17-a.
CT19	Bronson Buter Mammoth Lakes, CA Email, 8/13/2020	CT19-a. Wild trout fisheries on the Truckee, Upper Sac, East Walker, East Carson, and Kern need to be protected by these regulations. The regulations should be adjusted to ensure the health of the populations, as well as maintain economic benefits.	CT19-a. Refer to Specific Response CT17-a.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT20	<p>Torgeir Hansson Greenbrae, CA Email, 8/12/2020</p>	<p>CT20-a. Supports Cal Trout position letter, specifically the Upper Sacramento River - Rather than using three different regulations for this river currently, use a unified regulation: year-round, 2 fish bag limit, artificial lures with barbless hooks only (Option A3) to maintain harvest while protecting the large spawning fish and meet the primary management objective of the 2000 <i>Fishery Management Plan for the Upper Sacramento River</i>.</p>	<p>CT20-a. Refer to General Response CT-D.</p>
CT21	<p>Steve Nelson Email, 8/12/2020</p>	<p>CT21-a. Supports all changes requested by Cal Trout, especially the East Walker River proposal. The East Walker should be catch and release only, as other places are available for keeping fish in possession.</p>	<p>CT21-a. Comment noted. Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.</p>
CT22	<p>Patrick Crosby San Mateo, CA Email, 8/12/2020</p>	<p>CT22-a. Supports all changes requested by Cal Trout as they would simplify and engage anglers in the future.</p>	<p>CT22-a. Comment noted. Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT23	Chris Armstrong Email, 8/12/2020	CT23-a. Supports all changes requested by Cal Trout; any fisheries designated as catch and release should be designated for <i>single barbless hooks only</i> .	CT23-a. Comment noted. Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G .
CT24	Adam Beu Carlsbad, CA Email, 8/18/2020	CT24-a. Supports all changes requested by Cal Trout in their June 19, 2020 letters.	CT24-a. Comment noted. Refer to General Responses CT-A through CT-G .
CT25	Jessica Strickland Director, Trout Unlimited California Inland Program Email, 10/09/2020	CT25-a. Supports changes to Section 7.0 to make all streams catch and release during winter/early spring season.	CT25-a. Comment noted; see also General Response CT-A .
CT25	Jessica Strickland, con't.	CT25-b. Reconsider certain regulations in light of simplification falling inconsistent with resource conservation mandates. Supports making the mainstem Truckee River catch and release, artificial lures only from the confluence of Prosser Creek to the state border.	CT25-b. Comment noted; see also General Response CT-C .

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT25	Jessica Strickland, con't.	<p>CT25-c. Rush Creek between Silver Lake and Grant Lake – recommend adoption of additional catch and release only Season, Sept 30th – Nov. 15 (Option 6) – 0 trout, artificial lures w/ barbless hooks to coincide with Grant Lake regulations.</p>	<p>CT25-c. The regulation for Rush Creek seeks to maximize the protection of spawning fish during spring and fall breeding seasons to ensure a sustainable wild trout component to the Grant and Silver Lake fisheries. It also recognizes the historic and high public use of this popular and productive fishery during the summer tourism season. The regulation continues the current somewhat shorter summer regulation of 5 fish and no gear restrictions (June through September) to provide for traditional family angling. Supported by the Mono County Fish and Wildlife Commission and June Lake Loop locals. This fishery is extremely popular, easily accessible, surrounded by large high use campgrounds and resorts, and located within the June Lake Loop. The proposed regulation is the best combination of public opportunity and spawning protection.</p>
CT25	Jessica Strickland, con't.	<p>CT25-d. Lake Almanor tributaries – recommend adoption of additional catch and release only Season, Sept 30th – Nov. 15.</p>	<p>CT25-d. The intent of these regulation changes is for clarifying and simplifying the regulations. To achieve this, two small menus of open seasons, bag limits, and equipment types were created to encompass the diversity of inland fisheries statewide. Waters in the Sierra Nevada that have traditionally closed on November 15 now either close on September 30th or the last day of February. A September 30 through November 15 angling season was not an option in the season menu. Within fisheries management, being protective of fish species during spawning periods as well as the habitat being utilized for spawning is a well-recognized approach to improving recruitment. This approach is often more effective than reducing harvest at other life stages and should not be construed as bias towards lake fishing. Although brown trout are considered a non-native species, Lake Almanor and its tributaries provides a unique opportunity within California to provide a popular brown trout fishery. It is our hope that improving recruitment will help to increase contact rates and harvest opportunity for brown trout in Lake Almanor and its tributaries.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT25	Jessica Strickland, con't.	CT25-e. The proposed trout regs continue over-reliance on hatchery production and stocking for recreational opportunity in inland waters. CDFW should reduce reliance on hatcheries to provide sportfishing and harvest opportunity to adapt angling regulations that maximize wild trout populations.	CT25-e. This comment does not address proposed changes found in this rulemaking.
CT25	Jessica Strickland, con't.	CT25-f. TU thanks Commission and DFW for leadership and collaboration on this effort.	CT25-f. Comment noted.
CT26	Patrick Samuel Bay Area Program Manager, California Trout Email, 9/30/2020	CT26-a. The September 2020 revision of the regulations doesn't adequately protect wild trout fisheries in certain waters.	CT26-a. Comment noted. CDFW will continue to monitor waters and evaluate the effects of the new regulations on the fisheries with resources available.
CT26	Patrick Samuel, con't.	CT26-b. The unique Fall River fishery is primarily catch and release by flies, yet the latest science isn't being used to inform management via the proposed regulations.	CT26-a. Comment noted. CDFW will continue to monitor waters and evaluate the effects of the new regulations on the fisheries with resources available.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT26	Patrick Samuel, con't.	<p>CT26-c. Given their genetic distinction, trout in Fall River and Bear Creek deserve a different regulation than proposed. Cal Trout requests unified regulation including Ahjumawi, Eastman Lake, Lava Springs, and Bear Creek – year-round angling with barbless, artificial lures and a 0 fish daily bag limit (Option A6 from Trout Menu).</p>	<p>CT26-c. Bear Creek is one of the primary spawning areas in the upper reaches of the Fall River Complex (FRC) and will have significant protective measures from the proposed seasons/closures. In response to public input to protect the fall and spring spawning trout population in Bear Creek, CDFW shortened the angling season from Saturday preceding Memorial Day through November 15 to Saturday preceding Memorial Day through September 30. Harvest will be allowed during the summer months when most of the fluvial adult spawning fish have left the tributaries. Additional protective catch and release regulations are proposed during migratory periods (spring/fall) in the remaining FRC to allow sustainable angling opportunity.</p> <p>The “Fall River Complex” would encompass these waters; Ahjumawi Lava Springs and Eastman Lake as well as other waters within the complex.</p> <p>Refer also to Specific Response M10-a below.</p>
CT26	Patrick Samuel, con't.	<p>Cal Trout reiterates written and oral comments</p> <p>CT-A (not mentioned) CT-B through CT-G</p>	<p>Refer to General Responses CT-B through CT-G.</p>
CT27	Stephen Parry Napa, CA Email, 8/13/2020	<p>CT27-a. Supports California Trout’s recommended changes to proposed trout regulations as stated in June 19, 2020 letter.</p>	<p>CT27-a. Refer to General Responses CT-B through CT-G.</p>
CT27	Stephen Parry, con't.	<p>Reiterates Cal Trout comments</p> <p>CT-A (not mentioned); CT-B through CT-G</p>	<p>Refer to General Responses CT-B through CT-G.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
CT28	Rob Forbes Healdsburg, CA Email, 8/13/2020	CT28-a. Thanks Commission and Roger Bloom for leadership and collaboration on revised trout regulations, applauds CDFW for their willingness to encourage public participation.	CT28-a. Comment noted.
CT28	Rob Forbes, con't.	Reiterates Cal Trout comments CT-A through CT-G	Refer to General Responses CT-B through CT-G.
LA01	Eric See Chico, CA Email, 7/30/2020	LA01-a. Opposes regulation change to Almanor Lake tributaries, which would close fishing on 50+miles of streams during a peak time and for minimal benefit, exhibiting a bias for lake over stream fishing.	LA01-a. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-b. The proposed regulations demonstrate an unfair bias for lake fishing and unclear rationale behind the proposal, when year-round lake fishing is allowed at 5 fish limit, stream anglers are restricted – it seems unfair.	LA01-b. Refer to Specific Response LA01-c below.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-c. The proposed closure is inconsistent with stream management principles, and pushes the idea that fishing in streams is harmful to spawning trout populations. This is in conflict with existing fishing during spawning seasons on the upper Sacramento, Pit, Owens, East Walker rivers.	LA01-c. Lake and associated streams often function together to support a fishery, however management of those habitats is not always the same. Effects from anglers via harvest or catch and release vary considerably as fish move across these different habitats and seasons. Although some larger/longer riverine systems that support spawning can afford some level of angling during the spawn, other smaller/shorter streams may not. Generally, smaller streams that support adfluvial runs of spawning trout during the fall see low-water conditions that can aggregate spawning fish making them more susceptible to angling mortality and poaching.
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-d. Even Hat Creek is proposed for an expanded season to allow fishing during rainbow and brown trout spawning, thought with restricted bag limit. Why was this not proposed on the Lake Almanor tribs instead of the proposed closure after September?	LA01-d. Refer to Specific Responses CT25-d and LA01-c .
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-e. The proposal closes off stream currently open to the public, conflicting with Fish and Game Commission Policy of preventing loss of sportfishing opportunities (Section 703 of Fish and Game Code).	LA01-e. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d .

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-f. The fishing closure is proposed to protect a prized (but introduced) game species, brown trout, and is contrary to the intended benefit of providing recreational opportunity.	LA01-f. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-g. The Commission should increase fishing opportunities and expanded season for the streams in this area. Wishes he had seen the version proposed in 2019 when originally discussed, which he would have supported.	LA01-g. CDFW will monitor waters to evaluate the effects of the new regulations on fisheries with available resources.
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-h. Though focusing primarily on Lake Almanor tributaries, opposes changes to all other waters with "F1" menu option.	LA01-h. Comment noted.
LA01	Eric See, con't. 7/30/2020	LA01-i. Please preserve the 50+ miles of fishing and do not make this change for Lake Almanor tributaries.	LA01-i. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA02	Eric See Chico, CA Email, 9/23/2020	LA02-a. Opposes regulation change to Almanor Lake tributaries, which have been in effect for decades.	LA01-a. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
LA02	Eric See, con't. 9/23/2020	LA02-b. Opposes regulation change to Almanor Lake tributaries, which would take away fall fishing on 50+miles of streams.	LA02-b. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA02	Eric See, con't. 9/23/2020	LA02-c. North Fork Feather River neighbors oppose this closure, e.g., Rice Creek, Warner Creek, Hamilton Branch, and other small tributaries.	LA02-c. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA03	Ed Bruno Chico, CA Email, 8/20/2020	LA03-a. The proposal to close Lake Almanor tributaries misses its mark; when examining biology, brown trout recruitment is most affected by predation by bass, non-game fish, and other trout. Fishing in tributaries has minimal impact compared to predators.	LA03-a. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA03	Ed Bruno, con't.	LA03-b. Take the time to figure out areas needing protecting and impose catch-release, artificial lures only for some or all of those sections.	LA03-b. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.
LA03	Ed Bruno, con't.	LA03-c. Reduce limit in Lake Almanor to assure more spawning fish return to tributaries.	LA03-c. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
LA04	<p>Mike Lewis Napa, CA Email 8/17/2020</p>	<p>LA04-a. The earlier closure on Lake Almanor tributaries should help protect brown trout spawning and population. Thanks for opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>LA04-a. Support noted for shortening the current angling season.</p>
LA05	<p>Almanor Fishing Association Board of Directors Chester, CA Email, 10/8/2020</p>	<p>LA05-a. Extending the closure date to Feb. 28th would have a detrimental impact to the Lake Almanor fishery. Supports the Sept 30th closure date for tributaries to Lake Almanor.</p>	<p>LA05-a. Support noted for not extending the current angling season.</p>
LA05	<p>Almanor Fishing Association, con't.</p>	<p>LA05-b. While the brown trout fishery has been declining, fishing on Lake Almanor tributaries to Feb. 28 (prime spawning) would have a significant impact on the Lake Almanor fishery.</p>	<p>LA05-b. Support noted for not extending the angling season.</p>
LA05	<p>Almanor Fishing Association, con't.</p>	<p>LA05-c. Extending the season on Lake Almanor tributaries would allow for trout of questionable condition to be harvested as they head to spawning grounds.</p>	<p>LA05-c. Support for not extending the angling season noted.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
OR01	<p>Douglas Brown, Owner Browns Owens River Campground Email, 4/17/2020 (Pre-notice input)</p>	<p>OR01-a. Opposes the proposed changes to Owens River from Benton Crossing Bridge downstream to Crowley Lake from existing dates of last Saturday in May through Sept. 30 to last Saturday in April through July 31.</p>	<p>OR01-a. This regulation will allow take in a high use area frequented by anglers and families during summer months while protecting spawning fish in the fall. These proposed regulations align with other Owens River and Crowley Lake regulations, fulfilling the goals of the simplification and thus making the regulations less complicated. Under the current (unrevised) regulations there were no gear restrictions for the stretch of the Upper Owens River from Benton Bridge to the fishing monument, allowing use of bait. Then from the fishing monument to Crowley Lake, artificial lures with barbless hooks were required. The proposed changes would transition from no restrictions (e.g., use of bait) to use of artificial lures only for the combined revised reach of Benton Bridge to Crowley Lake for the period of August through September.</p> <p>The removal of bait fishing in August and September not only aligns with Crowley Lake regulations, but also serves to reduce hooking mortality for trout entering the upper Owens River during their spawning migration, while still allowing angling with artificial lures.</p>
OR01	<p>Douglas Brown, con't.</p>	<p>OR01-b. As owner of the Browns Owens River campground, the proposed regulations would greatly affect the business, reducing the season from less than 5 to two months, missing the busiest times of Aug and September for family and elderly bait anglers. It seems the regulation specifically meets the needs of fly fishermen.</p>	<p>OR01-b. These changes do not close the Upper Owens to fishing or reduce the fishing season, but rather adjust the allowable gear and reduce the bag limit from 5 to 2 trout from August to November. Accommodations have been made to allow families with children, the elderly, and disabled to still take fish during the peak visitation period of August through September. The changes in gear and bag limits are implemented to help the fish better survive through their spawning migration with the aim of maintaining fish stocks for this and next season's fishing trips to this popular area. Refer also to Specific Response OR01-a above.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
OR01	Douglas Brown, con't.	OR01-c. Only Upper Owens has the proposed change (as opposed to Hilton, McGee, Convict Creeks), so it doesn't seem like an issue of spawning fish. CDFW stocks this stretch of river when wild trout move to headwaters above Hot Creek.	OR01-c. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR01	Douglas Brown, con't.	OR01-d. Requests existing regulations for season are maintained, as they don't harm spawning fish in Crowley Lake.	OR01-d. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR02	Kelli Brown Browns Owens River Campground Email, 9/23/2020	OR02-a. Voices opposition to proposed change in Upper Owens River from bridge at Benton Crossing south through Browns Campground, stopping bait fishing through on July 31.	OR02-a. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR02	Kelli Brown, con't	OR02-b. The proposed change would negatively impact the campground, cutting the season in half, and affect their guest bait anglers, including children, elderly, and disabled.	OR02-b. Refer to Specific Responses OR01-a and OR01-b above.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
OR02	Kelli Brown, con't	OR02-c. The proposed change unfairly singles out this stretch of the Owens River. It appears CDFW caters to special interest groups rather than care about children maintaining the tradition of fishing. Do not take bait fishing from the Upper Owens.	OR02-c. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR03	Daniel Brown Email, 9/23/2020	OR03-a. The proposed changes to Upper Owens from Benton Crossing are unacceptable. This stretch of river is scrutinized by fly fishing community, the constant regulations changes are unfair and wrong.	OR03-a. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above. The proposed changes do not convert this reach of river to fly-only, instead allowing for artificial lures after August 1.
OR03	Daniel Brown, con't.	OR03-b. Owen's River is open year-round near Bishop, and the entire river should be open to fishing year-round instead of picking and choosing per the request of fly fishermen. We all pay for the same fishing licenses.	OR03-b. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above. The fishing season itself is a month earlier for the stretch from Benton Bridge to Lake Crowley, and other parts of the Owens River may be open year-round where they fall under the statewide regulation for streams and rivers.
OR04	Lari Brown Email, 9/23/2020	OR04-a. The proposed regulation change to Upper Owens River is sad and will affect my family's business, and the enjoyment of fishing from our campground clients.	OR04-a. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
OR04	Lari Brown, con't.	OR04-b. Kids learn on bait rods, and if the proposed regulations pass those hurt include our business as well as family traditions who fish in on this stretch of river. Please reconsider the regulation change.	OR04-b. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR05	Ed Pisani Garden Grove, CA Email 9/23/2020	OR05-a. Supports maintaining existing regulations for Upper Owens River, and not change bait fishing to July 31 (maintain through September). This section is highlighted by the Browns Owens River Campground, which provides valuable fishing opportunity for kids.	OR05-a. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR05	Ed Pisani, con't.	OR05-b. The proposed change would cause kids to miss out on bait fishing. If the concern is take of wild or spawning trout late in the summer, commenter states they've never caught any in the late summer in the Upper Owens.	OR05-b. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR05	Ed Pisani, con't.	OR05-c. Please reconsider keeping the existing Upper Owens River regulations as-is.	OR05-c. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
OR06	Lori Desoto Email, 9/22/2020	OR06-a. Commenter and family are opposed to any fishing changes on Upper Owens River.	OR06-a. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
OR07	Terry Calsadillas Bishop, CA Email, 9/23/2020	OR07-a. Opposes changes to regulations below Benton Crossing downstream to Crowley Lake Monument. Do not stop bait fishing through Browns Owens River Campground.	OR07-a. Refer to Specific Response OR01-a above.
M01	Bartsche Miller Eastern Sierra Policy Director Mono Lake Committee (MLC) Email, 8/14/2020	M01-a. MLC supports proposed regulations for 4 creeks undergoing restoration with the zero bag limit, and artificial lures with barbless hooks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lee Vining Creek from conduit downstream to Mono Lake •Parker Creek •Rush Creek from Grant Lake dam downstream to Mono Lake •Walker Creek. 	M01-a. Support noted.
M01	Bartsche Miller, con't.	M01-b. Reduced flows in the newly accessible winter season for these tributaries to Mono Lake would increase pressure on trout populations, in particular Rush Creek.	M01-b. Refer to Specific Response M01-c below.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M01	Bartsche Miller, con't.	<p>M01-c. MLC requests season or the above 4 creeks be modified from all year to Saturday preceding Memorial Day through Sept. 30 in order for monitoring to have a preferred baseline in terms of historical fishing season. This would protect brown trout in Rush Creek below Grant Lake Dam. Winter fishing can lead to damage of redds in sensitive reaches.</p>	<p>M01-c. The regulation align all streams in the area with similar regulations that meet the State Water Resources Control Board and Los Angeles Department of Water and Poser criteria for monitoring the fisheries that drain into Mono Lake while providing for the protection of the resource, protection of spawning wild trout, angling opportunity, traditional resource use and local economies of very small towns. Catch and release angling with a zero trout harvest aligns with the monitoring criteria for tributaries to Mono Lake. Opening the streams to year-round angling (C & R) should provide for increased opportunity while also protecting wild trout. The area is usually very cold and mostly inaccessible during the 'extended' season (Nov. through April) and CDFW believes low winter angling pressure coupled with catch and release angling will have little to no effect on the fisheries.</p>
M01	Bartsche Miller, con't.	<p>M01-d. MLC appreciates CDFW's management for recreation and trout protection, and easy rules to understand.</p>	<p>M01-d. Comment noted.</p>
M01	Bartsche Miller, con't.	<p>M01-e. MLC is concerned for Rush, Lee Vining, Parker, and Walker creeks that the year-round proposal doesn't fully consider restoration efforts in the Mono Basin.</p>	<p>M01-e. Refer to Specific Response M01-c above.</p>
M02	Erik Ramirez Email, 8/13/2020	<p>M02-a. Year-round mountain fishing will lure anglers outdoors during the off season while benefitting surrounding communities and being sensitive to trout populations.</p>	<p>M02-a. Support noted.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M03	Evan Sedlock San Rafael, CA Email, 8/14/2020	M03-a. Agrees with protecting smaller and sensitive creeks with zero harvest – E.g., Squaw Creek and Parker Creek.	M03-a. Comment noted.
M03	Evan Sedlock, con't.	M03-b. Extend zero harvest to all of Sagehen Creek, not just the portion upstream of Hwy 89, as this creek suffers from high use and potential overharvest.	M03-b. The fishery below 89 is dominated by small Brook Trout which is continually replenished from the upper sections of the creek above 89, hence it provides a sustainable harvest fishery for anglers interested in fishing/harvesting Brook Trout at a roadside meadow setting, while still protecting the upper section of the creek, research station, and the associated trout population.
M03	Evan Sedlock, con't.	M03-c. Single barbless hooks should be required whenever barbless is specified to minimize fish handling time and maximize survival of released fish (e.g., as opposed to treble hooks).	M03-c. The scientific literature does not support significant justification for the use of single hooks when using artificial lures exclusively.
M03	Evan Sedlock, con't.	M03-d. Agrees with additional opportunity by opening some streams to catch and release with barbless artificial lures only during winter/ early spring, but would add a single barbless hook requirement.	M03-d. The scientific literature does not support significant justification for the use of single hooks when using artificial lures exclusively.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M03	Evan Sedlock, con't.	M03-e. Parker Lake is a designated Wild Trout water yet there are no special regulations for the lake. Please consider some restricted harvest regulations for this lake.	M03-e. Parker Lake is at an elevation of 7000 feet and requires a two mile hike to access. Essentially the season for reasonable access is early May through early November. Although the June Loop Lakes are considered high use angling waters, Parker Creek and Parker Lake receive low use by anglers. Dirt road access and the short hike deter most casual anglers. These data support the proposed regulation. The proposed regulation should not increase angling pressure or alter the current status of the fishery.
M04	Ronald Escue La Canada, CA Email, 8/12/2020	M04-a. Agrees with barbless hooks and artificial lures for Trinity River Oct. 1- Fri preceding Memorial Day, 0 trout (steelhead)	M04-a. Comment noted. Also, these fish are trout, not steelhead. This section of the Trinity River is not anadromous and not accessible to wild or hatchery steelhead trout.
M04	Ronald Escue, con't.	M04-b. However, limit should be 0 with provision for 1 hatchery fish in possession and season limit of 2 hatchery fish for Trinity River, as hatchery steelhead possession wouldn't be detrimental to the Trinity.	M04-b. See Specific Response M04-a. .
M05	John Tobin Pasadena, CA Email, 8/14/2020	M05-a. Supports Upper Sacramento River, Option A3 ([from Trout Menu]).	M05-a. Refer to General Response CT-D.
M05	John Tobin, con't.	M05-b. Supports East Walker River, Option A6 ([from Trout Menu]).	M05-b. Refer to General Response CT-E.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M05	John Tobin, con't.	M05-c. Little San Antonio Creek (San Bernardino Co.) and Santa Anita Creek (near Arcadia) hold populations of apparently self-sustaining rainbow trout, but the special regulations seem to leave these streams out.	M05-c. CDFW recognizes the importance of the trout fishery in San Anita and Little San Antonio creeks and regional fisheries staff continue to monitor the trout population. Based on our surveys, we did not identify a need for special regulations for this fishery.
M06	Rick Hordin www.WriteAngler.com Email, 8/14/2020	M06-a. Regulations must be carefully implemented in the Tahoe area to ensure spawning and survival of wild fish in tributaries.	M06-a. CDFW will monitor waters to evaluate the effects of the new regulations on fisheries with resources available.
M06	Rick Hordin, con't.	M06-b. Rainbow trout spawn well into June in the area of Tahoe Creek, and the proposed May 31 risks their protection.	M06-b. CDFW will monitor waters to evaluate the effects of the new regulations on fisheries with resources available.
M06	Rick Hordin, con't.	M06-c. The population of fish in Tahoe's tributaries is never large enough to warrant a limit over zero – popularity and fishing pressure. Upper Truckee would be wiped of fish within a week by skilled anglers.	M06-c. The regulation for the Tahoe tributaries has been changed to catch and release fishing only.
M06	Rick Hordin, con't.	M06-d. Believes opener should remain July 1, and requests Single artificial barbless hooks, catch and release only.	M06-d. The angling season was increased by one month, while the bag and possession limits were reduced to from five and 10 fish, respectively, to zero fish. The small increase in the angling season will be offset by the change to catch and release angling. The scientific literature does not support significant justification for the use of single hooks when using artificial lures exclusively.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M07	Jonathan Sloat Redding, CA Email, 7/10/2020	M07-a. Opening Sacramento River from county bridge at Sweetbriar to Shasta Lake for year-round is not appropriate. Greater protection, not less, is needed for this special stretch of river.	M07-a. Refer to General Response CT-D.
M07	Jonathan Sloat, con't.	M07-b. Requests Commission adopt Option A6 (all-year, 0 trout, artificial lures with barbless hooks) for Section 156(C) of proposed regs. If A6 is not adopted, then the split season should be retained.	M07-b. Refer to General Response CT-D.
M07	Jonathan Sloat, con't.	M07-c. Upper Sacramento River, already has lots of year-round opportunities, so it makes sense to eliminate harvest on lower river year-round to protect spawning fish and	M07-c. Refer to General Response CT-D.
M07	Jonathan Sloat, con't.	M07-d. Menu option A6 would help simplify since regulations from Box Canyon to Scarlett Way are already A6 (2 regs simpler than 3).	M07-d. Refer to General Response CT-D.
M07	Jonathan Sloat, con't.	M07-e. Thus, Option A6 for this stretch of the Upper Sacramento River are consistent with the regulation's goals.	M07-e. Refer to General Response CT-D.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M08	<p>Rodney Peck President, Fall River Conservancy (FRC) Email, 8/9/2020</p>	<p>M08-a. Generally, FRC agrees with the recommendations of Cal Trout for the Fall River complex.</p>	<p>M08-a. Refer to Specific Response M10-a below.</p>
M08	<p>Rodney Peck, con't.</p>	<p>M08-b. Fall River Complex should be protected by 0 bag limit and artificial flies or lures with barbless hooks. For Tule River, FRC deviates from Cal Trout's letter in that barbless hooks should be required there as well).</p>	<p>M08-b. Waters within the Fall River Complex will be protected by a zero bag and artificial lures with barbless hooks gear restriction from October through May to protect spawning trout. Refer also to Specific Response M10-a below. The purpose of barbless hooks is to reduce hooking mortality. Therefore, because trout are allowed to be harvested on the Tule River, the use of barbless hooks is not required.</p>
M08	<p>Rodney Peck, con't.</p>	<p>M08-c. Allowing all-year angling would impair the spawning season in Fall River, especially in upper reaches and downstream of Thousand Springs.</p>	<p>M08-c. Refer to Specific Response M10-a below.</p>
M08	<p>Rodney Peck, con't.</p>	<p>M08-d. Given the small size of Upper Fall River reaches, spawning would be very vulnerable to angling during the Feb-Mar spawning season. Thus, FRC requests maintaining existing season of last Sat in April to November 15.</p>	<p>M08-d. Refer to Specific Response M10-a below.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M08	Rodney Peck, con't.	M08-e. Opening Fall River to winter angling during waterfowl season also presents public safety and other concerns.	M08-e. California manages various waterways throughout the state that have concurrent angling and waterfowl hunting opportunities.
M08	Rodney Peck, con't.	M08-f. The elevation of 3,000 ft means the fishery is inert during the winter, so allowing winter angling makes little sense.	M08-f. The fishery is still viable especially given it is a spring fed system. Anglers can have access to the fishery with a zero limit with little to no effect on the population.
M09	Val Atkinson Email, 8/12/2020	M09-a. Requests the spring-fed headwaters of Fall River – Ahjumawi Lava Springs and Eastman Lake be considered for special regulations as the rest of Fall River.	M09-a. The “Fall River Complex” will encompass Ahjumawi Lava Springs and Eastman Lake as well as other waters within the complex and will have the same regulations as the Fall River.
M09	Val Atkinson, con't.	M09-b. Worms and treble hooks are currently allowed, Ahjumawi and Eastman should be protected from overharvesting and possession. Help protect the last wild trout headwaters in the state.	M09-b. Refer to Specific Response M10-a below.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M10	Steven McCanne and Barry Scougale Fall River Mills, CA Email, 8/17/2020	M10-a. Fall River wild trout genetic studies imply that removal of the 14” maximum size limit would be detrimental to populations. Maintaining the limit would retain larger, older fish to stay in the system during low-water events. Request maintaining the 14” maximum size limit on taken trout. This is the issue of most concern to the commenters.	M10-a. CDFW does not believe the proposed limited harvest season and associated bag limits will negatively affect the trout population. Additionally, CDFW sees no evidence the current available harvest regulation is resulting in a population level effect. CDFW supports the opportunity for harvest during non-critical periods/areas and has proposed closures and zero bag limits with barbless hooks under this premise.
M10	McCanne & Scougale, con’t	M10-b. Keep the barbless requirement year-round to prevent injuries to these larger trout.	M10-b. Refer to Specific Response M10-a above.
M10	McCanne & Scougale, con’t	M10-c. Trout population studies on the Fall River should be undertaken to inform future regulation changes and monitor the impact of the current ones.	M10-c. Agreed. CDFW is currently working with UC Davis and will continue to monitor the Fall River and other waters to evaluate the effects of the new regulations on the fisheries with resources available.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M11	Bill Uyeki, con't.	<p>M11-a. Why not change bag/ gear for the Lower Stanislaus River [former (7.50(b)(186))] for trout (where there are no presumed hatchery steelhead plantings) to 0 trout, artificial lures with barbless hooks, and maintain the existing open season dates. Unless CDFW has documented evidence of hatchery steelhead in this reach, why not remove the steelhead bag/ possession limit completely?</p>	<p>M11-a. Sport fishing regulations for anadromous waters are not being addressed as part of this rulemaking.</p>
M11	Bill Uyeki, con't.	<p>M11-b. CDFW should scrutinize those Central Valley tailwater fisheries like Calaveras and Tuolumne Rivers in which hatchery trout or steelhead plantings occur either in far upstream reaches or in large reservoir impoundments behind dams with no fish ladders, as noted for comment M11-a.</p>	<p>M11-b. This comment does not address proposed changes found in this rulemaking.</p>
M12	<p>Bob Minor Berkeley, CA Email, 8/5/2020</p>	<p>M12-a. Opposes adoption of proposed inland fishing regulation changes, which haven't been well crafted and blanket rules are incorrectly applied.</p>	<p>M12-a. Comment noted.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
M12	Bob Minor, con't	M12-b. The recent “simplified” regulations would remove essential protection for Merced River trout.	M12-b. Refer to Specific Response M12-c below.
M12	Bob Minor, con't	M12-c. It makes no sense to open Merced River to the new statewide regulations allowing a change from existing zero limit (catch release) to take of 5 fish per day for this population of Merced River trout that isn't well understood.	M12-c. The section from the NPS boundary downstream to Foresta Bridge is an administrative zone managed by Yosemite National Park. CDFW could not get resolution on a 0 limit (both Rainbow Trout/BrownTrout) because the National Park Service (NPS) wants Brown Trout removed. In waters that contain multiple trout species, CDFW's proposed regulation simplification management options don't allow parsing out different trout species for different management objectives - though some exceptions have been made, this was not an option for the Merced. Therefore, CDFW proposed to move the Merced River to the proposed Statewide Regulation which is most closely aligned with the current regulation in place for the Merced River from Foresta Bridge downstream to Lake McClure. This allows the NPS, if they desire, to manage the Merced River within their boundaries for Rainbow Trout=0 take and 5 fish limit on Brown Trout. An inconsistency in regulations between State managed waters and NPS managed waters will likely be confusing to anglers.
M12	Bob Minor, con't	M12-d. Other fisheries besides Merced River may not also be based on good science. Despite the effort to simplify, the changes haven't been carefully considered.	M12-d. Comment noted.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

Responses to Oral Comments received during the three Public Hearings

Comments are paraphrased from the commenters for succinctness. Transcripts for each meeting are indexed with that meeting.

- **June 25, 2020 Notice Hearing** – comments denoted by code “JH” and are numbered sequentially.
- **August 20, 2020 Discussion Hearing** – comments denoted by code “AH” and are numbered sequentially.
- **October 14, 2020 Adoption Hearing** -- comments denoted by code “OH” and are numbered sequentially.

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
JH01	Steve Cochrane Oral Comment 6/25/2020	JH01-a. Appreciates barbless lure and wild trout stretch from Prosser down to the Nevada State line. Prefers catch and release all year-round barbless lures from Prosser Creek to the State line. Lots of pressure on the Truckee, and having this stretch helps protect wild fish.	JH01-a. Refer to General Response CT-C.
JH01	Steve Cochrane, con't.	JH01-b. Wants angling opportunities increased on other portions of the Truckee especially from 1000 feet below the dam outlet and Lake Tahoe. Previously abundant fish, now there are few. Wishes CDFW would plant or provide more opportunity there.	JH01-b. CDFW will continue to assess and actively manage all portions of the Truckee River while looking to increase angler opportunities if appropriate.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
JH01	Steve Cochrane, con't.	JH01-c. The East Walker river from Bridgeport reservoir down to the Nevada State is also a trophy trout area and the regulation to allow keeping ≥18" fish will really diminish the opportunity. Prefers this stretch remains a no- take a fishery with barbless loop on link.	JH01-c. Refer to General Response CT-E.
JH02	Trevor Fagerstar President, Truckee River Chapter of Trout Unlimited Oral Comment 6/25/2020	JH02-a. Commends the Commission and CDFW for their work to protect wild trout stocks in the state.	JH02-a. Comment noted.
JH02	Trevor Fagerstar, con't.	JH02-b. Urges CDFW to continue commitment to protect wild trout stocks by instituting the special regulations on the Truckee from Trout Creek down at state line by making it zero kill and artificial fly with single barbless hooks, year-round.	JH02-b. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
JH03	<p>Patrick Samuel Bay Area Program Manager, California Trout Oral Comment 6/25/2020</p>	<p>JH03-a. Agrees with Mr. Montna’s proposed regulation change (Option 2) in the ISOR.</p>	<p>JH03-a. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.</p>
JH03	<p>Patrick Samuel, con’t.</p>	<p>JH03-b. Upper Sacramento River gets a lot of fishing pressure. But having three different regulations for the same stretch of river really doesn’t make much sense biologically or from a simplification standpoint. Proposes a unified regulation there that would fit in the fishery management plan that was developed for the Upper Sacramento River (2000).</p>	<p>JH03-b. Refer to General Response CT-D.</p>
JH03	<p>Patrick Samuel, con’t.</p>	<p>JH03-c. East Walker River is a trophy wild trout fishery. Advocates for catch and release angling year-round with barbless lures, artificial lures.</p>	<p>JH03-c. Refer to General Response CT-E.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
JH03	Patrick Samuel, con't.	<p>JH03-d. For the Mokelumne River, proposes catch and release angling year-round with artificial barbless lures from the highway 49 Bridge downstream to Lake Pardee to provide opportunity for enjoyment of wild trout fishing. And also maintain access for folks their middle bar bridge to help increase participation mangling.</p>	<p>JH03-d. Refer to General Response CT-F.</p>
JH03	Patrick Samuel, con't.	<p>JH03-e. For East Fort Carson River, which is also designated a Wild Trout with an old management plan, advocates for catch and release angling, which would better meet stated objectives of the plan.</p>	<p>JH03-e. Refer to General Response CT-G.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
JH04	<p>James Stone President, NorCal Guides & Sportman’s Association Oral Comment 6/25/2020</p>	<p>JH04-a. Agrees with proposed bag limit recommendation for Prosser Creek to State Line because fish are planted there, despite it being a wild trout area. If planting continues, then hatchery trout should be marked to distinguish them from wild trout. Hopes to continue dialogue with Mr. Montna. We and 275 of our members oppose making this stretch barbless artificial fly only, and want to keep fishing accessible to kids. Supports CDFW recommendation for the Truckee.</p>	<p>JH04-a. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C.</p>
JH05	<p>Sam Sedillo Public Lands Coordinator, Trout Unlimited Oral Comment 6/25/2020</p>	<p>JH05-a. Commends CDFW for changing general statewide regulations for streams and rivers to have a split season for catch and release of trout from Nov. to April.</p>	<p>JH05-a. Refer to General Response CT-A.</p>
JH05	<p>Sam Sedillo, con’t.</p>	<p>JH05-b. Supports East Walker River as catch release artificial barbless fishery year-round because it is a trophy fishery, and can be negatively impacted by maintaining regulations as-is.</p>	<p>JH05-b. Refer to General Response CT-E.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
JH05	Sam Sedillo, con't.	JH05-c. Supports Option 2 for Truckee River (Montna) from Prosser Creek to State line.	JH05-c. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C .
JH06	George Osborn Montna Farms Oral Comment 6/25/2020	JH06-a. Number of guides on the Truckee have increased fourfold since regulations changed on the Truckee in 2007 increasing conservation measures. Doesn't believe their proposal restricts participation for anglers.	JH06-a. Refer to General Responses CT-B and CT-C .

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
AH01	<p>George Osborn Montna Farms Oral Comment 8/20/2020</p>	<p>AH01-a. The compromise reached for the Truckee River from Trout Creek to Prosser Creek will help protect fish. Zero fish bag year-round, barbless flies were required for the entire stretch. Under the existing regulations there's a two fish daily bag limit in the summer and barbless flies are required for only a portion of this stretch. For the stretch of river between Prosser Creek and State Line, the compromise retains the existing requirement for barbless lures in a winter and no take in the winter. Accepts CDFW's proposed change for barbed hooks in the summer, along with the existing 2 fish daily bag summer limit.</p>	<p>AH01-a. Support noted for Truckee River compromise.</p>
AH02	<p>Denise Boatel San Francisco Bay Oral Comment 8/20/2020</p>	<p>AH02-a. the Commission doesn't do enough to protect wildlife, as fish numbers are declining worldwide. We will continue to see fish decreases if we don't dramatically reduce take, If we have drought in future and numbers going down, we'll know why.</p>	<p>AH02-a. Comment noted.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
AH03	<p>Mark Smith Northern California Guides and Sportsmen’s Association Oral Comment 8/20/2020</p>	<p>AH03-a. We believe in increasing angler access and opportunity. And that includes promoting types of recreational fishing that are easily accessible and easily learned by all members of the public. So, we appreciate the compromise that was reached and again, want to thank everybody for allowing us to participate in that process and that dialogue</p>	<p>AH03-a. Support noted for Truckee River compromise.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
AH04	<p>Unidentified caller Oral Comment 8/20/2020</p>	<p>AH04-a. Opposes proposed regulation change to the Lake Almanor tributaries, which will cut off 45 days of the fishing season during the fall. This would close fishing in over 50 miles of trout streams. It's not consistent with Commission's All Toucher policy for preserving hunting and fishing opportunities, because it would be a significant impact to recreational fishing up there. Also, the Commission recently released a statement on equity, diversity and inclusion. And in this statement, it explains that increasing access to outdoor experiences is an important way to promote this policy. So, it would not be consistent with that as well. Supports other elements of this reg change, and states a good job on expanding overall opportunity.</p>	<p>AH04-a. Refer to Specific Response CT25-d above.</p>

Table 4. Specific Responses to Oral Comments – Simplification of Inland Sportfishing Regulations

#	Commenter Name, Format, Date	Comment	Response
OH01	<p>George Osborn Montna Farms Oral Comment 10/14/2020</p>	<p>OH01-a. Acknowledges joint efforts of the Commission and staff in CDFW to increase conservation on the Truckee River by proposing the compromise. Completion of the inland trout regulations project is truly monumental. We also want to personally thank the commission and staff, Ari Cornman, Director Bonham and Roger Bloom, for working with us and developing the compromise proposal before you today, which will significantly increase conservation efforts on the Truckee River. We asked for the Commission's aye vote for the compromise proposal.</p>	<p>OH01-a. Support noted.</p>
OH02	<p>James Aaron Kern River Fly Fisher Group Oral Comment 10/14/2020</p>	<p>OH02-a. Requests when regulations are effective that enforcement steps up, particularly in the Kern River.</p>	<p>OH02-a. Comment noted. Enforcement will handle all new laws with the responsibility and commitment it gives to existing laws.</p>