

Staff Summary for October 13-16, 2026

17. Recreational Gear Restrictions for White Shark (Emergency) (Consent)**Today's Item**Information ☐Action ☒

Consider adopting a 90-day extension of emergency regulations to further protect white shark during environmental conditions that increase nearshore aggregations of white sharks and increase the likelihood of humans interacting with sharks while fishing, by prohibiting specific gear types when recreational fishing from shore or within 1,000 yards of shore.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| • Adoption of emergency regulations concerning recreational gear restrictions for white shark | June 17-18, 2026 |
| • Marine Resources Committee (MRC) vetting and recommendation | July 16, 2026; MRC |
| • Approved MRC recommendation | August 12-13, 2026 |
| • Today consider adopting a 90-day extension of emergency regulations concerning the recreational gear restrictions for white shark | October 13-16, 2026 |

Background

As apex predators, white sharks are protected from take under federal law and under California Fish and Game Code section 5517. Juvenile white sharks commonly gather in southern California's nearshore waters. Recently, several juveniles were accidentally hooked by anglers using heavy gear that can also be used to illegally target white sharks, resulting in injuries to the species and at least three deaths of white sharks in 2026. A previous incident in 2014 also involved a swimmer being bitten by a white shark that had been hooked by an angler on a pier. With a strong El Niño expected to increase the presence of juvenile white sharks in California's coastal waters, the risk of both illegal take and dangerous human-shark interactions involving hooked sharks may rise. Additional background is available in Exhibit 1.

In response to these concerns, at its June 17-18, 2026 meeting, the Commission approved an emergency rulemaking to amend shore fishing gear and white shark take restrictions in sections 28.06 and 28.65 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2026-0626-01E). The emergency regulations went into effect on July 3, 2026.

The emergency regulations prompted media attention and online postings from shore-based shark-fishing enthusiasts and a shark conservation group. Hundreds of comments (individual and form letters) from the angling community, shark conservationists, and the general public were submitted before, during and after the public comment period. In light of the volume of interest, concerns, and suggestions received, the Department requested that a discussion about the emergency regulations be added to the July MRC agenda. After discussion at the July 2026 MRC, the Committee recommended that the Commission readopt the emergency regulations at the October 13-16, 2026 meeting, and request the Department return to the November 2026 MRC meeting with an update and recommend measures to incorporate into a regular rulemaking, if warranted. See Exhibit 2 for additional background.

Staff Summary for October 13-16, 2026

The Department's memo requesting consideration of readoption at today's meeting, along with the draft materials for the readoption—including the emergency statement, proposed regulatory language, and the economic and fiscal impact report—are provided in exhibits 3 through 6.

The current emergency rule will expire on December 31, 2026, unless it is readopted for an additional 90 days pursuant to subdivision (h) of Government Code Section 11346.1. Upon expiration of the emergency rule, the fishery will revert to regulations in place before the emergency rulemaking, potentially resulting in increased illegal take of and injuries to white sharks and decreased protections for nearshore users from interactions with sharks hooked on very heavy gear.

Significant Public Comments

A member of the public opposes the emergency gear regulations, arguing that broad bans on wire leaders and larger hooks unfairly hinder responsible anglers targeting legal shark species and effectively eliminates shore bound and nearshore shark angling, without addressing the few individuals illegally targeting white sharks. They urge the Commission to enforce existing laws against illegal white-shark targeting instead of imposing gear restrictions. (Exhibit 7)

Recommendation

Commission staff: Find, pursuant to Section 399 of the Fish and Game Code, that adopting the proposed emergency regulation is necessary for the immediate conservation, preservation, and protection of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, or reptiles, including, but not limited to, their nests or eggs and for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, or general welfare.

Further determine, pursuant to Section 11346.1 of the Government Code, that an emergency situation exists and find the proposed regulation is necessary to address the emergency.

Readopt the emergency regulation to amend sections 28.06 and 28.65 to extend the expiration of the emergency regulation for an additional 90 days, as proposed in Exhibit 5 and discussed today.

Department: Readopt the emergency regulations to amend sections 28.06 and 28.65.

Exhibits

1. [Staff summary from June 17-18, 2026](#) (for background purposes only)
2. [Staff summary from July 16, 2026 MRC meeting](#) (for background purposes only)
3. [Department memo](#), received September 14, 2026
4. [Draft emergency statement and informative digest](#), dated August 18, 2026
5. [Draft proposed regulatory language](#)
6. [Draft economic and fiscal impact statement \(STD 399\)](#)
7. [Email from Thomas Boctor](#), received June 23, 2026

Staff Summary for October 13-16, 2026

Motion

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission adopts the staff recommendations for items 16 and 17 on the consent calendar.

Staff Summary for June 17-18, 2026

*(For background purposes only)***6. Recreational Gear Restrictions for White Shark (Emergency)****Today's Item**Information ☐Action ☒

Consider adopting emergency regulations to further protect white sharks during environmental conditions that increase nearshore aggregations of white sharks and increase the likelihood of humans interacting with sharks while fishing, by prohibiting specific gear types when recreational fishing from shore or within 1,000 yards of shore.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

- **Today discuss and consider adopting emergency regulations** **June 17-18, 2026**

Background

White sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) are an important apex predator in the marine ecosystem and are protected from take under state and federal fishing regulations. Juvenile white sharks commonly aggregate in nearshore waters of southern California and have not been documented north of Santa Cruz.

Recently, several incidents have occurred in which juvenile white sharks were hooked by pier and shore anglers using heavy fishing gear, such as wire leaders and large hooks; this gear is commonly used to legally target other shark species but can also be used to illegally target white sharks. These fishing interactions can injure sharks and have resulted in the death of at least three white sharks in 2026. A previous incident in 2014 also involved a swimmer being bitten by a white shark that had been hooked by an angler on a pier.

This year, a strong El Niño event is expected to warm coastal water and increase the presence of juvenile white sharks in California coastal waters, making the sharks more susceptible to being hooked and significantly heightening the potential for human-shark interactions involving hooked sharks. Given these conditions, there is an immediate need to deter illegal targeting of white shark, improve survival of incidentally hooked white sharks, and reduce risk of incidents in which hooked sharks may pose a hazard to ocean users.

Based on the recent events and the anticipated increase caused by the upcoming El Niño event, the Department is requesting the Commission amend recreational ocean fishing regulations through the emergency rulemaking process to further protect white sharks from illegal take and incidental harm and to help prevent incidents between ocean users and hooked sharks (see Exhibit 1 for additional details).

The draft emergency amendments would require that any white sharks caught be released immediately and prohibit removing hooked white sharks from the water. The amendments would also prohibit the use of wire or other metallic lines or leaders and hooks larger than one and one-half inches in maximum inside measurement when fishing in ocean waters south of Pigeon Point (San Mateo County, 37° 11' N. lat.), the area where juvenile white shark aggregations are documented to occur and are expected to increase. For additional background, supporting information, and proposed regulatory text, see exhibits 2 and 3.

Staff Summary for June 17-18, 2026
(*For background purposes only*)

Significant Public Comments (N/A)

Recommendation

Commission staff: Adopt the proposed emergency regulation for recreational gear restrictions for white sharks as recommended by the Department.

Department: Adopt the emergency regulation described in exhibits 2 and 3.

Exhibits

1. [Department memo, received June 2, 2026](#)
2. [Draft emergency statement and informative digest, dated May 13, 2026](#)
3. [Draft proposed regulatory language](#)
4. [Draft economic and fiscal impact statement \(STD 399\)](#)
5. [Department presentation](#)

Motion

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission finds, pursuant to Section 399 of the California Fish and Game Code, that adopting the proposed emergency regulation is necessary for the immediate conservation, preservation, or protection of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, or reptiles, including, but not limited to, their nests or eggs and is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, or general welfare.

The Commission further determines, pursuant to Section 11346.1 of the Government Code, that an emergency situation exists and finds the proposed regulation is necessary to address the emergency.

Therefore, the Commission adopts the emergency regulation to amend sections 28.06 and 28.65, as discussed today.

Committee Staff Summary for July 16, 2026 MRC
(*For background purposes only*)

3. Recreational Gear Restrictions for White Shark

Today's Item

Information ☐

Action ☒

Review emergency regulations adopted in June 2026 to further protect white sharks during environmental conditions that increase nearshore aggregations and increase likelihood of human interaction with sharks while fishing, discuss rationale, and consider possible next steps, including potential readoption, notice of regulation change, and any modifications.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| • Commission discussed and adopted emergency regulations | June 17-18, 2026 |
| • Today review emergency regulations and consider possible next steps | July 16, 2026; MRC |
| • Commission consider potential readoption of emergency regulations | October 13-16, 2026 |

Background

The Department is responsible for managing shark fishing under regulations adopted by the Commission, and tracks interactions with white shark as a federally and state-protected species. At its June 2026 meeting, the Commission adopted emergency recreational ocean fishing regulations in response to projected increases in juvenile white shark presence associated with warmer El Niño conditions.

Specifically, the action established temporary restrictions for fishing from shore or within 1,000 yards of shore from Pigeon Point (San Mateo County) southward to the U.S./Mexico border. The restrictions include; (1) no use of wire or other metallic lines or leaders, (2) no hooks larger than 1.5 inches, and (3) no removal of hooked white sharks from the water. Although these gear types are typically legal for targeting other shark species, they have been involved in recent incidents in which juvenile white sharks were hooked with heavy tackle, resulting in injuries to a swimmer and harm to the sharks, including several mortalities.

The concerns regarding white shark are heightened this year by forecasted warmer-water conditions that shift the preferred range for juvenile white shark northward from Mexico and lead them to stay in California nearshore areas later in the year. The emergency regulations aim to deter illegal targeting of white sharks where nearshore aggregations are known to occur, reduce the likelihood and severity of incidental hooking of white sharks, improve post-release survival by preventing white sharks from trailing heavy gear, and reduce risks to ocean users posed by hooked white sharks or attached wire leaders.

More detailed background is provided in the June 2026 Commission meeting staff summary (Exhibit 1); associated supporting documentation and emergency regulatory language is available online at [Staff Summary and Exhibits for Item 6, June 17-18, 2026 CFGC meeting](#).

Committee Staff Summary for July 16, 2026 MRC
(For background purposes only)

Update

The temporary emergency regulations went into effect on July 3, 2026 and will continue for 180 days unless extended through subsequent Commission action. The emergency regulations prompted media attention and online postings from shore-based shark-fishing enthusiasts and a shark conservation group. Hundreds of comments (individual and form letters) from the angling community, shark conservationists, and the general public were submitted before, during and after the public comment period (see Significant Public Comments). In light of the volume of interest, concerns, and suggestions received, the Department requested that this topic be added to the MRC agenda — the only MRC meeting scheduled prior to the timing required for a potential readoption of the emergency regulations.

Today's meeting provides an opportunity to review and discuss the emergency action, the specific measures adopted in regulation, and considerations for future actions to extend and/or modify the regulations. The Department will present an overview of the implemented measures, the rationale behind them, and implications for recreational anglers targeting other legally harvested shark species (Exhibit 2).

Today's discussion is intended to support MRC consideration and input on next steps, including potential readoption of the emergency regulations and possible initiation of a regular rulemaking beyond the emergency period of approximately one year. To avoid the emergency regulations expiring, readoption would need to occur in October 2026. If MRC recommends, and the Commission approves, pursuing a regular rulemaking to maintain the current measures and/or explore adjustments, a public notice hearing for that action should be scheduled for December 2026 if any significant changes to the regulations are anticipated or February 2027 if there are limited changes; the latter would allow additional discussion at the November 2026 MRC meeting before a Commission decision is made on the contents of a regular rulemaking.

Significant Public Comments

No public comments were submitted specifically for this meeting. However, during the emergency rulemaking comment period — from the emergency adoption on June 17 through the comment period ending Jun 30 — the Commission received written comments supporting the action from just over 450 individuals (31 unique comments and 420 form emails), and opposing the emergency action from 89 individuals (including several "template" letters). Staff transmitted all unique comments to the Department and a set of example form letters and template emails; as a result, the numbers reported here differ from those in the Department presentation (Exhibit 2). A brief overview of the comments received is provided here.

Support: Individual commenters supporting the action, including white shark bite survivors, shark advocates, California residents, and the general public, highlight the need to reduce dangerous interactions between hooked sharks and swimmers, protect apex predators, and close loopholes in the pre-emergency regulations. Many also urged the Commission to consider further restrictions on the use of chum, live bait, mechanical gaffs from piers, and drones for bait deployment. The form letters, the result of an online campaign, continue to be received (over 800 as of July 9). Sample comments are provided in Exhibit 4.

Committee Staff Summary for July 16, 2026 MRC

(For background purposes only)

Oppose: Commenters opposing the action, including shore-based shark anglers, express concern about impact on fishing for other shark species (notably from shore), potential harm of gear on sharks and the environment, and impacts to scientific research. Commenters suggested alternative measures, including increasing enforcement of current law and using education rather than broader restrictions. Others emphasized their right to fish and questioned the emergency justification. Sample comments are provided in Exhibit 5.

Responses: A summary of the comments by theme, and Department and staff responses to comments that were submitted to the Office of Administrative Law, is provided in Exhibit 3. The general responses in Exhibit 3 address all comments received by the Commission.

Recommendation

Commission staff: Recommend that the Commission continue gathering feedback on and results from the adopted regulations; and (1) schedule for October consideration of potentially readopting the emergency regulations, and consider whether to include a possible exception for smaller wire leaders if the regulation is readopted. (2) Delay any recommendation on initiating a regular rulemaking to allow time to learn from the feedback and outcomes of the emergency regulations, which may lead to identifying potential additional modifications, if any, that may be incorporated into a regular rulemaking. (3) Request that the Department provide an update at the November 2026 MRC meeting to inform a potential MRC recommendation regarding a regular rulemaking and the scheduling of public notice.

Department: Continue to gather feedback on and results from the adopted measures, and (1) schedule consideration of emergency readoption in October, and (2) consider scheduling a regular rulemaking notice for consideration in December. Consider a possible exception for smaller wire leaders and the need for modifications, if any, to be enforceable.

Exhibits

1. [Staff summary for Agenda Item 6, June 17-18, 2026 Commission meeting](#) (for background purposes only)
2. [Department presentation](#)
3. [Summary of comments and staff responses to comments](#) regarding the emergency regulations received during the comment period, June 17-30, 2026
4. [Sample comments supporting the emergency measures](#), received June 17-30, 2026
5. [Sample comments opposing the emergency measures](#), received June 17-30, 2026

Committee Direction/Recommendation

Motion 1, Emergency Readoption (October): The Marine Resources Committee recommends that the Commission consider readopting the emergency white shark gear restrictions at its October meeting, either:

- with the current emergency measures *as adopted*; **or**
- with the following *modification(s)*: _____.

AND [next page]

Committee Staff Summary for July 16, 2026 MRC
(*For background purposes only*)

Motion 2, Regular Rulemaking (Future): The Marine Resources Committee recommends that the Commission either:

- ***not schedule*** a regular rulemaking at this time and return the topic to MRC for further discussion at the November 2026 MRC meeting; **or**
- ***schedule*** consideration of a regular rulemaking for the December Commission meeting, including the following potential modification(s) to the emergency measures:
_____, and return the topic to MRC for further discussion at the November 2026 MRC meeting with an update and any recommended measures to incorporate into a regular rulemaking.

Signed original on file,
received September 14, 2026

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 14, 2026

To: Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director
Fish and Game Commission

From: Meghan Hertel, Director

Subject: Submission of Finding of Emergency Statement and Regulatory Documents for the October 13-16, 2026 California Fish and Game Commission Meeting to Readopt the Amendment of Sections 28.06 and 28.65, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Re: Recreational Gear Restrictions for White Shark

Please find attached the Findings of Emergency Statement and regulatory documents for the 90-day extension to readopt the amendments of sections 28.06 and 28.65, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR). The proposed emergency regulatory action is needed to further protect white sharks from illegal take and incidental harm and to help prevent incidents between swimmers and other water users and hooked sharks. The proposed emergency regulation readoption will keep the emergency regulation in place for an additional 90-day period.

We request submission of this emergency readoption action to the Office of Administrative Law after consideration at the October 2026 meeting. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Craig Shuman at r7regionalmgr@wildlife.ca.gov.



Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director
California Fish and Game Commission
September 14, 2026
Page 2

ec: **California Department of Fish and Wildlife**

Chad Dibble, Deputy Director
Wildlife and Fisheries Division

Craig Shuman, Regional Manager
Marine Region

Eric Kord, Assistant Chief
Marine Law Enforcement Division

Anthony Cusato, Attorney
Office of General Counsel

Ona Alminas, Env. Program Manager
Regulations Unit
Wildlife and Fisheries Division

Emily McKim, Regulatory Scientist
Regulations Unit
Wildlife and Fisheries Division

California Fish and Game Commission

David Thesell, Deputy Executive Director

Gabe Lopez, Program Manager

Susan Ashcraft, Marine Advisor

Jenn Bacon, Analyst

State of California
Fish and Game Commission
Finding of Emergency and Statement of Proposed Emergency Regulatory Action

90-Day Extension of Emergency Action to Amend Sections 28.06 and 28.65
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Recreational Gear Restrictions for White Shark

Date of Statement: August 18, 2026

I. Emergency Regulation in Effect to Date

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

At its June 17-18, 2026 meeting, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) approved an emergency rulemaking to amend shore fishing gear and white shark take restrictions in sections 28.06 and 28.65 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2026-0626-01E).

Background

White sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) are an important apex predator in the marine ecosystem, and are protected under state and federal fishing regulations. There have been several recent incidents involving pier and beach anglers either intentionally targeting white sharks, or accidentally hooking them with very heavy fishing gear. These incidents have resulted in the death of at least three white sharks this year. Additionally, in 2014, a swimmer was bitten by a white shark that had been hooked by a pier angler.

This year, a forecasted strong El Niño oceanic event is anticipated to increase the presence of white sharks in California coastal waters, which will increase their availability to anglers and the potential for human interactions with hooked sharks. Young white sharks are already being observed in significantly higher numbers in southern California. Because of this, there is an immediate need to curtail illegal targeted fishing for white sharks, help ensure accidentally hooked sharks are released alive, and help prevent another incident where a hooked shark bites an ocean user, or the heavy gear used to catch such sharks entangles a person in the water.

II. Request for Approval of Readoption of Emergency Regulations

The current emergency rule will expire on December 31, 2026, unless it is readopted for an additional 90 days by a re-adoption effort pursuant to subdivision (h) of Government Code Section 11346.1. If the emergency rule is not extended, the fishery will revert to regulations in place before the emergency rulemaking, potentially resulting in increased illegal take of white sharks and decreased protections for ocean users from interactions with sharks hooked on very heavy gear.

III. Statement of Facts Constituting the Need for Readoption of the Emergency Regulatory Action

In response to the emergency situation, the proposed regulatory action readopts the amendments to sections 28.06 and 28.65 to amend shore fishing gear and white shark take restrictions. The proposed regulation for readoption is the same as the original emergency regulation.

The emergency action is necessary to better protect white sharks from illegal targeting, allow incidentally hooked white sharks to more easily break free from the line, and prevent sharks from being released with trailing wires that can entangle the shark after release. The restrictions will also help protect swimmers, surfers, and other ocean users from potential harm caused by a hooked shark attached to wire leader.

The boundary is set south of Pigeon Point because aggregations of juvenile white sharks have not previously been observed north of Santa Cruz, and Pigeon Point is an established, easily identifiable, geographical management line. The remainder of Section 28.65 is renumbered to allow for these additional restrictions to be added to this section.

IV. Existence of an Emergency and Need for Action

The Commission considered the following factors in determining that an emergency currently exists. The Department has indicated that increased shark aggregations in Southern California waters this year. Juvenile white sharks usually move into Southern California waters in the summer months, as waters to the south become too warm. During warm water events, white sharks are present in greater numbers and are present farther north. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has declared that a strong El Niño event has begun, that is bringing warmer than normal waters to the California coast. These warm water events have historically led to increased presence of white sharks in California, and a northward shift in the range of juvenile white sharks. In early April 2026, 20 juvenile white sharks were caught in a single day from the Hermosa Beach Pier. Additionally, at least three white sharks have been documented to have died this year after being hooked and released with heavy fishing gear consisting of wire leaders and large hooks.

The magnitude of potential harm:

Given the number of white sharks taken in recent months, the confirmed deaths of at least three white sharks, and the known potential for a hooked shark to bite a human in the water, the magnitude of documented and potential harm is great. As white shark presence has increased this year due to a strong El Niño oceanic event, it is likely that additional sharks will be killed through incidental and illegal targeted fishing activities over the course of the year. This could have a negative impact on white shark populations.

In addition to the harm to the species, a hooked white shark poses a serious risk of harm to ocean users. In 2014, an ocean swimmer was bitten by a shark that had been hooked off the Manhattan Beach Pier. The swimmer encountered the fishing line and was bitten by the shark fighting on the line. The individual was hospitalized with lacerations and puncture wounds on the right side of his torso and his right hand. An additional risk is an ocean user becoming entangled in the fishing line or leader. Wire leader has the capability of severely injuring an angler if entangled while a large shark is struggling on the end. With more people at the beach and in the ocean continuing into the fall with warmer than normal water and air temperatures, the risk of potential harm to people from hooked white sharks is significant.

The existence of a crisis situation:

Section 28.06 prohibits the take of white shark. White sharks are slow-growing, long lived, and have low reproductive rates compared to other fish species. As a top-level predator, healthy populations are necessary to maintain a balanced ecosystem. Additionally, a single incident involving a hooked white shark harming a bystander in the water is not acceptable. The

increased number of sharks already being hooked from piers and beaches indicates that a crisis exists, which will likely increase through the year without intervention.

The immediacy of the need:

The readoption of the emergency regulations is needed because of the strong El Niño event, warm water temperatures are expected to remain longer than normal this year and white shark aggregations and beach use are expected be higher than normal during the winter months.

Whether the anticipation of harm has a basis firmer than simple speculation:

The anticipation of potential harm is supported by confirmed recent cases of white sharks being hooked and dying as a result of the use of the gear proposed for prohibition, documented increases in white shark aggregations this year, NOAA's forecast of a strong El Niño event, and a documented 2014 incident in which a white shark bit a swimmer after it was hooked by an angler fishing on a pier.

V. Readoption Criteria

Same as or Substantially Equivalent

Pursuant to Government Code subdivision 11346.1(h), a readoption may be approved only if the text is "the same as or substantially equivalent to an emergency regulation previously adopted by that agency." The language proposed for this rulemaking is the same as the language of the original emergency regulation.

Substantial Progress

Government Code subdivision 11346.1(h) specifies "Readoption shall be permitted only if the agency has made substantial progress and proceeded with diligence to comply with subdivision (e)" [sections 11346.2 through 11347.3, inclusive].

A regular rulemaking (certificate of compliance) is currently being assessed and will be discussed by the Commission's Marine Resources Committee in November 2026.

Proposed Action by the Commission

The Commission's proposed readoption of the emergency amendments to sections 28.06 and 28.65 are the same as previously effective.

VI. Impact of Regulatory Action

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State

There are no anticipated costs or savings to state agencies or costs/savings in Federal Funding to the State as a result of the proposed regulations, which reinforces the existing prohibition of the incidental take of white shark to state what to do if one is caught incidentally, and prohibits the use of certain fishing gear within the shoreline that would potentially lead to such incidental take.

(b) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies

None.

(c) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts

None.

(d) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code

None.

(e) Effect on Housing Costs

None.

VII. Technical, Theoretical, and/or Empirical Studies, Reports, or Documents Relied Upon:

Anderson J.M., Burns E.S., Meese E.N., Farrugia T.J., Stirling B.S., White C.F., Logan R.K., O'Sullivan J., Winkler C. and Lowe C.G. 2021. Interannual Nearshore Habitat Use of Young of the Year White Sharks off Southern California. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 8:645142.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.645142>

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2026. California Shark Incident Database, <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Marine/White-Shark>. Accessed May 2026.

Fox 11 News Los Angeles. 2026. "Fisherman reels in 7-foot great white shark at Hermosa Beach Pier." April 3, 2026, <https://www.foxla.com/news/hermosa-beach-pier-great-white-shark-catch-release>

Montalto, K.H. 2025. Juvenile White Sharks in Monterey Bay: Effects of Thermal Habitat Patchiness on Local Densities of a Novel Range Shifting Predator. Capstone Projects and Master's Theses. 2003. https://digitalcommons.csumb.edu/caps_thes_all/2003

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Weather Service Climate Prediction Center. 2026. El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO) Diagnostic Discussion. https://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/analysis_monitoring/enso_advisory/index.shtml. Accessed May 14, 2026.

NBC News Los Angeles. 2026. "Nearly 2 dozen juvenile sharks caught and released by fishermen in Hermosa Beach," April 13, 2026, <https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/juvenile-sharks-hermosa-beach/3875429/>

Tanaka, K.R., Van Houtan, K.S., and Mailander, E. 2021. North Pacific warming shifts the juvenile range of a marine apex predator. *Sci Rep* 11, 3373. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82424-9>.

White C.F., Lyons K., Jorgensen S.J., O'Sullivan J., and Winkler C. 2019. Quantifying habitat selection and variability in habitat suitability for juvenile white sharks. *PLOS ONE* 14(5): e0214642. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214642>.

VIII. Authority and Reference

Section 28.06

Authority cited: Sections 200, 205, 255, 265, and 399, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 110, 200, 205, 255, 265, 1002 and 5517, Fish and Game Code.

Section 28.65

Authority cited: Sections 200, 205, 265, 270, 275, 7071, 7110, and 399, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 200, 205, 265, 270, 275, 7110 and 8585.5, Fish and Game Code.

IX. Fish and Game Code Section 399 Finding

Pursuant to Section 399 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission finds that the adoption of this regulation is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, or general welfare.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

At its June 17-18, 2026 meeting, the Commission approved an emergency rulemaking to amend shore fishing gear and white shark take restrictions in sections 28.06 and 28.65 (Office of Administrative Law File Number 2026-0626-01E). This regulatory action would readopt the emergency for an additional 90 days.

Background

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

No white sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) are allowed to be taken recreationally, as they are an important apex predator in the marine ecosystem and are protected under state and federal fishing regulations. There have been several recent incidents involving pier and beach anglers either intentionally targeting white sharks or accidentally hooking them with very heavy fishing gear. These incidents have resulted in the death of at least three white sharks this year. Additionally, in 2014, a swimmer was bitten by a white shark that had been hooked by a pier angler.

This year, a forecasted strong El Niño oceanic event is anticipated to increase the presence of white sharks in California coastal waters, which will increase their availability to anglers and the potential for human interactions with hooked sharks. Young white sharks have already been observed in significantly higher numbers in southern California. Because of this, there is an immediate need to curtail illegal targeted fishing for white sharks, help ensure accidentally hooked sharks are released alive, and help prevent another incident where a hooked shark bites a swimmer or the heavy gear used to catch such sharks entangles a person in the water.

Emergency Regulations

These restrictions are necessary to protect white sharks from illegal targeting, allow incidentally hooked white sharks to break free from the line, and prevent sharks from being released with trailing wires that can entangle the shark after release. This will also help protect people who are swimming, surfing, or engaged in other water sports from being harmed by a hooked shark or a wire leader attached to one. The remainder of Section 28.65 is renumbered to allow for additional restrictions to be added.

The Fish and Game Commission (Commission) determined that an emergency exists based on several factors. Shark researchers have documented increased white shark aggressions in Southern California this year, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is forecasting a strong El Niño event, that will warm coastal waters and further increase shark presence and northward movement in juvenile white shark range. In April 2026, 20 juvenile white sharks were caught in a single day from the Hermosa Beach Pier, and at least three white sharks have died this year after being hooked and released with heavy fishing gear.

Given the number of white shark captures, confirmed mortalities, and the risk that a hooked shark could injure a person, the potential harm to white sharks and humans is significant. Without these regulations, dozens more white sharks could be killed through incidental and illegal targeted fishing activities, negatively impacting white shark populations, and there is increased risk of human injury resulting from a hooked shark biting or entangling a person in the water.

The readoption of the emergency regulations are needed because of the strong El Niño event, warm water temperatures are expected to remain longer than normal this year and white shark aggregations and beach use are expected be higher than normal during the winter months. The anticipation of potential harm is based on firm evidence that white sharks have been hooked and have died as a result of the use of the gear proposed for prohibition. Additionally, a white shark bit a swimmer in 2014 after being hooked by an angler on a fishing pier.

Benefits of the Regulation:

The Commission anticipates benefits to the State's environment by sustainably managing California's ocean resources by limiting the potential increase of white shark take. The Commission also anticipates improved public safety, by reducing the chance that an incidentally hooked shark remains on the line and either bites someone in the water or injures a person with a trailing wire leader.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature delegated regulation of the take of white shark to the Commission. The Commission conducted an evaluation of existing regulations, and this regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 28.06, Title 14 CCR, is amended to read:

§ 28.06. White Shark.

(a) White shark may not be taken, except under permit issued by the Department pursuant to Section 1002 of the Fish and Game Code for scientific or educational purposes.

(b) If taken, white shark shall be released immediately and shall not be removed from the water, except when taken under permit issued by the Department pursuant to Section 1002 of the Fish and Game Code for scientific or educational purposes.

Authority cited: Sections 200, 205, 255, 265, and 399, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 110, 200, 205, 255, 265, 1002 and 5517, Fish and Game Code.

Section 28.65, Title 14 CCR, is amended to read:

§ 28.65. General.

Except as provided in this article, fin fish may be taken only on hook and line or by hand. Any number of hooks and lines may be used in all ocean waters and bays except:

(a) San Francisco Bay, as described in Section 27.00, where only one line with not more than three hooks may be used.

(b) On public piers, no person shall use more than two rods and lines, two hand lines, or two nets, traps or other appliances used to take crabs.

(c) South of Pigeon Point (San Mateo County, 37° 11' N. lat.), when angling from shore (including beaches, banks, piers, jetties, breakwaters, docks, and other man-made structures connected to the shore) or within 1,000 yards of the mean high tide line, the following are prohibited:

(1) The use of wire or metallic lines or leaders.

(2) The use of hooks greater than one and one-half inches at the widest inside measurement.

(d) When rockfish (genus *Sebastes*), California scorpionfish (*Scorpaena guttata*), lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*), cabezon (*Scorpaenichthys marmoratus*), greenlings of the genus *Hexagrammos*, or species listed in Section 28.49 are aboard or in possession, only one line with not more than two hooks may be used pursuant to sections 28.55, 28.54, 28.27, 28.28 28.29, or 28.49, respectively.

(e) No gaff hook shall be used to take or assist in landing any fin fish shorter than the minimum size limit. For the purpose of this section a gaff hook is any hook with or without a handle used to assist in landing fish or to take fish in such a manner that the fish does not take the hook voluntarily in its mouth. No person shall take fin fish from any boat or other floating device in ocean waters without having a landing net in possession or available for immediate use to assist in landing undersize fish of species having minimum size limits; the opening of any such landing net shall be not less than eighteen inches in diameter.

(f) North of Point Conception (34°27'00" N. lat.), where only one rod and line may be used by each angler fishing for salmon, or fishing from any boat or floating device with salmon on board.

(g) Mousetrap gear prohibited: It is unlawful to use, assist in using, or to possess aboard any vessel, hook-and-line gear commonly termed "mouse traps" constructed of a hook(s) or lure(s), attached to one end of a line that is attached to a float, or floats at the other end, and that when fished, is not attached directly to a person or vessel. Possession of such gear aboard a vessel shall be prima facie evidence that the gear is being used in violation of this regulation.

(h) North of Point Conception to 40°10'00" N. lat. (near Cape Mendocino), subsection 27.80(a)(3) applies to each angler fishing for salmon or fishing from any boat or floating device with salmon on board.

Authority cited: Sections 200, 205, 265, 270, 275, 7071, 7110, and 399, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 200, 205, 265, 270, 275, 7110 and 8585.5, Fish and Game Code.

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT NAME California Fish and Game Commission	CONTACT PERSON David Thesell	EMAIL ADDRESS fgc@fgc.ca.gov	TELEPHONE NUMBER 916-201-6201
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400 Readopt Emerg. Act. to Amd. Sec. 28.06, 28.65, CCR. T14 re: Shore Fishing Gear Restrictions and White Shark			NOTICE FILE NUMBER Z

A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ a. Impacts business and/or employees | ☐ e. Imposes reporting requirements |
| ☐ b. Impacts small businesses | ☐ f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance |
| ☐ c. Impacts jobs or occupations | ☐ g. Impacts individuals |
| ☐ d. Impacts California competitiveness | ☒ h. None of the above (Explain below): |

Emergency action: no economic assessment; only fiscal impact assessment.***If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.******If box in Item 1.h. is checked, complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.***2. The _____ estimates that the economic impact of this regulation (which includes the fiscal impact) is:
(Agency/Department)

- ☐ Below \$10 million
- ☐ Between \$10 and \$25 million
- ☐ Between \$25 and \$50 million
- ☐ Over \$50 million *[If the economic impact is over \$50 million, agencies are required to submit a [Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment](#) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c)]*

3. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: _____

Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits): _____

Enter the number or percentage of total
businesses impacted that are small businesses: _____

4. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: _____ eliminated: _____

Explain: _____

5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: ☐ Statewide
☐ Local or regional (List areas): _____

6. Enter the number of jobs created: _____ and eliminated: _____

Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: _____

7. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with
other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, explain briefly: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)**B. ESTIMATED COSTS** *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? \$ _____

a. Initial costs for a small business: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____

b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____

c. Initial costs for an individual: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____

d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: _____

2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: _____

3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements.
Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted. \$ _____4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: \$ _____

Number of units: _____

5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: _____

Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: \$ _____

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS *Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.*

1. Briefly summarize the benefits of the regulation, which may include among others, the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety and the State's environment: _____

2. Are the benefits the result of: ☐ specific statutory requirements, or ☐ goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?

Explain: _____

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? \$ _____

4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California that would result from this regulation: _____

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.*

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

Regulation: Benefit: \$ _____ Cost: \$ _____

Alternative 1: Benefit: \$ _____ Cost: \$ _____

Alternative 2: Benefit: \$ _____ Cost: \$ _____

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: _____

4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Explain: _____

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.****California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) boards, offices and departments are required to submit the following (per Health and Safety Code section 57005). Otherwise, skip to E4.***1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises **exceed \$10 million**? ☐ YES ☐ NO***If YES, complete E2. and E3******If NO, skip to E4***

2. Briefly describe each alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1: _____

Alternative 2: _____

(Attach additional pages for other alternatives)

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

Regulation: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 1: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 2: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

4. Will the regulation subject to OAL review have an estimated economic impact to business enterprises and individuals located in or doing business in California exceeding \$50 million in any 12-month period between the date the major regulation is estimated to be filed with the Secretary of State through 12 months after the major regulation is estimated to be fully implemented?

☐ YES ☐ NO*If YES, agencies are required to submit a [Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment \(SRIA\)](#) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c) and to include the SRIA in the Initial Statement of Reasons.*

5. Briefly describe the following:

The increase or decrease of investment in the State: _____

The incentive for innovation in products, materials or processes: _____

The benefits of the regulations, including, but not limited to, benefits to the health, safety, and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment and quality of life, among any other benefits identified by the agency: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT**A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT** *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*

- ☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
(Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

\$ _____

- ☐ a. Funding provided in _____

Budget Act of _____ or Chapter _____, Statutes of _____

- ☐ b. Funding will be requested in the Governor's Budget Act of _____

Fiscal Year: _____

- ☐ 2. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are NOT reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
(Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

\$ _____

Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimbursable and provide the appropriate information:

- ☐ a. Implements the Federal mandate contained in _____

- ☐ b. Implements the court mandate set forth by the _____ Court.

Case of: _____ vs. _____

- ☐ c. Implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. _____

Date of Election: _____

- ☐ d. Issued only in response to a specific request from affected local entity(s).

Local entity(s) affected: _____

- ☐ e. Will be fully financed from the fees, revenue, etc. from: _____

Authorized by Section: _____ of the _____ Code;

- ☐ f. Provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each;

- ☐ g. Creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in _____

- ☐ 3. Annual Savings. (approximate)

\$ _____

- ☐ 4. No additional costs or savings. This regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

- ☒ 5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

- ☐ 6. Other. Explain _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)**B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT** *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

It is anticipated that State agencies will:☐ a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.☐ b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for the _____ Fiscal Year☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program.☐ 4. Other. Explain _____
_____**C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS** *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.☐ 4. Other. Explain _____

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE

DATE

*The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or departments not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.*

AGENCY SECRETARY

DATE

*Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD. 399.*

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER

DATE



STD. 399 Addendum

90-Day Extension of Emergency Action to Amend Sections 28.06 and 28.65 Title 14, California Code of Regulations Re: Recreational Gear Restrictions for White Shark

Background

White shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) is an important apex predator in the marine ecosystem and are protected under state and federal fishing regulations. There have been several recent incidents involving pier and beach anglers either intentionally targeting white sharks or accidentally hooking them with very heavy fishing gear. These incidents have resulted in the death of at least three white sharks this year. Additionally, in 2014, a swimmer was bitten by a white shark that had been hooked by a pier angler.

This year, a forecasted strong El Niño oceanic event is anticipated to increase the presence of white sharks in California coastal waters, which will increase their availability to anglers and the potential for human interactions with hooked sharks. Young white sharks are already being observed in significantly higher numbers in southern California. Because of this, there is an immediate need to curtail illegal targeted fishing for white sharks, help ensure accidentally hooked sharks are released alive, and help prevent another incident where a hooked shark bites a swimmer or the heavy gear used to catch such sharks entangles a person in the water.

The proposed 90-day extension (re-adoption) of these regulations would continue to require that white sharks be released immediately if taken, and would prohibit removing white sharks from the water. This is necessary to help increase the ability for white sharks to survive after incidentally being hooked and to prevent injuries to people attempting to place white sharks back into the water after removal.

Additionally, the proposed regulations would prohibit the use of wire or metallic lines or leaders and hooks larger than one inch in maximum inside measurement when fishing south of Pigeon Point (San Mateo County) from the shoreline (including beaches, banks, piers, jetties, breakwaters, docks, and other man-made structures connected to the shore) or within 1,000 yards of the mean high tide line. This is necessary to better protect white sharks from illegal targeting, allow incidentally hooked white sharks to break free from the line, and prevent sharks from being released with trailing wires that can entangle the shark after release. This would also help protect people who are swimming, surfing, or engaged in other water sports from being harmed by a hooked shark or a wire leader attached to one.

The readoption or the emergency regulations are needed because of the strong El Niño event, warm water temperatures are expected to remain longer than normal this year and white shark aggregations and beach use are expected be higher than normal during the winter months.

Economic Impact Statement

Section A. Estimated Private Sector Cost Impacts

Question 1. Answer: h. None of the above.

Emergency regulations do not require an economic impact statement; only fiscal impacts must be evaluated (California Government Code Section 11346.1).

From: Thomas Boctor

Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 10:11 AM

To: FGC@FGC

Subject: Oppose Proposed Emergency Gear Restrictions for White Sharks

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the emergency regulations regarding finfish fishing gear restrictions (Amend Sections 28.06 and 28.65). While I understand the Commission's intent to protect white sharks, this broad prohibition on wire leaders and hooks over 1.5 inches creates an unworkable blanket ban.

This regulation disproportionately punishes law-abiding, local anglers who target other legal shark species such as leopard, soupfin, thresher, and mako sharks. Restricting tackle to monofilament and smaller hooks effectively eliminates shore bound and nearshore shark angling entirely, without addressing the few individuals illegally targeting white sharks. Instead of a blanket gear ban, I urge the Commission to rely on the enforcement of existing fishing laws rather than punishing everyday anglers.

Sincerely,
Thomas Boctor

