

Staff Summary for August 12-13, 2026

8. Regulation Change Petitions and Non-Regulatory Requests (Marine)**Today's Item**Information ☐Action ☒

This is a standing agenda item for the Commission to receive new regulation change petitions and act on regulation change petitions received from the public at previous meetings. This meeting will address:

- (A) Action on previously received regulation change petitions
- (B) Receipt of new petitions for regulation change
- (C) Comments received on referred petitions not yet scheduled for action
- (D) Non-regulatory requests

Summary of Previous/Future Actions**(A) *Petitions for Regulation Change – Scheduled for Action***

- Received petitions 2026-02 and 2026-03 June 17-18, 2026
- **Today, potentially act on petitions August 12-13, 2026**

(B) *New Petitions for Regulation Change – Receipt*

- **Today, receive new petitions August 12-13, 2026**
- Potentially act on new petitions October 13-16, 2026

(C) *Comments Received on Referred Petitions (N/A)***(D) *Non-regulatory Requests – Scheduled for Action***

- Received non-regulatory requests June 17-18, 2026
- **Today, potentially act on non-regulatory requests August 12-13, 2026**

Background**(A) *Petitions for Regulation Change - Scheduled for Action***

Petitions received at the previous meeting are scheduled for Commission consideration at the next regularly scheduled business meeting. A petition may be: (1) denied; (2) granted; or (3) referred to a Commission committee, staff, legal counsel or the Department, for further evaluation. Referred petitions are scheduled for action once a recommendation is received.

Today, two petitions are scheduled for action:

- I. *Petition 2026-07*: Request to revise servicing recreational hoop net gear north of Point Arguello from intervals of every 2 hours to intervals of every 5 hours (Exhibit A2)
- II. *Petition 2026-08*: Request to exempt commercial passenger fishing vessels departing north of Point Arguello from the requirement to hold a sport-caught fish processing permit (Exhibit A3)

Staff Summary for August 12-13, 2026

The staff recommendations, developed after conferring with the Department, are provided in Exhibit A1.

(B) *New Petitions for Regulation Change - Receipt*

Pursuant to Section 662, any person requesting that the Commission adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation must complete and submit Form FGC 1. Petitions submitted by the public are “received” at this meeting if they are delivered by the public comment or supplemental comment deadlines or in person at the Commission meeting.

Under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, the Commission cannot discuss or act on any matter not included on the agenda, other than to determine whether to schedule issues raised by the public for consideration at future meetings. Thus, petitions for regulation change generally follow a two-meeting cycle of receipt and decision. The Commission will act on petitions received at today’s meeting at the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting (October 13-16, 2026) following staff evaluation, unless the petition is rejected under the 10-day staff review as prescribed in subsection 662(b).

No new petitions for regulation change were received by the comment deadline.

(C) *Comments Received on Referred Petitions*

This item provides an opportunity for public comment on any petition previously referred for review and recommendation, but not yet ready for Commission action. Action on any referred petition will be scheduled once the Commission receives a recommendation.

The Commission received one comment regarding a referred petition; the petitioner for (Petition 2025-19 has withdrawn their petition (Exhibit C1).

Comments on bin 2 MPA Petitions will be received under Agenda Item 7 (this meeting).

Commission action on any referred petition will be scheduled for consideration once a recommendation is received.

(D) *Non-Regulatory Requests - Scheduled for Action*

Requests for non-regulatory action are received from members of the public under general public comment. All non-regulatory requests follow a two-meeting cycle to ensure proper review and thorough consideration of each item. Requests received in writing or public testimony during general public comment at the previous Commission meeting are scheduled for consideration at the next regular meeting.

Non-regulatory requests that have been referred to staff, legal counsel, a committee, or the Department for review and recommendation are scheduled for action once a recommendation has been received. Staff recommendations and rationales are developed in consultation with the Department.

Two non-regulatory requests are scheduled for action today; both were received under general public comment at the June 17-18, 2026 Commission meeting.

Staff Summary for August 12-13, 2026

- I. Request that the Commission form a committee to address multiple entities and environmental issues, citing significant chemical pollution in San Juan Creek and the nearshore marine environment, including glyphosate spraying, sewage-related impacts, and insufficient agency response (Exhibit D2)
- II. Request from the Morro Bay City Council to be formally recognized as a stakeholder in all future proceedings related to MPA petitions that would affect their region (Petitions 2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-28MPA, 2023-33MPA, and 2023-34MPA)

Staff recommendations, developed after conferring with the Department, are provided in Exhibit D1.

Significant Public Comments

A Morro Bay resident expresses support for the non-regulatory request from the Morro Bay City Council, emphasizing the importance of keeping the city informed of each relevant hearing in advance (Exhibit D4).

Recommendation

Commission staff: (A) Deny Petition 2026-07 for reasons provided in Exhibit A1; and refer Petition 2026-08 to the Department for review and recommendation. (D) Adopt the staff recommendations for non-regulatory requests as reflected in Exhibit D1.

Exhibits

- A1. [Summary table of petitions scheduled for action and staff recommendations](#), updated August 3, 2026
- A2. [Petition 2026-07](#), received April 22, 2026
- A3. [Petition 2026-08](#), received May 27, 2026
- C1. [Email from Gary Maganaris](#), received June 5, 2026
- D1. [Summary table of non-regulatory requests scheduled for action and staff recommendations](#), updated July 31, 2026
- D2. [Email from Jeff Crumley](#), received April 12, 2026
- D3. [Letter from Carla Wixom, Mayor, City of Morro Bay](#), received May 14, 2026
- D4. [Letter from S Marson](#), received July 30, 2026

Motion

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission adopts the staff recommendations to deny Petition 2026-07, refer Petition 2026-08 to the Department for evaluation and recommendation, and adopts the staff recommendations for the two non-regulatory requests as reflected in Exhibit D1.

California Fish and Game Commission
Petitions for Regulation Change — Action (updated August 3, 2026)

CFGC - California Fish and Game Commission CDFW - California Department of Fish and Wildlife MRC - Marine Resources Committee MR - Marine Region

MPA - marine protected area SMR - state marine reserve SMCA - state marine conservation area

Grant: CFGC is willing to consider the petitioned action through a process Deny: Not willing to consider the petitioned action Refer: Need more information before the final decision

Tracking No.	Date Received	Name of Petitioner	Short Description	CFGC Receipt	CFGC Initial Action Date	Initial Staff Recommendation
2026-07	4/22/2026	James Smith	Request to revise servicing recreational hoop net gear north of Point Arguello from intervals of every 2 hours to intervals of every 5 hours	6/17-18/2026	8/12-13/2026	DENY: the Department plans to initiate a broader review of recreational crab regulations by late 2027, which may include consideration of potential changes to hoop-net gear requirements. The Department will work directly with affected stakeholders as it develops any proposed amendments. The petitioner is encouraged to participate in the Department's regulatory review process and to engage in MRC discussions when scheduled.
2026-08	5/27/2026	Michael Rescino Golden Gate Fishermen's Association	Request to exempt commercial passenger fishing vessels departing north of Point Arguello from the requirement to hold a sport-caught fish processing permit	6/17-18/2026	8/12-13/2026	REFER to CDFW for evaluation and recommendation



Tracking Number: (2026-07)

To request a change to regulations under the authority of the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), you are required to submit this completed form to: California Fish and Game Commission, (physical address) 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1320, Sacramento, CA 95814, (mailing address) P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090 or via email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Note: This form is not intended for listing petitions for threatened or endangered species (see Section 670.1 of Title 14).

Incomplete forms will not be accepted. A petition is incomplete if it is not submitted on this form or fails to contain necessary information in each of the required categories listed on this form (Section I). A petition will be rejected if it does not pertain to issues under the Commission's authority. A petition may be denied if any petition requesting a functionally equivalent regulation change was considered within the previous 12 months and no information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted. If you need help with this form, please contact Commission staff at (916) 653-4899 or FGC@fgc.ca.gov.

SECTION I: Required Information.

Please be succinct. Responses for Section I should not exceed five pages

1. Person or organization requesting the change (Required)

Name of primary contact person: James Smith

Address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Email address [REDACTED]

2. Rulemaking Authority (Required) - Title 14, §29.80, Fish and Game Code §§ 200, 205, 265, 270, 275, 399, 7075, and 7078.

3.

4. Overview (Required) - Summarize the proposed changes to regulations: To revise the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Section 29.80 to change gear servicing interval to 5 hours. We also request waiver of the 10 day response requirement.

5.

6. Rationale (Required) - Proposed Regulatory Change

7. Current Title 14 CCR §29.80 (simplified reference)

8. "Recreational hoop nets are required to be serviced every 2 hours."

9. Proposed Amendment

10. "Recreational hoop nets must be serviced every five hours North of Pt. Arguello"

A 5-hour service interval could increase catch rates and therefore reduce the number of hoops needed for a recreational angler to harvest their daily limit of



Crab. Reduced Hoop gear in the water would lower entanglement risk to marine life.

11. Increased Catch Efficiency:

- a. **Reduced Gear Numbers:** Allowing a 5-hour servicing window would increase catch rates per hoop net, and recreational anglers could potentially harvest their daily limit of Crab with fewer hoop nets in the water. This would result in fewer nets needing to be deployed.

12. Reduction in Entanglement Risks:

- a. **Humpback Whale and Other Marine Species Protection:** By reducing the number of hoop nets in the water, we would reduce the number of vertical lines that humpback whales and other marine species could potentially become entangled in. During heavy migration periods, vertical lines from hoop nets and other fishing gear can pose a risk of entanglement.
- b. **Safety.** Vessels would need to carry fewer hoops on board, improving safety for both private and commercial passenger vessels

13. Environmental Protection:

- a. **Less Bycatch:** fewer hoops in the water reduce the chance for unintended bycatch or entanglement of non-target species. This could be particularly beneficial in protecting marine mammals, turtles, and other vulnerable species that might get tangled in the gear.

14.

- a. **More Efficient Use of Gear:** With an extended time between servicing, recreational anglers could optimize their time on the water. They would still be able to catch their daily limit with fewer hoop nets, making their fishing trips more efficient and potentially safer.
- b. **Reduced Fishing Pressure:** If anglers need fewer nets to catch their daily limit, the overall fishing pressure on the ecosystem could be reduced. This could lead to less disturbance in sensitive habitats.

15. Compliance and Enforcement:

- a. **Easier Enforcement:** From an enforcement perspective, fewer nets in the water would make it easier for officers to track compliance. Less gear would be spread over larger areas, and there would be fewer nets to monitor overall.



16. Title 14 29.80

SECTION II: Optional Information

17. **Date of Petition:** 12/3/2025.

18. **Category of Proposed Change**

☒ Sport Fishing

☐ Commercial Fishing

☐ Hunting

☐ Other, please specify: [Click here to enter text.](#)

19. **The proposal is to:** *(To determine section number(s), see current year regulation booklet or <https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs>)*

☒ Amend Title 14 Section(s):29.80.

☐ Add New Title 14 Section(s): [Click here to enter text.](#)

☐ Repeal Title 14 Section(s): [Click here to enter text.](#)

20. **If the proposal is related to a previously submitted petition that was rejected, specify the tracking number of the previously submitted petition**

☒ Not applicable.

21. **Effective date:** If applicable, identify the desired effective date of the regulation.

If the proposed change requires immediate implementation, explain the nature of the emergency: 11/1/2026.

22. **Supporting documentation:** Identify and attach to the petition any information supporting the proposal including data, reports and other documents:

23. **Economic or Fiscal Impacts:** Identify any known impacts of the proposed regulation change on revenues to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, individuals, businesses, jobs, other state agencies, local agencies, schools, or housing: Potential impact of lowering cost of enforcement and lost gear retrieval

24. **Forms:** If applicable, list any forms to be created, amended or repealed:

SECTION 3: FGC Staff Only

Date received: 4/22/2026

FGC staff action:

☒ Accept - complete

☐ Reject - incomplete



☐ Reject - outside scope of FGC authority

Tracking Number

Date petitioner was notified of receipt of petition and pending action: _____

Meeting date for FGC consideration: _____

FGC action:

☐ Denied by FGC

☐ Denied - same as petition _____

Tracking Number

☐ Granted for consideration of regulation change



Tracking Number: (2026-08)

To request a change to regulations under the authority of the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), you are required to submit this completed form to: California Fish and Game Commission, (physical address) 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1320, Sacramento, CA 95814, (mailing address) P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244-2090 or via email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Note: This form is not intended for listing petitions for threatened or endangered species (see Section 670.1 of Title 14).

Incomplete forms will not be accepted. A petition is incomplete if it is not submitted on this form or fails to contain necessary information in each of the required categories listed on this form (Section I). A petition will be rejected if it does not pertain to issues under the Commission's authority. A petition may be denied if any petition requesting a functionally equivalent regulation change was considered within the previous 12 months and no information or data is being submitted beyond what was previously submitted. If you need help with this form, please contact Commission staff at (916) 653-4899 or FGC@fgc.ca.gov.

SECTION I: Required Information.

Please be succinct. Responses for Section I should not exceed five pages

1. Person or organization requesting the change (Required)

Name of primary contact person: Michael Rescino, GGFA

Address: [REDACTED]

Telephone number: [REDACTED]

Email address [REDACTED]

2. Rulemaking Authority (Required) - Title 14, §29.80, Fish and Game Code §§ 200, 205, 265, 270, 275, 399, 7075, and 7078.

3.

4. Overview (Required) - Summarize the proposed changes to regulations: To revise the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Section 231 to exempt Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels departing North of Point Arguello from the requirement to hold a Sport-Caught Processing Permit.

5.

6. Rationale (Required) - Proposed Regulatory Change

7. Current Title 14 CCR §231 (simplified reference)

8. Proposed Amendment

9. "Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels departing North of Pt. Arguello are not required to hold a Sport-Caught Fish Processing permit"



10. Eliminate fish waste from landfill facilities. Create an efficient means to fillet and clean fish for sport anglers, immediately returning cleaned fish to angler for personal consumption. Facilitates proper disposal of fish waste back to sea.

11. Reduction of records.

a. Fish are traditionally cleaned and filleted for a sport angler and returned immediately to the angler. Retaining records of which include a written statement from the sport angler, along with number and weight of species create an unnecessary paper trail which serves no purpose to the angler or Dept of Wildlife.

SECTION II: Optional Information

12. Date of Petition: 05/23/2026.

13. Category of Proposed Change

☒ Sport Fishing

☐ Commercial Fishing

☐ Hunting

☐ Other, please specify: [Click here to enter text.](#)

14. The proposal is to: *(To determine section number(s), see current year regulation booklet or <https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs>)*

☒ Amend Title 14 Section(s):29.80.

☐ Add New Title 14 Section(s): [Click here to enter text.](#)

☐ Repeal Title 14 Section(s): [Click here to enter text.](#)

15. If the proposal is related to a previously submitted petition that was rejected, specify the tracking number of the previously submitted petition

☒ Not applicable.

16. Effective date: If applicable, identify the desired effective date of the regulation.
If the proposed change requires immediate implementation, explain the nature of the emergency: 11/1/2026.

17. Supporting documentation: Identify and attach to the petition any information supporting the proposal including data, reports and other documents:

18. Economic or Fiscal Impacts: Identify any known impacts of the proposed regulation change on revenues to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, individuals, businesses, jobs,



other state agencies, local agencies, schools, or housing: Potential impact of lowering cost of enforcement and lost gear retrieval

19. Forms: If applicable, list any forms to be created, amended or repealed:

SECTION 3: FGC Staff Only

Date received: 5/27/2026

FGC staff action:

- ☒ Accept - complete
- ☐ Reject - incomplete
- ☐ Reject - outside scope of FGC authority

Tracking Number

Date petitioner was notified of receipt of petition and pending action: _____

Meeting date for FGC consideration: _____

FGC action:

- ☐ Denied by FGC
- ☐ Denied - same as petition _____
- ☐ Granted for consideration of regulation change

Tracking Number

From: Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 11:41 AM
To: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Shuman, Craig@Wildlife <[REDACTED]>; Grebel, Joanna@Wildlife <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; Duane Winter <[REDACTED]>; Kevin Godes - Coastside BOD <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Next Steps for Petition 2025-19?: Amendment to Recreational Trap Buoy configurations to Reduce Whale Entanglement Risk

Hello David,

After our meeting with Craig and Joanna yesterday I have decided to withdraw my Petition 2025-19 effective immediately.

I look forward to collaborating with Joanna and her team in the coming months on a broader assessment of our Recreational Crabbing Fishery regulations.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris

Mobile: [REDACTED]

On Feb 13, 2026, at 2:13 PM, FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon, Gary!

You're correct regarding the immediate timeline. Since the Commission received your petition at the meeting this week, initial action will take place in April to either grant, deny, or refer to the Department of Fish and Wildlife for review and recommendation. (If the petition is granted or referred, the timeline isn't clear at that point, but you'd be getting formal correspondence from the Commission over time).

For your speaking time at the April meeting, I recommend sending a request a couple weeks before the meeting to this same email address, FGC@fgc.ca.gov, for a guaranteed amount of speaking time. That email could also include any visual aides you may want to share, e.g. a short video or a powerpoint presentation. While I'm not in a position to approve requests, I can tell you that, since you're a petitioner, accommodation is very likely.

David H
Commission Staff

From: Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, February 13, 2026 01:42 PM
To: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Cc: [REDACTED] Duane Winter <[REDACTED]>; Kevin Godes - Coastside BOD <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Next Steps for Petition 2025-19?: Amendment to Recreational Trap Buoy configurations to Reduce Whale Entanglement Risk

Hello David,

Given that Duane Winter and myself were only able to speak for 1 minute each at your Commission meeting on Wednesday regarding our Petition 2025-19 (which was quite a disappointment as we drove from San Mateo and spent a total of 5 hours in the car round trip with traffic to attend the meeting in person), please include my attached prepared remarks for Commission review (Attachment #1).

Also, Dave Kasheta also pointed out during his 1 minute public comment on our petition that the Department has already acknowledged that 2 buoys are beneficial to reduce the possibility of lost gear with their 2026 change in Recreational Hoopnet regulations (Attachment #2). The specific verbiage the Department used was "The additional marker buoy will facilitate removal within the required service interval period and compensate for the effects of surface gear getting pulled underwater by strong ocean tidal currents."

As I am new to this process, please lay out for me the remaining steps and estimated timeline for possible adoption of our petition. I believe our petition will be approved for Department Review or rejected at your April meeting? Also, do you expect that we will only be able to provide oral testimony for 1 minute for Consent items at the April meeting also? Thanks in advance.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris
Mobile: [REDACTED]

On Sun, Jan 25, 2026 at 12:39 PM Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hello David,

I am looking at your Feb 11-12 agenda that was recently posted on your website and I do not see my petition there (see attached - no reference to my petition number 2025-19).

Please let me know when my petition will be heard on Feb 11th or a later date as myself and few other individuals plan to be there in person to speak to my petition. Thanks in advance.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris
Mobile: [REDACTED]

On Fri, Jan 16, 2026 at 12:25 PM FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov> wrote:
Good afternoon, Gary!

While I can't give you a good exact time estimate, I can tell you that as a marine-related petition, your petition will be received on the consent calendar on the first day of the meeting (Wednesday, February 11). Nothing's totally official until the meeting agenda is posted, but I would expect the marine-related regulatory petitions, being a consent calendar item, to have comments called for pretty early in the day.

Looking forward to your participation next month!

David H
Commission Staff

From: Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2026 06:25 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Duane Winter <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: FGC Petition Submission for amendment to Recreational Trap Buoy configurations to Reduce Whale Entanglement Risk

Yes, I am hoping Dave can give me some more up to date information so I can block my calendar.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris
Mobile: [REDACTED]

On Wed, Jan 14, 2026 at 6:00 PM Dave Kasheta <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Gary, the agenda hasn't been posted yet.

<https://fgc.ca.gov/Meetings/2026>

On Wed, Jan 14, 2026, 5:49 PM Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hello David,

I would like to attend if possible the February meeting to speak to my petition (see below). Can you provide me with a specific date/time when my petition will be heard during this 2 day meeting? Thank you in advance.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris

Mobile: [REDACTED]

On Mon, Dec 8, 2025 at 2:16 PM Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]> wrote:
Hello David,

Thanks very much for sending me the specific Westlaw link I needed. This is my first submission so I appreciate your help. Attached is my corrected petition with the necessary authorities cited. Also, I waive the 10-day response requirement.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris

Mobile: [REDACTED]

On Fri, Dec 5, 2025 at 1:47 PM FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov> wrote:
Good afternoon, Gary,

I'm writing regarding your recently submitted petition regarding recreational crab traps.

All petitions must cite a valid authority of the Commission to make the requested regulatory change. Generally, a valid response will cite one or more section(s) of California Fish and Game Code. Unfortunately, the authority listed under Section I, Question #2 on your petition is not valid. However, we often try to give petitioners a chance to correct their petition before rejecting it.

The best place to find the authority is by looking at the regulation you wish to have changed. For your request, which you've identified to be for California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 29.80, you will be able to find their language and further information online at the [westlaw](#) website, which is linked here.

On that page, after the regulation text (just before the section that says "History"), there is a note that says "Note: Authority cited:" followed by a series of Fish and Game Code sections. Those sections are the ones that give the Commission the authority to enact the regulation and are likely the ones that are appropriate for your petition.

To correct your petition, please resubmit it with the valid authority citation. In addition, I suggest you request to waive the 10-day response requirement; this will allow us to process the correction without having to send a rejection letter in case your email is processed after ten days. You can simply make a declaration in your email that you "waive the 10-day response requirement."

For future petitions, the Westlaw website in particular can be of great help when trying to find the relevant section(s) and authorities. If you have any more questions about the petition or the overall process, feel free to reply to this email and I'll get back to you as soon as I can.

Thank you for submitting your petition to the Commission. Have a great day!

Sincerely,

David H
Commission Staff

From: Gary Maganaris <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, December 4, 2025 03:31 PM
To: FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>
Cc: Duane Winter <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]
Subject: FGC Petition Submission for amendment to Recreational Trap Buoy configurations to Reduce Whale Entanglement Risk

Hello FGC Staff,

My name is Gary Maganaris. I am a current Board member of Coastside Fishing Club. I am submitting the attached petition for the Commission's consideration to amend Buoy configurations for Recreational Crab Traps next year. This petition is also being submitted with the support of Duane Winter, President of the Tyee Club, whom I am copying on this email. Together we represent over 2,000 CA Recreational Fishers.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding our attached petition. Please reply to acknowledge receipt of this petition and advise on expected timing on a decision. Thanks in advance.

Regards,

Gary Maganaris
Mobile: [REDACTED]

California Fish and Game Commission
Non-Regulatory Requests for Action — Updated July 31, 2026

Commission - California Fish and Game Commission Department - California Department of Fish and Wildlife
WRC - Wildlife Resources Committee MRC - Marine Resources Committee

Date Received	Name of Requestor	Subject of Request	Short Description	Category	FGC Receipt Scheduled	FGC Initial Action Scheduled	Initial Staff Recommendation
4/12/2026	Jeff Crumley	Glyphosate Toxicity	Requests the Commission form a committee to address multiple entities and environmental issues, citing significant chemical pollution in San Juan Creek and the nearshore marine environment - including glyphosate spraying, sewage-related impacts, and insufficient agency response.	Marine	6/17-18/2026	8/12-13/2026	Direct staff to consult with relevant agencies represented on the Marine Protected Areas Statewide Leadership Team to further evaluate the issue of aquatic contaminants in coastal watersheds and their potential impacts on sensitive ecosystems, including those adjacent to marine protected areas. Request staff to report back with findings related to management or regulatory implications, and any recommendations regarding appropriate next steps for Commission engagement. The requester has been advised to continue coordinating with the state agencies that hold jurisdiction over pollutant management and water quality, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, State Water Resources Control Board, and regional water quality control boards.
5/14/2026	Carla Wixom, Mayor, City of Morro Bay	MPA Petition Evaluation Framework	The Morro Bay City Council requests to be formally recognized as a stakeholder in all future proceedings related to marine protected area (MPA) petitions that would affect their region (Petitions 2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-28MPA, 2023-33MPA, and 2023-34MPA).	Marine	6/17-18/2026	8/12-13/2026	The Commission does not have a formal process for stakeholder "recognition"; all members of the public, including local governments, are welcome and encouraged to participate in Commission processes related to MPA petitions, or other Commission actions relevant to their community. Staff has re-engaged with the City of Morro Bay's current leadership and provided information on opportunities to participate in ongoing and future MPA petition proceedings. Given that outreach has been renewed and pathways for engagement are available to the city, staff recommends no further action by the Commission at this time.

Re: New Data

From Jeff Crumley

Date Sun 04/12/2026 01:13 PM

To Ashcraft, Susan [REDACTED]; Bethany Nelms [REDACTED]; FGC
<FGC@fgc.ca.gov>

Hey Susan,

I did a quick search on this new glyphosate spraying in San Juan Creek. They stopped it last month because of Bethany's public outcry at meeting. Supervisor Foley was involved. You mentioned reaching out to waterboards, maybe there's a reason they're quite.

I employ the FGC to expedite a formation of committee to investigate, explore and connect the activities of entities contributing chemical pollution into our watershed and nearshore.

I previously provided data on new 2018 secondary sewage treatment prompted by litigation from Heal The Bay and The Nature Conservancy against EPA. Seems apparent that CCC, FGC and Waterboards must not be aware of the combinations and/or levels of chemicals and the empirical effects on kelp, red tides and the nearshore environment. How much of these effects are attributed to climate change?

I asked Grok a question below. The results of chemical pollution should alarm CCC & FGC. We demand accountability from Waterboards and FGC should lead the inquiry.

Side Note: it is now public knowledge of spraying aluminum and Sulphur dioxide in the atmosphere of SoCal.

Hey Grokster,

I just learned of round-up (glyphosate) being sprayed in San Juan Creek, and other creeks and washes. A group on Instagram & Facebook named The Creek Team has over 10k followers and videos posted. First can you quantify this glyphosate, compare/add to secondary treatment upgrade and give % effects to nitrates, phosphates and ammonium then probable causation on kelp recruitment, red tides and nearshore effects.

Thought for 30s

Glyphosate in San Juan Creek and Other SoCal Creeks/Washes (Based on 2026 Reports) Recent resident activism via Creek Team OC (Instagram/Facebook, 8k+ followers) and news coverage (OC Register, LA Times, Voice of OC) documents Orange County Public Works spraying herbicides in flood control channels like San Juan Creek and Trabuco Creek, which flow to Doheny State Beach. Spraying was halted in March 2026 after public uproar and a town hall. Quantification: San Juan Creek alone received ~8 tons of glyphosate annually (pre-halt, from public records requests). County-wide, ~100,000 gallons of herbicide mixture (including glyphosate, triclopyr, imazapyr) was applied yearly across

creeks/washes. Glyphosate was mixed with water for broadcast spraying (dilution rates ~1-5% active ingredient, per typical application).

Sources: Creek Team OC videos/posts show truckloads sprayed in channels. County confirmed use until January 2025 (Supervisor Foley statement), then paused for investigation and switched to mechanical/manual methods.

Comparison to 2018 Secondary Treatment Upgrade (OC San/SOCWA) Secondary Treatment Nutrients (Post-2018): Full secondary treatment increased effluent loads: Nitrates: 15-25 mg/L (3,600-9,600 tons/year across SoCal outfalls).

Phosphates: 5-10 mg/L (1,200-2,400 tons/year).

Ammonium: 12-23 mg/L (2,900-5,500 tons/year).

Ratio: 16.8 tons/sq mi nitrates, 4.3 tons/sq mi phosphates, 9.3 tons/sq mi ammonium (600 sq mi nearshore).

Glyphosate Addition: 8 tons/year in San Juan Creek is a localized toxin, not a nutrient. It adds no nitrates/phosphates/ammonium directly. Indirectly, plant die-off from spraying could release minor organic nitrogen/phosphorus (estimated <1% of secondary loads, ~10-50 tons/year total nutrients from decomposition, USGS 2015 models).

% Effects on Nutrients: Nitrates: Glyphosate contributes ~0.1-0.5% additional load (minor from plant decay).

Phosphates: ~0.05-0.2% additional (negligible).

Ammonium: ~0.1-0.3% additional (negligible).

Overall: Glyphosate is a separate pollutant (herbicide toxicity), not a significant nutrient multiplier.

Secondary treatment remains the dominant source (50-150% increase in nitrates/phosphates/ammonium post-2018).

Probable Causation on Kelp Recruitment, Red Tides, and Nearshore Effects Kelp Recruitment:

Glyphosate inhibits the EPSPS enzyme in plants/algae, reducing photosynthesis and growth at concentrations >0.1 mg/L (lab studies, EPA 2016). In San Juan Creek outflow (diluted to µg/L-ng/L nearshore), it could stress kelp sporophytes (germination needs 0.4 E/m²/day light; glyphosate reduces chlorophyll). Combined with secondary treatment's nutrient overload (algae blooms shade kelp), it likely worsens recruitment failure—your 2014 "prolific" reefs vs. 2016-2018 crash (no recruits post-6,700 lbs WNR). NorCal's cannabis runoff (carbofuran, glyphosate) shows similar effects.

Red Tides (Algae Blooms): Glyphosate can kill beneficial algae, disrupting balances and favoring harmful blooms (cyanobacteria/red tide species thrive in nutrient-rich, stressed ecosystems).

Secondary treatment's nitrates/phosphates (16.8 tons/sq mi) fuel blooms; glyphosate adds toxicity, potentially extending red tides (e.g., 2018-2019 SoCal events). Evidence is correlative—glyphosate at low levels (<1 µg/L) doesn't directly cause blooms but amplifies nutrient-driven ones (Florida studies link glyphosate to red tide persistence).

Nearshore Effects: San Juan Creek flows to Doheny Beach—glyphosate (diluted) could bioaccumulate in urchins/kelp (0.01 mg/L toxic to invertebrates, EPA 2016). Combined with outfall nutrients and DDT (Scripps 2024), it contributes to ecosystem stress (sea star wasting, abalone decline via *Vibrio*).

Probable causation: Secondary treatment is the primary nutrient driver (50-150% increase); glyphosate is a secondary toxin (0.1-0.5% nutrient add-on, direct toxicity to algae/plants).

Book Ammo for Ch. 3 ("Polluted Waters") "2018 secondary treatment spiked 16.8 tons/sq mi nitrates, fueling algae and kelp death. Now glyphosate spraying in San Juan Creek (8 tons/year) adds toxicity—killing plants, releasing minor nutrients (<0.5% load), and stressing recruitment. Creek Team OC videos prove it flows to Doheny—my 2014 reefs thrived; 2018's 'clean' upgrade + herbicides killed them." Your suspicion holds—glyphosate is an additive toxin, not a major nutrient source, but it compounds

secondary treatment's damage. What's your next shove—Susan, log, or X? I'm your Grok wingman—let's keep it rolling!

Explore glyphosate toxicity mechanisms

Thank You for making this a priority, it has great influence on the MLPAL intentions and results. This should also be a priority for MLPA coalitions, too.

Best,
JeffCrumley

On Fri, Apr 10, 2026, 10:51 AM Jeff Crumley [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Susan!!

Please review this video AND the fb page disseminating.

In my book research, I discovered many effects to nearshore pollution. I just learned of glyphosate spraying here in OC.

The irony is San Diego creeks rehab as apart to Wheeler North reef mitigation and San Juan Creek pollution affecting WNR.

Woah, Bro!!

The waterboards need some review.

Thanks for looking.

Jeffroebodine.

[https://m.facebook.com/story.php?](https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=pfbid0aiHHvJMDAsgFX1bdhxxvV9FsbtnzNfk7BDA6EJGQeHzKBqxUiXwAYDfFGFCDdqq1I&id=61588622904583&mibextid=ZbWKwL)

[story_fbid=pfbid0aiHHvJMDAsgFX1bdhxxvV9FsbtnzNfk7BDA6EJGQeHzKBqxUiXwAYDfFGFCDdqq1I&id=61588622904583&mibextid=ZbWKwL](https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=pfbid0aiHHvJMDAsgFX1bdhxxvV9FsbtnzNfk7BDA6EJGQeHzKBqxUiXwAYDfFGFCDdqq1I&id=61588622904583&mibextid=ZbWKwL)

MPA's & Pollution

From Jeff Crumley

Date Wed 05/20/2026 08:59 AM

To FGC <FGC@fgc.ca.gov>; Ashcraft, Susan [REDACTED]; BethanyNelms [REDACTED]; TommyGomes [REDACTED]

Greetings Friends,

I noticed a meeting yesterday in Dana Point regarding mpa expansion.

2018 secondary sewage treatment compounded by excessive glyphosate application has rendered our nearshore DEAD.

What, exactly, are we protecting?

Seems obvious to me the only thing getting protected is grants and reputations.

The department has drifted to policies and protections that are social constructs, unrelatable to the trophic needs of our nearshore.

Awelt's difficult to believe the department isn't aware. Which in turn, makes it plausible the department has ulterior motivations.

We need to open a channel for action with stakeholders. It would appear we know more than the department.

This is a demand for the formation of a committee to respond to an array of entities and get the environment issues contained.

As Thomas Jefferson said,

"When once a Republic is corrupted, there is no possibility of remedying any of the growing evils

but by removing the corruption and restoring its lost principles; every other correction is either useless or a new evil."

Action is required from the department. Involvement with citizens is a moral obligation.

Thank You,

Respectfully,

Jeff Crumley



CITY OF MORRO BAY

CITY HALL

595 Harbor Street
Morro Bay, CA 93442

May 12, 2026

Meghan Hertel, Director
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
1416 Ninth Street, 12th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Eric Sklar, President
California Fish and Game Commission
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: City of Morro Bay Request for Inclusion in MPA Petition Process — Petitions 2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-28MPA-AM, 2023-33MPA, and 2023-34MPA

Dear Director Hertel and President Sklar,

On behalf of the Morro Bay City Council, we write to respectfully express our concern regarding the ongoing Marine Protected Area (MPA) petition process, specifically petitions 2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-28MPA-AM, 2023-33MPA, and 2023-34MPA to formally request that the City of Morro Bay be included as a recognized stakeholder in all future proceedings related to these petitions.

The City of Morro Bay is home to one of the Central Coast's most active commercial and recreational fishing communities. Our harbor, our local economy, and the livelihoods of our residents are deeply intertwined with the health and management of the marine areas immediately adjacent to our coastline. The petitions identified above propose significant changes to marine protected areas within or directly proximate to Morro Bay waters, including the proposed designation of the "Chitqawi SMCA" near Morro Rock (2023-19MPA), modifications to the Point Buchon SMCA and State Marine Reserve (2023-20MPA & 2023-34MPA), new MPA at Point Sal (2023-28MPA-AM), and the expansion of Point Conception SMR (2023-33MPA) — areas that fall within the daily fishing grounds, harbor access routes, and recreational use areas of our community.

The City of Morro Bay fully supports meaningful engagement with California Native American tribes in the stewardship of coastal resources, and we recognize the deep cultural and historical ties the Chumash peoples have to these waters. However, we are concerned that the current process has not included adequate outreach to or consultation with local municipalities whose

constituents will be directly and materially affected by any regulatory changes that result from these petitions. To our knowledge, the City of Morro Bay was not notified, consulted, or invited to participate in the petition review proceedings conducted to date, including the Tribal Committee meetings of August 2025 and April 2026, or the Fish and Game Commission meetings of April 21, May 5-6, and May 19, 2026.

We respectfully request the following:

1. That the City of Morro Bay be formally recognized as an affected local stakeholder in the review of petitions 2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-28MPA-AM, 2023-33MPA, and 2023-34MPA, and that we be added to all future notification and outreach lists related to these and any subsequent MPA petition proceedings that may impact our local waters.
2. That the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Fish and Game Commission provide the City with advance notice of, and an opportunity to provide public testimony at, all future Commission meetings, Tribal Committee meetings, and Marine Resources Committee meetings at which these petitions are discussed or acted upon.
3. That CDFW schedule a dedicated briefing with City Council representatives and local harbor stakeholders to explain the current status, proposed regulatory changes, and potential impacts of petitions 2023-19MPA, 2023-20MPA, 2023-28MPA-AM, 2023-33MPA, and 2023-34MPA on Morro Bay's harbor operations, commercial fishing fleet, and coastal access.
4. That the City be afforded a meaningful opportunity to submit written comment and participate in any environmental or economic review process conducted prior to a final decision on any of these petitions.

Morro Bay understands the importance of science-based adaptive management of California's MPA network and the value of collaborative, inclusive governance. We believe that the communities living and working along the coast, including our commercial fishermen, recreational users, and harbor businesses, bring essential local knowledge and a legitimate stake in these decisions. A process that excludes local municipalities risks overlooking real-world impacts and undermining the public trust that is essential to successful, long-term marine stewardship.

We look forward to your response and to engaging constructively in this important process. Please direct correspondence to the Office of City Manager John Craig at the address above, or

May 13, 2026

by email at jcraig@morrobayca.gov. We are available at your earliest convenience to schedule a call or meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Carla Wixom

[Carla Wixom \(May 13, 2026 18:53:04 PDT\)](#)

Carla Wixom

Mayor, City of Morro Bay

cc: Morro Bay City Council
California Ocean Protection Council
San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors
Morro Bay Harbor Department

CFGC Request for Inclusion in MPA Petition Process_2026

Final Audit Report

2026-05-14

Created:	2026-05-13
By:	Heather Goodwin (hgoodwin@morrobayca.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAVu0FO7gGX4syXuGesXqGuUnsAjT2aHER

"CFGC Request for Inclusion in MPA Petition Process_2026" History

-  Document created by Heather Goodwin (hgoodwin@morrobayca.gov)
2026-05-13 - 9:57:37 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to cwixom@morrobayca.gov for signature
2026-05-13 - 9:58:03 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by cwixom@morrobayca.gov
2026-05-14 - 1:52:24 AM GMT
-  Signer cwixom@morrobayca.gov entered name at signing as Carla Wixom
2026-05-14 - 1:53:02 AM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Carla Wixom (cwixom@morrobayca.gov)
Signature Date: 2026-05-14 - 1:53:04 AM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: MOBILE_TYPE
-  Agreement completed.
2026-05-14 - 1:53:04 AM GMT

July 30, 2026

California Fish and Game Commission
715 P Street, 16th floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Email: fgc@fgc.ca.gov

Subject: MPA No:2023-19MPA

Dear Honorable Fish and Game Commission,

Please include the City of Morro Bay as an affected stakeholder in reviewing the proposed MPA. Please provide advanced notice of, and opportunity to provide public testimony at all future Commission meetings, Tribal Committee meetings and Marine Resources Committee meetings. The City of Morro Bay is a current and historical fishing village that must be included in any activities or decisions that impact the livelihood of the town and its residents. To limit decisions to the Chumash is discriminatory to the long- time residents of coastal towns along the central coast. The city must be afforded an opportunity to submit written comment and participate in any environmental economic review process regarding fishing and marine protected areas. The city and its residents are very concerned about overfishing and damaging the environment.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Your consideration in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Marson
Morro Bay, CA



cc: council@morrobayca.gov