

Staff Summary for February 11-12, 2026

4. General Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda

Today's Item	Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action <input type="checkbox"/>
Receive public comment regarding topics within the Commission's authority that are not included on either day of the February 11-12, 2026 meeting agenda.		

Summary of Previous/Future Actions (N/A)**Background**

This item is to provide members of the public an opportunity to address the Commission on topics not on the agenda. Staff may include written materials and comments received prior to the meeting as exhibits in the meeting binder (if received by the written comment deadline), or as supplemental materials and comments at the meeting (if received by the supplemental comment deadline).

General public comments are categorized as either: (1) requests for non-regulatory action or (2) informational-only. Under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, the Commission cannot discuss or take action on any matter not included on the agenda, other than to schedule issues raised by the public for consideration at future meetings. Thus, non-regulatory requests generally follow a two-meeting cycle (receipt and direction). Any non-regulatory request received at today's meeting will be evaluated by staff and considered by the Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting (currently April 15-16, 2026) under "Non-regulatory requests from previous meetings."

Significant Public Comments

1. New, non-regulatory requests are summarized in Exhibit 1; the original written request is provided as Exhibit 2.
2. Informational comments are provided as exhibits 3 through 14.

Recommendation

Commission staff: Consider whether to add any future agenda items to address issues that are raised during public comment.

Exhibits

1. [Summary of new, non-regulatory requests received by January 29, 2026](#)
2. [Robert Burton](#) requests that the Commission and Department revise the wolf management plan to require the use of livestock guardian dogs as a prerequisite for lethal control measures, and expand state compensation programs to cover 100% of the verified market value of any guardian dog killed by a predator, in addition to compensation for livestock losses, received January 21, 2026
3. [A member of the public](#) questions why detailed information on the 15 "shovel ready" projects of Aratina Solar Project, Phase II was not released to the public, noting that only project names were provided, and referencing a YouTube video and a

Staff Summary for February 11-12, 2026

Change.org petition related to the Aratina Solar Project for additional context, received December 8, 2025

4. [Tom Hafer, Secretary, Morro Bay Commercial Fisherman's Organization](#), provides links to articles examining the impacts of offshore wind farms in California and abroad, received between December 10, 2025 and January 10, 2026
5. [James Harvey](#) offers a link to a brief video illustrating the dog-like behavior and characteristics of coyotes, received December 10, 2025
6. [Cindy Krieman](#) advocates for protecting wolves, emphasizing their critical role in maintaining healthy ecosystems, and supporting the use of non-lethal management methods, received December 10, 2025
7. [Greg Morris](#) shares a perspective on the present state of abalone fisheries in California, received December 22, 2025
8. [Michelle Wahl](#) forwards a letter addressed to the Santa Cruz County Planning Department detailing grading, land disturbance, and occupancy violations adjacent to their property, and the sheriff's lack of enforcing an existing order to vacate an unpermitted structure, received January 2, 2026
9. [Greg Vinci](#) asserts he was improperly cited by a Department warden several years ago for guiding without a license while conducting a fly-fishing orientation. He urges the Department reevaluate its policy and provide a clearer definition of the activities that constitute guiding, received January 6, 2026
10. [Paul Weakland](#) shares a YouTube link examining factors contributing to the collapse of diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives, received January 19, 2026
11. [Two representative samples of 15 emails](#), received between January 26 and January 29, 2026, urging the Commission to mandate the use of ropeless gear during the Dungeness crab season to reduce the risk of lethal whale entanglements
12. [Dennis Porcher](#) opposes the culling of Catalina mule deer and supports using scientific based methods to maintain ecological balance, received January 28, 2026
13. [Elsa Knutson and Jesper Christen](#) encourage the use of non-lethal methods of wildlife management be prioritized and increase public education efforts to promote coexistence with wildlife, received January 29, 2026
14. [Brian Tillemans](#) provides a letter to the editor of the Inyo Register expressing concern over the significant decline of deer populations and urges immediate intervention and improved wildlife management, received January 27, 2026

Motion (N/A)

California Fish and Game Commission
Receipt List for Non-Regulatory Requests Received by 5:00 PM on January 29, 2026

Date Received	Name/Organization of Requestor	Subject of Request	Short Description	FGC Receipt Scheduled	FGC Action Scheduled
1/21/2026	Robert Burton	Wolf Management Plan	Requests that the Commission and Department revise the wolf management plan to require the use of livestock guardian dogs as a prerequisite for lethal control measures; and expand state compensation programs to cover 100% of the verified market value of any guardian dog killed by a predator, in addition to compensation for livestock losses.	2/11-12/2026	4/15-16/2026

Policy Proposal: Mandatory Prevention and Natural Capital Accounting in California Wolf Management

From Robert Bruton <[REDACTED]>

Date Wed 01/21/2026 11:47 AM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Cc Wildlife Management <wildlifemgt@wildlife.ca.gov>; Benedet, Jennifer [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]>; jason.elliott@gov.ca.gov <jason.elliott@gov.ca.gov>

Please accept the attached policy proposal for consideration by the Commission and relevant Department leadership.

TO: California Department of Fish and Wildlife; California Fish and Game Commission

FROM: Robert Bruton

DATE: January 19, 2026

SUBJECT: Proposal for Mandatory Non-Lethal Mitigation and Natural Capital Accounting in California Wolf Management

I. Executive Summary

The effective collapse of the Beyem Seyo wolf pack in Sierra Valley reflects a management model that is neither fiscally responsible nor ecologically sustainable. With over **\$2.6 million in combined state and private funds** expended to protect approximately **\$235,000 worth of livestock**, culminating in the first state-sanctioned lethal removal of wolves in California in over a century, the outcome demonstrates the failure of reactive, emergency-based intervention strategies.

This proposal recommends transitioning California's wolf management framework toward a **Mandatory Prevention Model**, informed by successful coexistence strategies used in Europe and adapted to California's regulatory and ecological context. The goal is to reduce conflict, minimize lethal control, and ensure responsible stewardship of both public funds and endangered wildlife.

II. Mandatory Use of Livestock Guardian Dogs (LGDs) as a Prerequisite for Lethal Control

To ensure accountability and responsible use of taxpayer resources, California should require that livestock producers operating within known wolf territories implement **a minimum of two proven non-lethal deterrents** as a prerequisite for eligibility for any state-funded lethal control consideration.

A. Livestock Guardian Dog Requirement

Producers should be required to deploy trained Livestock Guardian Dogs (LGDs)—such as Maremma Sheepdogs or Great Pyrenees—which provide continuous, adaptive protection that short-term human hazing, drones, or temporary strike teams cannot replicate. LGDs are among the most consistently effective deterrents documented in both U.S. and European wolf-livestock systems.

B. Full Asset Protection for Ranchers

To reduce economic risk and promote compliance, state compensation programs should be expanded to cover **100% of the verified market value of a Guardian Dog killed by a predator in the line of duty**, in addition to compensation for livestock losses. This ensures that ranchers are not financially penalized for implementing required prevention measures.

III. Accounting for Natural Capital and Ecosystem Loss

Current conflict response frameworks calculate “cost” almost exclusively through direct agricultural loss, while ignoring the substantial economic value that intact wolf packs provide to the public.

A. Ecosystem Services

Wolves contribute significant ecosystem services through trophic cascades, including improved riparian health, reduced overgrazing pressure, and enhanced water quality—services that would otherwise require costly human infrastructure and long-term maintenance.

B. Disease Risk Reduction

By preferentially removing weak, injured, and diseased ungulates, wolves can reduce transmission risk for diseases such as Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD), helping protect California’s multi-million-dollar hunting, recreation, and wildlife-tourism economies.

C. Cost of Lethal Failure

The \$2.6 million spent in Sierra Valley should be viewed as an **avoidable loss of public natural capital**, not merely a conflict response expense. Prior to any lethal removal authorization, the Department should be required to prepare a **Biological Impact Statement** that quantifies the anticipated ecological and economic losses associated with pack disruption or elimination.

Such accounting aligns with modern conservation economics and supports CDFW’s statutory mandate to conserve endangered species while ensuring responsible use of public funds.

IV. Conclusion

The current approach—spending millions of public dollars to protect thousands in private assets while destabilizing an endangered species—is unsustainable for ranchers, taxpayers, or wildlife. By mandating proactive prevention tools such as Livestock Guardian Dogs, integrating natural capital accounting into decision-making, and treating wolves as public ecological assets rather than liabilities, California can move beyond the failed precedent set in Sierra Valley.

This framework offers a fiscally prudent, science-based path forward that protects rural livelihoods while honoring California’s conservation responsibilities.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Bruton

Torrance / Los Angeles County, California



Re: Aratina Solar Phase 2 - "reviewed and permitted" by CDFW??

From Joshua Tree on Film <info@joshuatreeonfilm.com>

Date Mon 12/08/2025 01:01 PM

To Pohlman, Jeremy [REDACTED]; Wildlife Western Joshua Tree <wjt@wildlife.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Jeremy, please FWD this email to the following:

Chuck Bonham, Director

Erika Zavaleta, President

Samantha Murray, Vice President

Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Commissioner

Eric Sklar, Commissioner

Darius W. Anderson, Commissioner

Jeremy;

You claim that Aratina was "reviewed and permitted" by CDFW???

CDFW really needs to get its facts straight.

Claiming Aratina was "Reviewed and Permitted" is a stretch. It discredits the organization publicly, and I doubt it is something you want to take credit for.

Yes, Aratina was listed on Bonham's Emergency Order, but it was not "reviewed". Bonham's "secret" list (provided by the Solar Industry in some backroom, away from public view) did not provide any actual details of the 15 projects for "review", only their names: .

- NO Acreage Information
- NO Tree Counts
- NO estimation of the number of trees to be destroyed
- NO estimation of the amount of energy to be produced

There literally was nothing to "review".

"Rubber Stamp" is the appropriate term here.

Why wasn't any information known about these 15 "Emergency", "Shovel Ready" Projects??
Because this was Solar Industry's wishlist of projects for the next decade - and Bonham (pulled it out of his back pocket) and forced it through his organization. Disgraceful!

But yes, CDFW Rubber Stamped these 15 projects, allowing them to bypass all CESA projections (even Candidate species have protections) and cut down entire Joshua Tree forests. Not a good look for the organization.

If your memory is fuzzy on Aratina:

1) Watch the YouTube video "Who Approved the Aratina Solar Project"

HINT: CDFW Approved them sight-unseen!

Also, we thank Samatha Murray for calling "BS" on the entire scam!!!

2) Check out the change-dot-org petition "Stop the Destruction of an Old Growth Joshua Tree Forest by the Aratina Solar Project"

The petition has over 50,000 signatures of people disapproving of the actions of CDFW.

Aratina Phase II is only going to bring more attention to CDFW and Aratina. We know the Solar Industry is corrupt, but why does CDFW want to participate?

The Public

On Mon, Dec 8, 2025 at 11:52 AM K. Emmerich <[REDACTED]> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Pohlman, Jeremy** <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Wildlife Western Joshua Tree <wjt@wildlife.ca.gov>

Thank you for contacting the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The Project you are referring to is being built in two phases; however, both phases were originally reviewed and permitted together. Both phases of the Project were also censused as part of the Project's original emergency authorization under Fish and Game Code section 2084 for the take of western Joshua tree. Additionally, the Kern County Planning Department evaluated Phase 2 of the Project as part of their overall Project approval and prior to any associated permits being issued by CDFW. As such, CDFW is not aware of additional opportunities to comment. Please let me know if this answers your questions.

Thank you,

Jeremy Pohlman | Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor) | California Department of Fish and Wildlife | Central Region Renewable Energy Program | 3196 S. Higuera, Suite A, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 | [REDACTED]



Clean Energy Terminal terminates agreement with Port San Luis for Floating Offshore wind O&M port development

From mbcfo member <mbcfo1972@gmail.com>

Date Wed 12/10/2025 09:07 AM

To Doug Boren <douglas.boren@boem.gov>; CentralCoast@Coastal <CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Andrea Chmelik <Andrea.Chmelik@asm.ca.gov>; Dobroski, Nicole@SLC <Nicole.Dobroski@slc.ca.gov>; Eckerle, Jenn@CNRA <Jenn.Eckerle@resources.ca.gov>; Executive Officer of SLC <ExecutiveOfficer.Public@slc.ca.gov>; ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Flint, Scott@Energy <Scott.Flint@energy.ca.gov>; bgibson@co.slo.ca.us <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Greg Haas <greg.haas@mail.house.gov>; Nancy Hann <nancy.hann@noaa.gov>; Harland, Eli@Energy <Eli.Harland@energy.ca.gov>; Dr. Caryl Hart <CommissionerCHart@coastal.ca.gov>; Gonzalez, Kathleen@Waterboards <Kathleen.Gonzalez@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Hucklebridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Hucklebridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Kalua, Kaitlyn@CNRA <Kaitlyn.Kalua@resources.ca.gov>; Kato, Grace@SLC <Grace.Kato@slc.ca.gov>; Zara Landrum <zlandrum@morrobayca.gov>; Liu, Serena@Waterboards <Serena.Liu@waterboards.ca.gov>

On Dec. 2nd over 100 people showed up at the PSL Harbor District commission meeting to make comments on the \$3 million grant from the California Energy Commission for funding another feasibility study for an Operations and Maintenance Floating Offshore Wind port in Port San Luis. There was an overwhelming majority of folks against industrialization of PSL and against going forward with another study before the last study was finished. (They got \$1 million for a SLO county feasibility study Oct. 2024 that was never finished). The commissioners decided to delay accepting the funding until after the 1st study was finished. This lead to CET terminating their project agreement with PSL.

The tide has definitely turned.

December 4, 2025

Clean
Energy
Terminals

William D. Freshman
Harbor Director
Port San Luis Harbor District
1950 Avila Beach Drive
Avila Beach, CA 93424

Dear Will:

We appreciate the Harbor District's efforts and partnership over the last 15 months as we jointly evaluated the opportunity to develop an offshore wind Operations and Maintenance ("O&M") facility in San Luis Bay.

We continue to firmly believe that a PSL O&M facility is the most compelling maintenance hub option for the forthcoming Central Coast offshore wind generation projects. Your site has significant technical and commercial advantages compared to alternative sites within the Central Coast or in Northern and Southern California. In addition, an O&M hub at PSL would provide generational economic, workforce, and strategic linkage between the three Central Coast offshore wind projects and the businesses, educational institutions, workers, and constituents in the Harbor District political boundaries. Importantly, with much of the required port infrastructure already in place, these benefits could be realized with minimal impact on harbor operations, the aesthetics of San Luis Bay, and the local community.

Unfortunately, due to unprecedented uncertainties caused by changes in federal energy policy and changes in clean energy industry conditions, we have taken the difficult decision to pause our private-sector development activities related to this project. This letter is a formal notification of our decision to terminate the Project Evaluation Agreement (as amended in April 2025). Additionally, we are waiving the "Right of First Refusal" provision as outlined in the Agreement.

While this stage of our formal engagement together is concluding, we will continue to follow the project's progress with great interest. We strongly encourage the Harbor District to continue forward with the California Energy Commission (CEC) Waterfront Facility Improvement Program grant-funded scopes of work. Given the current macro-political uncertainties, utilizing state funding for such foundational project development work is exactly what is needed to craft a community-oriented vision for the future O&M facility. In addition, the grant-funded work will build a solid fact base from which the Harbor District can make informed project development decisions in the future. We look forward to coordinating a smooth transition of any outstanding CEC grant-funded work scopes and vendor relationships directly to the Harbor District, if desired.

Sincerely,

Brian F. Sabina

Brian Sabina
Member
Clean Energy Terminals, LLC

Tom Hafer
Secretary MBCFO
(805) 610-2072
mbcfo1972@gmail.com



The Trump Administration Protects U.S. National Security by Pausing Offshore Wind Leases | U.S. Department of the Interior

From mbcfo member <mbcfo1972@gmail.com>

Date Fri 01/02/2026 08:03 AM

To Doug Boren <douglas.boren@boem.gov>; CentralCoast@Coastal <CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Andrea Chmelik <Andrea.Chmelik@asm.ca.gov>; Dobroski, Nicole@SLC <Nicole.Dobroski@slc.ca.gov>; Eckerle, Jenn@CNRA <Jenn.Eckerle@resources.ca.gov>; Executive Officer of SLC <ExecutiveOfficer.Public@slc.ca.gov>; ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Flint, Scott@Energy <Scott.Flint@energy.ca.gov>; bgibson@co.slo.ca.us <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Greg Haas <greg.haas@mail.house.gov>; Nancy Hann <nancy.hann@noaa.gov>; Harland, Eli@Energy <Eli.Harland@energy.ca.gov>; Dr. Caryl Hart <CommissionerCHart@coastal.ca.gov>; Gonzalez, Kathleen@Waterboards <Kathleen.Gonzalez@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Hucklebridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Hucklebridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Kalua, Kaitlyn@CNRA <Kaitlyn.Kalua@resources.ca.gov>; Kato, Grace@SLC <Grace.Kato@slc.ca.gov>; Zara Landrum <zlandrum@morrobayca.gov>; Liu, Serena@Waterboards <Serena.Liu@waterboards.ca.gov>

<https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/trump-administration-protects-us-national-security-pausing-offshore-wind-leases>

Tom Hafer
Secretary MBCFO
(805) 610-2072
mbcfo1972@gmail.com

Brickbat: Off the Grid

From Tom Hafer <somethingsfishy@charter.net>

Date Sat 01/10/2026 06:52 AM

To Doug Boren <douglas.boren@boem.gov>; CentralCoast@Coastal <CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Andrea Chmelik <Andrea.Chmelik@asm.ca.gov>; Dobroski, Nicole@SLC <Nicole.Dobroski@slc.ca.gov>; Eckerle, Jenn@CNRA <Jenn.Eckerle@resources.ca.gov>; Executive Officer of SLC <ExecutiveOfficer.Public@slc.ca.gov>; ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Flint, Scott@Energy <Scott.Flint@energy.ca.gov>; bgibson@co.slo.ca.us <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Greg Haas <greg.haas@mail.house.gov>; Nancy Hann <nancy.hann@noaa.gov>; Harland, Eli@Energy <Eli.Harland@energy.ca.gov>; Dr. Caryl Hart <CommissionerCHart@coastal.ca.gov>; Gonzalez, Kathleen@Waterboards <Kathleen.Gonzalez@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Kalua, Kaitlyn@CNRA <Kaitlyn.Kalua@resources.ca.gov>; Kato, Grace@SLC <Grace.Kato@slc.ca.gov>; Zara Landrum <zlandrum@morrobayca.gov>; Liu, Serena@Waterboards <Serena.Liu@waterboards.ca.gov>

Brickbat: Off the Grid

Charles Oliver 1.6.2026 4:00 AM



(Illustration: Eddie Marshall | Midjourney)

In 2025, the United Kingdom [paid](#) a record cost of nearly £1.5 billion (\$2 billion) to keep wind farms from producing more energy than the nation's outdated power grid can handle. When high winds cause turbines to produce more energy than power lines can safely carry, the government must pay wind farms to shut down turbines in remote areas to prevent an overload; it must then pay other sources, such as gas plants, to turn on in order to meet demand. Last year, the government spent £380 million paying wind farms to shut off, and it paid power plants £1.08 billion (\$1.46 billion) to make up the difference. Without urgent infrastructure upgrades, experts warn these "constraint payments" will continue to rise, adding to customers' electric bills.



Clean Energy Terminal terminates agreement with Port San Luis for Floating Offshore wind O&M port development

From mbcfo member <mbcfo1972@gmail.com>

Date Wed 12/10/2025 09:07 AM

To Doug Boren <douglas.boren@boem.gov>; CentralCoast@Coastal <CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Andrea Chmelik <Andrea.Chmelik@asm.ca.gov>; Dobroski, Nicole@SLC <Nicole.Dobroski@slc.ca.gov>; Eckerle, Jenn@CNRA <Jenn.Eckerle@resources.ca.gov>; Executive Officer of SLC <ExecutiveOfficer.Public@slc.ca.gov>; ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Flint, Scott@Energy <Scott.Flint@energy.ca.gov>; bgibson@co.slo.ca.us <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Greg Haas <greg.haas@mail.house.gov>; Nancy Hann <nancy.hann@noaa.gov>; Harland, Eli@Energy <Eli.Harland@energy.ca.gov>; Dr. Caryl Hart <CommissionerCHart@coastal.ca.gov>; Gonzalez, Kathleen@Waterboards <Kathleen.Gonzalez@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Hucklebridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Hucklebridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Kalua, Kaitlyn@CNRA <Kaitlyn.Kalua@resources.ca.gov>; Kato, Grace@SLC <Grace.Kato@slc.ca.gov>; Zara Landrum <zlandrum@morrobayca.gov>; Liu, Serena@Waterboards <Serena.Liu@waterboards.ca.gov>

On Dec. 2nd over 100 people showed up at the PSL Harbor District commission meeting to make comments on the \$3 million grant from the California Energy Commission for funding another feasibility study for an Operations and Maintenance Floating Offshore Wind port in Port San Luis. There was an overwhelming majority of folks against industrialization of PSL and against going forward with another study before the last study was finished. (They got \$1 million for a SLO county feasibility study Oct. 2024 that was never finished). The commissioners decided to delay accepting the funding until after the 1st study was finished. This lead to CET terminating their project agreement with PSL.

The tide has definitely turned.

December 4, 2025

Clean
Energy
Terminals

William D. Freshman
Harbor Director
Port San Luis Harbor District
1950 Avila Beach Drive
Avila Beach, CA 93424

Dear Will:

We appreciate the Harbor District's efforts and partnership over the last 15 months as we jointly evaluated the opportunity to develop an offshore wind Operations and Maintenance ("O&M") facility in San Luis Bay.

We continue to firmly believe that a PSL O&M facility is the most compelling maintenance hub option for the forthcoming Central Coast offshore wind generation projects. Your site has significant technical and commercial advantages compared to alternative sites within the Central Coast or in Northern and Southern California. In addition, an O&M hub at PSL would provide generational economic, workforce, and strategic linkage between the three Central Coast offshore wind projects and the businesses, educational institutions, workers, and constituents in the Harbor District political boundaries. Importantly, with much of the required port infrastructure already in place, these benefits could be realized with minimal impact on harbor operations, the aesthetics of San Luis Bay, and the local community.

Unfortunately, due to unprecedented uncertainties caused by changes in federal energy policy and changes in clean energy industry conditions, we have taken the difficult decision to pause our private-sector development activities related to this project. This letter is a formal notification of our decision to terminate the Project Evaluation Agreement (as amended in April 2025). Additionally, we are waiving the "Right of First Refusal" provision as outlined in the Agreement.

While this stage of our formal engagement together is concluding, we will continue to follow the project's progress with great interest. We strongly encourage the Harbor District to continue forward with the California Energy Commission (CEC) Waterfront Facility Improvement Program grant-funded scopes of work. Given the current macro-political uncertainties, utilizing state funding for such foundational project development work is exactly what is needed to craft a community-oriented vision for the future O&M facility. In addition, the grant-funded work will build a solid fact base from which the Harbor District can make informed project development decisions in the future. We look forward to coordinating a smooth transition of any outstanding CEC grant-funded work scopes and vendor relationships directly to the Harbor District, if desired.

Sincerely,

Brian F. Sabina

Brian Sabina
Member
Clean Energy Terminals, LLC

Tom Hafer
Secretary MBCFO



Outlook

The Trump Administration Protects U.S. National Security by Pausing Offshore Wind Leases | U.S. Department of the Interior

From mbcfo member ·

Date Fri 01/02/2026 08:03 AM

To Doug Boren <douglas.boren@boem.gov>; CentralCoast@Coastal <CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Andrea Chmelik <Andrea.Chmelik@asm.ca.gov>; Dobroski, Nicole@SLC <Nicole.Dobroski@slc.ca.gov>; Eckerle, Jenn@CNRA <Jenn.Eckerle@resources.ca.gov>; Executive Officer of SLC <ExecutiveOfficer.Public@slc.ca.gov>; ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Flint, Scott@Energy <Scott.Flint@energy.ca.gov>; bgibson@co.slo.ca.us <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Greg Haas <greg.haas@mail.house.gov>; Nancy Hann <nancy.hann@noaa.gov>; Harland, Eli@Energy <Eli.Harland@energy.ca.gov>; Dr. Caryl Hart <CommissionerCHart@coastal.ca.gov>; Gonzalez, Kathleen@Waterboards <Kathleen.Gonzalez@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Hucklebridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Hucklebridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Kalua, Kaitlyn ; Kato, Grace@SLC <Grace.Kato@slc.ca.gov>; Zara Landrum <zlandrum@morrobayca.gov>; Liu, Serena@Waterboards <Serena.Liu@waterboards.ca.gov>

<https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/trump-administration-protects-us-national-security-pausing-offshore-wind-leases>

Tom Hafer
Secretary MBCFO

Brickbat: Off the Grid

From Tom Hafer <somethingsfishy@charter.net>

Date Sat 01/10/2026 06:52 AM

To Doug Boren <douglas.boren@boem.gov>; CentralCoast@Coastal <CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Andrea Chmelik <Andrea.Chmelik@asm.ca.gov>; Dobroski, Nicole@SLC <Nicole.Dobroski@slc.ca.gov>; Eckerle, Jenn@CNRA <Jenn.Eckerle@resources.ca.gov>; Executive Officer of SLC <ExecutiveOfficer.Public@slc.ca.gov>; ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>; FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Flint, Scott@Energy <Scott.Flint@energy.ca.gov>; bgibson@co.slo.ca.us <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>; Greg Haas <greg.haas@mail.house.gov>; Nancy Hann <nancy.hann@noaa.gov>; Harland, Eli@Energy <Eli.Harland@energy.ca.gov>; Dr. Caryl Hart <CommissionerCHart@coastal.ca.gov>; Gonzalez, Kathleen@Waterboards <Kathleen.Gonzalez@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Kalua, Kaitlyn@CNRA <Kaitlyn.Kalua@resources.ca.gov>; Kato, Grace@SLC <Grace.Kato@slc.ca.gov>; Zara Landrum <zlandrum@morrobayca.gov>; Liu, Serena@Waterboards <Serena.Liu@waterboards.ca.gov>

Brickbat: Off the Grid

Charles Oliver 1.6.2026 4:00 AM



(Illustration: Eddie Marshall | Midjourney)

In 2025, the United Kingdom [paid](#) a record cost of nearly £1.5 billion (\$2 billion) to keep wind farms from producing more energy than the nation's outdated power grid can handle. When high winds cause turbines to produce more energy than power lines can safely carry, the government must pay wind farms to shut down turbines in remote areas to prevent an overload; it must then pay other sources, such as gas plants, to turn on in order to meet demand. Last year, the government spent £380 million paying wind farms to shut off, and it paid power plants £1.08 billion (\$1.46 billion) to make up the difference. Without urgent infrastructure upgrades, experts warn these "constraint payments" will continue to rise, adding to customers' electric bills.



Coyotes living amongst us - I enjoy seeing them thriving with us.

From James Harvey <[REDACTED]>

Date Wed 12/10/2025 06:38 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

I've been reading a lot of coyote comments on Nextdoor. I hate to be sexist but it's mostly women that get hysterical about coyotes and what they might do. The stats on coyotes tell the real story. There has been only one human death by coyote in the last fifty years in the entire U.S. It is extremely rare for coyotes to bother humans. Not one person on Nextdoor, that I've read about, has ever been attacked by a coyote. Here's a short video that shows just how dog-like they really are. Please don't buy into the emotion driven anti-coyote hysteria. I love all our wildlife, especially coyotes. Regards, James

<https://www.youtube.com/shorts/y1Z51Slr3iA>



Outlook

Please Stop Wolf Killings

From cindy kreiman <[REDACTED]>

Date Wed 12/10/2025 07:47 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Good Morning Commissioners,

I am here on behalf of our wolves and ask that you please stand up and defend them. Their loss is our loss.

Their lives are paramount to the health and wellbeing of our ecosystems.

We are destroying families and killing innocent wolves when we do not implement the non-lethal methods available and instead condemn the wolves for our failures and lack of compassion.

Please stop defunding prevention and allowing for the conflicts that are costing wolves their lives.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely,

Cindy Kreiman





Outlook

Abalone

From Greg Morris <[REDACTED]>

Date Mon 12/22/2025 10:57 AM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

You folks are wrong. There's a great abalone population out there. U could have a limited, enforced season on them in many places in Comifornia. If your so concerned with the population trend, what are you actually doing about it? Besides a full shutdown. Have you dove lately in Mendo county? Maybe you should go look for yourself.



Fw: Grading Violations, Environmental Risk, and Sheriff Non-Enforcement of Vacate Order

From [REDACTED]

Date Fri 01/02/2026 04:19 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Wildlife Civil Rights <CivilRights@wildlife.ca.gov>; Wildlife SB & DVBE Advocate <SBDVBEAdvocate@wildlife.ca.gov>; Wildlife LRB <LRB@wildlife.ca.gov>; Wildlife Ask R5 <AskR5@wildlife.ca.gov>; rob.bonta@doj.ca.gov <rob.bonta@doj.ca.gov>

January 2, 2026

Documenting 20 years of complaints to the planning department

Attention: Santa Cruz County Planning Department

I am submitting this information to document ongoing grading, land-disturbance, and occupancy violations occurring adjacent to my property in Boulder Creek, as well as the failure of the Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office to enforce an existing order to vacate issued to an illegal dweller occupying an unpermitted structure. This individual cannot be considered a neighbor, as the County has already determined the structure to be illegal and issued orders requiring the occupant to leave the property.

Despite this, the individual continues to reside on-site, and associated activities—including unpermitted grading, soil disturbance, and drainage alteration—are creating safety hazards on steep terrain during an active storm season.

1. Grading Permit Thresholds (Santa Cruz County)

According to the County's grading permit requirements, a permit is required when a person:

- Moves significant quantities of soil (thresholds vary by slope and location; Environmental Planning determines the exact threshold during review).
- Alters drainage patterns.
- Creates cuts or fills requiring engineering review.
- Performs grading not tied to a building permit (a "standalone grading permit," which is discretionary).

Seasonal Restriction:

No grading is allowed October 15 – April 15 without special winter-grading approval.

If grading is part of a building permit:

A separate grading permit is not required; the grading plan is reviewed within the building permit.

2. Slope Rules (County Code Chapter 18.45)

The County's excavation and grading regulations require:

- Cuts and fills to meet engineering standards (18.45.080).
- Setbacks from property lines, structures, and slopes (18.45.090).
- Drainage and terracing rules to prevent erosion (18.45.100).
- Erosion-control measures installed before grading begins (18.45.110).
- Winter grading restrictions for all slopes (18.45.040).

These rules exist to prevent slope failure, erosion, and runoff impacts—risks that are heightened in Boulder Creek's steep, storm-prone terrain.

3. Riparian Setback Requirements

The grading code references protections for:

- Riparian corridors
- Fish and wildlife habitat
- Water supplies

Typical County riparian setbacks include:

- 100 ft from perennial streams
- 50 ft from intermittent streams
- 30 ft from ephemeral drainages

Exact setbacks depend on the parcel and mapped watercourse type.

4. Relevance to My Boulder Creek Property

Given the steep slopes, storm exposure, and the need for driveway stability:

- Routine maintenance (clearing ruts, adding gravel) generally does not require a permit.
- Major regrading, driveway reconstruction, or drainage redirection does trigger a grading permit.
- If the driveway or disturbed area crosses or parallels a seasonal creek, riparian setbacks apply.
- Winter grading restrictions apply unless special approval is granted.

5. Sheriff Non-Enforcement and Ongoing Illegal Occupancy

The County has already issued an order to vacate for the illegal dwelling on the adjacent parcel. Despite this:

- The illegal occupant remains on the property.
- The Sheriff's Office has not enforced the vacate order.
- The continued presence of the illegal dweller has resulted in unpermitted grading, soil disturbance, and drainage changes that violate County Code and increase hazard exposure to neighboring parcels.
- The occupant's activities are occurring during the winter grading prohibition period, without permits, engineering review, or erosion-control measures.

This constitutes ongoing non-compliance with County Code and creates public safety risks, including:

- Slope destabilization
- Erosion and sedimentation
- Altered drainage patterns affecting my driveway and access
- Increased risk during flash-flood or tornado-warning conditions

6. Requested County Action

I respectfully request that Santa Cruz County Planning, Code Enforcement, and the Sheriff's Office:

1. Enforce the existing order to vacate the illegal dwelling.
2. Investigate unpermitted grading and drainage alterations occurring on the parcel.
3. Assess slope, erosion, and riparian impacts under County Code Chapters 18.45 and 24.14.
4. Require immediate stabilization and erosion-control measures if violations are confirmed.
5. Ensure winter grading restrictions are enforced to prevent further damage during storm season.

Very truly yours,
Michelle T Wahl, BSN,





CDFW interpretation of regulations

From Greg Vinci <[REDACTED]>

Date Tue 01/06/2026 02:03 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Dear Commissioners:

A few years ago while conducting a Yuba River fly fishing orientation clinic, I was cited by a CDFW warden for guiding without a license. I was shocked, as I was very much aware of the wording of how a “guide” is defined in the CDFW literature, and was sure that, according to the definition, what I was doing was not guiding. As stated in your guide license application:

“guide” means any person who is engaged in the business of packing or guiding, or who, for a fee, assists another person in taking or attempting to take any bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, or reptile. “Guide” also includes any person who, for profit, transports other persons, their equipment, or both to or from a hunting or fishing area.

In simple English, the definition states that the individual being assisted must be *in the process of taking or attempting to fish*. My clients were not fishing or attempting to take or catch fish. They at no time entered the water or were in possession of fishing gear during my clinic, yet the warden cited me anyway.

It appears that under the department’s interpretation of the wording in the guide license definition, I would need a guide license if I had been paid by an individual to teach them how to fly cast on the grass of a local park, or to give fishing tips to individuals who log on to my website? Doesn’t make sense.

Soon after I had been cited I spoke to a friend who is a retired attorney, and he said that the department didn’t have a leg to stand on and suggested that I fight it. Being that attorney costs were going to be in the \$5,000 range, I asked for a public defender, with the result being that the citation would be dismissed if I paid the court \$1,000. I paid it, just to make the whole thing go away.

I would like to strongly urge you to change the policy of the CDFW regarding the way they currently interpret the definition of what actions constitute that of a “guide.” Thank you

Greg Vinci
[REDACTED]



Victor Davis Hanson: Is the DEI Empire Finally Collapsing Under Its Own ...

From paul weakland <[REDACTED]>

Date Mon 01/19/2026 02:00 AM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fyoutu.be%2FswZ5uHKFMf0%3Fsi%3DyuN2hvUFDCQJeoRv&data=05%7C02%7Cfc%40fgc.ca.gov%7Cac7b2fec375d44f2359708de574180aa%7C4b633c25efbf40069f1507442ba7aa0b%7C0%7C0%7C639044136032209714%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIiAiOjXaW4zMlsIkFOljoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C80000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=8xc9TepP4dIRwjjUISkHMbISpYra9AqgsUmnq2i%2Fnv8%3D&reserved=0>

Sent from my iPad



Protect our beloved whales

From KC [REDACTED]

Date Tue 01/27/2026 03:57 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

California Fish & Game Commission,

I am writing to strongly urge you to mandate whale-safe ropeless (pop-up) gear for the **entire** California Dungeness crab season.

In 2024, the U.S. saw a sharp rise in large whale entanglements—95 confirmed cases nationwide, a 48% increase over 2023—with California accounting for the largest share (25%). Many of these preventable incidents involved humpback whales entangled in Dungeness crab fishing gear, contributing to suffering, injury, and death for these threatened and endangered animals.

Ropeless gear eliminates vertical lines from the water column during whale migration and feeding periods, virtually removing entanglement risk while allowing sustainable fishing. Successful pilots in California (including expanded trials in 2025) have proven the technology is reliable, profitable, and effective—demonstrating high retrieval rates and strong crab harvests with no significant whale interactions.

These deaths are avoidable. **Now is the time** to act decisively: require ropeless gear statewide across the full season to protect our whales, support innovative fishermen, and secure the long-term future of the Dungeness crab fishery.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue. I look forward to your prompt action and would welcome any opportunity to discuss further.

Kathy Ciari
[REDACTED]



Outlook

comment on changes in crab fishing pots

From Karen Pickett [REDACTED]

Date Wed 01/28/2026 10:32 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

To the California Fish and Game Commission

It has come to my attention that there is a potential solution to the problem of whales being caught and mutilated in crab pot lines. Whale deaths and severe injuries have surged alarmingly in recent times.

The solution of the releasable float/buoy to retrieve the trap when whales are passing, to be replaced to the catch zone after whales have passed seems to be a workable solution for the monumental problem of endangered majestic species being killed as they migrate for the sake of profit.

I cannot urge you strongly enough to consider and implement this solution.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Pickett
[REDACTED]



Outlook

Catalina Mule Deer

From Dennis Porcher <[REDACTED]>

Date Wed 01/28/2026 08:28 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Good morning,

Do not cull the mule deer on Catalina. Use accurate and sound scientific management tools to keep the population in harmony with the flora and fauna.

Thank you,

Dennis Porcher
Long Beach, Ca.



Outlook

Protect our wildlife!

From

Date Thu 01/29/2026 10:20 AM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Please use only NON-lethal methods of wildlife management including for predators like coyotes and wolves.

Increase public education and promote co-existence with wildlife! We cannot kill anything that annoys us.

Concerned Citizen,
Drs. Elsa Knutson and Jesper Christen



Outlook

Letter to Editor for Inyo Register

From BRIAN TILLEMANS <[REDACTED]>

Date Tue 01/27/2026 03:28 PM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Submitted to Inyo Register 01/27/2026

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

The time to act is now. We cannot afford to sit idly while our deer herds continue to precipitously decline. I am extremely confident that this year's aerial counts will confirm what my friends and I have already observed. The deer are down even more than last year.

We need to wake up. There is no "balance of nature". Look at the human development along the deer migration routes and prime winter range, look at the fire scars from both man caused and natural fires on local winter ranges, recognize the exponential increase in human activities in the Buttermilks and winter range areas, check the daily highway mortalities that occur. This in addition to historical peaks in both mountain lion and bear numbers necessitates the need for human intervention and proper wildlife management; yet CDFW has done nothing.

Our wildlife viewing opportunities, hunting opportunities, wildlife photography, and shed collecting activities are disappearing as we speak.

CDFW staff recently implied that concerned citizens are only worried because they want to shoot big deer. This couldn't be further from the truth. First deer hunting has been reduced to a once in eight-year occurrence if you're lucky. Secondly, we have eradicated most of our mature deer with the late season Goodale and Round Valley hunts that CDFW refuses to change. I am a Life Member of the Wild Sheep Foundation, avid wildlife photographer, and hunter conservationist as well. My friends and colleagues follow suit, caring deeply about all our Eastern Sierra wildlife and habitats in what we refer to as our "backyard". Unfortunately, unlike the past, CDFW has become out of touch with the hunting community that pays their salaries with the purchase of hunting and fishing licenses.

Hopefully after this year's aerial deer counts CDFW will come to their senses and realize something must be done. They have already been given multiple suggestions to improve the habitat and quality of our deer herds in public and personal meetings. If they could just swallow their PhD egos and give in to the reality of what's occurring, we can be one step ahead.

Brian Tillemans, very concerned local