

Appendix O. Comments Received and Response to Comments

Comment A: Alan M. Grant; September 25, 2001

The listing of nudibranchs in Appendix D is incomplete and should include many other species. These species should be included in any list of important marine species worth preserving.

Response A: Appendix D is a list of marine fisheries managed by the state and includes all species for which there has been take or harvest (past or present). This list does not include all species found in California waters, or attempt to address the incredible biodiversity of our marine species and their preservation. We recognize the incredible diversity of nudibranchs but list only four that have regulations regarding their take for aquaria purposes; it is illegal to take all other nudibranchs.

Comment B: Bob Osborne; United Anglers of southern California; August 24, 2001

The issue of allocation should be addressed in the Marine Life Management Act Master Plan as this would provide direction and consistency between all fishery management plans.

Response B: The Master Plan has addressed allocation by identifying the issue and suggesting a framework be developed to provide guidance. This framework would involve extensive public consultation and involvement of an ad hoc committee to address the issues and develop potential policy options for the Commission. The Commission would decide whether an allocation policy would be placed in the Master Plan or reside as a separate document.

Comment C: Chris Miller; Lobster Fisherman; October 8, 2001

1)The list of collaborators in the section on ecosystem management and habitat considerations (2.5.5) should include fisheries scientists, resource economists, and ocean monitoring experts.

2)"...this section on ecosystem management needs some mention of the need for a holistic goal and an assessment of the goals being applied to method and practice."

3)The draft seems to be perpetuating the dichotomy of ecosystem management and fishery management. The current approach is fragmented and lacking in its vision for our future.

4)To the end of a more defined goal of sustainable fisheries that are ecosystem based, It is critical that fishermen embrace a fundamental concept of building a framework for professionalism in their trade that needs to be brought to and integrated into the master plan.

Response C: 1)The Master Plan mentions the need for collaboration with marine and ecological scientists and other interested persons. Although not mentioning them by name, this includes fishery scientists, resource economists, ocean monitoring experts, and any other interested persons.

2)The Master Plan mentions the need to establish ecosystem guidelines for inclusion in FMPs. These guidelines would naturally have defined goals with methods to assess their success. This is a very important area that requires considerable public input and the establishment of an advisory committee. As soon as these guidelines are developed, they will be incorporated into the Master Plan and FMPs.

3)The Master Plan's intention was to point out that the DFG is committed to ecosystem management, and is striving to achieve this. However, this is a long-term process that will require substantially more public input and collaboration with ecosystem experts. At present, there is still much needed information on individual species for fishery management that would also be useful for ecosystem management.

4)We agree. Fishermen need to participate considerably in the establishment of ecosystem management goals and the guidelines to be included in future versions of the Master Plan and FMPs.